B.P.C.L. in the country's development and the future of the employees working in it.

(v) Need to include Tileibani Block in Deogarh District of Orissa in the Tribal Development Agencies Programme

[English]

SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI (Deogarh): Tileibani block in the Deogarh District Orissa is very backward area. The percentage of tribal people in this block is also very high. But it is a matter of ragret that although the adjacent blocks under similar situation have been declared as Tribal Development Agency Blocks, this block does not get such benefits resulting in discontentment among the people.

I would therefore, request the Union Government to include this Tileibani Block under the Tribal Development Agency Programme forthwith. This would pave the way for the development of this neglected area which has a predominant tribal population.

(vi) Need to Provide Alternative Land to Tharu Tribals Displaced from Forest Land Under Dudua National Park in U.P.

DR. G.L. KANAUJIA (Kheri): Tharu Tribals settled in forests since centuries now falling under Dudua National Part are being evicted. The Forest Act was passed after 1972, whereas they have been dwelling there since long and are presently living together in 22 Gram Panchayats. The dwellers of one Gram Panchayat Golbuji, located near Bela Parasua lying in the heart of the Dudua National Park are being evicted by force. I request the Government to provide alternative land to these Tharu tribals with minimum permissible housing loans in case of eviction so that they may not be left homeless and helpless.

14.35 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: DISAPPROVAL OF THE SPECIAL PROTECTION GROUP (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE; AND SPECIAL PROTECTION GROUP (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL

[Translation]

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT (Ajmer): Sir, I beg to move:

> "That this House disapproves of the Special Protection Group (Amendment) Ordinance, 1994 (No. 12 of 1994) promulgated by the President on 16th November, 1994."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, ours is the largest democracy of the world. In a democratic country. The Parliament has its own significant place. Any important amendment of this kind or a modification in an Act should be brought about through Parliament. It has been disussed many a times. But the present Government holding reins of the country is continually deminishing the significance of the Parliament. If the amendment was so important, it could have been brought on 25th August when the last session of Parliament concluded. Such amendment could have been effected earlier if they had any little concern for their leaders or for the family of the late Prime Minister. This Government does not take timely steps despite our criticism and banks upon the ordinance, puts before the Parliament amended Acts for getting them passed after the time has elapsed. I highly condemn this tendency of the Government.

Our Constitution makers and great men of this democracy like Mavalankarji and Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru said that an ordinance should be brought only when it has become legally imperative in a state or when a situation of emergency has arisen or when it has become necessary in view of some urgency. Otherwise, the Government should use its farsight and effect amendment in such laws beforehand wherever necessary. But for some time now, the people holding the reins of power have been devaluating the Parliament and other Constitutional institutions. Announcement of important decisions is made outside Parliament or an ordinance issued through then hon. President and then that thing comes in the Parliament later. Then the Government expresses its compulsions. Sir, through you, I condemn this tendency of the Government to bring in Ordinances.

Secondly, it was not so important. The reason mentioned in it that the five year term of security of Sonia ji and her family was about to expire and it was necessary to enhance it for ten years. He was aware of it on 25th August as well. The hon. Home Minister is present here who while constituting S.P.G. which was meant to give security cover to all V.V.I.Ps. including the present and the former Prime Ministers and their families, should have been apprised of the expiry of period by his I.G. or D.I.G. or even his Home Secretary and while the session was on it should have been brought before the Parliament. But it was not done. This term was to expire on Dec. 1 and the session was to start on December 7. So, this Government brought the ordinance first. It is a wrong tendency and it deminishes the Parliamentary authority. This should not happen. Farsight should have been used in this case.

Thirdly, I would like to ask whether the spirit and objectives behind the Act under which SPG was constituted in 1988 are being achieved? It is published in the newspapers that our former Prime Minister Shri Vishwa Nath Pratap Singh is thinking of moving the High Court in this connection, because the SPG Security cover has created a problem for him. He is fed up of their escort like one's shadow. The Government should think over it also. The Government wants to protect the Prime Minister, the former Prime Ministers and VVIPs. During last Lok Sabha elections, our former Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi had gone to Sriperumbudur in South India for campaigning. He died there in a bomb blast. Verma Commission and Jain Commission were constituted to look into the lacunae and lapses on the part of Government or anybody else in it. We have received some of their reports and the work is on for the rest.

But it is yet to be known as to what was the laxity on the part of the Government. Parliament should be informed about it.

Our former President is struggling for life in PGI, Chandigarh. He also met an accident. The car carrying the security guards sped ahead of Gyaniji's car and a truck hit his car from behind and this is how this accident took

place. What the S.P.G. people were doing there? Several hon. Members have expressed their anxiety over this incident. But the Government has not so far given any information to the Parliament and the people as to how this happened. Was it a mere accident or a conspiracy? At times newitems appear the staff and officers of SGP that someone triggered the gun under aspell of liquor. Security guards fired with their guns in the back side of Prime Minister's residence or smoke gathered due to some other arm. These people are given special training and all the time they remain with political leaders even then such incidents take place and SPG personnel are often criticized. I would like to make a submission that while making amendments in the Act, these points should be considered.

Personnel of Paramilitary forces like BSF, CRPF, CISF, ITBP and SPG., should also be given training in the latest technology and arms, and they should be armed with latest weaponery too. These days we see that terrorists have sophisticated arms and they can explode bombs at any place and at any time with the help of remote control. I would like to say that in view of this our paramilitary forces should be given a matching training.

I would like to say that the objectives behind setting up SPG could not be achieved as effectively and successfully as was expected from this group. It was reported by the newspapers that during the last elections hon. Prime Minister visited southern states and lapses were found in his security arrangements. I would like to say that attention should be given towards deployment of SPG for the various categories of V.I.Ps. Members have expressed anxiety over this issue time and again. A Member faces several protests when he visits his constituency. People have a feeling of insecurity that when there are lapses in the security of Prime Minister or the former Prime Minister what will be the plight of common man in the country. Terrorists are killing innocent persons. Recently a bus was bombed in Jammu and several such incidents took place in Punjab in the past. There had been improvement in situation but still there is fear among common man. Terrorism is increasing in Nagaland, Manipur and Tamil Nadu also. In such condition while making deployment of SPG for various categories of VIPs it should be taken care of as to what type of security should be provided to a particular category. Whom this security will be given on request. I would like to know whether any such application has been received from '10-Janpath'. I would like to know whether the Government is worried for the family of Prime Minister only or for the family of former Minister also. The Government should also think about the lives of common man, and their representatives because life of every person is precious and Government is constitutionally bound to protect the life of common man. Only framing a law cannot be solution of this problem.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, as you know that former Prime Ministers late Pt. Jawarharlal Nehru and Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri used to meet frequently with common people and at that time there was on provision to stop them. But today when a person wants to meet Prime Minister to tell his or her problems SPG people stop him. They misbehave with them. They do not have any information about the persons who have taken appointment to meet the Prime Minister. I would like to say that common man should be allowed to tell his woes and problems to the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker Sir, through you I would like to say that practice of bringing such ordinance is undemocratic and unconstitutional and it should be condemned. Government should avoid such practice. I would like to say that the Government should enact a law directly through Parliament for maintaining the dignity and importance of Parliament and for effective implementation of the powers conferred by the Constitution. It is not good for democracy that an ordinance is brought first and later endorsed by the Parliament. There are some problems regarding the training, rights and facilities given to soldiers trained under SPG. Sometime people from villages face these problems. They are imparted training at Manesar. I, therefore request the Minister of Home Affairs that their problems should be solved. Discipline requires that they cannot say anything to high officials. Sometimes their relatives and family members come to meet them and were told that they were on duty for 24 hours. We should think about the welfare of their family when they are killed while protecting VIPs. We should think about the employment and facilities for their family members. Sir, through you I would like to know whether Smt. Sonia Gandhi has asked to extend the security arrangements for her family which was earlier meant for five years. Sir, through you I would like to say that people from your party raise slogans and demand for her presence at stage during congress meetings. At times it so happens that during Prime Minister's speech some leaders gather around Soniaji and start singing in her eulogy. Such situation require special caution that miscreants might hurt her or members of her family in disguise of party workers. Better your organisation thinks about it from the point of view of discipline in your Party. With these words I oppose this ordinance.

[*English*]

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S.B. CHAVAN): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move:*

> "the Bill further to amend the Special Protection Group Act, 1988 be taken into consideration."

Hon. Deputy Speaker, I propose that the August House may take into consideration the Special Protection Group Amendment Bill, 1994. The Special Protection Group Act, 1988 was enacted to constitute and regulate the functioning of the Special Protection Group which was made responsible for providing proximate security to the Prime Minister and his immediate family members only. With the amendment of the said Act in 1991, the SPG's proximate security cover got extended to former Prime Ministers and their immediate family members also for a period of five years from the date of former Prime Ministers ceased to be the Prime Minister. The SPG is at present providng security to the family of late Shri Rajiv Gandhi, former Prime Minister of India, Shri V.P. Singh and Shri Chandra Sekhar and members of their immediate families.

In accordance with the existing provisions of the Act, the family of late Shri Rajiv Gandhi seems to be entitled for protection by SPG with effect from 1.12.1994, while in the

*Moved with the recommendation of the Pesident.

case of Shri V.P. Singh and Shri Chandra Sekhar the security cover ceases from 9.11.1995 and 20.6.1996 respectively. While replying to a starred question in Rajya Sabha on 15.6.1994 seeking information as to whether the SPG protection provided to Smt. Sonia Gandhi would be extended for another five years, I assured the House that the Government proposes to extend this period and provide SGP cover even after the initial period of five years for the family members of late lamented leader Shri Rajiv Gandhi.

In accordance with the amended provisions of the SPG Act, 1988, the family of late Shri Rajiv Gandhi, namely Smt. Sonia Gandhi and her two children were entitled to SPG cover upto 1st December, 1994 because Shri Rajiv Gandhi demited the office of Prime Minister on 2.12.1989. The Government has in the meanwhile reassessed the threat perception to Smt. Sonia Gandhi and her children and has come to the conclusion that it is essential to continue to provide proximate security cover of the SGP to them for a further period of five years. The Government also feels it necessary to extend provisions of the proximate security coverage of SPG to other members of former Prime Ministers and members of the immediate family for a similar period of five years.

As Parliament was not in Session and the above-mentioned Amendment was required to be carried out before first of December, 1994, the President was requested to promulgate the Special Protection Group Amendment Ordinance, 1994 which was issued on 16th of November, 1994. The proposed Amendment would necessitate some extra man-power and other equipments, facilities etc for SPG which is estimated to cost around Rs. 34.10 crore per annum and this expenditure will be met from the Consolidated Fund of India.

The Bill seeks to achieve the above objects. I request this august House to take into consideration the Special Protection Group (Second Amendment) Bill, 1994.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Item Nos. 12 and 13 will be taken together and the time allotted to this subject is three hours.

Motions moved:

"That this House disapproves of the Special Protection Group (Amendment) Ordinance, 1994 (No. 12 of 1994) promulgated by the President on November 16, 1994."

"That the Bill further to amend the Special Protection Group Act, 1988, be taken into consideration."

[Translation]

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI (Garhwal): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, just now Shri Rasa Singh Ji Rawat has expressed his views to bring an ordinance on this issue. The hon. Minister has told about the reasons to bring this ordinance. Since the session of the Parliament was not going on and its period was also coming to an end on Ist. The hon. Minister has said himself that he was reminded in August and he had said that the security provided to Shrimati Sonia Gandhi was likely to be extended. The Government has been flayed down so many times in the House even then the ordinances are brought time and again. Not only today, but the veteran leaders have also said that the House should not be insulted in this way. You say that there was no winter session but what had happened in the Monsoon session. It is a small task of one or two pages, no big research was to be done in this regard and it was not such a task for which you had no time. Your logic that the session of the Parliament was not there, is invalid. My submission to the hon. Minister is that the Ministry of Hom Affairs was sleeping otherwise there is no reason that this small Bill could not have been brought earlier. Therefore, it will be good if your Ministry admits the mistake.

Secondly, I would like to say that as per the threat assessment Shrimati Sonia Gandhi and her family is being given special security. I am not criticising your assessment but both you and the Home Ministry know that today security has become a status symbol. Everyone wants to have one dozen of cars and black dressed persons around him. Have you pondered over it? Security is must but is it necessary to set up a new organisation for the security? Why cannot the organisation, you have, do such work? You need a separate organisation for the Prime Minister and the former Prime Minister. Recently, there was a doubt that the former President was attacked. Will you set up a separate security force for it? This tendency is not good, you should find a solution to it.

14.57 hours

[SHRIMATI SANTOSH CHOWDHARY in the Chair]

We have dozens of paramilitary forces.

[English]

Plethora of paramilitary forces have been created in this country for no reason at all...

[Translation]

You should rationalise them. You create a new organisation on a little pretext. It is a wrong tendency. By doing so, you are creating gap between the present organisations and are spending the money of the country for nothing. You should think over it if there can be no common organisations? Why separate organisations are created for the Prime Minister and the former Prime Minister? Today the number of the security forces is so large that none can dare to reduce their number.

I had raised the question regarding the persons covered under 'Z' category security cover and the amount spent on these but even that information was not given in the name of secrecy. We cannot know what is going on. Such type of tendency is totally wrong and it misleads the country and leads to the misuse of the country's money.

15.00 hours

Therefore my submission to the hon. Minister is that it should be pondered over separately. Do not treat it as an individual or party issue and particular people who have their vested interest in it. According to the threat assessment, which is done by you, if a person gets 'Z' category security, he does not want to leave it. Therefore, I would like to know about the number of those persons whom the 'Z' category security was given and later on

after the threat assessment their security cover was reduced. How long will it go? So long as you will not take stern action, such bungling will go on. It should not be like that, if any officer retires, he is absorbed in the Special Protection Force on account of the kindness of the Home Ministry. One can have one or two S.P.G. vehicles outside his bungalow but the crores of rupees of the country which is being ruined can be saved. At least think over it. Since we can see that the security people are working in your farms. The vehicle is parked in their farms.

[English]

Please take an overall view on this very sensitive issue and come out with some useful and justifiable conclusion.

[Translation]

The question regarding Shri V.P. Singh ji has been raised. He has said that he does not need the security. We would like to know about your decision regarding his security arrangement. What reply you have given to him. You should inform him and the people about the threat assessment regarding him. The people must know about it. On one hand he is denying it and on the other hand it is being provided to him. It creates doubt in the minds of the people since he is denying for it and you are providing it to him. Their doubt is right since it seems that the security is being provided to him to have the information about those who come to meet him. This doubt is coming up in the country about you in the name of the security. When he does not need the security, it should be withdrawn.

Regarding expenses, you have said that rupees 34 crore are being spent. How it is being spent? Please tell whether equal amount is being spent on the families of three persons or it is different on these three if it is different then how much is being spent on each? What is the amount of administrative expenditure. When you know that security is to be deployed for their safety then this Bill should have been brought for one year. Why have you brought it for full five years? Have you already done the threat assessment for them for five years? It is not a wise step to bring this Bill for five years at a time. My suggestion is that every year the threat assessment should be done and they should be given security accordingly. Why do you want to have blank cheque for five years? What is you compulsion?

Mr. Chairman, I am sternly against this tendency of the Government and my submission through you is that since now the ordinance has been moved therefore this Bill should be passed this time but I sternly oppose this tendency since you are misusing the majority of the Parliament. It is not right. My submission is that the full details of the security cover expenses should be given. You have merely stated about the expenses on three persons only.

Sir, please give the detailed analysis of the total expenditure on each party and each person. This security cover is concerned with each party and not with the Congress Party only. It should be withdrawn forcibly from those to whom you have provided the security. The Government of India is not donating the security cover up to all and sundry. If they feel the need then they should make their own arrangement of security. If you think they do not need it then it should be withdrawn. Therefore the threat assessment should be done seriously and honestly and those who do not need the security cover up in reality, it should be withdrawn from them.

Therefore, I oppose this Bill.

[English]

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): Madan Chairperson, I rise to oppose the Bill.

Madam, the point has been made about the misuse of the Ordinance making power of the Executive. I think, that point has been made so often that I dare say that the Government like an alcoholic is addicted to Ordinance making. We are living under 'Ordinance Raj'. And I see no sign of the hon. Minister taking note of this over voiced complaint in the House about the impropriety of using this power at any time. In fact, in this case it is absolutely clear that if necessary this Bill could have been brought before the Monsoon Session.

Madam, I feel that the Government is not sharing its thinking. It is its assessment that it talks about, its threat perception and its assessment of the threat. Well, just now the hon. Minister told us that for the next five years all these three persons and their families are under a certain level of threat. It is obvious that there cannot be any equality in this respect. and if you are projecting yourself for five years then in respect of all the three families, obviously the assessment is not being done seriously. That is why, I fully support the suggestion made by the previous speaker, Gen. Khanduri, who just preceded me, that this assessment must be made from year to year. And, in fact, I would suggest that perhaps this could be written into the law. Otherwise, after five years, you would again come back to the House. This can be made a part of the original Act, as a amendment, their once a threat perception arises, then for certain categories of people, their assessment shall be made from year to year and subject to their request, subject to their concurrence, the security cover shall be provided. And that will give them enough power. So, they never have to come back to the House again. So, this sort of a formulation perhaps would be much more desirable than bringing a Bill merely to extend the period of cover in particular cases for five years or six years at a time. I think, it does not make legislative sense. I think, the Government should have that power. I fully concede that. But this power should be for an annual assessment, an annual review and concurrence of the recipient of the security cover. And that brings me to the case of Shri V.P. Singh. We would only like to know what is happening. Shri V.P. Singh does not desire the security cover which has been forced on him. If the Government have any information which Shri V.P. Singh does not have, it is the Government's duty to share that with Shri V.P. singh and to convince him that it is in his interest that he should accept the security cover. Otherwise, surely Shri V.P. Singh is more conscious about the expenditure being incurred uselessly quite apart from the constraints it might have, in fact, imposed on his movements. Now we know that the security cover is not a panacea. We have not been

able to protect Mahatma Gandhi; we have not been able to protect Indira Gandhi and we have not been able to protect Rajiv Gandhi. And I personally believe that when the time comes, no security cover can protect anybody. Of course, the Government have to do their duty. But perhaps, one has to go into this that if you spread the cover very wide, then you cannot be effective. So, just to make that cover effective, you have got to keep it under constant review. The moment you are spreading your effort, you are not likely to be effective. That is one other point that I would like to make to you.

The third is that these Black Cats have really become a sort of a symbol of prestige, a status symbol. I am rather shocked to know that the cost is as much as Rs. 34 crore just for three families. In fact not for three families but perhaps for one family and two individuals. I understand that at one point the security cover was provided for Shri Rajiv Gandhi's widow, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi , and her children.

Now, the children will reach a certain age and will perhaps be on their own. Shrimati Sonia Gandhi perhaps may be provided cover for life. Is the cover for life going to be provided to the children as well or perhaps to their children ad infinitum. Is that the thinking of the Government? The Government should be more rational in this regard that if the children reach a certain age, and if they are on their own and if they are settled in their life, then they can be separated from the grand plan or the grand scheme. Therefore, assessment from that angle must be carried out so that the and cost to the exchequer can be brought down.

Now, we have the case of Shri V.P. Singh. But we do not know whether in the case of Shrimati Sonia Gandhi the Government have received any request from the family or whether at least the Government have obtained their concurrence. We have no information at all from them in this regard. We think that the Government have not really done their home work and the Government have not applied their mind seriously to the question. They have just come with the formal Bill. Suddenly they woke up and realised that it was going to expire on 1st December. So, naturally, they had promulgated this Ordinance and now we have been forced into a situation where perhaps the House will not have any other option but to agree to what the Government propose. I think the Government should take the House into confidence and should do their home work in advance and as has been suggested here make it a point that it should be done from year to year. This Bill even if it is passed by the House, does not give the Government the mandate to extend the security cover whether it is required or otherwise and whether it is requested or otherwise for the next five years. That will not be a correct way of spending public money.

With these words, I oppose this Bill that is before us.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA (Jadavpur): Madam, Chairperson, we are not objecting to this Bill because we think that it is the Government's responsibility to protect politicians as well as ordinary citizens who are under the threat of their lives. Shrimati Sonia Gandhi and her family as well as the two other former Prime Ministers also happen to be citizens of India. The question, of course, is whether they want this protection or not. This is a point which has been made by other Members, I think, this question certainly has to be raised before the protaction has to be extended. If the Government feels that Shrimati Sonia Gandhi and her family can be protected simply by extending the SPG Act for another five years, we are not going to stand in the way even if it requires Rs. 34 crore annually in our poor country.

Further the point that I want to make is that you cannot prevent terrorism simply by providing protection for a few selected individuals. You have to strike at the root of terrorism and whether this is being done that is the moot question Madam Chairperson and I think that the Government will have to look deep into its heart and ask itself this question. I am asking this question precisely because the assassination of Shri Rajiv Gandhi was a heinous act and it had a deep and widespread nexus. Is not it strange that in spite of two Commissions which were set up, not much progress has been made in uncovering this nexus. In fact, has not the Chairperson of one of the Commissions been quoted in the newspapers as saying that he is not getting adequate help from the Government, that he is not getting the data that he is requiring for the enquiry? So, I would like to ask whether this failure on the part of the Government to uncover the mystery of the heinous assassination of Shri Rajiv Gandhi is not going to encourage acts of terrorism.

So, on the one hand, the Government is unable to unfold this mystery and, on the other hand, it goes on extending the SPG Act. I think there is some irrationality in the whole proceedings.

It is not only the very important persons who require protection from terrorism, ordinary citizens also require protection. Of course, it cannot be done by SPG Act. It would be impossible to do so. But it can be done in other ways. But what do we find? We find that the Government has been continuing with TADA, also on the plea that this will discourage terrorist activities. But for the last few years, TADA has been known more by its abuse than by its ability to prevent terrorist activities. TADA has not done anything to prevent terrorist activities at all. On the other hand, we are getting frequent complaints of harassment and torture of ordinary citizens in the name of TADA who come not only from Punjab or from Kashmir but also from the minorities in States like Maharashtra and also other States. Therefore, my contention is that while taking a very close look at this SPG Act, we should see whether to extend it for five years at a go or to renew it year by year, as Shahabuddin Ji has suggested. At the same time, the Government must also take adequate measures to ensure protection from police and army excesses that are being committed in different parts of the country upon ordinary citizens who are not any less citizens on that account. They also have their right to safety. Also, at the same time, political incitement to separatist forces, which has often been the root cause behind the development of terrorist activities, must be stopped and ordinary people must be ensured protection from excesses of police and army, which are the complaints that we are getting from different States. This must be looked into right now and if these

complaints are true, then the persons responsible must be given exemplary punishments because they are not less guilty than the terrorists themselves. People who have the law in their own hands and who abuse this law are not less guilty, for they are committing acts similar to what the terrorists are doing. The terrorists are terrorising the ordinary people but if the police and the army also do the same thing, then certainly they are not doing their responsibility. If such measures are taken side by side with this kind of special protection for certain selected individuals, only then can people accept the logic of security coverage for a number of selected individuals.

With these comments, Madam, I thank you very much and I conclude.

SHRI YAIMA SINGH YUMNAM (Inner Manipur): Madam Chairperson, I thank you for giving me this opportunity.

Madam, in spirit, I rise to support the Bill which proposes the amendment of the SPG Act, 1991. It proposes to extend the period from five years to ten years. So, in spirit, I agree with it and I am agreeable to support the Bill.

However, as the other hon. Members have pointed out, I would also like to point out that there are certain persons who require such protection in the insurgency-prone areas, particularly in the State of Manipur. I would like to give instances of the former Ministers, how they are intimidated by the terrorists, threatening their lives. There, even the ordinary persons' lives are also uncertain always. These insurgents can shoot any ordinary person if their demands are not met. So, there is uncertainty as regards the security of these ordinary persons in the State of Manipur.

As regards the former Ministers and MLAs, very recently, one Ex-Minister was shot at point blank by two or three armed persons at his residence in broad daylight. Likewise, so many former Ministers are under threat. They cannot move freely. For instance, one Shri Manihar Singh and another Shri O-Joy Singh, who were Ministers belonging to my party, are under threat. I raised this issue in this House also. Our hon. Home Minister had assured for providing security to them but up-till now, no security has been provided to them. I have received a letter from the hon. Home Minister mentioning that the Government is being asked to provide security to them. But I myself met the Chief Secretary of the State and even the Governor of Manipur also. But the said that they were unable to provide security because they are short of security personnel. Not only this, I myself am under threat now. In Manipur, some armed youths entered my house and they asked something from me. I think they might have been satisfied with my reply, so, they did not do any harm to me. But still I feel insecured because in Manipur, this is the position. Even for myself, when I disclose all these things, I do not know how far I shall be safe again. So, this is the situation prevailing in the State of Manipur. What to talk of other Ministers, even the Chief Minister is not free.

So, while supporting this Amendment Bill, as the other hon. Members have pointed out, I would also like to point out that the Government is bound by moral obligation to protect these people and even the ordinary people. I support this view very much.

Madam, now coming to the amendment, it is for replacing "five years" by "ten years" and the financial involvement is Rs. 34 crore annually. It is a big expenditure but still it is considered unavoidable. I would like to propose that if the scale of security for the former Prime Ministers and their immediate family members can be scaled down a little, then this big sum can be reduced a little, If this fund of Rs. 34 crore could be made available to the small States like Manipur or Tripura, etc. it could be a very good contribution.

With these observations, I heartly support the Bill.

[Translation]

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Madhubani): Sir, there are many complications in this amendment Bill, I do not wish to support this Bill but at the same time I do not have courage to oppose it because in it a question of someone's life is involved and keeping in view our past experiences, it will not be right to take any risk in this regard. However, due protection is not being provided. The case of the assassination of former Prime Minister late Shri Rajiv Gandhi is under investigation, it is, therefore, not correct to go into its details. Several things pointing towards negligence have come to notice. This negligence took place in spite of the officer's report. I do not believe that any Government would like that its Prime Minister may die or may be killed. But negligence did take place.

Our friend Shri Syed Shahabuddin has rightly said that there should be some time limit for the security arrangements of Smt. Sonia Gandhi and her children. If this time limit is not fixed then tomorrow a new family can come under the provisions of the Bill because this practice is not confined to their security only. As has happened in the case of two ex-Chief Minister of Bihar who have been given life long security cover. I do not know whether this practice will spread to other states or not. I want that this should not happen. Even those Members of Parliament who have been elected for the first time, are having armed guards with them. I do not know as to how many people know that I have been attacked several times in my 60 years of political life. I am not sure, if somebody wants kill me then any body guard would be able to save me. Even President Kennedy could not be saved.

In 1940, I had told Gandhiji in Karachi Conference that his wish of meeting the same death as of Ganesh Shankar Vidhyarathi in 1931 would not be fulfilled. On this, he had asked me as to why it would not be? I told him that as he was a Mahatma and a vegeterian, nobody would like to kill him. I was released from the jail on 15th August and was arrested again on 22nd August, I came to know there that Gandhiji was assassinated in front of his followers in a V.V.I.P. area. A saint who always used to say 'Iswar Aallaha Tere Nam, Sabko Sanmati De Bhagwan' got this type of death and our country was divided in the name of 'aallaha'. Today, tendency is gaining ground in former Members of Parliament and former legislators to keep security guards with them as a matter of prestige. So far I know there is no threat to most of them. But even today several Members of Parliament and Legislators take

guards alongwith them. When someone goes to them for taking signatures, then only he comes to know that they have also got this security facility. Thus it is not only a misuse of Government money but also misuse of our security. This affects the dignity of the country also. Therefore, all should think over it as to how this problem can be solved. In this Bill, provision has been made for the security the children also, but for how long you can make these arrangements? Who knows someone may commit murder on this point also. I feel that some time limit should also be fixed for the security of the children. Death is inevitable. It is bound to come. When Yaksha asked Yudhishter asto what is the biggest wonder in the world then Yudhishter replied—

> "Ahanyahani Bhutani Gachhantahi Yamalayam Shesha Sthavarmichhanti kimashchyamata Param"

which means, though people are dying everyday as death is inevitable, but still, those who are alive, take it for granted that they will live forever. This is the biggest wonder. The present day situation makes me worried. Though Shri V.P. Singh has also said that he does not want security, but if something happens to him, then who will be responsible. Because in our country people have freedom to say anything. In these circumstances, former leaders particularly former Members of Parliament and former legislators are strengthening this practice, of course this does not apply to children. But time limit should be fixed in this regard. That is why I have said that I do not wish to support this Bill but neither have I courage to oppose it. I am in a dilemma, but it is quite possible that they too may be in the same position there. It is, of course, a matter of great concern that this practice is increasing day by day. As in Bihar, two persons remained life long Chief Ministers. It is, therefore, my submission that time limit should be fixed for former Prime Ministers and their children because there could be some persons who might have had grudge against a Prime Minister and the same may continue for three-four years.

I also submit that such a protection should not be made available from birth itself and may not take the form of a right. Though this expenditure has to be borne by the country and not any individual, yet we will have to discourage this practice. Since many Government officials and officers of the army become the victims of terrorists, the list of people requiring protection may not become endless and thereafter, a situation may arise where instead of defending to the country we may remain busy in protecting those people who are the protectors of the country. Therefore, I would like to say that this practice should be restricted to some persons only and should not become a regular feature.

With these words I conclude.

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI (Darbhanga): Hon'ble Madam Chairman, just now Shri Jha was expressing his views. Same is my position. I can neither support it nor oppose it. So far the question of protection is concerned, I think that nobody should have any objection on this because it involves a question of life. Once again a Bill of 1988 has been brought before us The Financial involvement of Rs. 34.1 crore has been stated in the financial Memorandum. In this amount, expenditure on SPG is also included. Our former Prime Minister Shri Morarji Desai is also alive, who does not want SPG. SPG has been provided to the former Prime Minister, Shri Chandrashekhar but Shri V.P. Singhji has publicaly declared that he does not want SPG protection and has requested to remove it. In fact protection, is needed by every citizen but is needed more for the Prime Ministers. However, to other political leaders, former defence or administration personnel there are other ways to provide protection. After setting up of SPG need to cover former Prime Ministers and their family members was also felt. SPG should be provided to those persons whose life is in danger and it is the duty of the Government. But this Bill has been brought particularly for one person. Personally I have no objection to it. But whether it is necessary that such a protection to former Prime Minister is provided under SPG imbrella? Then, why it should not be provided to former Presidents, Defence Ministers and Home Ministers and their children? If protection has been provided to Shri V.P. Singh then it should be provided to his children also. The country is facing terrorism. Shri Jha has said that no one needs protection. But it is not so. Several Members of Parliament make complaints in the House. Many members give their complaints in writing to the Minister and I have also given him in writing. Today people are afraid of terrorists and other elements. Protection is necessary to commonman as well as to the political leaders and administrators. I would like to submit that you should go into the details as to how Smt. Indira Gandhi was assassinated and how Shri Rajiv Gandhi in spite of all the security arrangements was killed and how the Minister of Punjab was killed.

I understand that people are still being killed in-spite of protection given to them and this danger is still there. I want to state that there should be a uniform system for protection but I am opposed to this practice of giving protection to some particular person and family members of limited people by forming a Special Protection Group. As Shri Bhogendra Jha has stated here that while discussing the issue of protection, he referred to the former Chief Ministers of Bihar. I would like to point out here that it is not an issue of amenity, it is totally a different issue. Here the matter is very simple. The question is as to how to protect the lives of our former Prime Ministers, former Home Ministers, former Defence Ministers etc. My submission is that this should be analysed as to how we have been successful in thwarting the designs of terrorists to kill the persons enlisted in their hit-list by providing security to those dignitaries. There are a large number of persons killed by terrorists at Delhi. Is the Government going to save the lives of the families of the persons in the terrorists hit list through SPG or through any other measure. My submission is that the SPG has been set up for the protection of the lives of former Prime Ministers: We cannot oppose it now. But in future the Government should make provision for a uniform system for providing security to all. The wards and relatives of for Prime Ministers, former Presidents, former Home Ministers, Dewfence Ministes who worked at the sensitive posts should be

provided security. It should not be that as Shri Rajiv Gandhi belonged to a particular party, only his family members may enjoy such facilities. But such facilities should be given without any discrimination to other deserving persons as well.

Secondly, I would like to state that in the present scenario of the country, the Government should provide security not only to selective persons but also to other deserving persons so that the ever increasing goondaism and hooliganism in politics may be curbed. This facility should not be confined to the Prime Minister or to a particular former Prime Minister. I know many persons in the country who do not need even two police constables, but they have been provided Black Cats. The Government money is being wasted on them. The Government should review it in every six months or a year whether the level of security, the black cats or the S.P.Gs are essential for those persons or not. I would not like to name them but certain former Ministers in the Chandra Shekhar Cabinet have been provided black cats. As it has been mentioned here I also understand that some people are having their security just to overawe the society. I, therefore, want that only the deserving and genuine persons should be provided protection. Many MPs and MLAs have also made request in this regard. You might have received their applications. But I do not know whether you have paid attention to it. Today people seek the security facility just to overawe the society and they are virtually not in its need. There are so many such cases. Even the people involved in the Sikh-massacre in 1985 have been provided black cats. I do not mean to say that they should not be provided security. But the most point is that they are provided black cat for their security. This facility is provided first to the Prime Minister, then to his sons and thereafter his grand sons and so on. If this trend of irregularily continuies, the list of the beneficiaries of this facility will be very long. The provision of the security through SPG or other security provision should be brought under an organisation, and then the Government should accordingly provide security to Prime Minister, former Prime Minister or other officials or diplomats in a uniform way.

SHRI VIRENDRA SINGH (Mirzapur): Madam, Chairman, Sir, there is one reason for introducing the resolution on behalf of the Government for providing SPG for Prime Ministers or former Prime Ministers of the country. The Government has the greatest concern for the security of Shrimati Sonia Gandhi and her children. Has it been the similar case with the family of any other former Prime Minister, the Congress Party would never have bothered to ponder over it. But special arrangement has been necessitated for Shrimati Sonia Gandhi. I, therefore, understand that the provision of security for a particular family has been made deliberately to glorify the family. I admit that everybody should be provided security.

As regards former Prime Ministers, they must be provided special security. A former Prime Minister must be given special security because in his capacity as a then Prime Minister he has certain confidential documents and confidential information. In the present global scenario of escalating terrorism if a Prime Minister or a former Prime Minister is kidnapped for the want of adequate security arrangement, the confidential informaltion may reach the kinnappers.

Our former Prime Minister Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh is asking for withdrawal of his SPG because he does not need it. I do not hold it just. I hold that his security is in the interest of the nation. If such a person is abducted in the present scenario of escalating terrorism, the security of the country may be jeopardised.

Thus the abductors may mount pressure on such captives to reveal information regarding atomic energy, confidential documents etc. In such a situation, I think these responsible persons would like to reconsider their decision for the withdrawal of the security, because their audaeity and determination may be shaken in such torturous circumstances. I, therefore, oppose the Bill on security introduced in the august House. But Madam Chairman, I would like to point out one thing. Useless security arrangement should be withdrawn. Some persons have made this security as a symbol of their status. Thus such unwarranted security should be withdrawn so that the misuse of public funds may be checked.

Madam Chairman, I would like to submit here that during the journey of a former Minister along with his convoy of commandos public vehicles are interlated there. He had been a former hon. Member of this august House. I, therefore, understand that there is no harm in referring to his name. shri Subodh Kant Sahay is an ex Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs. He also has been provided such security facility. If a person like Shri Subodh Kant Sahay is necessitated such security facility, I would like to say that all the 90 crore people of the country should also be provided such security.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Madhubani): This security has certain benefit in that area.

SHRI VIRENDRA SINGH: Now I do not know what is its benefit. By providing security to such individuals, somehow or the other it is used to boost his political status. People are overawed and are under impression that he might be a political biging because he has been given such security. The provision for the security of such persons should be checked so that the public funds are not misused. This time I would like to refer especially to Shri Subodh Kant Sahay and there might be many other such persons in Bihar and Uttar Pradesh also who might be misusing the security provided to them. They might be exerting influence over innocent farmers and other rural people through the security on their provincial level. The hon. member Shri Tej Narayan Singh hails from Buxar. He has aptly pointed out that some persons might be perpetrating criminal deeds also on the basis of such security. It should be checked instantly.

Madam Chairman, this Bill has been introduced to provide security for a particular family by equipping it with S.P.G. The Government has introduced this bill with its parochial mentality. The Government should not have introduced it. This Government is becoming more and more narrow-minded. It has got very limited support. My submission is that the Government should not work with a mean-mind as this country cannot be run in the manner.

The people in power are considered to be large-

hearted. You are making arrangements for providing security to the family of the former Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi though it may include the former Prime Minister Shri Gulzari Lal Nanda or former Prime Minister Shri Morarji Desai but in fact this Bill is being especially brought for providing security to the family of the former Prime Minister late Shri Rajiv Gandhi, Such a proposal should not be introduced with a narrow-minded attitude. In fact a comprehensive Bill should have been brought. If a comprehensive Bill had been brought on behalf of the Government it would have been better for the country and the forthcoming generation.

Madam Chairman, through you I would like to urge upon the Government that those cases must be reviewed where security has been provided to people unnecessarily. All our Members of Parliament demand security. They give it in writing even then they do not get it and in this case security is being provided without making a demnd for it, verbal or written. The black cat commandes have been provided. They are upgrading their status and maintaining it. Their security has been tightened. A man in the street is forced to regret that you are misutilising public funds on these people by providing black cat commandoes. I urge upon you to check such misutilization of public funds. I feel that it would be in the interest of the nation.

The S.P.G. facility has been provided for the former Prime Ministers. It is undoubtedly essential as heads of the Governments they are in possession of confidential documents. In order that these documents are not leaked under terrorist set ups the S.P.G. facility should be provided to Shri Morarjibhai, Shri Gulzari Lal Nanda, Chandra Shekharji and Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh. The S.P.G. facility should be provided to Vishwanath Pratap Singh ji no matter how much resistance he puts up for its withdrawal. Our former Prime Ministers possess the knowledge of atomic energy and the withdrawal of S.P.G. way endanger the security of the nation. I request Shri Vishwanath Pratap ji to not to endanger the security of the nation to meet political ends. With these words I conclude my speech.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to whether they have taken any decision in regard to providing S.P.G. facility to Vishwanath Pratap Singh ji?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S.B. CHAVAN): I will mention in my speech the decisions taken in this regard.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE (Calcutta South): Madam Chairman, I support the Bill brought in regard to special protection Group. This is a very sensitive matter. We should consider it by rising above party politics. Rajiviji was killed due to security lapses. At the time when Shri Rajivji was not the Prime Minister, the then Cabinet secretary Shri Seshan had said that there was a danger to Rajivji's life, so, S.P.G. facility should be provided to him. At that time Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh had refused to provide it. Rajivji had to pay a very big price for it.

I support the Bill which has been presented to provide security to the family of Soniaji and former Prime Ministers. When a person becomes a Prime Minister he is given full respect. It is our duty also to make arrangements for their security. Not only in India, but also in Sri Lanka we saw how Shri Premadasa was also killed in a bomb blast.

V.P. Singhji has said that S.P.G. should be withdrawn from his house. But after the withdrawal of the security if some untoward incident takes place then the whole responsibility will fall on the Government. Earlier Punjab was affected by terrorism and people were faced with a constant danger from the terrorists, Jammu & Kashmir and Assam are also faced with terrorism. *(Interruptions)*

16.00 hrs.

No individual has political question attached to him. We never say anything for this. I support the amendments presented by the Government. This is also correct that some people misuse it. It should not be misused. It should be given a serious consideration. Any terrorist activity may not take place in our country. Our country is a democratic country. Our Asian region which includes countries like Pakistan, Bangla Desh, Srilanka and other countries is affected by terrorism and India is no exception to it. It is the duty of government to take care of the security system and remove all security risks. It is correct that it requires funds. Nothing happens without money. We have to take care of the families which have made sacrifices for our country and which have some value for our country. Rajivji is no more but his family lives so it is our duty to protect his family. It is the responsibility of our country. There are other former Prime Ministers also and I would like to make an appeal for them also.

SHRI VIRENDER SINGH: Madam Chairman, there are several families which have sacrificed for this country. There is the family of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. There is the family of Mahatma Gandhi ji and several others whose families have made sacrifices for this country. But the Government is not concerned about providing security to their families. I do not say that the security should not be provided to Sonia Gandhiji but what I want to say is that it should be equally provided to other deserving families also. It should be provided to all those families who have made sacrifices for this country. This Bill should be made more comprehensive. The security should be tightened for other people also. Jaiprakashji has also made sacrifices.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Virendra Singh ji, Please sit down.

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI: I would also like to know one thing. They have raised it here that protection should be provided to Sonia Gandhiji. We have no objection to that but there are several such families, politicians, etc. Whose family members have been killed by terrorists. There are so many officials who were killed by terrorists. Is the Government proposing to provide protection to their families or not? The other thing that I want to know should be replied by the Minister of Home Affairs that the Members of Parliament get police protection in their states but there are some people of the then Chandra Shekhar Ministry who are still being

provided protection. I would like to know from the Minister of Home Affairs as to what is the number of MPs who need security and who have also requested for it but they have not been provided any security till date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have expressed your views. You may now sit down. You have availed of your time.

KUMARI MAMTA BANERJEE: I am talking about the security arrangements for Sonia Gandhi because there is no party politics in it. Her life is in danger. She has made sacrifice for the country. I agree with you on this point. There are many persons in America whose families have made sacrifices for their country. You would agree with me that Indiraji had made sacrifice. I agree with you. You might be knowing that there are several such families in Indian Army who fought for the security of the country who sacrificed their lives for the country. They should also be provided security cover. There are so many persons for the security of whom I would like to make a request to Home Ministry. It becomes the duty of the Government to provide security cover to the families who have made sacrifices for the country but no Government can provide security to each and every family individually. But there also comes the matter of choice and priority. But there should be no party politics in this choice and giving priority. First priority should be given to security of one's life.

It is also a fact that Journalists and Press photographers also face risk to their lives. They also need security cover. They also face risk to their lives When they go in search of news or taking photo. Do you not aware of the fact that how journalists are threatened in Bihar and their lives are in constant danger. They do not have even wage Board, pension or any other facility. It is an important point. We are ready to discuss this issue if you are willing to do so. But this is not related to the Bill. In context of this Bill, I would like to say that I support this view point of the Government. If any one wants to make any suggestion regarding providing security cover to any individual then one can give it in writing and Government will take case of that individual.

With these words, I congratulate the Home Minister for it. But it should not be misused. Common man should not be denied security I would also like to make a request to the hon. Minister to strengthen the security system for the common man.

16.08 hrs.

(Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee in the Chair)

DR. S.P. YADAV : (SAMBHAL): Mr. Chairman, Hon. Minister has moved a Bill and this House is discussing the issue regarding the need to provide SPG protection and now it should be provided. Madam, through you, I would like to request the leaders of all the political parties that there should be no shortcomings in making and adopting the policies to run the Government because there is always one or the other reasons behind rise and spread of terrorism.

Madam, when Shrimati Indira Gandhi was killed, she was Prime Minister. She was given the best SPG protection but SPG persons themselves were involved in her assassination. But even after this incident the Government did not take any steps to check the recurrence of such incidents. Hon. Minister should think over it and it should be looked into it to know whether SPG protection is being utilised properly or not. People of this country will never tolerate the wrong policies formulated by the political leaders. Our armed forces entered the Golden temple which staind our history with a spot and it was the main reason for assassination of the Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Bombs were exploded at 13 places in Bombay after demolition of Babri masjid on 6th December, 1992. The Government never make an analysis of its wrong policies which compell people to take such undesirable steps. The Government has a great responsibility to run the Government and fulfill the aspirations of common and not to hurt the fellings of people. It is a big responsibility and Governmnent should think over it. Hon. Minister is also present here and he wants to bring an amendment. We do not want to oppose him but I would like to say that inspite. of spending a big amount on security, a large number of innocent people are killed and police even refuse to lodge FIR, then where is the law? I have written several times to the Minister of Home Affairs and requested him to find out the whereabouts of the 8-10 people who have perhaps been killed on 6th December. but nothing has so far been done and till date the district administration has not been in a position to say whether these persons have been killed or not. Central Government as well as State Government has not made any inquiry so far into it. There is a need to provide a clean and honest administration for the people. People can not be satisfied without a clean and honest administration. Several members have mentioned the name of V.P. Singh who refused to have security cover given by the Government. This is the courage of a man. There are some person who did not need security at all. Hon. V.P. Singh feels that he has not taken any wrong decision so he did not need any security. It is the inner strength and courage of a person whch is expressed in this way. Some people demand security cover to show their importance to others and they do not face any danger to their lives. I do not consider it good an it is not being said to criticize any individual. Discussion in this House should be on the basis of facts.

In respect of this provision of SPG protection. I would like to say that amendments in this provision have been made from time to time only for providing security to one family only. I would like to say that such feelings should not be created among people that such a huge expenditure is beign made and debate in this House is being taken up for just to provide security to one or two families. Although, self security is best and it cannot be compared with the security given by the Governmental agencies. The security of former President was also discussed here as to whether SPG was with him or not? If it was there, then how his car was hit as a result of which he is struggling for his life. Have the functioning of security agencies have ever been avaluated any time or these are just for decoration? History is before us, persons like Shirmati Indira Gandhi, General Vaidya, Rajiv Gandhi and Father of Nation Mahatma Gandhi were assassinated and we do not find any improvement in this situation.

I have no objection to the Amendment Bill moved by the Hon. Minister. I would like to say that Special security should be provided honestly. Functioning of SPG should be evaluated every six months and law regarding SPG should be amended after six months.

SHRI TEJ NARAYAN SINGH (Buxar): Madam Chairman, I do not have any objection to the amendment in sub-section 4 of this Bill, wherein the period of 5 years has been raised to 10 years. So far as the question of the security of Mrs. Sonia Gandhi is concerned, I am not against it. Even the insignificant people are being provided security unnecessarily which a poor country like ours can hardly afford. There is no need to provide security cover to several former union Ministers. They are wasting lakhs of rupees of the Government. We must put an end to this kind of extravagance. 85 per cent population of this country is living below poverty line and they cannot even make their both ends meet. In such a situation, it does not look good to provide such facilities to these people.

Madam Chairman, the case of Mrs. Sonia Gandhi is an exception. As Smt. Indira Gandhi and Shri Rajiv Gandhi had been the Prime MInisters of this country and they were killed by the terrorists, there is a need to provide her full security. If the Congress Government is sincere, it can curtail that expenditure. Mrs. Gandhi can be elected to the Lok Sahba and thus, she can be duly given protection cover by the Government. I do not know what animosity you have with her? During the elections, you raise the slogan—The country will never forget the sacrifice of the Mother and the son. If their intention had been bonafide. they would have go her elected to the Lok Sabha from the same constituency, which Shri Rajive Gandhi had represented. They have elected a weak candidate from that constituency. The Government want to spend the whole fund meant for the security, on Gandhi family. They are gripped with the fear that Mrs. Sonia Gandhi may take the place of late Rajive Gandhi. Neither the Government nor our Prime Minister speaks about this. Had they been loyal to the Nehru family, the would have provided they security. They are shedding tears in the name of Indira Gandhi or Rajiv Gandhi. If a person becomes a Chief Minister or a Prime Minister, it would be unwise to give him protection throughout his life. In this country, lakhs of youth are jobless. The poor are starving while the Government is putting more burden on them by making security arrangements for VVIPs. I do not think it is a wise step. As Shri Virendra Singh has said, the Government should also provide security to the members of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri's and Shri Gulzari Lal Nanda's families On the other hand, there is no provision of security to the family members of the Father of the nation, Mahatma Gandhi. They too sacrificed their life for the well being of the nation. I think that the Government has not taken the trouble of giving security to the members of the family of these great leaders of the nation. Had they taken any initiative, something would have come out. However, I support this Bill. The Government should check the misuse of this Bill wherever it is not necessary. There are many people who are not part of the Government but are squandering lakhs of rupees of the Government in the name of security cover to the members of Prime Minister's family. This needs to be looked into. Only the life of those people who move among the people, face the danger of security. How could those people who lose their security deposit in the election face danger to their lives? Therefore, I again emphasise the point that this kind of expenditure should be checked and the fund should be diverted towards generating employment for unemployed youth, installing tubewells etc. Moreover, it can be utilized for providing drinking water to those localities of Delhi which lack the facility of drinking water. In this way, the poor can get safe drinking water.

With these words, I support the Bill and request the Government to look into the points submitted by me.

SHRI UMRAO SINGH (Jalandhar): Madam Chairman, I am thankful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak.

The Hon'ble Members have spoken at length on this Bill. One the one hand, they have supported the Bill but on the other hand, they have questioned the propriety of providing security to a particular person. This Bill in concerned with very few people. The SPG has been constituted only for giving protection to the Prime Minister and former Prime Ministers of India. So far as the question of providing security to other people is concerned, there are other alternatives like Police, BSF and CRPF for them. This facility is also available for MPs. It is not good if we say that we do not oppose but at the same time we go on opposing it. History is a witness to the sacrifices of Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi. It is a fact that this security has been prrovided for the welfare, unity and integrity of the nation. By entering into trivial arguments, their sacrifices can not be erased from the minds of the people. It is the duty of the Government to the provide them adequate security. It is not the question of a particular person. The laws are there for them. it is a special Act and we should not talk of interpreting it othewise. Shri V.P. Singh, Shri Chandrashekhar and Shri Morarji Desai are also covered under this Bill. There may be some people who are not required to be provided security cover. However, only such people talk like this who have not gone through the trauma of terrorism. The people of Punjab and the people of Assam have experienced this menance. The people of Jammu and Kashmir are still reeling under this trauma. Others talk of it and feel amused. These, type of people hold talks with such persons who give shelter to terrorists and thus, encourage terrorism. I would like to know from the former Prime Minister that the person about whom he is talking, should be given the security or not. When he had gone to Amritsar, who were the people in his procession and with whom he held the talks? The former Prime Minister had called a meeting in Delhi and held talks with the terrorists of Pakistan. It was a secret meeting. In this way, he unlawfully talked to them.

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI: Madam Chairman, it is very sad that such kind of aspersions are being made against our former Prime Minister, Shri V.P. Singh. The whole nation is aware of his integrity. It is a very serious charge that he had held talks with the terrorists. He has been the prime Minister of this nation and is at present the leader of our party. Such remarks should not have been used against them.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I do not think so. He has not named Shri V.P. Singhji.

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI: He has mentioned his name. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAM KAPSE (Thane): I am on a Point of Order. My Point of Order is, I know that he has not named any person, but at the same time, whatever reference he is making, I think it is objectionable and it is absolutely irrelevant as far as this Resolution is concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is the point. I sustain his Point of Order. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI UMRAO SINGH: Madam, let me also say. ...*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

How is it irrelevant? The former Prime Minister had held talks with the terrorists. If it was not so, why does not he fight against the terrorism?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Confine yourself within the periphery of the Bill. Please do not get involved an unnecessary controversy.

SHRI UMRAO SINGH: They have started this controversy. They criticised the Bill to give protection to the members of the former Prime Minister's family.

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT: The manner he is criticising the former Prime Minister is not justified at all. The former Prime Minister might have met them just to bring about an emotional integrity and stamping out terrorism. But he is speaking in a different tone. So, it must be expunged from the proceedings of the House.

SHRI UMRAO SINGH: The ex-Prime Minister himself has admitted that the has talked with terrorists.

[English]

SHRI RAM KAPSE: Nobody has objected to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute a please. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, I heard what he has said, But you are saying that some other people said this and so and so forth. Whatever may be the situation, I request the Member to remain within the framework of the Resolution. Then Minister is here to reply. I would also suggest that do not refer to anybody in that manner whether he is Shri V.P. Singhji or anybody else. Even if it is in your mind, kindly do not come out with it. ...*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI UMRAO SINGH: Madam, I am surprised that the name of Shrimati Sonia Gandhi is being referred to frequently here, but if name of any other former Prime Minister is referred, it becomes irrelevant.. *(Interruptions)*

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT: Please go through the Bill. Name of Shrimati Sonia Gandhi has been mentioned in the Bill and, therefore, her name has been mentioned here.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly allow him to speak, he is the last speaker... *(Interruption)*

[Translation]

DR. G.L. KANAUJIA (kheri): Madam Chairman, even if he is the last speaker, it does not mean that he can go on speaking whatever he wishes. *(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have appealed to him and you should not go on jumping at the Chair. That is not the way you should treat the Chair.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI UMRAO SINGH: You will appreciate my statement because I have experienced terrorism. You have not seen it but you have been aiding and abetting terrorism.. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI: Madam Chairman, I am on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is that point of order?

(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Umrao Singhji, on such a subject, why are you making such a controversy? I request all of you to remain within the limits of the subject since Shri Thomas is the last speaker. After that the Mover of the Statutory Resolution will also have his right to reply. And, then of course...

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI: What authorises him to level such allegations against us that we have been meeting the terrorists? At least these words should be expunged from the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I have told that there is no point of order.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under what rule are you raising the point of order?

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI: Madam, he has no right to level such allegations against a Member of the Opposition.. .

(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have told him already not to, haven't I? Please, all of you cooperate with me.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI UMRAO SINGH: My submission was as to why terrorism spread in Punjab and in other parts of the country. During whose regime, whose Prime Ministership did the terrorism spead? The answer is very simple. That is a historical fact and everybody knows it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If everybody knows it, then what is the use of narrating it here?

(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE (Vijayawada): It is you who have pampered it.

[Translation]

SHRI UMRAO SINGH (Jalandhar): This mess is the creation of you all. As regards this Bill, it is a fact that the Prime Minister fought against terrorism and sacrificed himself while doing so.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. I have asked you not to go in for such things. I have requested you with folded hands from the Chair to resume your seats. *(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI UMRAO SINGH: Madam, I conclude with saying that I support this Bill. I want to submit this much also that all those who need and deserve security should be provided security.

[English]

SHRI P.C. THOMAS (Muvattupuzha): Madam, I support this Bill. In fact I was astonished to see that there is objection to this Bill which only says that the period of protection which is already being given to the former Prime Ministers and the members of their families should be extended for another period of five years. I was astonished to see that objections were even taken to the extent that no protection should be given. In fact, this nation owes an apology for the very fact that proper security was not given to Rajiv Ji at the time when he was assassinated.

Now, it is not a question of accusing anybody but it is a fact that at that time when Rajivji was assassinated or nearabout that period he was touring throughout the country in connection with the general elections. Absolutely no protection was given. It is not a question of whether a person is entitled or not but it is the duty of the nation and the duty of the nation has to be carried out. If the Government had failed in it, then they are responsible for that. Of course, I do not accuse this Govt. Therefore, we owe a special apology for not having given adequate protection perticularly when it was known very well that the former Prime Miniser was in danger, I think we all have been responsible for not giving adequate protection to such a person at that time. Therefore, I think this is the proper time to discuss this matter.

There have been Commissions and they have also stated that adequate protection was not accorded to Rajivji at that time when he was having real threat to his life. This Bill is to protect the former Prime Ministers and their family members. Of course, the Bill specifically states that it is intended that Smt. Sonia Gandhi and her family members are to be given proper protection. There is nothing to object in this Bill and this Bill has to be passed.

We are hearing about terrorism and also about barbaric attacks and attempts on the life of persons who are not Prime Ministers. I can quote an example which is now happening in my own State where one Opposition party has gone to the extent of taking a stand that one particular Minister will not be allowed to move in the State. No party can take that kind of a view in a democratic set-up.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not interrupt, let him finish.

SHRI P. C. THOMAS: I am only saying that .....

SHRIMATI SUSEELA GOPALAN (Chirayinkil): He has not admitted that it was a peaceful demonstration.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I request my lady colleagues to sit down. Let him finish.

SHRI P.C. THOMAS: I do not know whether I have roused the passion of any Member. I only said such barbaric attempts should be avoided and should be dealt with strongly. I think, this is the stand we should take when we discuss a Bill of this nature. One can register one's protest. We have also shown black flags to the Ministers. But we have never heard of a party taking a view that a Minister or a person in power should not be allowed to move.

Everybody argues that every citizen should have the freedom to move about; every citizen should have his fundamental right to move about. That is what we all envisage; that is what we stand for. I am sure, my hon. friend, who has taken exception also will plead for freedom of every individual to move about in the country.

The situation has gone to this extent that we are thinking of such a Bill. We are passing a Bill where the protection which was being given to the family members of the former Prime Minister and also the protection that is given to the Prime Minsiter should be continued. We all know that SPG is something special; it is not an ordinary protection that is being given, the cover of which cannot be broken. That is what we understand.

We have to give this protection to the persons who are in power or the persons who really require it. This Bill is of that nature. I fully support it. I think the Government has done a right thing in extending the time in this regard. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member from Telugu Desam is not here. So, I am asking Mr. Rao to speak.

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: Firest of all, I do not have any objection to the passing of this Bill which has been proposed to extend the cover of this Act by another five years. We all have sympathy for the family members of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. But in this connection, is the Government having some rethinking on this? A lot of money is being spent on the security arrangement for different VIPs, VVIPs, MPs and MLAs. Really, there is a fantastic change when we first entered the Parliament House during the Eighth Lok Sabha and during the Tenth

Lok Sabha. Even near the statue of the Father of the Nation we find so many police men trotting.

We come across outside the Parliament House even a Commissioner of Police going with two cars in front and two cars in the rear. It is almost coming to a stage where several people feel that it is a status symbol to have gunmen, some security people with them. After all, whose money is it? Is it not the public money? There should be some rethinking on this. If a few people have some determination to harm somebody, it is very difficult to prevent it. This has been proved beyond doubt. Several people like John Kennedy, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and former Prime Minister of Ceylon had been killed in spite of security arrangement.

So, I would like to request the Government that this must be done away with at some point of time. I wonder, some former Prime Ministers, who claimed to be great socialists, are making the Government spend several crores of rupees on this secuirty arrangement. In this respect I congratulate Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh, the former Prime Minister of this country, for requesting the Government to do away with this SPG cover for him. He has volunteered to be without SGP cover. I hope many other former Prime Minsters, who are alive today, will also come forward with a similar suggestion. Thank you. *...(Interruptions)*

SHRI A. CHARLES (Trivandrum): He has a right to say that he does not want any security for himself, but he has no right to say that other should not be given. That is mischievous.

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: He has not objected for others. He has at least volunteered to say that he does not require for himself *...(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister is on his legs. Please sit down. Please, it is upto the hon. Minister to repley *...(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is this going on *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: When Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru was there, in spite of his security arrangement, he used to go along the public and into the midst of the people on many occasions. Those people had so much guts and confidence in the people that people were their protectors. What can your police protect? *...(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr Charles, please take your seat. Let the hon. Minister reply. *...(Interruptions)*

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: Madam, Chairman, I am extremely grateful to all the hon. Members for supporting the Bill in their own way. Knowing fully well that this is a Bill of such a nature and in spite of the fact that they belong to the opposition, they considered it necessary that they cannot possibly think in terms of taking a risk.

In fact we are quite alive to the problem and in fact, a point that was raised by some of the hon. Members I am in full agreement - that as far as possible we should try to avoid bringing ordinace on the matter of this nature. In fact, this has been my effort, I can assure you, but sometimes things go beyond our control and then it becomes necessary for us. This is a kind of necessary evil. Though the provision in the Constitution is very much there, at the same time, as far as possible, we should introduce the Bill, have full discussion in this House and thereafter get the Bill passed instead of promulgating an ordinance on a point which, at least, I take serious note of and to the extent possible, I would like to avoid the same.

Madam, a point was raised, whether the Government is reviewing the situation and trying to find out as to whether every year we should not review the same. As far as the members of late lamented Rajiv Gandhiji's family are concerned, at least I have no doubt about it that within the next five years, there is not going to be much of a change. If Government would come before the House saying that because that because of the threat perception we would like to provide security to Shrimati Sonia Gandhi and the members of her family, then the point is bound to be raised by some hon. Members, why are we trying to create some kind of a speical status only for Shrimati Sonia Gandhi and not for others? I can well understand that rest of the Prime Ministers there are two Prime Ministers - in fact, come within the purview of this.

A point was also made by an hon. Member as to whether Shri V. P. Singh has offered not to have security of this nature and what is the decision of the Government. Madam, this is not a question of an individual's decision. If he goes to the court and the court gives us order, then of course, we are safe. We have nothing to say about it. But if Shri. V.P. Singh has to offer that he does not want the security, it does not depend upon his sweet will and pleasure whether to accept or not to accept the security. As Government, it becomes our responsibility to provide him security. God forbid, if anything were to happen to him, then you are bound to ask, "Is the Government not responsible for the same?"

The entire concept of this SPG rose out of the assassination of Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Thereafter, this Bill was especially brought to see that special protection needs to be provided to the Executive Head who is the functionary and who decides all these cases. A question may be asked, why is it not given to the Home Minister; why is it not given to the Defence Minister? Every Minister takes his own decisions. But there are different categories of security, which have been provided to all other Minister. But, so far as the Prime Minister is concerned, he is the Head of the Government. He has to take a number of unpleasant decisions. Sometimes people may like it, sometimes people may not like it and sometimes, on matters which, in fact, are of such a nature that there we cannot possibly compromise, the Prime Minister, as the Head of the Government, had to accept the full responsibility. That is why, we have to make this kind of an arrangement.

How long this kind of a threat will continue is anybody's guess and we cannot possibly stand guarantee for that. Actually the provision is only for five years, that is, after demitting the office, it was for five years. But since Shrimati Soniaji and the members of her family had to be provided with security, this offer had also been made to the other two former Prime Ministers also. I will request that

please for God's sake, do not try to create any kind of feeling among the people as if you have something else to say in these matters. Threat is a matter in which you should not take a change. Even if we were to take a chance, certainly we cannot be oblivious of the responsiblities that we have to shoulder. And, that is why, our decision is this. I will not leave the matter. I have brought to his notice so many times that he has behaved the way in which the SPG protectee is not supposed to behave. In spite of that he has been behaving in his own way. It becomes my responsibility and that is why, I take this opportunity of requesting both the former Prime Ministers and also Shrimati Soniaji and the members of her family to follow exactly the guidelines which have been given by the Home Ministry. In spite of that, it does not necessarily mean that nothing untoward is going to happan. I cannot possibly stand that kind of a guarantee. We can take maximum precaution that is possible under the circumstances and that is what we are trying to do. So, do not try unnecessarily to create a problem as if he is a brave man he has offered not to accept the security. There is no question of any bravery involved in this. Sometimes you want to show the bravery. But God forbid, if anything were to happen to him, you are not going to leave me and you will definitely frame charges against me and say, "You are the Home Minister, you have failed in your duty of providing security to him". That is the kind of an argument, which is bound to put forth by all other hon. Members. That is why, I will request you kindly not to bring all irrelevant considerations. Uniform practices have been made applicable to all the former Prime Ministers and the members of their families.

A point was also made about providing security to the family members of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. According to me, the family members of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri are not facing any kind of threat. But, still taking cue from what you have stated here, I will certainly make it a point and ask the family members of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri whether they face any threat. If they face any threat, certainly we will be providing all necessary security which, in fact, is called for. When all other former Prime Ministers and their family members are entitled for security, so also if the family members of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri - in fact Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri had been a very valiant person and had done a tremendous amount of service to this nation - are facing any kind of threat, it becomes our duty to see that necessary protection is also provided to them.

I must bring to the notice of the hon. House that we have been reviewing the security arrangements provided to all the hon. Members of this House. And candidly if I have to say, I can say that when the Session begins, I have to restore the security almost to everyone. That is because of the fact that almost every day I am getting applications from the hon. Members and sometimes they approach the hon. Speaker also. He writes to me and thereafter, I do not think that I should take any risk. Immediately, I informed my Director of IB to please see that they are provided necessary security when they are in Delhi. I have written to all the Chief Ministers of the States that whenevar MPs are in their own State, it is their responsibility to see that they are provided necessary security. There are cases which I am aware of, where in fact, left to myself, I would have definitely withdrawn the security provided to some people. But there are a number of other considerations also which we have to take into account. Otherwise, unnecessarily, charges and countercharges are being levelled against each other as if he has been provided security and "why not to me"? I said, "All right. You also get security. But please unnecessarily do no try to question the motives of the Government as if Government's stand is discriminating between one section and the other." We would like to give fair treatment to everybody. My view is he might be having some security threat which he does not want to divulge. If that be the case, let him confidently approach and tell me what exactly is the threat. He does not want to subscribe himself to that kind of thing. It does not matter. Even if it incurs some expenditure more, we have to accept that kind of a position and that is why, security has to be provided.

Madam, a point was raised about the break up of Rs. 34 crore. I am giving you the details of Rs. 34.1 crore which is being spent on this. For family, recurring expenditure comes to 4.455 and non-recurring expenditure is 6.907. In all, it comes to 11.362. When all the three are taken into account, the total recurring expenditure comes to 13.365. Non-recurring comes to 20.721 and the total comes to 34.086. This is the total expenditure and that is why I thought it necessary that I should place this information before the House so that there should be complete satisfaction. There will not be any complaints that we have not bothered to reply to some other points which were raised on the floor of the House.

About family Members of other people, so far as Shri Rajiv Gandhi and his family members are concerned, we are going to continue for five years. in fact, I think, so far as I am concerned, at least, I have full information at my disposal which justifies that for another five years, there is not going to be any change. I know a number of people who in fact have almost taken a pledge. I do not want to say anything more. So on that account, five years is going to be a must. I would not be surprised even if we have to extend the period for another five years. That is the situation in which the entire family members of Shri Rajiv Gandhi are there.

So far as other people are concerned, if they were to inform me that we are not facing any threat, we will ask the people to have a fresh assessment of the threat faced by the people and thereafter if we come to the conclusion that there is no more threat to the family members, it might be that we will reconsider. But as far as possible, we would not like to make any departure from the norms that we have been following so far.

One hon. Member has raised a point about two Commissions which have been appointed. One is the Verma Commission and another is the Jain Commission. Somehow, I do not know how this impression is getting round as if the Government is not co-operating with one of the Commissions. I would like to contradict this kind of a report with all the force at my command. The Verma Commission has completed its job. They have submitted their Report. Necessary action is being taken against those who are responsible actually at the Centre and in the Tamil

Nadu Government. I am sure that we will be following this. There is no question of showing any kind of relaxation in these matters.

17.00 Hrs.

So far as the Jain Commission is concerned, I do not know how this impression is gaining ground as if the Government is not prepared to give them any cooperation. Certainly I can assure this House that the Government is giving them full cooperation. The Commission has been created by us and that too with a definite purpose. By now 103 Affidavits were to be filed before the Jain Commission and we have filed them. if more infomration is asked by them, I am sure, that there will be no officer who will be lacking in his duty and we will see that all the cooperation that they want, all the information and documents which the Jain Commission also wants, we will certainly be placing that information at their disposal.

As far as Manipur is concerned, a point was raised by Shri Yaima Singh Yumnam that in spite of the orders, the security has not been provided to some of the former Ministers. I will have to specially issue the orders to the Governor. Whatever be his personal views, the orders given by the Central Government are binding on him. He will have to provide the security. There is no escape in this matter. It would not go according to the whims and fancies of any particular Officer or a Governor. He will have to provide the kind of security which anybody who, in fact, faces a threat of this nature is entitled to.

Madam, I have tried my best to reply to the questions raised by the hon. Members. So, with these words, I will request the House to pass this Bill.

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI: Madam Chairman, I seek one clarification so far as this Bill is concerned, I do not oppose it. But the hon. Minister of Home Affairs has made an announcement here. My point was that much security is being provided to the MPs in the States to which he told that security would be provided during the session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He did not say so. He told that security was provided when they come here.

[English]

How could you stand up? Prof. Rasa Singh Rawat is supposed to reply.

DR. G.L. KANAUJIA: It is a question of security.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There may be many questions of security. There are some rules and regulations.

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI: Such security must be provided in Delhi.

DR. G.L. KANAUJIA: It is a question of security. The hon. Minister of Home Affairs has stated that the hon. Members of Parliament are provided secuirty in States also any they will continue to get such secuirty. I have written in this regard. I am seeking a clarification on his reply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you have any complaint, please give it in writing.

DR. G.L. KANAUJIA: I have met twice. I have also made correspondence with him. I have written to Pilotji and to our state Chief Minister also. In my letter I have written that my Parliamentary Constituency Lakhimpr Kheri adjoins the Nepal border. There are about 60 thousand Sikh voters. This area is adjoining Pilibhit also. *(Interruptions)*

[English]

SHRI UMRAO SINGH: I object to the words used by Dr. Kanaujia about the Sikh community and his motive behind labelling all sikhs.

[Translation]

DR. G.L. KANUAJIA: I am quoting it only because certain incidents have taken place in my area. Various incidents of terrorism have taken place in my area. Number of times guns have been fired there.. ...*(Interruptions)***

[English]

Mr. Chairman: This is not going on record.

[Translation]

Whatever you are stating is not going on record. Please resume your seat and let other speakers speak.

*(Interruptions)***

f17[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: There must be a limit. This does not go in the record.....*(Interruptions)* Let him report to the Speaker what measures he has taken.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Madam, since the Home Minister has said that so far as the security of Members in their respective States is concerned, the Home Ministry has simply written letters to the Cheif Ministers to see that the Members are given proper protection in their States, is that the sole thing? Suppose the State Government has been complained by so many Members but, for some reason or the other, they do not give protection to the Members, then is it not the responsibility of the Government to see that proper protection is given to them in their respective States? That is the point.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: Provided the State Government were to say that they are not in a position to provide security and that the Central Government should provide, then certainly I shall look into it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rasa Singh Rawati Ji, now kindly start replying.

[Translations]

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT: Madam Chairman, I have heard the reply of the Hon'ble Minister of Home Affairs but so far as issue of ordinacnce is concerned, I condemn this tendency. Although, this privilege rests with the Government - as the Hon'ble Minister of Home Affairs has said - yet, through you, I would like to say

*Not recorded.

that I expect from the Government that it would not misuse this privilege and would show some sagacity. Had the Government should some sagacity this Bill would have been passed in the Monsoon Session itself.

Madam, we want the law and order situation to be normal so that everybody could live in a fear-free environment. We wish that Smt. Sonia Gandhi and her family members should be well protected. Some of my friends have talked about the sacrifices of Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi. Nobody can deny this fact but besides them, many other revolutionaries have also sacrificed their lives for this country ...*(Interruptions)* I have a right to speak I am continuing my speech ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: what is all this going on? Is it a fish market? It is Parliament. Please let him speak. ...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pawan Ji, you are the Whip of the party. It is your particular responsibility to maintain the dignity of the House.

[Translation]

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT: Madam, I have not said anything which might have caused such a furore. So far as Smt. Sonia Ji is concerned, we wish her a long life. The Hon'ble Minister of Home Affairs has just now spoken about providing security cover to her for five years. If the need arises, it can be extended further also. However, I hope that such a situation does not arise but the Government by talking of providing protection for 5 years has confirmed that the Government is not in a position to contain terrorism in the next five years and the atmosphers of fear would continue to grip the people. We want that initially it should for a period of one year and if after one year the situation improves and the peace dawns, there will be no need to extend it further.

Madam, it is the duty of a democratic Government to give protection to every citizen of the nation. Under this system of Government, all the citizens irrespective of their status get equal level of security. I am not accusing anybody. I am talking of the sacrifices people have made. Nobody can underestimate the sacrifices Indiraji and Rajiv Ji have made for the unity and integrity of the nation.

When Bagat Singh's mother heard the news of his son being hanged, she said:—

"Parvah Nahin Jo Ban Gayee Bachhe Ki Jaan Par,
Arey ek To Kya Lakh Bhee Hon To War Doon Bharat Ki Shaan Par."

One I had gone to Andaman. In the Cellular Jail, I read the names of those martyrs and revolutionaries who were tortured by the British Government:

"Jab Wakt Chaman Par Pada, Woh Lahu Hamne Diya,
Aur Jab Baharon Ka Samay Aa Gaya To Kah Diya Tumhari Zaroorat Nahin."

...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are a vgery experienced Member. May I request you not to hurt others' feelings on such a question.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT: I have not said anything wrong. Nobody denies their sacrifices but regarding martyrs ...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him speak. Then, you have the right to reply. Do not do like this.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Chandigarh): The way he is speaking, he is casting aspersions on others ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: He did not contest the patriotism of either Indira Gandhi or Rajiv Gandhi, so far as I heard.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE: He is speaking about Bhagat Singh and other family members. But we are discussing the post independence period. That is why, it is not related. But everybody respects the pre-independence movement.

[Translation]

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT: The Hon'ble Home Minister has just now said that Rs. 34 crore have been provided for this purpose. I think this is on higher side and should be curtailed. The Government should reconsider it.

I would like to say something about the welfare of SPG. I had raised this point earlier also but the Hon'ble Minister has not said anything on this. We should so something about these jawans who stake their life for the protection of VVIPs. There should be some provision for the welfare of the dependents of the jawans who die in harness.

When we talk of giving protection to the family members of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, we should not ignors Smt. Maneka Gandhi. She is the wife of late Shri Sanjay Gandhi. She should be given equal protection. I would ony say that:

"Jako Rakho Sainya, Mar Sake No Koi,
Bal Na Banka Kar Kake, Chahe Sabh Jag Bairi Hoi."

17.14 Hrs.

[SHRI TARA SINGH *in the Chair]*

We should have this type of feeling. I am against the tendency of issuing ordinances. Therefore, I would not withdraw the statutory Resolution of Disapporval. Smt. Sonia Gandhi and her family members should be provided security.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Rasa Singh Rawat, would you like to withdraw your Statutory Resolution?

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT: Sir, I would not withdraw it. I oppose the tendency of issuing ordinances becase the Government is in the habit of misusing it. I support the intention of the Bill that the family members of the Prime Minister or Smt. Sonia Gandhi should be provided security but we should try to curtail the expenditure on it. It would

be better if Smt. Maneka Gandhi is also covered under this provision.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

...(Interruptions)

SHRI UMRAO SINGH: Sir I am on a point of order. When Dr. Kanaujia was speaking about his constituency, he said that 60,000 Sikhs are living in his constituency and he was alleging against the entire Sikh community. He should withdraw those words which are highly objectionable. He is misleading the House. And he has accused the peace loving people of India, those people who have got freedom for this country, and those people who are fighting on the borders. He is blaming them. *...(Interruptions)*

DR. G.L. KANAUJIA: I blamed only certain people because they have done it. There are several cases pending in Pilibhit, Lakhimpur Kheri. And are you claiming that they were not the accused? *...(Interruptions)*

SHRI UMRAO SINGH: Sir, what is he saying?

Dr. G.L. KAMAUJIA: There have been several terrorist activites, banks have been looted and people have been murdered there. *...(Interruptions)*

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: Sir, there might be some people who might have been involved in these things. But to blame the entire Sikh community is not correct. That is what he is alleging.

DR. G.L. KANAUJIA: Sir, I have not blamed the entire Sikh community. This is a wrong allegation. *(Interruption)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am giving my ruling now. Nobody can challenge any community, whosoever he may be. If anything has been said against the Sikh community in general, that will be removed.

Now, the question is:

"That this House disapproves of the Special Protection Group (Amendment) Ordinance, 1994 (No. 12 of 1994) promulgated by the President on November 16, 1994."

The motion was negatived

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Special Protection Group Act, 1988, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House shall now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

The question is:

"That Clauses 2 and 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

Amendment made:

Page 1, line 3,——

Omit "Second" (1)

(Shri S.B. Chavan)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That Clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Enacting Formula and the long title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Enacting Formula and the long Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: I beg to move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

The motion was adopted.

17.20 hrs.

[English]

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: DISAPPROVAL OF THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK OF INDIA (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, AND !NDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK OF INDIA (AMENDMENT) BILL

[Translation]

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT (Ajmer): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House disapproves the Industrial Development Bank of India (Amendment) Ordinance, 1994 (No. 11 of 1994) promulgated by the President on 12 October, 1994".

Mr. Chairman, sir, as in case of the previous Bill, I would like to reiterate that the Government is again presenting another ordinance in this House. India is the largest democracy of the world. That the Government should directly present Bills etc. in the House for its consideration which is a representative institution of the people, supreme in power and sovereign in character is a democratic tradition. The Government should after discussions know the opinion of all the parties and take a decision in the interest of the country. But this Government is continually going wayward for some years now. The Government is trying to avoid bringing important matter before the House and later promulgates ordinance in the name of the President, who is revered by the whole country. Then the Government comes with the Bill in the House and we are forced to agree to it. In this context, I would like to say that this tendency of the Government of bringing ordinances is undemocratic, unconstitutional and deminishes the dignity and decor of the Parliament. It defies the right of the representatives of the people who represent public feelings and put them before this august House. I condemn this practice of bringing in ordinances. I would like to remind you that on the issue of the provision of ordinances in the constitution many hon. Members said to late Prime Minister, Jawahar Lal Nehru that this right of promulgating ordinances was being given to the Government only for a situation of emergency, that of a grave crisis in the country when the Parliament is not functioning. In such a situation, the Government should bring in an ordinance, if necessary, in the paramount