

ments suggested by Shri Rasa Singh Rawat. He is not present.

The question is:

"That Clause 6 stands part of the Bill".

*The motion was adopted*

*Clause 6 was added to the Bill.*

### Clause 7

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are amendments suggested by Shri Girdharilal Bhargava. He is not present.

The question is:

"That Clause 7 Stands part of the Bill".

*The motion was adopted*

*Clause 7 was added to the Bill*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the question is: "That clause 1, Enacting formula, Preamble and the long Title stand part of the Bill"

*The motion was adopted*

*Clause 1, Enacting Formula, Preamble and the long Title were added to the Bill*

SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed".

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is: "That the Bill be passed".

*The motion was adopted*

15.22 hrs.

### SPECIAL PROTECTION GROUP (AMENDMENT) BILL

[English]

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS  
(SHRI S.B. CHAVAN): I beg to move:

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

As the hon. Members are aware, the existing Special Protection Group Act, 1988 provides for the SPG security cover only to the Prime Minister in office. After the unfortunate assassination of late Shri Rajiv Gandhi, former Prime Minister, many of the hon. Members had demanded that SPG security cover should be provided to the members of the family of late Shri Rajiv Gandhi in view of the fact that they are under high risk of security. The Government of India considered the matter and the Special Protection Group (Amendment) Bill, 1991 was introduced in the Lok Sabha which was aimed at amending the SPG Act in order to cover the family of late Shri Rajiv Gandhi. However, some of our hon. Members had expressed the opinion that no distinction between an assassinated ex-Prime Minister and a living ex-Prime Minister should be made.

Honouring the views expressed by the hon. Members in this House, the Government have reconsidered the Bill and it is now proposed to amend the SPG Act in order to cover the former Prime Ministers. The Government have decided that the SPG cover may be provided to the former Prime Ministers and the members of their families for a maximum period of five years from the date of their demitting the office of the Prime Minister. Time is a healer. It is expected that with the lapse of five years, the threat will recede and will become less imminent and could be dealt with by non-SPG security cover.

Sir, I hope the proposed amendment will meet the aspirations of a large number of people who have expressed their serious concern about the security of the former

Prime Ministers/their family members.

2. Shri L.K. Advani

I commend the Bill for consideration of this august House.

3. Shri Somnath Chatterjee

4. Shri Indrajit Gupta

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

5. Shri Jaswant Singh

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

6. Shri Ram Lal Rahi

7. Shri V. Sobhanadreeswara Rao

There are certain notices of amendments to the Motion for consideration given by certain Members:

8. Shri Rabi Ray

9. Shri Shibu Soren; and

1. Shri Dau Dayal Joshi - Not present.

10. Shri George Fernandes.

2. Shri Rasa Singh Rawat - Not present.

With instructions to report by the first day of the next session".

3. Shri Rajendra Agnihotri - Not present.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Shri Ram Naik to speak.

4. Shri Girdhari Lal Bhargava:

[Translation]

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA (Jaipur): I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 9th December, 1991".

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): I beg to move:

"That the Bill to amend and Special Protection Group Act, 1988, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of 10 members, namely:-

1. Shri Basudeb Acharia

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay North): Sir certain Amendments should be made in the Bill and also in its objectives. Drafting and objectives of the Bill were not in proper form and that is why the Government have made certain Amendments in the Bill because of the objections raised at the introduction stage. Though Amendments are discussed Clause by Clause yet I would like to say that not only the family of Rajiv Gandhi but the family of any other Prime Minister with whom such incident happens, should also be given protection. Shri Rajiv Gandhi has been brutally murdered so there are not two opinions about it that protection should be provided to his family. The hon. Home Minister has said in his speech that protection will be provided for five years and it also appears from his

[Sh. Ram Naik]

earlier statement that this time will be from five to ten years. But I think that the time limit should not be restricted by law but it should be left to the discretion of the Government. We shall discuss it in details when Amendments will come up for discussion but I would like to say that such situation may arise when the Government needs to extend the time limit. Therefore, under such circumstances, the Government should have discretionary power and that is why the time limit should not be imposed by the law.

Secondly, the Government very well knows, whether there is need to provide security or not. A Prime Minister takes several decision during his tenure and there is every possibility of taking revenge by any individual or by any organisation against the decision taken by the Prime Minister. Our former Prime Ministers like Shri V.P. Singh, Shri Chandra Shekhar and Morarji Bhai have taken many decisions which might have put vested interest into trouble. And such vested interest can take revenge at any time. Therefore, I would like to say that not only a particular family but all the former Prime Ministers should be provided such security. And there should not be any limit of time. I think it would be a right step if special security is provided to all the former Prime Ministers and I think that it is necessary too.

It has been stated that an expenditure of Rs. 4.5 crores is involved in it. I agree that all citizens are equal and if security is provided to all the former Prime Ministers that would involve a lot of expenditure. We would discuss the expenditure at the time of Budget and criticise it or commend it depending on the merits. I think the Government should not think that it would require a huge amount if

such security is provided to all the former Prime Ministers. all former Prime Ministers should be provided protection and there should not be time limit of five years.

With these words, I support the spirit of the Bill, In the end I would like to say that under the present circumstances the lives of all the former Prime Ministers are facing the risky, and therefore, they should all get special security. With these words I conclude.

[English]

SHRI M. RAMANNA RAI (Kasaragod): Mr. Chairman Sir, under this Bill, the Government intends to give sufficient protection to the former Prime Ministers living or the assassinated Prime Ministers' immediate family, etc. For that purpose, the Government of India is going to spend about Rs. 41/2 crore. We are not grudging about it. My point is whether the protection is sufficient. We know after all why is the protection required. In this country, anything may happen. There is no doubt about it. In this country, there are organisations which assassinated Mahatma Gandhi also. Such associations are working even now. So, when such associations and organisations are working in this country, not only the Prime Minister's or ex-Prime Minister's or any of the immediate relatives life but anybody's life is no doubt in danger. But I want to pose one question as far as the immediate relatives of our late assassinated Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, that is, Mrs Shrimati Sonia Gandhi and Shri Rajiv Gandhi's two children are concerned.

We know that recently assassinated Prime Minister's wife, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi, went abroad. What kind of protection or what

kind of security did the Government of India give to her? In the same way, Rahul Gandhi, son of the assassinated Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, is studying in USA. What kind of protection is the Government of India going to give him? We know that the extremists are the people who kill sometimes for money, sometimes for nothing and sometimes for revenge. They are not only working in India but they are working outside also. What kind of protection does the Government of India intend to give? The assassinated Prime Minister's son, Rahul Gandhi, is studying in America. What kind of protection did the Government of India give to Shrimati Sonia Gandhi when she went abroad recently? I want to know about it. Even if we are spending Rs. 41/2 crore, I think, it is only inside India and not outside. If the protection is given whenever the immediate relatives of the assassinated Prime Minister go out, then this amount of Rs. 41/2 crore is not sufficient. So, I want to know how are you going to protect them when they are abroad.

I would like to suggest that the safest thing is that they should not indulge in politics. If they keep away from politics, there is no danger. So, please advise the immediate relatives of the assassinated Prime Minister not to indulge, for any reason in Indian politics at least for five years. If for five years, they simply keep quiet in their house, there is no need for this protection. So, my suggestion is, the best protection as far as the immediate relatives of the assassinated Prime Minister are concerned, they should not meddle with politics.

Now you want to spend Rs. 41/2 crore. We know in this country, our beloved Prime Minister Indira Gandhi was assassinated by

her own security guard. So, what kind of protection did we give? In this case also, by spending Rs. 41/2 crore, you will give police protection. You give police protection more and more. So, how do you know that they will not be deciding to assassinate the very person in whose protection they are employed.

The amount of money for the reason given by me to give this kind of protection is not only improper but waste also. So, my humble suggestion is, as I said earlier, they should keep away from politics.

SHRI INDER JIT (Darjeeling): We also have a case where the killers say that they will want to eliminate and destroy: the entire family. The threat goes to the whole family. (Interruptions)

SHRI M. RAMANNA RAI: In this case, our beloved Rajiv Gandhi became the Prime Minister by chance. The then Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi was assassinated and before her assassination, Shri Sanjay Gandhi had expired due to accident and so, Shri Rajiv Gandhi came into politics. You say that the life of Shri Rajiv Gandhi's immediate relatives are in danger. Danger is more to Shri Sanjay Gandhi's wife and his son. Risk factor is more to Shri Sanjay Gandhi's wife and son (Interruption) Shrimati Indira Gandhi wanted Shri Sanjay Gandhi to be her successor as Prime Minister. So, danger is apprehended more to Shrimati Maneka Gandhi and her son, Varun Gandhi. Do you consider their lives to be more precious than others or not? So, as I said earlier, the immediate relatives of the assassinated Prime Minister should be away from politics for some years.

[Sh. M. Ramanna Rai]

With these submissions, I conclude my speech.

[*Translation*]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we oppose this Bill.

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may also speak on your amendment, of a Select Committee, in the same speech.

[*Translation*]

SHRIGEORGE FERNANDES: All right, Sir, you know as to why this Bill was brought. First time it was brought to provide security to a particular family. I am happy that hon. Home Minister have made some improvement in it.

SHRI INDER JIT: It was your suggestion.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: It was not my suggestion and I will never give such a suggestion. This suggestion came from your side. Earlier the Government was concerned about the security of one family only but now it has been extended to three families. The Prime Minister has already been provided special security so this Bill was not brought for that purpose. Now this Bill has included three former Prime Ministers. If the Government is going to spend Rs. 4.5 crores on the security of family of one former Prime Minister that means Rs. 13.5 crores would be spent every year on the security of three former Prime Ministers.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, at the time of intro-

duction of the Bill I opposed it and said that through this Bill the Government is going to create two types of citizens in the country. I am not saying that practically there are not two categories of citizens in the country. We know that at the cost of 90 per cent of the people of the country three per cent of the people are leading luxurious life. But by bringing such laws, the Government is going to strengthen this categorisation of citizens. Therefore, I strongly oppose this Bill. We can never accept it that life of a person sitting on the highest post and that of a common man has different values. You can differentiate the citizens on account of their intelligency, their ability or on any other ground but this trend which has been coming up to differentiate the life of citizens, is most objectionable.

Sir, sometime people become Prime Minister in this country because of the death of some one in his family. Just now an hon. Member was saying that because of the death of younger brother, elder brother reluctantly become the Prime Minister. An individual becomes Prime Minister in this country not because of his ability but because of his family background. Such circumstances has been created that only few people can hold the power. The question arises whether only these people are capable of holding these posts and not the others.

SHRI INDER JIT: But they are getting mandate also.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: The question of mandate comes afterwards. The system is the main thing. Once Dr. Lohia said about the system of our country that three things are important in our public life i.e. upper caste, knowledge of English lan-

guage and money. And if two things out of these three, combines together that becomes very dangerous. Therefore, we should not say whether anyone has got mandate or not. We should not go into it. I would like to say how such type of people reach the top level and we have already experienced as to how they make use of Government funds, media and muscle power.

So, Sir, I am strongly opposed to the manner in which human life is being treated and because of this I am opposing this Bill.

Now it is said that come what may, inspite of our opposition there is a particular situation and in view of that situation they have to safeguard the lives of the people. We should not restrict this provision of security to former Prime Ministers alone. This morning a matter was raised in the House that one of our colleagues has been killed. A letter which he had written five weeks back to the S.P. of the district was also presented in the House. In that letter he had said that he was apprehending threat to his life, so he should be given protection. But it was not given to him. It is not the only case of this kind. According to my information there is one more instance. I have got a letter of Shri Rajdev Singh, an hon. Member of the previous Lok Sabha and the leader of a faction of Akali Dal. The whole House is aware of the difficult situation under which he had contested election in 1989 and also the conditions under which he dared take the oath of office. The entire House is aware of his courage that he exhibits here. However that Lok Sabha was dissolved and elections were again declared in punjab.

SHRI INDER JIT: Not only that. He had also said that the Punjab problem should be

solved within the constitutional frame work. That way he had shown great courage.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: That is what I am saying. He exhibited great courage. Security arrangements for Rajdev Singh were withdrawn as soon as he returned after filing his nomination. In fact security was withdrawn in case of such a person who went to file his nomination from a danger fraught area which was an expression of his ardent faith in the Indian democratic setup. You cannot say that it is the duty of Uttar Pradesh Government in U.P. and likewise it is somebody else's duty here. However in Punjab, it is the duty of the Central Government to provide security, as the state is under the governor's rule. Shri Rajdev Singh had filed his nomination papers on 26th April and since then he has met all the officers right from the Governor of the State to the Home Minister at the Centre. At the risk of his life he is moving about in this metropolitan city which is the capital of this country and nobody bothers for him. The Chief Secretary of Punjab has admitted that the S.P. of his district has got enmity towards him. That is why the protection provided to him earlier has been withdrawn. He said that he was aware of it and he would find some way out. But no such solution has been found.

This case was referred to the Home Ministry. A number of MPs have also given it to the Minister in writing, but I do not know whether those papers have reached the Home Minister or not. But this much I know that in addition to Rajdev Singh's letter the letters of a number of MPs from this House demanding the security for him have reached the Home Ministry. But no action has been taken on it. While on the otherhand, the government is bringing a piece of legislation in the House today to provide Rs. 3.5 crores

[Sh. George Fernandes]

for the security of the family of an ex-Prime Minister and other such three families. I do not know as to what sort of country we are going to create here? It is said that holding the office of the Prime Minister gives tremendous opportunity of enjoyment and merry making to a person but one should also imagine the magnitude of stress and strain that comes along with that enjoyment. The pleasures of the posts are liked by you. Generally a Jumbo 474 aircraft is used for the journey to be performed by the P.M. which involves a daily expenditure of Rs. 2-3 crore. You like to enjoy world tours by a couple of Jumbo aircrafts and you do not bother about the way of life to be led after the expiry of that tenure. The Prime Ministers really care more to use their influence and do so in almost every matter. Generally he enjoys to exercise his powers to instal or change Chief Ministers overnight. That power drunkenness gives a lot of pleasure to the person who holds that high office. After all what is meant by the family sacrifice? What sort of family sacrifice is being done in India? How many people have lost their lives during the freedom struggle of this country? Mr. Chairman, Sir, a large number of people had sacrificed their lives in the freedom struggle? Babu Genu was one such freedom fighter who while participating in Satyagrah movement against foreign goods stretched on the road in the face of a running vehicle and laid down his life. Does anybody remember the name of Babu Genu?

We have been listening to the family sacrifices for the last 30-35 years. Here I am not quoting the name of Bhagat Singh. Everybody knows him. But nobody in this House knows the name of Babu Genu. Mr.

Speaker, Sir, there are so many others who sacrificed all their belongings for the independence of this country. Has the government finished its duty by giving Tamra Patra and facility of second class free railway journey to the people who made a lot of sacrifices themselves along with their families. Here it is mentioned that a particular family made a lot of sacrifice for the country. But we should know as to what is actually meant by the sacrifices of that family. I do not want to discuss that thing here. That will also be discussed someday in this House. The extent of that pillage would also be discussed. It is not an ordinary thing that the lectures written by the officers are published by the Publications Division and the royalty of such publications is paid to somebody else. Since it is a very serious matter, it will also be discussed here. In the present world India is the only country where after the death of a person 100 acres of land are kept by the people in the name of his family members. Houses are built up in their name but these are converted into the places of "Darshan". and in this way a land upto 100 acres is retained. In Delhi, people do not have houses to live in, but the people have managed to occupy 100 acres of land by planting trees on such plots of land in the memory of the dead. One day all these things will be discussed in this House and there should be a countrywide discussion on such issues. If it is said that a person lands himself in an unusual trouble after he is elected Prime Minister, the people who are worried about their lives should not be tempted by that post. They should not come forward to contest for the same. In fact it is not the Prime Minister who is to defend this country. But these are only jawans of the army who stand in guard of their country. Even at this moment they are alert on their places of duties on the tops of the Himalayan ranges where

their lives are always at a stake. Our jawans discharge their duties there in difficult weather conditions for continuous span of 6 months at a stretch. That sight moves us at the depth of our heart and our eyes well up in tears. It shows as to how our young boys are sacrificing their lives for the defence of this country. As regards the working conditions of a Jawan at Siachen, even without a battle it is very difficult to face it. Is the Government aware of the fact - perhaps the Members know it - that at least 10 percent of the jawans posted in Siachen are sure to die without a battle and bullet, because that place is located at a very high attitude where sufficient quantity of oxygen is not available and one is sure to die in such conditions. It is said here that the office of the Prime Minister in this country is fraught with a lot of risk. Then there are many people who love this country (*Interruptions*). Who has insisted upon your becoming the Prime Minister, We would like to say with due respects that such excuses should not be given before this House that the Prime Minister is in great danger. So we would like to say it in quite clear terms that we are not going to accept this Bill. One thing more is required to be mentioned here. If there is an atmosphere of violence in the country and if there is no security of the life of a political leader, or a worker or on the whole there is no security of life of anybody and it is not certain whether a person can survive or a person is always thinking in the terms of security of his life, then it is the duty of the Government to identify the factors that have led to such a situation. It should also find out its solution. This morning went through a newspaper. I believe the hon. Home Minister too must have read it definitely. Some of the newspapers of Delhi have given a brief of the incidents of killings in Delhi during the last 24 hours to show as to how the people of Delhi have been facing a difficult situation. Day in

and day out, there are killings in this city, and Government has not been able to check it. Yesterday, an incident of killing was attributed to a criminal tribe by the police. By criminal tribe they mean that any person who is hungry tries to snatch and loot and when he is caught, he may commit a murder. Such a situation has permeated in this country during the last 40-42 years in the name of national development that the poor man of this country has been left with no other option but to think of theft and dacoity to eke out a means of livelihood for himself. A week ago, I was in Bombay. Since you are from Bombay, you know that there are nearly 20 lakhs of peddlers and hawkers who earn their livelihood by the roadside. The Municipal Commissioner, who is an IAS Officer has decided that the business of these peddlers and hawkers should be stopped, forthwith, and by a single order he declared the business of these two lakh hawkers as illegal. He also made it clear that they would not come on the roadside again. It was followed by a scuffle and lathi wielding and the trucks of the Municipality were also used to round up these peddlers. Finally the Chief Minister of Maharashtra had to intervene. Then I had to ask him as why he was throwing those people on the path of dishonesty, violence and loot who want to earn their livelihood honestly. I was the Railway Minister for eleven months, minor items such as sweets, candy, chana or groundnut are sold by minor children at the railway stations. They are not allowed to sell these items, in the suburban trains of Bombay. But during my tenure I as a Railway Minister, I issued an order that their business should not be hampered.

I was talking about the railways. As far as the country's political structure is concerned, we were in power for just 11 months

[Sh. George Fernandes]

and then we were ousted. What we consider as the strongest system in the country is actually far from that. If they are issued licenses honestly the role of the middlemen would come to an end. The present police set up whether it is the railway police or the regular police and the municipality and Government inspectors are encouraging the growth of violence. Why do we forget this fact? Whenever there is any discussion on violence we come to know how the country's police set-up contributes to the growth of violence in the country. Let us think over it.

Sir, we are shocked when an M.P. is physically assaulted and a question of privilege arises. 5-6 days back we went for an on-the-spot assessment of the Bharai incident and later raised this matter in the House. The Ameena case raised a furore in the House but cases of luggage thefts at railway stations go unnoticed. One day we raised this matter. As far as violence is concerned, whichever way you look at it, the Government is responsible for half of the violent incidents in the country. I am not talking of those people who indulge in violence for their livelihood but I am talking of violence by the police and the Government. As far as checking violence is concerned, I would like to say that in the present atmosphere of violence the lives of political leaders, big industrialists etc. are in danger. I request the hon. Home Minister to find out the root cause of this. Only then we can protect the lives of such people.

Sir, the name of the late Indira Gandhi was mentioned, that her bodyguards killed her. I have always believed that there were two persons in the world who should not have died as a result of assassination. One

was Mahatma Gandhi and the other was U.S. President John F. Kennedy. Security was provided but still they were killed. The type of security we are talking about is not enough. We must go to the root of the matter and then find a solution. My friend Shri Ram Bhasu sitting on my left made some incomplete remarks about the period of 5-10 years, and the hon. Home Minister while presenting the Bill also said that the threat could possibly diminish after 5 years. Time is a great healer. I am not saying so with any malafide intention but I am talking about the serious problem which you are taking very lightly. I would like to give an example in this context. It is an historical fact that General Dyer was killed after 26 years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where was he killed?

SHRIGEORGE FERNANDES: He was killed in London. Therefore, we should not take this so lightly. Regarding this Bill, I would appeal to the others that we should not make two categories of people. Everyone's life is of equal value. Such a system should not be established in the country. In view of these facts I strongly oppose this Bill.

16.00 hrs.

[*English*]

SHRIDIGVIJAYA SINGH (Rajgarh): Sir, I rise to support the Bill and it is unfortunate that hon. Members on this side of the House are treating this very serious issue in such a light-hearted manner. We are in a situation where one of the most dynamic leaders of modern India, Shri Rajiv Gandhi was brutally assassinated only a few months back and his immediate family is also under a threat of life. Their security is utmost essential.

I was very sorry to hear the arguments which were brought forward by some of my friends. One of my friends said, "Why should a person of a family of the Prime Minister come into active politics? He should remain behind the closed doors and he will be secure."

Hon'ble Shri George Fernandes made a long speech. There is no question of differentiation. The point remains that the Special Protection Group is a highly trained group of Police officers who are to be trained only for the security of VIPs. A special Act has been provided for them. So, this group is essentially for the protection of the VVIPs who need protection. Earlier it was confined to the family of the assassinated Prime Ministers only. But now the point is raised by some of our Opposition Members and the Government is including the families of ex-Prime Ministers also. Though they may not have threat of life today, they may have it later. So, I welcome that provision also.

I fail to understand why this protection of SPG is being confined only to five years. Why does the Government feel that there should be a time limit to this? The moment the threat to life is not there, or if the family feels that it does not need it, it can be withdrawn. That is why, this bureaucratic wrangle of fixing a time limit of five years is not necessary. So, I feel that this should be again considered.

There is not much to be said about this Bill to support and the situation in this country has come no such a sorry state that politics as such in this country are being criminalised. Today only, on the floor of the House we heard about an ex-Member of

Parliament and a Minister in Uttar Pradesh, who in spite of his letter of warning could not be saved. He could not be provided security.

Hon'ble Shri George Fernandes has rightly pointed out the instance of Shri Rajdev Singh, a Sikh who is openly coming out against the terrorists in Punjab. These are the people whom security of the highest order should be given. These are the people who will defend this country against terrorism. No amount of policing and no amount of military can save Punjab and Kashmir from terrorism. Only people of Punjab and Kashmir who have the guts and courage to stand up against terrorism can do it. They may not be provided SPG protection. But I would urge upon the Government to consider such cases and provide them the highest possible security that is possible to the Police force, the NSG or anyone.

That is why, I strongly advocate and support this Bill. I would also request the Opposition Members to support this Bill.

In view of the present situation which has been created by the utmost criminalisation of politics in this country, this Bill must be passed and security of the highest order especially SPG should be given to the family of ex-Prime Ministers and assassinated ex-Prime Ministers.

[Translation]

Translation of the speech originally delivered in Telugu.

\*SHRIBH. VIJAYAKUMAR RAJU (Narasapur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, The Special

\*Translation of the speech originally delivered in Telugu.

[Sh. Bh. Vijayakumar Raju]

Protection Group (Amendment) Bill, 1991 is before the House for consideration.

Smt. Indira Gandhi, the then Prime Minister was shot dead by her own Security Guard in 1984. Everyone in the House knows how had the situation was in the country and especially in Punjab during those days. Situation was tense everywhere. Shri Rajiv Gandhi became Prime Minister after the assassination of his mother. There was a threat to his life and to the lives of his family members after the assassination of Smt. Indira Gandhi. It is a fact which nobody can ignore. The prevailing atmosphere, the worsened law and order situation is quite well known to everyone. Keeping in view the threat to the life of Shri Rajiv Gandhi and his immediate family members, a Special Protection Group was constituted in the year 1988 to provide for the proximate security to him and his family members. Thus a special security cover was provided to him thereafter.

Now this Amendment Bill has been introduced in the House extending the scope of the parent Act to the assassinated Prime Minister, assassinated ex-Prime Minister and to their immediate family members. The death of Prime Minister or an Ex. Prime Minister may depend on various factors. It may be a natural death or a murder. We have to consider all aspects when a Prime Minister or an Ex. Prime Minister is assassinated. What is important is the prevailing situation, both political and social, during that period. Security cover very much depends on the prevailing situation. This Amending Bill is now introduced to extend the security cover of the Special Protection Group to the immediate family members of the assassinated Prime

Minister and assassinated Ex. Prime Minister. Now the Hon. Minister has stated that the security cover would be provided for a period of 5 years. I humbly submit that the security cover should not be tagged to a time frame. Security cover cannot be decided by a particular, prescribed time limit. It very much depends on the prevailing atmosphere. It is the primary duty of the Govt. to provide security to all those who need it. Ensuring the safety and security of every citizen is the fundamental responsibility of any Government. Nobody can dispute this basic fact. Any citizen, whosoever he might be, is entitled to get protection from the State if his life is in danger.

Sir, we are living in an uneasy atmosphere. The law and order situation, is worsening day by day. Crime is intruding the body-politic of the country. There is no security to anyone. In such a situation protection by State is quite imminent to confine the security cover to family members of the assassinated Prime Minister and Ex. Prime Minister only to 5 years is not justified under these conditions. It should be provided as long as it is necessary. The Govt. should review the position from time to time and decide about the security arrangement. An amendment Bill to this effect should be introduced as early as possible. It is upto the Govt. to decide how long a person or a family needs the State protection. Constant review is necessary for the purpose. The financial memorandum says that the expenditure involved for this purpose is Rs. 4.5 crores per annum. It is only two or three families which need special security today. But tomorrow the situation might be different. For 44 long years: after independence, the Prime Minister came from one family only. Situation is going to be different now onwards. Already we have seen the frequent

changes in the Prime Ministership in the last couple of years. What is going to be the burden on exchequer in coming years if we provide security to each and every family of the ex. assassinated and assassinated ex. Prime Ministers. Is the country in such a sound position economically to bear the burden? Hence the need should be taken as the primary consideration but not time. It should not be by virtue of death, but it should be by virtue of the prevailing situation. Moreover, now the Bill is confined only to the immediate family members of the assassinated Prime Ministers and ex. Prime Ministers. It should not be so. As the Hon. members who preceded me pointed out, the life of our Ex. Members of Parliament, who also had been an Ex. Minister, was not protected, though, he brought to notice of the Govt. one and a half month ago that there is a threat to his life. Ignoring all the persons who really needed and deserved protection, to spend Rs. 4.5 crores on a singly family is highly objectionable. The same facility should be extended to all those who need it. Mahatma Gandhi advocated peace. He is the father of the nation. Millions, under his leadership, sacrificed their lives for the sake of independence. They faced bullets cheerfully for the sake of their motherland. But, today the situation is quite opposite. People run away the moment they see the guns. The society has degenerated to such a low level. What is the reason for this demoralisation? We the men in politics are responsible for this degradation of the society. We cannot shun away from this responsibility. Even after 44 years after independence, we could not achieve economic equality. We failed to provide social justice to our citizens. We failed to achieve our economic and social goals. This is the sum the substance of our 44 years' rule. What is more, we could not even provide security to our people. The

society has been divided on communal, caste and regional lines. Terrorism and extremism are ruling the roost today. It all speaks volumes of failure of the successive Govts. The time has now come to think about of progress and the well-being of everyone. Individuals in the country should not be left to make their own arrangements for the safety and security of their lives. It is the responsibility of all the political parties to think and make up their mind as to which direction the nation has to proceed.

I do agree that the security cover has to be provided to the families of assassinated Prime Minister and assassinated Ex. Prime Ministers in the country. But at the same time let me tell you that nobody is safe in the country today. The Government should at once take steps to improve the situation. Sir, I am not one of those who think that providing special security to the families of assassinated Prime Ministers and Ex. Prime Ministers is not at all necessary. Those families do deserve protection. We agree on this point in principle. But at the same time the special protection should be extended to all those who are in need of it. Under the prevailing circumstances it is very much necessary.

I conclude my speech Sir, thanking you for the opportunity you have give me to speak.

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT (Ajmer):  
Sir, I would like to express my views on the Special Protection Group (Amendment) Bill, 1991 which is under consideration of this House.

All citizens of our country are equal from Kashmir to Kanyakumari and from Gujarat to Nagaland. The primary duty of the Government of the day is to ensure the safety of life

[Prof. Rasa Singh Rawat]

and property of citizens. If it fails to do so then it has no right to continue in power.

Sir, rulers of ancient India put their subjects before themselves. I regret to say that a dynastic rule prevailed in India subsequent to Independence and now Congressmen have brought this Bill to express their loyalty towards the Nehru family. Till now they had expressed their loyalty towards Rajiv Gandhi but now that has changed to loyalty towards Rajiv Gandhi's family as is evident by the introduction of this Bill. Unfortunately, there is a race among Congressmen to prove their loyalty to Shrimati Sonia Gandhi. The brutal assassination of Rajiv Gandhi was a blot on the country. But what were the circumstances that led to the killing and who was responsible for it? Which Government was in power at that time? In spite of this, crores of rupees would be spent towards NSG protection for Shrimati Sonia Gandhi and her family. Initially the SPG was set up for the protection of the Prime Minister. Now the Bill is being amended to provide such protection to former Prime Ministers and family members of Prime Minister also. This is a clear-cut discrimination between one citizen and another. We have three former Prime Ministers in Shri Morarji Desai, Shri V.P. Singh, Shri Chandra Shekhar and also Shri Gulzari Lal Nanda who has been caretaker Prime Minister on 2-3 occasions. The Government has never paid any attention towards providing protection to them and their families. All this is being done to portray and demonstrate loyalty towards Nehru family and Smt. Sonia Gandhi. Sometimes they advise the Prime Minister to set up 'Rajiv Foundation' and then on gauging the futility of the exercise, they start opposing the idea by saying that Mrs Sonia Gandhi

is against all such moves. I would like to make clear that large sums of money of the country now will be spent in the name of Jawahar Jyoti and on Rajiv Jyoti.

Recently a detailed report about Nehru Memorial Museum appeared in the newspapers as to how the wealth of the country is being misused in the name of private expenses. I submit that it is the duty of the Government to protect life and property of all the citizens of the country. In Punjab and Kashmir thousands of innocents are being massacred. They are not being spared at the time of travelling even. They are being brutally killed in trains and buses, they are made to disembark from buses and are asked to form a queue thereafter the militants shot them dead. River waters of Punjab have become red, and in Kashmir lakhs of persons have been made to flee from their homes. Nobody is bothered about the safety and security of women and children in these two States. To provide security to members of a particular family nearly a crore will be spent annually at the cost of the people of India. How much amount will be spent in five years and by how much will it increase? This Bill has been introduced on superfluous grounds to provide security to elitist set up and to create some kind of fantasy. I therefore oppose the Bill.

Sir, through you, I would like to remind the House of the recent statement made by the hon. Minister of Home Affairs, who is present in the House, regarding his inability to raise another battalion of CRPF for shortage of funds. Due to paucity of funds a new battalion could not be raised. But for this at one go Rs. one crore (*Interruptions*)

Our country is facing economic and foreign exchange crisis. On the one hand the Ministers and the Prime Minister are ap-

proaching foreign nations with begging bowls and on the other hand the money is being squandered away like this. Such extravagance needs to be checked.

The former Chief of Army Staff sacrificed his life for the cause of nation. He fell victim to the bullets of militants for ordering troops to enter into Golden Temple during Operation Blue Star to flush out terrorists from the temple premises. The Government could not protect his life at Pune. It has even failed in providing adequate security to Mr Rebeiro, who served as Punjab Police Chief for a long time, and is at present an Ambassador abroad. I would like to remind the Congress (I) members making loud proclamations about secularism that-

"Jako Rakhe Sayain Mar Sake  
Na Koi,  
Bal Na Banka kar Sake Jo Jag  
Beri Hoya".

Have faith in God and formulate such policies, that people do not kill each other and life and property of citizens are safe and secure.

In the end I oppose the Bill and thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak.

[English]

SHRIPAWANKUMAR BANSAL (Chandigarh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the last decade has witnessed violence of unprecedented magnitude. Political frustration has led to the criminalisation of politics. Different sections of political parties and political groups which have not been able to come to power, to form the government in a State or at the Centre, have resorted to means which are

not becoming of political parties of political groups in a civilised country.

When Shri Rajiv Gandhi took over the reins of this country in 1984, it was in the aftermath of a great national tragedy, we had lost Mrs. Indira Gandhi because of political violence in the country. There were various options opened before Shri Rajiv Gandhi at that time. He could have gone in for soft options. He could have compromised with forces which were inimical to the country or, in any case, were not conducive to the welfare of the country. But that was the time when he stood firm. That was the time when he had decided what path he had to follow for the glory of the country, and he chose the path of righteous struggle. He chalked out a goal for the country which was meant to take India to the 21st century. That was the crucial moment in the history of India when Rajiv Gandhi took firm decisions. When Rajiv Gandhi took bold decisions, people who were flabbergasted over his success, started contriving, started a conspiracy to eliminate him. It was in that environment when the Government thought it fit to enact the Special Protection Group Act of 1988 to provide security to the Prime Minister and his immediate family.

In the 1989 elections, the people gave their verdict against the Congress. Shri Rajiv Gandhi ceased to be the Prime Minister but the security threat did not abate. It rather aggravated because there were people, both inside and outside the country, who wanted to ensure that he did not come back to power. Those conspiracies which I have just referred to caught momentum. People worked overtime to ensure that Rajiv Gandhi was eliminated. We raised the voice at that time to seek Special Protection Group's security for Shri Rajiv Gandhi. The Government of the day then declined it on the ground that the security under the Special Protection Group Act, 1988 was available only to the Prime Minister. (Interruptions)

[Sh. Pawan Kumar Bansal]

Yes, it was. But there was nothing stopping the Government to amend the Act to provide that security to Shri Rajiv Gandhi also. And you have seen the consequences of not providing that security to him. My hon. friend Shri Rawat, speaking from the other side, was referring to the cost involved in this case. Does he want to measure the security of a former Prime Minister, who was poised to take over the reins of the Government again, in terms of Rs. 4 crores, or something like that? I am afraid, my hon. friend Shri Rawat has not gone into the amendments moved by the hon. Home Minister to the Bill before the House. If you read the Bill with the amendments, it will be clear that the Special Protection Group security would be available to any and every former Prime Minister of the country. And if we start working out the cost involved in providing security to those people who held high offices in this country, then, I am sorry, we are not doing our duty and we are not coming up to the expectations of our political system. It is not just that a person happens to hold one position today and ceases to hold that position tomorrow. In our democracy, and for that matter in any democratic system, a person who has held any high office today may be voted out by the people tomorrow and then returned day after.

It is with utmost regret that I am constrained to express my opinion and to express a fear that the opposition to this Bill does not emanate from bonafide intentions. I know I am making a little stronger remark on this, particularly about my friends from the B.J.P. But if you look at the security environment prevailing in the country today...

PROF. PREMDHUMAL (Hamirpur): Sir, will you allow me for a minute? *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: No please. Why do you interrupt now?

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Sir, I am wanting to rebutt what hon. Member Shri Rawat said from the other side *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have spoken. He is replying. That is all. There cannot be reply to reply. Nothing is allowed. The time is going up.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Hon. Member Shri Rawat, while speaking from the other side, has over-strained himself to accuse the Congress of wanting to perpetuate one - that is Nehru family in the country. I want to remind Shri Rawat that what the country is today - the country owes its position of pre-eminence to the Nehru family *(Interruptions)*

Shri Rawat is forgetting today, and so also my friends on the other side, as to what was the contribution of Shri Motilal Nehru to the freedom struggle. *(Interruptions)*

He is forgetting about what was the contribution of Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru *(Interruptions)*

He is also forgetting the glorious heights the country attained during the regime of Mrs. Indira Gandhi. And when Mrs. Indira Gandhi died,

Perhaps they were - again I am sorry to make the statement

Their dreams will not come true because the people of the country... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Sir, I am on a point of order.

SHRI RABI RAY (Kendrapada): I am on a point of order (*Interruptions*)

PROF. PREM DHUMAL: I am on a point of order (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not make any uncharitable remarks, to this extent, against any political party.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRIPAWANKUMARBANSAL: I never wanted to. I just wanted to discuss what the Bill was. (*Interruptions*) There is nothing uncharitable. It may be uncharitable to the Members on the other side, when I say that...

SHRI RABI RAY: Mr. Chairman, I am on a point of order (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Also please do not make any defamatory statements.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A Member while speaking is not allowed to make defamatory statements against any Member or any political party please.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RABI RAY: I am on a point of order (*Interruptions*). Let me make my point of order. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

I am on a point of order. Sir, the hon. member has got every right to express his views, but I would like to say that the allegation levelled against the opposition parties regarding assassination of the former Prime Minister, Smt. Indira Gandhi are not correct (*Interruptions*) I would like to say that despite being checked by you or the hon. member kept on reiterating the allegations.

[*English*]

Try to be self-introspective. Don't talk like this about the former Primer Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi for whom everybody had affection. That does not behove well of you. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: I would like to clarify, because what Mr. Rabi Ray said is a comment against my conduct.

Let me say what I said. Sir, you could call for the record to see what I said. I would only like to say... (*Interruptions*) I want to raise the point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go to the other point, please.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: What I said was that there were people who perhaps thought...

That is what I said, Sir. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whatever you said refers to the other political parties (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not proper to make defamatory statements against other political parties. You go ahead now. Go to the other point.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am proud of it if I am called the disciple of Rajiv Gandhi. If I am called the disciple of Mrs. Gandhi, I am proud of it, If I am called the follower of Rajiv Gandhi, I am proud of it. I am proud of being the follower of Rajiv Gandhi. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: You address the Chair.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Sir, are you permitting those remarks? If Mr. Rabi Ray has got up to say this, you ask me to keep quiet on that remark. Is that remark being permitted? *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: If any derogatory remark is made against the Member, I will expunge it after seeing the record.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Sir, it is unfortunate. I can understand the fear of my friends from other side. Because the dominating personality of the eminent people from Nehru family it has not yet been possible for them to come out of their fearful Parehoia.

Sir, it was not in good taste for my hon. friend, Shri Rawat to keep referring to the name of Mrs. Sonia Gandhi today on this matter. *(Interruptions)*

[*Translation*]

I think, I am well educated to understand intricacies. With your permission I would like to come to the provision of the Bill.

[*English*]

Mrs. Sonia Gandhi is the widow of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. If there was any \*\* on the part of these people, they would not have made those comments which they are making.

Sir, in deference to the sentiment of the friends from the other side, the hon. Minister has moved an amendment.

Sir, an uncharitable comment was made on the Rajiv Gandhi Foundation, I don't understand the relevance of that in this provision. This Bill simply seek to provide proximate security by the special protection Group to the immediate family of former Primer

Ministers, besides that of the present Prime Minister and his family. *(Interruptions)*. I want to tell my hon. friends from the other side that none other than me in this House knows, I know what is the agony of terrorism. My own bother was kidnapped for two months and I did not say that here. And he is wanting to give a lecture on that.

I never approached their Government or any of those people. It was in their State that my cousin's kidnap was said to be. I did not come to any of them. I did not approach them. Today they ar wanting to give sermons to me here. I know what they are up to. That is what is unpalatable to them. Even today sitting in their seats, they are thinking of 10 years ahead. Still the ghosts of fear haunt them because they know that in the presence of the Nehru family, in the presence of the Congress tradition, given the history the Congress has, despite all sorts of propaganda unleashed against the Congress, they are not able to fulfil their ambitions.

On hon. Member while speaking on some other bill the other day referred to the atma of the country. India does have its soul. India has inherited the traditions of the past. It does have the soul. If that soul is bleeding today, it is because of some sections of political group here because of whose acts, the country finds itself in a mess.

Sir, I would seek your indulgence because not many people have to speak from our Party. I would not exceed the time allotted to our Party. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ignore all the commentaries, address the Chair and speak on the subject.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: If my hon. friends on the other side are just considerate enough, large-hearted enough to accept the reality, after having hurled all sorts of abuses, after having made all sorts of

malafide allegations against the Congress-I, against the Government for bringing this Bill, this occasion would not have arisen. This Bill is in response to the responsibility not only of the Government but in response to the responsibility of the nation to protect the lives of the former Prime Ministers to protect the lives of the immediate families of the former Prime Ministers. I do not think any of our friends on the other side would rise to say, let the former Prime Ministers go to dog. They would not say that the country need not bother about the former Prime Ministers. Let the former prime Ministers and their families be thrown before the wolves—they do not wish to say so, I am sure. If that is the spirit behind this Bill, I do find it unfortunate when all sorts of extraneous matters are being brought in when arguments are going off the tangent, from the basic provisions of the Bill.

Sir, I support this Bill. It was the sacred responsibility of the Government to bring in this bill. What we had said earlier was proved true in the death of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. had the then Government paid heed to what we were saying, we would not have faced the national calamity, national catastrophe in the death of Shri Rajiv Gandhi.

Before I conclude, I would only say that this Bill deserved outright acceptance by the House. Referring to the various amendments moved to the Bill now, I would honestly say and I would like to draw the attention of the Government to one glaring fact which is noticeable now that the standard of the drafting of legislation has deteriorated. It is not suddenly that this has happened. Over the years we are seeing this. If you see the amendments, they are more lengthy than the Bill itself.

I feel that this Bill itself could have been withdrawn and a new one could have been brought in its place. But since the Government has responded to the views of the hon. Members in this house at the time of intro-

duction of the Bill, the Government deserves kudos for this and not condemnation as it is being done from the other side.

I just like to make one comment on Clause 4.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are not considering Clause by Clause at this stage but the general principles.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Sir, if I refer to the Clauses, you will bar me from doing so, But you asked me to confine to the provisions of the Bill. For that reason, I am referring to Clause 4. Clause 4 provides for the security by the Special Protection Group only for a period of five years to a former Prime Minister or Members of his immediate family and that period of five years is reckoned from the date the Prime Minister ceases to hold office.

I think this provision also could lead to some difficulties at any given point of time, in future.

It is not that after a period of five years, the security perception, the security threat to any former Prime Minister would not be there.

If in a given case, the Government were to find that the security threat still remains, the Government would again have to come with an amendment.

My suggestion in view of that would be that provision as this could have been deleted and instead it could have been left to the Government. That is, if in a given case, the Government feels that the security has to be provided to any former Prime Minister or the members of his immediate family, that could be done at any time because the law that is framed is for good.

It is not a transitional piece of legislation.

[Sh. Pawan Kumar Bansal]

It is meant to be on the statute book for all time to come as a symbol of the manifestation of our concern for the welfare of any person who happens to hold the high office of the prime Minister of the country because during the period the Prime Minister holds that office, there may be many uncharitable decisions which he may have to take. There may be many strong, difficult decisions which he may have to take and it may earn the wrath of some people both in and outside the country and, for that, it becomes the responsibility of the nation to provide security.

With these words, I support the Bill.

**SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE** (Bolpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, So far as the personalities are concerned, we have to avoid that because last time at the time of introduction also I said I am not referring to any personalities.

But the Government has, by its own action, brought certain persons who unfortunately belong to a bereaved family and we have all our sympathies for them. They have been brought into the central position. Kindly look at the Statement of Objects and Reasons. The objects and reasons are meant for one family. It makes the Bill applicable only to one family. It says:-

"Following the tragic assassination of Shri Rajiv Gandhi, Government have received reports that indicate that several extremist organizations, inside and outside India, are conspiring to cause harm to the members of his immediate family. The threat perception emergin from these reports confirms that the danger to the members of the immediate family of the assassinated ex-Prime minister is grave and serious."

"Therefore, this Bill". Therefore, you have made it very very clear to be only for one

family. I sympathise with that family. I am sorry for what has happened. I am extremely sorry that this Bill has been brought and necessarily the personalities are coming in the discussions.

The point we made last time at the time of introduction of the Bill, apart from the clumsines of the drafting which stated as assassinated Prime Minister, assassinated ex-Prime Minister and so on and so forth. Now, to give company, the former Prime Ministers have been brought in. The present Prime Minister and his family are already covered under the Act. Therefore, to make it less obvious, without changing the Statement of Objects and Reasons, you have brought in now the former Prime Minister and his family. Well, I had made this submission earlier and I have to make it again that it is the obligation of the Government to provide security to all and sundry. Security to everybody and everybody's family, the life of every person in that family is precious. Somebody may be losing his father; somebody may be losing his son. It is as important to that family as to any other family. The threat perception may be more. But in this country, are not innocent people being killed? Rightly, one hon. Member said that people are brought down from the bus, from the train and they are being killed indiscriminately. What is their fault? What is the feeling of the Members of their family? Therefore, I strongly feel about it. It is the obligation of the Government to provide security to everybody. I say that you take the power to provide security. But why do you bring in a Bill mentioning one particular individual or individual family? Really, the Bill, as originally introduced, was only for three individuals in this country. There is no doubt about it. The Prime Minister and his family are already covered. Therefore all these questions have now come up. I say that you take the power. I said on the last occasion and I still say that I trust the Home Minister. He will decide who will require special protection or not. Now, a

mandatory duty is being imposed on the armed forces to provide security to 'A', 'B,' or 'C'. Why it is singling out by law?

Sir, I know some people, because of the positions they occupied or they have occupied as Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal says, and because of the fact they have taken or have to take unpalatable decisions, require a little more concern. But we are becoming prone to threats. Even today we were discussing about it. We were present and the Home Minister was also present. Regarding security, sometimes to me it seems we are over-reacting. But how many people are able to protect themselves? For that matter, after this Bill was made into a law and the Special Protection Group was constituted as an armed force, could you save the life of the former Prime Minister? You could not save the life of the former Prime Minister? Therefore, this is not the final protection. Could you save the life of Shri Rajiv Gandhi?

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: That was not provided to him?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: What are you talking? Was it not provided to him? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: It was automatically withdrawn. He died because security was not provided to him. Many times, we have raised in this House about the withdrawal of security to him. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: What is the law? How to do it? Under the law, you cannot withdraw it. The law as it stands say:

"There shall be an armed force of the Union Government called the Special Protection Group for providing proximate security to the Prime Minister and the Members of his immediate family..."

He was ex-Prime Minister. But every

possible security arrangements you had made? Did you not make arrangements?

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: You come to a different point.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Therefore, what I am saying of this is that you may not have given the name of Special Protection Group. But you had provided special Protection group for him. Can you deny that?

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: You understand it in a different way.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Therefore, the point is by giving a name to a force, nobody has said you withdrew the special protection to him.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: That was exactly what happened, which costed the life of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: No interruptions please. Shri Somnath, you may address the Chair.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: So far as the country knows, Shri Rajiv Gandhi was being provided with full security. What had been commented upon was the supposed remissness of the Tamil Nadu Police. But, so far as the other security is concerned, there was no lack of it. It was not that he ever had made any complaint of lack of security. He never made any complaint about the lack or security of absence of security. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: It was not our Government.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: If you are talking of the responsibility of the then Government, then it was your Government. (*Interruptions*)

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee]

When a sitting Member of Parliament was threatened, what was the security that was provided to him. A member of my group, Shri Zainal Abedin, had moved a resolution. He was threatened more than once by telephone, letters, and a threat for extermination of his family. I brought it to the notice of the Home Minister, I brought it to the notice of hon. Speaker and after repeated representations, one or two persons were provided at his House. But, he has no car; he is going about on the streets with a plain-clothed policeman following him. Is it a security? Is that a protection? Did you provide him with a car? What are you talking?

It was the same with the former Member of Parliament, Shri Rajdev Singh. What was his crime? It was that he was Member of Parliament; he belongs to Punjab and he was already a candidate. That was the crime, he has committed. His security has been withdrawn. Does he not require the security? The question is whether you should be allowed to play double standards. That is what Shri George Fernandes has correctly pointed out. His reasoning cannot be faulted.

This country which is in such a serious economic crisis with many other problems, are you able to solve that problem by passing this law, by making some people more equal than the others? But, as I said, I am not on behalf of my party, I am not on behalf of myself, saying that no protection should be given. It will be misunderstood. I do not want to give any signal to the country that we are not concerned about the security of that family. They had suffered a lot and they should be given full security. But, why this special security? That is what I am trying to find out. What special protection group we will provide and can there not be any other protection? It has been rightly said that so many people in this country have given their lives, have sacrificed everything. It is not

something knew. Shri Santosh Mohan Deb was for a while in the Home Ministry, why he was brought in and why he was removed, I do not know. I have written to Shri Chavan, the other day. Now, people are coming to us and we are making representations after representations. Sometimes, they say that "well, those of your co-prisoners' signatures are not legible properly; his records are not recoverable. Since 30 or 40 years old records were not found, they have been thrown to the winds. These people are suffering today, in spite of their sacrifice they had made for the country You are saying, some sacrifices are more important than other sacrifice. We are not approving of this attitude. We don't like this approach.

DR. DEBIPRASAD PAL(Calcutta North-East): Special security is being provided to the Chief Minister of West Bengal and his son.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Through Special Protection Group?

DR. DEBI PRASAD PAL: Yes.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: You are a totally ignorant person as we all know:

DR. DEBI PRASAD PAL: His son requires protection. He is not in power. Why the West Bengal government is spending so much of money on him?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: He is a totally ignorant man. There is no Special Protection Group applicable there. I thought he was enjoying his sleep, now suddenly he has woken up:

What I was appealing to this Government is that, they are unnecessarily creating some kind of a feeling about a family in this country which could have been easily avoided. Have all the powers exercise with discrimination, with discretion, so that people

can understand that the Home Minister who is in charge of the country's security situation has applied his mind and has given protection - whether it is Shri Zainul Abedin or Shri Rajdev Singh or Mrs. Sonia Gandhi and her family? But here you are singling out some particular family for a particular benefit. For that, of course, you cannot deny that a huge sum is being spent. No doubt that it is a huge sum.

Now you have included former Prime Ministers. By this proposed amendment, you are including the former prime Ministers, etc. for five years. If they choose to decline, it is OK. If they don't choose to decline, then you have to provide it. Then Rs. 4.5 crores on every family will be spent.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: It is not so. It is the total amount that is going to be spent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let the Home Minister reply, why do you bother about it?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I shall stand clarified. I don't think he has been briefed by the Home Minister or whether he is contemplating him as his colleague. It says "the expenditure that will be incurred for the additional personnel, equipment and facilities required for the above purpose"-above purpose is to protect this particular family - "is Rs. 4.5 crores per annum". If more families are added, more money is to be spent. This is simple arithmetic. In Haryana they have good mathematicians, I suppose.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): All Lals are good in accounting:

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: We were told that supporting this Bill is showing large heartedness and being considerate. Mr. Bansal says it is the responsibility of the nation. That is precisely what I am talking. The responsibility is to protect everyone in

this country. You are not talking about others. You have not spoken about Shri Zainul Abedin, you have not spoken about Shri Rajdev Singh. Therefore, we are opposed to this double standard. I say, provide all the necessary protection to this family. But you must provide similar security to whoever needs protection in this country.

It is a matter of great concern that more and more people are requiring security in this country. Ministers are requiring security. I get scared whenever I go in that main portico entrance. So many Ministers are coming and MPs are coming. As soon as the doors of their cars are open, AK-47 things come out and people jump out from the cars. For us, who have neither any security, nor even a plain clothed security man, nor AK-47, I don't know what is going to happen. We seem to be men of no status.

17.00 hrs.

I believe, nowadays some people are taking this because that has become a status symbol. If you have an AK-47-WALLAH, with you, then you are sufficiently important in this country to be a target of terrorists. Some of them should be target however.

Therefore, my party would not vote against this Bill. I can assure you. But we do request you that do not try to show your affection or your respect by laws of this nature. You are only showing disrespect to the former Prime Minister. You are not showing respect to his memory by providing this and singling them out for comments and criticism probably which they have not deserved themselves. His widow and his children have not deserved this criticism. They are the victims of the circumstances. You could have done it with much greater grace and much greater consideration for them. By this, you are only opening the gates of criticism.

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee]

[English]

I would have expected and I would expect the Home Minister to give this assurance that everybody will be given protection so that they do not have to run after police officer, Home Minister and then Speaker, Secretary General, and so on and so forth to get the minimum protection for which they are not at fault.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think, I should now ask the Home Minister to reply.

*(Interruptions)*

Sufficient people have spoken on behalf of your party. *(Interruptions)* We are running against time. Now it is five o'clock. Two hours given for this Bill will be over by 5.10.

[Translation]

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA (Jaipur): Two names are still left in the list of speakers from this side. I have also given an amendment for circulation of the Bill for eliciting public opinion. With your permission we will finish our speeches quickly.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will give you one minute.

*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI TEJ NARAYAN SINGH (Bauxar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, from our side also a few speakers are waiting for their turn. We also want to give a few suggestions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chitta Basu, please be brief.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): Sir, to begin with, let me make it clear that I do not share the threat perception behind this Bill. The Bill has been conceived with a perception to provide security to an individual. We have got a law in the country. Before law, a everybody is equal. But that does not mean that we are opposed. As far as my party or myself is concerned, we are opposed to providing the most sophisticated security arrangement for an individual, namely, Mrs. Sonia Gandhi and her children. We are not opposed to it. But the perception of the Bill is faulty because the entire idea is to classify a group of persons among the masses of our country. It is a violation of this principle of equality before law. If my friends do not become very much angry with me, I would say, if you allow me to say, it is nothing but an exhibition of unwanted sycophancy from within a group of the ruling party today. I think, this was not necessary at all. There is nobody in this House, there is nobody in the country who does not want proper protection to be given to a widow, a respectable lady of our country, who happens to be the wife of the former Primer Minister of the country. Nobody denies it. It was nothing but an exhibition of unwanted sycophancy. Therefore, I cannot accept the very basic idea of the perception of this Bill.

Sir, I am told that a special committee was set up to look into the security arrangements made by the Government for the family of our former Prime Minister. A special committee was set up to advise this Government as to what improvement is necessary for the security arrangements of Mrs. Sonia Gandhi and her family. Some of the highly placed officials - I do not want to mention their names - made three trips to the United States of America to examine what kind of

security should be provided to a person whom we have got in our mind... (*Interruptions*)... I am told that the special committee also did not recommend for the coverage under the SPG. They did not recommend it. I think they felt it a wrong thing to do. They say that improvement must be done on the existing security arrangements but they did not recommend the coverage under SPG. Sir, is the SPG the only instrument to provide protection? There are other organizations and institutions. Why is it that only the SPG should be brought in?... (*Interruptions*)... Is it that SPG protection is the status for Mrs. Sonia Gandhi? I think some of my friends led by Mr. Bansal might have thought that SPG protection is the status for Mrs. Sonia Gandhi. It is a pity that they have got that view in mind.

So far as the general condition in the country is concerned, I want to draw the attention of the hon. Home Minister to one point. Can you give protection to your own officers or not? Many of the officers of the Central Government and public sector undertakings have been killed in Jammu and Kashmir and Assam. Shri Rajiv had been killed. I do not know the fate of other seven hostages. You know that the ONGC workers have gone on strike and the strike is costing the country to the extent of Rs.25 crores. You do not think for a moment that there is a need for providing security for your own men, your own ONGC workers and officers. Can you provide adequate security to other officers of your own Government or not? There is no concern shown for them. You have shown unnecessarily a concern for a particular person, however highly placed he or she might be.

Sir, even in this House, complaints have been made by Mr. Ram Vilas Paswan that Government has failed to provide security for him. Today morning, we have seen some Members of the House saying that an ex-

Minister of UP Government had complained that security was not provided for him inspite of the fact that he had applied for it to the Superintendent of Police. In this environment of lack of security for the general masses, political and social activists all over the country, I think, this kind of an attitude to provide special category of security is not commendable and cannot be acceptable.

So far as the sacrifice of the family is concerned, I can say that that question has also been brought in. I want to draw the attention of the hon. Home Minister to one point. Are the persons who have joined the RIN Mutineers not patriots? Are they not freedom fighters? Are they not patriots? Are they not freedom fighters? I put this question to that side of the House. They are freedom fighters. But do you know what your Department has done? Many persons who participated in the RIN mutineers. I refuse to call them mutineers. I call them freedom fighters. But Government of India's Home Ministry has written a note saying that the participants of that freedom struggle are not entitled for pension as freedom fighters. Is their sacrifice less than anybody of us, including myself?

Therefore, I am opposed to the principle of this Bill. But let me clarify that we are in favour of providing security - adequate security - for a person who occupies the exalted office of the prime minister and his family also should receive protection. I do feel that this SPG protection is not called for. It is not necessary. It is undesirable. I think the Government is well advised to withdraw this Bill announcing to the nation at the same time that they will provide adequate security arrangements to the former Prime Ministers and their immediate families.

17.11 hrs.

[MR DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAMASHRAY PRASAD SINGH (Jahanabad): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the amendment Bill has been introduced to provide security to the family members of former Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Deliberately a particular person has been singled out while launching a tirade on the issue.

People of the country hold in high esteem Nehru family, but the praise and respect showered by them is a specific instance. The Government withdraw the allocation made for 'Rajiv Gandhi Foundation' on the Budget after vehement protests in the country. Everyone is aware of the circumstances in which the allocation was done away with. The Government withdrew the allocation on refusal of the person concerned from accepting the money. Nation has been reduced to a grazing ground and these persons are out to wrought havoc. None opposed recruitment of 300 SPG personnel to provide security to late Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi.

It should not have been opposed. But it is being done on personal basis. This issue was discussed earlier also and an uproarious scene was created then. Shri Shayama Prasad Rawat, who belonged to a national party and was a Minister also, was murdered, as no security was provided to him. On the question of security, he was asked an amount of Rs.4000/- per month. On the other side, there is the issue of Rs.4.5 crore. The Government have to look into all these things. The Government has a lot of force. There is BSF and CRPF. If these were to provide security it would have been another thing and there was no need to bring this Bill. Particularly, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi should realise that so many people want to do such a thing for her. It is their conspiracy to bring her from the backdoor one way or the other. but I would like to submit that this country

should not again be made a pasture for a few people. This is true and there is no other thing in it...(*Interruptions*)... I would like to submit that there is insecurity even in the ring of security. You have the examples. Shrimati Indira Gandhi and Shri Rajiv Gandhi were assassinated well within the security ring. All these questions are regarding security. You should at least have some shame that VIPs were assassinated even inside the security ring. How the people can be protected? Do not subject this country to exploitation. You exploited this country for 42 years and the situation has become very miserable. Today, the situation in the country is very bed and the masses are suffering. What Shri Chitta Basu had said was right that a lot of officials are being killed. How will you run the country? Will you run it alone? All have to run this country together and the participation of officials is necessary in it. You have not gone through all these things and have just brought this Bill as if it is your personal property. It should not have been done like this because this country to belongs everyone.

What is happening in Bihar? There are a lot of ex-Ministers in Bihar. They have no danger there, but they have been given a lot of security. Where that expenditure is going? We are the people, who do not have any danger, we are even prepared to go anywhere in the midnight. Those who do wrong things, are always afraid of danger...(*Interruptions*)... That is why I am saying that do not defame them. Don't start a discussion on them. As you have withdrawn that Bill, withdraw this Bill also. It will be better for them. Do you have anything like security...(*Interruptions*)... Secondly, there have been seven Prime Ministers so far. The houses of three late Prime Ministers at Safdarjung, Janpath and Redcross have been converted into memorials and museums. The actual practise should have been allotting the same house to all the Prime Ministers, but it was not followed. These questions remain unanswered. Different

Prime Ministers occupied different houses. It involves a lot of expenditure. This money goes from the pocket of the poor, the labourer, the farmers and the salaried class. It is their hard earned money and we spend it like this. I would like to say that there should be some way of working. As you have honourably withdrawn that Bill, withdraw this Bill also. With these words, I conclude.

**SHRI RAM PRASAD SINGH** (Bikramganj): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak. Sir, this is a great country whose culture and dignity was of highest order. But what is the reason that the citizens of this country, are not feeling safe and secure today which used to provide security to others are into feeling safe and secure today. It symbolises the lack of farsightedness on the part of the leaders sitting in this House. The high-flying bureaucrats of this country who think that they are running the country, have several short comings. Particularly, the industrialists of this country, who spend the money of the country to manufacture goods also have a lot of shortcomings. Actually, these three classes the democrat, the bureaucrat and the industrialist who are running this country have a lot of shortcomings. We all say that we are running this country and frame laws in this House to provide protection to the masses and to bring peace in the country, but we ourselves are the victims of these laws. I am quite pained to see deteriorating condition of the country. A person like me, who has himself tilled the land and has reached this House by doing social service, I had thought that when people like me will be there in the House, we will bring improvement in the deteriorating situation of this country and security arrangements in the villages. If we cannot provide security to our big leaders and our former Prime Ministers, we can never provide security to anyone through this special Protection Bill which we are going to enact. If security could have been provided by

making such laws, John F. Kennedy, the former President of U.S.A. could also have been saved. But he could not be saved.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi was assassinated by her own bodyguards. Therefore, we cannot provide security through such law. I am saying this because the bureaucrats, the democrats and the industrialists, who are running this country have totally indulged in fulfilling their vested interests. Instead of being persuaded by national feelings, they are persuaded by their self interests. They are leading the society today. The entire society has lost its direction. I am opposing this Bill because it is necessary to change this psyche today and until we change the psyche of the masses of this country, whatever Bill we may present, we will not be able to provide any security... (Interruptions)... I am saying this because the democrats, who take the oath of defending the democracy, protecting the masses and development of the country, do just opposite. Is it not true that in the service book of the bureaucrat, he is described as a public servant, but has today become the master and has no regard for the feelings of the masses. Is it not true that the I.A.S. officers, who prepare the plans for the development and upliftment of the country and which are implemented through this House, accept bribes. The industrialists of this country say that they are making good quality products but they actually manufacture substandard goods. A lot of bureaucrats and democrats provide shelter to these industrialists. Sir, until this nation will remain, this country cannot be developed through such democrats, bureaucrats and industrialists. Until the psyche of these three is changed, how much law we may enact, we can never guarantee the security of the masses. That is why, I oppose this Bill. I would request the Members of this House that we are the leaders of this country and we are patriots, we should create an atmosphere of love and affection and should bring back the old heri-

[Sh. Ram Prasad Singh]

tage of Indian culture. Only then there will be peace everywhere.

Tulsidasji had said:-

"Par hit saris dharam nahin bhai, par peeda sam nahin adhmai."

The Bharatiya Janta Party members should remember this Chaupai and should love the others and should accept that no religion is above the benevolence and to create sufferings for others in the biggest crime. If all the people adopt this policy, there will be no quarrel, among the people and their will be no need of such Bills.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I oppose this Bill. We should create an atmosphere of humanity in which the bureaucrats, the democrats and the industrialists will work together and bring progress to the country.

17.26 hrs.

[SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA *in the Chair*]

PROF. PREMDHUMAL (Hamirpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am speaking of this Bill only because I want to tell something to hon'ble Member of Parliament from Chandigarh.

The first thing is that my friend has not listened to the complete discussion. He is not aware as to what the speakers from my party said earlier and also later on. He was perhaps present even on the day the Bill was introduced. At that time, the leader of our party, hon. Shri Advaniji had told that you are telling about the family of assassinated Prime Ministers only and had requested not to talk of any specific family and all Prime Ministers should be included in it. The area of functioning of this Bill should be enlarged. He had said that he supported the Bill and no

one will deny the protection that is going to be provided in this Bill. Now it is a different thing as to what are its reasons. What ever policies your party had been adopting earlier today that family needs protection but you have added many more things. Even the assassination of Mrs. Indira Gandhi has been included in it. I would not like to go into these issues.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Chandigarh): I made my point after listening to the speech of Shri Rawat. (Interruptions)...

PROF. PREM DHUMAL: That is why I said that you did not listen to the complete discussion. Had you listened to it completely, you would not have said so. (Interruptions)...

Mr. Chairman, Sir, we support the feeling behind the Bill and it is now a reality that you need Special Protection Guard for the family of the former Prime Minister, late Shri Rajiv Gandhi. At the same time, the amendment given by Shri Advani has also been accepted by you and you have amended it by including words former Prime Ministers" in it, but you have not brought the entire issue in the amendment. Moreover, you have made the provision of only Rs.4,50 crores. For one family the amount provided was Rs.4.50 crore and now that 4 family have been included, the amount remains the same.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, my friend is objective to the mention of the names of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi or of his family. But you have given the same reason in the statement of "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill. I would therefore, urge that if the motive behind the Bill is to provide protection to only one family then do not to use this occasion to prove your loyalty. The feelings expressed by my friends must have been noted. Subsequently, many other Members have expressed that you will be adopting double standards by this Bill. On one hand when an ordinary person is killed or head of a family is killed, the family is

unable to get even food and on the other hand, you are thinking of providing protection to some particular families. You should think about the families of the common man also. People are brought down from the buses and are killed. The Government should pay attention to them also.

I do not want to go into it all but do not blame us. You are going to organise the Special Protection Group for providing protection to that family, and you have also agreed to the amendment brought by us regarding provision of protection to the former Prime Ministers and their families. But fund should also be increased. At the same time, I would also like to say that the protection of common man is equally important. You must realise this also.

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA (Jaipur): Hon. Madam Chair-person, my submission is that this Bill regarding Special Protection will divide the people into three categories; first, people with security, the second, people with special protection and the third, those who are without any protection. On one particular family, an expenditure of Rs.4.5 crore will be incurred. My submission is that to spend such a huge amount on the protection of a single family is not justified.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may speak at the time of presenting the amendment.

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA: Madam, I will not speak at that time. I will not take time on that issue. There should be certain rules for these persons when they travel within the country and also outside the country. Under this arrangement, they will be given Special Protection during their journey abroad also and all the guards will accompany them during this journey. This Bill was introduced in the past also. At that time also, the only thing in the mind was to provide protection to Shri. Rajiv Gandhi.

Now, a Bill has been brought in his and in his family's name. Under this Bill, no attention has been paid to other Prime Ministers and the members of their families.

I would like to ask hon. Home Minister as to what amendment in this Bill is going to be made regarding the protection of other four Prime ministers and their families. Suppose the Prime Minister is not a Member of Parliament and embarks upon some other venture, he will not be able to hold confidential discussions with anyone in the presence of such Special Protection Group. He will say people from Special Protection Group are sitting. Suppose you want to speak to Mrs. Sonia Gandhi. She will say first Special Protection Group people should be asked to leave, only then she will talk. So what is the use of all this? The Opposition wanted to bring this Bill earlier for providing protection to former Prime Ministers. The Congress Party did not agree to that. What we have to ensure is as to how this atmosphere of violence and hatred can be removed.

We have been asking for providing protection to the Uttar Pradesh Chief Minister but you put a spanner in that effort.

Today, on him also, one hundred crore rupees are being spent. I have come to know from reliable sources that 300 jawans from Italy have been trained. This Bill has been brought to employ those 300 jawans. I have got this confidential information and on that basis, the Congress Party... (Interruptions). Why did not you bother to bring this Bill after Smt. Indira Gandhi's assassination? No one will appreciate the killing of Shri Rajiv Gandhi; that was a deplorable act. Your security personnel themselves kill your Prime Minister. Smt. Indira Gandhi fell victim to them. Why did it not concern you at that time? What makes you worried this time? In the case of S/Shri Morarji Bhai, V.P. Singh, Chandra Shekhar, Charan Singh and Lal Bahadur

[Sh. Girdhari Lal Bhargava]

[English]

Shastri...*(Interruptions)* Kindly ask them not to interrupt...

*(Interruptions)*

[English]

SHRI DIGVIJAYA SINGH: Madam Chair-person, he is supposed to speak on his amendment. But he is not speaking on his amendment. He is making irresponsible statement. What is this?...*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA: You are going to spend four to five crore rupees on one family. What will be the expenditure on security, have you calculated that?...*(Interruptions)* A Private Member Bill was also brought here. Nothing was done. In the name of security, eight vehicles keep on escorting even an ordinary Minister or the Prime Minister. An ambulance also accompanies so that in case of heart failure of the Minister, treatment could be given...*(Interruptions)*. Earlier, when the Prime Minister used to pass through a certain route, the traffic was blocked for hours together and even the Members of Parliament were not allowed to pass through that route. Even an ordinary Minister is provided with eight vehicles to escort him and gunmen with their hand on trigger keep on sitting in those vehicle...*(Interruptions)* People's representatives do not need such elaborate security arrangements. I am, therefore, opposing this Bill but of course, they and certain families should be provided security. This Bill has been brought just to provide employment to those 300 jawans from Italy who have been trained. That is why I am opposing this Bill. I conclude by saying that security should be provided to the Prime Minister and others.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S.B. CHAVAN): Madam Chair-person, I must express my gratitude to all the hon. Members for having freely expressed their points of view, and whatever they had in their mind without any holds barred, I think, they have been able to express there views in very unmistakable terms.

We are also partly responsible because the Statement of Objects and Reasons did mention the name of the family. And to that extent, we are also equally responsible for giving you an opportunity to say the things which normally should not have been spoken after the assassination of the ex-Prime Minister. But this provided an opportunity and I cannot possibly defend this because it is a statement of fact that in the Statement of Objects and Reasons we have given the names. So I would not deal on that point. You are perfectly within your right to say whatever you had in your mind about family. Any way, we are not concerned about it.

I fully agree with the hon. Members that people at large deserve more security. If you see the entire atmosphere, I am sure, the hon. Members will agree with me that the atmosphere of violence and terrorism is found not only in India but in most of the countries of the world. But this is not a consolation that we should take that why you should bother about violence and terrorism in India. There are some people who, in fact, are entrusted in creating a situation where they would like to carve out a country for themselves. Some people are agitating for Khalistan. Some people are agitating for Jammu and Kashmir not only for a special status but they would like to see that though they are not in favour of merging with Pakistan, yet in the heart of their hearts there is a feeling that they would like to have independence if possible. These are the forces with which we have to deal. There is a third force which is almost playing

an identical role in Assam. ULFA, Bodos and other forces are combining and creating that kind of a situation. We cannot forget LTTE in the south who are creating problem there. All these examples I am giving with a view to see the kind of atmosphere which has been created.

I am one with the hon. Members when they say that ordinary people also require minimum security and it is the responsibility of the Government to see that that security is being provided. We cannot run away from that fact. But in this also we will have to discriminate between security which is to be given to people at large and some people amongst them who have greater threat.

17.43 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

If the hon. Members would say that they have no right to be given that kind of a security, I am prepared to do that. I will not quarrel about it. Thereafter there are Members of Parliament. Here the hon. Member, Shri Somnath Chatterjee, is very right. There are some hon. Members who have expressed their views on the floor of the House. Thereafter if they feel that they have been threatened, I cannot possibly dispute that. If the hon. Members were to express this opinion, Government has no option but to provide security. That is why, yesterday, when Mr. Sonkar was asking for security, thereafter most probably in order to test me whether I am to react differently, hon. Members from this side said: "we are also getting threats". I said, if you feel threatened, by all means, I am prepared to give you also security. All Members are equal in this House whether they belong to this side or the other side. This is a new thing which we are finding that even for expressing their opinion, hon. Members have to ask for security. It is something which I never heard before. It is for the first time that this thing is happening. The situation is such

that we have to take these realities into consideration. That is why, this Bill has been brought forward for persons of a particular category.

The hon. Member, Shri Advani, has said that this has not been properly drafted. Your phraseology has to change. Why giving the special protection only for the one family, why not giving to others? That was the point which was made. I am sure that the hon. Members if they go through all the amendments that I have brought about, they will feel satisfied that all the ex-Prime Ministers after demitting their office, we provide security for five years. Now, the point is why give security for five years, why not more? Why not Government have the discrimination of giving this point of view but since hon. Members have raised this point, it is my responsibility now to respond to that. This is a kind of politics which we are having in this country now that with the change of Government even the security threat also changes. I am sorry that whether this Government or any other Government, if the threat perception is there, irrespective of the kind of the Government and the political party, which is in the ruling party, you can't possibly take chance with the security of the person. Shri Mulayam Singh was facing a particular situation immediately after the change of the Government. Somehow, he feels that I am facing a threat to my life. In spite of some kind of a opposition from some hon. Members, I had to conceive the point that certainly we will give you security and we have provided the same. My difficulty is with the state Government. It is the primary responsibility of the State Government to see that security is being provided.

Now, a question was asked as to what happens if the person to whom the security is provided goes abroad? I won't be able to give all the information but we have clear arrangements with the respective countries. What kind of arrangements are and what

[Sh. S.B. Chavan]

security will be provided is a matter which I would not like to divulge on the floor of the House. All the security required is being provided when such a person goes abroad. We get in touch with the Government concerned and they provide all the security that is called for.

I would like to again request hon. Members to kindly consider that five years period has been provided only from this point of view. But, after five years, if the threat perception is still there, it is a non-SPG security which will become available. Normally, we feel that after five years, it should not be possible, it should not be necessary for us to provide SPG security to the person concerned. But, if the threat is of such a nature that non-SPG category will not suffice, then at that particular time that aspect will have to be taken into account. But, I should say that non-SPG security is available which can be provided under the circumstances.

A point was raised about Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Shri Rajiv Gandhi had all the security and still he was killed. I would not like to tell anything because a Commission is sitting on this particular issue whether adequate security is there or whether any security lapse has been committed? This is a point under the consideration of the Commission which has been appointed. Verma-Commission is going into all these aspect and that is why I do not think that it will be proper on my part to say anything about it. But, there is no running away from the fact that there were lapses might be or might not be, I can't possibly give an expression to any opinion which hon. Members expected from me.

The security was given to Shrimati Indira Gandhi and her security guard killed her. It is a fact of life. A Commission was ap-

pointed. They also gave there recommendations, but once in a while these things also do happen and it will not be proper on my part to say that while providing the security everything is going to be provided for and there will be no security lapse on the part of the officer concerned. In spite of this also, the person concerned will have to be more careful to see that all directions which are given in a blue book or some of the guidelines which have been given, have to be unscrupulously followed. If they do not follow them and then make the officer who is going to be incharge of their security responsible, then it will be very difficult for us to defend such a case.

Points have been made which, in fact, were not very germane to the discussion that we are having - about freedom fighters' cases and other things. I think we will have to discuss those things separately. It will not be proper on my part to discuss them now because I do not have the information readily available with me.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: But you should consider their cases sympathetically.

SHRI. S.B. CHAVAN: I have taken note of what you have said. So, these are the major points which were raised. I have tried my best to explain. For the rest of the things, I do not think it is necessary for me to give any response.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: What about Rajdev Singh's security?

SHRI. S.B. CHAVAN: I have got the information that Rajdev Singh was provided security. Security has been sought. Government of Punjab have been given instructions by wireless on 23.8.1991 for providing security in Punjab. Police Commissioner, Delhi has also been instructed to provide him security when he visits Delhi. But if there is any such complaints, I will beg of the hon. Member to ask the gentleman concerned to

come and see me. If there is anything he requires, I will certainly look into it.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: He will be seeing you tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put amendment No.4 moved by Shri Girdhari Lal Bhargava to the vote of the House.

*The Amendment No.4 was put and negatived*

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put amendment No. 9 moved by Shri George Fernandes to the vote of the House.

*The Amendment No. 9 was put and negatived*

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

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

*The motion was adopted*

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

**Clause 2 - Amendment of Long Title**

MR. SPEAKER: There are amendments to clause No.2 suggested by the hon. Members. Shri Ram Naik.

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay North): Sir, I beg to move:

Page 1,—

*for clause 2 substitute—*

2. In the Special Protection Group Act, 1988 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act), in the long title, for the words "Prime Minister of India and the members of his immediate family", the words "Prime Minister of India and ex-prime Minister of India and the members of their immediate families" shall be substituted.'

MR. SPEAKER: Shri K.P. Unnikrishnan - Absent.

Shri Rasa Singh Rawat's amendment is identical with the amendment moved by Shri Ram Naik. So, I am not calling him.

Shri Girdhari Lal Bhargava.

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA (Jaipur): Sir, I beg to move:

Page 1, lines 7 to 9, —

*for* "the members of the immediate family of the Prime Minister, assassinated Prime Minister and assassinated ex-Prime Minister"

*substitute*

"members of the immediate families of the Prime Minister and ex-Prime Minister" (13)

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S.B. CHAVAN): Sir, I beg to move:

Page 1, lines 7 to 9,—

*for* "the members of the immediate family of the Prime Minister, assassinated Prime Minister and assassinated ex-Prime Minister"

[Sh. S.B. Chavan]

*substitute—*

"former Prime Ministers of India and Members of their immediate families" (19)

SHRI RAM NAIK: Sir, my amendment says that the entire section has to be substituted by another section. The amendment reads like this:

Page 1, —

*for clause 2 substitute -*

' 2. In the Special Protection Group Act, 1988 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act), in the long title, for the words "Prime Minister of India and the members of his immediate family", the words "Prime Minister of India and ex-Prime Minister of India and the members of their immediate families" shall be substituted.'

In my amendment and the amendment moved by the Home Minister, there is absolutely no difference. The difference - if at all that can be called a difference - is that I have said 'ex-Prime Minister' and the Home Minister has said 'former Prime Minister'. 'Ex' and 'former' do not make any difference. He has accepted our contention and we also agree with what the Government says. So, I would only appeal that there has been a general practice just to reject the amendments which are moved by the Opposition, and that particular practice should be changed now. Whatever I have suggested is precisely the same which the Home Minister has suggested. Moreover, my amendment is first. I have suggested it earlier and the

Home Minister has come afterwards. So, I appeal to the House that my amendment should be accepted.

AN HON. MEMBER: And his amendment should be rejected.

SHRI RAM NAIK: No, no. Once my amendment is accepted, probably he will withdraw his amendment. That is what I would like to say on my amendment.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I quite appreciate the sentiments expressed by hon. friend Shri Ram Naik. But, at the same time, I will request him to withdraw. There are some legal formalities which have to be completed. My amendment has been vetted through the Law Ministry. That is why I am requesting him. The principle is acceptable. Wordings should not be insisted. I request him to withdraw.

SHRI RAM NAIK: Sir, in deference to the wishes expressed by the hon. Home Minister I request you to allow me to withdraw my amendment. I seek leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the hon. members leave of the House, to withdraw his amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Yes.

*The Amendment No. 5 was, by leave, withdrawn*

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF STEEL (SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV): All Maharashtra - Member, Minister and Speaker! (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Is this an aspersion on the Chair? (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Well, Maharashtra is inclusive of 'rashtra'.

It is not exclusive of all other provinces.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Let there not be fraternity. Too much of fraternity is not good. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Bhargava, I have come to know that you have delivered a speech in your First amendment.

MR. GIRDHARILAL BHARGAVA: Right Sir, I will follow what you say.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much. It is finance bill now and I have decided that we have work on finance bill after six.

[*English*]

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA: I seek leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the hon. Member of the House to withdraw his amendment?

SOME HON MEMBERS: Yes, Yes.

*The Amendment No. 13 was, by leave, withdrawn*

MR. SPEAKER: Now I shall put Amendment No. 19, moved by Shri S.B. Chavan. The question is:

Page 1, lines 7 to 9,

*for "the members of the immediate family of the Prime Minister, assassinated Prime Minister and assassinated ex-Prime Minister"*

*substitute:-*

"former Prime Ministers of India and members of their immediate families". (19)

*The motion was adopted*

I will not put Clause No. 2, as amended, to the vote of the House.

The question is:

That Clause No. 2 as amended, stands part of the Bill.

*The motion was adopted*

*Clause No. 2, as amended, was added to the Bill*

18.00 hrs.

**Clause 3 - Amendment of Section 2**

MR. SPEAKER: We will now take up Clause No. 3. Shri Ram Naik, are you moving the amendment?

SHRI RAM NAIK: Sir, I move:

Page 1, —

*for lines 11 and 12 substitute -*

' (i) in clause (a), for the words "Prime Minister of India and the members of his immediate family" the words "Prime Minister of India and ex-Prime Minister of India and the members of their immediate families" shall be substituted.' (6)

Page 1, lines 16 and 17,-

*for " assassinated Prime Minister or assassinated ex-Prime Minister"*

*substitute " and ex-Prime Minister". (7)*

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Unnikrishnan, are you moving the amendments?

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): Sir, it seems most of my amendments have been accepted in the form of the amendments of the Home Minister. All that I wanted to say was that security should be provided for those who seek security. But, unfortunately, he has brought in another element, restricting it to former Prime Ministers for five years after they demit their office. This is not necessary because it would look like excluding one person who has recently been given Bharat Ratna. That is very unfortunate. Anyhow, I do not want to propose to move my amendment.

[*Translation*]

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA: It you permit (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I request you not to move, if you want.

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL Bhargava: The Chair's ruling will be acceptable to me.

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT: I am not moving.

[*English*]

*Amendments made:*

Page 1, line 12,—

for ' "the immediate family" ' substitute

" his immediate family or a former Prime Minister and the members of his immediate family" (20)

Page 1, —

omit line 13 to 17 (21)

(Shri S.B. Chavan)

SHRI RAM NAIK: I would not like to take much of the time of the House. The basic concept is the same. That is why I won't make a speech - provided the Home Minister

requests withdraws, then only I will concede. Otherwise I won't.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: I would request you to withdraw.

SHRI RAM NAIK: I seek the leave of the House to withdraw my amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the amendments moved by Shri Ram Naik be withdrawn?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Yes.

*Amendments No. 6 and 7 were, by leave withdrawn*

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clause 3, as amended, stands parts of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted*

*Clause 3, as amended, was added to the Bill.*

**Clause 4 - Amendment of Section 4**

SHRI RAM NAIK: I move:

Page 1, —

'4. In section 4 of the principal Act, in sub-section (1), for the words "Prime Minister of India and the members of his immediate family" the words "Prime Minister of India and the ex-Prime Minister of India and members of their immediate families" shall be substituted.'" (8)

Now, this is a little different amendment. Whatever has been the amendment which has been suggested by the Home Minister, he said that the security would be available to the ex-Prime Ministers for 5 years. Now, I have given an amendment to amendment to delete "for a period of five years from the date on which the former Prime Minister ceased to hold the office of the Prime Minister". My

only purpose is whether it is to be for 5 years or 10 years or 12 years, I would like to leave it to the Government. But just because some law is there, if some adamant officer is there, then probably he may say that law says that five years are over'. I would not like these things to be left like that. So, I would insist that this particular period of five years should be deleted, and if that is deleted, then the purpose would be served. This is my view and I would like to have response from the Home Minister on this particular aspect.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I can understand the difficulty which the hon. Member has expressed, but at the same time, we cannot rule out the possibility of some people trying to take this advantage and the situation as it might prevail. After five years, if the hon. Members feel that this needs to be extended at that time, might be that we will have to consider the whole thing, but even after the period of five years, the non-SPG cover is definitely available, but if the security threat is even more than what is contemplated, at that particular time we can consider and that is why I will request the hon. Member to withdraw his amendment.

SHRI RAM NAIK: I don't agree with him because it is not for that member to say whether security should be given or not. It is for the Government to decide and if there is an administrative lapse on the part of the Government, then probably I feel the protection which is intended to be given may not be available. On this point I do not wish to withdraw my amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put the amendment moved by Shri Ram Naik to the vote of the House.

*Amendment No. 8 was put and negatived*

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: I beg to move

Page 1—

for clause 4, substitute—

4. For sub-section (1) of section 4 of

the principal Act, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

"(1) There shall be an armed force of the Union called the Special Protection Group for providing proximate security to—

- (i) the Prime Minister and the members of his immediate family; and
- (ii) any former Prime Minister or to the members of his immediate family for a period of five years from the date on which the former Prime Minister ceased to hold the office of the Prime Minister:

Provided that any former Prime Minister or any member of the immediate family of the Prime Minister or of a former Prime Minister may decline such proximate security." (22)

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

Page 1—

for clause 4, substitute—

'4. For sub-section (1) of section 4 of the principal Act, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

"(1) There shall be an armed force of the Union called the Special Protection Group for providing proximate security to—

- (i) the Prime Minister and the members of his immediate family; and
- (ii) any former Prime Minister or to the members of his immediate family for a period of five years from the date on which the former Prime Minister ceased to hold the office of the Prime Minister:

Provided that any former Prime Minister or any member of immediate family of the Prime Minister or of a former Prime Minister may decline such proximate security." (22)

*The motion was adopted*

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put Clause 4, as amended, to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That Clause 4, as amended, stands part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted*

*Clause 4, as amended, was added to the Bill*

MR. SPEAKER: Now the question is:

"That clause, 1, Enacting Formula, and the Long Title stand part of the Bill.

*The motion was adopted*

*Clause 1, 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. SPEAKER: The question is:

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

*The motion was adopted*

18.07 hrs.

#### BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

##### Fifth Report

[English]

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): I beg to present the Fifth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): What is it?

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Saifuddin Choudhary has presented the Business Advisory Committee Report. It will be circulated and it will come up for adoption.

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay-North): We were told earlier, at least it is my information, by our Chief Whip that we have not agreed for taking up the Finance Bill today.

MR. SPEAKER: I will accept it.

SHRI RAM NAIK: If there is any other information, I do not know. But by the way, he told us that only we have agreed for passing this Bill today.

MR. SPEAKER: No. I think this matter did not come up for discussion today. It was not discussed today whether we are sitting late. It was discussed yesterday that too many Bills are pending with us and the House is sitting only up to 16th of this month and some of the Bills have to go to Rajya Sabha also. So there was a broad agreement that we will cooperate and sit for long hours also if it is necessary and we may pass it also. In deference to the consensus, which was broadly arrived at, not specifically on this point, I would request that let us sit for some more time and transact the business.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD): Shri George Fernandes suggested yesterday that we sit up to 11 O' Clock. But we may not sit up to 11 O' Clock. We may sit up to 8 O' Clock.

18.01/2 hrs.

[English]

#### FINANCE (NO. 2) BILL, 1991

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now take up the Finance (No.2) Bill. Twelve hours have been allotted for discussion of the Bill. If the House agrees, we may have nine hours for General Discussion, two hours for Clause by Clause consideration, and one