

15.32 hrs.

**Title:** Consideration and passing of the Special Protection Group (Amendment) Bill, 2002 (Bill amended and passed)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, the House will take up Legislative Business, Item no. 15. The time allotted is two hours. Shri I. D. Swami.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI I.D. SWAMI): Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, I beg to move :

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

In fact Sir, this Bill was enacted for the constitution of Special Protection Group (SPG) in the year 1988 and within a period of 10 to 11 years from 1988 to 1999, the Act was amended thrice.

First, it was amended in the year 1991 because primarily the SPG was constituted to provide for the SPG cover for the Prime Minister. But, later on it was felt that the former Prime Ministers should also be provided the same cover. So, in 1991 the amendment was made and in 1991 by that amendment all the former Prime Ministers after the demit of office were also provided SPG cover for five years.

But, after that in 1994, again the amendment was made and the period was extended from five years to ten years. But, in 1999, again it was felt that even after ten years period, there may be necessity - because of the threat perception to the former Prime Ministers and their immediate family members - that such a protection is needed, such a cover is needed.

Then in 1999, it was further amended to provide for even beyond ten years on the basis of the threat perception. So, it is now to bring that uniformity and the basic requirement on the case to case basis that the present amendment Bill is being moved so that all the former Prime Ministers and their immediate family members are provided this SPG cover on the basis of threat perception from year to year so that the Government is not bound to provide for ten years or five years - now, of course ten years and beyond ten years. It is because beyond ten years, as you will see, in the case of our Leader of the Opposition Smt. Sonia Gandhi, after 1999 also the cover has been provided every year on the basis of threat perception. I feel that the whole country realises and the Government is conscious of it and it will continue to be provided till such time that threat remains to her life or to the life of her immediate children - both the son and the daughter. So, in that case, that is why, this Bill has been moved for amendment so that the changes would be in addition to the consequential changes that the Prime Minister, former Prime Ministers and their immediate family members, this cover shall be available for a period of one year from the date on which the Prime Minister ceases to hold office.

It is also provided that if the assessment requires the continuation of the security cover, then it will be continued on a year by year basis. Of course, the condition is that not more than twelve months shall elapse between the first assessment and the second assessment. Within 12 months, this assessment should be made and it should be extended. This is done on the basis of the threat perception. This is what we would like to seek through this Bill.

Of course, we have also added in the amendment, which will be officially moved later, namely :-

"(A) that the threat emanates from any militant or terrorist organisation or any other source;

There can be Mafia and other groups. That is why, the words "other sources" have been added.

(B) that the threat is of a grave and continuing nature."

With these amendments, this Bill has been moved before the House. I will request the hon. Members, through you, that this Bill may be considered and passed.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

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

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL (LATUR): Sir, the Government has moved an amending Bill to the Special Protection Group Act and has also introduced amendments to the amending Bill. We appreciate the stand of the Government and we support the amendment to the amending Bill, and the amending Bill also.

15.36 hrs. (Shrimati Margaret Alva *in the Chair*)

The law was made to provide protection to the Prime Minister. We cannot forget that one of the most illustrious Prime Ministers lost her life, and we also cannot forget that one of the former Prime Ministers had lost his life after the SPG cover was withdrawn. It is also known to us that one of the Chief Ministers of our State also lost his life. Of course, this law is applicable to the Prime Minister, former Prime Minister and immediate members of his family. Yet, this fact also cannot be forgotten by us that one of the Chief Ministers was assassinated. It has also to be realised that there are other leaders in the country, who face the danger to their lives. Of course, this law is not applicable to them, but the danger is quite visible; it is quite known. Therefore, we have to be very, very careful. We lost one of the MPs: she left this House, went outside and she was assassinated.

Now, as far as the Prime Ministers, former Prime Ministers and leaders of the political parties are concerned, the danger to their lives arises not because of anything done by them personally -- maybe, in one case, but that may be a different case -- but we have seen that the danger to the lives of these leaders arises because of the political stand they have taken and because they had to discharge some duties. In the process of discharging their duties, they had created enemies to themselves. Now, this has to be borne in mind.

We have been discussing this issue in our country sometimes on the floor of the House and sometimes outside the House also. One of the views expressed is that we should not spend so much money on providing security to these leaders. It is true that funds should be used in a very frugal and economical manner to provide security. At the same time, it should be realised by us that if anything happens to the political leaders the damage does not remain limited to the people involved or the families involved but it has wider implications. It creates a sort of an atmosphere in the country wherein people would lose faith in themselves, in their Government and in the establishment which is created by us to provide security and protection to the citizens. The cost involved in facing that kind of a danger is much more than the cost involved in providing security to some leaders. This fact has to be borne in mind.

You in the Government, and also we as representatives of the people sitting on this side of the House shall have to take a very responsible and balanced stand on this issue. On the one hand funds should not be wasted and on the other we have a duty to provide security and confidence to the citizens, to those who are involved in policy-making, and to those who are involved in discharging their duties. If those who are involved in policy-making and discharging their duties face danger to their property, or to their limbs, or to their lives or to the lives of their kith and kin, the confidence which the people would lose as a result of that would prove to be very difficult to restore. That is why we shall have to take a very balanced, very responsible and scientific, I would say, stand in this respect. Fortunately, in my individual opinion, the present Government is trying its best. We think that they will continue to do this in future also.

There are certain historical facts which cannot be forgotten. We shall have to bear those historical facts in mind while assessing the level of threat, which is directed against some leaders in a party. Not only the Prime Minister or the former Prime Minister, but their relations also sometimes are in danger. That has to be borne in mind. Not only Prime Minister, former Prime Minister and their kith and kin, but there are some other leaders who face threats. I have spoken on this issue not once but many times. I have spoken on the floor of this House that we know whose lives are in danger and the Government has a duty, has a responsibility to provide proper, appropriate security to them also. I hope the Government will not be only taking into account the criticism levelled that funds are being wasted. We should not waste funds. That is not our money, it has to be properly used. At the same time, the other things are equally important. The Government should bear that also in mind. I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything more than this in this regard.

What has been done by the Government appears to be correct in the circumstances. Only one point which I would like to make is that if you are providing proximate security cover to a Prime Minister, after he retires you are providing that proximate cover to him only for one year. My personal assessment is that this period is not enough. One year's security cover provided to the person who has demitted the office of the Prime Minister is not sufficient. It should be more than that. You may not have it for ten years, you may not have it for five years, but one year is not sufficient.

It could have been three years. Then, after assessing and after obtaining the opinion of the experts, if something has to be done, I think, it should be done, and if it is done, I think, the House will agree to it also.

With these few words, I conclude.

SHRI ANADI SAHU (BERHAMPUR, ORISSA): Madam Chairperson, I stand here in support of the amending provisions of the Special Protection Group and the amendment to the amending provisions both.

As the hon. Minister has indicated, the amendments to the amending provisions have come because of certain constraints regarding the children of the Leader of the Opposition. Very rightly so, these amendments have come because the next of kin had been omitted in the first amendment itself.

Madam Chairperson, when I stand here to speak on the protection that is to be given to the former Prime Ministers and the next of kin, I would invite an attention to the proviso which has been given in the second amendment. You would kindly appreciate that the security scenario has become bleak in this country. It is mostly because of the Islamic fundamentalism which has been spreading its tentacles from across the borders. *Al-Qaida* and its sister organisations, be that by different names they are being called, viz., *Jaish-e-Mohammad*, *Lashkar-e-Taiba*, *Al-Badr* or any other name they take, from day-to-day, from month-to-month, have been raised, nurtured, funded and are being sent to India to destabilise this country, to create problems in this country and in the process to exterminate the leaders of this country by whatever means possible.

We have to keep it in account that the mindset of Islamic fundamentalism is to ensure that the entire world is ruled by the *Shariat* and to ensure that the Islamisation takes place in a proper manner. The manner in which these are being done has been very succinctly indicated by an American journalist. Here, I would like to quote him. He said:

"The persistence of *Al-Qaida* underscores how hard it is for the Governments to stamp out Stateless, decentralised networks that move freely, quickly and stealthily across national borders to engage in terrorism."

And, that is what is happening in our country.

Madam, Chairperson, we have seen the activities of the Pakistani High Commission and the stooges that have been working in Delhi itself. About 62 ISI modules have been working in Delhi to the detriment of the peace and security of this country.

Recently I had been to West Garo Hills of Meghalaya and Assam after a lapse of about 25 years. I was shocked to find that there has been a large-scale infiltration of Bangladeshis into India. You would kindly appreciate that in spite of this influx of these Bangladeshi Muslims, there is a clear division in Assam in the Muslim Society. Those of the Muslims who have been staying in Assam right from the Gaud Kingdom are called *Gaudiyas* and those of the Muslims who have come from Bangladesh are called *Mians*. Even now, there is no intermingling between these two groups. The *Gaudiyas* look down with contempt on the *Mians*.

The entire economy of that area is shattered because of the influx of these people. I have seen in two police stations of West Garo Hills District *i.e.*, *Mahendraganj* and *Phulwari* police stations of West Garo Hills District where the entire population is almost of Bangladeshis. I do not say that all the people who have come from Bangladesh are potential threat to this country or belong to any terrorist organisation. But I would like to point out that there is lax in vigil on the part of the BSF. Here, I am sorry to state this thing. I was told by the people that if the Commandant is strict, then there is no infiltration or smuggling of goods, but if the commandant is not strict, free flow of people, goods and everything take place. I was amused to find that good chicken and hen are brought to the table of the BSF personnel by the persons who live in Jamalpur or the previous Maimansing district of Bangladesh. Why I want to stress this thing, when the Special Protection Group amendment is being brought here, is to hit upon the fact that we have to be very cautious, when we find that people of the same ethnic group or of the nearby ethnic groups are coming and going, and that the border fencing is being broken and disturbed at places. There are rivers which have not been fenced at all. These people have shattered the economy also. In Tura, I found that a person of the Mia group is satisfied with Rs. 50 a day as daily labour charges, whereas the local people would like to take nothing less than Rs. 75 per day. Now, these people are being engaged by the local traders and by the local people. These people carry information regarding movement of important persons. I fully agree with Mr. Shivraj Patil. Now the scenario is such that one is not free from any attack from a terrorist group or a militant. I am only stressing my point on the terrorist groups. No leader of any importance is free from anything. You give him any type of protection that you may like to and unless the infiltration is completely or to some extent curbed from Pakistan and from Bangladesh sides - they are soft borders, they are porous borders - you cannot do anything.

Of late, the West Bengal Government has woken up. They were turning a nelson's eye to the influx of Bangladeshi people in the West Bengal. Now, they have woken up. It is a good thing that they have taken stern action. The State Governments have to take stern action in this matter. But, those people who have been coming in, they are being funded by the ISI modules inside Bangladesh.

The Foreign Minister of Bangladesh had come recently to India. Directly or indirectly, he said 'yes' ISI modules of Pakistan are operating in Bangladesh. When he is telling this thing, we have to be very cautious. It is because yesterday, there was an attack on the Parliament, many important members have been attacked here and there, and the history is replete with examples of Prime Ministers being killed, and unless we defy certain means by which we should be able to curb the activities of these people and be cautious about our Jaichandras, it would be very difficult to bring about any type of security.

Kindly give me few minutes because I have already informed my party that I would like to take some more time here. Kindly be condescending enough to give some more time to me, Madam.

MADAM CHAIRMAN : There are still more speakers to speak on this Bill.

SHRI ANADI SAHU : I never disobey, as you know, but here I would like to take some more time. If you permit me I will speak otherwise I will sit down. It is up to you Madam.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: You have got your party's time, and you use it. But there are many hon. Members to speak on this Bill.

SHRI ANADI SAHU : It is all right. The total time allotted for discussing this Bill is two and half hours. So, I should be given more time. I think my other colleagues will also agree with me.

SHRI A.C. JOS (TRICHUR): You carry on.

SHRI ANADI SAHU : What I would like to tell Madam is that we have to find out the terrorist organisations which are being funded by Pakistani agencies, we have to find them out, and take steps to curb them. We have strengthened the SPG. Previously, we had started them with the NSG, National Security Guard where terrorism has been defined in one of the Sections. Then we came with the SPG Act. The Government of India has been cautiously and strenuously trying to find out as to whether we should be able to engage other force also to provide security coverage to important persons.

The CISF is being trained properly now. CISF is a force which has about 90,000 personnel. Three battalions of CISF could be trained or five battalions of CISF could be trained properly and posted here in Delhi itself because as I said, there are 62 modules of ISI which are working here – whether they are active or not is immaterial. If CISF is properly trained in VIP security and a blueprint is prepared it would be good. I am not talking of the Prime Ministers now or then or of those Prime Ministers who had demitted office ten years ago, for whom a public road is closed for safety; I am not talking about that; I would not like to talk about that too. I would not talk on the SPG people asking even MP-level cars not to be kept near the fence of the former Prime Ministers' residences. That is beside the point. I am not talking about that.

What I am trying to impress upon is this. In Delhi, we would like to have some sort of special cover not only for former Prime Ministers, but also for former Ministers, different leaders who are active in political life, each one of the political leaders whether he is a Member of Parliament now or was a Member of Parliament earlier, or was a Minister earlier, requires total coverage and that is the most important matter which is to be considered by the Government at this juncture.

As I said earlier, there is a criticism regarding coverage being given. We have to bear with that criticism. We have to keep in mind that we are still in a feudalistic society although we say that we are a democracy. Persons would like to be followed by a retinue of people whether they are of different special coverage groups or PSOs or anything of that sort. We have to bear it; we have to suffer that. Public also suffers because of the blip of the siren, there will be this stern look of the persons who have been accompanying the VVIPs, the pushing and jostling that are taking place at different places – we have to suffer that; we have to accept it as a way of life. Those are the matters which are on the other side of the story itself.

The basic concept which is to be thought of now is that we have to grapple with the infiltration, the terrorist activities, and the funding of terrorists under different names by the whole fundamentalist approach of Islamisation, etc. That is most important and that is to be taken into account. Let the country not be unstable and let the country not suffer because of the activities of the people who have been trying to create fissiparous tendencies in this country.

In supporting this Bill, I would urge upon the Government to bring up a blueprint and place it before Parliament as to in what manner important persons could be given due protection, as Shri Shivraj Patil has very clearly indicated. I fully support him too. That is the most important thing that is to be taken into account.

DR. RAM CHANDRA DOME (BIRBHUM): Thank you, Madam Chairman. I rise not to oppose this Bill. But while supporting this Bill, I want to raise some points for clarifications from the hon. Minister.

This SPG (Amendment) Bill is going to amend the SPG Act. Really the internal security situation in our country is very grave and there is no doubt about it. The hon. Members from all sides have already pointed it out. It is our day-to-day experience and it is our historical experience too. Even statesmen, former Prime Ministers – Madam Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi – had to lay their lives.

**16.00 hrs.**



They were the victims of terrorist activities as also so many other leaders. In this backdrop, the SPG Act was enacted to provide special protection to our Prime Minister, former Prime Ministers and their kith and kin. Now, the Government is commending this Bill to amend that Act. The main object is to reduce the span of SPG protection to the former Prime Ministers and their kith and kin. I have no objection on that point. Now-a-days, there is a wide criticism for increasing the special security for the political leaders, statesmen, etc. But we have to judiciously consider the exact situation and the real threat to the particular leader and his family. Even here in the Bill itself, it is mentioned that case-to-case consideration will be there. I think the Government will be serious on this point and no discrimination or under-estimation will be made. No discriminatory consideration on the basis of political affiliation, caste or creed will be there. This should be assured.

We would like to know from the Minister what sort of constraints are being faced. It is mentioned in the Bill that the Government has no option but to go for this measure due to financial overburden and manpower constraints. So, I want to categorically know from the Minister since the enactment of SPG Act till date, what is the total expenditure involved in providing SPG cover to our leaders and how many SPG personnel are involved in this noble act.

Madam, it is also stated that while withdrawing the SPG protection from a particular person, alternative security arrangements may be made for that person. So, this should be clarified. It should be specified as to what sort of security would be made available.

Today, the whole country is facing security problem. We cannot categorise this problem. This sort of special protection should not be a status symbol. That should be borne in mind. No common people have security these days. It is not confined to the statesmen alone but the ordinary wage earners are also facing security problem in this country. Presently, borders are very much tense due to provocation from across the border. So many insurgent groups, terrorist groups, foreign agencies like ISI, CIA, etc. are all active in our country to destabilise us. We have border disputes.

There are terrorism of many hues. The hon. Member from the Treasury Benches analysed the point that Muslim fundamentalism has been very active in this country. There is no doubt that Muslim fundamentalism are being helped by foreign agencies actively to spread terrorism in this country. But this is not the only factor that is breeding terrorism. There are so many other insurgent groups in the country that are threatening to destabilise not only our internal and social security but also the integrity of our nation. This is a fact.

Our people and our women, in particular, are not safe. There are gang rape of women taking place. The people belonging to the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and backward communities are being butchered by fundamentalist forces. It is well-known to everybody. So, while providing security to the VIPs, we should not compromise with the security of our common people in this country. This aspect should be borne in mind.

Our borders in the North-Eastern and the Eastern region are getting tense day by day. A lot of influx and infiltration of people across the border of this region are taking place. The reason as to why such a thing is taking place can be best explained by the Government. But in our State of West Bengal we are facing this problem. Our porous border has been the cause of this problem. Though the BSF *jawans* posted in the borders are doing their duty to the best of their ability, yet we cannot say that our borders are very secure. So, the porous nature of our borders would have to be taken care of so that there is no influx of people from across the borders.

Madam, the two States in the North-Eastern region are going to the polls this month. Insurgent activities in these two States, particularly in the State of Tripura, are on rise. They already have claimed the lives of hundreds of people and political activists. These things are going on. So, the Central Government have a duty to maintain security at the borders. Sometimes the BSF people tend to get over-active and confront even the civilian people. There are so many such instances in our State. The State Government has already reported about these things. On trivial grounds the BSF people have killed innocent young men. Such a thing should be checked so that common people are not victimised by the BSF.

Madam, finally I would like to express my views on an important point about which our leaders have already expressed their views today morning. This is about the draconian law POTA. This POTA is being indiscriminately misused by the authorities. Many State Governments, namely, Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand, Gujarat and other States are using this law on very trivial grounds.

MADAM CHAIRMAN : We are talking on another Bill. You can discuss about POTA, when that subject comes up.

DR. RAM CHANDRA DOME : This is an opportunity to say something on a draconian law.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: But, this is about the SPG.

DR. RAM CHANDRA DOME : Anyway, I am concluding, Madam. POTA should be withdrawn immediately and all the cases against people who are being harassed and being charged with POTA should be judiciously considered.

Innocent people should not be harassed under POTA. I hope that the Government would take care of my submission and try to redress the agony of the common people. The Government should take care of their relief.

I conclude my speech while supporting this Bill.

**SHRI M.V.V.S. MURTHI (VISAKHAPATNAM):** Madam Chairman, I rise to support the Special Protection Group (Amendment) Bill, 2002. It is a necessity that the precious lives have to be protected. While protecting the precious lives, we should send a message that the security of this country is well protected, so that it is well appreciated in all parts of the world. While doing so, we are only trying to provide SPG cover to the former Prime Ministers and their kith and kin, which is a laudable effort.

We should also see that terrorist activities are curbed in general. All our neighbouring countries which are engaged in extremist activities have gunned them towards India. The Pakistani terrorist and ISI activities, Sri Lankan LTTE activities, Nepal's Maoist activities and Bangladesh's insurgent activities are all creating problems in our country, which in turn are destabilising the peace and tranquillity here and sometimes are also creating threats to the lives of our innocent people.

At the same time, I would like to submit that the security that is being provided to most of the hon. Members is more of an ornamental nature rather than protection by well trained people. We have seen that some of our colleagues also have been gunned down in the very presence of the security people. Recently, in the State of Karnataka, Shri Nagappa's life could not be saved. A poor man that he was, he died in the forest. In some other States like Andhra Pradesh, even the police personnel have been kidnapped. Police Stations are stormed and police personnel have been taken away!

**16.14 hrs.** (Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav *in the Chair*)

How can we say that the security and protection is available if terrorists and Naxalites or extremists feel that they can do anything to any ordinary man and an important politician alike? Therefore, it becomes a difficult thing to keep a cool air amidst fire. It is not possible.

In generality, we should see that protection is being provided, safety measures are taken and deterrent punishments are given wherever they are being caught. We are not doing that. We are only keeping in mind giving SPG protection or other sorts of protection to only one person and at the same time, there are so many terrorists and extremists going around. How have they been taken care of? This is posing a threat. So, in generality, if security is being tightened, the security to VVIPs will also be automatically taken care of. This also has to be kept in mind.

The attack on Parliament in December, 2001 is nothing but a lapse. Unless security is being tightened properly, only providing cover to former Prime Ministers and their kith and kin will not solve their problem.

While appreciating that these amendments are necessary, a periodical review is required. Simply giving security cover for ten years and keeping quiet is not enough. If a former Prime Minister is not in active politics and he does not want to be in active politics, there is no need for a cover when people are not bothered about him. Then why blanket cover should be given to such people? Cover is required if there is a threat to that particular former Prime Minister when he or his kith and kin is likely to come into active politics. Otherwise, there is no need for it. It is all right that you have given blanket cover for one year. After completion of one year, you have to make a periodical review as to whether it is needed or not. If he or anybody in that family is likely to come into active politics, then it may be required. Otherwise, you can drop it.

My submission is, security cover may be given wherever it is necessary and it may be dropped wherever it is not needed. Otherwise, it will be only ornamental cover. And ornamental cover creates more problems than giving cover.

With these words, I support the amendment Bill and say that it should be passed.

**श्री राशिद अलवी (अमरोहा) :** सभापति महोदय, फोर्मर प्राइम मिनिस्टर और उनकी फ़ैमिली की सिक्युरिटी दस साल से घटाकर एक साल की जा रही है। यह एक मुनासिब कदम है। सिक्युरिटी पर हमारे बजट का एक बड़ा हिस्सा इस्तेमाल हो रहा है। मैं यह तो नहीं कहता हूँ कि सिक्युरिटी न दी जाए। इस बिल के मुताबिक अब कोई भी प्राइम मिनिस्टर ऐसा नहीं है, जितने फोर्मर प्राइम मिनिस्टर है, सबको एक साल से ज्यादा हो गया है। अब इस बिल को आगे लिए लागू किया जायेगा। अब तो कोई फोर्मर प्राइम मिनिस्टर ऐसा नहीं है। लेकिन जिसे जितनी सिक्युरिटी की जरूरत है, इंटेलीजैन्स के हिसाब से उसे उतनी सिक्युरिटी प्रोवाइड की जाए। देश के हालात बहुत खराब है। टैरिज्म पर काबू नहीं पाया जा सका है, क्रॉस बॉर्डर टैरिज्म बढ़ता चला जा रहा है। हम उससे कामयाबी के साथ लड़ाई लड़ने में नाकाम रहे हैं और इन हालात के अंदर पोलिटीकल लोगों की जिदगियां यकीनन खतरे में हैं। यह सिर्फ फोर्मर प्राइम मिनिस्टर के लिए है। लेकिन मैं सरकार से कहना चाहूंगा कि जितने भी ऐसे पोलिटीकल लोग हैं, जिनके पास ऑफिसेज रहे हैं, जिन्होंने देश के लिए कुछ किया है और उनकी जिदगी खतरे में हैं, उन्हें पूरी प्रोटेक्शन

मिलनी चाहिए। वह चाहे एक साल के लिए हो या एक साल से ज्यादा के लिए हो। हमने बहुत सी कीमती जिंदगियों को जाया कर दिया। प्राइम मिनिस्टर, फॉर्मर ५ प्राइम मिनिस्टर, चीफ मिनिस्टर इस मुल्क के अंदर खत्म कर दिये गये और उनका कसूर सिर्फ इतना था कि उन्होंने देश के लिए अपनी समझ के मुताबिक कुछ काम किये थे। यकीनन ऐसे लोगों को पूरी सिक्योरिटी मिलनी चाहिए। उत्तर प्रदेश में उत्तर प्रदेश की मुख्य मंत्री जिस तरह से टैरिज्म से लड़ रही हैं, क्रिमिनल्स से लड़ रही हैं, ऐसे लोगों से जिन्होंने आतंकवाद फैला रखा था -- उनकी जिन्दगी के खिलाफ भी इन्चार्ज रचे जा रहे हैं। इस तरह के पूरे मुल्क में जिन लोगों के साथ होता है कि जिन लोगों के पास ऑफिसेज़ हैं और वे देश या प्रदेश के लिये कुछ करना चाहते हैं, उनकी जिन्दगी की हिफाज़त करना सरकार की जिम्मेदारी है। इसमें शुबहा की कोई बात नहीं है और मैं इस बिल को मुकम्मल तौर पर सपोर्ट करता हूँ।

इसके साथ साथ मुझे इजाज़त दी जाए और बोलने दिया जाए कि इस मुल्क में ऐसे लोग जो देश के अंदर नफरतों की आंधियां चलाना चाहते हैं, जो इस मुल्क को तोड़ देना चाहते हैं, मैं किसी एक मज़हब की बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ। जो थोड़े से राजनैतिक फायदे के लिए अपनी जुबान को काबू में नहीं रख सकते, जिनके होंठ हिलते हैं तो ज़हर उगलते हैं, उनको बड़ी भारी सिक्योरिटी दी जाती है। मेरा कहना है कि ऐसे तमाम लोगों की सिक्योरिटी वापस ली जानी चाहिए। यह देश का पैसा है। इसे ज़ाया नहीं होने देना चाहिए। चारों तरफ ब्लैक कैट खड़ी है और कोई एक आदमी किसी एक कौम को, किसी एक आदमी को जो जुबान में आता है कहते चले जाते हैं। (व्यवधान)

**श्री राजो सिंह (बेगूसराय) :** किसके बारे में कह रहे हैं? कुछ ज़िक्र भी करिये।

**सभापति महोदय :** श्री राजो सिंह जी, आप स्थान ग्रहण कीजिए। माननीय सदस्य को बोलने दीजिए। माननीय सदस्य अपनी बात कहने में सक्षम हैं, आप उनको टोकें नहीं।

**श्री राशिद अलवी :** यहां एक अहम मसले पर बहस हो रही है। मैं किसी एक आदमी या मज़हब का नाम नहीं ले रहा हूँ। मैं न एक्शन और न रियैक्शन की बात कर रहा हूँ। मैं यह नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि एक तरफ से कहा जाएगा तो दूसरी तरफ से दूसरे आदमी द्वारा कहा जाएगा लेकिन सरकार ऐसी कमेटी बनाए जिसके अंदर अपोज़िशन और सरकार के लोग हों और वे यह फील करें कि किसको प्रोटेक्शन मिलना चाहिए और किसको नहीं मिलना चाहिए। आपकी ज़ाती गलतियों की बिना पर अगर आपकी जिन्दगी खतरे में है तो आपको कोई प्रोटेक्शन नहीं मिलना चाहिए। यह आपकी अपनी जिम्मेदारी है। आप अपना पैसा खर्च करके उन्हें अपनी जिन्दगी बचाने की कोशिश करते हैं। प्रोटेक्शन उन्हें मिलना चाहिए जिनकी जिन्दगी देश के लिए खतरे में पड़ी है। हर आदमी खड़ा होता है, जुबान बेलगाम कर देता है, इलेक्ट्रॉनिक मीडिया देश के कोने कोने में उसका नाम पहुँचा देता है और उसको आसान नुस्खा मिल जाता है कि इस मुल्क में आसानी से शोहरत हासिल की जा सकती है और अपनी जिन्दगी के लिए वह प्रोटेक्शन हासिल कर लेता है। जो रही-सही कसर है, वह भी पूरी हो जाती है। जिसको चाहे गाली दो, जिसको चाहे जलील करो, कोई कुछ नहीं कहता। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरीके का कानून बनना चाहिए कि उनकी प्रोटेक्शन वापस होनी चाहिए और इस संबंध में सरकार चाहे पार्लियामेंट के तमाम ग्रुप और पार्टी के लोगों की कमेटी बननी चाहिए जो फैसला करे कि कौन सिक्योरिटी का हकदार है और कौन नहीं है।

आखिरी बात जो मैं अर्ज़ करना चाहता हूँ, वह यह है कि इस सिक्योरिटी के सिस्टम से आम आदमी को बड़ी परेशानी होती है। खास तौर से दिल्ली के अंदर और स्टेट्स की जो कैपिटल्स हैं, वहां तीन-चार गाड़ियां एस.पी.जी. की भरी हुई चलती हैं और आम आदमी को ऐसी नफ़रत की निगाह से देखा जाता है, एक तरफ धक्का दिया जाता है, गाड़ियों से बंदूक की नलियां निकली होती हैं। यह तो मैंने तारीख में पढ़ा था कि फ्रांस जब इंकलाब आया था तो वहां का शहज़ादा जब निकलता था तो उनकी बगधियों के पहियों के नीचे मासूम बच्चे आ जाते थे, तो उनके बाप-दादाओं को इसलिए सज़ा दी जाती थी कि अपने बच्चों को आपने बगधी के आगे क्यों आने दिया।

चेयरमैन साहब, यह डेमोक्रेटिक कंट्री है। इसके लिए भी आपको कानून बनाना पड़ेगा। रैड लाइट पर रुकना पड़ेगा। क्या मतलब है कि वी.आई.पी. की गाड़ी रैड लाइट पर हॉर्न बजाती हुई निकल जाए ? आपके पास सिक्योरिटी है। फिर आप रैड लाइट पर क्यों नहीं रुकते हैं ?

अभी प्राइम मिनिस्टर की सिक्योरिटी के अंदर कोई आदमी आया और दो दिन तक उसे जेल में रखा गया। बाद में पता चला कि वह बेगुनाह था। कौन होगा उन दो दिनों के लिए जिम्मेदार, जब उसे बेगुनाह होते हुए भी जेल में रखा गया ? उसके खानदान पर क्या गुजरी होगी, क्या सरकार ने उसे कोई कंपेंसेशन दिया, क्या सरकार ने कोई माफी का लैटर लिखा, क्या कोई माफी नामा भेजा, क्या सरकार ने देखा कि दो दिन तक उसके बच्चों पर, उसकी बीवी पर क्या गुजरी ?

महोदय, मैं यह नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर की सिक्योरिटी खत्म कर दी जाए या उनका ख्याल नहीं रखा जाए। हिन्दुस्तान का प्राइम मिनिस्टर हमारे लिए सबसे ज्यादा काबिले अहताराम है। उसकी सिक्योरिटी का पूरा इन्तजाम होना चाहिए, लेकिन इसके साथ-साथ इस बात का ख्याल रखा जाना चाहिए कि सोर्कोल्ड वी.आई.पी. के लिए आम आदमी, गरीब आदमी, इस मुल्क के अंदर परेशान नहीं हो। उसके लिए जिस तरह की कवानीन बन सके, उस तरह की कवानीन बनानी चाहिए। कैसे रोड पर चला जाएगा, कैसे रैड लाइट पर रुका जाएगा, आम आदमी का कैसे अहताराम किया जाएगा, इन सब बातों का ध्यान रखना पड़ेगा जिससे आम आदमी यह महसूस करे कि इस जम्हूरी मुल्क में उसकी भी इज्जत है।

मैं दरखास्त करता हूँ कि जो बातें मैंने कही हैं, वे पूरी ईमानदारी के साथ कही हैं। उन पर सरकार गौर करेगी और इस बिल का मैं अपनी और अपनी पार्टी की ओर से सपोर्ट करता हूँ।

**श्री दिलीप संघाणी (अमरेली) :** मान्यवर सभापति महोदय, मैं इस बिल को सपोर्ट करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री और उनके परिवार को एस.पी.जी. की सिक्योरिटी दी जा रही है। इसे उनके टाइम पीरियड में, एक साल में समाप्त करना है या आगे बढ़ाना है, वह बात गवर्नमेंट रिपोर्ट के अनुसार तय करेगी, इस बारे में यह बिल सदन में लाया गया है और इसको पारित करना चाहिए।

महोदय, यह देश जब आजाद हुआ था, उससे पहले देश में लगभग 500 से ज्यादा रियासतें थीं। रियासतों के राजा-महाराजाओं के पास अपनी खुद की मिलिट्री और सिक्योरिटी थी। आजादी के बाद संविधान के मुताबिक राजा-महाराजाओं को सालाना प्रिवीपर्स देने का आश्वासन दिया गया और उसकी व्यवस्था की थी। राजा-महाराजाओं की खुद की अपनी मिल्कीयत उन्होंने सरकार को समर्पित कर दी। उसी के साथ जो उनका सैन्यबल था, जो उनकी सिक्योरिटी की व्यवस्था थी, वह भी समाप्त हो गई। जो रियासतें भारत संघ में शामिल नहीं हुईं, उन्हें सरदार वल्लभ भाई पटेल ने आश्वासन दिया और संपूर्ण रियासतें भारत संघ में सम्मिलित हो गईं। यह सब बातें आप सबको मालूम हैं। उस समय राजाओं को भारत में विशेष अधिकार प्राप्त था। उनकी कारों के आने-जाने की विशेष सुविधा तथा अन्य अनेक प्रकार की सुविधाएं उन्हें दी गईं। उनके बारे में बताकर मैं सदन का बहुमूल्य समय नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ। राजाओं के पास उस समय जो सिक्योरिटी और मिलिट्री थी और संविधान के अनुसार उन्हें जो आश्वासन प्रिवीपर्स देने का दिया गया, वह भी सन् 1972 में रद्द कर दिया गया। इस प्रकार से देखें तो राजा-महाराजाओं की सुविधाएं कायम नहीं रहीं बल्कि पीढ़ी-दर-पीढ़ी कम होती चली जा रही हैं। जो राजा-महाराजा जिन्दा हैं उनकी हयात में ही रद्द किया जा रहा है। आज की स्थिति में कोई भी पूर्व प्रधानमंत्री सुविधा ले, उनके ऊपर कोई आतंकवादी या जैसा इसमें बताया है कि किसी गैर कानूनी संगठन से खतरा हो तो उसके मुताबिक उन्हें सुविधा दी जाए, जैसे लीडर ऑफ द अपोजिशन को सुविधा दी जा रही है, जो सुविधा उनके लिए जरूरी है। सरकार तय कर ले। एक दफा हाउस में तय कर लेना चाहिए और कहीं न कहीं इस

पर रोक लगनी चाहिए तथा यह रोक ऐसी होनी चाहिए, क्योंकि लोकतंत्र में गवर्नमेंट आती-जाती रहेंगी और उनके पक्ष अलग-अलग होंगे, किसी को यह कहने का मौका न मिले कि आज हम विपक्ष में हैं इसलिए हमें सिक्योरिटी मिलनी चाहिए। जीना-मरना तो सिक्योरिटी होने के बावजूद भी होता है। इस देश में सिक्योरिटी होने के बावजूद भी पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री तथा कई अन्य लोगों की जान गई। मेरा कहने का मतलब यह नहीं है कि सिक्योरिटी समाप्त हो, सिक्योरिटी जरूरी है। लोगों को यह पता चलना चाहिए कि सिक्योरिटी के उमर क्या खर्च देश की जनता का हो रहा है। सिक्योरिटी कहां तक सीमित होनी चाहिए, यह भी तय कर लेना चाहिए।

महोदय, आज भी कई ऐसे आफिसर हैं, जिन्होंने काश्मीर और पंजाब में जब टेरेरिज्म था तब वहां से टेरेरिज्म के खिलाफ काफी कड़क हाथों से काम लिया। उसके बाद, उनकी ड्यूटी समाप्त होने के बाद उन्हें तीन साल से ज्यादा सिक्योरिटी नहीं मिलती है। उन्हें भी अपनी जान का खतरा इसलिए है, क्योंकि उन्होंने फील्ड में खुद काम किया है। लोकतंत्र में भारत सरकार और राज्य सरकार का काम सिर्फ प्रधान मंत्री और चुने हुए प्रतिनिधियों की रक्षा करना ही नहीं है, बल्कि सारे देश की जनता की रक्षा करने की जिम्मेदारी सरकार की है।

महोदय, यहां मेरे पूर्ववक्ता ने बताया कि अपनी सिक्योरिटी खुद करनी चाहिए। खुद की सिक्योरिटी किस ने करनी है, क्या करनी है, यह तय करने के लिए इस हाउस में, कानून में जो सुझाव सरकार को उचित लगे, वह लाना चाहिए। प्रधान मंत्री जी तक यह सीमित रखनी चाहिए। प्रधानमंत्री जी के पति या पत्नी तक सीमित करनी चाहिए। उनके बेटे, बेटा और दामाद तक सीमित करनी चाहिए। आज दिल्ली में कहीं प्रधान मंत्री जी के दामाद या बेटे-बेटा बाजार में जाते हैं तो उनके लिए जो सिक्योरिटी लगी हुई है, उस पर विचार करना चाहिए। पहले जैसे राजाओं के प्रिवि पर्स और उनके खास अधिकार संविधान में थे, वे बंद किए हैं। यह सरकार जो समय पर कानून एवं सुझाव लाई है, उसे मैं सपोर्ट करता हूं।

SHRI E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN (SIVAGANGA): Thank you, Chairman, Sir. The Special Protection Group (Amendment) Bill, 2002, is supported by us. Our hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition has given the clear picture about the support. I would like to draw the attention that this type of Bill is important for a democratic country.

It is because we know that democracy started in the United States of America and Abraham Lincoln was a foremost people's leader of that nation. But he was assassinated because he fought for the civil liberties of a particular group of people there. So, when an individual becomes the Head of the State, he symbolises the nation and its principles. When such persons become more popular, naturally the people who do not like them take up the path of terrorism and assassinate them. We know that John F. Kennedy was a very charming and popular leader at the international level and also at the grassroots level that even in small towns and villages, many people named their children after him.

Similarly, Mahatma Gandhi fought for our country's freedom and stood for non-violence, but he was also assassinated. In the same way, Martin Luther King fought for civil liberties and he was assassinated. Then, Indira Gandhi who stood for national integration and wanted India to become a superpower was assassinated in a similar fashion. She was very popular among the people of India, but some people did not want her to be popular. So, they could not fight her democratically, but they chose some other route and killed her. In the same way, the charming, youthful leader Rajiv Gandhi, who wanted India to become the topmost country in the world, was also assassinated. Therefore, these great leaders, who symbolised the nation, its culture and principles, have become victims of terrorism.

So, to protect such leaders, the nation has to incur some expenditure. I feel it is necessary because such expenditure is incurred for protecting the great leaders who symbolise our nation and its values. We are all aware of such assassinations of some Presidents and Prime Ministers that have taken place in some developing countries of the world. The first Prime Minister of Sri Lanka was also killed in the same fashion. I can go on giving many such examples. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was killed in Pakistan and Sheikh Mujib-Ur-Rehman was killed in Bangladesh. Many leaders have been killed in a similar fashion in various countries.

Sir, we are using some human beings as a tool to protect such great leaders and for that purpose, we have created the Special Protection Group in our country. The personnel of the Special Protection Group are exclusively trained to even sacrifice their own lives in order to protect the person whom they have to protect from terrorists. So, the personnel of the SPG are ready to face the bullets of the terrorists in order to protect the Prime Minister or the former Prime Minister or some other VIP. Therefore, the welfare of such persons who are being used as tools to protect these VIPs should be taken care of by the Government.

At present, the personnel of the SPG are looked after well. They have got an exclusive residential colony for them, their children are getting good education and other facilities. This special category people are just like the persons serving in Armed Forces who also go to the borders and face the enemy without worrying about their lives. So, the Special Protection Group personnel are at the risk of facing bullets of terrorists throughout their service period, but they carry out their duties in an exemplary manner without worrying about their own lives. So, the families of these personnel should also be protected. The wives and children of the SPG personnel should not feel neglected because they know that in the process of protecting the great leaders, their own husbands and fathers are at the risk of getting killed any time. So, their families should be protected in every way. There should be a special insurance scheme for the SPG personnel because then only they would be able to carry out their duties and protect our national leaders without worrying about their family members.

That type of feeling should be created for the youngsters who are protecting the national leaders.

I would like to suggest some other things also because this new amendment indicates: "any former Prime Minister



or to the members of his immediate family – " The words 'immediate family' have not been defined.

At the same time, there is a clause which says about 'daughter' and 'son'. In such a situation, an enlarged interpretation should be there that if the former Prime Minister or any such person is getting the benefit of protection, his father, mother, sister, brother or any immediate member of his family should also be protected because they may also be a target.

We have said in the clause itself: "on the level of the threat". That interpretation has to be made. These types of people, who are nearer that person, should also be protected in case anything happens to that particular individual. Therefore, I would like to stress upon this point. When the Rules are framed, some definition should be made for this purpose.

This aspect of bringing forward the amendment is well appreciated. We have to protect the interests of leaders who are the embodiment of our principles and ethics.

With these words, I support this Bill.

**डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (वैशाली) :** सभापति महोदय, व्यवहार में हम देखते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो लोग अपने को ज्यादा काबिल समझते हैं, वे अंग्रेजी में ही लिखते पढ़ते और बोलते हैं जबकि कम पढ़े लिखे लोग अपनी-अपनी मातृभाषा में बोलते हैं। माननीय गृह मंत्री जी पहले अफसर थे इसलिए उनकी अंग्रेजी अच्छी रही होगी। इनके अफसर लोग भी सिक्योरिटी और होम डिपार्टमेंट में हैं इसलिए वे भी बढ़िया पढ़ाई लिखाई किये होंगे। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप स्टेटमेंट ऑफ ऑब्जेक्ट्स एंड रीजन्स को देखें। मैं उसकी एक पंक्ति पढ़ना चाहता हूँ।

"In case the proximate security is withdrawn after one year, the former Prime Minister and his spouse would continue to get necessary security for three years as based on the level of threat assessed by the Central Government."

यानी उनको तीन वा का प्रोटेक्शन मिलेगा। यह अंग्रेजी में लिखा हुआ है। (व्यवधान) एक वा के बाद मिलेगा। यह अंग्रेजी में है। मेरा कहना है कि इन्होंने और इनके अफसरों ने इसे पढ़ने का कट नहीं किया क्योंकि यह अंग्रेजी में कुछ लिखते हैं और हिन्दी में कुछ और लिखते हैं। हिन्दी में इन्होंने लिखा है कि : "किन्तु इस प्रकार कि इस संबंध में किए गए जो क्रमवर्ती निर्धारणों के बीच बारह मास से अधिक का समय व्यतीत न हुआ हो।" अब बारह मास वाली पंक्ति हम अंग्रेजी में खोजते हैं तो वह हमें नहीं मिलती, यानी जो अंग्रेजी में लिखा है वह हिन्दी में नहीं है और जो हिन्दी में है वह अंग्रेजी में नहीं है। अब यह अनुवाद है, विवाद है, त्रुटि है, भूल है या लापरवाही है, इसे क्या कहा जाये ? आप सिक्योरिटी का कानून बनाने जा रहे हैं जो सबसे संवेदनशील विषय है। हमने इतनी लापरवाही कहीं नहीं देखी। यह सन् 2002 का बिल है। बीच में किसी ने भी यह पंक्ति पढ़ने का कट नहीं किया। क्या वे इतने से ही समझ जायेंगे ? इसमें यह पंक्ति है ही नहीं। तीन वा वाली पंक्ति न तो बिल की बाडी में है और न हिन्दी में है केवल अंग्रेजी में है। अब अंग्रेजी वाली आपकी मूल कापी है या हिन्दी की कापी है, यह हमें नहीं मालूम। यह अनुवाद भी मूल नहीं है। यह तथ्यात्मक (व्यवधान) इसे भूल कैसे कहेंगे ? यह लापरवाही है। भूल तो किसी से भी हो सकती है लेकिन यह लापरवाही है। हिन्दी के मुताबिक हम बिल को समझें या अंग्रेजी के मुताबिक बिल को समझें। मान लीजिए कि कोई काबिल आदमी इसे अंग्रेजी में पढ़ता है तो वह तीन वा वाली बात खोजेगा जबकि तीन वा वाला क्लॉज इसमें है ही नहीं।

यह कैसा विधेयक आ रहा है, कैसी-कैसी लापरवाही हो रही है। (व्यवधान)

अब मैं विधेयक पर आता हूँ। सुधार कर लें, कैसी गड़बड़ी हो रही है, कहां-कहां, क्या-क्या गड़बड़ी इन्होंने की है। हिन्दी में तीन वाक्य और अंग्रेजी में चार वाक्य हैं, एक तीन साल वाला फाजिल है, उसमें बारह महीने का जिक्र है, अंग्रेजी में क्रमवर्ती वाला है ही नहीं। यह देखा जाए, यहां अंग्रेजी में काबिल लोग ज्यादा हैं, इसलिए हम अंग्रेजी में ज्यादा दखलअंदाजी नहीं करते। लेकिन हमने तनिक देखने का कट किया है। (व्यवधान)

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : It is mentioned here: "that not more than twelve months shall elapse between two consecutive assessments"

**डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह :** नहीं दिखा, बहुत पढ़ना पड़ेगा।

The Statement of Objects and Reasons says:

"The Central Government has considered the matter further. In view of the manpower constraints being faced by the SPG and the financial burden being borne by the Government on providing such security, it is considered that proximate security to be provided to the former Prime Ministers and their spouses should be made available for a period of one year from the date on which the former Prime Minister ceases to hold office, and beyond one year as decided by the Central Government."

प्रथम पंक्ति "based upon a review of the threat perception to the concerned dignitary." बारह महीने वाला कहां है, इसमें बारह महीने का जिक्र नहीं है। इसके बाद जो वाक्य है ---

"In case proximate security is withdrawn after one year, एक वा के बाद सिक्योरिटी विद्वान कर ली जाए। उसके बाद - "The former

Prime Ministers and their spouses would continue to get necessary security for three years based on the level of threat as assessed by the Central Government." तीन साल वाली पंक्ति यहां कैसे आ गई, क्या बिल में तीन साल का प्रावधान है। तीन वर्ष बिताने के बाद तीन वर्ष तक बढ़ेगा। इसे हिन्दी में देख लिया जाए। केन्द्रीय सरकार ने मामले पर आगे विचार किया है। विशेषा संरक्षा ग्रुप द्वारा महसूस की जा रही जनशक्ति की बन्दिशों और ऐसी सुरक्षा प्रदान करने पर सरकार द्वारा वहन किए जा रहे वित्तीय भार को दृष्टिगत करते हुए, यह विचार किया गया है कि पूर्व प्रधान मंत्रियों और उनकी पत्नियों/ पतियों को प्रदान की जाने वाली निकट सुरक्षा पूर्व प्रधान मंत्रियों के पद पर न रहने की तारीख से केवल एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए ही उपलब्ध होनी चाहिए और एक वर्ष के पश्चात् जैसा केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा विनिश्चय किया जाए, किन्तु इस प्रकार कि इस संबंध में किए गए दो क्रमवर्ती निर्धारणों के बीच बारह मास से अधिक का समय व्यतीत न हुआ हो। (व्यवधान)

**सभापति महोदय :** आप मूल विधेयक पर आइए, वह मंत्री जी अपने जवाब के क्रम में बताएंगे।

**डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह :** क्या जवाब देंगे, इसमें भयंकर गड़बड़ी है, जो अंग्रेजी में है वह हिन्दी में नहीं है और जो हिन्दी में है वह अंग्रेजी में नहीं है। (व्यवधान)

**सभापति महोदय :** आप विधेयक पर आइए।

**डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह :** अब मैं विधेयक पर आता हूँ। जो विधेयक लाया गया है, सरकार को यह विधेयक जब तब जैसे सूट करता है, वैसे ले आती है। यह संवेदनशील मामला है। देशभर में कहा जा रहा है कि सिक्योरिटी थ्रेट परसेप्शन बढ़ रहा है, टेरोरिज्म आ गया है, विधि व्यवस्था चौपट है। देश के सब लोग यह महसूस करते हैं और ये कहते हैं कि अब हम पूर्व प्रधान मंत्रियों पर से सब सिक्योरिटी हटा लेंगे। हमको लगता है कि जो उप प्रधान मंत्री हुए हैं जिसकी वजह से इनको अब अहसास हुआ है कि उसमें ज्यादा खर्च बढ़ रहा है, ज्यादा मैनपावर लग रही है, इसलिए कटौती की जाए क्योंकि उप प्रधान मंत्री की तरह वह इसमें फाज़िल हो गई है। इसलिए इनको लगा कि पूर्व प्रधान मंत्रियों की सिक्योरिटी काट लेंगे तो उप प्रधान मंत्री को ज्यादा सिक्योरिटी देने के लिए बनेगी मतलब उप प्रधान मंत्री जी ने सिखा कर भेज दिया क्योंकि श्री आई.डी. स्वामी सीधे आदमी हैं, कमीशन फेस करेंगे। इस तरह भविय में कोई खतरा हो, राम करे न हो लेकिन जब खतरा हुआ तो ये विधेयक लाए हैं। हम लोगों को कमीशन में क्यों गवाह बनवाएंगे, हम लोग वह कमीशन फेस करने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं जो दुखद हादसे के बाद होता है।

इसलिए यह सीधा आदमी है, कमीशन फेस करेंगे लेकिन सदन को इसमें क्यों घसीट रहे हैं? बढ़िया कानून बना रहे हैं कि केस टू केस बेसिस पर करेंगे। यानी जो मनपसन्द के लोग होंगे, उनको खूब प्रोटैक्शन देंगे और जो मनपसन्द के नहीं होंगे, उनको नहीं देंगे। यह अधिकार आपने क्लॉज में लिखा हुआ है कि केस टू केस बेसिस पर होगा। भला ऐसा कहीं कानून हुआ है? कानून सबके लिए बराबर होता है। केस टू केस बेसिस कर रहे हैं तो फिर कानून बनाने की और विधेयक लाने की क्या जरूरत है? ऐसा कानून न हमने कहीं देखा है और न सुना है। फिर क्या जरूरत है कानून बनाने की यदि मनचाहे आधार पर निर्णय लेंगे कि किसको प्रोटैक्शन दिया जाए और किसको नहीं दिया जाए। इसी आधार पर देश भर में छानबीन की जाए, जांच करवाई जाए। एक से एक डाकू अपराधी हैं और राशिद अलवी मुलायम जी से कह रहे थे कि जो उपद्रवी तत्व हैं, उनको भी प्रोटैक्शन मिला हुआ है। हुकूमत के फेवर में जो लोग हैं, चाहे वे राक्षस भी हैं, उनको प्रोटैक्शन दे दिया और जो भले आदमी हैं, उनको छोड़ दिया। आम जनता की सिक्योरिटी का इनको कुछ ख्याल नहीं है। इसीलिए हम यह कहना चाहते हैं कि हम इसमें शामिल नहीं हैं कि ये हटवा रहे हैं। पूर्व प्रधान मंत्रियों के लिए दस वर्ष का फैसला हुआ था। शुरु में पांच वर्ष का प्रोटैक्शन हुआ था और उसके बाद अब एक वर्ष कर रहे हैं। केस टू केस आधार पर प्रोटैक्शन दिया जाएगा। यानी केस टू केस आधार पर कि जो हमें सूट करेगा, वह हम करेंगे। इस तरह का कानून न कहीं हमने सुना और न कहीं देखा। क्या केस टू केस कानून भला कहीं हुआ है? यह खतरनाक विधेयक लाए हैं और स्वयं फसंगे। यहां बोलकर अगर प्रोसीडिंग में दर्ज करा देते हैं तो उसमें भागी हम लोग नहीं हैं। कमीशन पूछेगा तो उसमें ये साक्षी बनेंगे, कमीशन फेस करेंगे, वॉ तक कमीशन चलता है लेकिन सदन को उसमें क्यों घसीट रहे हैं?

मैं अब देख रहा हूँ कि हमारे पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री हमसे छीन लिये गये। मुख्य मंत्री, मंत्री, एमएलए, और एमपी सब पर हमला हो रहा है। लोग मारे जा रहे हैं और ये सिक्योरिटी घटा नहीं रहे हैं, हटा रहे हैं तो इसकी जिम्मेदारी आप पर होगी, आप जानिए।

'पोटा' कानून हमें चाहिए, एक तरफ यह कहते हैं तथा हम आतंकवाद खत्म करना चाहते हैं, एक तरफ यह कहते हैं। लेकिन केस टू केस बेसिस जो कर रहे हैं तो क्या विधि व्यवस्था अब देश में सही हो गई है कि सिक्योरिटी हटा दी जाए। घटा नहीं दी जाए बल्कि हटा दी जाए, यह विधेयक लाए हैं। इसीलिए इसमें हम भागी नहीं हैं। पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री जी के परिवार में से श्रीमती सोनिया गांधी जी हैं। हमें लगता है कि उन्हीं के लिए यह विधेयक लाए हैं कि उनको हम प्रोटैक्शन न दें, उनकी सिक्योरिटी छीन ली जाए। आप लोग किसी दूरी, किसी हद तक जा सकते हैं, ऐसी हमारी आशंका है। इसीलिए इनको हम सावधान कर देना चाहते हैं। सिक्योरिटी का जिम्मा आपका है। इंटरनल सिक्योरिटी आपने बिगाड़कर रखी हुई है और परिस्थिति खराब है नहीं तो विदेश में तो हम लोग सुनते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी के लिए भी कोई जरूरत नहीं पड़ती। ऐसे ही लोग चलते-फिरते रहते हैं। (व्यवधान) जहां-जहां सब लोग काबिल लोग गये हैं, घूमकर आते हैं, वे सब हम लोगों को बताते हैं। यहां तो हम लोग भी पार्लियामेंट में आते हैं तो वहीं जहां का तहां रोक दिया जाता है, हमारा क्वेश्चन भी छूटता रहता है। उम्र प्रधान मंत्री जी आते हैं तो हमें वहीं रोक दिया जाता है कि आप अभी नहीं जाइए। हमें लगता है कि ये पुलिस वाले अपनी तरफ से कर रहे हैं लेकिन कानून ही ऐसा बना है और पुलिस वालों पर हम लोग नाजायज गुस्सा कर देते हैं। कानून ही ऐसा बना है कि जहां का तहां ट्रैफिक रोक दिया। हम प्रतीक्षा करते हैं कि गाड़ी अब आ रही है। वह अभी घर से भी नहीं निकले हैं और यहां हजारों गाड़ियां पुलिस वाले रोक देते हैं। ट्रैफिक जाम पर जाम हो जाता है। रोज दस मिनट का विलम्ब हो जाता है। सिक्योरिटी के मामले में हम लोग हस्तक्षेप नहीं करना चाहते हैं परंतु इसके नियम कायदे की सामान्य नीतिपरक होनी चाहिए। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए कि भेदभाव किया जाए और मनचाहे आधार पर किया जाए। केस टू केस बेसिस पर नहीं होना चाहिए। वीआईपी सिम्बल हो गया। अदना आदमी भी फोर्स लेकर इधर से उधर चलता है। यह स्टेटस सिम्बल हो गया।

उसमें कितने लोगों को आर.एस.एस., विश्व हिन्दू परिषद, बजरंग दल और कितने उपद्रवी तत्वों को आपने सुरक्षा मुहैया कराई हुई है, यह सब अपने जवाब में बताएं। आप एक तरफ उन पर इतना खर्चा कर रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ मैनपावर के नाम पर पूर्व प्रधानमंत्रियों से सुरक्षा वापस ले रहे हैं। आप देखते हैं कि सभी पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री विपक्ष के हैं इसलिए इनको क्यों सिक्योरिटी दी जाए। इसलिए यह विधेयक भेदमूलक लगता है। आप सदन को सारी बातें बताएं, अन्यथा कमीशन में आप फेस करेंगे तो हम आपको बचाने वाले नहीं हैं।

**श्री रघुनाथ झा (गोपालगंज) :** सभापति महोदय, मंत्री जी ने जो बिल पेश किया है उसका हम समर्थन करते हैं। लेकिन समर्थन करने के साथ-साथ कुछ सुझाव भी देना चाहते हैं। अभी रघुवंश जी बोल रहे थे। लगता है जो संशोधन का वितरण हुआ है, उसको उन्होंने नहीं देखा है। उसका हिन्दी अनुवाद आप देखें उसमें साफ कर दिया गया है कि किसी भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री या उसके अव्यवहित कुटुम्ब के सदस्यों का उस तारीख से जिसको भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री, पद पर नहीं रह जाता है, एक वर्ष की अवधि तक और एक वर्ष के बाद केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा यथाविनिश्चित खतरे के स्तर पर आधारित अवधि तक, तथापि इस प्रकार की निकट सुरक्षा की आवश्यकता के सम्बन्ध में किए गए दो क्रमवर्ती निर्धारणों के बीच 12 मास से अधिक का समय व्यतीत न हुआ हो, किन्तु केन्द्रीय सरकार खतरे का विनिश्चय करते समय अन्य बातों के साथ निम्नलिखित बातों का ध्यान रखेगी, अर्थात् (क) खतरा किसी उग्रवादी या आतंकवादी संगठन से अथवा किसी अन्य स्रोत से उत्पन्न हुआ है, और (ख) खतरा गम्भीर और लगातार बने रहने वाली प्रकृति का है। इसलिए यह सुधार इसमें किया गया है इसलिए रघुवंश जी तथ्य से परे बात यहां रख रहे थे।

**श्री राजो सिंह :** आपको यह मिल गया है इसलिए आप कह रहे हैं। यह पहले से हाउस में सर्कुलेट नहीं हुआ।

**श्री रघुनाथ झा** : सर्कुलेट हुआ है।

**श्री राजो सिंह** : हम लोगों को कागज नहीं मिला है। आपको मिला है, जब आप बोलने के लिए खड़े हुए।

**श्री रघुनाथ झा** : ऐसी बात नहीं है। जब हम हाउस में एंटर कर रहे थे तो वहां जो अटेंडेंट थे, उन्होंने दिया था।

महोदय, हम सब लोग जानते हैं कि एस.पी.जी. का कंसेप्ट तब बना जब देश की प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी थी। उनकी हत्या होने के बाद जब राजीव गांधी जी देश के प्रधान मंत्री बने, उस समय इस बिल को लाया गया था। यह पहले केवल प्रधान मंत्री के लिए था। जब राजीव जी प्रधान मंत्री पद से हटे तो उनसे एस.पी.जी. की सिक््योरिटी वापस ले ली गई थी। कांग्रेस पार्टी की तरफ से तब यह प्रयास किया गया था कि इनकी जान को खतरा है इसलिए इनको एस.पी.जी. की सुरक्षा मुहैया कराई जाए। चूंकि कानून में इस तरह का प्रावधान नहीं था। उस समय की सरकार ने उनकी एस.पी.जी. की सुरक्षा विद्रा कर ली और दूसरी तरह की सुरक्षा दी। जब राजीव जी की हत्या हुई तो उसके बाद लोगों ने महसूस किया और इस तरह का संशोधन आया, जिसमें असली मकसद था राजीव जी के परिवार को सुरक्षा देना। लेकिन वह सीधे कैसे कर सकते थे इसलिए पूर्व प्रधान मंत्रियों को भी इसमें शामिल किया गया। पांच बरस की अवधि तक सुरक्षा देने की बात थी। फिर उसको दस बरस किया गया। अब इसको घटाकर एक साल कर रहे हैं। इसमें हमारी कोई आपत्ति नहीं है। लेकिन जिस बात की आशंका रघुवंश जी व्यक्त कर रहे थे और हम भी कर रहे हैं कि इसका क्या मापदंड होगा, कौन सी मशीनरी जांच करेगी। यह आपके ऊपर निर्भर करेगा कि जिसको सुरक्षा मिलनी चाहिए उसको मिलेगी और जिससे हटानी है, उससे हटा दी जाएगी।

**17.00 hrs.**

इसलिए इस बात पर आपको विचार करना चाहिए कि कोई ऐसी मशीनरी बने जिससे कोई आप पर उंगली न उठा सके। आप ऐसी व्यवस्था करें जिससे आप पहचान सकें कि किसको सुरक्षा दी जाए और किसको सुरक्षा न दी जाए। आज राट्र पर खतरा है और जिस प्रकार की परिस्थितियां पैदा हो रही हैं उनसे खतरा और पैदा हो रहा है। आज क्रॉस-बार्डर टैरिज्म के साथ-साथ आतंकवादियों की गतिविधियां बढ़ती जा रही हैं। साथ ही क्रिमिनल्स लोगों से भी खतरा है। आज मंत्रिमंडल में बैठे लोगों द्वारा माफियाओं को संरक्षण देने की बात भी कही जाती है।

**श्री राजो सिंह** : आप किस मंत्रिमंडल की बात कर रहे हैं?

**श्री रघुनाथ झा** : हम बिहार के मंत्रिमंडल की बात नहीं कर रहे हैं, हम दिल्ली की बात कर रहे हैं। **अनुराग** (व्यवधान) ऐसे लोगों से जो श्रेष्ठ है, उसके बारे में सरकार क्या कर रही है। सुरक्षा पर खर्चा घटा देने से आपकी कितनी बचत हो रही है, वह बताएं। हमारा कहना यह है कि सरकार में जो फिजूलखर्ची हो रही है उसको घटाने के लिए आप क्या कोशिश कर रहे हैं, वह कोशिश भी तो होनी चाहिए। हमारा मत तो यह है कि सभी सांसदों को सुरक्षा मुहैया कराई जानी चाहिए। विधान सभा में सभी लोगों को सिक््योरिटी मिलती है, हर राज्य में मिलती है लेकिन यहां पर नहीं मिलती है। सांसदों के लिए सिक््योरिटी की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं है, इसलिए खतरा बहुत लोगों को है। आप सुरक्षा का खर्चा घटाने की बात करते हैं तो हर चीज में घटाइये। अपने मंत्रिमंडल को छोटा बनाइये। हम देखते हैं कि हर समय मंत्रिमंडल का विस्तार होता रहता है। इस मंत्रिमंडल के विस्तार की कहानी तो गिनीज-बुक में लिखी जाएगी।

एसपीजी वाले को सुरक्षा-भत्ता मिलता है, वह सुरक्षा भी करता है लेकिन हमारे पार्लियामेंट के सुरक्षा-कर्मियों को सुरक्षा-एलाउंस नहीं मिलता है। हमारे तीन आदमी मारे गये।

**समापति महोदय** : आप रिस्क-एलाउंस की बात कर रहे हैं।

**श्री रघुनाथ झा** : जी हां। इस पर भी आपको विचार करने की आवश्यकता है। मैं दो बातें आपसे कहना चाहता हूं। एक बात माननीय सदस्य श्री राशिद अलवी जी कह रहे थे। चाहे कोई हिंदू हो, मुसलमान हो, सिख हो या क्रिश्चियन हो या किसी भी संगठन या समुदाय का क्यों न हो, अगर उसकी वाणी से, बोली से राट्र के अंदर तनाव पैदा होता है, देश के अंदर कोई मतभेद पैदा होता है और ऐसे लोगों को आप ब्लैक-कैट की सुरक्षा प्रदान करते हैं तथा वे ब्लैक-कैट कमांडोज लेकर अगर आतंक पैदा करते हैं तो ऐसे लोगों की सुरक्षा हटा देनी चाहिए। हम यह नहीं कहते हैं कि ऐसे लोग हिंदुओं में नहीं हैं या मुसलमानों में नहीं हैं या सिखों में नहीं हैं। सब वर्गों में हो सकते हैं। ऐसे लोगों से सिक््योरिटी हटा देनी चाहिए।

आप टीवी. रेडियो और अखबार, सब में देखते और पढ़ते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी की सुरक्षा में दो बार गलती हुई। एक बार एक मोटर-साइकिल वाले को पुलिस वाले ने जाने दिया। आगे जाकर एक पुलिस वाले ने उसको रोक दिया। वह बैंक का पदाधिकारी था। उसको दो दिन जेल में रखा गया। अब आम आदमी को क्या पता कि कौन जा रहा है, प्रधान मंत्री जी जा रहे हैं या कोई और वीआईपी जा रहा है। अब यह देखा जा रहा है कि जिस किसी एरिया में अगर प्रधान मंत्री जी जा रहे हैं तो पूरे एरिया को सील कर दिया जाता है। अब किसी को मैडिकल इंस्टीट्यूट जाना है या किसी को हवाई-जहाज पकड़ना है तो मुश्किल हो जाती है। तीन-चार रूट पुलिस को बताए जाते हैं और आखिर में सही रूट डिस-क्लोज किया जाता है।

इतनी मजबूत व्यवस्था है। अगर मरना होगा, तो मर जायेंगे, फिर कोई नहीं बचा सकता है, लेकिन इतना डरने की क्या बात है। गांधी जी इसी देश में मरे हैं। बापू हम शर्मिन्दा हैं, तेरा कातिल जिन्दा है। इसी देश ने दो-दो प्रधान मंत्री खोए, मुख्यमंत्री खोया और पूर्व सेनाध्यक्ष खोया। लेकिन इतना डर कि अगर कहीं प्रधान मंत्री जी जायें, तो अगल-बगल से कोई नहीं आए, नहीं तो हवा लग जाएगी। हम चाहते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी सौ बरस जीयें। वे ग्लोरी की स्थिति में हैं, भगवान न करे कि कोई दुर्घटना हो जाये। अगर हो जाएगी, तो राट्र के लिए शहीद हो जायेंगे। ऐसा हम नहीं चाहते हैं, लेकिन हम यह चाहते हैं कि आम लोगों को प्रधान मंत्री के कारण कट न हो।

DR. NITISH SENGUPTA (CONTAI): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I rise to support this Bill, although I have some concerns which I should express. The first is that there is no definition of 'immediate family' anywhere.

SHRI I.D. SWAMI: It is there in the main Act.

DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : Then, I stand corrected.

SHRI I.D. SWAMI: 'Wife, husband, children and parents' is the definition in section 2 (e) of the main Act.

DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : Historically speaking, this Act was passed during the days of the late lamented Rajiv Gandhi, when he was the Prime Minister.

To my mind, there is no country where there is a special law for creating a special force for the Prime Minister's security. In this case, we are familiar, in the earlier days, – Shri Swami would also be familiar – basically, it was the Intelligence Branch people who used to handle security. Thereafter, the NSG and all that came up. To my mind, it is not very logical to have a force only for the Prime Minister. Thereafter, it was enlarged to cover former Prime Ministers also. So, I would urge the Government to consider whether we cannot go back to the old arrangement where either the Intelligence Branch or the NSG or some other agency would be able to provide the security. Maybe, more personnel are needed but their cadre could be increased instead of creating a force. It is a sort of an island. It is not in direct touch with the intelligence.

The mistake we commit very often is that we are more concerned with *bandobast* but not with intelligence. I would say that there should be only plainclothesmen, not armed personnel. There should not be these uniformed people who create all kinds of nuisance everywhere.

Earlier, the cover was only for the Prime Minister. Thereafter, former Prime Ministers were added. We have got five or six former Prime Ministers ordinarily resident in Delhi. By sheer law of statistics, every time anybody goes on the street he normally comes across some sort of Prime Ministerial cavalcade travelling, resulting in delays. It has outlived its utility. So, it is good that we are going to have an arrangement where only after one year the normal arrangement would be terminated unless a special review justifies the retention of the security arrangement for any former Prime Minister.

Shri Rashid Alvi raised a very good question: "If a former Prime Minister is retired or is not in active politics, why does he need security cover?" If he were in active politics or if there was a threat perception according to intelligence, he could be given security. That was a good point. It should be considered.

If for the Prime Minister to come from Prime Minister's house to Parliament so much *bandobast* is needed every day, would it not be worthwhile to arrange his visit by a helicopter as they do in the United States for the President? A helicopter could bring him to the House and take him back. I think, that would be much cheaper in the long run than this colonial type of arrangement where every day for four or five hours different routes are blocked.

I think, Shri I.D. Swami might consider whether it is not possible to do away with this Act altogether. It was created in a particular situation and that situation has long gone by. I would like to know whether it is not possible to make a common arrangement where the Intelligence Branch, the NSG or the existing forces, especially the trained people, could provide security to these people, rather than creating this kind of an island force whose only duty is confined to providing security to the Prime Minister, his family members, the former Prime Ministers and their family members.

Sir, with these few words, I support this Bill.

**SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE):** Sir, I follow all the illustrious predecessors of mine, starting from hon. Shrivraj V. Patil, who is one of the most respected Members of this House, in supporting this Bill.

Well, there is a necessity for providing this proximate security to the Prime Minister, to the ex-Prime Ministers and their family members. But what should be the guiding factor for providing it? Should it not be decided on case to case basis?

Today, everybody listened to Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh. He said that why it should be decided on case to case basis. He said that it should be uniform for everybody. Well, it sounds very nice. But take the example of ex-Prime Minister, Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh. He said that he did not require any special security, but because there was a law to provide security to ex-Prime Ministers, it was forced on him. Is it a very good thing to force security when somebody does not require it? Do you mean to say that the threat perceptions to Shrimati Sonia Gandhi and also to Shri I.K. Gujral are just the same? Is it because they were all ex-Prime Ministers, they will get the same type of security on the expenses of the people?

Sir, I fully support this Bill for the reason that the threat perception should be reviewed and it should be reviewed on case to case basis. More than 600 SPGs, over 3,000 Delhi Police personnel and 1,750 CRPF personnel are deployed to protect the former Prime Ministers, their family members and their officials, who are residing in Delhi or in the States. Sometimes, the security perception is creating a problem for the people. Take the example of one of the hon. Members of this House from Karnataka. He wrote a letter to the hon. Minister of Home Affairs that one of the ex-Prime Ministers and his family members are misusing the security cover provided to them and it should be removed. This is true that one of the Members of this House wrote a letter. There is a manpower constraint and there is a financial constraint and when you combine these two things

together, you will find that actually there is a necessity of reducing the security cover provided to the ex-Prime



Ministers. I agree that with the introduction of suicidal terrorism, the threat perception to so many ex-Prime Ministers and VIPs has increased. However, the point about the security cover -- real or ornamental -- has already been raised by Dr. M.V.V.S. Murthy. It should not be a status symbol that how many Black Cats do I have around me and how much nuisance they may create among the people. What sort of nuisance these security people, the black cat commandoes are just creating by pushing, shoving and misbehaving with these people! In a democratic country, should this be the policy? So, I strongly recommend to curtail the use of the technical teams; to curtail the use of electronic protective devices; and to surrender the vehicles deputed to the people for their security on round-the-clock-basis.

Sir, there is one more point. As I have already told you, it is an irritating curtailment of the civil rights. Most of the times it happens. I will give you an example. When Shri T. N. Seshan was the Chief Election Commissioner, and when he was passing through a Delhi road, another car tried to overtake his vehicle. He ordered his SPG guards to fire on the other car which overtook his car. The SPG guards totally refused, that they will not do so. And you know, when Shri I. K. Gujral was the Prime Minister, just five years ago, a 48 year old Delhi salesman, whose name was Martin Mosey was beaten by half a dozen policemen because he strayed into the VIP route of Shri Gujral. So, this is one of the very important points which we should also consider while just going for the provision of the VIP security to our ex-Prime Ministers and others.

In Delhi, we have many layer security system for the VIPs. It involves 13 per cent of the 55,000 of the police force. Sir, 13 per cent of the police force are only engaged in providing security.

Take the example of Uttar Pradesh. Sir, 1400 politicians, bureaucrats and others enjoy the protection of 8,000 cops. In Jammu & Kashmir they spent Rs. 90 crore in between 1998-2000 for VIP security.

Take the example of the letter written by the DGP of Manipur. He said : "How long the VIP protection should continue out of the expense of the State exchequer?" In Manipur due to the increased VIP duties, investigation work had suffered, and the needs of the ordinary citizen took a back seat. Nobody was willing to take care of theft or any other ordinary crime. Everybody was only busy in providing security to the VIPs.

There are also people who were provided VIP security even after they demitted office. I will say, Sir, Bihar is the brightest example in this regard because of which Shri Raghuvansh Prasad Singh was so annoyed, as to why security should be provided on case to case basis. They want that all sorts of culprits in Bihar, and everybody who just becomes a Minister or anybody should also be provided with such type of security. I very strongly oppose this. I very strongly support the case that on the case to case basis it should be decided as to who should be provided with security and who should not be. (not recorded)

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : If Shri Swain yields, I would like to say something.

Sir, he is making a speech and he is entitled to say anything he wants to say, but making a reference to the President or the ex-President is not good. It should not be part of the record. There should, at least, be one person in the country whose name should not be dragged in this fashion. This is my submission. I will leave it to you and leave it to him also.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Reference to ex-President should not form part of the record.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Yes, Sir, I abide by what you say.

**डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह** : टैरेस्ट्रस के लिए जो नामी आदमी होता है, वह सॉफ्ट टारगेट बनता है। उसे मारकर वे आतंक पैदा करते हैं। सॉफ्ट टारगेट का क्या इलाज है।

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : I agree with what you say or your instructions. However, I merely submit that the President is never a soft target. If the President is a soft target, then India is a 'banana' state. India is not a soft country.

You take the example of these SPG guards. They are trained to counter hijack. They are trained to counter terrorist attacks. They are trained in hand to hand combat. They are also trained in ambush sessions. An SPG shooter should clock, at least, 85 per cent of the hits. Otherwise, he will be removed. They are also trained to remain without food and sleep for four to five days. We provide such type of highly skilled and trained persons just to provide security to only some VIPs? It should not be that way.

Finally, I will raise certain questions. While I fully agree that this Bill has been rightly brought forward to reduce the security cover to the VIPs, which is unnecessary, I will raise certain questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Swain, please conclude now.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : I will conclude. There is a lot of time - we are sitting up to six o'clock.

Should the State provide police protection to the VIPs, including MPs and MLAs, who have Mafia links? This is one of my questions, which should be considered. If somebody has become a VIP, should he get it? Should the personal animosity form the basis for providing security to a VIP? Police protection should only be given to those VIPs, who face a threat from the terrorists, Mafia syndicates and political rivals. If the VIP is linked to a crime syndicate, the State or the Central Government should not provide him with security.

My second question is, what sort of security we want. Is it a qualitative security or a security of quantity? My specific question is, let the hon. Minister reply, should we require distinctly-dressed, sinister-looking, but ill-behaved security personnel for the VIP security? Take the example of the Israeli Prime Minister. He is one of the most threatened persons on the surface of the world, but he is guarded by so inconspicuously looking security guards that the ordinary people hardly notice his security entourage. Can we not do any such thing? We just like very vicious looking people surrounding us because it gives us a lot of pride and satisfies one's ego that one is so precious to the nation that he is surrounded by so many people around him. But is it the correct thing to do?

My point is that this security threat in this country has given rise to the establishment of private security agencies. It is now a Rs. 1,500 crore business in this country. When the ex-President of the United States of America, Mr. Jimmy Carter, came to India about three years back, in 2000, the CIA hired two of the local private security agencies, besides the security that was provided by the Government of India, for the protection of their former President.

So, my question to the hon. Minister is, should there be some standardised guidelines for these private security agencies on the lines of guidelines being considered by the Government for Non-Banking Finance Companies?

My last question is, can we provide security to everybody? This point has already been raised by many hon. Members. My point is that the standard of the police forces in this country should be improved. Police forces should be thoroughly modernised. I say this because it is not possible to provide security to each and everybody in this country. It is simply not possible. So, the overall security scenario must be improved. That can only be done through modernisation of police forces and by imparting proper training to police personnel in the country, which the State Governments are not capable to do.

With these words, I support the Bill.

**SARDAR SIMRANJIT SINGH MANN (SANGRUR):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, thank you very much for giving me the time to speak on this very vital matter dealing with the security of the Prime Ministers, the former Prime Ministers and the Leader of Opposition.

My humble submission is that in a democracy, in an egalitarian society, no Government can afford to have special elite groups to guard Prime Ministers or former Prime Ministers or Leaders of Opposition. If they need security, they should be provided security from the ordinary police forces of the country. We have no dearth of commandos in the BSF, CRPF, CISF, Indo-Tibetan Border Police or even in the Army. However, to provide any person with a special elite force is totally undemocratic, and not an egalitarian practice. It is a heavy pressure on the public exchequer. I do not think any person with a fresh mind, with a modern mind would allow any Government moneys to be spent on elite forces to guard retired Prime Ministers.

Constitutionally, India is a secular democratic country. However, I have found - and I have written to the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister over and over again - that neither in the NSG nor in the SPG, any Sikh is recruited or allowed to perform his duties. Hon. Minister of State for Home Affairs may tell us that there is no sectarianism or discrimination against the Sikhs. I have seen the security of Shri Chandra Shekhar, Shri Deve Gowda, Shri Gujral, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi, Shri Narasimha Rao and Shri V.P. Singh, and found that no Sikhs are deployed, either in the NSG or in the SPG. The Minister must give us a clear answer why the Sikhs are being denied entry into these forces. It is true that Sikhs are alleged to have killed a Prime Minister. But Hindus have also killed Shri M.K. Gandhi and Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Does it mean that if any Sikh or a person belonging to a religion kills a VIP, the entire population of that religion will be barred from these elite forces?

Sir, I totally disagree with this unsecular approach to the composition of these Groups - the NSG and the SSG.

The second problem that I face is that these patent elite groups have become a law unto themselves and the people they are guarding have also become something extra-constitutional. Traffic is held up. Red lights are there on their cars; sirens are there on their cars. This is not a democratic practice that somebody should be more equal than others.

Just today I had experienced this outside Parliament House when my car was held up for 15 long minutes. I felt claustrophobic; I felt suffocated and barricaded because the Prime Minister was moving. Even if the Leader of the Opposition is moving or the Deputy Prime Minister is moving, to tell you truly, they have become a nuisance to the

general public. It is against the spirit of the republic or the democracy that traffic should be held up for any person, no matter how high his stature in the country is.

Sir, the other thing is that I do not think that we are serving the security of the VIPs as diligently as we should. The Prime Minister's rightful house is at Teen Murti Lane where the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru lived. That is the safe place; that is the secured place.

Sir, there have been many famous American Presidents but the White House has not become a museum. There have been many great British Prime Ministers but the Ten Downing Street has not become a museum. So, I think, the Prime Minister should be moved into Pandit Nehru's house. That is the fit place for him to live in. This place where he lives is insecure. It is overlooked by high-rise buildings like Ashoka Hotel, Samrat Hotel. Then, there is a Safdarjung Airfield right next door to the Prime Minister's House. God forbid! There are so many stray Stinger missiles unaccounted for. If somebody has a pot shot from these high-rise buildings into the Prime Minister House, or a shoulder firing missile or if somebody from the Safdarjung Airport puts the aircraft into the Prime Minister's House in a suicide dive, then how we could protect the Prime Minister?

So, my suggestion is that the Prime Minister should be put back in his due place. His rightful residence has been turned into a museum for the Late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. We do respect our late Prime Ministers but we should find other modes of paying them homage rather than making their homes into museums.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, please conclude.

SARDAR SIMRANJIT SINGH MANN : Yes, Sir.

Shri Shivraj V. Patil, the hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition has very rightly said that the assassinations of the Prime Ministers had happened because they had followed some policies. Now, it is not the policy of any Prime Minister to put the troops into the Golden Temple and knock the most sanctum sanctorum place of the Sikhs and reduce it into a rubble. Secondly, it is not a wise policy of another Prime Minister to set the IPKF against his own Tamil people in Sri Lanka.

Now, these policies which are foolish do not lead to national integration. They rather disintegrate the nation. We must call spade a spade and we must tell the Prime Ministers that they must follow the policies which do not divide the nation but tie together in a strong net on a strong knot.

Secondly, I want to talk about the policy of the Government of India. The Sikhs have never been allowed to be witnesses or partners in the decision-making process of the Government of India. For example, in the freshly created Nuclear Command System, there is no Sikh. At present, there is no Sikh Secretary to the Government of India. Previously, the portfolios of Defence, Finance, Home and External Affairs were given to the Sikhs. Now you are not given any portfolio worth the name.

Thirdly, even in Parliament, when there are minority issues at stake, the minority MPs are not allowed to speak on these issues. If there is something to be criticised about the minority, it would be a majority community MP who would lead the debate. If there is charity amongst the majority community, it will be from the majority community that somebody will defend us. Why does not the hon. Speaker and the Rules of this House allow the Sikh or the Muslim or the Christian to speak regarding their own people? This is something that needs to be rectified. There is an old saying – a Victorian adage – that children should be seen and not heard, that is the policy that this House follows pertaining to the minority that they can be seen, but they are seldom heard. I hope you will rectify what I have said.

**श्री रामदास आठवले (पंढरपुर)** : सभापति महोदय, पूर्व प्रधानमंत्री जी को जो सुरक्षा मिल रही है, उसे घटाने के बारे में यह विधेयक आया है। अगर पुलिस की रिपोर्ट में उन्हें कोई श्रेट है तो उसे कुछ साल तक बढ़ाने के बारे में यह विधेयक आडवाणी साहब के नाम पर यहां आया है। आडवाणी जी इस समय हाउस में मौजूद नहीं हैं, लेकिन आई.डी. स्वामी जी मौजूद हैं और यह भी एक्सपर्ट मंत्री हैं।

महोदय, मेरा सुझाव है कि पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री जी को जो सुरक्षा दे रहे हैं वह उन्हें आखिरी तक मिलनी चाहिए। इसमें आप जो पैसा बचाने का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं, वह बचेगा नहीं। इसलिए मेरा सुझाव है कि जो पूर्व प्रधान मंत्रियों को सुरक्षा दे रहे हैं – इनमें राव जी, वी.पी. सिंह जी, देवेगौड़ा जी, चन्द्रशेखर जी और गुजराल जी हैं और बाद में अटल जी रहने वाले हैं। हमारा यह सुझाव है कि आखिरी तक इन्हें सुरक्षा मिलनी चाहिए। पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री जी की सुरक्षा करने की नैतिक जिम्मेदारी आपकी सरकार की है और उसे अगर कम-ज्यादा किया जाता है तो उसके लिए फिर हम स्वयं जिम्मेदार नहीं रहेंगे, आप बोलेंगे कि हम तो पार्लियामेंट में बिल लाए थे, आपसे पूछा था। इसलिए प्रधानमंत्री जी को सुरक्षा देने के बारे में अगर आप कोई योजना तैयार करते हैं तो उसके लिए हमारा सपोर्ट रहेगा। पूर्व प्रधानमंत्री जी को सुरक्षा मिलनी चाहिए। सोनिया गांधी जी को भी सुरक्षा मिली हुई है। स्व. राजीव गांधी जी और इंदिरा गांधी जी की हत्या हुई। सोनिया गांधी जी के परिवार के लिए सुरक्षा ठीक है मगर बाकी के जो भी पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री हैं, अगर उन्हें कोई ज्यादा श्रेट नहीं होगा तो उनके बच्चों के लिए ज्यादा सुरक्षा की आवश्यकता नहीं है।

पूर्व प्रधानमंत्रियों की सुरक्षा तो ठीक है, लेकिन हमारा सुझाव है कि दिल्ली में जब प्रधानमंत्री जी जाते हैं तो बहुत बार हमारी गाड़ी भी रोकते हैं। एक बार तो ऐसा हुआ कि 10 बजे हमें यहां आना था और जीरो ऑवर के लिए नोटिस देना था, लेकिन हमारी गाड़ी रोक दी। पुलिस वालों ने एक मंत्री की गाड़ी को छोड़ा, हमारी गाड़ी पर एम.पी. का बिल्ला भी था, मैंने कहा कि मुझे भी छोड़ दो तो कहा कि नहीं छोड़ेंगे। मैंने कहा, क्यों नहीं छोड़ेंगे तो पूछा कि आप एम.पी. हैं। मैंने कहा कि मैं एम.पी. हूँ। उसने कहा कि आप एम.पी. नहीं हैं। मैंने कहा कि मैं कैसे एम.पी. नहीं हूँ, ऐसे तो तुम भी पुलिस वाले नहीं हो। इसलिए जिस तरह से पुलिस की ड्रेस है, इसलिए उनको पुलिस बोलते हैं, लेकिन हमारी ड्रेस अलग-अलग होती है। इसके बारे में भी विचार करने की आवश्यकता है।

हमारा मंत्री महोदय से इतना ही निवेदन है कि सुरक्षा की व्यवस्था जो आप कर रहे हैं, यह हमारे देश के नेताओं के लिए जरूरी है। (व्यवधान)

**सभापति महोदय :** आप यूनीफार्म पर न जायें, विय पर आयें।

**श्री रामदास आठवले :** मैं सुरक्षा के विय पर ही बोल रहा हूँ। इस विय में हमारा सुझाव इतना ही है कि हम लोग इसका विरोध तो नहीं करते हैं, लेकिन एक साल तक सुरक्षा का आप जो बिल लाये हैं, उसका हम समर्थन करने वाले नहीं हैं। इसका पीरियड दस साल रखना चाहिए, बाद में 10 साल से बढ़ाने की आवश्यकता है। इसके बारे में आपको विचार करना चाहिए। आप इसे 10 साल से घटाकर एक साल कर रहे हैं। मेरा लास्ट प्वाइंट यह है कि एम.पी. की सुरक्षा करने के बारे में भी विचार करने की आवश्यकता है। (व्यवधान)

**श्री विजयेन्द्र पाल सिंह बदनोर (भीलवाड़ा) :** आपकी कविता हो जाये तो मैं शुरू करूँ।

श्री रामदास आठवले : पूर्व प्रधानमंत्रियों की सुरक्षा करनी है, इसमें कविता करेंगे तो क्या होगा। एम.पी. की गाड़ी पर भी लालबत्ती या दूसरी बत्ती होने की आवश्यकता है। इसके बारे में आपको विचार करने की आवश्यकता है। जिस तरह से जिला परिषद के अध्यक्ष की गाड़ी पर बत्ती होती है, बाकी लोगोंकी गाड़ी पर भी होती है, इसी तरह से मैम्बर ऑफ पार्लियामेंट की गाड़ी पर भी होनी चाहिए।

सभापति महोदय : आप लालबत्ती कह रहे हैं कि मोमबत्ती कह रहे हैं, स्पट नहीं हो रहा है।

**श्री रामदास आठवले :** हम तो पौने दो साल के बाद उधर ही आने वाले हैं, हमारे पास अभी टाइम नहीं है। पौने दो साल के बाद आप इधर आयेंगे और हम उधर जाएंगे। एम.पी. की सुरक्षा होनी चाहिए और पूर्व प्रधानमंत्रियों की सुरक्षा बढ़ानी चाहिए। मुझे इतना ही कहना है।

**SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH BADNORE :** Sir, I stand to support the Special Protection Group (Amendment) Bill, 2002.

This Bill was enacted in 1988 and it has gone through three amendments already in 14 years. This particular amendment is not to decrease the security of the Prime Minister and the family in any way. It is only to see and review whether they require the sort of security which is being given to them. Basically it is only to do that.

Sir, I feel that this review is a very important one because the threat perception is different from one Prime Minister to another. This is why, it is being really amended. I feel that this is a very important one also looking at the manpower constraints of the SPG and the financial burden. There are a few suggestions that I want to put forth to the hon. Minister.

One is that the SPG goes through a rigorous training including the commando training. He has to go through everything. But at least he should also be given a behaviour training so that he behaves properly with the other members of the society. That is lacking. Why can we not do something about it? Different sorts of securities are being given to different VIPs and WVIPs. But this behaviour training which we are talking about and everybody had his concern about that, has to be looked into. It may be at the airport or at the traffic jams that we are facing. These people behave as if they have become very superior. Even at the airport they ask people what the hell are you doing here; you go this way and that way. Let them talk, at least, decently. They think everybody else is just rubbish. That is what is really needed to be looked into. This is a suggestion that I want to put-forth.

Sir, it is a fact that the ISI has really made in-roads into not just Jammu and Kashmir – earlier it used to be in Punjab – but in the whole of the country now. The threat perception to a lot of WVIPs and VIPs has increased. There are different layers of security. The SPG might be at the highest level. There are other levels of security which also have to be beefed up. The terrorists attacked Parliament. They have a definite advantage as the choice of place, weapon, time, etc. is theirs. He can attack at any time of the day or night. You cannot be really vigilant for the whole 24 hours. So, all those things have to be looked into. They are always looking for a soft target. I have always said that I do not know why the terrorists attacked Parliament. I think it was just to make a big flash. But otherwise, we are staying in nearby flats. There is no security there. Anybody can walk there. Somebody can put a bomb and could any time blow up about 20 Members of Parliament. When Parliament is in Session, it can be done. It is such a soft target. Those are the things that have to be looked into also. It may not be in the ambit of this Bill but I thought that I must put this forth because we have got a chance to say things like that.

Sir, everybody is using red light on his car right from the smallest judge to the Supreme Court judge. I do not say that the Supreme Court judges should not use the red light. But why should the Members of Parliament be debarred? We may not want to use a red light in Delhi as there is no use of it. But we travel in other areas and we travel in night also. We face many problems. Why do you not allow that? You are allowing a small little judge to use it. In protocol, we may be very high but we are not allowed to use it. You should look into that as well. We are not interested in status symbol security. But some sort of security of that kind should be there.

The other thing is regarding private security which has been very rightly talked about by my colleague here. There is private security which is going about and everybody is wanting to hire and have the black cats with them. There should be some sort of rules for them also specifying who can be private security guards and who cannot be. There is nothing like that. So, this also has to be looked into.



Sir, I am grateful to you as you have given me time to speak.

SHRI I.D. SWAMI: Sir, I am grateful to all the hon. Members who have participated in this debate and have made very valuable suggestions. Not almost all but all have really supported this. That shows the concern of the nation and the House for the protection and security of not only of the Prime Minister but the former Prime Ministers also.

To begin with, Shri Patil, had really brought out very succinctly the necessity for the protection and security of not only the former Prime Ministers, but also other leaders and VIPs. A general security concern has also been expressed by most of the Members here in which they have brought out the issue of border management and many other problems and difficulties of the general public. The internal security scenario as is obtaining now in the country was also focussed on during the debate. Though this aspect was not very much concerned with the present amendment Bill, yet that showed the concern of the House and concern of the country on the issue. I can assure the House, through you, that so far as the issues of border management and internal security are concerned, efforts are being made in this regard. Recently the Group of Ministers made certain recommendations. They appointed a Task Force for Border Management, internal security etc. Certain suggestions were made and as a result of that, some action has already been taken to beef up the intelligence apparatus in the States and in the country. As regards border management, a separate division in the Home Ministry has been opened under the supervision of a Secretary level officer. This is about the general thing.

Sir, so far as this Bill is concerned, this Bill is primarily meant to ensure that security would be provided to the former Prime Ministers and their immediate family members. A question was raised on this point of 'immediate family members' and they wanted to know whether family members would include father, mother etc. It has already been defined in section II(e) of the main Act and this includes wife, husband, children and parents. They are already included in that.

Shri Patil was very clear about the fact that we do want to be frugal in our expenditure. There is no doubt about it. At the same time I can assure you that the country can afford it, the country has been affording it and the country would always afford any amount for the security and protection of our former Prime Ministers as well as the Prime Minister. There is no doubt about it.

Sir, so far as the general public is concerned, the scenario in the country is improving after the Group of Ministers made certain recommendations that internal security and general security scenario should improve and security is made fool-proof and this would help us win the proxy war that has been thrust upon us.

Sir, so far as this Bill is concerned, it is only meant for a limited purpose. Instead of binding the security paraphernalia and security arrangements under a statute, we have made it clear that it would always be provided for one year and then it would be assessed every year and on the basis of that assessment, it would be prolonged. While seeking your permission to move for a discussion on this Bill I mentioned that we have a case in hand that our hon. Leader of the Opposition, Smt. Sonia Gandhi, even though ten-year has elapsed, is being given security and she should be given and nobody grudges it, rather everybody wants it.

Sir, in the same breadth there was a point raised by Shri Patil that instead of one year it should be more. I think, when in the beginning we are making it for one year and then when it has to be assessed on a year to year basis and there is not going to be any gap in assessment for more than 12 months between one assessment and the other, or so to say, the consecutive assessment period will not exceed more than 12 months, that point does not very much remain material in the sense that it would ultimately be done on the basis of an assessment.

Sir, some of the hon. Members had raised this point as to how this assessment would be made. With due respect to the hon. Members I would like to submit that we cannot make the exercise of assessment by including the MPs, MLAs or other political people because every political party has their own views. But all the same there is a proper methodology and proper paraphernalia and there is also a proper apparatus for making assessment of the threat perception. There is a Protective Review Group at the lower level and there are senior officers in that group. After they make their recommendations, it goes to the Security Categorisation Committee which is represented by a Joint Secretary in the office of the Prime Minister, the Home Secretary, a Special Secretary, Director or a Joint Director from the IB and various other officers. They make the assessment and after they make this assessment, the threat perception is assessed.

On the basis of the threat perception, ultimately the decision is made.

There was a point raised by Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh on the aims and objects of the Bill. He has already sought clarifications from hon. Member Shri Shivraj Patil. I would like to make it clear that the Bill was circulated much earlier whereas we have moved the amendment now. Therefore, after moving of the Government amendment, certain words in the aims and objects have certainly become redundant. What he was reading was

perhaps from the document which was circulated earlier, before the introduction. Now that a few lines in the aims and objects have been changed after the introduction of the Government amendment, certainly there are a few lines circulated earlier, which have become redundant. The changed version has been moved yesterday and has been circulated today.

One hon. Member mentioned about the quality and quantity of the Group. These are issues of a very large debate. They cannot be encompassed in the debate on this Amending Bill. But, all the same, I would say a few words on the point that he has made about the private security agencies that there should be some regulation on them. I can assure him that a Bill has already been introduced in this regard in the Rajya Sabha. Perhaps in this Session that Bill may be passed there and may come to the Lok Sabha also. We are taking care of that aspect.

DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : What about improving the public behaviour?

SHRI I.D. SWAMI: If it is really unobtrusive, then the whole problem is solved. But, if it continues like this, certainly you will appreciate that some action will have to be taken. We have been giving special training to the police not only on human rights, on the public and police relationship, but also on their own behaviour and attitudinal changes. All these things have been included in the training course from constable to senior officers and the in-service training is meant only for this purpose. I hope, as compared to many mofussils and districts in the States, when we see them in Delhi, there is a world of difference in their behaviour. So, it depends upon the people who have been recruited and the training given to them. Slowly and gradually changes are coming, though they may not be very significant. Perceptible changes have taken place; there is no doubt about it.

A point was raised about the total expenditure that is incurred on SPG and whether there is any scope to save on this count. This Bill is not primarily meant for saving money or saving the personnel. The question is that the personnel are short. The total expenditure on SPG till now is Rs.556 crore and Rs.75 crore is being spent every year on the SPG, as special and sophisticated training is given to them.

Shri Simranjit Singh Mann mentioned that Sikhs are not recruited into the SPG. For the information of the hon. Member and for the information of the whole House I may say that there is no bar on any caste or any religion coming into the SPG. The SPG is constituted from among the officers and officials brought on deputation from different organisations, be it para-military forces or State forces. There is no recruitment as such for the SPG. They are all brought into the SPG on deputation from different formations or organisations. Those who want to come to it, on them there is no bar. On the other hand we find that most of the officers are reluctant to join the SPG. It is a very hard and difficult job. Even now we have a shortage of about 650 personnel in our SPG. The total sanctioned strength is much more than the number of personnel now available in the SPG. Therefore, it is not that people belonging to a caste or religion or community is debarred. Anybody can come into the SPG; there is no doubt about it.

I think I have been able to meet most of the points raised by the hon. Members. At the end, I would like to thank all the hon. Members who have participated in the discussion.

SHRI K. YERRANNAIDU (SRIKAKULAM): You have not covered the point on the threat perception in respect of Members of Parliament. Underground militants and PWG people are targeting MPs and are openly proclaiming who are their targeted MPs. We do not know what you are doing in this regard.

### **18.00 hrs.**

About three months back, I had written a letter to the Home Ministry. Even recently also, it has come in the newspapers that some Ministers and Members of Parliament are targeted in three districts. Here we are talking about the Prime Minister and the former Prime Ministers. We want security for them also. But we are Members of Parliament elected by 10 lakh people. We are not asking security for all Members of Parliament. The Government should take care of Members of Parliament if there is a threat perception. If there is an IB Report and information regarding the MPs security, the Home Ministry *suo motu* should act on it. If any Member of Parliament asks for security, you may deny it. But if you have information about it, you should take care of such MPs also.

SHRI I.D. SWAMI: I agree with you. In the beginning, I have already said that there is an alternative arrangement where SPG or NSG cover is not thereâ€¦(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Ramdas Athawale, please take your seat.

SHRI V. VETRISELVAN (KRISHNAGIRI): You must give security to Members of Parliament. Without being an MP, one cannot be a Ministerâ€¦(Interruptions)

SHRI I.D. SWAMI: In the beginning, I have already said that there are alternative arrangements for whom SPG or NSG cover is not available and other cover is available. There are three or four categories of security provided like

'X', 'Y', 'Z' and 'Z plus' categories. According to that, security is provided. The point raised or the suggestion made by the hon. Member is well taken.....(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. The Minister is replying.

SHRI I.D. SWAMI: I have taken note of their requests or grievances or their sentiments. I will certainly keep them in mind and they are well taken. But all the same, whenever any Member of Parliament is writing about threat perception and it is noticed, as per the assessment made by Intelligence Bureau and other agencies, he is provided with some security.

श्री सुरेश रामराव जाधव (परमनी) : मैं दो साल से कोशिश कर रहा हूँ, लेकिन मुझे अभी तक सुरक्षा नहीं मिली है। (Interruptions)

SHRI I.D. SWAMI: The hon. Member can tell me about it separately. It is not concerned with this...(*Interruptions*) But all the same, I can assure the hon. Members that they can meet me separately, give me in writing and we will take care of it.

I think I have been able to meet all the points raised by the hon. Members in the House and I request them to pass the Bill. Thank you very much.

SHRI K. YERRANNAIDU : The hon. Minister should know our anxiety. There is no doubt that we are going to pass this Bill. There are 745 Members of Parliament. Threat perception is not there for every MP. Only a few Members, maybe 30 or 40 Members, are facing it. Every district has Central Intelligence Agency but the Home Ministry is not reviewing the position. Every month, you have to review the position from the IB as to whether any threat perception is there for any Member of Parliament. Suppose any MP requests for security, you may deny it but it is the obligation of the Home Ministry to find out from its sources in this regard. Out of 745 MPs, about 30 or 40 Members may be having the threat perception. The Home Ministry should act on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister has already noted your point.

SHRI K. YERRANNAIDU : It is all right. But I am telling this again and again due to my anxiety. I am expressing the feeling of Members on the floor of the House. It is not for me that I am raising the point. Everybody is talking outside about it. We are also writing about it. But nobody is taking care of it. They are taking care of only former Prime Ministers, their fathers, mothers and sons of former Prime Ministers. This is the opinion outside and everybody is talking like this outside. I am only expressing the feeling of the MPs through you to the hon. Minister.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I wanted some explanation from the hon. Minister. But, in the course of his reply, he has already explained what I wanted to get explained.

Sir, on one point I seek your indulgence and the indulgence of this House. In the nineties, the security of the Parliament was tightened and we had taken some steps to provide better security to the Parliament. It caused some inconvenience to Members and they objected to it. We requested them to put up with the inconvenience and they did understand it, and the security continued. It was because of that, because of the cameras, the control room and the signal given from the control room to the security personnel in the Parliament House that doors were closed and the Parliament was saved when it was attacked. Why I am mentioning this is that, if security is to be provided to the dignitaries in the country, maybe Prime Minister, Deputy Prime Minister, President, Vice-President and other Ministers, then some inconvenience is likely to be caused. I think that inconvenience should be reduced as far as possible. Sophistication should be introduced. But we should not grudge that kind of security to them because they represent the nation and they represent the people. If something happens, God forbid, that has larger implications. So, it should be looked at from that angle and we, who are sitting on these benches, do understand these difficulties and we would not like to grudge the security provided to the dignitaries of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is:

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

*The motion was adopted.*

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

Clause 2 Amendment of Section 4

*Amendments made:*

for lines 7 to 11, *substitute* –

i. any former Prime Minister or to the members of his immediate family –

(a) for a period of one year from the date on which the former Prime Minister ceased to hold office and beyond one year based on the level of threat as decided by the Central Government, so however that not more than twelve months shall elapse between two consecutive assessments made in regard to the need for proximate security:

Provided that while deciding the level of threat, the Central Government shall take into account, among other things, the following factors, namely:-

- A. that the threat emanates from any militant or terrorist organisation or any other source; and
- B. that the threat is of a grave and continuing nature;" (3)

Page 2,--

*omit* lines 1 to 3 (4)

(Shri I.D. Swami)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 2, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 2, as amended, was added to the Bill.*

*Clause 3 was added to the Bill.*

Clause 1 Short title

*Amendment made:*

Page 1, line 3, --

for "2002"

*substitute* "2003" (2)

(Shri I.D. Swami)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

*The motion was adopted.*

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

Enacting Formula

*Amendment made:*

Page 1, line 1,--

for "Fifty-third"

*substitute* "Fifty-fourth" (1)

(Shri I.D. Swami)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That Enacting Formula, as amended, stand part of the Bill."



*The motion was adopted.*

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

*The Title was added to the Bill.*

SHRI I.D. SWAMI: I beg to move:

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

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is:

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

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. CHAIRMAN : House now stands adjourned till Eleven of the Clock tomorrow.

1810 hours

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock  
on Friday, February 21, 2003/Phalgun 2, 1924 (Saka).*

---

-----