

RAJYA SABHA

*SYNOPSIS OF DEBATE

(Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

Tuesday, December 03, 2019 / Agrahayana 12, 1941 (Saka)

MATTERS RAISED WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE CHAIR

1. Need to start teaching of Maithili in the University of Delhi

***SHRI PRABHAT JHA:** (Spoke in Maithili).

2. Exemption of District Mineral Foundations (DMFs) from the Purview of Income Tax and GST Acts

DR. AMAR PATNAIK: I rise to make a submission for exemption of District Mineral Trust Fund from the purview of income tax and Goods and Services Tax. These DMFs undertake developmental work under the guidelines of the Pradhan Mantri Khanij Kshetra Kalyan Yojana and the provisions of the Odisha District Mineral Foundation Rules, 2015. The mandate of the DMF is to provide basic developmental interventions to benefit the people inhabiting mining affected areas, most of whom are from tribes and Scheduled Areas. It is not clear whether these trusts will also have to pay the Goods and Services Tax. Unless these funds are exempted from the purview of the Income-Tax Act, 1961, and the GST, they are

*This Synopsis is not an authoritative record of the proceedings of the Rajya Sabha.

* Synopsis of speech delivered by hon'ble Member in Maithili will be published separately as supplement.

likely to incur substantial tax liabilities from their inception, which would adversely affect availability of these funds for carrying out the intended objects. I would make a request that the CBDT should exempt these District Mineral Foundation funds from Income Tax and amend the GST Act to exempt services offered by DMFs from tax.

(Shri Sasmit Patra, Shri Bhaskar Rao Nekkanti and Shri Ashwini Vaishnaw Associated.)

3. Need to Install a Portrait of Nandalal Bose in Central Hall of Parliament House

MS. DOLA SEN: The original handwritten Constitution is a work of art. This House should commemorate its illustrator, the great artist, Nandalal Bose, on December 3, which is his birth anniversary. He is known for his indigenous style and depiction of rural life. He worked with Mahatma Gandhi and Rabindranath Tagore and contributed immensely towards the freedom movement with his art works. Nandalal Bose and his students adorned the pages of the Constitution with beautiful art pieces from the history of India. On the occasion of his birth anniversary, the House must take the resolve to honour the memory of Nandalal Bose by installing his portrait in the Central Hall of the Parliament House. During the last Session, we had raised the matter of installing the statue of Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyay, one of the greatest Indian writers and the writer of Vande Mataram, in the Parliament House. These two persons have made great contributions in the field of art and culture. Hence, there is an urgent need for them to get representation in the Parliament.

(Several hon'ble Members associated.)

4. Revival Package to BSNL/MTNL and Payment of AGR Liability by Telecom Companies

SHRI VIVEK K. TANKHA: Our telecom sector is staring at a collapse. BSNL and MTNL stares at a Rs.69,000 crore revival package. Even in that package, there is no provision for 5G, new technology induction into BSNL or MTNL, or for other R&D. Today, even the private sector is collapsing. Vodafone and Airtel Bharti are

virtually on the verge of not being able to pay their dues. They have a debt of Rs. 90,000 crores together. There will be only one player left in the country and monopoly is never good for any country. We must strengthen our public sector and, also invite active Government intervention, otherwise, this sunshine industry which actually brought India on a global map is seeing its end. The only sufferers are going to be the people of India.

(Several hon'ble Members associated.)

5. Mushrooming Fake Call Centres in the Country

SHRI SURENDRA SINGH NAGAR: I want to draw the attention of the Government to the online fraud being done through fake call centres in Delhi-NCR and big metros cities of the country. Recently a fake call centre was traced in Noida which used to steal data from Flipkart, Myntra and insurance companies and based on that, they call customers and cheat them by luring them for new schemes and huge discounts. There is no law for such companies from where data is leaked, so that the police can take action against them. I request the government to take action against such companies by enacting a law to stop online fraud.

(Shri Rakesh Sinha and Shri Naresh Gujral associated.)

6. Need for More Trains from Chennai to Thanjavur Junction in Tamil Nadu

SHRI R. VAITHILINGAM: Thanjavur is an ancient town located in the heart of Cauvery delta in Tamil Nadu. The town is famous for the Brihadeeswara temple which is a World Heritage Site and the Navagraha temple that are thronged by pilgrims from all parts of the country. Thanjavur has a railway junction. Thanjavur Railway Station came into existence in the year 1881 but trains operating through Thanjavur junction are still a few. This poses great inconvenience to the commuters of the region and the domestic and foreign tourists. I appeal to the Government to introduce exclusive superfast trains between Chennai and Thanjavur in greater frequencies to cater to the increasing number of commuters on the route. In the

same way, exclusive trains may be introduced from Thanjavur to destinations like Trichy, Madurai, Pattukottai and Thiruvavarur enabling the local commuters and alighting tourists to visit those important towns.

(Shri S. Muthukaruppan and Shrimati Vijila Sathyananth Associated.)

7. Bringing Maharaja Duleep Singh's Ashes to Amritsar

SHRI PARTAP SINGH BAJWA: Maharaja Dalip Singh was born in 1838. He was the youngest son of Maharaja Ranjit Singh ji. At the age of five he was declared as the Maharaja of Punjab. In 1849, the British captured Punjab and took him and his mother, Rani Jindaan first to UP and later to England. When he wanted to leave the British and return to India with his family, the British arrested him on the way due to fear of revolt. He was buried at Elveden Estate near Cambridge. It is my demand that his ashes should be brought back from there and a memorial may be established in the religious capital of the Sikhs, Amritsar, with the Sikh rites.

(Several hon'ble Members associated.)

8. Ad-hoc Teachers of the University of Delhi

PROF. MANOJ KUMAR JHA: The sword is hanging on ad-hoc appointments at the University of Delhi. On August 28, a letter was issued and as per that letter they are being converted into a contractual appointment. Due to this, at least 5,000 teachers are going to be affected directly. It shall have an important bearing on promotion as well. If you are not counting the ad-hoc experience itself, then promotion in Delhi University and other Central Universities will become meaningless. There will be an attempt to eliminate representation through the roster system by contractual appointments. I would like to urge the Government to withdraw this letter dated August 28 and restore the old conditions.

(Shri Sushil Kumar Gupta, Shri Sanjay Singh and Shri Ahmad Ashfaque Karim Associated.)

9. Need for a Chair for the Study of patriotism and works of Subramania Bharathiar

SHRIMATI VIJILA SATHYANANTH: Mahakavi Subramania Bharathiyar was one of the greatest poets, a national poet. We remember this son of the soil on his 137th birth anniversary on 11th December. He was a proficient linguist. He knew Tamil, Sanskrit, Hindi, Telugu, English, French and Arabic. I want the Government to recognize all his patriotic songs and his wonderful literary works. His literature and poetry have to be digitized. His handwritten work should be digitized and a Chair has to be established in the Manonmaniam Sundaranar University. There should be diploma and certificate courses in Bharathiyar thoughts. It has to be UGC funded in Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli.

(Shri S. Muthukaruppan, Shri A. Mohammedjan, Shri R. Vaithilingam and Shri N. Chandrasegharan Associated.)

10. Need to Compensate the Families of Bengali Labourers Killed in Kulgam, Jammu and Kashmir

SHRI AHAMED HASSAN: Five Bengali labourers from our State were brutally killed in Kulgam, Kashmir, on 29th October 2019. They were all from the village of Bahal Nagar, Murshidabad and all the labourers belonged to economically weaker section of society. Hon. Home Minister is always assuring the nation that situation in Kashmir is totally normal. After listening to the assurances of Home Minister the families of the deceased labourers allowed them to go and work in Kashmir. But in spite of the additional tight security measures, this gruesome killing occurred unhindered. The Government is silent over this incident. The Central Government has not given any compensation so far to the families of the victims. The Mamata Banerjee Government has provided all necessary support to these families. I urge upon the Government to protect the lives of the citizens.

(Several hon'ble Members associated.)

11. Need for averting incidents like Bhopal Gas Tragedy in the Country

SHRI DIGVIJAYA SINGH: On December 3, 1984, terrible gas tragedy had happened in Bhopal. We pay our tribute to the people who have lost their lives in that tragedy. We should take a pledge that this type of chemical accident never happens in the world.

(Shri Ajay Pratap Singh associated.)

12. Need to Release Pending Compensation to People Affected by Construction of Road from Parwanoo to Solan by NHAI

SHRIMATI VIPLOVE THAKUR: Nine houses and a senior secondary school were destroyed due to the construction of a four-lane road by the National Highways Authority of India. These people have not yet been given the compensation. I request the government that these people should be given compensation at the earliest and some provision should be made for the fully damaged school also.

13. Need to Release 1st and 2nd Installment of Amounts as per the 14th Finance Commission for Panchayat Samiti in Rajasthan

SHRI RAMKUMAR VERMA: The Central Government provides financial assistance on quarterly basis for rural development as per the recommendations of 14th Finance Commission. Under this, Rs 1,850 crore has been provided to Rajasthan as the second instalment. The problem is that the amount is not being given to the Gram Panchayat, rather it is being transferred to the PD account of the Panchayat Samiti so that it can be used elsewhere. Financial assistance is provided through 15th Finance Commission on quarterly basis to the panchayats. Almost third quarter has passed, but still they have not received that amount. Therefore, I want to say to the Finance Ministry in particular that the amount of Rs 1,850 crore, which should be received directly through the Gram Panchayat for the development of the villages, is not being received in Rajasthan.

(Several hon'ble Members associated.)

14. Need to Set Up The International Disaster Resilience and Risk Management Institute in Odisha

SHRI PRASANNA ACHARYA: Every year in the world around 60,000 people die because of natural calamities. Many parts of India including Odisha, get severely affected by natural calamities every year. Particularly, States like Odisha are regular victim of such vagaries. Odisha was hit 78 times by different types of natural calamities. Odisha and other States of the country, are victims of natural calamities like cyclones, floods, avalanches, etc. We can reduce disaster deaths through earlier correct prediction, having resilient infrastructure and response system. Therefore, the Government should set up an International Disaster Resilience and Risk Management Institute in Odisha.

(Dr. Sasmit Patra and Shri Bhaskar Rao Nekkanti associated.)

15. Illegal Mining in Various Parts of the Country

KUMARI SELJA: I want to raise the issue of illegal mining. Illegal mining is rampant in the state of Haryana. There is no strict law for this. According to the CAG report, mining contractors have been found to exploit the mineral on double mining area. Even the river has been diverted for illegal mining. Mining contractors are looting revenue. I demand that the government pay attention to this problem.

(Shri Ahamed Hassan and K.K. Ragesh associated.)

SHRI RIPUN BORA: Illegal open-cast mining is violating the Order of Supreme Court and violating the Order of Green Tribunal in Patkai hills of Assam.

(Shri Ahamed Hassan associated.)

16. Need to Increase Efforts towards AIDS Control and Treatment

SHRI MANAS RANJAN BHUNIA: The day before yesterday was marked as the World AIDS Day. Central Government and the State Governments jointly are confronting this very serious

issue which has affected the entire generation and human beings. As per the records of NACO, India is doing a nice job on AIDS but the most important factor is transmission of the HIV virus from the mothers' blood to the babies. The Health Department of West Bengal has remarkably controlled this disease in the mothers infected with HIV. Lakhs of people in our country do not know that they are infected with HIV virus. The NACO should be more and more surveillant and the investigation procedure must be done in a proper way to identify the HIV infected persons. India should be made free from HIV infection and AIDS.

(Dr. Santanu Sen, Shrimati Shanta Chhetri, Shri Manish Gupta and Shri Ahamed Hassan associated.)

17. Non Registration of Large Number of Farmers in The P.M.- Kisan Scheme

SHRI SUKHENDU SEKHAR RAY: The Prime Minister Kisan Scheme was announced to pay Rs. 6,000 in three instalments to 12.5 crore small and marginal farmers. A budgetary provision of Rs.87,000 crore was made to cover all sections of farmers. But only 8.11 crore farmers have been included against the targeted inclusion of 14.5 crore farmers in the Scheme. According to experts about 5 crore farmers are yet to be registered for this Scheme. Therefore, I would urge upon the Government to expedite the registration work so that no farmer is left out of this Scheme.

(Shri Md. Nadimul Haque, Ms. Dola Sen, Shrimati Shanta Chhetri and Shri Manish Gupta associated.)

18. Concern over the Living Conditions of Slum Dwellers in the Country

SHRI BINOY VISWAM: I rise to draw the attention of the Government to the sorrowful plight of the slum dwellers. Around 26 per cent of the population still lives in slums after 72 years of Independence. Millions of slum households do not have basic facilities in India. They can be evicted any time. High crime rate is also a reality there. They are living but not leading a dignified life. It

is high time now that their lives are secured. The money meant for the slums should reach there and all their rights should be ensured. I request the Government to issue a White Paper to explain as to what has happened to the money meant for the slum dwellers.

(Shri K.K. Ragesh Shri B.K. Hariprasad associated.)

19. Fake Currency Notes in the Country

DR. SANTANU SEN: Demonetisation and removal of fake currency from the country was done by the government in 2016 but this fake currency is still prevalent in most of the States of India. A number of cases have been found in the country in which fake currency has been used. It shows that demonetisation could neither detect the actual black money nor it could remove fake currency from the country. I request the government to take strong steps to revive the economy of the country which is really in distress now.

(Shri Ahamed Hassan and Shrimati Shanta Chhetri associated.)

20. Rise in Prices of Essential Commodities, Especially Onion

SHRI K.K. RAGESH: The prices of onion are soaring and it has reached more than Rs. 120 per k.g. in various parts of the country. Onion is getting rotten in the godowns but it is not being provided to the people. The Government was aware of the rise in demand. But unfortunately nothing has been done in this regard. We are the largest exporter of onion in the world. This price rise is not for the first time. The Government could have intervened in the market but it is not doing that. Unfortunately hoarders and black-marketers are benefitting out of it. If the Government is serious, the Government must intervene. So, I am requesting the Government to intervene in the market and ensure that the price hike in onion can be curbed.

(Several hon'ble Members associated.)

21. Harassment of Political Leaders and Dalits in Andhra Pradesh

***SHRI KANAKAMEDALA RAVINDRA KUMAR:** Shri N. Chandrababu Naidu constructed many buildings in the Capital region of Andhra Pradesh when he was the Chief Minister of the State. There was allegations that the construction did not take place. In this regard Shri N. Chandrababu Naidu visited the Capital on 28th November, 2019 along with his party leaders. On his way to Capital, people belonging to opposition party threw stones and slippers on the bus he was travelling in and created law and order problem. The matter was reported to the police. Shri N. Chandrababu Naidu is in Z+ security category and there is a threat to his life. In the same manner some dalits of Atmakur village were ostracised. A complaint was lodged with the National Human Rights Commission. I request the government to maintain law and order in Andhra Pradesh and direct the State Government in this regard.

22. Punjab and Maharashtra Co-Operative (PMC) Bank Crisis

SHRI HUSAIN DALWAI: I want to raise the case of Punjab and Maharashtra Cooperative Bank here. RBI did not interfere properly in this matter. An amount of 2500 crores rupees was given to HDIL but that amount was not properly regulated. Rupees 2 lakh, 11 thousand crore were given under NABARD's "Rainbow Scheme" but no one knows what happened in this matter. The case of CKP Co-operative Bank is of the year 2014. Funds were given in this case too, but we do not know yet what happened to this case. For the insurance amount, I want to tell you that an amount of 12 lakhs rupees is earmarked for BRICS countries, whereas only 1 lakh is given here. It should be increased as early as possible. Where a loan of Rs 100 crore is given, it takes a lot of time to get information about it. It is necessary to make efforts so that they can get this amount at the earliest. I request that PMC account holders get their money back.

* Spoke in Telugu.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

1. The Special Protection Group (Amendment) Bill, 2019

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI G. KISHAN REDDY), moving the motion for consideration of the Bill, said: The Special Protection Group is an armed force of the Government of India. A high-powered committee had recommended to have this Special Protection Group to provide security cover to the Prime Minister of the country. This expert committee had recommended to raise this Group after conducting a survey of all the security forces across the world. There is a threat to the life of the Prime Minister of India by the internal and the external forces. The Group was formed in 1988, in view of the importance of special protection of the Prime Minister. I have moved this Bill to amend the Act related to it. In 1991, it was proposed to provide SPG cover to the former Prime Ministers and their immediate family members for 5 years after demitting office. In 1999, the former Prime Minister and members of his immediate family were given SPG cover even after 10 years of demitting office. In 2003, under this Act another amendment was brought in to protect the former Prime Minister and his immediate family members after a period of one year of demitting the Prime Minister's office. It was proposed in the Bill that the SPG protection given to the members of the Prime Minister's immediate family should be reviewed after 12 months. There was no sunset clause in this act to withdraw the SPG cover from the protectees. As a result, there is a severe constraint on the SPG's basic duties in terms of the Prime Minister's security. The SPG will find it difficult to perform its basic duties if they provide security cover to the immediate family members of the Prime Minister. This will also put pressure on proper training and other activities of the SPG. The Bill only includes members of the immediate family of the Prime Minister, who have been residing with him in his official residence for more than five years. Although there has been some propaganda about withdrawal of the SPG cover from some families. The provision of the SPG cover should be made only for the

Prime Minister. For this reason, this Bill has been brought in today by amending the original Bill. There is no politics in it. I request that it be passed unanimously.

SHRI VIVEK K. TANKHA: We could never imagine that the party politics of our country would reach such a level that we would forget about the safety of our leaders. When I was 18, my father gifted me a book - 'Discovery of India'. When I read that book, I understood about Nehru's personality. Nehruji participated in the freedom struggle with his father. During the freedom struggle, Nehruji went to jail nine times. When he first went to jail, he did not know that one day he would become the Prime Minister. I am talking about such a family. There have been three such incidents in this country that have shocked the conscience of this country. Mahatma Gandhi was assassinated in 1948, then Indira ji was assassinated on 31st October 1984 and after that Rajiv ji was assassinated on 21st May 1991. We proudly say that we are members of the party whose leaders sacrificed so much for this country. The SPG Act was enacted after the sacrifice of Indira ji. In 1984, a new form of violence ie terrorism emerged in this country. Then after the formation of the SPG by an executive order, Rajivji and his family were given SPG cover. The SPG Act was then passed for the first time in 1988 and was formalized to protect the Prime Minister and his family. The government changed in 1989. The whole country knew that Rajivji's life was in danger. At that time, Rajivji was not given SPG cover despite a request from the then Prime Minister and thus a youth leadership was taken away from us due to neglect. After 21st May 1991, an amendment to the Act provided the SPG protection to the former Prime Minister and his family. The NSG cover that was given to the Prime Minister and his family for ten years, was reduced to one year in 1999. Now you have made a provision to provide SPG protection to the family of the former Prime Minister for five years provided that they reside with him in his official residence. Therefore, this bill has been brought to exclude Rajivji's family from the purview of this Act. According to you, there is no threat to his family. It is not in the national interest. Its purpose is not to provide security to the opposition. If this thing will be presented

in this way in any country across the world, no one will consider it a good Act. God forbid if another incident happens with this family, then you will have to take the blame for it. You are reducing the security of this family at a time when violence is spreading all over the world. Two-three days ago, an incident happened at Priyankaji's place. This security lapse has taken place because you have reduced security. This security is not a part of party politics. During the tenure of the Congress, Vajpayeeji and his family were given security cover with full respect. If you will give the SPG cover to this family, then we will be highly obliged.

SHRI NEERAJ SHEKHAR, making his maiden speech, said: I have been benefitted of the SPG cover, so I can say something about it. Everyone knows that after the assassination of Indiraji, it was felt that there should be a special protection group to protect the Prime Minister and it was formed in 1985. You are repeatedly saying that when the Congress Party was not in power and Rajiv Gandhiji was not the Prime Minister of this country, why was he not given the SPG cover? I want to know that when this Act was enacted in 1988, then why did you not put a provision in it that this protection should also be given to the former Prime Minister. At that time there were also two former Prime Ministers and this protection was not provided to them. Then, you did not think of giving SPG protection to the former Prime Minister. After the tragic incident with Rajiv Gandhiji in 1991, several amendments were brought in. After that, amendments were brought in 1991, 1994, 1999 and 2003 and now this government has brought amendments. I think the four amendments that were brought were wrong. The first Bill was appropriate in which provision was made to provide the SPG cover only to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister should get the SPG cover and a separate security force should be raised for the former Prime Ministers. I was also given the SPG protection after the amendment in 1991, however I did not need protection. Nobody even recognized me at that time, but because of the SPG security, I felt like I was a very important person. Once in Chennai I was given so much security that I felt that I was the Prime Minister of this country. Since the year 2001, ever since I became an

MP, I do not keep a security personnel. I agree that if I have got SPG protection then I should also undergo security check. Also today's youngsters do not like VIP culture. Therefore, our government wants to end VIP culture. The SPG cover was not needed for a person like me. Tankhaji told that an incident has just happened. I would like that incident to be investigated and those who are guilty for it, should be punished. But I have not yet understood why only the SPG cover is demanded. When the security cover provided to V.P. Singhji, I.K. Gujralji, Deve Gowdaji and Manmohan Singhji was removed, then no one spoke about this. The Home Minister has repeatedly said that complete security cover will be provided. I want to say that in these 11 years I have seen how much the standard of SPG security personnel have fallen. They could not be given the training that the SPG should get. Hon'ble Prime Minister took such steps that not only some people in the country are upset, but some people in our neighboring countries are also disturbed by these things. If SPG will not get a good training, they will not get all the systems, then there will be a lack of security. I have also said earlier that the Act of 1988 should be the same. I support it and I would urge all members to pass it unanimously.

SHRI MANAS RANJAN BHUNIA: Today we are discussing the Special Protection Group (Amendment) Bill, 2019. I will talk on a centric point, not on the political issues or the issues of vendetta in politics. In 1985, the Birbal Nath Committee gave certain recommendations. On the recommendations of this Committee, an executive order was passed, which continued from 1985 to 1988. On 7th June, 1988 this Act came into effect and gave all security by the name of SPG protection to hon. Prime Minister elected, and his family members living within the residence of the Prime Minister. In 1989, Hon'ble V.P. Singh's Government relaxed it and withdrew the SPG protection to the Prime Minister. Later, Mr. Narasimha Rao's Government amended this Act and extended it for ten years. But the present amendment has become so much critical for this Government. My basic question is, it is not a question of a family. Don't take and don't mention the name of a 'family'. It hurts the basic sentiments of the Indian polity. It is against the essence of parliamentary democracy.

We should be very free to accept what is the reality, what is the past, present and where we are going in the future.

SHRI A. NAVANEETHAKRISHNAN: I have read the reply given by hon. Home Minister in the Lok Sabha on 27.11.2019. I think a reasonable decision has been taken by the Central Government. The security cover is being provided depending upon the threat perception. It is a settled position. I welcome this Bill.

PROF. RAM GOPAL YADAV: Security is provided to important persons or anybody who is under threat, depending on the threat perception. The present case of the SPG, is only about the Prime Minister. But I tell from my experience that the definition of security threat varies as the Government changes, while the truth is that the threat perception for those who hold important positions is higher when they are not in the Government. The incumbent Government should always keep this in mind. It has been said in our scriptures that whoever is the king is the representative of God and the public is like sons to him. Therefore, there should be no discrimination. There should be no discrimination of any kind, no matter whoever faces the threat. The security system should be such that their lives are protected, the people around them should be safe. Security should not be associated with status. I am of the opinion that the message should not go to the people that any of action is being taken in any form of resentment or in vendetta.

SHRI PRASANNA ACHARYA: I support this Bill. The Government is the competent authority to assess the threat perception of an individual or a leader. If the Government thinks that the danger that was there on the Gandhi family has reduced, I think it is very much competent to decide how much security should be provided to which individual or which leader. I don't deny the contribution that Gandhi family has made to this country. But, that doesn't mean that this will continue. There are so many families in the country which have no comparison of their sacrifice in history. We don't provide security to their descendants. I think, there is nothing wrong in this

Bill. But, the Government should examine the threat perception to all such leaders time to time and take appropriate decision. I think, this is an appropriate Bill and I support this Bill.

SHRI RAM CHANDRA PRASAD SINGH: I fully support this Bill. Regarding the matter of security of VIPs, I would like to tell that when you are in a position, it is the responsibility of the security agencies to see how the security is given to you in view of the security threat you are facing. Our Prime Minister cannot be compared to anyone in the democracy of India. The Prime Minister has a status and a place of his own. It should always be kept in mind. In this whole matter of security, it should be understood that security has not been removed, rather it has been changed. Our responsibility is that all the 130 crore people of the country should be protected. We people should try for this. We do not have as much police as there should be on per lakh people. We should make efforts to ensure that the security of the general public is also provided and at the same time, those who have security threats, should get adequate protection. I support this Bill.

SHRI K.K. RAGESH: I oppose this Bill. The Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Bill states that number of individuals provided SPG cover has become quite large. In such a scenario, there can be severe constraint on the resources, training and related infrastructure of SPG. It is ridiculous. This Bill is politically motivated. The hon'ble Minister has repeatedly said that SPG cover must not be used as a status symbol. Hon'ble Minister also spoke on the violation of the SPG protocol. When our Prime Minister violates the SPG protocol, it is heroism but when others violate it, it is disregard. I am requesting the Government to withdraw this Bill.

SHRI P. WILSON: DMK opposes this Bill, as it is targeted against one family. The legislation is brought to make them vulnerable to security threats and curb their movements. Birbal Nath Committee had recommended for formation of SPG which is a qualitative security protection, especially formed for the Prime Minister, the former Prime

Ministers and their families. The Special Protection Group Act was amended to provide for ten years in the year 1999. In the year 2003, it was scaled down to one year, but renewable every year if intelligence agencies perceive a threat. The Statement of Objects and Reasons says that because of expenditure, the SPG cover to the former Prime Minister and their families are restricted to legislative amendment. The threat perception cannot be statutorily reduced or confined to one place. The amendment not just goes against the very object of the Act to provide security, but it is unreasonable, arbitrary and brings disrespect to the outgoing Prime Minister and his family. The legislation classifies five years for threat perception which is highly unreasonable. Therefore, we request the Government to kindly consider that it is going to affect not only the Gandhi family but it will also affect you after you demit the office after five years.

SHRI K.T.S. TULSI: The hon'ble Home Minister will agree with me that there can be no politics in matters of security. It is the Government's obligation to protect everyone according to the level of threat. In fact, Justice J.S. Verma's report on the assassination of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi says that the prime cause was the withdrawal of the SPG. I submit that the Government must discharge its obligation. It is no favour to anyone. The level of protection will depend on the level of threat.

SHRI V. VIJAYASAI REDDY: I thank the hon'ble Home Minister for bringing forward this very important Bill for two reasons. It is a step in the right direction towards bringing reforms in the SPG Act. Secondly, the two amendments may be very small amendments but they will bring reforms in a big way. I believe that any protection should be given only on the basis of threat perception, and not just because a particular person is born in a particular family. The only criterion should be the real threat perception. I believe that Z+ security is sufficient. This amendment to the SPG Act very effectively counters that. Government has proven to address two diseases which plagued our country. One is our colonial hangover and the other is entitlement. I support this Bill.

PROF. MANOJ KUMAR JHA: SPG was formed in 1985. In 1988, the Act came. Mrs. Indira Gandhi was assassinated by her own security personnel. That is something we all should keep in mind. The second point is about security threat and threat perception. I think that does not serve the purpose. I would not like the security ring of today's Prime Minister or Home Minister to be withdrawn.

SHRI BINOY VISWAM: In this Bill if there is something, it is only a political vendetta. Your words are something and deeds are something else. Government talks about the cost factor of this. To the tune of lakhs of crores, money is spent for writing off bad loans. They want to withdraw the SPG because of the cost effectiveness. The truth is that the Government has a vendetta against Nehru. They are the leaders of a family which has given blood and life for the country's cause. Please try to understand the reality of the country and try to behave as Government of a big country. Narrow politics is not good for a country. This country demands a secure atmosphere where the people feel that they are secure. Priyanka Gandhi is the General Secretary of the Congress Party. She is the daughter of the Congress Party's President. That family's political and economic policies may be wrong but they have a reason to live in this country. So, their SPG security is very important for the country. I request the Government to rethink about this Bill.

DR. SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I welcome this amendment Bill. Under the Constitution, we all are equal before the law. Now, the argument being given is that two members of the family were assassinated. In the case of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, IB had presented a Report saying that two of your security guards are infected and they should be transferred out. In the case of Shri Rajiv Gandhi, Shri Tulsi quoted Justice Verma's Report. I challenge Mr. Tulsi where it says in that report of Justice Verma that because SPG was withdrawn and, therefore, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi was assassinated. It must be very serious; otherwise, Z+ security would not have been given. The Supreme Court said that this crime was so gruesome that they should be given capital punishment. Mrs. Sonia Gandhi wrote a letter

to the President where she advocated that their punishment should be reduced to life imprisonment. Later on, the daughter of Mrs. Sonia Gandhi went to jail to meet Nalini. The jail manual says that only relatives can meet the convicted prisoners. She broke the prison rule. So there is no threat from LTTE. Islamic forces cannot be a threat because they are very secular. There cannot be a separate Constitution for them. The Constitution applies to all of us.

SHRI B.K. HARIPRASAD: This Bill amends the Special Protection Group Act, 1988. This Act provides for the constitution and regulation of the Special Protection Group to provide security to the Prime Minister, former Prime Ministers and their family members. Honorable Home Minister has given a speech which I have read in newspapers. He says that the SPG is being removed because those receiving this protection have violated the guidelines given in the SPG's Blue Book 600 times. I accompanied Congress President Sonia Gandhi and Rahul Gandhi while visiting various states including Gujarat. The Bharatiya Janata Party government was there and which car did we get? They used to give us such a bulletproof vehicle that a bullock cart would have been better. So we had to change those vehicle. Whatever kind of CRPF might be there, Congress Party also has a CRPF - Congress Reserve Protection Force. Those people provide us security, your security is not necessary. People sitting in government should exercise some restraint. In every third speech, the Home Minister and Shri Narendra Modi attack Sonia Gandhi and Rahul Gandhi. Don't you think they are in danger? Incidents of mob lynching are taking place in the country. People are not safe. Leaders of political parties are not being protected. Probably you will not understand this. You do not know that pain. Had there been such a murder in your house, then you would have known what that pain is. Sonia Gandhi ji saw the murder of Indira Gandhi before her eyes, she also saw what happened to her own husband in Chennai. Yet she did not run, but to save this party, she stood for the unity of this country. Even if she is not the Prime Minister, she has been the President of this party. This party has a history. If she does not get into politics, no problem, you do not give SPG protection. But when she enters

politics, she is the president of Congress. there are many people against its principle. They are also sitting here. they are also sitting outside. You do not know that danger but we know. In fact, when people hold the post of the Prime Minister, the Home Minister, they make some decisions. Whether those decisions are against terrorists, against Naxalites, against extremists or against communal forces, due to which they face a threat. This does not mean that when they step down from that position, they are in no danger. We can take an example of Gujarat where no one has been able to trace the killers of Home Minister Haren Pandya. The difference between the CRPF and the SPG was clearly visible yesterday when some people entered the house of our General Secretary, Priyanka Gandhiji. Had there been SPG, it would not have happened. Being the Home Minister, if you remove the security and get out, then you will realize its seriousness. Its financial implications have their own merit. However, the assessment on threat perception must be carried out by Home Ministry. This process must not be politically motivated. There was immense threat to Smt. Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi as they took major decisions on unity and integrity of the country. Threats are not caused only by making big speeches. If the family members of former prime ministers are still there in politics, they must get SPG protection. Given the national interests and sensitivity of the issue, the bill must be withdrawn.

SHRI G.V.L. NARSIMHA RAO: I congratulate Hon Home Minister that focus is back on Special Protection Group and security concerns on nation's Prime Minister are not diluted. Here, the decision must be driven by logic instead of some kind of loyalty. The opposition bench failed to appreciate that a Prime Minister leading the war against global Jihadi terror needs security. He is the leader raising the issue of terrorism at international forums. He is one leader who has brought even corruption, money laundering into the discourse at the global level. All those who are enemies of India, be it the Maoists, the terrorists, the militants and the anti-India propagandists see no future for themselves. You have seen several incidents of terrorism happening in this country every now and then. No major city in this

country was left free from any attacks of terror. You had several attacks in every city of the country, Mumbai, Jaipur, Bengaluru, Guwahati, Delhi. But in the last five years we have ensured a terror-free secure India. Therefore, if there is one leader in the world today, who is the most targeted in the world, it is certainly India's Prime Minister because no other Indian Prime Minister faced such a threat. Therefore, this is the time to ensure that the focus is on the protection of our national leader. In 2018, we have seen that Pune Police filed a charge sheet and the raids in the premises of the so-called urban Naxals revealed a sinister plot to assassinate the Prime Minister of this country. Today you have some political parties which are actually calling for exoneration of such people, political parties wanting a fresh investigation to bail the urban Naxals. So, there is a threat coming from within the country as well. Therefore, I think, this is the time for the country to be entirely focused on ensuring the security of the Prime Minister and you are concerned about the security of the former SPG protectees. I was expecting that you will explain it by logic. But where is the logic? I will name the Indian's national security threat today. Islamic terrorism, Jihadi terrorism is the first threat that this country faces. Maoists, Naxalism, these are the threats that India faces and I don't see you facing any threat from them. I think you will have a difficulty, but you will have to explain to the people of this country. The Prime Minister of Pakistan goes to United Nations General Assembly and takes the name of Congress Party and say, 'we are on the same page as the Congress Party in India.' A global terrorist, Hafiz Saeed says that the Congress Party is on the same page about Kashmir. So, the logic about threat must prevail over *parivaar bhakti*. Please tell us the kind of threat and the name of terrorist group or militant group posing a threat to them? Z plus security is the highest security given in this country to anyone other than the Prime Ministers. If you say that Z plus security is not enough to protect you from your Congress supporters who are visiting the houses of Congress leaders, I think, people will really have a great laugh. You want protection from your own cadre. In fact, this is the time not to be playful about the security of the nation's leaders. Smt. Indira Gandhi died in very, very shocking circumstances. All of us, across party

lines, expressed our grief. But, no member of the family ever faced any threat from any Jihadi organization which poses a threat to this country. I strongly condemn it. In fact, I would be the last person to comment against anyone. I never really intended that. In sum, the security review must be based on professional assessment and this is not a personal decision made by anyone.

SHRI NARESH GUJRAL: I was fortunate enough to grow in a very peaceful environment of Delhi. I remember that Pandit Jawharlal Nehru and Shastri Ji had minimum security cover in those days. Because, there was no need for security and nobody asked for it. But, after the unfortunate assassination of Mrs. Gandhi, the country had to relook at the security requirements.

SHRI SATISH CHANDRA MISRA: As per the level of threat security cover must be provided. Since you have kept only the Prime Minister under the SPG cover for a period of five years. However, there is a need to keep in the mind how those who have been affected or likely to be affected should be protected. We have been the victims of this. Therefore, our party believes that according to the security threat, the adequate security must be provided.

SHRI SANJAY SINGH: If the government wants to scale down security or make a plan, then it must be carried out. We are not at all advocates of superfluous VIP security. But here the people of the ruling party themselves have expressed concern about the safety of the Prime Minister. I request that the Prime Minister's security be strengthened as required. Also, the leaders of other political parties should get proper security and any kind of double standards should be discontinued.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SOCIAL JUSTICE AND EMPOWERMENT (SHRI RAMDAS ATHAWALE): I support this Bill. The Government is committed for safety of Shrimati Sonia Gandhi and Shri Rahul Gandhi. Their SPG cover has been withdrawn because they no longer need that much

protection. Members of the family of the former Prime Minister have been given Z Plus security. SPG has been removed after review. So there is no question of injustice. I support this Bill and it is very important.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI AMIT SHAH), replying to the debate, said: First of all I want to clarify a few things. I think that even after reading the Bill, there are some misconceptions among many members, public and media. One or two members said that this Bill has been brought keeping in mind one family, it is not a reality. Prior to the introduction of this Bill, according to the old law, Gandhi family's SPG protection was lifted after reviewing the threat assessment to them. Therefore, there is no connection between this Bill and the SPG security cover of the Gandhi family. There was no need to bring a Bill for this. This is the fifth change under the SPG Act. The fifth change is not due to any family. After a review, they have been given the highest security in the country. They are provided with Z Plus security with ASL and ambulance. Security can never be a symbol of status. It may be that any common citizen of this country is more threatened than the Prime Minister. In addition to the security of the Prime Minister, the SPG oversees his communications, correspondence and health. It also takes care that there is no bugging in his office. They do all these duties because Prime Minister is Head of State here. Government takes care of the security of not only the Gandhi family but of all the 130 crore citizens of the country. But the insistence on having an SPG for security is not appropriate. The SPG consists of CRPF, BSF, CISF, ITBP, SSB and Police. There are many forces in which many personnel are trained as SPG. They are also agile and fit like SPG. These three persons have been given the same personnel, who have trained at SPG at some point or the other. It was alleged that the Bill was brought with a vindictive approach with a family. They said that it is messing up with security. The issue of security should not be taken lightly. We request you to reconsider it. Only the security of

Gandhi family has not been removed in this country. On the basis of review, the security of Shri Chandrashekhar, Shri V.P. Singh, Shri Narasimha Rao and Shri I.K. Gujral was also lifted. Recently, the security of Shri Manmohan Singh has also been removed and he has been made a Z Plus protectee. But there is no discussion in this regard in the country. Whether we are living in democracy or living in medieval India, we have to decide this. Law is equal for all and is not exclusive to a family. I want to clarify again that security has not been withdrawn, security has been changed. The number of jawans who were posted there earlier, the same number of jawans are still deployed. The security given to them is the same that the Defense Minister, Home Minister, Vice President and President of the country have. The government has not taken any casual approach in the matter of security. This government is not running with political vendetta. Shri B.K. Hariprasad ji just mentioned the incident at Shrimati Priyanka Vadra's house. Therefore, I want to clarify the situation in this regard. A high-level inquiry has been ordered and the three persons responsible for it have been suspended and an investigation is being conducted by the senior most Inspector General. This change in the law has been done with the objective of not allowing the security of the Prime Minister's office, his place of residence, his personal security, his communication and his correspondence becoming dilute. The responsibility of protecting 130 crore people, including the three protectees of Gandhi family, is with the Central Government and the State Governments and we will discharge it seriously.

The motion for consideration of the Bill was adopted.

Clauses etc., were adopted.

The Bill, was passed.

2. The Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu (Merger of Union Territories) Bill, 2019

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI G. KISHAN REDDY), moving the motion for consideration of the Bill, said: The government has decided to merge the Union Territories of Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu as both have very small population. Even if we look at history, the language of these two union territories is the same. Both of these were under Portuguese rule. Both Daman and Diu and Dadra and Nagar Haveli were under the same administration. From 1962 to 1987, the Lieutenant Governor was the ex-officio Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu and Dadra and Nagar Haveli. By the early 1970s, there were two union territories and two secretariats for a population of 5 lakh, 86 thousand. Officers has to visit a particular place three days a week and another place two days a week. Due to this, the efficiency of administration is not increasing. They have to travel 600 kilometres every day. Our government was being requested for a long to unite these two Union Territories for administrative convenience and rapid development and also for efficient administration. We have brought this Bill for administrative efficiency, it will reduce extravagance and expenditure also. Therefore, it is the government's effort to merge Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu and the Bill has been brought for it.

SHRI MADHUSUDAN MISTRY: I feel a little strange because a strategy is such that the smaller units are more administratively effective. One reason was that Gujarat was not able to grow as it is a large state. We believe that small units can be better managed administratively. I have my doubts. Whatever the structure of the tax exists in Silvassa and Nagar Haveli, we have got less share in it. Because it is a union territory, it is run by the central government. The biggest attraction for Daman and Diu is because we have open liquor sales there. But one of these stated objectives is that in which it is said that this will save the government money. How the government will be able to administer it effectively. No mention is

given about it. I do not even understand a reason why the jurisdiction of the cases that are in it has gone to the Bombay High Court. But Daman also has a different identity, as the most prominent smugglers were inside Daman and smuggling activities were vigorously carried out in the area. Because of this, I believe that making it a unit will not have much effect in it. The paradox is also that on the one hand, a state has been given within three union territories and on the other hand, two union territories are being united here. I have my doubts that it will make much difference.

DR. VINAY P. SAHASRABUDDHE: Due to historical reasons, various states were declared as Union Territories in our country. I believe that what was a historical backlog is being cleared through this Bill today. We always talk of minimum government and maximum governance by the Honorable Prime Minister and through this government. The two new Union Territories, Jammu and Kashmir and Ladakh, should be kept a little different, because they are newly formed. Chandigarh is an urban state in a sense, but Lakshadweep, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu, which is a union territory formed together, have different problems. The problems of these two states are of a slightly different pattern as far as the subject of Dadra and Nagar Haveli is concerned. There is a lot of water problem. The second thing is that these two regions are seen from the point of view of tourism. There is a need to think about it in particular. In some times the Union Territories also got an identity as a corruption zone. There seems to be a possibility of corruption here, so I believe that that possibility must also be definitely explored. Despite being small states, they are multilingual regions. From administrative point of view, an Agramut cadre exists in all these union territories. That cadre also needs to be taken care of. However, for the struggle of Dadra and Nagar Haveli, a group of patriotic and dedicated activists of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh and some other organizations formed a group of such freedom fighters who played a very important role in the freedom struggle of Dadra and Nagar Haveli. But an important point in this is that there should be no difference in the sacrifice and dedication of all these freedom fighters. Their ideology differs only because of ideological diversity. This was a recognized

thinking in this country. The point is that the neglect of all these freedom fighters ended in 1985. In 2000, the Centre recognized them as freedom fighters. Even when the government does not recognize sacrifice, and surrender then they have no value. When a newly merged Union Territory will be formed then consideration should be made for Silvassa for the demand to construct a Jaistambha in the memory of the fighters who participated in this freedom struggle. Parliamentary committees must also visit the Union Territories several times. Their concern is ultimately the work of this House itself and the members of the House. I support this Bill.

SHRI MANISH GUPTA: I rise to support this Bill. We have to give a thought to the people of these territories. There is a case for having proper representation. There is a need for mini assembly in a suitable place so that the people can decide what they want to do. The Statement of Objects and Reasons have made pious statements on development and reducing costs and delivery of services. The Standing Committee of Parliament has opined that over the years, there has been a reduction in costs in the Budget. More money should be made available to these territories. There are some fearful words used in the initial document. The employees should not be removed on account of this development. An aura of uncertainty has been introduced with this Bill. Basically, mini assembly is the main issue here. So reforms are required, The officers have to move on alternate days from one territory to the other Why not post the officers there? If you are serious about developing these territories, a more permanent administrative set up is required and it should be decentralized. We have to empower the people. There is a need to see what they have to say. No political parties, no political leaders were consulted when this Bill was drawn up. We must involve the people more readily and more objectively in the future of the nation.

SHRI A. NAVANEETHAKRISHNAN: I welcome and support this Bill For administrative convenience and for the benefit of the people. They have done good things. As per the Act, the Bombay High Court has been given the jurisdiction to these newly formed

Union Territories. Our judiciary is known for arrears and delay. The Objects and Reasons should be very carefully worded.

DR. SASMIT PATRA: It is a very historic Bill, I would like to talk a little bit about history very quickly. There was a possibility that they might have merged with Maharashtra and the whole thing could have been closed. I want to share just a small demographic detail. I think it is in rightful spirit. If you look at it administratively, there are not a lot of changes that have happened. In terms of services in UT, it is being merged. Primarily, the duplication of work will reduce and at the end of the day, people will be able to execute better. If we are coming into a merger what we will achieve out of it. The first thing that we seek to achieve out of it is the tourism sector in terms of infrastructure, that could be looked into. Finally, because of this merger, the financial autonomy and the financial discipline that will come in, will really help both the UTs to come together and function better. On behalf of BJD, we support the Bill.

* * * * *
* * * * *

Desh Deepak Verma,
Secretary-General.

rssynop@sansad.nic.in

***Supplement covering rest of the proceedings is being issued separately.