

## STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER

### CONSTITUTION OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH): Madam,

The Government have decided to set up a National Security Council to take a comprehensive and coordinated view of all matters relating to the country's security. The Council will be headed by the Prime Minister and will include the Ministers of Defence, Finance, Home Affairs and External Affairs. Other Union Minister and Chief Minister(s) of States will also be associated as and when necessary. The Council will also invite experts and specialists to attend its meetings.

The need for such a structure has been felt necessary in the context of the rapidly changing external environment and the internal situation in the country. The Council will endeavour to evolve an integrated approach to policy making as it affects national security, taking into account both military and non-military threats. They will help in identification of strategies to optimise our efforts in defence, internal security and foreign affairs and develop medium-term and long-term assessments to serve as a perspective for shaping government policy.

One of the objectives of the National Security Council is also to evolve a national consensus and public awareness on strategic and security issues. To achieve this it is proposed to constitute a National Security Advisory Board comprising members drawn from among the Chief Minister, Members of Parliament, academics, scientists and persons having rich experience of service in the administration, armed forces, press and the media. The Board will meet at least twice a year and serve as a mechanism for obtaining a broad range of informed views and options on national security issues.

The National Security Council will have a separate Secretariat. It will be assisted by a Strategic Core Group comprising of the representatives of the three Services and the Ministries concerned.

A Resolution setting up the National Security Council along with its functions and scope is placed on the Table of the House for the information of Hon'ble Members.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, this new decision announced by the Government is net good. It is true that the external environment and the internal situation in the country has been changing. We are facing problems from both external forces as well as internal forces. It is true that the Government should take cognizance of this—how to face the situation, how to combat the situation.

As regards the situation which has developed in Kashmir...

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated): Madam, I am on a point of order. I am respectfully submitting that this body which is sought to be constituted is of such far-reaching importance having Constitutional implications that I demand from the hon. Prime Minister that there should be a full-fledged debate on this issue because this is a matter which I respectfully submit is an outrageous assault on the Cabinet system of Government, collective responsibility of the Council of Ministers and parliamentary democracy. It is an attempt... (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him say. Let him make his point. It is not for you to decide. It is for me to say whether it is a point of order or not.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: It is an attempt to run the Government with the support of favourite Ministers on the pattern of oligarchy. I respectfully submit that constitution of this National Security Council or the so-called Council is such a matter that it amounts to playing around with the Constitution and that is a matter which cannot be dealt with just by way of clarifications and I demand that there should be a full-fledged debate on this particular issue and there should be an immediate debate. There was no urgency whatsoever for making this announcement on Friday particularly when this House observes it as Private Mem-

[Shri Madan Bhatia]

bers' day. There is absolutely no element of urgency on this particular statement. This statement I believe has been made with a calculated attempt to divert the attention of the people from accumulating failures of this Government on the various issues and particularly the stir....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You want that there should be a full-fledged discussion.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: I want that there should be a full-fledged debate.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: There was absolutely no element of urgency. This day has been particularly chosen to divert the attention of the people. If this statement was to be made, this should have been made on another week day. Since this has been made today, I cannot help it because this has already been made in the Lok Sabha. But I respectfully submit that this is not a matter which can be disposed of by means of clarifications from this hon. House. This is a matter which is going to be destructive on the Constitutional system of this country.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I heard and I would like the Leader of the House to react... (Interruptions)...

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: It is destroying the whole Cabinet system of Government. The Prime Minister wants to run the Government with a handful of his Cabinet Ministers, with the help of the officials and bureaucracy on the pattern of oligarchy. This country will not allow it and I demand a full-fledged debate on this.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me deal with him. His contention is... (Interruptions)

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA (Bihar): That was not the point of order. (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He wants that there should be a full-fledged debate and if the Leader of the House wants to react, he can. (Interruptions). Let the Leader of the House say because he is the Leader of the House from the Government. He will speak. (Interruptions). I will ask him. (Interruptions).

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): That is not the only point he raised. (Interruption). He said, it is unconstitutional.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let the Leader of the House reply to it. I don't reply. It is for the Government to answer. The Leader of the House is on his legs and let him reply. (Interruptions).

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: He is raising a constitutional point which destroys the Cabinet form of Government and let him answer that point also. (Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the House is on his legs.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER): He could reply last of all. (Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him answer and then he can again react.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: May I request that he could hear me and react?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You see, yesterday an allegation was made that I don't recognise him. Today, I have identified him. (Interruptions).

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: No, madam. He never makes such allegations. (Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I have identified the Leader.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY): Madam, with great respect to the hon. Member, may I submit that every day

in Parliament is important whether it is Friday or Sunday or Monday, any day whenever we meet, it is important. So let us not draw a distinction between Friday and other days. Any time is important for Parliament. Secondly, he has said that there is a constitutional violation. He has not mentioned any specific point. He has not raised any specific issue except making a general remark that it violates the Constitution. So in my view, Madam, it does not violate the Constitution. We have taken into consideration all aspects.

Thirdly, he has said, there has got to be a debate. We never shirk a debate in this House at all. I have been maintaining this position all along. But we can have discussion later on and now the Prime Minister has made a statement and let us concentrate on a few clarifications that are important and approve of this statement. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to refer to the four aspects that the hon. Prime Minister has been pleased to bring in the statement that he has just made in the House. One is, the National Security Council is to take a comprehensive and coordinated view of all matters relating to the...

SHRI M. A. BABY (Kerala): Madam, I am on a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

SHRI M. A. BABY: My point of order is that once a statement is being made here, there is a convention that the Members seek clarifications and there has been a list and you have already asked Mr. Sukomal Sen to seek clarification. Now I am against some other Member... *(Interruptions)*.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish. I will allow you to make your clarification. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): Mr. Madan Bhatia raised a point of order and that is why, he made Mr. Sukomal Sen sit. *(Interruption)*. But now this Member's right is being usurped. *(Interruptions)*. Mr. Shiv Shanker, you can seek clarification later on.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I won't take more than half a minute. *(Interruption)*.

SHRI M. A. BABY: Madam, I respect the role of the Opposition Leader. *(Interruption)*.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I convert my expression into the expression of seeking clarification. Are you satisfied?

SHRI M. A. BABY: Then the order should be taken. *(Interruption)*.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Mr. Sukomal Sen should be allowed to complete first. *(Interruptions)*.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sukomal Sen was half-way through his clarification when Mr. Madan Bhatia raised a point of order to which the Leader of the House reacted. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: No, my submission is this. I could have completed by now. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He can seek clarification after Mr. Sukomal Sen has finished his speech. *(Interruptions)*.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No point of order. It is not a question of the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition. There was a question raised by the hon. Member Shri Madan Bhatiaji that this matter is of great importance and there should have been a full-fledged discussion. I cannot decide that there should be a full-fledged discussion. That is why I asked the Leader of the House to mention it. That matter is over. He is not shying away from a discussion. Now, he was on his legs... *(Interruptions)*.

डॉ० अबरार अहमद खान : (राजस्थान) :  
लीडर आफ़ दी हाउस यहां हैं....  
(व्यवधान) उनका रीएक्शन .. (व्यवधान)

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR  
(Uttar Pradesh): Madam, I will assist  
you. (Interruptions).

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I sought  
your permission. (Interruptions). I sug-  
gested that the Leader of the House could  
react after I made my submissions. That  
was what I was submitting. (Interrup-  
tions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shiv  
Shankerji, I will permit your clarifications  
over and above the names. I assure you  
that I will permit your clarifications. (In-  
terruptions). Let the Member who is  
half-way through finish. (Interruptions).

SHRI P. SHIV SHAKER: Then, my  
submission is, I may be heard at this  
stage because I am going to plead. (In-  
terruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is for  
the Member, for Mr. Sukomal Sen, to  
oblige. If Mr. Sukomal Sen yields....  
(Interruptions).

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH (Maha-  
rashtra): Are we supposed to keep quiet?  
Are we supposed to watch it? (Inter-  
ruptions).

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: By shouting,  
our Member cannot be made to stop.  
(Interruptions).

डॉ० अबरार अहमद खान : रीएक्शन  
लेना चाहते हैं ।.... (व्यवधान) कुछ  
कहना चाहते हैं ।.... (व्यवधान)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If Mr.  
Sukomal Sen yields to Mr. Shiv Shanker,  
I have no objection at all.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I would  
complete in one sentence. (Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHIRMAN: Mr. Suko-  
mal Sen, are you yielding? (Interrup-  
tions).

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: What is  
this? (Interruptions). I am submitting  
that this has far-reaching consequences.  
Instead of seeking clarifications from the  
hon. Prime Minister, better we have a  
debate on Monday itself. (Interruptions)  
It has far-reaching consequences because  
I am also finding... (Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have  
left it to the CPI-M Member Mr. Suko-  
mal Sen. I called him. If he yields to  
Mr. Shiv Shanker, I have no objection.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR:  
Madam, I am on a point of order.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I am  
sorry that the hon. Members sitting there  
are standing on a technicality of con-  
ventions which day in and day out are  
broken in this House. (Interruptions).  
What are they taking about? If they  
would like to shut me out, I will sit  
down.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr.  
Sukomal Sen, can you yield to Mr. Shiv  
Shanker? (Interruptions)

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: It is very  
strange that the left parties today are  
standing on conventions.... (Interrup-  
tions).... for seeking clarification. A  
convention has been etabilshed in this  
House not to limit the persons. (Interrup-  
tions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I  
have no objection whatsoever if he yields.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I am also  
reminding them of a convention. The  
convention of this House is that whoever  
tries to seek clarification, is allowed to  
seek the clarifications. And we have been  
limited to three, four or five, I protest  
against it. When that convention was  
broken, they did not raise their voice.  
Now they want to raise their voice...  
(Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He was  
already on his legs.

**SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER:** When it comes to them, it is a question of convention. If it comes to us, there is no convention at all.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Sukomal Sen,.... (*Interruptions*). Please Just a minute. Let me first deal with the Member, (*Interruptions*). Just a minute, Just a minute. Mr. Sukomal Sen, on my personal request, you please ask the Leader of the Opposition to say his word.

**SHRI SUKOMAL SEN:** Yes, Madam.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much.

**SHRI SUKOMAL SEN:** But, Madam, let this not be a precedent.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** It is not so. This will not be a precedent. It is on my personal request because it is a serious matter. (*Interruptions*). Let him also make his say. He is the Leader of the Opposition. Let him say what he wants to say.

**SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER:** For the first time, I am unhappy with the way an objection is being raised. (*Interruptions*).

**SHRI ANANTRAY DEVSHANKER DAVE (Gujarat):** I am on a point of order. (*Interruptions*). Please.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** No more point of order. (*Interruptions*). Please.

**SHRI M. A. BABY:** I do not want to be misunderstood. I do not have any disrespect for Shiv Shankerji, a veteran Parliamentarian. The only point which I have tried to raise is that so far as certain clarifications are concerned, we have set up a very great tradition in this House. Clarifications are sought not on party lines, but names are given and in that order, clarifications are sought. When the hon. Member raised a point of order that has been disposed of.

**SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR:** That has not been disposed of.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** No, that point of order has been disposed of because there was no point of order. Just a minute, Mr. Fotedar. It was not a point of order. It was his feeling that this matter was serious. That can't come under a point of order. He said that it was a serious matter and we should have a full-fledged discussion on it and we felt that there were some legal complications in it. For that, I asked the Government to react. So, that is over. If it was a point of order, I would not have allowed him. Now that matter is closed. Now Mr. Shiv Shanker, you please speak.  
... (*Interruptions*)...

**SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR:** Madam, the Leader of the House reacted only to one statement. (*Interruptions*).

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** No, I have identified Mr. Shiv Shanker.

**SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR:** After that I will be asked to speak.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** No; after that I will ask Mr. Sukomal Sen to speak because he very kindly listened to me. Mr. Hanumanthappa also listened to me.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : (उत्तर प्रदेश सहोदय, एक मिनट लूंगा। आपकी चर्चा बिल्कुल सही है। यहाँ पड़ती है कि अब एक मैनबर बोलने के लिए खड़ा हो तो उसको बीच में छोड़कर दूसरा बोलना। यह बिल्कुल ठीक किया है, आपने जो कुछ कहा है यह बिल्कुल ठीक कहा है। मैं बधाई सुकमल सेन जी को दूंगा कि आपने रिक्वेस्ट को स्वीकार किया, अपने आपको उन्होंने यिल्ड कर दिया। मैं बड़े निवेदन से, निम्न भाव से नेता विपक्ष के कहूंगा कि उनके प्रेम्प्टीज का सवाल नहीं है और व उनके अपना का सवाल है.... (व्यवधान)

श्री साखन लाल फोतेदार : संविधान का सवाल है।.... (व्यवधान)

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Dr. Abrar Ahmed, please don't make a dis-

[The Deputy Chairman]

pute on every issue. There is a procedure in the House ... (Interruptions) ... Mathur Sahib, there is a procedure in the House. A Member is on his legs; if he yields, then only we can have our say. There is no question of any disrespect to anybody.

माथुर साहब, समय जा रहा है।

श्री जादीश प्रसाद माथुर जो माननीय-सदस्य हैं उनके अधिकारों की रक्षा करने: सदन का अधिकार है। ... (व्यंग्य) आपका भी अधिकार है, हमारा भी अधिकार है कि उनके अधिकारों की रक्षा करें।

उपसभापति: माथुर साहब, शुक्रिया।

धन्यवाद।

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Madam, at no point of time have I ever raised an issue of my prestige. In fact, I am a man of humility. At no point of time have I ever made such a thing. Hon. Members know me very well. I never make it a matter of prestige. But if it is a question of conventions, my only submission is that the conventions that have over the time developed, apart from the rules, must be scrupulously followed. There was a time when whoever sought clarifications, he was allowed. Now it has been limited so far as my party is concerned.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Shiv Shanker please don't go into any controversy because that will lead to a lot of interruptions.

आप तो अपनी बात कहिए, बाकी छोड़िए।

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Madam, I am only referring to conventions. I just wanted to remind the House of the conventions.

I just thought that I should bring to the notice of the Prime Minister four aspects made in his statement. The first is that the National Security Council is being set up to take a comprehensive and coordinated view on all matters relating to the country's security. The second aspect is that the Council will endeavour to evolve an integrated approach to policy making as it affects national security, taking into account both military and non-military threats. The third aspect is that this Council shall evolve a national consensus and public awareness on strategic and security issues. The fourth aspect is that this Council will have a separate Secretariat. Now, these are the functions which are of a far-reaching consequence which obviously make an inroad into the Cabinet system of governance. I am not trying to criticise it in any form. What I am submitting is that this is a very serious matter; seeking clarifications will take about 1-1/2 to 2 hours; instead of that, if the Leader of the House agrees, on Monday let us have a straight debate! That is all that I am submitting. It is a matter for the Leader of the House to consider and it is for the House to take a decision. This is what I am submitting for your kind consideration.

(Interruptions)

उपसभापति: आपकी बात हो गयी।  
उन्होंने कह दी, अब रिपीट क्यों कर रहे हैं ?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Madam, a point has been raised that it is eroding into the Cabinet system. We have given full thought to this and we have decided that the National Security Council will work within the Cabinet system. That is why it is distinguished from any other system in other countries. The CCPA will remain supreme and the final authority will be that of the CCPA and the Cabinet; it remains. That is the structure that we have evolved. So it is not at all, not even one decimal outside the Cabinet system CCPA is the final authority, the cabinet is the final authority, and within that the National Security Council will work.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Even so, Mr. Prime Minister, what is the difficulty in having a full-fledged debate, instead of going in for clarifications?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I have no objection for a debate. The Business Advisory Committee can take it up; the Chair can take it up.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I had better ask Mr. Sukomal Sen, (*Interruption*) Now that matter is closed. Mr. Sukomal Sen, will you ask for your clarifications?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If some body else wants to ask a question, how can I say no? We have to see whether they are agreeable or not to have a debate.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Let us have a debate straightway.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No clarifications? Some Members have given their names. They want to have clarifications.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, we want a debate.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Right now? (*Interruptions*) I want to be clear, Do you want to have a debate right now?

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: On Monday.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): On a point of order. Everybody is for a debate. But the point is every Member has a right to seek clarifications. A convention has been developed in this House and clarifications cannot be washed out, provided all the Members from all the political parties agree... (*Interruptions*)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We want a debate on Monday.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Some Members have given their names for seeking clarifications. I will not stop it. It is their right.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Whether the Prime Minister likes it or not or whether Mr. Gurupadaswamy likes it or not...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let the House decide it. I think the Leader of the House wants to say something.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: I said at the beginning itself that we are not shying away from a debate...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Nobody said that.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: It is for the Business Advisory Committee...

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Let me make my submission. If the House so desires, let there be a debate. But both a debate and clarifications should not be allowed. Both of them should not be allowed. Either you have clarifications or you have a debate.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let the Members decide it.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: I leave it to the House.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: We have the first right to participate in the debate. This is a very serious matter. Without amending the Constitution you are changing the Constitution.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Dipen Ghosh.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Madam, I submit that the statement can be made the basis for a debate and if it is going to be a debate, let the debate be held today itself... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: No, Mr. Gurupadaswamy... (*Interruptions*)... You yourself at the outset said that there could be clarifications and there could be a debate also... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: No... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Mr. Gurupadaswamy, you yourself said at the outset that there could be clarifications and there should be a debate also, and now you say, "Either this or that,"... (*Interruptions*)... Madam, at first, his stand was for both.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: No... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I can show it from the records. You said that there could be clarifications and also the debate. But I suggested a debate only and side, "Let us have a debate."... (*Interruptions*)... I would earnestly appeal to the Members that this is a very serious matter and nobody is interested in scoring a point. But certain far-reaching consequences are likely to follow and the Prime Minister can concentrate on them and decide. But what he says is final. But let us be heard first. What the Government says is final. But let us be heard... (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Dipen Ghosh. You make your submission.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Madam, may I say just this? I am not standing on technicalities. I thought that they wanted a debate and the House also would desire a debate because this is an important document.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Yes.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Therefore, I suggest that we may have a debate, a full-dress debate. Let us sit a little longer today and finish the debate... (*Interruptions*)...

Some hon. Members: No... (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have allowed only Mr. Dipen Ghosh and let him speak now... (*Interruptions*)... Actually, Mr. Sukomal Sen should have continued with his clarifications because

he was just half way through. Yes, Mr. Ghosh.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Madam, it has so happened that sometimes *suo motu* statements have been made, but no clarifications were sought, but the whole thing was converted into a debate or a discussion. But that was discussed before the statement was made, obviously in the Business Advisory Committee meeting or by the leaders of the various groups with the Government side. But now a *suo motu* statement has been made and clarifications have been allowed to be sought. In the meantime, Madam, a point of order was raised and you have been kind enough to dispose of that point of order. Now, the Leader of the Opposition has asked for a debate. The Leader of the House and the Prime Minister also have consented, or they have said that they have no objection to having a debate, a full-fledged debate, on this issue. We do not also have any objection to having a full-fledged debate on this issue. But, as Mr. Kulkarni has pointed out, this is the convention of this House that once a statement is made, Members are entitled and are allowed to seek clarifications and it is their privilege. Obviously, when Members started seeking clarifications, they should be allowed to seek clarifications and in addition to that, a debate can be held on Monday or on Tuesday or on any other day.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: It was only concerned with the time that it would take. It would consume more time. That is my point... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Madam, in the statement itself, in paragraph 5, it has been stated that a Resolution settling up the National Security Council along with its functions and scope is placed on the Table of the House for the information of the honourable Members.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Resolution on what?



SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Just listen to me. It is stated here... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: That is all right. But resolution on what?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It says:

"A Resolution setting up the National Security Council along with functions and scope is placed on the Table of the House for the information of honourable Members."

So, any Member is entitled to move a motion on the resolution which is tabled, which is laid on the Table of the House. A motion can be raised and there can be a discussion and a full-fledged debate can be held and there is no bar. So, there is no ban or restriction on raising a full-fledged discussion even after a *suo motu* statement is made particularly in view of what has been stated in para 5. Therefore, Madam, I would request you to give kindly your ruling that as the Members were allowed to seek clarifications, they could do so ... *(Interruptions)* ..

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: No. You cannot canvass for a ruling .. *(Interruptions)* ... You cannot canvass for a ruling ... *(Interruptions)* And thereafter as agreed upon by the leaders ... *(Interruptions)*.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have not yet come to his canvassing *(Interruptions)* If I had come to his canvassing, then ... *(Interruptions)* I have not ...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: And thereafter the date and time can be decided for a full-fledged discussion in consultation with the leaders of groups, etc. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Monday or whatever it may be as it suits the hon. Prime Minister. We are agreeable for a discussion.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Maharashtra): It is highly regrettable that with the best of intentions we are getting involved in a rigmarole for no rhyme or reason.

Madam, it is such an important document informing us about the constitution of National Security Council. Madam, we should not stand on technicalities. *(Interruptions)* I have heard you. Will you please listen to me? I would submit very respectfully to all the Members not to stand on technicalities, not to stand on their right to ask for clarifications, because this is not an ordinary statement by the Prime Minister. Madam, when I read that this National Security Council will deal with all matters relating to the country's security and that it has to take a comprehensive and coordinated view, reading this makes me feel... *(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I think let us first discuss...

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: On a point of order. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Madam, what are the... *(Interruptions)* Please bear with me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think Salveji, we should stop the controversy... *(Interruptions)* Just a minute

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Kindly listen to what I have to suggest. *(Interruptions)*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will give my observation. My observation is... *(Interruptions)* My observation is, please sit down and listen to me. Please take your seat.

आप बैठ जाइए । सुब्रह्मण्यम स्वामी जी आप जरा बैठिए ।

Just a minute. If any body is getting up, I will convert it into a clarification. When your time comes, I will permit you. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I would have finished, Madam, by now. *(Interruptions)*

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On my personal request Mr. Sukomal Sen sat down. He was already on his legs. Let me take the sense of the House, not one side or two sides, If cannot be a matter of one or two. Let the House

[The Deputy Chairman] decide what they want. If they want a debate, fine. But if there are Members who want to seek clarifications, I must ... (Interruptions)...

उनका हो जाए, उसके बाद ।

Mr. Sukomal Sen, would you like to seek clarifications or a debate?

SHRI M. A. BABY: Debate should not be at the expense of seeking clarifications.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: I appeal to the democratic I appeal to... (Interruptions) I appeal to you Madam... (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Vishvjit Singhji do not bring my ancestors and forefathers. There is no question of forefathers. All of us are democratic. I am using my right because of this, and not overruling anything and asking the sense of the House. And if I allow Mr. Sukomal Sen, it is absolutely democratic. I am not overruling anybody. I am allowing the Members to decide. So do not bring in my ancestors over here. (Interruptions) I do not want you to talk about my ancestors (Interruptions) what has the national security to do with my ancestors? I am really surprised. I am absolutely surprised.

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह ग्रहलुवालिया : . .  
(व्यवधान) बाहर जाकर देखें क्या हो रहा है ? बाहर जाकर देखिये, छात्रों के ऊपर लाठियां चलायी जा रही हैं, टीयर गैस छोड़ी जा रही है . . . . (व्यवधान)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sukomal Sen, do you want clarifications or a full-fledged discussion? (Interruptions) I suggest to the hon. Members that they may speak on it when we have a full-fledged discussion.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Madam, I will finish within a minute.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then you would ask the Prime Minister to answer.

डा० अब्दुल अहमद खान : मेरा प्वाइंट ग्राफ आर्डर है ।

उपसभापति : अभी एलाउ करूंगी ।

He is on his legs and he is not yielding to you. He yielded to Shiv Shankerji. When he yields to you, I will allow you. (Interruptions) Don't interrupt. It is up to him. He is on his legs. I have identified him. (Interruptions). He is not yielding. I request you to please take your seat.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Madam, the Prime Minister has agreed to a discussion on the *suo motu* Statement made by him. It is a very important subject. So, the Government may be prepared for a debate. We can have a discussion. I will be very brief.

Madam, this statement is vital for our national security from external danger as well as internal danger. Some doubts have arisen in my mind and I will seek clarifications on those points. I want to raise only one point before the Prime Minister. This decision of the Government to set up a National Security Council is introducing a new element in the decision-making process of the Government? It comprises several Ministries such as Ministry of Defence, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Home Affairs and Ministry of External Affairs. Now the National Security Council will take a comprehensive view and an integrated view of defence, internal affairs and external affairs and take long-term and short-term strategic measures. In the present context when we are facing threats from all sides, internal as well as external, it is necessary that the Government takes a comprehensive and integrated view. A confusion that has arisen in my mind is whether the formation of the National Security Council and its functioning will overlap the functioning of the individual Ministries like Defence or Finance or External Affairs. (Time Bell) How will the Government obviate overlapping in the functioning of the National Security Council and the individual Ministries?

Madam, I would like to quote one sentence from the Statement. In para 2 it has been said:

"They will help in identification of strategies to optimise our efforts in defence, internal security and foreign affairs and develop medium-term and long-term assessments to serve as a perspective for shaping government policy."

All the individual Ministries also frame their perspective and decide about their long-term and short-term strategies. After the National Security Council has been formed, what will be the inter-relationship between the Security Council and the individual Ministries? That is the main point that has come to my mind. I will be thankful to the hon. Prime Minister if he clarifies this point.

About having national consensus on this problem, the Government should have decided that they will form a National Security Council and Advisory Board comprising people from different walks of life. Will the formation of Advisory Boards solve the problem of having a national consensus on this issue or will the Government take other measures so that a national consensus can be built up on security measures in view of the threats that we have?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sen, have you finished? I have to find out whether we are going to have a discussion. The rest of the Members have to know whether we are going to discuss the matter. It is a serious matter.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Madam, these are the points which are in my mind. So, I would like to seek the clarifications from the Prime Minister because this decision has come out all of a sudden. So...

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI MURASOLI MARIAN): It is there in the Manifesto.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: So, in the Manifesto, it is there. But, for this

also, it requires that we should build up a national consensus. Even for the formation of the National Security Council as well as the Advisory Board also, we should build up the national consensus. And to popularise the idea and to have the national consensus, what is the Government going to do? I would like to seek this clarification from the hon. Prime Minister. (Interruptions)

SHRI M. M. JACOB (Kerala): Madam, it is a very lengthy Resolution and the Members have no time to go through the Resolution which is placed on the Table of the House. We should know about the Resolution also. So, inevitably, a debate is required. There is no doubt about it. It is a lengthy Resolution. I am not objecting to the clarifications. If anybody wants to seek clarifications, let them seek the clarifications. But the Resolution is a very bulky one and it requires time for us to read and understand it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

डा० अब्दुल अहमद खान : मैडम, मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर यह है कि प्रधानमंत्री जी ने वक्तव्य दिया और उस पर अपोजीशन के नेता ने यह मांग रखी कि इस पर डिबेट कराई जाए ... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : उन्होंने एग्री भी कर लिया ।

डा० अब्दुल अहमद खान : एग्री कर लिया ठीक है । मैं आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जवाहर रोजगार योजना पर इस सदन में प्रधानमंत्री श्री राजीव गांधी ने एक स्टेटमेंट दिया था और उस पर क्लैरिफिकेशन पूछने के लिए नाम भी दे दिए गए थे लेकिन श्री गुरुपदस्वामी और श्री दीपेन घोष की तरफ से यह प्रस्ताव आया था कि उस पर डिबेट कराई जाए तो उसको बंद करके उस पर डिबेट कराई गई थी ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I said it.

DR. ABRAR AHMED KHAN: You can see the record.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am saying without seeing the record, because I remember the record.

DR. ABRAR AHMED KHAN: They know it very well.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is saying that.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I also advocate it. Earlier, there were such occasions.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Abrar Ahmed, you did not hear what he was saying.

डा० अबरार अहमद खान : जवाहर रोजगार योजना पर डिबेट का प्रयोजन रखा गया था तो क्लैरिफिकेशन को इमीडियेटली बंद करके डिबेट कराई गई थी ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Agreed. But there is no point of order. It is a point of information, which I remember. But the technicality was that I had already called Mr. Sukomal Sen who was already in the process of seeking a clarification and... (Interruption) In any case, on my request, he sat down and allowed the Leader of the Opposition to make his say, and some others also. I am duty-bound to let him continue. If he wanted to continue, it was his right. If he wanted to give up his right, I would not have any objection. And I still would say that if there is going to be a debate on this subject which is a serious matter, I leave it to the House to decide. I do not want to make my opinion prevail on the House. Let the House tell me what should be done. Let everybody say.

डा० अबरार अहमद खान : महोदया हाऊस में अंदर ऐसा पहले भी हुआ है ।

उपसभापति : हुआ है तब जब देयर वाज़ एक कंसेसस । जब पूरे हाऊस का कंसेसस था। अगर पूरे हाऊस का कंसेसस होता है तो ठीक बात है ।

डा० अबरार अहमद खान : महोदया, आज भी वह कंसेसस है । सेम कडीशन है, सेम सिचुएशन है, आज भी बिल्कुल वही स्थिति है ।

उपसभापति : कपिल वर्मा जो आप बोलना चाहते हैं क्या ? आप डिबेट की मांग करके ही बैठ जाइए ।

SHRI KAPIL VERMA (Uttar Pradesh): Let there be a debate.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You want a debate. Okay.

कुलकर्णी जी, आप अगर बोलना चाहते हैं तो बोल सकते हैं ।

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Madam, my Party wants a debate. But I desire that I should speak and seek some clarifications also, instead of participating in the debate which is beyond my time, and it will not be possible for me to participate also. So, in this connection, I want to seek a few clarification from the Prime Minister. Apart for the constitutional aspects which has been brought in by my friend—perhaps, the Prime Minister will reply adequately about the constitutional validity, etc.,—I want to know particularly one thing from the Prime Minister. The CPA is already functioning. And this new organisation, as he has stated, will work under the Cabinet system. Will this Council, in any form, override the powers of the Defence Chiefs? I ask this question because the Defence Chiefs have their own powers and arrangements.

In this connection, I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to one thing. He may also be aware of it. He might have been in the Lok Sabha or the Rajya Sabha. During Mrs. Indira Gandhi's time, the Subramaniam Committee was appointed to prepare a

perspective plan in regard to defence requirements. What happened to that plan? If that plan has been shelved, what will be the weightage to the new body which you are envisaging?

Then, there is another aspect. I put a question on this. It became unstarred. The point is, Mr. Arun Singh has now been asked to consider defence matters, particularly, the saving aspect. You have replied like that. What Mr. Arun Singh is going into is the saving aspect. But this saving aspect has a bearing on defence and the threats to the country. We may save any amount of money, but whether it will be worthwhile and whether it will be in the interest of the country. This has to be seen.

Then, Mr. Prime Minister, you have included in this the aspect of internal security also. Does it again mean that it supersede the functions of the Home Ministry? Does it supersede the intelligence wings of the Government and whether it will have its own version of functions? Madam, I have done.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. J. P. Mathur. Since we are going to have a discussion, I hope every Member will be brief.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : महोदया, मैं भाटिया जी कि इस बात से सहमत नहीं हूँ कि यह संविधान के विरुद्ध है अथवा डिक्टेटरशिप ला सकता है। लेकिन यह बात जरूर है कि इसमें ऐसे तत्व हैं जो इस ढांचे का कोई दुरुपयोग करना चाहें तो यह कैबिनेट सिस्टम को नष्ट करने के लिये पर्याप्त है। मैं मानता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री और आपकी सरकार इस ढांचे का दुरुपयोग नहीं करेगी, लेकिन निस्संदेह यह ऐसा हथियार है कि इमरजेंसी की जैसी घटनाएँ हुई, वैसी स्थिति आ जाए तो लोकतंत्र का ढांचा यह नष्ट कर सकता है। इसके तत्व मौजूद हैं, इसमें संदेह नहीं है।

जो वक्तव्य रखा गया है उसमें प्रधान मंत्री, प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री, वित्त मंत्री, गृह

मंत्री और विदेश मंत्री इसके सदस्य हैं। यह लगभग वही है कि पोलिटिकल अफेयर्स कमेटी है।

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह : नहीं पोलिटिकल अफेयर्स कमेटी तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर अपनी पोलिटिकल परस्यूट के अनुसार बनाता है

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : लगभग वही लोग हैं

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह : जरूरी नहीं है। यह फक्शनल है।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : तो इससे संदेह पैदा होता है कि जो विभिन्न मंत्रालय हैं उनके काम और इसके काम का ओवरलैपिंग तो नहीं होगा? ये दो लोगों ने पूछा और मैं भी पूछना चाहता हूँ।

इस प्रस्ताव के अन्दर बताया गया है कि कुछ टास्क फोर्स बनाये जायेंगे। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो विषय आपने दिये हैं उन्हीं पर टास्क फोर्स होंगे या उसके अलावा भी होंगे या स्थायी भी होंगे? इनका काम सचमुच में क्या होगा? क्या केवल रिसर्च स्कालर के नाते वे काम करेंगे? अगर केवल रिसर्च वर्क करेंगे तो इस प्रकार के ढांचे की आवश्यकता नहीं है। हमारे पास सरकार और गैर-सरकारी-गैर-सरकारी मैं इसलिये कह रहा हूँ कि वह सरकारी में शामिल होते हैं लेकिन ऊपर से सरकारी नहीं दिखाये जाते, लेकिन सरकारी काम करते हैं। तो उनका क्या होगा?

मेरी जानकारी यह भी है, प्रधान मंत्री जी को ज्यादा मालूम होगा, कि सन 1962 के बाद यह प्रथा थी कि कैबिनेट सेक्रेटरी, डिफेंस सेक्रेटरी और चीफ ग्राफ स्टाफ, ये प्रमुख लोग रोजाना इकट्ठा होते थे। एक सेक्योरिटी पेपर तैयार करके रोजाना उनका फारमेट प्रधान मंत्री को दिया जाता है। अब यह प्रथा है या नहीं है मुझे मालूम नहीं। यह

[श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर]

जो नयी कौंसिल बनेगी क्या यह भी इसी प्रकार का काम दिन के दिन करेगी या नहीं करेगी ? अगर दिन के दिन वह काम करेगी तो निश्चित रूप से मंत्रालय के जो काम हैं उनको समाप्त करेगी।

दूसरी बात यह है कि यह कहा गया कि अंतरिक अवस्था या सीमा के आर-पार जो गड़बड़ होती हैं उनको देखने के लिये सलाह करेगी। आज जो पेपर तैयार हुये होंगे, जैसे कश्मीर का सवाल है, इसमें शब्द इस्तेमाल हुआ है एंटी इनसरजेंसी एक्सेक्टरा तो क्या आज जो पेपर तैयार होंगे कश्मीर के संबंध में, पंजाब के संबंध में, उत्तरा के संबंध में या सम्प्रदायिक दंगों के संबंध में तो वह पेपर रद्द करके नये सिरे से शुरू किये जायेंगे ? अगर नये सिरे से शुरू किये जायेंगे तब तो मैं समझता हू कि हानिकार होगा। इन सारी बातों पर मैं लम्बा चौड़ा बयान नहीं कहूंगा, डिबेट पर कहूंगा। मैं चाहूंगा प्रधान मंत्री जी इसका स्पष्टीकरण करें।

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह : एक चीज का उत्तर दे दूंगा क्योंकि वही सूत्र हर में आ रहा है और वह यह आ रहा है कि क्या यह केबिनेट सिस्टम के बाहर है और क्या अन्य मंत्रालयों से उसका संबंध होगा, क्या उन पर टकराव होगा तो हम लम्बा उत्तर नहीं देंगे। मैंने पहले ही कह दिया कि सी.सी.पी.ए. की अथोरिटी फाइनल रहेगी, केबिनेट; फाइनल रहेगी इस चीज पर।

दूसरे यह है कि इसको बनाकर फिर से आप टकराव पैदा करेंगे ? ऐसी बात नहीं है। आलरेडी इकोनोमिक मैटर पर सी.सी.पी.ए., केबिनेट कमेटी आन इकोनोमिक अफेयर्स वह फक्शन करती है, पालिसी मैटर पर फक्शन करती है, सब को कोऑर्डिनेट करती है। लेकिन इसकी वजह से आज तक टकराव या दूसरे मंत्रालयों पर उनका यूजपरेशन नहीं हुआ है। यह चीजें ध्यान में रखें। इस तरह की आशंकायें दूर

करने के लिये आलरेडी इस तरह की कमेटी है जिससे मदद मिली है, उसको कोऑर्डिनेशन मिला है और उनको बल मिला है।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : एक बात रह गयी है। मेरे हाथ में जो रेजोलूशन है इसमें पड़ा हुआ है : 13 अगस्त, 1990 जो टेबल पर रखा गया है ... (व्यवधान)

श्री माखन लाल फोतेदार : आपके साथ कैसा बीता है उसी क्या ... (व्यवधान)

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : आपको \* बाहर कर दिया उसी की हमें खुशी है। आगे हमारे साथ क्या होगा वह देख लेंगे। (व्यवधान)

माननीय सदस्य : आपके ऊपर आगे क्या नौबत आने वाली है... (व्यवधान)

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : जब नौबत आयेगी तब देख लेंगे। अभी से क्यों रो रहे हैं। (व्यवधान) अभी तो हम सब लोगों ने आपको बाहर किया है। अभी तो मजा ले जिए। (व्यवधान) ली

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है...

नेता (विरोधी दल) : \* एक्सप्रेसन नहीं आना चाहिए... (व्यवधान)

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : \* मैं भी यही कह रहा था।

उप-सभापति : नहीं आना चाहिए। (व्यवधान)

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE (Maharashtra): Is it a parliamentary word? Can you use this word on the floor of the House?

श्री पी. शिव शंकर : माथुर जी आप जैसे व्यक्ति ने ऐसा शब्द इस्तेमाल किया है ... (व्यवधान)

श्री ज. वी. प्रसाद माथुर : मैंने नहीं कहा उधर से यह कहा गया है कि आप को \*देने । (व्यवधान)

कुमारी सरोज खापर्डे : \*बात आपकी तरफ से आयी है । (व्यवधान)

उप-सभापति : चाहे सीधे हाथ से \*पड़े, चाहे उल्टे हाथ से पड़े, यह अन-पार्लियामेंटरी लफ्ज I won't allow it. मैं दोनों तरफ से \*काट देती हूँ। माथुर जी आप बैठ जाइये ।

श्री श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : आपने मेरी तो \*काट दी इनकी भी \*काट दीजिए । (व्यवधान)

उप-सभापति : रिकार्ड में से काट दी : मेरे हाथ में सिर्फ रिकार्ड ही है और कुछ नहीं है । (व्यवधान) माथुर जी आप बैठ जाइये । आपका जवाब प्रधान मंत्री जी से आ गया है इसलिए आप बैठ जाइये । श्री भंडारे साहब को बुला लिया है ।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : आप बोल कर मेरा समय नष्ट कर रही हैं । मेरा वाक्य पूरा होने दीजिए । प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बड़ी कृपा की कि बीच में खड़े हो गये और मुझे जवाब दे दिया । जो प्रस्ताव सदन में रखा गया है उस पर डेट पड़ी है 13 अगस्त, 1990 और उसके ऊपर लिखा है :  
in the Gazette of India, part 1, section 1

यह राष्ट्रपति जी के यहां से जारी किया हुआ है । मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह आलरेडी गजट में आ चुका है या आना है ? मैं समझता हूँ गया नहीं होगा । मेरी विनती है कि जब तक इस सदन से पास नहीं हो जाए

इसको गजट में भेजने का कोई अर्थ नहीं होगा । गजट उसके बाद होना चाहिए ।

6 00 P.M.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRA-KANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra): Madam, I am pained that though this subject was discussed twice through the Consultative Committee of the Ministry of Defence, the discussions were inconclusive. In fact, the hon. Prime Minister had assured the Members of the Consultative Committee that a final paper, taking into account the views expressed in the Consultative Committee, would be placed before it before taking a final decision. I am really pained that a decision has been taken without concluding the discussion.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: May I say, on the first part of the proposal in the first Consultative Committee there were suggestions in the light of which we made changes and after making changes I have brought it again in the Consultative Committee for final discussion.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRA-KANT BHANDARE: I am sorry, you diverted me. I wanted to find out what signals you were giving. That is why I got up. Otherwise I would have yielded. I do not mean any disrespect to the Prime Minister. Any day, I will yield to any senior Minister. There is no question about it. However, this matter will be dealt with when we have a fuller debate on this issue.

Now, undoubtedly, we have grave reservations about the National Security Council. The statement in no manner explains how the present system has failed and how the National Security Council will improve matters. In fact, this is taking after the Pentagon, if I may say so. So, in course of time, I am afraid, the National Security Council will become another CIA and we should be extremely careful before we rush into any such body without adequate thought.

The other clarification which I ask is as to whether the Government proposes to give any statutory sanction to this

[Shri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare]

proposal so that it attains some permanency and it does not happen, like in the case of Governors, that the moment the Government is changed, the Governors also go, the moment this Government goes, the National Security Council will also go.

The next point which I am asking is whether the inter-institutional forums for strategic thinking on political, economics, technological and military issues will really exchange their information and ideas there, I may give one illustration because my learned friend, Dr. Ramanna, is here: how far will the experts from the Atomic Energy Commission be prepared to tell the other components the state or the result of their work? I do not expect any co-ordinated or cooperative team work, as is envisaged in the statement as well as in the Resolution.

What is worse — and this is my next clarification — as it happens every day, the inter-departmental groups will tend to become unwieldy. So have you taken into account that there is a real danger of the basic issues being lost in this inter-departmental cross-talk?

Then you have got a secretariat. What is most objectionable is the secretariat part of it which will inevitably result in a very high centralisation of power and ultimately, the two questions which you will have to answer are — whether the system would be a reform of the existing system, or whether the NAC will become a parallel government or a super government, making a serious inroad into our democratic fabric, the Cabinet form of Government, or whether, as I said, it will become a super government.

And last, but not the least, because of the manner in which it has been brought without any conclusive debate in the Consultative Committee on a Friday evening, is the Prime Minister trying to give a message of war psychosis to the country and the rest of the world?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kpali Verma. You misunderstood me when I asked you whether you are for debate or for clarification.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: I want to be very brief, Madam. Madam, I am very sorry that the Prime Minister has chosen to inflict a surprise on us. I cannot mention the forum because I am barred, being a Member of the Consultative Committee, but I had the impression that he was for consensus because he has always been talking of consensus in security matters also. I tried to find out today from various parties whether they have been consulted about the National Security Council. At least, my party leaders told me that they were not consulted about it. Then how is he talking about consensus? And there is one paragraph about consensus also.

Madam, Mr. Vishwanath Pratap Singh once belonged to the Congress: he knows the history. For the last 40 years the Cabinet system has been working. Various Prime Ministers were there. Jawaharlalji never thought of this, Indiraji never thought of this, even the previous Prime Minister rejected it in 1986. What new factors have come up now? If there is any lacuna in the present system, is it incorrigible? Can it not be corrected? Because, as my friends here have pointed out, we are working under the Cabinet system, and we look to Britain for it and not to America. In Britain there is a Cabinet Sub-Committee, mind you, Mr. Prime Minister. I am not fit to say it, but I would only say that sensitive information like the one about which we are talking cannot be shared with everyone. The Prime Minister being the leader of the nation, certain types of information can come only to him. There are certain types of information which he will not share with even his Home Minister or Finance Minister. So, how can he share it with others? And then, may I point it out, if he gives it to some experts or some other people, are they sworn to secrecy? It is a question of clearance—high level security clearance.

And when you talk of America—probably they have taken this from America—in America Dr. Kissinger did not consult the National Security Council while going to China, changing the entire Cabinet



policy. You know, the whole experiment started in America in 1948. Kennedy, in the Bay of Pigs exercise and attack on Cuba, never consulted the National Security Council. The National Security Council became redundant. The basis on which you are taking the National Security Council, it is not working there at all, Mr. Prime Minister, I may tell you. I have great respect for you, but may I point this out to you: Is it not a repetition of the Political Affairs Committee of the Cabinet? The Ministers are the same.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: May not be the same.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Almost the same. There may be one or two changes only. And, probably, your reply will be: Yes, sometimes I want to change those Ministers.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: The Ministers are not the same. The facts are there. We are not the same.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: No, the Ministers are almost the same except one or two.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: They need not be the same.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Well, the whole idea is that the ideal working system is that of a Cabinet Committee and that is the answer to this problem. In Britain, under the Cabinet system, it is the Cabinet Committee which is responsible for such situations. Only a Cabinet Committee can be trusted upon and can be given all the information. Mr. Prime Minister, your main argument is that you want to take an integrated and holistic approach. This is what your Resolution also says. Now, who will take it except the Prime Minister, at the highest level? You cannot share it with a Council, you cannot share it with an Advisory Committee, you cannot share it with anyone else. So, the main thing is, you reform the present system. Have a Cabinet Committee. And you have your Chiefs of Staff Committee, General Staff Committee, you have your "Super Board"—I don't know what it is—the IB and so many other things. All these will consider the whole thing. This is altogether

a break from the Cabinet system. You have taken it from the American system, which is not the proper thing to do.

One important thing is, you are talking of a 10 per cent cut in expenditure and now an entirely new thing is being created, and at a time when you are talking of consensus, you are introducing a new scheme which is creating such a hullabaloo in the society. People or political parties are thinking that this instrument is going to be used against them. Please, for God's sake, do consider this.

Thank you.

THE VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: May I clarify immediately?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: It is basically a reform of the present system. It is not a new system. Basically the NSC in essence is a sub-committee of the Cabinet.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Let it be a Cabinet committee only.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: It is.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Why call it "Council"? Call it "Security Committee."

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I will come to the details. But I am answering some basic points immediately so that no misconception remains. I will answer completely. But in essence it is a committee of the Cabinet.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Then, why call it "Council"?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I will come to that later.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: May I ask only one question of the Prime Minister?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. You are not asking any question, let me tell you, please. Mr. Sahu.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: The statement has been made...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, no. Many statements can be made. Let

[The Deputy Chairman]

him ask. Let us have some order. Now at least we have come back to some normalcy.

श्री रजनी रंजन साहू (बिहार) :

उपसभापति महोदया, अभी सदन में विचार लिया गया कि इस पर चर्चा हो, मैं इस पक्ष में हूँ कि चर्चा होनी चाहिए। लेकिन अभी जो वक्तव्य दिया गया है इस के संबंध में मैं एक दो बातों पर प्रधान मंत्री जी से स्पष्टीकरण चाहूंगा। मुझे राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा परिषद के गठन के संबंध में वक्तव्य से आश्चर्य ही नहीं हो रहा है। मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी की भावनाओं का आदर करता हूँ लेकिन सिर्फ भावनाओं से ही देश नहीं चलता है। मैं याद दिलाता चाहता हूँ कि भावनाओं से कर्तव्य ऊँचा होता है। साथ ही, मैं यह भी याद दिलाता चाहता हूँ कि जिन भावनाओं को लेकर अपने इलेक्शन मैनीफेस्टो की सारी बातें जल्दी-जल्दी इम्प्लीमेंट करना चाहते हैं उसमें यह भी एक है। तो सिर्फ भावनाओं से देश नहीं चलता। इस देश ने एक पोलिटिक रूलर बहादुर शाह ज़फर को देखा है और उसके बाद ही भारत वर्ष डिस्टींग्विश्ड हुआ था। उसी तरह से काव्यात्मक (???) बातें हम वक्तव्य में कही गई हैं। इससे देश की अक्षुण्णता को हम सुरक्षित नहीं रख सकते हैं। इसके लिए दोस कदम उठाने पड़ते हैं। आज देश में ऐसा वातावरण बन गया है कि हम चारों तरफ से अपने को असुरक्षित पा रहे हैं। सिर्फ परिषद बनाने से काम नहीं चलता है। कश्मीर में जे.के.एल.एफ., पंजाब में खालिस्तान कमांडो फोर्स तथा अन्य उग्रवादी संगठन, आसाम में उल्फा और तमिलनाडु में एल.टी.टी.ई. का बोलबाला अहसास कराता है कि जहाँ राष्ट्रीय पार्टियाँ कमजोर हुई हैं और क्षेत्रीय पार्टियों का वर्चस्व हुआ है वहाँ ऐसी घटनाएँ हुई हैं। राष्ट्रीय पार्टियों की समाप्ति के साथ-साथ राष्ट्रीयता से ओतप्रोत व्यक्तियों की हत्याएँ भी बढ़ी हैं। पंजाब इसका एक ज्वलंत उदाहरण है। ऐसी घड़ी में ऐसी परिषद को बना कर मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ क्या प्रधानमंत्री जी देश में जो

समस्याएँ हैं और चारों तरफ इनसिक्युरिटी है उसका समाधान कर सकेंगे। इसका संवैधानिक स्वरूप क्या होगा? इसमें जो खर्च होगा जिसमें कहा गया है कि अन्य जो सरकारी सेवाओं से निवृत्त लोग होंगे उनकी भी सेवाएँ ली जाएंगी तो क्या उसके बारे में आपने वित्त मंत्रालय से विचार-विमर्श किया है? क्या आपने एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मंत्रालय से विचार-विमर्श किया है? क्या डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री से इस पर विचार-विमर्श किया है? क्या आपने गृह मंत्रालय से विचार-विमर्श किया है? मैं इसका ठोस उत्तर चाहूंगा। हम लोगों ने अभी तक टू इन वन तो सुना था। आज सदन में कहा गया कि चार मंत्रियों को लेकर ऐसी परिषद बनाई जा रही है तो क्या मैं इसे फोर इन वन मानूँ। टू इन वन तो सुना था लेकिन फोर इन वन नहीं सुना था। सी.सी.पी.ए. के बारे में बातें हुई। प्रधानमंत्री जी ने कहा है कि सी.सी.पी.ए. के अन्तर्गत यह परिषद काम करेगी। मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि जिस परिषद की अध्यक्षता प्रधानमंत्री करेंगे क्या सी.सी.पी.ए. उसके ऊपर काम कर सकेगी? यह एक आश्चर्यजनक बात लग रही है और सदन के समक्ष प्रधानमंत्री जी को इसे स्पष्ट करना चाहिये। पालिसी ग्रुप, सिक्युरिटी कोर ग्रुप के बारे में कहा गया है। सिक्युरिटी कोर ग्रुप जिसमें सभी प्रमुख लोगों की सेवाएँ ली जाएंगी। तो यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह कितना बड़ा पिटारा होगा जिसमें सभी प्रमुख लोगों को रखा जाएगा और सब की बातों को सुन कर फंसला लेगी। और जब भी देश पर दूसरे देश का हमला होगा, उस समय यह परिषद मिलेगी और भानुमती के पिटारे में से फंसला निकाला जाएगा कि इस पर क्या कार्यवाही की जाए तब तक देश की जमीन दूसरे देश के कब्जे में होगी। इससे सुरक्षा का वातावरण नहीं बन सकता।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह (बिहार) :  
मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी के बयान से दो

चीजों की जानकारी चाहूंगा। एक तो इसमें इंटरनल सिक्योरिटी और एक्स-टर्नल सिक्योरिटी के बारे में कहा गया। मगर इसमें जिओ-पोलिटिकल सिचुएशन की बात छोड़ दी गयी है। कभी-कभी ऐसे हालात भी होते हैं जब आपको किसी देश से सीधा खतरा नहीं होता है, कोई देश आप पर आक्रमण नहीं करता, मगर उस देश में ऐसी कोई घटना घट जाती है जिससे आपके देश की सुरक्षा पर खतरा हो जाता है, जैसे कि अभी जो पाकिस्तान में जिओ-पोलिटिकल सिचुएशन हो गयी है। तो क्या नेशनल सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल ऐसे विषयों पर भी अपनी राय देगी और रखेगी। एक तो मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा।

दूसरा, इस नेशनल सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल के स्टेटस के बारे में तो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बता दिया। मैं सिर्फ इतना जानना चाहता हूं कि इसकी एकाउंटेबिलिटी किसके प्रति होगी? यह इस सदन के प्रति, लोक सभा या राज्य सभा के प्रति उत्तरदायी होगी या कैबिनेट के प्रति उत्तरदायी होगी? मैं ये दो सवाल प्रधान मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूं।

**SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY:** This four-tier body has been brought into being by a Resolution. At least in the statement circulated, there was no reference, it is resolution of what. The Prime Minister waves some papers at me, I don't know what they are. If it is a Government Resolution, then I am afraid it is not sufficient. What is required perhaps is a statutory resolution of the House itself.

I would like to know from the Prime Minister what he sees in the game, by this new set-up because there was an old set-up which was not formalised like this, but it was an old set-up. There was the CCPA. Then there was a consultative committee which took the opinions of the Members of Parliament. There was also an Institute of Defence Studies and Analysis and also some other institutes, which

provided research papers to the Government. Then, of course, there is the Joint Intelligence Committee of the Cabinet Secretariat. These bodies were there. With the CCPA at the apex, it fitted in with our concept of Cabinet form of Government. Now, of course, it is a fact that under Mr. Vishwanath Pratap Singh's leadership, the CCPA has been thoroughly devalued, because it has become as big as eight Members. It has even brought in the Pepsi Cola Minister as a Member on the CCPA.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** You should not refer to any Minister as Pepsi Cola or Coca Cola. You should call by proper designation.

**SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY:** O.K. The Minister for Food Processing has been now brought in as a Member of the CCPA. I cannot understand how the original concept of CCPA was not any Minister and any Minister. So, this has been devalued. Of course, at other levels also devaluation has taken place. There was a Minister for Kashmir Affairs when there was a Home Minister and the Energy Minister is frequently despatched to the Middle East in place of the Foreign Minister. This has been going on. But I would like to know in what way have you really gained by this new set-up, except that you have devalued the Cabinet set-up. I would say perhaps in the National Security Council you should have the Petroleum Minister, because that is one of the more important Ministries. I am sure you will agree.

In all this that has been placed on the Table of the House, there is no mention of the development of the national security doctrine. They say there will be a position paper on this topic or that topic, but not about the comprehensive view. It begins by saying there is a need for wholistic approach today. But in the whole note there is no reference to the formulation of a National Security doctrine. If you are going to have a National Security Council without a National Security doctrine, what kind of a Council is it going to be?

The final point is that you are going to have 9 non-Ministers, non-Governmental officers and non-Government people in this set-up. Are you going to administer

[Shri Subramanian Swamy]

an oath of secrecy to them because they will be dealing with a fair amount of sensitive material? My sources in the Defence Ministry once again tell me...

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Would you tell me privately your sources?

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I met the Prime Minister, went to his residence and told him that one of his officials is involved with Mr. Hinduja in the Bofors. He has not taken any action. When I am certain that he will take action, I will tell him who are my sources in the Defence Ministry.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I only feel that in this House if we make any allegation...

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: What is the allegation, I would like to know.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am not putting any... (Interruptions)... just listen. The Defence Ministry is a sensitive Ministry and if sources are for good information, it does not make any harm but if your sources of information are finally going to pass some kind of a comment, it might be harmful to the interest of the country. I am only cautioning you to be careful because you are a senior Member of this House.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Madam, I have been a member of the Defence Committee of Parliament for many, many years.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is reason why I said that.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I also know that this country is a democratic country. We are not at war with anybody. If in this House I am to restrict my freedom of opinion because you have some imagined fear that some neighbour of ours is going to benefit...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have no fear at all.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: We should, therefore go case by case.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am not fearing about anything. I have a job to do which I am only doing.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: If I am a responsible Member, then, I know what will be of value of the enemy, and I know what is not of value to the enemy. It is my discretion. Since I have not been administered any oath of secrecy, if I come into some information which I think the people should know irrespective of what the Chairman says, I will inform the people about it as long as it is not in violation of the rules of the House.

So I would like to say that according to my sources in the Defence Ministry, the military is extremely agitated about this National Security Council because they feel that it would involve interaction with the civilians outside the governmental system and perhaps access of such people to sensitive documents and, therefore, may make this agency open to penetration by foreign powers.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: I share this information. I have got some information.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please keep your information to yourself. Let him at least devise the information. One source is good enough.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: If you listen to me, you learn a lot more. I have many sources in other Departments.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't make a speech ask your clarifications.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I am asking a clarification.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then ask a clarification.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: You are only all the time...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please ask your clarification and don't make any comment.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I am asking a clarification.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ask and finish because I have other names.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Yes, I know you have other names. If you don't want me to speak just tell me, I will sit down. That is your intention

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I strongly object to it. I have no intention for any Member not to speak. But please speak on the subject concerned and ask your clarification.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I am speaking on the subject concerned.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Put questions only.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I am putting a question and I cannot put a question like a school boy. I have to put as a Member of Parliament. I am giving the source of information I have had and I would like to know from the Prime Minister as a precaution before he appoints members to this Council from outside the governmental system, whether he would have their antecedents checked by the Intelligence Bureau and that they be administered in oath of secrecy before they are taken on the Council.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Under which law an oath of secrecy?

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Wel, that is something for him to say because he came here rushing, perhaps. I do not know why on a Friday evening. It is for him to specify but there should be some method by which these officials should be held accountable once they join the Council. Thank you.

SHRI SHABBIR AHMAD SALARIA (Jammu and Kashmir): Madam Deputy

Chairman, the statement of the hon. Prime Minister with regard to the constitution of the National Security Council talks of firstly, the National Security Council. Secondly, it talks of Security Advisory Board and thirdly, it talks of Strategic Core Group. I would request the hon. Prime Minister to kindly make the statement more elaborate so as to remove the doubts in my mind that these three groups, these three institutions, sought to be created will not be something overlapping among them. The second question is with regard to the Members on the National Security Council. What I find is that in the statement it is said that it will include the Minister of Defence, the Finance Minister, the Home Minister, the External Affairs Minister, the other Union Ministers and the Chief Ministers of the States will also be associated as and when necessary. The Chief Ministers again find their names in the Security Advisory Board. It will consist of the Chief Ministers, Members of Parliament, academicians, scientists and other persons. So will he kindly clarify as to how these Chief Ministers are to be chosen for the Security Council and then for the Board and this Core Group to which a reference has been made?

The third question is, it will have representatives of three services and Ministries concerned. What do we mean by Ministries concerned according to the estimation of the hon. Prime Minister? The next clarification sought is with regard to the Advisory Board meeting only twice a year in the matters of defence and the security of the nation. Twice a year is a rider which I think should not have been there. The hon. Prime Minister may kindly clarify as to why twice a year, in particular, has been pointed out there.

Fourthly, he has said that the purpose will be to achieve national consensus. I would like to know whether in order to obtain national consensus, the Members of the parties other than the parties in power, any representatives, will also be associated with any of these three tiers which have been thus created by the hon. Prime Minister.

[Shri Shabbir Ahmed Salaria]

Last but not least, I will tell the hon. Prime Minister to kindly ensure that this will not bring into being a much more cumbersome machinery and thereby delaying the arriving at of conclusions which have to be arrived at quickly when matters develop with regard to our defence and internal security. I have a doubt that this may create a cumbersome machinery thereby making it difficult for the Prime Minister and those responsible for running the country in arriving at conclusions. These are my submissions.

**श्री सुरेश पचौरी (मध्य प्रदेश) :** मंडम मेरा नाम नहीं आया है ?

**उपसभापति :** अभी आप बैठिये ।

**SHRI MADHAUSINH SOLANKI (Gujarat) :** Madam, I would like to know from the Prime Minister as to what exactly is new and innovative about the National Security Council. Will the Prime Minister please elaborate as to what are the deficiencies of the existing arrangement with the national security system which has evolved after years of experience and how the proposed system is going to set right these deficiencies? If the new set up is in a sense as just now told by the Prime Minister a sub-Committee of the existing CCPA, why not just reorganise the existing system instead of creating a separate National Security Council? Thank you.

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र :** उप-सभापति महोदया, मेरा पहला पॉइंट यह है कि प्रेसीडेंसियल फार्म, खासकर अमेरिका में जो नेशनल सेक्युरिटी काउंसिल है, उससे इसमें फर्क है ? किन बिंदुओं में ये इससे अलग है ? इसको जरा प्रधान मंत्री साफ कर दें । दूसरी बात, जो मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि और भी जो दुनिया के देश हैं, जहां कि कैबिनेट सिस्टम है जैसे ब्रिटेन है, वहां क्या इस तरह की नेशनल सेक्युरिटी काउंसिल है या क्या पद्धति है ।

**श्री कपिल वर्मा :** कैबिनेट कमेटी है... (व्यवधान)... एक कमेटी है ।

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र :** मैंने उन से पूछा था, आप बीच में क्यों ऑफिसिएट कर रहे हैं ।

(व्यवधान)

तीसरी बात, मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि इस रिजोल्यूशन में है कि स्ट्रेटेजिक कोर ग्रुप अंडर द कैबिनेट सेक्रेटरी एंड टास्क फोर्स—तो ये दोनों क्या वैसे नहीं बनाए जा सकते थे, वर्तमान पद्धति में नहीं बनाए जा सकते थे ? हम को लगता है कि वर्तमान पद्धति में भी बनाए जा सकते थे । एक और प्रश्न मेरा यह है कि एक्जिसटिंग सिस्टम में क्या डिफीकल्टीज आई जिससे कि यह बनाने की जरूरत पड़ी । इस बिंदु को भी साफ कर दें । एक और बिंदु पर बहुत-से माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा है कि यों डिफेंस सेक्रेटरी के बारे में टाइम-टू-टाइम कुछ-कुछ निकलता रहता है । इस को कैसे आप गारंटी करेंगे ? यह फर्दर वाइडर होगा ।

इन्हीं चार-पांच बिंदुओं पर मैं माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी से स्पष्टीकरण चाहूंगा ।

**DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh) :** Madam, we are very thankful to the hon. Prime Minister who has come out with this *suo motu* statement which is a commitment of the National Front Government to the people. After all, the country cannot be governed by a coterie and decisions cannot be taken by a coterie and decisions cannot be taken try if such a method is continued. That is why we are very thankful to the National Front Government for taking up this issue of democratisation of the thinking by taking the patriotic sections into confidence with regard to our internal and external security arrangement. I want to point out that there is a low-intensity war going on today against our country. This has to be faced. We do not know when it is going to hot up. So also there are regional imbalances that have developed. In such a big country with so many languages, these imbalances are flaring up into various conflagrations. We have problems in the South, East, West and the North. Everywhere we have problems. That is why, a constant study is required and this study and advice to the Cabinet are intended by this step. I think this is democratisation of a process of the country.

This is trying to get the patriotic forces, patriotic scientists involved in the thinking process on defence and ultimately to get process on defence and ultimately to get internal and external, without the participation of people and without the help of people, cannot function in any country. That is why it cannot be compared with other countries' security arrangements. This is something evolved in the tradition of our freedom and national movements. That is why we are very thankful to the hon. Prime Minister for making this *suo motu* statement and certain policy changes that are required to change the entire atmosphere of the security arrangement. Security does not mean only certain functioning, but it means the total involvement of the people of our country, the patriotic sections of the country and the scientists and others in the country both in advising the Government and in having a careful watch over the developments that are taking place both internally and externally, that they build up a kind of scientific opinion as to how to tackle all these issues. Madam, I come from Andhra Pradesh. We have got the Naxalite problem. Why has the Naxalite problem developed? There had been no land reforms in Andhra Pradesh strictly implemented and there had been disparity in land-holdings. And there is a tribal areas where people do not have security of land and do not get the benefits of their produce. They are losing the rights over the forests. Like that, certain things are developing and we must try to go into all these matters and try to understand what the problems are that are existing, both for internal security and for external security. That is why I thank the hon. Prime Minister for making this *suo motu* statement which will enlarge the thinking of our people on both internal and external security and will also elicit the patriotic opinion in the country to fight for our unity and integrity.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Vishvjit P. Singh, Please briefly ask your questions.

**SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH:** I shall, be putting straight questions. I will not be getting involved in any preamble.

My first question, Madam Deputy Chairman, deals with para 2 of the Resolution. Para 2 of the Resolution mentions: 'The domestic situation is also changing as the process of development releases new energies and raises aspiration which, in many regions, have strained the social fabric and the administrative structure'. I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister what he is referring to when he talks of 'the process of development releases new energies and raises new aspirations which have strained the social fabric and the administrative structure'. What is he referring to and is he specifically referring to the Mandal Commission? I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister what he is referring to when he goes on to say that 'these trends, if allowed to go unchecked, could undermine the nation's integrity and unity'. What are the threats which have been created and what is the time-frame in which they have been further to para 4. He talks of the main endeavour of the National Security Council and he mentions various subjects for the consideration of the Council. Is it not a fact that subjects (a), (b) and (c) will impinge upon the functioning of the Defence Ministry, subject (d) on Home subject (e) on Home and Social Welfare, subject (f) on Finance and Commerce, subject (g) on Energy, Commerce and Agriculture, subjects (h) and (i) on Home and External Affairs? What is the basis of these present Cabinet Committees—Cabinet Committee on Political Affairs, Cabinet Committee on External Affairs and Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs? Are they not sufficient? Is this going to be Cabinet Committee? And as the hon. Prime Minister has said that this is going to be subordinate to the Cabinet Committee on Political Affairs, why is it not mentioned in the Resolution itself that this is going to be subordinate to that Committee? I is not mentioned, is it going to be amended? If it going to be subordinate or is it going to be a

[Shri Vishvjit P. Singh]

separate Committee? If it is going to be of a new Government for all practical purposes because these areas are so widespread and so all-encompassing that it is like forming a parallel Government.

Going at para 5 and para 6 I have a problem. The hon. Prime Minister talks of the National Security Council and then he talks of a Secretariat. It is mentioned that the National Security Council shall be assisted by a Strategic Core Group. The Strategic Core Group will be comprising the Cabinet Secretary as Chairman and representatives of three Services, and the Secretariat will be headed by a Secretary. The Secretariat will service the Strategic Core Group. And then he goes on to talk about what the Core Group is going to do. The Core Group will supervise the submission of appropriate studies, papers and reports to the National Security Council and who will prepare these reports? The Task Force. And what is the Task Force to consist of? Its membership will be drawn from the Ministries and the agencies dealing with the security issues within the Government. And at the end of para 7, he goes on to say, "Why the Task Forces will be administratively attached to the Secretariat of the Security Council, they may request for expert assistance from agencies within or outside the Government." So, you contradict yourself in para 7. And the fact is that this will become like a super, super Government consisting of the Cabinet Secretary, the Defence Chiefs assisting him, and the Secretariat assisting him, and the experts called from outside the Government. Outside the Government and knowing your propensity for calling people from outside the Government... I would like to know who these experts are going to be. Why are you not satisfied with the present system? Going further, in para 8 you talk of the National Security Council meeting twice a year. How much different is it from the National Integration Council? Today the National Integration Council meets and you know the kind of agenda that is put forward in front of them? It

is more or less the same thing. The National Security Council will also be talking of in terms of this threat and that threat. The same thing will be done here also. How different is it from that? Once again I will participate in the debate and I am sure I will get an opportunity and I will request my leaders that I must be enabled to participate in the debate when I can say more on this subject. I feel that this is, as far as I am concerned creating a parallel Government through the backdoor which is not answerable to Parliament. This National Security Council will not be answerable to Parliament. It is not set up by any Act of Parliament. It is set up by merely laying a paper on the Table of the House, by merely making a *suo motu* statement and publishing it in the official gazette. This is creating a completely extra-constitutional authority in all-encompassing areas. The democrat in me—I believe there is a democrat in me—is very much upset; I am emotionally upset at the idea of an emergency coming into the country through the backdoor and creating a parallel Government which will not be answerable to Parliament. I would, therefore, like to know from the Prime Minister his very sincere answers to these specific questions. And I reserve my right to take part in the debate on this issue which will take place, hopefully, on Monday or Tuesday.

**SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:** Madam, first I will come to some of the fundamental issues before coming to the specific points. One broad point that has been raised is that this is something outside the Cabinet system, that it will erode the Cabinet system, it is a super-Government, it is a parallel Government. That is why I intervened immediately at the earlier stage so that some of the answers were availed of in the subsequent questions for clarifications. May I say that this is within the present Cabinet system? The National Security Council is a committee of the Cabinet. It is under the authority of the CCPA and the Cabinet. That is number one, it is within the existing system. Now you ask—the other point arises which Solanki raised—if it is within the existing system, where is the need for it? Today security—I am not



[Sbri Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

talking only of defence—involves aspects of home, economy, geo-political considerations as well as social alienation which, if not detected well in time, will develop into a major alienation and into a security threat ultimately. So what is being done—if we are bringing it within the present system, then what is new?—is to integrate all these aspects through a holistic approach so that a coordinated response is possible. It is institutionalising of this coordination that is being attempted by forming a National Security Council. Now the question arises whether that this will conflict administratively with various Ministries, as has been mentioned just now, over-lapping this Ministry or overlapping that Ministry. It is not overlapping, it is not conflicting; it is coordination. Already the present Cabinet system has got a Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs which takes individual decisions as well as policy decisions. Nobody says that this Cabinet Government on the economic side, all the other Ministries, that it comes into conflict with others, that it is a parallel Government on the economic side. No one has said it. But it has functioned well and we have tested it out and it has helped in co-ordination in the economic field. Therefore, the National Security Council will function within the Cabinet system. Just as in the economic field the Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs has contributed all these years to a co-ordinated approach on the economic side, on the security side, integrating Home External Affairs, Finance and Defence has been envisaged within the Cabinet system. I think this answers the broad questions that were raised and I think this will satisfy the honourable Members and their apprehensions that there will be a parallel Government or a super-Cabinet or overlapping of Ministries or Emergency need not be there.

Now, I come to the other question. One more general point I may make about the Strategic Core Group. It has been asked as to what it will be doing, whether it will become a superpower, it will be aside of the Government or apart from it and so on. Even today we have a core group the Group of Secretaries. We have a Committee of Secretaries functioning on almost

a very regular basis. But till now it has not come into conflict with others and I think these apprehensions are not well placed, because of the experience we already have, and I think the National Security Council which we have envisaged is within the Cabinet system.

As far Mr. Sukomal Sen's point of over-lapping on other Ministries, I think I have met it.

Then, NSC's relation with other Ministries. In fact, here we want to co-ordinate and there is a need for it. But we have seen that while sometimes co-ordination may be good, sometimes it has not been good. I think there are some problems. Here I do not mean any asperson on anybody or something like that. For instance, today, there is the Naxalite problem. Its genesis is very much in the socio-economic system, and one day it could become a threat. Now, on this, if tries, it could become a threat later. The Home Ministry treats it as a law and order we do not integrate those various Ministries and the Defence Ministry says, "Well, it has not come to us so far.". But once it does come, then it might be too late. So, it is integration in the present system which we have evolved.

Now, about the Advisory Board. It is basically to meet at least twice a year. But it does not mean only twice a year. The aim is to have a forum outside the Government also where we can get advice. It is an Advisory Board and it is not that access to sensitive information will be given. Some information, of course, will have to be shared; otherwise, the Board will not be able to play its role. But, certainly, it is not that in the Advisory Board more sensitive information is going to be shared openly. But it will be a very important thing to the Government because many people, many talented people, have got views about Defence and, that way, it can be very useful and it will be useful in giving information and in getting to know what the Government thinks and sharing it with the people.

Then, it has not come suddenly. A point was made that suddenly we have come with it. We have announce

[Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

ed it in our manifesto. I do not remember, but if my memory serves me right, I think it has also found a place in the president's Address. I cannot say for certain. But, as for as my memory goes, it was reflected there, and it was taken up in the Consultative Committee also. When the proposal first came various amendments were suggested by honourable Members and we took note of them and we changed it also. Mr. Murlidhar Bhandare knows it well and he is aware of it all. He is a good lawyer and he knows it well... (Interruptions)... Also, we have accommodated the views of the honourable Members of Parliament and also their recommendations. I went a second time to the Consultative Committee.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: You have retained...

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Yes, I have a right to retain my face... (Interruptions)

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: In a hurry... (Interruptions) And then you insisted on implementing it.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: It is not in a hurry.

We went again to the Consultative Committee, not in a hurry. There was a time gap. And after that we gave thought to it. So we were processing it since the very first day. Now we have several months. So it is not in a hurry. So I think the setting up of the National Security Council in the present context is not even one day late. In fact it should have been earlier. I should have been apologizing here for the delay rather than the haste (Interruptions).

If it has come to that, I am very happy, because you will be endorsing my point of view. Only the question of time can be debated.

Shri A. G. Kulkarniji raised the point whether the Defence Chiefs would be overruled. Maximum weightage is given to the advice that we get from the Army, Headquarters and the Chiefs. Even now every week I meet the Chiefs for consultations. If you see it, in the core all the three Chiefs are there. Sir they are very much involved now in a much larger role of the total security. Economic side will also be involved in a larger role of the security side. So there is no question of riding rough shod over the Chiefs, etc.

Kulkarniji raised the question of perspective plan. In fact, as soon as I assumed office I took the threats from there. And I have asked for an assessment of the security threat to the country—what is the perspective regarded, what should be our responses, and our weapon acquisition policy should follow those contours—not item by item canvas we should come to this. That but in a very larger perspective and exercise is on.

Now, in this Committee, Arun Singh Committee, we have the fullest confidence. Mr. Arun Singh has the knowledge and has capability and is very experienced in it—not that it will affect our defence capability but we can better use our money.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: I asked, what is the fate of C. Subramaniam perspective plan for defence?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Well, I cannot say about that. But in the Ministry we had prepared one exercise. I cannot specifically at this moment respond to that.

J. P. Mathurji raised a question about the Cabinet system in relation to the various Ministries. I may answer this. He asked whether this task force will be permanent. The concept is not a permanent task force. It will be of a specific assignment and will have well selected people in

which you can have confidence. For that assignment the task force will be there, with specialisation which is not there in the Government.

Certainly the National Security Council cannot be permanent, because then it shall be a carry-over of the previous Government into the next one.

One thing, and that was also the general view, to which I may respond, which I forgot...*(Interruption)* On hope one spends the whole life.

Then, one general point raised was that when there is the CCPA why the National Security Council has come. Now, the choice that the Prime Minister has—information by the CCPA—is entirely his political judgment where he can draw upon and nobody has questioned it. Nobody has questioned it. But the National Security Council is functional. Certainly the Minister concerned is the most important one by designation Defence Minister, Home Minister, Finance and External Affairs Minister.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: That was the original concept of CCPA.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Well, not necessarily. You have seen the functioning of it and we should go by the functioning of it. *(Interruptions)* That was not the original function.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: What is this National Security Committee of the Cabinet?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: So far I am not aware of the Committee of the Cabinet.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: If you call it National Security Committee of the Cabinet, what is your objection to calling it that?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: One thing is that here also the flexibility is given. If you feel that someone important enough in whom the Government has confidence is there, you can involve him at the National Security Council level itself. But if you call it a committee totally only of this, then perhaps the flexibility may not be there.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Is it not dangerous to have outsiders there? How will you ensure secrecy? How can you guess that you can give information to him?

SHRI MADAN BHATIA : That is in fact the real reason why you are constituting it that is why you are having this extra constitutional authority. You cannot play with the words.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: You are a lawyer. You should not get worked up. A lawyer should never get worked up.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER. Mr. Prime Minister, lawyers always pretend to be angry.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: That is why I am not getting infected by his anger.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Will this Council have authoritarian power overriding the power of the Cabinet itself?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: No, it will not have. The Cabinet and the CCPA will be the final authority over this National Security Council. It is only an enabling thing. After all, we are all outside the Government. We come into the Government. It is not that anyone from outside will be compulsorily there. He may not be necessarily permanent. He can be invited for one meeting for a particular thing. We can only listen to him and not necessarily discuss. So, this flexibility is there.

**SHRI KAPIL VERMA:** The problem is that of security.

**SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:** Not so, if we are secure. I think patriotism is not confined only to those who take oath.

**SHRI KAPIL VERMA:** How can you give sensitive defence information to outsiders?

**SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:** Leave it to us. What is to be given only that will be given and to the level it should be given. Mathurji asked whether the present papers which have studies will be cancelled. No. No. Why should the present papers be cancelled? They will be made use of. He asked whether they are already gazetted or not. This resolution is not yet gazetted. I have asked the House into confidence. Bhandareji mentioned about Consultative Committee. I have answered that. (Interruptions) When I come to that, I will answer it. I have answered most of the points. The points of Mr. Verma have also been covered. Sahuji said;

7.00 P.M.

भावनाओं से नहीं चलता । भावनाओं से नहीं चलता है लेकिन प्रतिबद्धता से चलता है और वह प्रतिबद्धता जो है वह हम लोगों ने दी है अपने मैनिफेस्टो में हमारे प्रेमिडेंट एड्रेस में है । हम लोगों ने रिपीटेडली कंसल्टेटिव कमेटी में कहा है तभी यह नेशनल सेक्योरिटी कौंसिल लाये है, भावनाओं से नहीं आया है अपने प्रतिबद्धताओं से आया है, जो जनता से कहा है उसको पूरा करने के लिए आया है । कुछ भावनाओं से भी देश चलता है । आखिर झंडे को आप कपड़ा कह दें और अपने राष्ट्रीय गीत को गाना कह दें तो कैसे होगा । कुछ भावनाओं से भी चलता है, बिना उसके नहीं चलता है । एक झंडा और गाना इन भावनाओं से पूरा राष्ट्र चलता है ।

**श्री रजनी रंजन साहू :** प्रतिबद्धता की ओर ज्यादा जल्दी-जल्दी चल रहे हैं...

**श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह :** चल रहे हैं और चलेंगे । आप उसके साथ कदम मिलाइये हो सके तो । हम उसी रफ्तार से चलेंगे । संवैधानिक रूप के बारे में मैंने बता दिया कि केबिनेट सिस्टम के अंदर काम करेगा इसलिए संवैधानिक से आगे कोई बात नहीं है । सी० सी० पी० ए० के बारे में बता दिया, खर्चे के बारे में बता दिया । हां, अन्य मंत्रालयों से इस पर विचार हुआ उसके बाद ही यह बना । दिग्विजय सिंह जी ने पालिटिकल सिच्युएशन के बारे में ये जो कहा है वह सही है । जो रेजोलूशन में कहा गया है उसके बारे में कहा गया है । एकाउंटेबिलिटी किस की होगी ? जो केबिनेट की कमेटी है उसकी एकाउंटेबिलिटी होती है, पार्लियामेंट की होती है, हम सब लोगों की एकाउंटेबिलिटी है ।

Shabbir Ahmadji mentioned whether the other Parties also will be involved in this Advisory Board. Yes, other Parties will be involved in the Advisory Board.

Madhavsingh Solanki, raised a point that if it is in the present way, what is new about it, and what were the deficiencies. I have mentioned that. I answered it earlier that it is within the system. The innovative thing about it is, it is institutionalising the coordination that is needed today for responses, to detect pretty early the threats, and take action on all fronts rather than Departmentally which has caused us problems.

Chaturanan Mishraji asked: in the USA, what is the pattern? It is an entirely different pattern. It is a separate system. This is within the Cabinet system. And he has asked what has been the British system. The British system has these Committees. In the United Kingdom, the

National Security mechanism consists of Parliamentary Committees or Sub-Committees, of which the Defence Committee of Parliament to oversee the Defence Committees, and the Intelligence Security Committee of the Cabinet are the most important. These are Committees of Parliament. We have not set up the Committee system here. So, in our context, we have formed this National security Council.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: There is a Cabinet also.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Well, now the Security Council is a Committee of the Cabinet.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Since you are on this issue, will you consider strengthening the Defence Committee of the Parliament? That is also very important.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: We have the Consultative Committee.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: It is only consultative.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: We can give thought to that. At least, at the moment, it will not be possible to give an assurance. But, certainly, I have noted your suggestion.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: That will be good.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Vijaya Mohan Reddyji mentioned about the Naxalite threat and how the socio-economic factors lead to alienation and security problems. It is better to do when we see it there, and we take steps for socio-economic justice earlier rather than when it becomes a law and order problem. We will secure our integrity and ensure the security of the nation.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: Mr. Prime Minister, are you making another statement on Monday?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Why? Now you have asked for this. I will be ready for it on Monday also. Whenever you are...

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: One statement a day.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: After raising all these issues, please have some interest. Please have some patience.

Vishvjitji said, why is it not mentioned in the Notification, the relationship with the CCPA and all that. The point is well taken. This has not yet been issued. We can mention that clearly.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Thank you.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Then, I have answered about the core group becoming extra powerful. Even today, we have these structures. But the benefit of this will be that within the Government, with the expertise that we have got collected and co-ordinated, co-ordinated approaches and suggestions will come.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Mr. Prime Minister, will you yield for a minute? Your previous experiment in co-ordination resulted in a total failure. I would like to warn you that this experiment...

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: ...will also fail.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Let me complete my statement. I would like to warn him. What is the guarantee that this experiment will not suffer exactly the same fate? You do remember that you tried this experiment in Kashmir, when you appointed Mr. George Fernandes as the Minister for Kashmir Affairs.

**SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:** This is a political point. I can also make several political points in regard to Kashmir; lack of co-ordination, etc., that led to this situation. Let us not go into it.

Madam, the structure is already existing in various forms at present. We have the experience. They have been working well. There is no need for such an apprehension. The Cabinet Committee on Political Affairs co-ordinates with various Ministries at the Cabinet level. We have the Committee of Secretaries which co-ordinates at the Secretaries' level. This has not created any problem. This apprehension is not there.

I think I have covered all the points made by hon. Members.

**SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY:** What about the national security doctrine?

**SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:** I am sorry, Mr. Subramanian Swamy. That page I have...

**SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY:** ...thrown it away?

**SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:** About the doctrine of nation-

nal security I mentioned that the study is being made; the assessment of security threat, our response to it and other details. I have stated that we have a strategic defence policy. If you see in this Resolution, there is a mention of the strategic defence policy and it is included.

**SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY:** The point is, is there a comprehensive statement as to what the Government would do in the face of certain threats? I wanted to know about the doctrine.

**SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:** The doctrine is included. Now, how much should be stated and how much should not be stated, let us leave it to the Council.

**SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY:** Doctrinaire approach.

**SHRI KAPIL VERMA:** It was in the original paper given to us.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The House is now adjourned and we will meet again on Monday, at 11 a.m.

The House then adjourned at eight minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 27th August, 1990.