

2

**STANDING COMMITTEE
ON DEFENCE
(1996-97)**

ELEVENTH LOK SABHA

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

*[Action taken on the Recommendations contained in the 6th Report of the
Committee (Tenth Lok Sabha) on the subject 'Defence Policy, Planning
and Management']*

SECOND REPORT



सत्यमेव जयते

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

December, 1996/Agrahayana, 1918 (Saka)

SECOND REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
DEFENCE
(1996-97)

(ELEVENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

[Action taken on the Recommendations contained in the 6th Report of the
Committee (Tenth Lok Sabha) on the subject 'Defence Policy, Planning and
Management']

Presented to Lok Sabha on 4 DEC 1996
Laid in Rajya Sabha on



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

December, 1996/Agrahayana, 1918 (Saka)

COD No. 02

Price : Rs. 10.00

© 1996 By LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Eighth Edition) and printed by Akashdeep Printers, 20 Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi-110002.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
CHAPTER I Report.....	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations/Observations which have been accepted by Government.....	5
CHAPTER III Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's Replies	12
CHAPTER IV Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee	15
CHAPTER V Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of Government are still awaited.....	17
Minutes of the sitting	18
APPENDIX Analysis of action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the 6th Report of the Standing Committee on Defence (Tenth Lok Sabha).....	20

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON DEFENCE
(1996-97)

CHAIRMAN

Shri B.K. Gadhvi

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Jaswant Singh
3. Smt. Sushma Swaraj
4. Shri Banwari Lal Purohit
5. Shri Baburao Paranjpe
6. Lt. Gen. Shri Prakash Mani Tripathi
7. Shri Rajendra Agnihotri
8. Dr. Chhatrapal Singh
9. Dr. Vallabhbhai Kathiria
10. Shri Ram Chandra Benda
11. Shri Nihal Chand
12. Col. Sona Ram Choudhury
13. Dr. Mallikarjun
14. Shri Shivraj V. Patil
- *15. Shri Rajesh Pilot
16. Shri P. Upendra
17. Shri P. Namgyal
18. Maj. Gen. Bikram Singh
19. Smt. Nisha Amarsinh Chaudhary
20. Shri H.D. Kumaraswamy
21. Shri Hannan Mollah
22. Shri A. Sampath
23. Shri C. Narasimhan
24. Shri Pratap Singh

* Ceased to be member w.e.f. 8.10.96

25. Shri T. Nagaratnam
26. Shri Raja Ram Parasram Godse
27. Shri Nitish Kumar
28. Shri Major Singh Uboke
29. Shri Madhavrao Scindia
- *30. Shri Suresh Kalmadi

Rajya Sabha

31. Shri Sushil Kumar Sambhajirao Shinde
32. Shri Peter S. Alphonse
33. Shri Lachman Singh
34. Shri Satchidananda
35. Shri Surendra Kumar Singh
36. Shri K.R. Malkani
37. Shri Satish Agarwal
38. Shri N. Thangaraj Pandian
39. Shri Adhik Shirodkar
40. Shri Suresh A. Keswani
- **41. Prof. Ram Kapse

SECRETARIAT

1. Dr. A.K. Pandey — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri V.N. Gaur — *Director*
3. Shri Pawan Kumar — *Committee Officer*

* Nominated w.e.f. 8.10.96.

** Nominated w.e.f. 5.11.96.

INTRODUCTION

1. The Chairman, Standing Committee on Defence (1996-97) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Second Report on Action Taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Sixth Report of the Committee (Tenth Lok Sabha) on the subject 'Defence Policy, Planning and Management'.

2. The Sixth Report was presented to Lok Sabha/laid in Rajya Sabha on 8th March, 1996. The Government furnished their replies indicating action taken on the recommendations contained in the Report on 4th October, 1996. The Draft Report was considered and adopted by the Standing Committee on Defence (1996-97) at their sitting held on 4th November, 1996.

3. An analysis of action taken by Government on recommendations contained in the Sixth Report of the Standing Committee on Defence (Tenth Lok Sabha) is given in Appendix.

4. For reference facility and convenience, the observations/recommendations of the Committee have been printed in thick type in the body of the Report.

NEW DELHI;
November 20, 1996
Kartika 29, 1918 (Saka)

B.K. GADHVI,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Defence.

CHAPTER I

REPORT

1. This Report of the Committee deals with the action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in their Sixth Report (Tenth Lok Sabha) on the subject 'Defence Policy, Planning and Management' which was presented to Lok Sabha on 8th March, 1996.

2. Action Taken Notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 16 recommendations/observations contained in the Report. These have been categorised as follows:—

- (i) Recommendations/Observations which have been accepted by Government :
Sl. Nos. 3 to 6, 10 to 13, 15 & 16.
- (ii) Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies:
Sl. Nos. 7 to 9 & 14.
- (iii) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee :
Sl. Nos. 1 & 2.
- (iv) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of Government are still awaited :
Nil

3. The Committee will now deal with the action taken by the Government on some of their recommendations.

India's National Defence Policy

Recommendation (S. No. 1, Para No. 1.18)

4. The Committee were informed that there was no formal written document called India's National Defence Policy. The Committee felt that in the absence of any document explaining articulated policy with stated national objectives and national interests it was not possible for the policy to be analysed and modified. The Committee, therefore, desired the Government to examine the

feasibility of preparing a formal National Defence Policy document for being placed before the Parliament.

5. In the reply, the Ministry have stated that India has a comprehensive policy on strategic and security issues, based *inter alia* on, our threat perceptions and the global and regional security environment. This policy is kept continuously under review in the light of such developments which impact on the national security. Government have considered the suggestion that a formal National Defence Policy document be prepared for being placed before the Parliament. Government wish to submit that absence of such a written document should not be construed to imply the non-existence of the policy. It is a result of a conscious decision that such a document has not been published.

6. The Committee are not convinced by the argument given by the Ministry in the favour of not having a written National Defence Policy Document. While not suggesting that the Ministry should furnish their long-term perspective plan or other similar documents, the Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation of having a formal National Defence Policy document, based on our national objectives & threat perceptions.

National Security Council

Recommendation (Sl. No. 2, Para No. 1.29)

7. The Committee had felt that the Government should urgently come up with the formal institutional mechanism with adequate support structures to monitor the state of our Defence preparedness and to oversee progress on Defence programmed modernisation/upgradation acquisition/re-equipment apart from achieving speedy decision making on crucial issues affecting national security.

8. In the reply the Ministry have *inter alia* stated that the Cabinet Secretariat were in the process of examining the re-structuring the National Security Council.

9. The Committee are not satisfied with the reply of the Government. The National Security Council was set up on 24 August, 1990. The National Security Advisory Board was also set up to provide a broader cross-section of views on the working of the National Security Council. The National Security Advisory Board which was required to meet at least twice a year has not met even once. The National Security Council met only once on 5 October, 1990. Then there was a change of Government. The new Governments have since been examining as to how they should re-structure this Council to holistically go into the question of national security. The Committee are dismayed to find that the Government are not serious about

activating the National Security Council and the National Security Advisory Board. These institutions were set up after years of deliberations and within a short period of time, these were found unworkable. Even the end of the process of reconstituting these high level Committees does not appear to be in sight despite repeated assurances by the Government both on the floor of the House and outside for nearly five years.

The challenges to national security are increasingly more complex. Its management, therefore, requires much higher levels of co-ordination among different Departments and Ministries of Government. A number of major decisions relating to national security particularly regarding nuclear option, missile programme, level of Defence expenditure etc., need to be taken after integrated and collegiate thinking. Though mechanisms and systems do exist for consideration of such issues but the same have not been satisfactory as has been stated by the Government themselves. The Committee desire that the Government should take expeditious action for restructuring and reactivation of the National Security Council without further delay and report to the Committee within a period of three months.

Funds for prioritised Defence Projects and Acquisitions

Recommendations (Sl. Nos. 4 & 6, Para Nos. 2.34, 2.35 and 2.37)

10. The Committee had impressed on the Government the imperative necessity for adequate availability of resources as to ensure that prioritised Defence acquisitions/projects/schemes and modernisation programmes were implemented within stipulated time-frame.

The Committee had desired that the Committee on Defence Planning, which consisted of Cabinet Secretary, Principal Secretary to PM, Defence Secretary, Secretary DP&S, Secretary R&D, Finance Secretary, Secretary Planning Commission, Secretary (R) in the Cabinet Secretariat and the three Service Chiefs, should make its role more meaningful and purposeful for securing allocation of resources for approved Defence Plans of minimum inescapable requirements.

The Committee had also liked the Government to evolve suitable mechanism to ensure that the Government must firmly commit the funds at least for those projects and acquisitions which were high on the priority list of the Defence.

11. The Ministry of Defence have in their action taken replies stated that the observations of the Committee regarding Defence allocations had been communicated to the Ministry of Finance, which made final allocations for Defence, through a written communication. The Ministry of Defence have also

stated that issue of inadequacy of allocations was brought to the notice of the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister. The Ministry were encouraged by the assurance given by the Finance Minister while presenting the General Budget, 1996-97, that, if required, more funds would be made available to equip and keep our Armed Forces in fighting fit condition.

12. Long term planning is of utmost necessity in case of Defence projects and acquisitions. The Seventh Defence Plan, 1985-90 could be finalised only in the last year of the Plan and the Eighth Defence Plan, 1990-95 and later changed to 1992-97 initiated in 1989 has not so far been finalised though we are in the last year of the Plan. A situation has arisen when the Government have not firmly committed funds for the Defence Budget for a year. Lack of resources to meet the immediate projected requirements has also been a major drawback of our Defence Planning.

In the absence of long term financial commitments a number of highly prioritised Defence projects and acquisitions have been pending for a long period. Some such proposals initiated as far back as 1984 are yet to fructify.

The Government do finalise the five year plans of the Civil sector well in time. Therefore, there is no reason for such long delays in finalising Defence Plans.

The Committee are not satisfied with the situation where Eighth Defence Plan from 1992-97 could not be finalised till the very end of the Plan period. The reasons given by the Ministry for non-finalisation of the Eighth Five Year Defence Plan indicate as if the Government are not taking the matter very seriously. This also reflects poorly on the Defence Planning mechanism of the Government. The Committee would like to be assured that the country's Defence preparedness will not be adversely affected by this delay.

The Committee, further, desire that the Ninth Defence Plan for the period 1997-2002 be finalised on time.

Draft Defence Plans for the period of five years are examined and finalised by the Committee on Defence Planning (CDP) having senior representatives of all agencies of Government responsible for making financial allocations for different sectors of the economy of the country as its members. The Committee would like the Government to mobilise additional resources and make provision for the outlay as visualised in the Defence Plans finalised by the CDP in the Defence Budget.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Sl. No. 3, Para No. 2.8)

The Committee, therefore, recommend that Ministry of Defence should make it a matter of policy to ensure a stable tenure of minimum two years for the post of Director-General, Defence Planning Staff so as to enable the Directorate to achieve its objectives.

Reply of the Government

The Director-General of Defence Planning Staff is selected from the three Services, in rotation. The recommendations of the Committee have been brought to the attention of the Service Chiefs.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 1(1)/96/PO(Def.) dated 04.10.96]

Recommendations (Sl. No. 4, Para Nos. 2.34 and 2.35)

.....The Committee are undoubtedly aware that there will always be competing demands in our developing economy from various sectors. The Committee desire that the Committee on Defence Planning should make its role more meaningful and purposeful for securing allocation of resources for approved Defence Plans of minimum inescapable requirements.

.....As the long-term Defence plans of the country have never taken off in real sense due to a variety of reasons particularly the absence of long-term financial commitments, the Committee would like the Government to evolve suitable mechanism as to ensure that the Government must firmly commit the funds at least for those projects and acquisitions which are high on the priority list of the Defence.

Reply of the Government

The observations of the Committee regarding the need for a firm commitment of resources have been conveyed to the Ministry of Finance whose privilege it is to make the final allocations for Defence.

The assessment of the Strategic and Technological Environment relevant to India's security has been carried out upto year 2000 and beyond. The long term

Perspective Plans of the Services prepared for the next 10-15 years are translated into five-year plans prioritising the modernisation schemes, Defence projects and acquisition plans.

The draft Defence Plans for the period of five years are then examined and finalised by the Committee on Defence Planning. Issue of inadequacy of allocations is brought to the notice of the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister. Ministry of Defence are encouraged by the assurance of the Finance Minister, while presenting the General Budget-1996-97, that "...if required more funds will be made available to equip and keep our Armed Forces in fighting fit condition".

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 1(1)/96/PO(Def.) dated 04-10-96]

Comments of the Committee

Please see para No. 12 of the Chapter I of the Report.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 5, Para No. 2.36)

The Committee also expect the Ministry to take adequate remedial measures to overcome the drawbacks noticed in the earlier plans and to ensure that finalisation of Ninth Defence Plan would be completed well ahead of the beginning of the plan and the firm commitment of the Government for allocation of resources would be available in time so that the targets fixed and the major projects scheduled for completion during the Plan are completed without cost and time overruns.

Reply of the Government

The observations of the Committee regarding the need for adequate remedial measures for removing the drawbacks noticed earlier and for ensuring timely action for finalisation of the Ninth Plan have been noted for compliance. Recommendations of the Committee regarding firm commitment for timely allocation of the resources, have also been conveyed to the Ministry of Finance.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 1(1)/96/PO(Def.) dated 04-10-96]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 6, Para No. 2.37)

The Committee regret that the 8th Defence Five Year Plan (1992-97) has not yet been finalised. The Committee are concerned that inadequate allocation will have adverse impact on many of the modernisation programmes and also result in deferring of priority programmes and procurements to the next Defence Plan.

The Committee would, therefore, like to impress on the Government the imperative necessity for adequate availability of resources as to ensure that

prioritised Defence acquisitions/projects/schemes and modernisation programmes are implemented within stipulated time-frame.

The Committee also recommend that the Government mobilise resources to provide a substantially additional outlay in the light of projections made by the Ministry of Defence to meet the minimum inescapable needs of the Services for modernisation vital for security of the country during the remaining period of Eighth Five Year Plan.

Reply of the Government

The observations of the Committee have been conveyed to the Ministry of Finance as the latter decides on the Defence allocations taking into account the overall availability of resources, the projected National Security concerns as outlined by the Ministry of Defence and the demands from the other sectors of the economy.

Inadequacy of the resources is a recurring phenomenon and the Defence allocation for 1996-97 has only compounded the difficulty. The position regarding the non-finalisation of the Eighth Defence Plan has already been explained to the Committee vide our note 1(7)/91/PO(Def.) Vol. II dated 21 December, 1995.

The Finance Minister's assurance, whilst presenting the General Budget, 1996-97 for more funds, if required, is encouraging. Additional resources in the last year of the Eighth Plan will not, however, be able to offset the overall shortfall experienced during the Eighth Plan period.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No.1(1)/96/PO(Def.) dated 04-10-96]

Comments of the Committee

Please see Para No. 12 of the Chapter I of the Report.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 10, Para No. 3.24)

The Committee further note that apart from problem in securing spareparts and ancillaries for ex-Soviet equipments, there are various other technology control regimes that are being established in the international system, and that are being very restrictive. The Committee therefore desire that DRDO should not only double its efforts to indigenise the equipment from ex-Soviet sources but also maximise self-reliance on Defence technology particularly in weapons development.

Reply of the Government

In order to overcome the hurdles in development of state-of-the-art systems

due to export restrictions under various technology regimes, a programme to develop critical and emerging technologies for future weapon systems in consortium with national Science & Technology agencies and industry has been launched which has made good progress.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 1(1)/96/PO(Def.) dated 04-10-96]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 11, Para No. 3.25)

The Committee would like the Ministry to chalk out a time-bound strategy in a mission-mode for maximum indigenisation of whole range of weapon systems in pursuance to the self-reliance report given by the Study Group headed by SA to Defence Minister. The Committee would like the Ministry to adhere to the targets fixed thereunder and impress upon the Ministry of Finance for making available adequate resources to achieve the targets set for self-reliance in this regard. The Committee would like to be apprised of the follow up action taken on the said Report.

Reply of the Government

In consonance with National Mission for enhancing Self-reliance in Defence systems, Defence Research and Development Organisation have already been vigorously pursuing a number of programmes in mission mode which include Combat improvement of T-72(M1) tank (AJEYA), development leading to production of MBT ARJUN, Light Combat Aircraft (LCA), Integrated Electronic Warfare Systems for three Services, Missile Systems, Naval Systems and development of critical & enabling technologies. Clearance for production accorded by the users during 1994-95 for DRDO developed systems such as AJEYA, ARJUN, EW Systems, 125 mm Soft Core tank ammunition etc. alone will lead to indigenous production value over Rs. 4000 crore during the coming years. With the progressive completion of development of other major systems and their variants/derivatives, the target of National Mission for enhancing Self-reliance of Defence Systems to raise the acquisitions from indigenous sources to the level of 70% of total annual Defence acquisition by the year 2005 would be realised.

In order that progress of self-reliance mission is supported by adequate funds, the Government are committed to progressively increase the budget allocation for Defence R&D, from the present 5.3% to 10% of Defence budget by the year 2000.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 1(1)/96/PO(Def.) dated 04-10-96]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 12, Para No. 3.26)

The Committee are of the view that due to resource crunch in the Government of India during the last several years, Defence preparedness is not receiving the attention it deserves. Cuts in the budget allocation for Defence have hampered the modernisation of the Indian Armed Forces. As a result India could not keep pace with hostile neighbours in acquiring and upgrading its weaponry. Defence funding has been just adequate and barely sufficient to meet inescapable requirements and to maintain the required operational levels.

Reply of the Government

The observations and recommendations of the Committee have been conveyed to the Ministry of Finance, who make the determination on the final allocation for the Ministry of Defence (MoD), after considering the overall availability of funds, the requirement of funds projected by the Ministry of Defence, the National Security concerns projected by the MoD and the competing demands for resources from other Ministries/Departments of the Government. The Finance Minister, in his budget speech while presenting the General Budget, 1996-97, has assured that "...if required, more funds will be made available to equip and keep our Armed Forces in fighting fit condition".

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 1(1)/96/PO(Def.) dated 04.10.96]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 13, Para No. 3.27)

No country can afford compromise on its Defence preparedness and complacency in dealing with matters concerning national security. In view of the threat posed by rapid military build up and modernisation of Armed Forces and other new generation Defence capabilities in the neighbourhood, the Committee desire that Government should accord priority to modernisation and upgradation of weapon systems, chalking out a phased induction programme for new weapon systems, aircrafts and ships for qualitative improvement of offensive capabilities and maintaining combat effectiveness of the Services.

Reply of the Government

The modernisation and upgradation of the equipment and weapon systems of the equipment and weapon systems of the Armed Forces is a continuous and on-going process to which Government attach the highest priority. A concerted exercise is undertaken every year, in consultation with the Service headquarters, to determine the modernisation priorities. This exercise must necessarily be predicated on the resources available and earmarked for this purpose.

Developments in the immediate neighbourhood, the regional security environment and other global events that could impact on our national security are continuously kept under review. Appropriate measures are taken from time to time to maintain the required and adequate level of Defence preparedness.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 1(1)/96/PO(Def.) dated 04-10-96]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 15, Para No. 3.29)

The following issues which have also come to notice of the Committee deserve consideration by the Government:

- (i) Our Armed forces personnel deserve better compensation for the hazard of their profession and the rigorous of their daily lives.
- (ii) Adequate allocation of resources for indigenous development/production of major Defence equipments within laid down time-frame should be ensured.
- (iii) Commitment of a fixed percentage of the gross domestic product say four per cent, to be allocated to Defence outlays to enable the Services, long-term planning, acquisitions/re-equipment and research and development for maintaining superior offensive capabilities.

Reply of the Government

The proposals of the Defence Services for better compensation for the hazards of their profession and the rigours of their daily lives are before the Fifth Pay Commission.

The issue of adequacy, or otherwise, of the allocation of resources for indigenous development/production of major Defence equipments within the laid down time-frame is a matter of concern for the Ministry of Defence. Critical technologies required for the indigenous development and production of these systems and to effect their deliveries to the Services have been identified. Though Government are committed to provide adequate resources to support the indigenous development and production of these systems, the technological problems, developments of sources for input materials and their timely supply in desired quantity and quality also impact on achieving the development and production within the laid down time-frames.

Observations and recommendations of the Committee for adequate allocation of resources and commitment of a fixed percentage of Gross Domestic Product to be allocated to Defence Outlays have been conveyed to the Ministry of Finance for suitable action.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 1(1)/96/PO(Def.) dated 04-10-96]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 16, Para No. 3.38)

....The Committee, however, desire that the Government should undertake quinquennial review of the performance of JIC after ascertaining the views of the user agencies by an Expert Committee consisting of *inter alia* experts independent of the Government with a view to revamping this organisation so as to provide accurate and effective intelligence assessment for systematic and efficient long-term planning in critical areas of Defence preparedness.

Reply of the Government

The observations and the recommendations of the Committee have been conveyed to the Cabinet Secretariat. The role and function of the Joint Intelligence Committee is being considered by the appropriate authorities in the Government.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 1(1)/96/PO(Def.) dated 04-10-96]

CHAPTER III

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF GOVERNMENT'S REPLIES

Recommendation (Sl. No. 7, Para No. 2.46)

The Committee are, however, of the opinion that the long-term planning in Defence has been highly erratic due to preoccupation of higher military establishment with operational role, inadequate attention to the planning and force development components and absence of direct interaction with other Government agencies and departments. The Committee feel that the issue requires in-depth study and analysis as to find ways and means to enhance the level of interaction and ensure better co-ordination amongst the Service Headquarters, the Ministry and other Government agencies and departments.

Reply of the Government

There is continuous and on-going interaction between senior levels of the Armed Forces including the Chiefs of the Staff, Ministry of Defence and the other agencies and departments of the Government.

The Service Chiefs alongwith Cabinet Secretary, Principal Secretary to the PM, Foreign Secretary, Defence Secretary, Secretary (Defence Production and Supplies) and Scientific Adviser to the Raksha Mantri also meet the Raksha Mantri regularly every week apart from other meetings that are taken by the Prime Minister and the Raksha Mantri etc.

The Service Chiefs, in the existing scenario, have a clearly defined role within the Governmental system. Ministry of Defence draw heavily on the professional and technical expertise of the Service Chiefs for all Defence related matters, including the long term perspective planning. Integration beyond this point would be fraught with the drawbacks of losing out on independent in-depth analyses and re-evaluation of proposed policies.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 1(1)/96/PO(Def.) dated 04-10-96]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 8, Para No. 2.47)

The Committee would also like the Ministry to examine the possibilities of appointment of Advisors, who may among others be retired Senior Services Officers, in the Ministry of Defence to provide professional expertise in the

working of the Ministry besides acting as yet another source of advice outside the ambit of military discipline.

Reply of the Government

Advice is available to the Ministry of Defence from a large body of retired Service personnel, the Institute of Defence Studies and Analyses and other qualified professional military and security analysts. Government invite advice, whenever necessary, on a case-by-case basis.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 1(1)/96/PO(Def.) dated 04-10-96]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 9, Para No. 2.52)

The Committee note that Joint Chiefs of Staff/Chief of Defence Staff has been preferred in major countries to efficiently meet the needs of the Armed Forces and for integrated planning and unified command. In India, we do not have a system of Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Ministry have explained the position stating that the requirement of our Armed Forces is to function within the geographical limits of our country and the control of operations by Service Chiefs through their field commanders, unlike, United States where military has a global role to play.

The Committee feel that in-depth study of the system of Joint Chiefs of Staff and its relevance in the Indian context may be immediately undertaken.

Reply of the Government

The recommendation of the Committee has been noted. As the Indian Armed Forces are unlikely to be called upon to mount an Inter-Service operation on a global scale, like the United States of America, the current system of the Chiefs of Staff Committee with the senior-most Chief serving as the Chairman, would suffice.

The proposed Joint Chiefs of Staff contemplates a global military role, wherein the Chiefs would not retain command of their respective forces.

Government after careful consideration and drawing on the experience since independence, have opted for the current system.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 1(1)/96/PO(Def.) dated 04-10-96]

Recommendation (Sl.No. 14, Para No.3.28)

In view of the change in the strategic environment and developments of military significance in the neighbourhood having bearing on the security of the

nation the Committee feel that the time has come when the Government should review their Technology Demonstrator—Agni missile project and that a decision is expeditiously taken to go in for serial production of this strategic missile for induction into the Armed Forces.

Reply of the Government

'Agni' is a re-entry technology demonstration project, which has been successfully completed and all the objectives have been met. The 'AGNI' project did not envisage development of a missile system. The decision to develop and produce a missile system based on AGNI technologies, however, can be taken at an appropriate time consistent with the then prevailing threat perception and global/regional security environment.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 1(1)/96/PO(Def.) dated 04-10-96]

CHAPTER IV

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH REPLIES OF GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE

Recommendation (Sl.No. 1, Para No.1.18)

The Committee are informed that there is no formal written document called India's National Defence Policy. However, these are guidelines, these are the objectives which are being strictly followed and observed since Independence while conducting the Defence Policy. There is a policy but there is no policy document. In the absence of any document explaining articulated policy with stated national objectives and national interests it is not possible for the policy to be analysed and modified. The Committee, therefore, desire the Government to examine the feasibility of preparing a formal National Defence Policy document for being placed before the Parliament.

Reply of the Government

India has a comprehensive policy on strategic and security issues, based *inter alia* on, our threat perceptions and the global and regional security environment. This policy is kept continuously under review in the light of such developments which impact on the national security. Government have considered the suggestion that a formal National Defence Policy document be prepared for being placed before the Parliament. Government wish to submit that absence of such a written document should not be construed to imply the non-existence of the policy. It is a result of a conscious decision that such a document has not been published. There are several well defined guidelines and objectives on Defence matters which are strictly observed while conducting our Defence Policy.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 1(1)/96/PO(Def.) dated 04-10-96]

Comments of the Committee

Please see Para No.6 of the Chapter I of the Report.

Recommendation (Sl.No. 2, Para No. 1.29)

The Committee are not sure whether under the intended 'flexible arrangements', separate Committees/groups of Ministers for different aspects of national security would attain the desired objectives. The Committee, however, feel that the Government should urgently come up with formal institutional

mechanism with adequate support structures to monitor the state of our Defence preparedness and to oversee progress on Defence programmed modernisation/upgradation acquisition/re-equipment apart from achieving speedy decision making on crucial issues affecting national security.

Reply of the Government

The recommendations of the Committee were conveyed to the Cabinet Secretariat who are in the process of examining the re-structuring the National Security Council (NSC). These recommendations, to the extent that they pertain to the NSC, will be carefully considered for the establishment of a new mechanism.

Government are conscious to the need to maintain an appropriate level of Defence preparedness. For this purpose, the Armed Forces need to be equipped adequately so as to enable them to undertake the tasks assigned to them. Modernisation programmes are designed to facilitate the achievement of this objective.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 1(1)/96/PO (Def.) dated 04-10-96]

Comments of the Committee

Please see para No, 9 of the Chapter I of the Report.

CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL REPLIES OF GOVERNMENT ARE STILL AWAITED

-Nil-

NEW DELHI;
November 20, 1996
Kartika 29, 1918 (Saka)

B.K. GADHVI,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Defence.

MINUTES OF THE SIXTH SITTING OF THE STANDING
COMMITTEE ON DEFENCE (1996-97)

The Committee sat on Monday, the 4th November, 1996 from 1500 hours to 1600 hours.

PRESENT

Shri B.K. Gadhvi – *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Smt. Sushma Swaraj
3. Lt. Gen. Shri Prakash Mani Tripathi
4. Dr. Chhatrapal Singh
5. Dr. Vallabhbhai Kathiria
6. Shri Ram Chandra Benda
7. Shri Shivraj V. Patil
8. Shri P. Upendra
9. Shri P. Namgyal
10. Maj. Gen. Bikram Singh
11. Shri A. Sampath
12. Shri C. Narasimhan
13. Shri T. Nagaratnam
14. Shri Major Singh Uboke

Rajya Sabha

15. Shri Sushil Kumar Sambhajirao Shinde
16. Shri Peter. S. Alphonse
17. Shri Satchidananda

18. Shri Surendra Kumar Singh

19. Shri K.R. Malkani

20. Shri Satish Agarwal

SECRETARIAT

Shri V.N. Gaur - *Director*

The Committee considered the Draft Report on Action Taken by Government on recommendations contained in Sixth Report of the Committee (Tenth Lok Sabha) on 'Defence Policy, Planning and Management'.

2. The Chairman invited Members to offer their suggestions for incorporation into the Draft report. The Members suggested certain additions/modifications/amendments and desired that those be suitably incorporated into the body of the Report.

3. The Draft Report was then adopted. The Committee then authorised the Chairman to finalise the Report in the light of factual verification and vetting from security aspect by the Ministry as also of verbal and consequential changes for presentation to the Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.