

know that Sunita, a girl was to be married but police entered in her father's house and snatched Rs. 51000 from there and broken hands and legs of four persons. Not only that but they had to face high handedness at police station also. A fire Brigade and tear gas shells other force reached at the spot in wee hours to control only 50 people.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Paswanji.

[English]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : I accept your verdict, Sir. I am not conflicting against you.

SHRI P.M. SAYEED : Rules do not permit me. I cannot say anything.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : This matter relates to Delhi and this matter does not relates to their police but yours.

SHRI P.M. SAYEED : Do you have more faith in their police.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : In view of this incident, I have more faith in their police than yours.

I wish that atleast the hon. Minister should say in this House that the matter would be re-examined. This matter relates to Delhi. The Minister should accompany me and see. Something must be done.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This is an extraordinary circumstances. Shri Paswan is allowed to raise supplementary.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Hon. Minister please throw some light into it.

[English]

SHRI P.M. SAYEED : Rules do not permit me. I cannot say anything.

14.34 hrs.

GENERAL BUDGET 1995-96 — DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

Ministry of Defence — contd.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Jaswant Singh has already taken 32 minutes. The time allotted to BJP is 1.11 minutes. Shri Jaswant Singh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I was interrupted by the Private Member's

Business when we first took up the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Defence. I shall attempt to continue from where I had left Friday last.

I will not repeat any of the observations that I had made on Friday. But, I must certainly express more anguish, yet again. As I see these empty benches, I must give voice to my anguish and repeat that is it simply because Defence matters do not appear to have any votes for the politician, therefore, my colleagues chose to be absent form what I consider to be a discussion of vital national importance. It is for them, particularly the Treasury Benches, to reflect on the continued neglect of this subject. I do not have to continue to give voice to this anguish. Their conduct itself is demonstrating what I am repeating.

I was, Sir, on the question of manpower in the Armed Forces. I had spoken about manpower policy and what this absence of manpower policy had resulted in the Ministry of Defence.

I will now take up three specific aspects of manpower policy, which is recruitment, training and welfare. This is what I have to say about this shortage of officers, particularly certain crucial rank of officers in the Army, Navy and Air Force. Shortage in Captain to Major rank is, to my mind, a very acutely debilitating shortage. That is the fighting element of the officer class and continued shortage, in that rank, in all the three services is an aspect that we must pay very careful attention to.

The point that I am making can perhaps be statistically rebutted. But that will be an inadequate rebuttal. Shortage of officers in Air Force, in pilot category, is a very critical shortage. I would seriously advise the Ministry of Defence to address itself to this shortage, identify why the shortage has come about and what can be done to rectify it.

There is, as I had said even on Friday, a much lower intake, then That intaken has chosen not to go into the combat element of the Armed Forces, it is going into the support element. About support element, I will come back to, I will revert in a munute. But here again, what is an aspect of singular concern is the recently introduced lowering of standards in the selection of officers through the Services Selection Boards. That is taking place because the required number of right candidates are not coming forward, and those that are coming forward, are coming forward for altogether different reasons. Therefore, the Services Selection Boards have been compelled to reduce the levels that they want from the prospective candidates. This too is a very serious matter.

Both are serious; that the required number of candidates are not coming forward and that in the process, the Ministry of Defence and the Services Selection Boards have reduced the standard for recruitment; both are very serious. I would request the Ministry of Defence to address itself seriously to this

problem too. No doubt, when you come to answering you will perhaps give some replies. But, no matter what replies you give on the floor of the House, as long as you address yourself seriously to the aspect of the problem that I have pointed out, it does not matter to me what white-wash you engage in the House. Please recognise that it is a serious problem and it will not suffice to simply rebut the point in the House.

There is another aspect connected with recruitment and that is recruitment of other ranks. I know that because of our repeated decries about corruption in recruitment centre some changes were made also in the methodology employed in the recruitment centres. Those of us that come from areas which are high recruiting areas for Servicemen where it is not simply a question being of an employment opportunity, where it is a tradition to go into the Armed Forces as a calling of honour, the districts of Rajasthan, the district which my distinguished friend Ayub Khan represents, Jhunjhunu, or the entire West Rajasthan, or a Tehsil like Shergarh in Rajasthan which, as one single Tahsil in the country, has the largest percentage of ex-Servicemen and Servicemen than any other Tahsil. Jhunjhunu is a district. As a Tahsil, I am talking.

So, the point I am trying to make is, to point out the deficiencies in recruiting and corruption in recruiting, which are vital wrongs. We are not pointing out something for the sake of finding fault with the recruiting method. We are pointing out something, which we face on a day-to-day basis, when prospective candidates are unable to find themselves in the Armed Forces and come back to us. Their fathers have served in the Armed forces; their grandfathers have served in the Armed Forces. And they come back to us and say that they are unable to join the Armed Forces simply because there is corruption in recruiting centres. Please address yourself to it. I had occasion to ask the distinguished and gallant Chief of Naval Staff about this, the other day. I was astounded when he gave me a figure - and I could be corrected - that six per cent of the Indian Navy officers are presently from Rajasthan. Ordinarily, looking at the naval tradition, one would think that having nothing at all to do with Sea if such a large percentage of the Indian Navy is from Rajasthan, it says something about the desire of Rajasthan to continue to serve, and serve with honour. Therefore, if there is this desire to serve with honour, not as a job, but as a calling, a vocation and as a commitment and if this is combined with corruption in recruiting, then somewhere you are corrupting the very spirit of our services. That is why it is so vitally important. This is why I pointed out the lowering of the standards in the selection of prospective candidates for the various services through the Services Selection Board. This next is a sensitive issue. I have a view point. Perhaps the Armed Forces themselves will disagree with me, but I think that it is an aspect that the hon. Minister and the Ministry should apply themselves to.

The cadre review conducted in the Armed Forces some years back resulted in a mushrooming of ranks. From NCOs to officers, the job has remained the same. The ranks have increased. Yet Somethings has given in the process. What that 'something' is, please examine and find out. I do not wish to elaborate this point. But there is a need to look again at the benefits and the damages of the cadre review. I do not believe that you can now unscramble that egg. That omelette has got made. You cannot, therefore, reform the eggs. But whatever you can do to improve, whatever you can do to set right, and to rectify some of the wrongs that have taken place, please do take those steps. But you would not be taking even the first step unless you recognise that cadre review is not an unmixed or unalloyed success that you thought it would be.

Now, I come to training. I must point out - and I will be happy if the hon. Minister corrected me - that neither the Army, nor the Air Force, nor the Navy has really seriously trained for the last eight years. When I say seriously trained, I mean trained at the level of formations, which would enable the services themselves to test their concepts, test their equipment, test their command and control structures and test their higher command. Ever since exercise Brass Tacks - and before brass tacks the preceding mobilisation exercise was ordered and then curtailed - and simultaneous exercises then undertaken by the Navy, there has not been any large scale exercising of any of the three Services. This is a very serious matter. There are many reasons why you have not done it, but those reasons do not carry sufficient conviction with me. Of Course there has been a shortage of money. The lessons of Brass Tacks have not been fully absorbed. The mistakes of Brass Tacks continue to trouble you.

All these things together - shortage of money, I also accept the over-employment of the Armed Forces in activities other than their own routine requirements - has resulted in not only there being no training at that level in any of the three Services for the last eight years. I do believe that in the case of individual, unit and collective training, there has been a decline in standards. I am not ready to believe that the level of individual training or unit level training or collective training is what it ought to be, is satisfactory. You can by all means, stand up in your reply and say, "It is satisfactory and we are very happy with it". But, when you go back, please address yourself to this problem; and you will find that it is not a satisfactory situation.

I will just say a word in passing about the Sainik Schools. The Sainik School system was a very laudable venture. Over the years, the sainik schools, having been set up, now there are about 18 of them, I find that instead of improving, they are declining. This is the first thing. Secondly, the original aim of the sainik schools which was to provide an already prepared young aspirant for the Armed Forces has not really materialised. Thirdly, I think, and this is very damaging, and that is,

the support that ought to have been provided to the Sainik Schools by the respective State Governments is not forthcoming. So, these Sainik Schools are now caught in an extremely unhappy situation. The original purpose of the Sainik Schools is not being subserved; the Defence Ministry as such is starved of funds, and the State Governments that ought to have provided a corresponding support to the Sainik Schools are not coming forward. The result can only be one; and the result is that the product from the sainik schools is declining, the quality of education in sainik schools is declining; in fact, the condition of school buildings themselves are deteriorating; the buildings have begun to leak, etc. I do not wish to labour this point. I think, you have to address yourselves to the whole question of Sainik Schools very purposefully and find an answer. It will not serve, if you simply transfer these 18 schools from the Ministry of Defence and pass the baby or the buck on to the Human Resource Ministry and say, "Now the problem is over; since we could not effectively function as an organ of the Ministry of Defence, it is your baby, Ministry of Human Resources Development, so, you take care of it." You address yourself to this problem; please set up a small committee; give them two months' time; sixty days is enough time to find an answer. Please give them two months to find out what has gone wrong and what can be done to set these sainik schools right.

I now come - to my mind, the most acute problem - to the aspect of welfare and that is of continuing housing shortage. I am not going into a complete analysis of why this housing shortage has come about and why it continues to bedevil. Many committees have examined the whole question of Cantonments, many times. I do not think any more study of Cantonments is required. I do not think, the answer lies in raising or in trying to carve out portions of Cantonments and by raising what do you call this FSI index, as the Poona Cantonment has tried to do. The purpose of the Poona Cantonment appeared to be, at one time, quite reasonable until I realised that your own Ministry was trying to really carve out portions from the Poona Cantonment so that the people could start making money. You change the level of FSI in any Cantonment. Secunderabad suffers from the same problem, you carve out a portion of the Cantonment, you raise the FSI there, then, the 'sharks' of building trade will immediately invade it; and that will be the end of the story. Housing is an acute shortage. It is a crime, I repeat, it is a crime that we in this assembly continue to commit, if we are unable to provide the required houses to our Armed Forces, be that of the Army, the Navy or the Air Force.

I just cannot understand how, year after year, these long waiting lists and this continued housing shortage continues to afflict the Armed Forces. There is no more time to wait. We say this every year, and every year a reply comes from the Government that they are addressing themselves very meaningfully to this

problem. There are many ways to solve this problem. If it is due to a shortage of resources, there are many ways in which resources can be raised. You can go in for commercial borrowings, there are these housing development companies which will provide you with the necessary wherewithals, there are endless number of other ways. This is not the occasion for me to suggest ways to rectify it. But if you cannot, then I certainly cannot accept the situation in which this continues to be a critical welfare shortage for the Armed Forces.

I would like to say, Sir, three things about ex-servicemen. The first thing is about one-time increase scheme. I was a member of that High Level Committee on Ex-servicemen. I am not going to go into an analysis of what that Committee did or did not do. The one point that I am making is that after the Committee's recommendations, certain anomalies were left and for those anomalies, another Committee was set up; that Committee has made some recommendations. The Annual Report speaks of all the various categories including ex-State forces, KCIOS, etc, in whose regard the improvement has been carried out.

There are two observations that I make here. The first observation is that this improvement that you have carried out is combined with some very awkward accountancy difficulties. For example, take dearness allowance. Dearness allowance - though it becomes a point of detail - which was paid for some categories is now being recovered and this is causing very great avoidable hardship. The question of widows too is causing very great hardship. There is question of some left-out categories. There is no doubt that CDA is a very able organisation but the CDA is also a heartless organisation. When it comes to simple things like the loss of a PPA, they are so bound by the rules that they have devised for themselves. But the loss of a PPA is not the widow's fault. An illiterate widow sitting somewhere in the rural pastures of Gharwal or Kumaon or Rajasthan has no knowledge of why suddenly the money stops coming. When these widows come to us and say that the CDA does not pay them since the PPA has got lost, it is a very distressing thing.

I make some suggestions for your consideration. Firstly, for the remaining wrinkles of the OTI, have a very speedy action. I am not suggesting setting up of yet another committee. Make a sub-Committee from your own Standing Committee on Defence or the Consultative Committee or whatever. But for very speedy action on the remaining wrinkles of the OTI, please formulate some plan.

Second suggestion is in respect of simplifying pension disbursement. Sit together with the State Soldiers Sailors Airmen Board or their Secretaries and work out a method whereby all the connected bureaucratic requirements are sorted out. For example, there is certificate of non-death, that is, you are still living and therefore, you are entitled to pension. Why

do they have to be repeatedly submitted to draw pension? All these kinds of bureaucratic requirements can certainly be simplified provided you have the attitude and provided you apply yourself to it.

I had earlier commended and said that I really do not subscribe to this phraseology of 'teeth versus tail'. It is an archaic phraseology. In current warfare, a much more apt and relevant phraseology is combat element and support element. The Indian Army's ratio of combat and support element is a very commendable ratio.

It is 68 or 70 combat and 32 or 30 support element. This is very commendable. I had then pointed out what I thought, were the shortcomings in the combat element of the Army. I will leave some thoughts with you about this 32 or 30 per cent of the support element.

In the first 25 years or so of our Independence, the very demands of the circumstances were such that we specialised in 'Do it yourself', 'find an answer, find a cheaper answer', 'build your own houses.' The Armed forces were required to look after themselves. Your Annual Report also speaks of altered conditions, the last three-four years of different economic policies. So, I leave a thought with you. Examine it for what it is. Does this continued detailed organisation of this support element - and I am not defining all that constitutes of the support - really continue to have relevance now, in 1995? I will give you some examples. The hon. Minister, Shri Thungon is sitting here. He perhaps does not recollect but it was shared with me. His State produces apples. He once complained to the then Minister of State for Defence. His State produces apples there is a large deployment of Army in his State, his State is ready to sell apples to the Army in Arunachal at Rupee One a kilo. But the Army's rules require that they cannot buy it in Arunachal. The apple has to travel all the way to Calcutta and then bought by the Army at Rs. 20 kilo. It does not make any sense. You can rebut me if I am wrong. The same thing happens with Himachal. These archaic systems of imperial vintage continue to shackle the support element of the Army. The systems that were laid down soon after mutiny of 1857 are largely the systems that you continue to observe. It is beyond my comprehension, why that should now be necessary.

I think it is time that you applied yourself to decentralisation. Why should you continue to make bulk purchases of milk, meat and such other rations? Why can you not devise a more cost effective, a more efficient and less corrupt way of doing it? The whole country now knows that in some of the service elements of the Armed forces, this creeping corruption of the rest of the country has also crept in. Please recognise the damage that this is doing.

I, therefore, recommended for the consideration of the Ministry of Defence that you appoint a Committee — I am not recommending the appointment of a Committee to shelve the decisions. I am recommending a

Committee which should examine seriously and within a given time frame, say, three months, the following :

Firstly, re-examine this proposal that comes up and dies, the decentralisation of the logistic support that the Army requires - purchase fresh rations, etc. It is no one's suggestion that troops that are deployed in Siachen also engage in local purchases. It is no one's suggestion, indeed it would be an absurd interpretation to give to my recommendation. But I do suggest that a Committee or Commission be set up to examine, for example, the amalgamation of base workshops and civilian facilities. Now, there is a great deal of duplication of work that takes place in the base workshops of the Army, particularly which are engaged in heavy repairs. A great deal of this is now spread and is available elsewhere. Please examine that.

Secondly, please examine the possibilities of avoiding the horizontal overlap between, for example, the Maintenance Command, Kanpur of the Air Force and the HAL. A great deal of what the Maintenance Command does, though perhaps not with the same efficiency to start with, can certainly be got done by the HAL. This again takes us back to what I have said about the cost effectiveness of Defence expenditure and the efficiency of it.

Thirdly, I would recommend one aspect for your consideration, particularly in the light of remarks that have been made by the Chief of Naval Staff and others to which I will come in a moment. This is about the Mazagaon Docks and the Bombay Docks. What is the state of orders in Mazagaon Dock? That is an enormous capital asset. Examine the possibilities of amalgamating these assets of the nation which are really now horizontally overlapping.

I have just one more suggestion about the support element. Please examine, as an in-house exercise of the Army itself, the interchangeability of the support element and the combat element. When you come to the kind of rationalisation that we are talking of with a limited quantum of money available, you will increasingly have to think in terms of interchangeability of these elements and see what sort of support element can, in a very short notice, become combat element. For example, see what can be done with combat engineers, part of electrical and mechanical engineers and so on. There is need to apply yourself to this aspect.

15.00 hrs

(Shrimati Santosh Choudhury *in the the Chair*)

Madam Chaiman, I will go on to what I have to say about equipment policy. Before I come to equipment policy, let me very briefly, reiterate that what we are faced with in the Ministry of Defence is not simply an absence of policy. We are also, thereafter, faced with another problem concerning implementation. Whenever decisions are taken, whenever there is a beginning of even the semblance of a policy, the implementation of that decision or that policy is flabby, is not efficient and

is not cost effective. Let me explain what according to me is equipment policy. I will explain by sharing with you what I believe it is not. Firstly, equipment policy is not simply about money allocation. Of course, money allocation is a very important aspect of it. But equipment policy is not simply money allocation. Secondly, there exist two mismatches in our equipment policy. One is this fundamental mismatch between our tactical doctrines and the peculiarities, or the characteristics of the equipment itself. This is something that has been shackling us from Independence and more particularly from 1962 onwards. Earlier the ethos of equipment was of British India, the tactical doctrines too, were largely of the British Indian Army. Midway, in this 50 year period that we have spent, 70 per cent of the equipment that started coming into our Army, in quantity terms at least was of Soviet origin. Soviet equipment has originated from Soviet tactical strategic doctrines and not the other way round. There the equipment did not dictate strategic tactics. With us, equipment arrived as a graft but tactical doctrines remained the same. This mismatch between equipment peculiarities and tactical doctrines continues to trouble us till today because our mix of equipment continues to be of that same variety.

Thirdly, I must share with you, Mr. Minister, that equipment policy is about prioritisation, about timely selection, then about decision making and then about an extremely cost effective execution.

That is why, fourthly, equipment policy is also about attitudes and approach. None of these theoretical explanations would suffice unless I illustrate it. I illustrate first, by unreservedly expressing my admiration for the gallant and distinguished Chief of Naval Staff and Chief of the Army Staff for having candidly given voice to their concerns about the deficiencies in their respective services. I believe, and I wish to say it here that they have done a singular service to national good by having done so publicly, clearly and openly. If the Chief of the Air Staff has remained silent, it is not because he is entirely satisfied with the state of the equipment in the Air Force, it is because he, perhaps, has found it not necessary thereafter, after two of his other colleagues having given voice to their concerns. Indeed, the Chief of the Naval Staff has gone to the extent of saying, 'that in the next two years if I do not receive orders for the Mazagaon docks, a very great national asset is in danger of atrophy.' He has gone to the extent of saying that if the present state of the Indian Navy is permitted to continue, then the Indian Navy will no longer be fit to fulfill the role that is assigned to it by the country.

It is in the background of what I said as to what the equipment policy is, and what is not and what the current deficiencies are that I wish to cite just a few instances, I have already spoken about the Navy's Mazagon docked. Take this Army. I would give only three instances of the Army. The first is the continued, magical sort of an attachment to the AK-47. By the Government equipping its own paramilitary forces and

police and all these fancy personal armies - some wearing black *dangris* and others not wearing black *dangris* they are conveying a very wrong message to the Army and the Army Ordnance, particularly to Ichhapur Rifle Factory. If the Government is so enamoured of the AK-47 rifles - why do you not cancel the entire scheme for our own small arm weapons that we have developed? Do I have to name them? They are perfectly good weapons. But you are so attached to this AK-47 which is coming all the way from Afghanistan via Pakistan; and all these personal body guards would much rather use AK-47 than what is produced in Ichhapur. What has happened to the 5.56? I am amazed at the mental attitude of this Government. That is why I spoke about attitudes and approaches also as very important integrals.

Let me give another example of attitude and approach. We all know that there are AFV shortages currently in the Army. I have a view point on this which I have shared with the Government. The basic brick of an Armoured Corps Regiment, I am not mistaken, is 55 tank brick. If you reduce that basic brick from 55 to 44 and then correspondingly all your reserves, wastages etc. built up behind it will reduce perhaps, they would do a great deal in the management of this whole shortages of AFVs. The question that, therefore, arises is: Is the AHV shortage real or is it because conceptually you are unable to address yourself to the fundamentals of it?

Take the MBT Arjun. I think, It is a perfectly good tank. It is a very good effort made by very devoted and committed soldiers and scientists of our country. It needs to be supported. But for you to think that suddenly, overnight the DRDO would be able to or our armament factories would be able to produce so many of these Arjuns that the entire AFV fleet would be replaced is an illusion. It cannot. No country in the world can do it. Then by your attitude and approach, you cripple the effort of the scientists; your attitude and approach cripples the effort of small arms.

Take the third example of Bofors.

It was your action which shackled Bofors to permanent identification with corruption. It was your action that resulted in Bofors now becoming a byword for corruption. The logic of buying a towed Howitzer gun was that you convert that towed Howitzer into a self-propelled Howitzer. You have no courage to do so. With the result you have bought 155 mm towed Howitzer some 10 years back. The equipment in another five or ten years would have run its life through. You are unable to take a decision on SP and you keep on hunting all over for SP gun's conversion into one form or another only because of your attitudinal approach and because you are unable to take decisions.

Let me give you an example of Air Force. I do not need to explain to the Hon. Minister what all these acronyms, AJT or LCA stand for. It is necessary for me

not to explain what they stand for in the House in the hope that the hon. Members would then endeavour to find out what I am saying. For example, take the question of upgradation of MIG. It has taken 12 years to take a decision on upgradation of MIG, I think the airframe begins to collapse. What is the point then? To take a decision? That is why I say, take a decision in time, have a policy and then have the determination to implement that policy, determinedly. I must also point out that it is a fact that a decision was taken. Perhaps Advaniji did not know about it. Jaguar was purchased many years ago. I am pointing this example now because it will point out the same difficulty. Jaguar was purchased without the Black Box. So, when the requirement for the Black Box came, you had to have a separate contract. The kind of mindless lacunae that you leave in implementation of your equipment policy is a national crime because deficiencies in equipment are not simply deficiencies of military hardware. They are essentially deficiencies of the state of preparedness of the Army, Navy or Air Force and the totality of the combat effectiveness of our three Services.

Madam, you are looking at the clock. I will have to seek your indulgence. I come to the question of missiles. My senior and eminent colleague, the present Chairman of the Standing Committee on Defence is not here. I must express yet again my disagreement with the report that the Committee has just now submitted. This being a prolific Committee, the present Chairman has simply inherited his difficulties. In two years time the Committee has produced only four Reports. That is a very great deal of work. Be that as it were, I disagree with some of the observations that this Committee has made on the question of missiles. Let me offer you the great dilemma of missiles that faces the country. I offer four points on the question of missiles.

This is the only country in the world, and perhaps the only instance where a product has preceded the concept. Missiles have arrived in this country. The country owes a debt of gratitude to that very eminent scientist Abdul Kalam. The country owes a debt of gratitude to successive Heads of DRDO and the successive Defence Secretaries who have guided it. The country owes no debt to the political leadership or the Defence Minister. This is the only instance in which a product has preceded the concept.

Madam, I would be able to concentrate just a little better if casual gossip was not here. But I do not want to make a point out of it.

Now, what do I mean by a product preceding the concept?

We have the hardware. The missile is there. But because the Government is unable to define a concept, articulate a concept, that hardware, that product, that missile is not accompanied by any corresponding thought about its employment.

And, secondly, I charge this Government of not having had any substantive or serious discussions with the uniformed fraternity on the totality of these missiles. Otherwise, how is it possible that we have a missile and — I point out some of the anomalies also — we lack an employable concept of it. I am talking of, Madam, specifically and only in the context of Agni and Prithvi. What is the consequence of all this? We have been spreading internal confusion about missiles and an avoidable and needless international alarm, which in turn your Government is failing to manage the control. Thereafter, and much more unforgivably, a dilution of the credibility of our Defence capability as such, and not providing to our organs of defence the required input and force-multipliers that would enable them to be so much more combat effective.

I will illustrate by asking you, Mr. Minister, a simple question. The payload - if I am in error in some of the figures, please correct me - the payload of Prithvi, Madam, is roughly one tonne. If the payload of Prithvi is roughly one tonne, what do you intend employing it as? The hon. Prime Minister has said somewhere recently - I think in the other House - that the user trials have been conducted. If the user trials have been conducted, what were those trials based on? Which user? What were the yardsticks? What were you actually looking for in the user trials? The Prime Minister said, "not only have user trials been completed, we are now taking subsequent follow up action." What is that subsequent follow up action? If you have roughly one tonne payload on Prithvi, how do you intend employing it? Do you intend to have one tonne of cluster bombs in the warhead and employ that missile for runway denial? I will call it the most ineffective method of otherwise uprooting them.

I am not able to explain the absurdity of employment of a missile only for one tonne payload. You will fill it with cluster bombs, try and land it on runway so that there is runway denial! Therefore, the question comes of dual-use capacity. What is this dual-use capability? Please clarify it, Mr. Minister. You cannot keep it under cover. If this assembly is not interested, certainly in this country there are many who are interested because you are not addressing yourself to the fundamentals of the absolute inseparability of the missile and the nuclear policies of this country. There is an absolute inseparability and if you continue to play this kind of verbal games, they might think that we are all an assembly of ignorants.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI MALLIKARJUN): I do not want to interfere in such an impressive expression of yours. So far as missile technology is concerned, tomorrow I will clarify, the Prime Minister will clarify so that the misconception and misunderstanding which is being deliberately created by known and unknown people will be thrashed out.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I would like to say, Madam, that I am reassured by this assurance. But, without meaning any disrespect to the hon. Minister, we have received so many assurances from this Government that by now the very credibility of assurance has lost all sense altogether. Now, for the hon. Minister to say that some misapprehensions are being created, there is no possibility or scope for creating misapprehensions and doubts, if you are clear and if you clearly articulate where the country stands.

It is because you are not clear; it is because you are pressurised; it is because you speak with various voices in various assemblies; and it is because you are not able to answer the logic of the situation, therefore, You cannot answer my question.

We have a situation in India in which we have a product preceding policy. The missiles are an example of it. The product has preceded. Now that the product is on our door-steps, the Government has to try and structure a policy. Tomorrow, if they come and announce it as a policy for missile employment, I would be delighted even though I am not convinced in my mind that it would be an intelligible or cohesive policy.

It takes me therefore to the essential and inseparable part of it viz., nuclear policy. Earlier this morning, Madam, during Question Hour, the hon. Minister for State for External Affairs, when being queried on this nuclear policy and particularly in reference to Pressler Amendment and what Pakistan was doing, or not doing, said that this question should be put to another Ministry. I would like to inform the Minister of Defence that in the Annual Report of the Ministry of Defence, there is a reference to nuclear policy. What has the Ministry of Defence got to do with the nuclear policy other than this statement? The Ministry of Defence has got nothing to do with the nuclear policy. To which Ministry did the Minister of External Affairs address us to, or refer us to? So far as the NPT is concerned, it is looked after by the Ministry of External Affairs. You have got nothing to do with it. So far as nuclear power is concerned, the matter is dealt with by the Department of Atomic Energy. Then, what has the Ministry of Defence got to do? The Ministry of Defence, therefore, has absolutely no policy in this regard. They have no doctrine. There is, of course, no training, nor any preparation.

Madam, I am not going to refer to the reports that have been appearing in newspapers for a very long time about *Chashma*, plutonium, enrichment Pakistan, etc., what PRC is doing, and Iran receiving support and cooperation from the Russian Republic, the People's Republic of China, as also from Pakistan in terms of development of nuclear power. I have not referred to Iraq or North Korea or even the confusion of central Asian Republics. But I will submit, Madam, for very serious consideration of this Parliament that on the 12th, the day of voting, if voting is to take place, will

start on NPT - Review and Extension Conference, in New York. We have time upto the 10th. Before the 10th, I appeal to you, Mr. Minister, and I appeal to this entire House, which is largely empty, to please consider the articulation of this Parliament's will and wish in respect of 12th May. Please do it before 10th May. Please consider the adoption of a unanimous Resolution by this House before the end of this debate on Demands for Grants for Defence, a Resolution somewhat similar to the Resolution that we had adopted about Jammu and Kashmir. That will only strengthen the hands of the Government. Under no circumstances can it weaken them. I am not offering, Madam, the draft of a Resolution but I am offering a broad contour map of it, or the principal landmarks of it, around which any one can draft. The hon. Speaker can undertake to do it. But I urge you to do it and I urge you to do it latest by the 10th so that there is sufficient time for that message to reach New York and elsewhere that the Parliament of India has spoken and spoken unanimously about NPT.

It has spoken about NPT. It has spoken about nuclear weapons etc. and it should say, to my mind, the following. Not the exact phraseology that I am using but certainly following in what I believe should be the contents of that Resolution.

I believe, Madam, that all weapons of mass destruction should be eliminated globally. Therefore, I believe that it is no good legitimising the nuclear while simultaneously banning the chemicals or the biological. Therefore, we, this Parliament ought to say that we do not accept legitimising a weapon of mass destruction in the hands of only a few powers and that too in perpetuity. Therefore, we do not accept an indefinite extension of NPT, as, among other things, it has two other implications. Firstly, it contradicts the Preamble and Article VI of the Treaty itself. Secondly, it will lead to a situation of a possibility of a nuclear terrorism. Therefore, we reiterate that only universal, non-discriminatory elimination of all weapons of mass destruction is acceptable to India. We must also say thereafter that a temporary extension followed by a series of supplementary treaties which fill the gap, fill the lacuna of the existing NPT or the Treaty that they wish to attempt with these supplementary treaties will be all non-discriminatory, verifiable and universal. The Parliament should express a view about no first use, about Comprehensive Test Ban about cut off of fissile material production, time bound, verifiable, and fissile material as for weapons production and as required for production of nuclear energy. These are some of the essentials around which the elimination of the nuclear weapons can be considered by this House. These are important because simply a skeleton of an NPT which the Club of Five wish to now inflict on the rest of the globe will not do. Therefore, India while opposing this legitimisation of nuclear weapons and resolutely voicing its opposition about a discriminatory treaty on nuclear and missile systems, commits itself, persists to work for

a nuclear weapons free world. But until that is achieved, India should be a nuclear weapons power. But it will also, simultaneously declare that it will never be the first user.

Madam, I have submitted only the details. You can, of course, disagree with me on these details. But if this House were to find the essentials acceptable in what I have said, then I urge you to please consider my proposals. I request you for serious support to what I am saying and I urge that you adopt it latest by the Tenth so that before 12th, the message that we want to send to that community that is sitting in New York from 12th onwards, gets the message that the Indian Parliament would send. Mr. Minister, I would be deeply grateful if you at least responded, not formally then but now as the Government's view point. It is rather thinly spread Government at the moment. Perhaps not very interested, but nevertheless please examine what I am saying. Madam, I come to the end of my speech. You were very considerate. I have no time to expand on the question of national security environment which the authors of the Annual Report of the Ministry of Defence very ably depicted. I wish to share two or three thoughts on the totality of national security environment.

Firstly I believe that it is not enough to simply have an assessment of threats alone. I do believe that the Ministry of Defence would do well too, also when it prepares these Annual Reports and paints, depicts the national security environment, to somewhere identify and pinpoint opportunity areas for cooperation, which would enable the country's total defence ability to be bolstered. In that, there is one caution that I would voice and three opportunity areas, which, I believe, have been missed out and which I commend to the Government's attention.

The one thing that has been missed out, to my assessment, Madam, is an assessment from the Ministry of Defence of the reality of what People's Republic is about. I accept that in the totality of the Government's posture, there can be simultaneous attempts at normalisation of relations with the People's Republic of China. But, whilst that effort continues, it is vitally necessary that the Ministry of Defence recognises the nature of the State, that is, the People's Republic.

I do not base what I am saying on any subjective viewpoint. I am repeating some of their own documents to say what I am. I am also, Madam, not going to spend time into pointing out an obvious enough message that is contained in the dispute over Spatley Islands and similarly Spatley Islands and Coco Islands of Andaman not simply because they are islands, but more on account of this saying something about People's Republic of China's Naval ambitions. I am also not going to speak or elaborate upon the occupation by People's Republic of an Island territory, which is Indonesian, that has recently been occupied by People's Republic.

China, Madam, claims sovereign interests in the Asia Pacific region and its right to an economically advantageous living space - their phraseology - within strategic borders - their phraseology - not necessarily coinciding with State border.

15.33 hrs.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

People's Republic is of the view that these should be extended in relation to the State's economic and military need. It is my apprehension that People's Republic in the balance of the 1990s and in the coming decade will strive for a re-division, redefinition of its strategic borders and in expansion of this living space, in the 21st Century. This living space in strategic borders, are the enunciated principles of the People's Republic of China. How do you, as the Ministry of Defence, assess thereafter the threat from the People's Republic?

I hold that there are five, possibly four, yardsticks to apply. Firstly, the PLA is about three million. It is in that sense the world's largest military machine. Secondly, there has been a double digit growth in China's Defence Budget. That has its own logic. Thirdly, there is evidence enough that the current political leadership of China is committed to eliminating all deficiencies in development of the PLA.

Fourthly, the recent agreement between the Russian Republic and the People's Republic of China will provide to PRC on commercial terms, no doubt, some very advanced weaponry. This will enhance the PLA's military capability.

Fifthly, I hold that in the coming decade, we will see a progressive withdrawal from this region. I am very sorry. I have said, 'Madam'. I owe an 'apology. Sir, I expect we will witness in the not-too-distant future, possibly before the turn of this millennium, an inevitable and an unavoidable withdrawal of the United States of America from this region. This progressive withdrawal, and when that progressive withdrawal takes place, there are only three great powers in Asia and they constitute a triangle. They do not necessarily constitute an equilateral triangle; and in this triangle of India, PRC and Japan, how is India to find its balance subsequent to that inevitable withdrawal, is a challenge to India's statecraft and that is something that the Ministry of Defence ought also to be addressing itself to.

As far as opportunity areas are concerned, I feel the Ministry of Defence is silent and I would recommend for their consideration, the three areas which are presently seen absent, though meriting very close examination are firstly, South Africa. South Africa is a country of great military potential, very good diplomatic and other relations with India. That it merits not even a mention in the Annual Report of the Ministry of Defence, perhaps, speaks for itself. The second - and this worries me - is that in the Annual Report of the Ministry of Defence, there is not even a mention of Afghanistan. To

me, it is reflective of an approach, a mental approach to the totality of the security environment of this country. Afghanistan, the virtual tribal anarchy into which that country has today descended has a direct consequences on India's security interests. One of those direct consequences is, of course, the proliferation of smuggled small arms; and that smuggled small arms is a direct aspect that we have to address ourselves to when we address the totality of national security concern. The third is France. I think, there exists great potential for India to have very many areas of military cooperation between India and France and the fourth, is India and Israel. The Report is entirely silent about Israel and that bewilders us. Sir, I come to the end of my intervention. I will leave just one or two suggestions with the Government.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Ministry of Defence is not a part time job. Since the 5th of March, 1993, there has been no Minister. I mean, no disrespect either to the person or the high office of the Prime Minister. I hold his years and his experience of public life in great regard. However, if I were not to say what I am saying, I will be failing in my duty and I reiterate that the Ministry of Defence is not a part-time job. Since March 1993, you have not had a Minister of Defence, then you are proving a point about your approach and attitude to the defence of the country.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO) : I would like to submit very respectfully that I am keeping Defence with me not because there is no other Minister or no other capable person to take it, but I think, the time has come, from my point of view, when the Prime Minister has to continue to be the Defence Minister. That is the reason.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Then, let me share another concern with you because that is actually what I have written here. I strongly believe, I respectfully submit to the hon. Prime Minister that no Prime Minister should be his own Defence Minister. This is my view. You can disagree, the Prime Minister and the Congress Party can disagree. I believe very sincerely that no Prime Minister should be his own Defence Minister now particularly when we are saddled with some very complex problems.

I buttress what I say because Defence, as I said, is not a part-time job. Secondly, I believe that the Defence Minister requires to be separate from the Prime Minister because the Defence Minister must address questions of Defence only as Defence Minister, and thereafter, whatever he has to say like what I have just said about PRC. The Prime Minister could very well then say, "I appreciate what you are saying about the People's Republic of China, but as Prime Minister, having considered Defence, having considered external relations, having considered the economy, having considered all other aspects, I will rule otherwise."

Sir, for an individual to be both the Defence Minister and the Prime Minister, and to be able to sit upon judgment of what he is deciding, as Defence Minister,

I beg to submit. I beg to disagree. I beg to disagree because it is not possible. It does not carry conviction with me. Also, this is not a small point. If the Prime Minister had the needed support element to provide him with the necessary input of information, alternative choices; then perhaps, but the Prime Minister has not had a CCPA. The Prime Minister can very well turn round and say "as Prime Minister I do not also need a Cabinet Committee on Political Affairs"! It does not work like that.

The hon. Prime Minister was also good enough to mention about the National Security Council. I want to point this out, that the first one to say that — I do not recall the exact phraseology that was used - in 1955 the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said that there would be a Council. I do not know the exact phrase that he had used. In March 1955 he had said that there would be a Council for working out the questions of National Security. The same promise was repeated not by the late Indiraji but certainly by the late Rajiv Gandhi as Prime Minister. Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh when he was the Prime Minister, actually formed a National Security Council. The hon. Prime Minister had twice given an assurance here in this House. The last time when he intervened on the Demands for Grants for the Ministry of Defence, he was good enough to say that they had decided to form a National Security Council. It was two years ago. It is now two years. Why do I make this point? I do not want to make these points as debating points. These are not debating points that I am wishing to make because, at the very start of this discussion, Mr. Prime Minister, I had said that in the National Security mix many integrals come in. But the Defence Ministry part of that integral is the apolitical integral. He could have the mix of the Ministry of Home providing the integrals of national security, the para military forces etc., and we could have and indeed do have separate views on that point. But so far as the integral of the Ministry of Defence is concerned, because it is apolitical, therefore we require of it efficiency, because that efficiency directly impacts on the national security of the nation's Defence.

Yet again, Mr. Speaker, Sir, not really with a view to rebutting a highly learned man, — for me it is not behaving to rebut points as debating points, but the hon. the Prime Minister choose to have a defence Minister for the first two years of his Premiership, from 1991-93. Did he choose to have a Defence Minister because then the Defence of the country was relatively an easier matter?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I would like to say, please do not make it a debating point. These are matters in which certain discretion has to be left to the Prime Minister. When is it time to have another Defence Minister, when is it time for him to take over Defence, and again when will it be the time when to make another

person — these are matters which would have to be left to the Prime Minister, and I want to assure the House that these decisions have not been taken accidentally or by force of circumstances but deliberately.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I will proceed.

MR. SPEAKER : Can we have a better Defence Minister than the Prime Minister as a Defence Minister.....

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Indeed we can.

MR. SPEAKER :because he can coordinate?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : No, Sir. I do not wish to enter into a disputation with you. But I proceed.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I will be able to convince you. But please go to the next point. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I am sorry, I disagree.

MR. SPEAKER : The coordination has become very important. Coordination at the Prime Minister's level becomes easier.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I agree, Sir. But coordination where? Coordination between the various Ministries is the Prime Minister's function. However, the Prime Minister is well within his right to choose to say that 'I am present here.' Of course, he has the right to be; of course he has the right to choose when to have a Defence Minister or not to have a Defence Minister. But I can only give voice to my conviction. I cannot give voice to those convictions which I do not hold. This is the conviction that I hold and I say it not because I simply want to make a point, but I say firstly that the Ministry of Defence is not a part-time job and secondly I do continue to hold that the Prime Minister should not be his own Defence Minister. But I will proceed. *(Interruptions)*. I do not want also to repeat about the National Security Council which is in assurance that the Prime Minister had given. It is for the Prime Minister to reflect on the fulfilment of his assurance. As to when will it be fulfilled etc. is then a smaller detailed aspect of it.

I wish to share with you, hon. the Prime Minister and the Treasury Benches, a vital component of National Defence That Sir, is the national Defence and quality of veneration. When I say 'veneration', I mean veneration of the whole national endeavour towards the safety, security and preservation of the country. Let me illustrate what I am trying to say.

Recently in the State of Rajasthan was appointed a Secretary to the State Soldier, Sailor, Airmen's Board. This recently-appointed Secretary, a retired serviceman was good enough to pay a call upon me and ask me what I felt, he as Secretary of the State Soldier, Sailor, Airmen's Board should do in Rajasthan. I was touched that he chose to consult me. It is illustrating what I am saying about veneration. I asked him a simple question: 'How many memorials to fallen heroes, was heroes are there in Rajasthan?' Rajasthan is one State of this Union as there are many States in this Union, equally

illustrious and equally gallant, but in Rajasthan each district has, perhaps, got a war hero. And it is not 'perhaps', I have no doubt about it that each district has got a war hero, as is the case with Garhwal and Kumaun. He did not have the list. When I asked him that 'when was it last that a national level political leader came and paid homage to any of the memorials in Rajasthan', he said, 'I cannot recollect'. I asked him — and this I say in great sadness — 'when was it last that any of the serving Chiefs of Staff or any of the Formation Commanders on routine visit came to pay homage to that memorial?' He said, 'I cannot recollect'. When I asked him, 'of those memorials that you have knowledge, are they in a good state of repair? Are they kept clean?' He said, 'am sorry, they are not in good state of repair, they are not kept clean, cattle sit there, brushwood has come about, grass is growing, dogs urinate, goats graze there.'

It is the absence of this quality of veneration, of those that laid down their lives for this nation. It is not a quality that I can elaborate upon. It is either there as a consciousness or it is not there. I was saddened when I witnessed a clip for the celebrations that they are observing in Great Britain and elsewhere on victory in Europe 50 years ago. They have very good relations with Germany now. They are partners in NATO. But the kind of national will that is then created, out of this veneration is important. Till today we do not even celebrate nationally our victory in Bangladesh war.

It was a major feat of arms. It was not a feat of arms that was achieved by anyone from outside. It is not for me to remind that there are many great feats of arms that very many great young Indians have performed in the last fifty years. Does it have to be somebody else to come and tell us that we ought to venerate our own dead? The endless and continuous heroism that our young men continue to display day in and day out on those bleak and inhospitable heights of Siachin, uncomplaining. They are not special troops, they are not troops recruited from the hills, they are troops that come from the plains and acclimatise and go and serve there. I met some of the young officers and young men that come out after six months - darkened, blackened, frostbite cases - and yet if we do not pay any attention to them, it is because we lack this quality of veneration. I do not wish to elaborate. I submit for the hon. Prime Minister's consideration that to inculcate this quality of veneration of our dead, please start now for a plan to erect a befitting memorial in Delhi or wherever else you might think proper. We have only memorial which was created by the British...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI UMRAO SINGH (Jalandhar) : We have one coming up in Ludhiana, a very big one. This is for your information.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I am very glad because such memorials bolster respect. But you underline the point I am making, Sir. Let there be a national memorial

with on it carved the names, as a 'Roll of Honour' of all those soldiers, sailors, army men, that have laid down their lives in the first fifty years of India's Independence. Let there be a second decision taken by this Government. Let there be at least a statement table every year in the House, of the condition of all the monuments, countrywide, of our national heroes because they are the true heroes.

The third suggestion that I make in this regard is about the establishment of a National Military Museum. Almost fifty years after Independence, there does not exist a national military museum. The Academies have what they have, some of the Units have what they have, some of the Regimental Centres have what they have, but we do not have one. Let there be formed a Standing Committee - a committee really not of politicians or civil servants but of those that are part of it - for national war memorials. In the light of that and as part of the totality of this veneration, I repeat one of the suggestions that I had made a very long time back. Let us think in terms of establishing at least a veterans hospital. The overcrowding of medical facilities of the Armed Forces being claimed by the serving and the ex-servicemen, does not now any longer suffice. Let there be a veterans hospital also established, at the same time.

There could be any number of suggestions, Sir, but I shall conclude. At the end of this intervention, I must say that I am weighed by an apprehension that of what use is all this passion, of what use is what I am saying, who will pay heed to it or who will act on it? Perhaps it will be just another parliamentary intervention that one has made and it will go and get passed off. That will sadden me, yes, Sir. But what will sadden me more is not simply that what I, with so much feeling or passion, pleaded in this House, whether it was NPT or about the quality of venerating our dead. That is not the point. The point is that in the process, the bolstering of national spirit, national will and national morale will also suffer. I cannot say any more than that.

I am very grateful for the time given to me.

MR. SPEAKER : Before I call Shri Sudhir Sawant to speak, I would like to bring one point to the notice of the hon. Members. We have allotted 8 hours and 30 minutes for this debate. The Congress gets 3 hours and 49 minutes; The B.J.P. gets one hour 43 minutes; the CPI(M) gets 32 minutes; the Janata Dal gets 20 minutes and others get very little time. The party leaders and the party Members will keep in mind the time taken by their Members.

Now Shri Sudhir Sawant to speak.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT (Rajapur) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Demands for Grants for the Ministry of Defence. As usual, it is most difficult to speak after a most articulate Jaswant Singhji who has spoken for two hours. I am sure he will not give me that much of time.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (Mayiladuturai) : He has spoken for one hour and fifty minutes.

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT : It is to be more precise.

Sir, at the outset I share Shri Jaswant Singh's view about the presence of Members in the House during the debate on such an important subject as Defence. And for a soldier like me it is most discouraging. But I do not accept his jibe at the treasury benches because he could look behind himself to judge for himself.

At the outset, today I would like to address myself to two points that Shri Jaswant Singh has brought out — that there is no Defence Minister and there is no defence policy. But I think it will do more credit if he judges a Government or its Prime Minister by the results and by the performance rather than how it is being done. And to that effect I would like to take all of us back to June, 1991, to a situation when this country's prestige and power - you know very well — was at the bottom, I do not know where. Nobody was asking or considering India as a power at all. You know as to whose responsibility it had become to restore the prestige. That is why, after June, 1991 and after a tremendous transformation India's power and prestige has enhanced by May, 1995. This is sufficient and eloquent testimony of the performance of the Government as far as the foreign policy is concerned and as far as the security is concerned. I think this aspect is one of the single-most important achievements of this Government. Nobody can deny it.

I would just bring out certain points which I would like to highlight as to what has happened. Because in June, 1991 and during the period prior to that India had to give refuelling rights to United States warplanes going to Iraq.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : Shame!

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa) : But your party supported that Government. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT : Sir, from thereon we are today a confident India which can face any kind of threat and a country which has refused to bend to any kind of pressure. We know that we have not reneged on any of the strategic Defence programmes as it was being tried to be made out. Shri Jaswant Singh has brought about the payload of *Prithvi* and he said that there has been no training on missiles. In 1986 in the Staff College I had undergone training on the utility of missiles. That is why this hypothesis is totally incorrect. Everybody knows what it means about the one-tonne payload of *Prithvi*. It does not have to be articulated. I will say, whether the Government says it or not, that the payload of one tonne can well be utilised either with nuclear warhead or with conventional warhead. The potential of one tonne payload of *Khatas* of Pakistan is very well-known. I do not understand what is the insinuation being brought out by them.

The hon. Prime Minister has clearly stated in his reply that as far as the programmes regarding *Agni* and *Prithvi* are concerned, they will continue and I am sure that whenever the Indian army requires or the Indian Defences require, they will be available for deployment and use. It is not for us to ask how they are going to use them. ...*(Interruptions)*

16.00 hrs.

Sir, the second question is about nuclear option. We have retained our nuclear option. That has been categorically stated and India's stand in N.P.T. has been articulated a number of times. This is an aspect which we have not given in, in spite of the threat of not supplying cryogenic engines to us. Despite this threat, India continued on its path.

Sir, whenever Pakistan has tried to engage in a low cost option by fuelling terrorism in this country, it has been replied to adequately by us. When it tried to internationalise the issue, it has been successfully defeated by cleverly drafted diplomatic initiatives. As far as diplomacy is concerned, I do not want to go into great details, but through diplomacy this Government has today, in 1995, secured for itself a position which most countries in the world would like to be in. For example, I was scared that after the Cold War, what would be the situation of India? In my first defence speech, I had said that India is isolated. But by cleverly drafted foreign policy, India has been brought out of the situation and today, India stands confidently. As far as the United States of America is concerned, we have seen their response to the initiatives which we have taken. Many high level delegations have come and lot of things are happening.

Sir, in 1991 when I was in the Army, I thought Iran would be an adversary of this country, supporting Pakistan. But today, Iran has supported our Resolution on Jammu and Kashmir in the United Nations. This is a phenomenal achievement which was unimaginable in 1991. Our initiative with China is commendable. Whatever would happen in future would happen. But certainly we have gained a lot of ground. We have re-established our relationship with Russia and we have taken many diplomatic initiatives with the CIS States. These are all testimony of what we have done about security and foreign policy and that too, Sir, from a position strength, not from a position of weakness. We have not bent before anyone. We have secured our rightful position in the Community of Nations today and India looks confidently towards the future. India looks confidently to have a seat in the United Nations Security Council and it is working towards that end. India's power and prestige would be greatly enhanced by that and in the 21st Century we will be able to face the challenges based on the strong foundations laid by this Government, because this period will go down in history as a period of achievement, as far as security is concerned. In the 21st Century, it will certainly secure for us the rightful place. But I would like to say one

thing. These achievements have not been easily made. They have been made with a combination of strong economic and security policies. They have made it possible. Twenty billion dollars of foreign exchange gives you tremendous power to go out in the world and face the world. How has it been achieved? That should be given due credit.

Sir, I am not going to be satisfied by just giving accolades to our Government, because one thing is certain. Whatever our achievements are, we cannot be complacent, because war is an inevitability. I would like to quote Machievelli in this context. In his famous book, "The Prince", he says :

"War should be the only study of a Prince. You should consider peace only as a breathing time which gives you leisure to contrive and furnish the ability to execute military plans."

Why do I say this? It is because, in times of peace, there is a habit of being complacent, of ignoring our responsibilities and this percolates down to the forces more often than not. I am going to come to those details soon, in which Jaswant Singhji has covered sufficient ground. So, I would like to support him on certain of his views, though I disagree with a few.

But before that I would like to lay down a hypothesis which I have done earlier and also like to just take a brief overlook of the international situation as it prevails today.

Sir, after the cold war, we had expected that this world would be a better world. A world where we can proceed towards disarmament; a world where there would be peace. But that has not happened because the situation has not stabilised. New countries are being born daily. There is a tremendous instability in the world. That is why, we have to now find for ourselves a policy, a path which will secure, for us our future. Tomorrow's world is a different world - which we have seen in the cold war - which was governed by ideologies. But tomorrow's world, is a world of pragmatism where ideology will take a back seat and hence a system of alliances - which will take place in the future world order - will be based on pragmatism and not idealism. So to this extent the requirement would be - as I had earlier mentioned - that our foreign policy and our security policy will have to be highly flexible to adapt to changing circumstances and changing situations. I think two issues, as I said earlier, will govern the system of alliances - one is the economic, i.e., trade war, battle for markets; and another is fundamentalism. It will depend on which time which has the primacy that would decide the alliance system. When fundamentalism is on the rise, definitely our allies would be different and when there are trade wars - because there are a number of groupings taking place in this world like groupings for trade - the alliance system would be different. So, with this hypothesis, I would like to go further.

I disagree with Jaswant Singhji when he said that the fundamental principle of forming a policy for Defence is that you should have a Defence Policy first and then go on various steps. I feel that first the requirement is to analyse the threats. In this, I am not going to cover what has been said in the annual report largely because it relates to Defence Ministry as security is not just relevant to Defence Ministry. But there are many other factors involved. I would like to take an overview of the security environment and the threats that confront this country now and in the future. I categorise this threat into three parts and I would base my discussion mostly on those. One threat is the external in which there is a threat of direct aggression from the powers. The second is external threat but indirect process for destabilising our country. I would relate the second aspect to internal threats which are manifest. The third type of threat which has come up in the last decade is a threat from that element which is irresponsible, which is not based on any Government - international crime and international terrorism. What they can do we have seen in Oklahoma. So, these are the three kinds of threats with which every State will have to deal today and unfortunately as on today, there is no great realisation of this threat and of what potential damage it can do.

Going on to the first premise about external threat - because we will have to analyse it very carefully - an external direct threat in our environment are well-known. Here, I would like to draw your attention to Pakistan, China and Indian Ocean. For, Pakistan has been living on 'hate-India' syndrome and its policy-makers have always - to quell their internal disturbances - taken resort to an anti-India rhetoric and that has been the result of what the situation is today. We emphasise that India wants a strong and united Pakistan. We are not interested in balconising Pakistan. But the route which they have taken, will take them to that result.

If Pakistan has to be united and strong, the necessary precondition is that it has to cooperate with India and that can be only done in a process of 'give and take'. Sir, the military has always ruled Pakistan. Even today, the military power is the power that is behind the rulers of today. I do not see any establishment of genuine democracy there. There was one period when democracy was established during Bhutto's time when the Shimla Agreement was signed. Of course, that was a different occasion; I do not want to discuss that. But unless genuine democracy is established in Pakistan, we will have to suffer whatever it is; we may call it a minor threat; I do not want to call it a very major threat; it is a threat in being. And in this context, I would like to say that geographically speaking, 50 per cent of the area where we have to deploy our forces against Pakistan is inhospitable and the same is the case with China. I am deliberately bringing out these facts so that certain inferences could be drawn from these.

The second fact that I would like to bring out is that China is a nuclear power and India cannot ignore it.

That is why, I will come to certain inferences. And the third aspect is about the Indian Ocean and its littoral States, a highly unstable region especially after the Cold War.

Sir, these are the three direct threats. The threat could be from the sea also against which we have to cater ourselves. The first inference that I can draw from whatever direct threats that have been articulated is that the inhospitable terrain would put an emphasis on man, continued emphasis on man. There is no question of high-tech war. You can take that if three-fourths of the land borders are governed by inhospitable terrains and climate, it is the man who would determine the results in future. And that is why, I want to emphasise the fact here that we have to concentrate on that man which is not being done.

The second aspect I would like to bring out is that in a high-tech warfare or mechanised warfare where we would have to strike is along the borders of Punjab and Rajasthan where all these sophisticated equipment, forces multiplied would play their important role. And that is why, if we have to concentrate more on man, then the question of mobilisation comes. We must have a very sound mobilisation system and a communication system which will be based on the principle of a small standing army as a reserve. Unfortunately, this concept, though is making some progress, is not being realised. In the mountains, we cannot deploy in every inch of the ground a man, a soldier. We will have to depend on reserves and efficient mobilisation.

The fourth inference that I would like to draw is that China is a nuclear power. So, whatever is the relation with China, I am sure it will improve; we will have good relations in spite of the pessimistic vision that has been presented; I fully appreciate that we have to take all those things into account.

India cannot give up its nuclear option till the time its security is guaranteed as far as the nuclear weapons are concerned. And that is what I would like the world to know. As far as NPT is concerned, the world is seized of Indo-Pakistani relation and they talk of regional agreement, regional cooperation and all that. It is not possible. China which is our neighbour, with whom we have already fought a war, is a nuclear power. And in these circumstances, it is not possible for us to give up the nuclear option and this has been articulated by the Indian Government most efficiently. And that is why, I am sure, the world would recognise this fact. Sir, I happen to be the Chairman of the Forum for Strategic Studies. We had sent a delegation to the NPT Extension Conference.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Sudhir Sawant, how much time will you need?

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT : I want to take some more time.

MR. SPEAKER : Let me know how much time you need.

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT : I need another half-an-hour.

MR. SPEAKER : Well, I have nine Members with me from the Congress Party and if I give you 45 minutes, I do not know how I will accommodate others. I will have to either withdraw these names, or you curtail your speech.

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT : I am the first speaker today from the Party side.

MR. SPEAKER : I will give you as much time as you need but with the understanding that other Members will not ask for time.

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT : Certainly. I will take just 15 minutes and try to be as brief as possible.

Another interference I must draw is about the Indian Navy. The Indian Navy has aspired to be a blue water navy. But I must request examination of this fact. When we tackle our coast guards and Indian Navy, there is something in between which is missing. Have we been able to make our coastal areas secure? That is the first basic task that the Indian Navy must perform and complete because lot of arms have landed on these coasts from various sources and, that is why, the coast guard and Indian Navy will have to work in an extremely integrated manner in future because they are to combat during the war not only threats from the sea but also threats which are other than naval ships from enemy countries.

Coming to the Air Force, to meet the external threats, the Air Force must, first and foremost, be capable of dealing with a nuclear threat. Whether it is capable or not, that is what the Government must address itself to and support all the ground forces and the Navy.

The next factor is activism in diplomacy. If we are to ward off threats specially in the Indian Ocean, diplomatic moves would have to be swift in future. I talk about flexibility. That is why, to meet a different situation, we would have to have an activist diplomacy.

The next factor is logistic support. I really wonder if the rail and the road network in this country have integrated and the plans have been integrated in the Defence Plan. It is very important. When we talk of a small standing army and a large reserve, we must have the capacity to mobilise in a short time and, that is where the communication should address itself because that is where our logistic depots are and movement to the forward areas must be swift.

The next factor is about Pakistan. I would like to bring to your notice that if Pakistan continues to interfere in the internal affairs of this country, India cannot be oblivious of the unfinished Agenda in PoK, as the Prime Minister has rightly brought out some days back. If

human rights is the question, then we must look into what is happening in Sind where diplomats are being killed in broad day light.

The next factor is external threats which are indirect that Pakistan had most efficiently used against India, unfortunately. I have brought out facts about the operations against India and plans to infiltrate into India by the ISI. Their having stationed in places like Bombay and their funding and promoting terrorism in this country is a fact which is known universally. Unfortunately, the United States has dropped that fact from this year from their Senate proceedings. But basically Pakistan has directed itself to employ a low cost option to embarrass India and, in that, promoted narcotics trade in this country for funding terrorism. Last time I have brought out in great detail the drug chain set up by Pakistan drug barons. Narcotics are being brought up to Western Coast of India and from there are going to Gulf, Africa, United States and the West European countries. They have formed a terrible chain which resulted in incidents like Bombay blast.

The Bombay blast is an act of narco-terrorism and such are the threats that have been posed by Pakistan. It will have to be replied to. Something has to be done about this. What is required to be done in the overall security environment is that we require a very strong second-line of defence because when you go in for war, if at all, it is that time that this network will be more dangerous which has been established in this country. The linkage of the ISI and the LTTE is most dangerous. The linkage of ISI and the North-Eastern Insurgents is most dangerous. All these things have to be taken into account. We must thus establish a sound counter-intelligence system which is not prevailing in this country. So, something has to be done about it. Of course, I would speak on intelligence a little later.

The next threat that we should come to is the internal threat. The former Soviet Union, a Super Power, was balkanised overnight without a shot being fired and that is the potential of internal threat. Today, in this country, unfortunately, maybe for votes, maybe for whatever purposes concerned, there is a consolidation, a regional consolidation, a consolidation on the caste line, a consolidation on the communal line. This has become the political agenda of this country. How can this country survive if it continues? So, something has to be done about this. The regional parties are gaining primacy. Unfortunately, if these trends continue, they are divisive trends, they have to be arrested immediately if this country has to stay united. Therefore, we cannot keep our eyes closed to these threats. Along with this consolidation of regionalism, casteism, communalism, the other factor is terrorism and crime. Now, crime does not have borders. The underground has network throughout the country. This is another machinery. It sometimes and many times has more power than the State power itself. That is why, we come to TADA again. When people have opposed TADA, I feel that it should

be there. When incidents like the Oklahoma happened, the United States of America has said that there is a requirement of more power for the FBI. Of course, I know TADA has been misused.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY : It happened because they did not have TADA!

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT : The TADA has been misused. But then you direct your attention and focus to those who have misused the instrument. Why are you criticising the instrument itself? If criminals can hold power over and above the State power, what happens? Your man murders; he is taken to jail under section 302 of the IPC and he is out on bail in the night.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY : The murderer is not taken. But you are taken!

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT : I am talking about the IPC whereas you are talking about the normal law. This country has got institutions. That is why, about the Human Rights Commission also, I had opposed it because this country does not require the Human Rights Commission. It has got institutions. It is a democratic country. It has got an independent Judiciary, a Legislature, an Executive, a free Press. All the elements of our democracy have been well-established here. I do not want to enter into that argument because this has been used against Jammu and Kashmir also because the United States of America has very effectively tried to use the human rights argument to talk about Jammu and Kashmir. Therefore, I would like to reply in a few words.

Sir, the question in Jammu and Kashmir is not the question of whether the people want to be part of India or not. The question is of a right of a State to secede from the Union. We cannot afford it. America fought a Civil War on this very issue. In the American Civil War, millions died. That is why you talk of human rights of a country, when you are faced with the problem. But when the State wants to secede from the Union, India will not accept it.

This message has to go loud and clear. India will have to use whatever force is there at its disposal to prevent any State from seceding from the Union. Nobody, no power from outside has got any business to interfere in India's internal affairs. These are messages which should go loud and clear because there are certain attempts to distort images.

And the same thing is about Punjab. Punjab was the lost case. It is the another achievement of this Government. In 1991 when I was in army, I had thought that Punjab was a 'lost case'. But today Punjab has become one of the most peaceful States of this country. Its economy is roaring up again and the enterprising farmers of Punjab are feeding this country. So when we talk about internal threat, we will have to be very careful about it and what is required to be done is that there has to be greater coordination between a State and the

Centre because law and order, till date, has been a State subject. And the same situation continues whether it is in this era of international crime, whether it is in this era where criminals are networking from Nepal to Kanyakumari or whether there would be some federal crime which would be brought under the Central List and where central forces and agencies can be deployed.

The second factor is that the coordination between security forces is not at all present. Everyone is having his own army. Something has to be done immediately to bring all the security forces under one umbrella. What that umbrella could be, we will come shortly to.

The third thing is, there has to be again a sound intelligence system. I will again speak of it in a few words, later on.

The fourth thing is about the mobile forces. The Rapid Action Force, as the name suggests, should be placed around the country to deal with the various situation like Ayodhya or anything which may come up.

The fifth and the most important one is that along with a free market economy, there is a requirement of establishing a crime free economy. That is a message because drug money is a phenomena which is just one exclusive to India but it is an international phenomena. The drug money laundering has to stop. I request that the Money Laundering Act be enacted soon.

I come to the third aspect of international crime where irresponsible threat can become more manifest in future, as has been proved in the World Trade Centre in Oklahoma and in Bombay blast. As I have said about the international crime terrorism, the crime has no boundary. Italian mafia has networked with the Russian mafia - four hundredth rank in Russia - with Colombians and Americans. There is a regular international network which can subvert any kind of international attempt. To add to that, there have been 272 cases of smuggling of nuclear material detected in Germany itself. The cases reported are four but there are 272 cases of smuggling of nuclear material. There is a brain drain in those States where it was nuclear powers like Belarus, Ukraine, Kazakhstan which are available to anyone on a particular price. It is a hypothesis which merits consideration and that is about nuclear terrorism. In Bombay blast, conventional bombs were used. Had there been a nuclear device, we can well imagine that these terrorists, these criminals would have held any Government to ransom. How are you going to tackle this problem? This is not a problem of one Government. This has to be addressed by the entire international community. To that extent, again, the question of crime free economy comes. A crime free economy corridor in the world has to be established because there are tax havens which are utilised regularly for silting away drug money.

The same money is cycled back into terrorist activities. It has been proved. Fortunately, the Europe or the European Community has passed a law which makes reporting of this kind of money compulsory. Now,

even Swiss Bank has passed a law as far as the narcotics is concerned that those accounts will be disclosed immediately. So, these are the initiatives which will have to be taken at national and international levels. In that the normal fears of security should sometimes be overlooked as this is the single most threat because of its irresponsibility; because the State power acts to certain rules of the game, irresponsible people do not.

Thus, what are the priorities of the National Security Policy. I would put it in a different order. Priority one is, we will have to put our house in order first. That is, this country has to realise that we all have to act and function together. The regional tendency, the tendency to regionalism, communalism and casteism has to be defeated. That is what the policy of this Government has always been. That every man in this country irrespective of its creed, caste and colour must work unitedly so that India becomes a powerful nation in the 21st century. To this extent, we must address.

The second priority, I feel, is to tackle infiltration. Any kind of low-cost option should be defeated at its root and this infiltration has to be tackled.

The third priority is, we must look at the external aggression. I am not saying that importance of any aspect is less, but these are the priorities. Shri Jaswant Singh has also mentioned about national will. It is integrated in this. We have to build that so that the security of this country, in true sense and aspect, is maintained when we involve the people of this country.

Thus, coming to my requirements, which I would suggest, the requirement one is, Sir, we today require a mechanism to take a holistic view of security issues, a mechanism which would take into account all aspects dealt by the Defence, Finance, Home and External Affairs and that is the National Security Council. Sir, I know that attempts are on to form it. There are some problems. But, I would request that the National Security Council is formed immediately because that is the precise reason, Sir, today that our Defence Minister has to be the Prime Minister. We cannot afford, I fully agree, we cannot afford to have a Defence Minister today because he is the only person capable of taking a holistic view. That is the reason I disagree with Jaswant Singhji on this point. There has been a tradition and many a time, a Prime Minister has kept Defence with himself because it is the most important issue of this country; it cannot be played around and that is why, I feel, the present arrangement is good, but at the same time, I would request that the National Security Council may be established at the earliest.

The second fact in the requirement one is the integration of intelligence effort. I am sorry to say that I have worked in an intelligence set up myself. I do not want to speak about that. But, I found one thing which I want to share with this House. There is a total lack of coordination. There is only one-upmanship. We do not share....

SHRI AMAL DATTA (Diamond Harbour) : It is damaging.

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT : It is not damaging. It is a hard fact because we will have to take stock; we want this Parliament to take stock of this fact. If there can be a Senate Committee for Intelligence in United States, there should be a Parliamentary Committee, a Standing Committee to look into Intelligence. Here, the answer to the Defence Ministry's question is that in public interest it cannot be answered. Sir, if Pakistan Army knows everything about those issues, why can Indian Parliament not know of it? So, there is a requirement of greater transparency in security matters. I will explain why I am addressing it in this manner when I come to the manpower policy.

The next point is, there should be a permanent policy planning staff, which is not there in India. An attempt was made during Rajivji's time to have perspective planning staff. I would request for that along with National Security Council because in the Armed Forces officers are shifted regularly after two years from one post to another. For planning we require some specialists because today planning has become highly complex and complicated. So this is one aspect.

The second requirement is manpower. Jaswant Singhji has spoken about this aspect. We must realise that the Indian soldier today functions in utmost difficulties. I have served in Siachen for six months myself. We have seen that we have to carry barrels for two nights, so that we can supply kerosene to that post. Our socks are torn, but we keep on walking. When you deal with insurgents in a place like Kashmir, in the night the fire comes from any side. A soldier is a human being. He reacts. That is why when we talk of human rights and we expect the soldier to function, it is very difficult. Who will talk about human rights of the soldiers? They are staying away from their families. They are functioning in difficult and different environment. When in the night they go out on patrol and in jungles or in urban areas they are fired upon, they will react; they are human beings. Self-preservation is there. Of course, the characteristic of Indian army is, in its long tradition, it has used force with compassion whenever dealing with civilians. That is the single most achievement of this Army. But that should be kept in mind and that is why the manpower policy must be given priority today. I feel that our soldiers are working under the most inhuman conditions. Imagine in Siachen, a man loses his will to live. He says he wants to die. How are you going to function in those circumstances? Siachen is a block of ice. Only Pakistan and India are the two countries which are capable of fighting at that height. I remember the hon. Speaker had visited that place when I was in Siachen. We have to take stock of the situation and find a solution to the Siachen problem immediately.

About manpower policy, as Jaswant Singh has brought out, something has to be done. Here a soldier retires at a young age. I am sure that a soldier cannot be expected to do the task of an infantry soldier at the age of forty. Every year he has to pass a ten mile-run test. He has to run ten miles and pass the test. He has to pass a two mile-run test also. These are physical parameters which will not make him fit to keep on serving in infantry. That is why I had given a suggestion that the colour service of the soldiers of infantry should be reduced to seven years and these soldiers should be side-stepped to Border security Force, Para-military Forces, Rastriya Rifles, State Police. This is how we will reduce the pension burden and keep the army young. Now what is happening is that, after his retirement, you take him in Para-military Forces. Nobody is interested in again going and doing the same thing. They will not go. That is why you reduce the colour service. This proposal has been widely welcomed by the Defence Ministry, by the Home Ministry also. Everyone says it is a good idea. But somehow it is not jelling. So I would request you to appoint a committee to decide on the manpower policy. We all accept it, the only thing is, it is not being coordinated.

The second fact is about civil service. We will have to formulate a certain policy that whoever enters the Government service, either State or Centre, must at least serve in Defence for some time. This is where the national will develops. MPs would be a good idea!

The next point I want to bring out is about the pay and perks. Now the Fifth Pay Commission is deciding the pay factors. But I would like to emphasize here that let us not count the services of a soldier on par with civilians.

The requirements are entirely different. For an infantry soldier - I remember the days when I was an infantry soldier - there are hardly two years in five when he could go to a peace station. And when he goes to a peace station, he is again employed in internal security duty. So, if you count the days, there is hardly any time he can stay with his family. This is the situation. But the same soldier is compared to a man in supply corps or ordnance. Both are paid the same amount. What is the incentive for a man to serve in the infantry? Jaswant Singhji brought out that an officer in the Inter-Military Academy does not want to join the infantry or the combatant corps because they are getting the same pay. Now, after the introduction of free ration to the officers, another traumatic situation has arisen. When an officer is getting free ration, if he is posted in the field, he has to maintain two establishments, whereas an officer in the supply corps is very comfortable, getting everything and is in peace. After all, who are promoted later on? I have seen people serving in peace areas managing to get away from field.

Now, let us go to pay and perquisites. When I was serving in Siachen, I was getting around Rs. 250 as

allowance, to be in Siachen. People say, 'we will pay Rs 250 to the Government not to the soldier'. This is the reality of life. Let us realise that and have allowances as per the conditions in which we have to work. I would request that immediately a combat allowance should be instituted. When a man joins infantry or armoured corps - these are the two combat arms - he should get a lump sum amount as an incentive. Otherwise, nobody would want to join them.

The next item is, promotions. Unfortunately, my experience about promotions in the armed forces is a very sad one. We had a very good tradition, but lately, sycophancy has become the order of the day. The people who serve in the field, the people who serve and get decorations are not promoted. I can give you innumerable instances of such occurrences. I do not know what is 'comparative merit'. When I asked a question, they said 'comparative merit'. What is the basis of 'comparative merit'? What are the parameters of 'comparative merit'? Let us also examine the field criteria. Is a man fighting a war going to get credit? Or, is a man serving in the staff going to get all the benefits? This has to be examined.

The next point is about Territorial Army policy. A Committee has been constituted just recently to look into the question of the reserve forces. The entire question of the reserve forces, which I call a small standing army and a large reserve force should be addressed taking into account the Territorial Army concept because if we want immediate mobilisation, we will have to do something about that. So, the idea was, as has been brought out, where public sector undertakings are there, Territorial Armies could be started, as is done in the case of the Railways. Similar experiments could be done where people who have retired from Army could go to the reserve, be in Territorial Army, as I am, and can be available in times of war.

About the equipment policy, I will not say more because Jaswant Singhji has said quite a bit. But the only thing I would like to mention about Air Force is on the Light Combat Aircraft. I have nothing against the Light Combat Aircraft or the LH. I would request that the Air India also goes ahead step by step. We are manufacturing a trainer LCA. I think that the logical course would have been to manufacture an Advanced Jet Trainer before going on to the LCA. That Advanced Jet Trainer would have been available to us by now. In the next stage, we could have easily gone on to the LCA. This is the graduated manner in which we should have tried to acquire technology instead of straightaway going in for something which is very difficult to achieve. This is the aspect about Research and Development which should be kept in mind.

Whatever Jaswant Singhji said about training, I fully agree with them. In 15 years of my service, as far as individual training is concerned, I may not have done one month's individual training. There is something

seriously lacking. As a Company Commander, I used to get frustrated to find my boys working somewhere and cutting grass.

This is the culture which, Shri Jaswant Singh has just mentioned. Something has to be done about that now. Shri Jaswant Singh mentioned about cars going around, carrying ladies. I do not have anything against it. But this is not the culture of the Armed Forces. Something has to be done about this immediately; and misuse of manpower has to be stopped. Earlier, 'fatigue' was for those people who committed some crime or indiscipline. But nowadays, you will find at 2 o'clock everyday in the infantry battalion or in other battalions, that the soldiers line up with a sickle in hand to cut grass. I did not want to mention it; for the last three years, I have kept quiet. But, Shri Jaswant Singh mentioned it today and I could not resist myself; and so, I mentioned it.

About housing, I would fully support Shri Jaswant Singh's view that Armed Forces personnel must be provided with housing. But, something has to be done about the Military Engineering Service; and the quality of service which they provide, I feel, is not at all up to the mark. When I was in the Army, I remember the approach which these people had. This Service is to be made more efficient.

There was a proposal earlier about the sale of Defence lands. I would like to just bring out one thing, that is, the Defence land, if at all they are to be used, they should be used for sports or for training or for welfare activities or for ex-servicemen. These are very welcome endeavours which I think, all the people will support.

One thing I would mention about reservation for ex-servicemen about the Supreme Court ruling restricting the reservation up to 50 per cent. There is a problem. I feel threatened whether the reservation for ex-servicemen would not be available. This is something for which the Government should reply.

About Ex-servicemen's Corporation, which you have planned, some States have already announced; but many States Ex-servicemen's Corporations had to come up. There is one request to make on behalf of Ex-servicemen concerning employment of ex-servicemen and their children. CSD or Canteen Stores Department is a very large segment which provides consumer goods to the Indian Army. I would request that at least 100 items in these Canteen Stores Department should be reserved for those ex-servicemen who manufacture them and Ex-servicemen Cooperative Societies which manufacture them. This would provide tremendous boost to self-employment among ex-servicemen. I thank you again for extending the Indira Avas Yojana to the ex-servicemen which has been welcomed by all ex-servicemen and also by those people who are in service in this country.

About missiles I have already made a mention. Finally I would speak about NPT. I fully agree with Shri Jaswant Singh's proposal that there should be a Resolution by the 10th of this month. This House should unanimously pass a Resolution with whatever text it may be, on lines of what India's policy has been — that India must oppose the indefinite and unconditional extension of the NPT. Then, India must demand a Treaty which treats all nations equally. We can of course grant either conditional extension or extension for some time, for review purpose so that a Treaty which is uniform and universal can be devised. So, that period would be required to be mentioned.

The Forum for Strategic and Security Studies have already given a proposal and a time-bound plan as an improvement on the Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan which calls for 2035 as a year by which we should achieve total elimination of nuclear weapons. On those lines, we can draft it. About nuclear terrorism, what has happened is a tragedy. Then, small countries are not just bothered about NPT. They are going to go to New York and just sign on dotted lines because they do not face the nuclear threat because of their sheer size. But they do not realise that they can very well be subjected to nuclear terrorism. So, that is something which has to be propagated at New York by someone. We are trying to do it but someone else may also try to do it and this aspect must be brought out. We must lobby so that we can succeed in what we want, that is, NPT should not be extended for an indefinite period and in an unconditional manner.

Lastly, I again congratulate the Government for bringing back this country's prestige and power. We are a proud nation with an ancient civilisation. We are a nation which has been built on the blood of freedom fighters and soldiers. We have a long way to go and still, we have to sacrifice ourselves a lot because it is not with dreams but with blood and iron that we have moulded the nation at last.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Amal Datta may speak now. CPI(M) has 32 minutes.

16.51 hrs.

SHRI AMAL DATTA : Sir, I have to start by making a comment on what has been said about the attendance in the House being so sparse.

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT : It has improved now.

SHRI AMAL DATTA : It has improved a little bit. But it is always said so. It is so not only this year but every year. The reason for this is very simple. We, the Members of Parliament, are not familiar with what Defence is all about unless we happen to come here after serving in the Defence Services. Moreover, when the Government is not too keen to let us become familiar by refusing to answer all kinds of questions and by not admitting questions on the ground of security policy or something like that, why should one be interested to come and attend the debate on such an unfamiliar

topic? So, the blame lies on the Government, on the policy of the Government keeping the Defence matters totally secret, as if everything concerning Defence can or should be secret. I understand that this is a 19th century British policy which the British are still proud of following or just about to give up but we are still following that. I read in some books and magazines that in the 1970s, there was a lot of introspection in the US Army followed by a similar introspection in the US Navy and Air Force which led to a total change in the doctrines and tactics of how to fight by the Army, the Air Force and the Navy. Now, these were debated in public. These were the suggestions made. They were brought before the public; there was a debate and after six years in one case and two years in another case, taking into consideration both the experience and the public comments, these manuals were changed. The manuals were made public and US Army's document on how to fight a battle is available to anybody who wants it. But in our country, even a single page would be marked 'restricted' or 'top secret' or something like that. Nobody will be able to see it.

I would like to just mention our experience in the Standing Committee on Defence. I think since 1993 the Standing Committee has been trying to scrutinise the Defence Budget and this year, the Committee wanted to have a look at the report which was prepared during 1990-91 by Mr. Arun Singh who was once the Defence Minister of State. The Standing Committee was examining Defence expenditure and how to economise the expenditure and that was the reason why the Standing Committee wanted to see what the Arun Singh Committee has said. That Report has not been made available. I think that Report was given to the Government in 1991 and in 1995, it is still thought to be so secret that it could not be given to the parliamentary Standing Committee which was sitting with the exclusive purpose of scrutinising the Defence Budget. If such is the attitude of the Government, how could Members of Parliament be interested in the debate on Defence?

In fact, some of us in this Standing Committee have been thinking of getting out of that Committee because no useful discussion is possible with the scanty information which is made available through the answers and statements given by the Government to the Committee. So, I think that explains at least partly, the reason why there is so little interest in Defence amongst MPs. In other Parliaments like the British Parliament, the US Congress and Senate - I am told - that there are a large number of people who have come after serving Army in one capacity or the other, either as officers with voluntary rejoin or those who have been drafted into the Army because conscription ended in both the UK and the USA, in the early Seventies. Before that, everybody had to go for a national service for a period of two years and some people volunteered to go for another three years because of some monetary benefits and so on. So, they had an experience in the

Armed forces. Certainly, much more interest can be evoked thereby. Now, that is not the case in this country. I think, the Government should now, at least in the days when the electronic snoop, electronic distance remote visibility and all that have probably made everything, which they think or the Defence Establishment thinks to be top secret have become known to countries, which would easily give those secrets away to our enemy countries. So, what is being kept secret is really secret from our own people, from the peoples' representatives i.e., ourselves and not really from the enemy. This should be understood, appreciated and acted upon which they are unable to do till now. I am sure that Arun Singh Committee Report is available to the United States Defence Services or C.I.F. But it is not available to us.

Sir, something has been commented upon on security policy and the need to have a National Security Council. In this context, I would like to refer to a study made by the RAN Corporation about Indian Defence strategy and the reports come to the conclusion that Indians have no consciousness of strategy - never had in the past and do not have even now - and it is because of the fact that the strategy flows from a national security policy which in turn is a policy to protect national interests. Once the national interests have been defined, only then one can have a National Security Policy. If the national interests cannot be defined, well, it is not our fault today that national interest policies cannot be defined. It is the fault of successive Governments for the last 45 years or so that the country has remained at a stage where there are conflicting interests all around. If the interests are all conflicting with each other, what are then the national interests? If the people cannot be homogenised to the extent of having certain basic conscience about what is needed for the country's defence, then you cannot even evolve a National Security Council and that is the stage at which we still are even after 45 years of Independence. That should be realised, appreciated and perhaps something can be done, even at this late stage to bring enough consensus among the people to have some minimum consensus so that we can have certain interest which we want to protect through a National Security Policy. And, only then we can have national strategy. Our strategy today is to defend our borders from whoever we think are threats who will come across the border and assault us physically. So, for that the National Security Policy has to be given proper formulation. First of all the realisation of what are the threats; what are the policies, alternatives available and all that, it is necessary to have a National Security Council because as Maj. Sawant said that he was in the intelligence and there is no coordination.

17.00 hrs.

I could discover this at least in spite of the very nodding acquaintance that I have with the Defence Systems. I discovered long time back that there was no

coordinaton whatsoever. What happened in Kashmir happened so suddenly that it just took us by surprise. We had no information. But the Intelligence people told me that they had information and that they had given that information. But those people who had to look into the information and act upon it, did not have time or did not coordinate themselves enough to act upon that information. Similarly, the Gulf War too took us by surprise. But the preparations for the Gulf War had taken a long time. But we did not prepare ourselves to meet the contingencies that would necessarily arise if there were to be a war. The Islamic fundamentalism suddenly came through Iran. It was brewing there for a long time, but we did not know. There are umpteen number of instances which are apparently intelligence failures, but which in reality are not. Intelligence did come but that intelligence was not appreciated, it was not received properly, it was not coordinated and it was not acted upon. For that you require not a Minister. If Prime Minister becomes a full time Defence Minister or if a full time Defence Minister is appointed, that might partially retrieve the situation but certainly not in full. For that purpose, you require people from outside and that is where the crunch is. The Defence establishment does not allow people from outside to come and have a peep and try to understand what is happening in Defence. I think two reasons are there. One is, they are not confident about what they are doing. They do not know whether what they are doing is correct or not. They do not want others to have a look and gain some knowledge of what they are doing because they do not want them to go out and criticise. The second reason which perhaps coexists with the first aspect is that they do not want to share this knowledge. In modern world, knowledge is power and they do not want to share that power with people from outside their establishment. These are the two reasons and it is perhaps not so much the concern for the security of the country, which inhibit them from sharing information even with Members of Parliament who are expressly assigned by Parliament to study the very matter. So this is the position.

Sir, I understand that at one point of time, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru promised to set up a National Security Council. Rajiv Gandhi had certainly acted on it and it was actually set up by a Government executive order, though it was not a very satisfactory arrangement. What was sought to be set up was a three-tier arrangement of which outsiders, academics and parliamentarians who would act at least in an advisory capacity will form one of the three tiers. Even that would have been a great advancement on the present situation where nobody knows what exactly is happening in this sphere. Nobody knows anything about Intelligence, about the application of Intelligence, about the various policies which must be taken up, formulated and acted upon today, if they were to be effective ten or fifteen years hence. We do not even know that will be our country's position to

defend itself in fifteen years hence and what will be the relative position of other countries. We must know that. Maybe, at the present movement, some aspects have been revealed to us in the Standing Committee. But without understanding what will be the threats emanating from those countries, it would be of no use. What is being done in laboratories today? I have a book with me here, 'Asian Strategy Review'. It shows what are available in laboratories at least in one country which somehow opened its doors to the world and that is today's Russia. What is available in Russia's laboratories for tomorrow's weapons is revealed and they seem to be wonderful weapons and I wish we could have gone into some kind of arrangement with them for acquisition and joint production and things like that. This is the sort of knowledge which the Government must acquire. Not only acquire, but it must also share the information with the Standing Committees, Members of Parliament and so on so that there can be a purposeful debate both in the Committees and on the floor of the House as well as nationally.

There is no reason why people should not be allowed to know what they would otherwise know from the American Television and things like that.

Sir, therefore, the National Security Council will not only receive and coordinate the intelligence, but also will apply that and coordinate the defence policy and formulate the national defence strategy. It is a must. It should be set up as soon as possible with outsiders, from the defence establishment, being given a more significant role than was earlier attempted to be given during 1990.

So, the National Security policy will also take in its ambit the internal threats, the weapons necessary for meeting the internal threat and would also go into the infrastructure which is necessary - both for defence as well as for defence industries which must be there for proper preparedness in defence matters. So, it is only with that kind of a situation that the country would be able to meet the threat which would appear to be coming from one place or the other.

Now, sometimes, if we donot know enough and quite often we do not know, there may be suspicion where suspicion is probably not due. Shri Jaswant Singh said about Chinese acquisition of weapons, I am also referring to that. It is said that China itself is modernising its army. There is no harm in that because Chinese Army, Air Force and Navy have been very old. But he says that China's intentions are such that from there, there may be a threat to us. What he said is, they want a living space by which it is meant that they want to expand their territory; they want to re-draw their strategic borders. What are the actual intentions of China? That we must know. It is true that they have not only modernised their Army or modernising their equipments and Air Force and so on, but also have supplied arms to Pakistan which, of course, we cannot

view very complacently. They have supplied tanks, aircraft, M-11 missiles, atom bomb triggers and some other nuclear technology including the missile technology. Now, the question is : Why are they doing that? What efforts have we made to dissuade them from doing that? What efforts have we made to build up a closeness with China by going in for better economic relations, defence relations and joint production of the several of the defence equipments which we can do, which we can go in for and then we would not need to go for these equipments to other countries? What efforts exactly we have made is not known. I suspect that we have done very little in this sphere.

The idea that must percolate in the mind of the Government here is that they must try to persuade China to think likewise that if China and India could come together then the synergetic effect of that coming together would be tremendous. That is why, there are people who are trying to keep India and China separate. So, there seems to be a suspicion between the two countries. I believe the efforts which are required in this direction have not been taken by the Government. The Government should make these efforts so that both the countries are put in a much better and amicable position.

Regarding the NPT and COCOM treaties, which are supposed to be extended and for which a meeting has been called, all of us share the same feeling that India cannot sign the NPT and India can only support the total Nuclear Ban Treaty. That is the only way India can go for it; whether India can go for it in a gradual way, as indicated by Jaswant Singhji, I do not know. But apparently the NPT, which is so much made upon by USA, has not been effective and USA is one of the parties who had closed its eyes when surreptitiously Pakistan was acquiring both technology and parts for making of the nuclear weapons. This is disclosed in the recent book which has come out from USA itself saying that, "The Commerce Department of USA was actively encouraging the firms, which were not supposed to deliver any of these banned items to Pakistan, to export them to Pakistan. Even when the companies themselves have pointed out that Pakistan has asked for an item which is banned, but they would like to inform the Commerce Department that this is so, the Department went ahead and told them to go and supply this. They have no difficulty". This is the kind of two-facet attitude which has been taken by the USA in this. Earlier USA had also in similar ways supplied the same kind of things to Iraq. Both the technology and the crucial parts have been supplied by USA to Iraq I suppose, to see that Iraq is armed enough to be a kind of policeman for USA in the Middle East. But the policeman went astray and started hurting USA interest. Therefore, if there is a proposal for a unanimous Resolution to be passed by the House before the 12th of this month regarding the NPT and COCOM, I do not know whether COCOM is also a part of that meeting, then certainly we would like

to examine that, after a draft is made available to us. I think all parties should combine and an agreed draft Resolution can be unanimously passed. That will help the country's progress towards the Nuclear Ban Treaty.

We have also got to redefine our attitude to use of nuclear weapons because it has now come out in the open, is rebuttable and still now a rebutted statement given by the ex-Prime Minister of Pakistan, Shri Nawaz Sharief, that Pakistan does possess nuclear bombs and not merely the capability to make nuclear bombs. If that is the evidence, and also in the light of the evidence which is given in the US Congress that the political leadership of Pakistan will not necessarily be consulted or even informed by the military if they are going to use nuclear bombs — if that is the position of the political leadership even though they have come through elections - then it is all the more reasoned that India has to think hard as to what action it will take and what will be its posture to the world about the use or non-use of nuclear bomb. One must know that it will take weeks to make a nuclear bomb whereas if a bomb is there which is not armed it will take only six hours to arm it and use it. So unarmed bombs may be one solution, I do not know.

The other thing is about missiles. That is also a very funny situation that we are not able to tell the world what we want to do.

17.14 hrs.

(Shrimati Santosh Chowdhary *in the Chair*)

The difficulty that arises in this is, if all these are meant to be deterrents, both nuclear bomb and missile should be used by India not as a weapon of offence but as a deterrent. But if they are deterrent, we have to tell that they are available and they are deterrent and they are only to be used as deterrent otherwise there is no value of deterrence. The problem here, as I understand, is that India has considered itself a nonviolent country and, therefore, these missiles and nuclear bombs, everything must be necessarily abhorrent.

But, at the same time, you cannot have a deterrent without telling others that "I do have a deterrent and I mean to use it as a deterrent if I am attacked". There is a dilemma here but it has to be resolved. Otherwise, our Defence preparedness becomes weak, and morale goes down.

Now, coming to the preparedness in the Army and other Services, we are told that the Armoured Corps of the Army is lacking in many respects. On the one Tank which we were sure to be able to depend on, from the late-Eighties onwards we had enough assurances in this House itself. I remember, in 1984 when our ex-President and then before that the ex-Defence Minister, Mr. Venkataraman was replying to the Defence debate, he assured the House in 1984 that in four year's time

the MBT Arjun will be inducted into the Army because we raised questions about what was being done on the development of MBT. But nothing has happened. As yet it has not been inducted. Trials have been going on, as far as I am aware, for the last five years. They have been tried out since 1989-90 and I do not know why the Army has not been satisfied. Maybe they are raising the specifications again and again and, therefore, again something has to be improved upon I do not know. But if the gestation period is going to be so long, then necessarily the difficulties will arise because the user will find that in other countries some improvements have taken place and they want that improvement to be incorporated. Therefore again and again the production will be postponed. I think this should not be allowed to carry on any more. The Tank should be productionised as soon as possible.

The other two types of Tanks we have which are of Russian origin T-72 and T-55, are being modernised or upgraded but we are told that certain vital parts have not been obtained. One among them is tactical fire control. Without fire control a Tank as such is nothing. Why is it that it has not been done. These are pretty old Tanks. If they had to be modernised the modernisation should have taken place long time ago. Maybe, the idea was they will be scrapped and then they will all be replaced by the MBT. I do not know what was the idea but certainly that is the fact.

I think Mr. Jaswant Singh has said about the self-propelled guns, the Bofors and the confusion created because of the Bofors having been found out to be a corrupt company. These deficiencies have been there but have not been set right. The Army is not probably in a good shape just now. I hope that these things will be remedied very quickly and for that money which is required should be made available. It should not be allowed to suffer for lack of funds.

Then there is the recruitment, training, and planning for optimisation etc. These are to be looked into. The Army probably is too big, I do not know. My own feeling is that we do not require an Army which is one million strong. It should be smaller but there should be enough reserve and the reserve should be capable of being mobilised quickly. The Army which will be there, should be fully trained and kept in combat readiness most of the time of the year excepting when the personnel are on leave.

I think, in most parts of the world they have a standing Army. The USA and today's Russia - we do not know much about China - have fairly large Armies. Today even the Russian Army is something like 2.5 millions. They are modernising the concept of the Armed Forces as well as the training which the Army is receiving and the battlefield training which is being given through operations.

They are changing the concept by bringing in a concept of immediate reaction force, viz., a concept of Rapid Deployment Force. They have done it in Russia. These are independent commands. They can be - without mobilising the main Army - mobilised and they can react in a few hours' time to any assault in any part of the country with all the necessary equipment that are required to repulse such an attack.

We have a self-sufficient small Army which is always on the alert. We deploy the Rapid Deployment Force also or something of that nature which will take, maybe, two to three days to be mobilised. By that time it is mobilised, the Army will have to be mobilised. This is the concept which they have adopted by looking at the environment. I do not say that we must immediately follow what they have done but what I say is that there is a necessity for looking at our environment and see what we require in this context. I cannot say that we may require either of these two or we may require some other alternative. I cannot give any concrete suggestion also because I do not know the threat environment which is there at present or in the future. But, the Defence Ministry should do something about it.

Then, the recruitment should be of such type that the young men who will be recruited should not only be physically fit but also mentally alert. The I.Q. required at present should be much more because the future war is going to be a hi-tech war. The soldier will have to be on his own sometimes or in a small group without any Leader or even the Leader should be able to take decision which will be of very far-reaching character. It is because the weapons are also becoming much more destructive than before and they will find themselves in a spot where they have to take such decisions. They have to use hi-tech equipment, both surveillance equipment and communication equipment as well as weapons. So, they will have to have people with much higher quality of not only mind but also body. That should be ensured.

Similarly, training which they receive should also be a quality training and not a time bound or period bound training which were being given in all the Armies earlier. But, now, it seems that the Armies of other countries are moving on to a performance-oriented training, whether you acquire one skill or not. Until you acquire that skill to the level of perfection required of you, you do not move on to acquire next type of skill and so on. So, that quality of training will have to be changed. Today, there are four operations. Up till now training operations are subject to surveillance by electronics and laser and put on a computer. One can see and assess the performance not only of a Unit but also of individual soldiers in battlefield conditions and the accuracy etc., can be seen. These are simulator war trainings which are to be incorporated, otherwise, I think, our Army will not be able to stand up to the Armies

which receive this kind of training and I can see that once USA and Russia have gone in for such type of training, other countries will follow them very soon. So, I think, apart from this, we have to inculcate some amount of military training amongst the young people of this country. Now, I am not quite clear as to how this can be done. But one suggestion may be, that people going up to the university level, before they are admitted to a university, must pass through a period of military training. It may be necessary. But some kind of discipline should be inculcated. That could be a qualification for entry into universities.

You will find that the importance that should have been given to Air Force is not being given. This is because in this year's Budget, the allocation to Air Force is only 25.7 per cent as against last year's allocation of 27.8 per cent. It has gone down by two per cent instead of going up. It should have gone up because the lesson of Gulf War is that the Air Force is the determining factor in today's warfare particularly in the plains. So, in the plains of Rajasthan and Punjab, I think, the Air Force will have the most significant and crucial role. Therefore, many equipments and many things are required. The attitude of the Government is that things can go on as they are going on and no emphasis need be given to the Air Force and this attitude one cannot agree with. This has to go and proper importance should be given to the Air Force. The types of surveillance, the types of communication, the types of command and execution of command which we shown with such great shattering consequences in the Gulf War have to be naturally studied and to the extent possible they have to be brought into this country by indigenous effort and not from America. I do not know what we are doing to this effect. We are still somehow doing what we were doing in mid-eighties. We are still continuing with MBT. We, of course, got the missiles and even about missiles we have got a split mind as to what to do about these missiles. We are also going to upgrade our aeroplanes, Mig 21s and 29s. This decision should have been taken long ago. It could have been taken and it should have been taken long ago and should have been completed by this time. But we are going to just start the work and that too in such a graduated manner that it would take years to complete this upgradation. If we upgrade our planes, there is no need to buy new planes. But we are going to buy aeroplanes. I do not know what deficiencies would remain after upgradation. We are going to buy new aeroplanes. We are looking for multi-role strike aircraft. Well, again I would say that we should have been able to manufacture one by this time. I do not know why we had started this manufacturing of Jaguar in this country with the intention that we will carry it on. I do not why we went for Jaguar because Jaguar was end of the line production which we purchased and they had made kits ready for India and we gradually brought them over the years and then assembled and

manufactured parts of it with the idea that we shall be able to build indigenous capability. For what purpose? It was for the purpose of building more planes. But we gave up as soon as the last kit finished. That is not the way to bring self-reliance in the country and unless we do it we are going to pay through our nose. Even now there is a possibility of joining Russia. We can start producing planes with the help of Russia. We should do that. Moreover, it is possible to have Defence technology even without the help of the country or the Government. From USA many technologies flowed down because of people going there and getting trained there. Apparently people from Iran and Pakistan got trained. I do not know whether the US Government was just keeping their eyes closed for these two countries. India can also try. Sometimes the Defence industry is bought. If the industry is bought, the equipments come under ones control. Now, these are the possibilities. Even experts from abroad can come and serve. There was a very well-known ballistic expert called Bull who was assassinated by Israelis in his home at Belgium because he was helping Iraq. He was helping Iraq to build a super gun and had already put together three Scud Missiles so that the range of the Scud Missiles could be increased.

Now these experts are available. What have we done? The experts are available even today in Russia and other CIS countries. They are willing to come. They go to U.S.A. and they go to U.K. I have met people working in England for exactly at ten pounds a month with food and lodging. But we do not think about it. Five years have gone by. So, we could have done a lot if we wanted to. But somehow we have not given Defence the importance that it deserves. Nothing can illustrate that more expressly than the figures of what we spend on Defence. This year we are going to spend on Defence 2.43 per cent of our Gross National Product. What Pakistan is going to spend is about 7 per cent of its GNP. So, it is about three times of ours in terms of the ratio of GNP. China is going to spend on Defence 5.53 per cent, that is, more than twice of ours. So, that is our expenditure in terms of ratio of GNP.

Our Army is also one of the smallest in terms of our population. In terms of the ratio of soldiers to one thousand citizens, in Pakistan it is 6.98 and in India it is 1.28. So, that is the kind of situation, which we have and we, as a nation, give to Defence and as a Government we give to Defence through the Budget.

What we have to do is to rethink the whole idea of Defence. If we are going to defend this country properly, then we have to think not only of today but of the scenario of the future. We have to think of brining the people together to the minimum level of consensus so that we have our national interests, which are acceptable to everybody for protection through a national strategy, evolution of a national strategy.

17.32 hrs.

(Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair)

There are other small matters, which I will refer to. We have had a recommendation by a very high level Committee appointed under the Air Marshal La Fontaine regarding prevention of accidents in the air. This Committee gave its report. I am not quite sure about the year, whether it is 1982 or 1983. It had made some recommendations. One of the recommendations was that there must be an advanced jet trainer. It was not the first time that the concept of having an advanced jet trainer came up. It had come up before that also. But this was a high level Committee giving the same recommendation, which was perhaps already known and the Government should have immediately acted upon it. But the Government has not till date acted upon it. The Government says that they are in the process of acquisition and the acquisition process was started, they have invited the tenders, they have examined the tenders, they have technically shortlisted the tenders and they are going to see the commercial terms. But, unfortunately after waiting for 11 or 12 years, we find that the other alternatives are on the horizon. That is bound to happen. The two shortlisted ones happen to be 25 or 30 year-old vintage aircraft. Again we are saying that if we buy those, then they will hand over all the machinery to make them and we will make them in our own country.

Now we have the example before us of what happened with Jaguar. We have the example before us what happened with the HW submarine. We are going to acquire still more experience by acquisition of these obsolete planes as HITs. We say that our defence Ministry itself will say that a plane's life is 25 years. Not only the plane but also the whole design and everything becomes obsolete in course of 25 years. These planes are of 1964 and 1974 vintage and we are going to acquire them now and if we place orders today, they will require two or three more years to deliver the first plane. So, that is the kind of condition now. In the meantime, other planes have arisen and have appeared in the horizon but apparently we are not considering them because we are now in a great hurry. I think, the Government will be well advised to reject this kind of planes and go for the new ones which have now come.

Then, again, insofar as Air Force is concerned, I repeat, the emphasis that should be given has not been given, and it should be much more. The Air Force should have much more allocation in future Budgets, apart from the present 25 per cent or something to at least 33 per cent of the Budget.

Again, as for Navy, what is the type of warfare which is expected to take place in the water? The idea is now that since Pakistan is buying submarines, so we should buy submarines. Yes, I agree that we should buy

submarine because we are very close to them, and these can be a match for the new submarines. In fact, the submarines which Pakistan is going to acquire, I understand, will be a no match for anything but that same submarine only or a nuclear submarine. But I do not know what is going to be the policy but the Government does not have a policy to acquire submarines in significant numbers and in good quality at the moment as we can see. So that policy also should be changed.

Now, Sir, coming to the question of DRDO, one thing I gathered that in the Russian laboratory — it is in this book *Asian Strategic Review* which I was only reading last night I came across the information which is of a very crucial character — that a number of sub-lethal weapons are under production or under testing which will be productionised soon in Russia. These include amongst other things, and acoustic weapon with such low frequency of sound that it will hurt a person in such a way that he will be out of commission for some time. But he will not die. Again there are laser beam technologies which will attack the retina of a person and make him blind or semi-blind or something like that. I am not saying that this should be used ordinarily. But then these weapons are at least better than those weapons which are used for shooting down. And if we are dealing with militants, particularly, once inside the country, in that case, these are the weapons, perhaps, to be used. We have no weapons which can just partially immobilize a person and not fully kill him. I think, our DRDO should find out about these available weapons and see whether we can also produce them or we can make some changes in our laboratories as so on. I think there are a lot of other equipments which are going to come out. This book says that the Russian laboratories which were found to be far more advanced than we had thought them to be, are now open. Apparently they trade each on its own basis and there is not much control of the Government. But if the Government is also there, they will not be, I think, averse to sharing this technology with India because for whatever they say, they are also modernizing the Army at great cost. They are not giving up as we thought they had given up to America to the rest of the world. They have not given up. They are in a weak position till now. But they are ready to help us with whatever knowledge and armaments etc., they have got. In fact all these upgradations and everything are going to be done with their help. So we should try to take much more technology from them and their laboratories as far as possible.

Coming to another topic, this was also partially mentioned by Shri Jaswant Singh and that is about the Sainik Schools. We have one Sainik School in our State — only one — at Purullia. Shri Basudeb Acharia happens to be the president of the Staff Association. He

knows about it and told me that it is in a terrible condition. 'Terrible condition' because the Government does not help it, and the Government does not do anything to maintain it properly.

The Sainik Schools were established with a certain idea in mind, or a concept. If that has been given up, I have nothing to say. But if that concept remains, then the Government should properly look after the Sainik Schools and see that they are well maintained.

There is also something about the personnel which one should mention. There was a promise that there would be one pension for one rank. This promise was made during V.P. Singh's Government's time. But apparently, some partial amelioration of the lot of the pensioners has been made but this particular promise has been kept. This is a long standing promise and I understand that during the British days this was the principle of one rank one pension. Government is a Government. If V.P. Singh Government was a short duration Government, it still was a Government and the commitment made by that Government should not be dishonoured by this Government. I think that should also be implemented as soon as possible.

Then, I have already mentioned about the reserve forces and all that. The Territorial Army is one area where lot of involvement of civilians can be made. It has been neglected for a long time. The strength of the Territorial Army today is not even two-fifths of what it is meant to be. It is meant to be one lakh. It is not even 40,000. So, the Territorial Army requires to be refurbished and upgraded. For that the Government will have to provide funds. It is absolutely necessary. In fact the Territorial Army, I want to say, with that one lakh figure, was established in 1949 and since then the population has doubled. The Indian Army itself was not more than two and a half lakhs then. Now it is one million, four times more. The Territorial Army should be at least two lakhs or more. With proper training they will be of immense service in times of emergency, in war, helping out the Army in the auxiliary duties as well as, if need be, in the frontline.

So, all these matters should be looked into by the Defence Forces and the Ministry of Defence.

I thank you for giving me the time.

[Translation]

SHRIMATI GIRIJA DEVI (Maharaj Ganj) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, you have allocated me time to speak and my party has faith upon me to express my views on National security and arrangements therefore. I have no knowledge in comparison to Shri Jaswant Singh, who has spent half of his life in Army and Sawantji, who has spent 15 years of his youth as a soldier and in comparison to the Members of Standing Committee on

Defence. But as a citizen of India no one can remain unaffected by such an important issue like security of the country which also includes the security of self-respect, dignity, society and culture of this country.

Whenever I think to give honour to anybody, it seems to me that after visiting a temple, Masjid, Gurdwara and Adiyariyon when I enter the office of a command, a special feeling of honour arises in my mind for these brave soldiers because in any circumstances, whether there are snowy peaks or glacier of sia chin or hill tops of Himalaya or sea waves or a desert wherever there is a turmoil, they fight for their country at the risk of their lives and lives far away from their homes, and kith and kins.

Sir, after studying the budget, the acceptance of these Demands for Grants is not a very difficult task. Demands for Grants are presented here for all the departments and hon. Finance Minister accepts them after a little bit changes. But the department of Defence is such an important that no one dares to make any cut into it. This issue is not linked only with the prosperity of soldiers but to the prosperity of the whole country. Our country could not make any progress if its borders and society will be insecure. After delegating the responsibility of country's security to this department we devote our plans and tasks for betterment and development of the country.

Sir, for the last two years we have been hearing that army or defence department has been provided enough resources and importance. But I feel very sad and depressed while comparing our defence budget with that of the whole world. Defence budget cannot be seen or studied merely by figures. Our border area is quite vast.

We have 300 km. border line along Pakistan, 400 km border line along Bangladesh and 550 km. along China. Besides, we have a maritime zone also which is always faced with danger from foreign invaders and antisocial elements.

Our army has a glorious past. We fought many domestic battles, as well as foreign invasions after 1947. There Indo-China war in 1962, Indo-Pak War in 1965 and in 1971, we fought for the liberation of Bangladesh. In the meantime we also fought for liberation of Goa. It is really a thing of pride that we had been victorious in all these military operations.

Army has its own weak points and sufferings and it is essential to consider these at the time of the budget review. Jaswantji has mentioned many important points during his 2 hours long speech. It is a new subject for an artist but security is an important issue for everyone. How one can tell story of his progress when his security depends on others. I, therefore listened to it carefully and that too from a soldier who has given his youth to

the army. Now he has given his opinion that how Army can provide proper security with this small budget. I associate myself with the views expressed by him but I do not agree with one issue and that is as to who should be appointed as Defence Minister. I could not understand and agree with his opinion regarding the problems with the provision of Defence Minister working under the supervision of the Prime Minister. If this matter is being linked with age, then Bahadur Kunwar Singh's story is not different from it. If we see around us, we will find that only one person is responsible for any such arrangement and he has to look into it at every level. Commander of the Army is a single person and with the changing of the commanders modus operandi his subordinates style of functioning changes accordingly. ..(Interruptions) It is for the first time that a lady Member is speaking on defence so, no interruptions please.

Sir, it has been said that sufficient resources have been made available for army but we will find that terms of GDP nothing has been given. From whom our borders are insecure. On one hand in Pakistan, which was a part of our country and culture sometimes back, on the other hand are China and Bangladesh. Apart these we have our territorial waters as well. On examining all these facts it seems that principles of Panchasheel have lost their relevance. That philosophy did not work for long and failed ultimately. Today for the security of border we need a strong defence Force. Even to this day it remains undecided whether a large part of the lower area of Shanghai, which is a part of Siachin, was recovered during 1962 or lost. Pakistan is always ready to attack us and it is a proof of our tolerance that we are not fighting with it. But for how long it can prolong? This area was under our control sometimes back but we have developed some weaknesses or due to lack of coordination America is dictating its terms of trade. What is with America? America is the biggest seller of arms, the only delivery of atom bomb was made by America. What was the difference between America and Russia. They had a rivalry between them as to who is the biggest arms seller and who can involve the whole world in a war to sell its arms. I do not find any difference in it. Therefore, we should not see Pakistan's presence in our neighbourhood but America's presence through Pakistan. In the same way on east-west and southern border line of the country, America is present through Diego-Garcia. Therefore, we need to strengthen our defence forces. China spends 5.5 percent of its total G.D.P. on arms, our neighbour spends 7%. Last year we spent 2.5% and this year 0.07% decrease has been made and we say that we are raising defence budget. We have earmarked Rs. 25,000 crore this year, which is less than the last year. If we talk about figures only, this year 7.78% defence budget has been raised and rate of inflation has increased by 11-12%. In reality we

have not given anything but curtailed the defence budget. How can we raise our defence power by reducing the allocation in the budget. Attention should be paid towards all these factors. Earlier a Standing Committee was set up under the Chairmanship of hon. Buta Singh. I have read the report given by it and examined the items on which expenditure can be reduced. I consider that today wars are not fought with physical strength but with arms. Wars have not been limited to earth or sky but this battle of human minds has reached to Electronics war after crossing the atomic age.

Therefore, it has become a battle of our principle and resources. On the basis of all these factors we should see that the funds allocated in the budget is sufficient or not? I feel very depressed when I analyse all these points. We have said that size of our defence force is quite large which should be reduced. Several deductions have already been made and we have saved a few hundreds of rupees. Sir, we must save the resources but items on which deduction is made should be justified. Apart from the Army we have set up several other armed forces and one of them is our Rashtriya Rifles. It was set up due to failure of paramilitary forces including CRPF and BSF which have 180 and 200 units respectively. On failure of paramilitary forces we thought that educated youth from army, who have strong will power should be given responsibility of the security of our society. Sometimes terrorists or secessionist movements start in our society and two operations, namely 'Bajrang' and 'Rhino' were taken to curb those activities. Kashmir is also under the rule of army. We depend upon the army whenever any communal violence takes place anywhere in the country-whether it is Kanpur, Lucknow or the incident of Ayodhya. In the first line of our defence structure is the state security forces and in second line are paramilitary forces and in the third line is army which is deployed in the last for protection. These all should be abolished or not, or how coordination could be maintained among them, such points neither have been mentioned in the budget nor in the estimates received today. Army cannot be seen apart from the society and its problems. It has been said about the Defence that this Ministry prepares basic policy structure and provides equipments for the army. But under the basic policy structure also several policies have been formulated. But we do not have any clear-cut view behind our defence policy. Due to this ambiguous defence policy we deploy our army at some places or send army personnels somewhere and after 4-5 days we start criticizing the decision as unjustified and call the army back. In the meantime some soldiers and officers of our army are killed. In this way we have to suffer several such losses for not having a clear-cut policies...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Madam, How much time more you need to complete the speech?

SHRIMATI GIRIJA DEVI : Sir, I took only 15 minutes. I need more time. I do not think I will complete it today.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You can continue your speech tomorrow.

Now the House stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow, the 9th May, 1995, at 11.00 a.m.

18.00 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then Adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, MAY 9, 1995/VAISAKHA 19, 1917 (SAKA)
