

afraid, nor it should create a fear psychosis as to what will happen to the world. Power is with the person who has atom bomb if we have got atom bomb, then we exist and if not, then we do not exist. We have to make an atom bomb. Today, the Prime Minister must make an announcement while delivering his speech that we are capable of manufacturing atom bomb and we shall manufacture it and we shall stand to the world.

With these words, I finish my speech.

SHRI SURYA NARAYAN YADAV (Saharsa) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, if power is needed for establishing peace, then we must manufacture a bomb I welcome it.

SHRI KRISHAN DUTT SULTANPURI (Shimla) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I support the demands of Defence Minister. I feel that the Prime Minister and officers of all the three services and young army men deserve congratulations, who have left no stone unturned for protecting their country in the wake of the crisis. Since, Mr. Prime Minister has to reply to this discussion, I will, therefore, like to submit certain points.

Dogra Regiment personnel used to be recruited from Himachal Pradesh, Kashmir and Garhwal, now this practice has been stopped. I feel that they are not being recruited in the strength. Civilians reside in army cantonments and they have raised their shops there. They are faced with problems because they cannot build their houses there unless they get the permission of the cantonment authorities. I want to request that this should be considered and they must get permission to build up their own house.

Cantonments are there in the required number for the army. In my area 'Chapatu' in Jatam district and Solan in Shimla have got cantonments which are faced with problems. Shops are auctioned every year for the people of these areas; this is done by cantonment officers on annual basis. This aspect should also be considered and permission should be granted or continuous allotment of the shops so that their business does not suffer. In addition to this, the condition of cantonment roads in the mountainous regions are very bad. It is urged upon that more money should be sanctioned for this purpose. We must provide facilities for army men's widows. We must have a special arrangements for the army men's widows who stay in remote areas and special attention should be paid to ex-servicemen.

There is a Soldier Board from whom call letters for interview in different Department are sent but they are not selected. Special measures should be taken to ensure that ex-servicemen and their children may get employment facilities so that soldiers may protect the country properly.

It was said about Kashmir that our army men kept standing one and half kilometer away. I want to say that we must not talk these kind of things here. We should talk about the things that may strengthen the unity and

integrity of the country. We must talk about as to how the nation will go ahead. You people just talk that the Government is doing wrong things. What suggestions you have given to check the forces that want to disturb the unity and integrity of our country? Everywhere the people of India have given sacrifices. The nation remained united during the war of Bangladesh, and as he has said about 80 thousand soldiers laid down their weapons there. Whose work was this? This was the work of Congress. Even today I think that our leader is committed to take the nation forward. Then what is your problem and why do you say that Prime Minister can not run this Department? We all are one with the Prime Minister. The army is very strong; then what is the threat? Is the threat emerging for Prime Minister or for you? I think that you should set aside political things and talk about unity and integrity of the country. Army men's children should have proper educational facilities and more and more children should be admitted in the army schools. I will request to Mr. Prime Minister to remove the threat to them for ever so that peace could prevail in this House. They do not allow this House to run for days together. Mr. Speaker, Sir, what can you do? You keep sitting here and keep giving us directions to sit down and not to do such things. But they make such moves that the House is unable to work for the entire day. They are interested only in making speeches. We all must act together for the unity and integrity of our country, only then our country could go ahead. We should not humiliate each other. People have sent us to work here. We have to strengthen our forces and keep their moral high. If you demoralise them and talk about Hazrat Bal and Bofors, then the moral of our forces will go high? You should always think that you have to take the nation ahead.

I will not speak longer because you have rung the bell twice, I therefore, conclude.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, this debate seems to have been completed by several instalments. It is possible that something of what was said on the first day has been forgotten by today. But I have got all the notes and I find, Sir, that most of the factual details, whatever was asked for, have been given by my colleague, the Minister of State, and if there is anything which is still to be furnished to the hon. Members, we will certainly do so.

I would only confine myself to a few matters, a very few matters impinging on the defence policy of the Government and I would like to take the House into confidence and explain these things to the best possible extent, to the extent I can.

Sir, the first criticism has been rather an extraordinary kind of criticism to say that we have no National Defence Policy. I would like to submit very respectfully that this is not true.

We do not have a document called India's National Defence Policy. But we have got several guidelines which are followed, strictly followed and observed and those can be summed up as follows :

- (1) Defence of national territory over land, sea and air encompassing among others the inviolability of our land borders, island territories, offshore assets and our maritime trade routes.
- (2) To secure an internal environment whereby our Nation State is insured against any threats to its unity or progress on the basis of religion, language, ethnicity or socio-economic dissonance.
- (3) To be able to exercise a degree of influence over the nations in our immediate neighbourhood to promote harmonious relationships in tune with our national interests.
- (4) To be able to effectively contribute towards regional and international stability and to possess an effective out-of-the-country contingency capability to prevent destabilisation of the small nations in our immediate neighbourhood that could have adverse security implications for us.

A mention was made about the recommendations of the Estimates Committee suggesting that the Government should articulate a clear and comprehensive Defence Policy. It may be noted that the Ministry, in its Action Taken Notes on the 19th Report of the Estimates Committee, explained the position very clearly to the Committee. The reply was accepted by the Committee and was treated as acceptance of their recommendations, as mentioned in their 41st Report. This Policy is not merely rigid in the sense that it has been written down, but these are the guidelines, these are the objectives, these are the matters which are always kept in view while conducting our Defence Policy. I think no more explanation or elaboration is needed than this. And particularly in the context of our own Estimates Committee having accepted it. I do not think that any further question can arise.

A question was raised about the National Security Council. It is true that we had a National Security Council, first established in 1990 and it had only one meeting. After that nothing happened. When this Government came into office, the question was raised both in the House and outside. In the Government, a lot of thinking has gone into it meanwhile I had occasion to promise a National Security Council or some body which takes into account the questions of national security and we have examined the entire gamut of possibilities and options available to us.

I have referred to this important subject earlier and indicated that we were reviewing the orders issued on the subject by the Government in 1990. It is not because a new Government has come that we wanted to change everything. It was because the experience of the National Security Council as it existed from 1990 was found a little unworkable. A Strategic Policy Group headed by the Cabinet Secretary and including the Service Chiefs, Secretaries of Ministries concerned like Defence, Home, External Affairs and Finance and heads of agencies was also set up to consider the strategic policy papers. Now, according to the decision at that time the National Security Council was to comprise of the Prime Minister as Chairman and Ministers in-charge of Defence, Home, Finance and External Affairs as members as well as some others including Chief Ministers as and when needed. Essentially, it was, what is known as the Cabinet Committee on Political Affairs, plus one or two added.

It was a kind of mechanical addition. It was not a functional addition. A fairly large advisory board comprising experts, academics, scientists, journalists, former Government officers, some Chief Ministers and MPs was also constituted to enable interaction with non-official resource persons. It is this big body which was found to be a little unwieldy and its deliberations tended to become a little diffused in the sense that we could not in matters of national security come to a particular decision or particular conclusion after deliberations in this big body. The Board was to assist the NSC in providing a broad range of informed views and options. My opinion is - after examining the working and whatever happened in that meeting - that this objective cannot be achieved by a body of that size and composition. We have undertaken a thorough review of the above mechanism and come to the conclusion that a number of changes would be required. For one thing, the National Security Council as set up in 1990, as I have just submitted, is not much different from the CCPA. Secondly, the advisory board as proposed in 1990 appears to be somewhat unwieldy. Discussions in such a body, large body, would tend to lose focus and make the whole exercise blurred and confusing. Consultations with experts outside the Government including Members of Parliament and experts in academic and other institutions are important and advantageous. But such consultation is best done in small well-knit groups with persons having specialised knowledge or expertise of that specific subject concerning national security.

National security is a very wide subject. It consists of so many items and it is better to concentrate on each item and while discussing that item, it is better to have experts in that particular item, in that area, rather than having every expert in a big body and losing focus. This is the idea and this is the conclusion we have come to, Sir. The same set of persons to be consulted always in a large advisory board would not serve much purpose. We therefore feel that instead of having one large

advisory board, it would be more appropriate to provide for meaningful interaction with selected experts in each specific field under study or discussion. Such experts can be associated at the stage of preparation of strategic policy papers as well as during discussion of such papers at a higher level. Our review of the system prevailing in other countries shows that different structures exist for dealing with national security issues depending upon the type of system of Government prevailing in that country. Generally, the national security council set up is found in countries where the presidential form of Government has been adopted, the most notable example being that of the United States. We find that it is difficult to have such a system transplanted in India because here the business of the Central Government has to be ultimately transacted in the Cabinet or Cabinet Committee with Ministers in-charge being responsible for their subjects to parliament. In the United Kingdom, for instance, no single national security council has been set up and the work pertaining to national security matters is considered in different Cabinet Committees, for example, the Committee on Defence and Overseas Policy, the Committee on Nuclear Defence Policy, the Committee on Northern Ireland, the Committee on Intelligence Services, etc. In our case, a system more akin to that prevailing in the U.K. might be more appropriate. We are, therefore, veering to the view that specific Committees of Ministers or Groups of Ministers could be set up for different aspects of national security whenever strategy or policy papers are brought up for consideration of the Ministers. This flexible arrangement would provide inclusion of the concerned Ministers in-charge as well as other Ministers, the Chief Ministers and persons in public life including Members of Parliament who have specialised knowledge and experience and whose contribution would be valuable. Even though a separate national security council is not in place today, mechanisms and systems do exist for consideration of national security issues. The Joint Intelligence Committee in the Cabinet Secretariat constantly interacts with the concerned Ministries and agencies. There is regular consideration of the defence aspects of national security in the Chiefs of Staff Committee who have their own Secretariat. The Chairman, Joint Intelligence Committee and heads of other agencies interact with the Service Chiefs. We have all these working even now. The core group of Secretaries is also there. They look into these matters of internal security. These mechanisms and systems have been working well but this is where the difference comes that we are not satisfied with the present dispensation.

We would like to have an overarching body which looks into the conclusions drawn, the reports sent by these different mechanisms. While these mechanisms and systems have been working well, we still feel that there is a need for strengthening the present arrangement in certain respects. But one thing is that

the resource persons including experts from outside the Government need to be associated more in the study and preparation of policy papers. There is also need for having papers prepared from a central point of view instead of from one Department or Ministry. Therefore, the need for an overarching body is felt here.

On many aspects of national security a holistic approach and an integrated action plan involving a number of Ministries and agencies can be better achieved if the paper is prepared in an Inter-Ministerial Group or a nodal agency instead of any one Ministry or Department. So, both aspects, the specialised aspect of a particular area of activity or an item being considered in a specialised mechanism plus the general aspect, the holistic aspect from the national security angle by a body which is not unwieldy but which is an overarching body which takes into account and coordinates with all these views is necessary. And I feel that we should be able to come to the right conclusions and the right pattern of the Committee very very shortly. I am glad that hon. Members have brought up this issue and given me the opportunity of clarifying the Government's stand on this issue. We are in the process of giving a final shape to our proposals and before we take a formal decision, I would solicit the views of hon. Members on our proposals on the NSC. This is what I would like to say. It is more or less ready, in its final stages and before losing any more time, I would come back to hon. Members for their views.

The third point which has been raised prominently, Sir, is on the NPT. We have a very interesting but rather disappointing situation that for a full month there has been what is known as a Review Conference on NPT in New York. I would not like to be critical on what happened there. Our position being clear, I have not been able to understand what was achieved in that Conference; maybe, I will be enlightened by those who participated in that in due course. But as of now, I find that what was achieved was only the indefinite extension of the NPT as it exists. Right from the beginning, right from 1968 when NPT came into existence, India has taken a view and that view is that NPT as it was drafted, as it was accepted, is discriminatory. It allows vertical proliferation, it divides the world into nuclear haves and nuclear have-nots and NPT is actually meant, in effect, to work against the have-nots and those who by their own efforts might become threshold States. Their idea is 'we have had it; we will continue to have it but no one else will be allowed to have it'. Simply, Sir, this has not worked. This has neither brought in disarmament nor brought in any restriction on countries becoming nuclear, going nuclear. Both the things have happened and both were supposed to be stopped by the NPT. Now if the both objects have failed, I fail to see why a Treaty like this is being continued indefinitely. It only means that the present situation and worse that can follow should continue indefinitely; that is what it means.

It goes against the grain of our policy. Therefore, we do not accept it and I would like to say something very pertinent, very significant. While representatives of States were talking about the NPT, what happened during this one month? The following happened. This is taken from a document of the 'Greenpeace', might be one of the NGOs. I am not vouching for absolute accuracy. But I would like to say what has been happening. This is number one :

"While diplomats met during the past month at the United Nations Nuclear Non-proliferation talks :

Britain sent its newest Trident nuclear submarine on patrol. On Saturday April 29th, the Vanguard submarine went on its second patrol. Vanguard carries up to 96 100-kiloton nuclear warheads on its complement of new Trident missiles. Each missile has a 4500 mile range and each warhead has a killing capacity equivalent to 640 Hiroshima bombs."

This has been happening while they are talking about NPT. Number two is :

"France inaugurated a new above-ground nuclear testing facility. At the end of April, Prime Minister Edouard Balladur inaugurated a laser facility near Bordeaux for simulation testing of nuclear weapons. The facility is estimated to cost six billion French francs.

On Sunday, May 7th, Jacques Chirac, the elected President of France said that France would resume testing if military experts advised it."

That was before he was elected. After he was elected :

"He told the New Zealand Prime Minister that France might conduct five to seven tests before concluding its testing programme."

So, everything is business as usual. During that one month they were talking about whether NPT is to continue or not to continue, whether it is to continue with changes or with no changes, even at that time, there is nothing like a pause, there is nothing like a re-thinking. It is just a matter of taking the whole thing in such a non-serious manner that we go on talking but we go on doing whatever we do on the other side. There is a long list of what Russia has been doing, what the United States has been doing, what others have been doing. I do not have to go into details. I only have to say that this is not acceptable to us. Therefore, we have not accepted it. We will try. We will continue our efforts for genuine nuclear non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament and the only positive document which is there on the Table right now, and which has been lying on the Table for the last seven years is the 1988 Action

Plan given by the then Prime Minister of India, late Shri Rajiv Gandhi in the Special Session on Disarmament. It has not been improved upon. It has not been rejected. It has not even been considered as it ought to be considered. It only means that all this that is happening there is totally against our own view. This needs to be given a new turn. We have to do that. We cannot simply give up and say 'So many people have done it. So we cannot simply stop.' No. We cannot stop. We will have to continue with this. We have a view. That view is the correct view. You cannot have haves and have nots in the nuclear field. They may take 20 years or they may take 15 years, but within a particular time, unless we aim at total and complete disarmament, disarmament is never going to happen, never going to come about. There has been too much of smuggling of nuclear material. This is known. We read it in newspapers every day. It is happening from so many other countries whom I need not name. Is it the right atmosphere for disarmament? Is it for disarmament that the world is really trying for continuing the NPT indefinitely?

We do not think so, Sir. I am sure that all the sections of the House will agree that this conference has not ended in something which is useful for humanity. We stand for complete abolition of all weapons of mass destruction—nuclear and other weapons also. This is the position and I am sure that the House will appreciate the position of the Government on this.

The other question which was raised was about a War Memorial. I think it has taken a long time. But the position is like this. On 1st of March, the Chiefs of Staff Committee recommended construction of a War Memorial at Dhaula Kuan in 32 acres of land opposite Defence Service Officers Institute. As the project is of national importance, designs and models are proposed to be prepared on the basis of an open national competition. After the selection of design and model of the National War Memorial, a decision on the construction of the Memorial will be taken.

Then, about the War Museum also, a question was raised and the position is that the Services headquarters have been requested to locate an appropriate site for the proposed War Museum. Regrettably, this also has taken too long a time and there have been too many views. There has been some difficulty in coming to a final view. After the site is located, necessary action to establish the War Museum will be taken.

One rather good suggestion which came from one of the hon. Members is that the period of Colour Service be reduced to seven years and on release from the Army, the soldiers be absorbed in para-military forces or State police forces. Now this has its pros; this has its cons. But the suggestion on the whole is good. We could make some changes and modification in it. We are taking it up for examination, detailed examination. It has the advantage that the Colour Service is reduced and at the same time, he is not sent home. He is able

to find a berth in the para-military forces while he is still active, still young and still has some experience which he has gained for seven years in the Army. Therefore, the advantage seems to be on both sides. But we have to see that about 20,000-25,000 jobs per year have to be created. Now, whether the total recruitment in police forces in the States can find 20,000-25,000 slots apart from the local aspirations of the youth there who would like to come into the police forces, how much can be accommodate — these are matters on which we will have to consult the State Governments. But the suggestion is good and I would like to say that this will be examined in depth.

Points have been raised about housing shortage. I agree that there is shortage and I understand that this year, the additional allocation will fund the construction. Allocation has been given and it will construct the additional married accommodation for officers 506 quarters, for JCOs 505 quarters and for Other Ranks 4215 quarters — 5226 quarters in all. The Service headquarters are also authorised to hire private accommodation. This has had the effect of reducing the deficiencies and increasing the satisfaction levels. But the ultimate solution lies in having our own self-contained accommodation, the way we want it, by the design we want it. Rented accommodation will be only a stop-gap.

A question was raised, which is a serious question, about the upgradation of the MIG-21 Bis. There has been some error in the statements made.

Let me put the record straight. The MIG 21(Bis) aircraft was inducted in the IAF in 1977. As of now, the MIG 21 (Bis) has served only for over 15 years. Technological advances over the last decade especially in the field of airborne radar weapons and navigation attack system have made it possible to improve the combat effectiveness of the MIG 21 (Bis) substantially which was not feasible earlier. The current proposal includes adaptation of powerful air interception radar, advance air to air missile, air to ground precision, guided weapons and an accurate navigational attack defence system. I must say that earlier I had not heard about these improvements being possible. I came to know about it only four years back and since then we have been trying to mount these things and get this upgradation done. These improvements were not available ten years ago. The upgradation that is being considered holds the promise to improve the combat effectiveness of the aircraft substantially. So this is the position. We would not like to lose any more time in doing this. I know that all the investigations, all the efforts are being made. They are in final stages and I think it will fructify.

Something was said about Jaguars also. Jaguar aircraft was initially procured without the black box. The

same was added subsequently. Now, Sir, the position is that, initially 16 Jaguar aircrafts were taken on loan from the RAF in 1979. These aircrafts did not have a black box as the Royal Air Force had not sought the same in their standard of preparation for their aircraft. However, when our own aircrafts were purchased in 1980, 1981, they were with the black box fitted as our SOP required the same, the black box. This is the position. It is not that we just bought Jaguars without the black box. It is not true. We hired the first 16. They did not have the black box because they were not required to have the black box as they were at that time.

I think, these were the important points, points of policy raised in the debate. If there is anything I have missed, I am prepared to answer, if I can, otherwise, I can send the answers to the hon. Members. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER : I think, we have discussed the Demands of the Defence Ministry for a pretty long time.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) : With a long period of time.

MR. SPEAKER : Both things. One or two questions which are very pertinent, can be allowed.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore) : I only wanted to know one thing as I could not follow, perhaps. The hon. Prime Minister said that the Government is now thinking of some sort of revised structure which may be called a National Security Council or may not. It may have some other nomenclature. It may be some sort of a main structure assisted and complemented by certain Committees and so on. The final shape is still to emerge. But I would like to know where the Service Chiefs fit in, in this new structure which they are thinking of, where will the Service Chiefs come in? As I said earlier, our information, right or wrong...

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : Wrong.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore) : ...you should verify it, is that in all matters, in Defence policy matters, in Defence planning matters, the Service Chiefs are generally left out in the cold. So, we would like to know about this.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : Sir, this is not correct. Service Chiefs are very much in the picture even now and they will continue to be in the picture because without them no National Security Policy can really be finalised. This is quite clear, Sir.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, when hon. the Minister of State had intervened during the debate, he briefly touched upon the question of missiles. He said that he will briefly touch it because hon. the Prime Minister when he comes to answering the main debate, we will further to clarify it. I missed the

portion on missiles because perhaps, the hon. Prime Minister would like to take up from where the Minister of State had left on both the questions, viz., Prithvi as also *Agni* and that would fill a gap which was being left out.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I may remind the House, Sir, that in my reply to the debate on the President's Address, I had dwelt upon this point in all the detail that is necessary. I had said clearly that *Agni* is a technology demonstration project. We have had some tests already; some more have to be done and that is the present position. I have visited the factory. I have seen both *Agni* and *Prithvi* recently and I can say with all confidence that the programme, as conceived, will continue. There will be no let up. There will be no modification and this is what I have already stated in both the Houses. The deployment of *Prithvi* is under consideration. I can take the House into confidence whenever the next stage arrives. I have no difficulty about that.

Let me assure the House once again - although I have done it earlier already - that no amount of persuasion or pressure or anything, etc., which has been alleged to have been brought to bear on us; no amount of all those things will make an iota of difference in the programme, as conceived by us.

MR. GEN. (RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI (Garhwal) : I wish to raise two issues. One is that the Prime Minister talked about the Estimates Committee's Report when talking of the Defence Policy. He has said that the Estimates Committee has accepted the view of the Government. I would request you, Sir, to kindly go through the Estimates Committee's Report. There are derogatory remarks on various recommendations made by the Estimates Committee on the response of the Ministry of Defence. If you go through that probably the picture will be entirely different. Lots of good suggestions have been given in the 19th Report of the Estimates Committee, but the response of the Ministry has been negative.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Khanduri, the Action Taken Report has been accepted by the Estimates Committee. That is what the Prime Minister has said.

(Interruptions)

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI : He talked about the Defence Policy only, but there are many more recommendations in that. I have read out that....*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : We will not discuss the Estimates Committee's Report because we do not know what is the entire Estimates Committee's Report and what are the recommendations. It is not before us now. Please come to the second point.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI (Garhwal) : My request to the Prime Minister is that other recommendations of the Estimates Committee...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : We do not discuss the recommendations given by the Committee in the House because those recommendations have to be carefully examined by the Government and the Action Taken Report has to be given. Please leave that point. Come to the second point. This is my ruling. You must come to the second point.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI : I am talking about the Action Taken Report and not the initial report. I will proceed now.

The second thing is that I had raised an issue about the threat perception and I had asked two specific questions. What is the vintage year of this threat perception which has been worked out by the Government? What is the vintage? How old is it? Is it ten years or 15 years old? That is one question.

My second question is based on that threat perception. You have given certain task to the Armed Forces. Have the Armed Forces got that much capability? It is because we say that modernisation is not possible due to shortage of funds. When the capability has not been there with the Armed Forces then have you reduced the task or are you hoping that by improvisation or ad-hocism somehow the Armed Forces will get through? These questions have not been answered.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I may submit to the House that the threat perception of a country is not constant. It has a part which is constant and a part which is variable. It varies from time to time according to circumstances. Therefore, I have been taking presentations from the Chiefs for four years now. They have not said to me the same things in two consecutive years. They have been giving the latest position in regard to the threat perception and also what we ought to do in order to meet that.

It is true that we have a resource crunch. Which country has not? We have a resource crunch. Take AWACS for instance. We never went in for AWACS. But that does not mean that we are defenceless without the AWACS. Our people have been ingenious enough to find a way around the AWACS and today everybody agrees that there is no AWACS necessary here. So, they have been doing their job very very competently. I am satisfied that in spite of the resource crunch, the kind of savings that they have made, the kind of innovations that they have made, are really commendable. If the resource crunch had not been there, I am sure, they would not have made it. So, there is a necessity and there is an answer to that necessity.

I would like to assure the House, however, that the efficiency of the Armed Forces, the effectiveness of the Armed Forces will not be allowed to be such as to impede the capacity to meet our threat perceptions from time to time. This assurance I can give. In fact, this year I have personally taken into account some areas in which there was some neglect, lack of necessary attention. I have corrected that. This will be the position year after year. It is not that we are just giving something more than last year, something less than last year. We are going into all the details. In one year we may give a little more, for instance, to the Navy. In another year we may give a little more for the Air Force or the Army or maybe on the production side. All this is being gone into meticulously, I can assure the House.

SHRI AMAL DATTA (Diamond Harbour) : The recent Gulf War has shown amongst others the effectiveness of the joint operations by more than one service. So, my question is, are we doing or are we contemplating having operations, integrated joint operations, by more than one service - Army, Navy, Air Force together - wherever possible.

Secondly, the combat manual and the training manual of many countries have been changed during the last fifteen years. I believe that we have not made any changes. They have introduced electronics and laser guided simulation in training for combat. We have got some of these, but we have not introduced them for large scale training in the Army as yet. What is the Government's feeling regarding introducing them, so that the combat perfection is reached? The recruitment of people into Armed Forces must be of people who are much more intelligent than the sort of people who are being recruited up to now.

Thirdly, the last question is that, we should go in for joint production with some countries who have got a storehouse of technology which is available to us with a little persuasion. I have mentioned Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States in this regard. They have amongst others many sub-lethal weapons whose effectiveness in combating the terrorism cannot be overstated.

So, what are your reaction to these points?

17.00 hrs.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : Sir, in regard to the electronic part of our Defence equipment, this is adequately being taken care of. The items referred to by the hon. Member are part of an on-going process. I cannot go into details and tell him what is being introduced, what is not being introduced. If it is under introduction, it only means that it will be introduced if it is found necessary. Again, here, I would say that whatever is necessary will be done and it will not be

stopped for want of funds. This is what I could say as Minister in-charge of Defence. When they find that something is necessary, they justify the necessity. And to the extent we can, we think of several alternatives, but do not on the whole allow our competence to suffer, effectiveness to suffer.

What is the third one?

SHRI AMAL DATTA : Joint exercises and joint production with other countries.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I have no knowledge on that particular matter, Sir. I can find out and let him know. About the joint enterprises, joint manufacturing facilities, etc., now, here, we are doing it already in respect of many things. So, it is nothing new.

SHRI AMAL DATTA : We can do more.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : What really is at issue is, for what purpose? My view is - with which some of my colleagues, some of the Members of Parliament do not quite agree - that it should be for our own purposes. It is not for commercial exploitation. Our foreign policy, our policy of peace goes against the grain of becoming merchants of death. That is where I will draw a line, Sir. For the rest, so far as the defence of our country, defence of our territory, defence purposes are concerned, we are entering into joint ventures, we would like to enter into joint ventures. But there is a place where we have to draw the line. We would not like in the ordinary circumstances to go commercial. This is what I would say. But that is a question which is not totally closed. There are alternatives. There are sort of modifications in that. In the case of small arms, for instance, we have made a departure from what I have said. But where do we stop? Now, if you really want to become a commercially significant exporter, seller of arms and ammunition, that is something which perhaps has to come to the notice of this House. We have to discuss about it. The Government has to go into it in greater detail.

SHRI AMAL DATTA : That is not the question ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I have been asked to go in for it by some of our own colleagues but I have been a little hesitant. And the question does not arise today because the simple reason is, we are nowhere near it. We will be, perhaps, approaching it even with full vigour if you do it maybe after ten or fifteen years. So, the question is a little premature. And we do not want to get ourselves lost in these discussions. Let us first concentrate on our needs and those needs are increasing. Because the threat is increasing, the needs are increasing. On the other hand, we have also to concentrate on reducing the threat. In the case of one

country, we have managed to do it to some extent. So, Defence and External Affairs, external relations go hand-in-hand. It is something which we cannot dissociate from each other and in that respect we are happily placed.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack) : We have given cut motions on one issue, almost the entire Opposition has. That is on the issue of Bofors. And you have assured this House that 'personally I am looking after this issue and I am monitoring the whole issue'. So, may I request the hon. Prime Minister to kindly tell us what is the latest position regarding Bofors.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : Sir, regarding Bofors, the focus has shifted to Switzerland long ago. It is in the courts of Switzerland over which we have neither jurisdiction nor have we anything to do there. It is for them to take a decision. They have their own appeal and other provisions. Those who are interested in delaying it are getting it delayed through whatever legal devices are available. It happens in every country. So, I have nothing more to add to that except that the whole thing, the scene, has shifted to Switzerland.

SHRI R. ANBARASU (Madras Central) : Sir, I am happy to know that the Government of India...

MR. SPEAKER : The Defence Ministry deals with the wars with others, not internal wars!

SHRI R. ANBARASU : Yes, you are right.

Sir, I am happy to learn that the Government of India has extended support to Sri Lankan Government to put down terrorism in Sri Lanka. The then Government under the able leadership of Shri Rajiv Gandhi also sent to the IPKF to Sri Lanka to save the lives and properties of innocent Tamils as well as to find out a political solution to ethnic problem in Sri Lanka. But unfortunately, unceremoniously the IPKF was sent back. It was really an insult to the Government of India. So, the history should not repeat this time.

So, what I would like to insist on here, Sir, is that while making use of our own assistance, the Sri Lankan Government should not misuse in wiping out the Tamil race in Sri Lanka because it is the past history. Therefore, I would like to appeal to the hon. Prime Minister whether any pre-condition has been...

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Anbarasu, we will deal with it when we come to the Demands for the External Affairs Ministry.

SHRI R. ANBARASU : Okay, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : A number of cut motions have been moved by the Members to the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Defence. Shall I put all the cut motions to the vote of the House together or does any hon. Member want any particular cut

motion to be put separately to the Vote of the House? I would like to know whether any hon. Member would like his or her cut motion separately to be put to the Vote of the House.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA (Jadavpur) : Sir, I want my cut motions No. 40 and No. 63 to be put separately to the Vote of the House. Cut Motion No. 63 is about One Rank - One Pension Scheme for Ex-Servicemen and cut motion No. 40 is on Bofors.

MR. SPEAKER : Okay.

SHRI AMAL DATTA : You put my cut motion No. 14 and cut motion No. 16. Cut motion No. 14 is regarding need to replace the old weapon system in the Indian Air Force. Cut motion No. 16 is regarding need to improve the surveillance for all the three Services.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would respectfully plead with the hon. lady Member not to insist on voting on that particular cut motion regarding One Rank - One Pension. It is not good to get it rejected by the House.

MR. SPEAKER : I hope, Maliniji, you will agree to it.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA : Sir, I will not press it but I would be very happy if the hon. Prime Minister were to give us some assurance on this.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : It is under constant review.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA : It is because this disparity has been there for a long time...

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : It is true. We have given partial satisfaction. Statements have been made, action has been taken. This is an on-going process. It is not good for Parliament to vote it down.

MR. SPEAKER : I think, Maliniji, you agree to it.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA : Yes, Sir.

Cut motion No. 63 was, by leave, withdrawn.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA : Sir, cut motion No. 40 is there.

MR. SPEAKER : Cut motion No. 40, we are taking.

I shall now put cut motion No. 40 moved by Maliniji and cut motion No. 14 moved by Mr. Amal Datta to the vote of the House.

Cut motion Nos. 40 and 14 were put and negatived.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : The light is gone Sir!

MR. SPEAKER : Please understand that is because of the breakdown of the electricity supply from outside.