

श्री ईश दत्त यादव : मान्यवर, ... *

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री मोहम्मद सलीम) : प्लीज बैठिए। रिकार्ड नहीं हो रहा, ईश दत्त जी।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद भायूर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सर, ... (व्यवधान) ... *

उपसभाध्यक्ष : नहीं, नहीं। चनपुरिया जी, बोलिए।

Irregularities in Education System in backward areas particularly in Madhya Pradesh

श्री शीव प्रसाद चनपुरिया (मध्य प्रदेश) : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आदिवासी अंचल में शिक्षा की जो दुरावस्था है, उसका उल्लेख करते हुए मैं एक ऐसे स्कूल की बात कहूंगा, जो साल में केवल एक दिन खुला है गणतंत्र दिवस के दिन। स्वतंत्रता दिवस के दिन उसमें झण्डा-आरोहण भी नहीं किया गया। शिक्षक साल भर वहां हाजिर नहीं, एक दिन आकर हाजिरी दे देता है। वहां केवल बेगा जाति के आदिवासी लोग हैं। यह बेगा बहुत ही पिछड़ी जाति मानी जाती है आदिवासीयों में। हर राज्य सरकार को केन्द्र शासन अनुदान और सहायता देता है आदिवासीयों में शिक्षा संचालन के लिए। इस वर्ष 1994-95 के बजट में 1,055 करोड़ रुपये आदिवासीयों में शिक्षा संचालन, ऐसी व्यवस्था के लिए दिया गया है, लेकिन, महानुभाव, वहां की दुरावस्था क्या है? शिक्षा स्कूल खुल नहीं रहे हैं।

मान्यवर, मैंने उदाहरण दिया। उस गांव का नाम भी मैं बताए देता हूँ मंडला जिले में आदिवासी तहसील है निवास, निवास तहसील के भीतर भानपुर नाम का गांव है, पोस्ट कनेरी के अंतर्गत आता है। वहां स्कूल साल में एक दिन खुला। शिक्षक हाजिरी साल में एक दिन हुई और 13 वर्ष से चलने वाले उस स्कूल में एक भी लड़का प्राइमरी पास नहीं हुआ। राज्य शासन के शिक्षा अधिकारी आदिवासी अंचलों के, बनों के भीतर रहने वाले गांवों में शिक्षा की व्यवस्था की कोई निगरानी नहीं करते और मनमाने तरीके से वहां शिक्षक काम करते हैं। आदिवासी गांव वालों की उनकी परवाह कभी रहती नहीं और हर दिन की हाजिरी लगाते रहते हैं। शासन से पैसा लेते रहते हैं। तो मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि एक ऐसा निगरानी बल केन्द्रीय शासन की ओर से बने, राज्य शासन के सक्षम अधिकारियों को भी साथ में लें और एक ऐसा अभियान चलाएं आदिवासी अंचल में कि

एक-एक प्राथमिक स्कूल या मिडिल स्कूल, सबकी निगरानी वह करता रहे और जहां इस तरह की गड़बड़ियां हों, उनके शिक्षकों को कड़े से कड़ा दंड दे क्योंकि यह देश के लिए बड़ा घातक है। हम आदिवासीयों के कल्याण के लिए सब कुछ करने को तैयार हैं, अरबों रुपये खर्च कर रहे हैं, लेकिन आदिवासीयों के बीच में हो क्या रहा है, इसकी जानकारी हम लेने की कोशिश नहीं कर रहे हैं। मैं अभी जल-जंगल-जमीन विकास अभियान के सिलसिले में आदिवासी गांवों में गया था, मैं और उल्लेख नहीं कहूंगा कि वहां क्या-क्या अव्यवस्था है सिंचाई आदि की, लेकिन यह मेरी नजर में है कि वहां के गांव के लोगों ने एक एप्लीकेशन दी, पचासों लोगों के दस्तावेज थे वहां के ग्रामीणों के कि हमारे स्कूलों का यह हाल है।

इसलिए मैं उसी विषय पर बोलकर इस सदन से और आपसे चाहता हूँ कि आप केन्द्रीय शासन को यह निर्देश दें कि आदिवासी अंचल में केवल मध्य प्रदेश की बात में नहीं कर रहा, जहां भी आदिवासी गांव हैं, उन सब की शिक्षा व्यवस्था के लिए एक निगरानी समिति गठित करें, राज्य शासन के भरोसे ही यह काम नहीं होगा, राज्य शासन शायद उपेक्षा कर रहा है मैं खुले रूप से कह रहा हूँ, क्योंकि मैं गांव-गांव घूमता हूँ, मैं जानता हूँ कि राज्य शासन कुछ नहीं करता है। तो मेरा आपसे यही निवेदन है कि आप इस पर ध्यान देने की कृपा करें।

श्री राघवजी (मध्य प्रदेश) : महोदय, माननीय शिव प्रसाद चनपुरिया जी ने जो मामला उठाया है, मैं अपने आपको इनसे एसोसिएट करता हूँ।

Discussion on the working of the Ministry of Defence

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): We will now take up the discussion on the working of the Ministry of Defence. Shri Suresh Kalmadi to raise the discussion.

SHRI G. G. SWELL (Meghalaya): How long are we going to sit? Up to 6 p.m.?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Up to 6 p.m.

SHRI G. G. SWELL: That means, the debate would continue tomorrow also.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): If it is not concluded today.

SHRI G. G. SWELL : We have barely two hours left.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra) : Four hours have been allotted for this.

SHRI G. G. SWELL : Only two hours are left now.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM) : It depends on the mood of the speakers. Now, Shri Suresh Kalmadi, please.

SHRI SURESH KALMADI (Maharashtra) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would start by paying my tributes to our valiant Armed Forces who are, round-the-clock, looking after the defence of the country, whether it is on the top of the Himalayas, or, patrolling the coastline, or, guarding our skies. We are very proud of the officers and men of our Armed Forces. They are a very disciplined lot and a non-politicised lot. It is only in the forum of Parliament we can speak up for them, which they cannot do. I think it is the duty of Parliament to see that they are well-looked-after and that they continue to be one of the finest Armed Forces in the world, in terms of arms, in terms of ammunition and in terms of manpower.

Sir, defence has always been regarded, for many years, as the holy cow. Today, we are discussing defence, in the Rajya Sabha, after a gap of many years. Unfortunately, it never came up for discussion. It used to be listed in the Lok Sabha. But as far as the Rajya Sabha is concerned, I do not think we have had a chance, for many years, to discuss the Defence Budget.

I am happy that Standing Committees have been formed for the various Ministries. There is one for Defence as well. Mr. Buta Singh is the Chairman of the Committee. My friend, Mr. Jaipal Reddy, is also a Member of this Committee. For the first time, I think, in the Standing Committee, we tried to carry out a very in-depth study of the various problems and I am happy that the officers of the Defence Ministry too were very co-operative. They answered most of the queries and gave us information which we did not possess. The Cold War scenario has changed, and it is in this perspective that we shall have to look at the Defence re-

quirements of the country. The Defence budget, unfortunately, has been static for many years. In fact, this year it is only kept up with inflation. With armed forces of this size, all the material requirements are definitely going up, and the budget for the purchase of equipment, to equip ourselves with the most modern equipment, is unfortunately very, very low. You are aware, Sir, that Pakistan has been spending seven per cents of its GDP on defence for the past so many years. Even a country like China spends five per cent of its GDP on defence whereas India has been spending only 2.5 per cent of its GDP on defence. So, from that point of view, I for one was quite disappointed that an adequate amount has not been provided for defence in this particular budget.

They have also to consider that Pakistan has been very belligerent on our borders. They have been very belligerent in Kashmir. We cannot ever rule out an element of surprise, when they will walk in, when they will play mischief, and we have to be prepared at all times. On top of it, we have the news of F-16s being given to Pakistan. At a time when the greatest democracies of the world should be co-operating with each other, it is most unfortunate that the USA has chosen to escalate tension in the region, and we sincerely hope that during the coming visit of our Prime Minister to the USA, this matter will be taken up. We have given our mind to all the envoys of the US President who came here in no uncertain terms, that we cannot tolerate it, we cannot allow Pakistan to be armed to its teeth, because those aircraft can only be used against India and nobody else. On top of it we find China also arming Pakistan. They have given them over 300 tanks in the past three years, they have given them M-11 surface-to-air missiles, and they have been arming Pakistan quite a bit. China has also been arming Bangladesh. They have been arming Myanmar also. China is increasing its military presence in Tibet quite a bit. China is modernizing its airfields in Tibet, which has definitely to be viewed seriously. Again we must congratulate the Prime Minister who, in his discussions with the Chinese leaders, had defused it to some extent, but we have at

all times to know that there are dangers from many quarters. Take Myanmar for instance. You will be surprised to know that this small country, which has a military junta, will, by the year 2000 A.D., have an armed force of over five lakh troops. This is a new situation which is coming up in the sub-continent, and this country is being armed by China. A systematic ring is being put all around us. That perspective should not be lost.

The Indian Air Force which has a strength of about 45 squadrons, has been static for the last few years. The Subramanian Commission which had gone into the Air Force requirement, has said at that time, over 10, 15 years back, that India required 65 squadrons to defend itself. But we are grossly below that figure. Definitely steps have to be taken to fill the gap.

I am very concerned about the accident rate in the Indian Air Force. It has been over the years the highest in the world. There is no doubt about it. On the one hand, we have been purchasing a lot of aircraft, and on the other hand the accident rate has been going up and up. There is need for a jet trainer. We have been talking about this need for the past ten years. Unfortunately, no decision has been taken. There is no intermediate trainer. From the basic aircraft, our pilots are going to the sophisticated MiG or Miraj without the intermediate aircraft, and no wonder so many accidents are taking place.

English and French companies have made offers, but they have been short-listed. I hope a decision would be taken soon, whichever way they want to take. I believe some new offers from Czechs and some offers from Russians themselves have been received. If people want to consider their MiGs with different engines and different avionics, they are welcome to do it. A decision is expected. The Air Force has long been looking to the Government for an early decision. Every Air Force officer we have met in the last ten years has been asking, "Why don't you hurry up with the AJTs so that accidents go down and whatever fighter aircraft we have are safe from various accidents that are taking place."

The other immediate need of the Air Force is upgradation of the MiG aircraft which also has been going on for a long time to keep our MiGs absolutely updated and fighting fit. We have to upgrade the MiGs because upgrading them is a much cheaper option. The MiG-21 is a very good aircraft, but its avionics have to be changed and various other things have to be modified. Talks have been going on for upgradation of the MiGs for a long time. There were discussions with the Israelis. Now again there are discussions with the Russians. I read in today's papers that the USA is also interested in participating in the upgradation of the MiG aircraft. Again, what is required is a fast decision on this particular issue. It means also budget. I do not see any budget provision either for AJTs or for upgradation of the MiG aircraft. So, I do not know how they expect to meet this expenditure and whether it is going to be on credit. But, whatever be the way, I think this is the crying need. I am not going into the details of any other things. But I think AJTs and upgradation of the MiGs are the crying needs of the Air Force and I think we in Parliament must lend total support to these programmes.

We have seen, from the Gulf War experience or even in a smaller way in Bosnia or in Afghanistan, that the conventional warfare will remain the order of the day and that conventional arms will remain the order of the day. So, there is need for keeping a small army but packed with the most modern firearms. What is required is updating of our equipment. Our tanks need updating. Our guns need updating. Our ammunition also need updating. Today, there are so many kinds of ammunitions available in the world which are much better in performance and which are having a much better piercing element. So, a continuous search must be made for the best ammunition in the world which would suit our gun.

I would also like to know what is happening about ammunition for the 155 MM Tow Howitzer. Since a long time a discussion has been going on for acquiring ammunition. I am not aware if any ammunition has been found for this particular gun.

On many occasions, the Army is being used for the purpose of internal security. Our Armed Forces are doing quite a bit of it. We shall have to keep in mind this particular aspect when we think of the overall morale of the Armed Forces.

The Navy has been long neglected. We have a very long coastline. Now with the liberalisation and opening up of trade the Navy has a bigger role to play. It has to protect and guard our coastline. Submarines have been the prime need of the Navy. Unfortunately, after the HDW episode, nobody seems to talk about submarines. The Mazagon Dockyard was supposed to manufacture submarines but they are not doing it. They do not have any work. They are sitting idle. The submarine project has been shelved. I think this aspect needs to be looked into immediately.

We have been saddled with a very old aircraft carrier. There is a prime need for acquiring a couple of modern aircraft carriers on board. I did read a day or two back because of the severe resource crunch, the Navy has offered its services to the ONGC for protection of the rigs. I think it is a good idea. Wherever the Armed Forces are offering their services to an organisation, the organisation should pay for the services of the Armed Forces. I think this is a very good way of collecting revenue and this would make the Armed Forces a little more self-sufficient.

I would like to congratulate Prof. Abdul Kalam and his team of scientists on the excellent work being done by the DRDO in the missile programme. The entire country is proud of them. We are sure that the Government will back up this programme to the hilt and make India deterrent with those missiles. There has always been a debate all over the world whether we should have more aircraft and more missiles. Now we are producing indigenous missiles. We are all proud of it. It has to be fully backed by the country. However, I am not happy with a few projects of DRDO which are overambitious. Some of the projects are not within the reach of our scientists, not because our scientists are not up to the mark, they are excellent. The main reason is they do not have infrastructural facilities for the Light Combat Aircraft.

For many years, many people have been mentioning that this aircraft is beyond our scientists. Today, we are not producing a single aircraft in the HAL. Though HAL is one of the oldest organisations in the whole of Asia, unfortunately things have not been all right. We have not produced a single aircraft for the last 20 to 25 years. And, now, we want to make the most sophisticated aircraft in the world, the LCA, which even the most modern countries of the world are not in a position to do. Some have even scrapped their LCA projects in spite of the infrastructure. What is the cost of the LCA project? It is a real miracle that in India we hope to make an LCA with a very minimum budget. But the F-22 has cost about 13 billion dollars; the Eurofighters, for their LCA, have spent over nine billion dollars; the Rafels have spent over six billion dollars. And, we have provided for Rs. 2,200 crores. Without the infrastructure, without the equipment, without the foreign exchange, how are we going to have the LCA flying? What was the weight of the LCA when we first went in for the LCA and what is the weight today? What was the time-frame when we started the LCA project in 1982? Today it is 1994. At that time, I remember, the budget first came to Rs. 300 crores. Then it was Rs. 500 crores. Now, they have raised the budget to Rs. 2,200 crores. This is only for two prototype aircraft. What is going to be the cost? Nothing less than Rs. 25-30 thousand crores. And what is the time-frame? Now, the two aircraft, the prototypes, are going to be ready by 1994-95. It was about to come into squadron service in 1997-98. Now they are saying that it would come into squadron service by 2000-2005. But by that time, the Light Combat Aircraft is going to be absolutely obsolete. And who is going to be accountable? Will the people who started this programme be accountable? The people who started this programme went on for a certain time. Then they gave up. They went to foreign universities to teach. They are not accountable. How did they go? They should have completed this project. Whoever is behind this programme and who said that this can happen should be responsible. They should be accountable. And that is not happening today. I agree that there may be some spin-offs of the LCA project. But that could be

utilised by the industry. What is the position for the engine for the LCA? It was supposed to be ready some time back. But they are not ready even now. When is it going to be ready. Is it going to be ready at all? Or, are we going to finish importing the engine and finally importing the whole aircraft, after Rs. 15-20 thousand crores have been already sunk in? I would like to know. This cannot happen. We do not have the infrastructure. Even a single officer of the Indian Airforce is yet to say that he feels that the LCA is up to the mark. Unfortunately, the LCA project has been tied up with the MiG replacement. Delink it. If you want to go ahead with your experimentation on the fantasy, delink it from the purchase of the next generation aircraft. Ask the Airforce. They are crying. They say that the LCA is not going to come. So much of money has been spent already. I think now that so much of money has been put in, at the prototype stage, after we have spent about Rs. 3,000 crores, a rethinking must be done as to whether this project should go on. There is no shame. So many countries have given up so many projects when they found them not viable. There is nothing to feel bad about it. We will save another Rs. 30,000 crores if we forgo the Rs. 3,000 crores which have been spent so far. I do not think that is wasted altogether. Our scientists have learnt a lot. There will be spin-off for the industry. I do not want to discourage the scientists who have been putting their heart and soul into the LCA project. But, at some point of time, there should be a rethinking. There must be an expert committee which will go into it at least at the prototype stage which is probably a year or two away. Then only, I think, we should go ahead.

I would also like to know what happened to the 11 or 18 F-404 engines which have been bought. What is the condition of these engines? Why so many engines were bought? When you were going in for only two prototypes, why did you have to purchase nearly a dozen engines? They are lying waste. Money has been spent on them. Our precious foreign exchange has gone into them. I think the entire LCA project has to be reviewed. And people who are backing the project

today must be accountable till the very end, till the project comes up. Also, they have had the ALH project which has been going on for the last 25 years. There was a demonstration some time back, but I do not know what happened after that. This is also a project which has been going on for a long time and I think attention needs to be paid to the ALH. In the case of MBT, of course, the trials are over. It has been going on for years and finally, we have got all the right systems. We have got the right engine for it and the trials are over. But when are you going to start making it? When is the Government going to take a decision on making the MBT? When are you going to start placing the orders? When is the Army going to place the orders? If they decide that they are going to place the orders, where is the money? So, again we come down to a total resource crunch. But there is something which has got to be done. Money has to be found for these projects which have been started and done by our scientists and I am sure, the Government will find ways and means to complete them. I just mentioned the HAL. Unfortunately, I think only 40 per cent of the staff is kept occupied, 60 per cent has no work anywhere in the HAL. It is a very sad state of affairs. I don't blame any particular individual. It has been going on for the last 25 years. Right decisions have not been taken. But the situation has been rectified a bit. We must stop thinking of producing only aircraft there. Now, with the liberalisation and when the whole of Asia is one I think, the HAL can be converted as one of the main servicing centres, the main maintenance centre in Asia. We should go in for this. Forget about aircraft building. The HAL has got tremendous infrastructure. The infrastructure which is there in HAL is not anywhere in Asia. We should have some tie-up with other countries who can bring in modern machinery. Today, all our aircraft, air taxis are going out of the country for their service and maintenance. Even in Air India, all the aircraft have to go to Singapore for maintenance. It is a shame. When we have got a facility like HAL, why can't we tie-up with other countries? All over the world, people are having tie-ups now. As I said, defence is no more a holy cow. Luckily there are a lot of

changes coming about. We must think of making HAL one of the premier maintenance units in Asia and I think, this matter should be discussed with various aircraft companies. Otherwise, we are just contained. I saw a news item today that HAL is making doors for Boeing company. Are you going to be satisfied by manufacturing doors or are you going to be a big maintenance firm? I think we could do that and we should start with some small aircraft. Instead of dreaming of LCA, let us start with a small aircraft. Let us start building a small aircraft and then make a bigger, bigger and bigger aircraft. Let us start from it. Let us have some tie-up. Let us start manufacturing it. You see, our own scientists and our own engineers are second to none in the country. We must go ahead with what our infrastructure allows in this country. We must chew what we can eat and so, I think there is need for that. About the Ordnance Factories. I would like to say that some good work has been done and I must congratulate the Government that the Ordnance Factories have undergone a lot of change. Inventory control has been brought about and also there is a realisation that things which are not needed to be done by the Ordnance Factories like shoes and socks, can be given to the private sector. That is not the job of the armed forces machinery. There cannot be two opinions about the fact that every unit should be self-supporting. Every Ordnance Factory should be told to be a profit-making organisation and in that way only we can continue. I am also happy to note that the defence exports have picked up. But there is a lot of scope for improvement on this front. I would also like to know as to what the position is about the spare parts supply. When the Russian President, Mr. Yeltsin, came to India, an agreement was signed. I would like to know whether all parts of agreement have been fulfilled and whether we have received all the equipment and all the spare parts which Mr. Yeltsin has promised in terms of aid, etc. whether we are getting adequate supply of spares because most of our equipment are Russian-oriented, and whether we are getting proper facilities.

Sir, another aspect which I would like to harp upon is the cantonments. We have cantonments in our constituencies. We

have been quite perturbed over the state of affairs of the cantonments. The cantonments are the hang-ups of the British regime. They were meant to tie-up the country. By having these cantonments in Pune, Secunderabad, Bangalore, all over the country, there is no mutiny in the country. So many cantonments have come up in the North, near the borders. We really have to reconsider the need of having cantonments. Also, a sea change has taken place in the cantonments. Today 95 per cent persons living in the cantonments are civilians and only five per cent are military. And thousands of acres of land are lying with them. It is bad for ecology because no tree plantation is taking place there. There is no budget for tree plantation. They have no use for the land for the next thousand years. They do not have a budget for the next thousand years and the land is just lying there. There is a lot of infringement in that area. A general rethinking has to be done about the cantonments and the cantonment policy about civilians who have a greater role to play in the cantonments. The State Governments, the Central Government and the cantonments, all together, have to look after the people living in the cantonments. I think there is a dire need for that. A complete rethinking has to be done. Also, the Members of Parliament are coming forward to cooperate with the panchayats, zilla parishads. They should also be nominated to the various Cantonment Boards. There is a liaison between the Cantonment Boards and the M.Ps. who take up the problems of the people of such cantonments. I am happy that in this Budget about Rs. 25 crores extra have been provided for sports which is a step in the right direction because all over the world, the Armed Forces are the backbone of sports of a country and the cream of the youth is going to the Armed Forces. So I think it is a step in the right direction. They also come out with lots of boys' battalions etc. I think, this should be a nucleus sport in the country.

Sir, before I conclude, I would like to give a little warning—equipment-wise we have already spoken—about the manpower superiority which our neighbours seem to be gaining. The cream of the youth in Pakistan is going to the Armed Forces,

whereas in India you find the cream of the youth going to business the next slot going to civil service, police etc., and then comes the Armed Forces. On the one side this is the state. On the other side, Sir, we have modern equipment, modern aircraft. A Mirage costs us Rs. 40 to Rs. 50 crores today, but we are not paying the pilot who is flying the Mirage. A Mirage costs Rs. 50 crores, but we are not paying the pilot well. Why don't we treat the pilot as the managing director of a Rs. 50 crore firm? Why are we not giving him the perquisites? We are not getting the right people, the technicians, the trained technicians to look after these Mirages. You just ask the Ministry for how many courses the people have not applied, the right people are not applying. On the one side, they are getting a lot of sophisticated equipment. On the other side, we do not have the right manpower to look after this equipment. You do not have the right manpower to fly these planes. You do not have the right manpower to man these guns. So, the person, the man behind the machine has to be looked after well. We have to make sure that he is paid well, he gets his proper flying bounties and he gets proper high altitude allowance. We in Parliament must make sure that income-tax is abolished for the Armed Forces. We were giving incentives. It is our duty to send the best team of youth. We have to create these conditions. There is still a shortage of housing for the Armed Forces.

Finally, I would like to say that the British system should be followed in India. As far as promotion is concerned, there is a lot of unhappiness because we cannot have a few people on the top. There are a lot of people at the Wing Commander level or the Group Captain level or the Colonel level who are a dissatisfied lot. We must, like the British system, delink the rank and the pay. If a person, is a Wing Commander for the rest of his life, his salary goes upto the level of a General or an Air Marshal. So, he is not satisfied. As long as he gets salary, he is satisfied even if he does not get any promotion. Unfortunately, in India he gets a salary of a Colonel throughout his life, which is not too much. So, at the middle level or at the senior level, there is a lot of discontent which we can be removed by this system.

I once again congratulate the Armed Forces on doing an excellent job. Thank you.

SHRI K. R. MALKANI (Delhi): Mr. Vice-chairman, Sir, I would like to join my good friend, Mr. Suresh Kalmadi, in getting our gallant Armed Forces. They have done an excellent job in war and peace. The whole country is proud of them.

It is satisfying to note that after six years, the Defence Budget has shown some significant increase of 7 per cent. My only fear is that Mr. Manmohan Singh's inflation of 8 to 10 per cent might cancel that out. Sir, eight years ago, 4.02 per cent of the GDP was devoted to Defence. Today the share of Defence has come down to 2.42 per cent. Is it fair? In all the well-organised Defence establishments, throughout the world, arms, equipment, ammunition, fuel, etc. consume more than 50 per cent of the Defence Budget. Even in India Defence Budget on these items was 52 to 54 per cent only six years back. But today the expenditure on these items has come down to 42 per cent. In view of the fact that much of the equipment has to be imported, and because of the decline in the value of the rupee, import prices have gone up, we will be getting much less on this 42 per cent. This is a matter of anxiety.

There are some worrying features in the Budget. On revenue account, the DRDO allocation shows an increase. But if you go into the capital expenditure, there is a decline of Rs. 85 crores. We would like the Government to tell us which projects they are giving up. Why are they doing it?

I have also found that every year, on an average, the Defence Ministry has to spend about Rs. 500 crores on jobs done for different States. Earlier, the concerned Union Ministry or the concerned State Government used to foot the bill. There is no reason why the Defence Ministry should spend either for floods or famine or earthquake relief or anything else. The necessary money should come from the relevant Union Ministry or from the concerned State. I would also

like to say that the Indian Defence budgeting system is rather old-fashioned. In the UK and the USA and all other developed countries, they have what they describe as programme budgeting or functional accounting. They say that they would add so many guns, so many planes, so many ships and they also mention how much that would cost. Here we give only financial figures. Prices keep rising all the time and hence we do not get the equipment at the price we had budgeted for.

In this connection I would also like to draw the attention of the House to Arun Singh's Report. I have not seen it. I am told that it is a very valuable report. It is a report on Defence economy, Defence organisation and improving of efficiency. I do not see any reason why that Report should be gathering dust. It is not a stool on which the Government may sit. The Government would be very well advised to make this Report public. Let the whole country know about Defence problems and how they should be handled.

Everybody is conscious of the dangers facing the country. In this connection it is also conceded that our Defence forces need to be modernised. I am afraid enough is not being done in this direction. A few years ago we had decided to have the 155 mm gun. After long delays we went in for the Bofors gun and the whole thing got shrouded in a scandal. Today nobody knows where it stands. Is the Bofors gun being imported? Are steps being taken to fabricate the gun? Nobody seems to know anything about it. Let the Government come out clean on this issue.

While they go into this matter I would particularly like to add that the agreement had a very very funny clause. The gun was to come from Sweden. The ammunition was to come from Italy, which does not manufacture it. Italy was to get it from Belgium. I expect the Government to snap this very dubious Italian connection. Whatever ammunition we require should come from the country which manufactures it. We do not need these third parties in between. We have decided to induct the Arjun tank. Very good. But probably it would take some time before these tanks can be manu-

factured in enough numbers. It is therefore, important to update our existing tanks which too have given us very good service. For some time now we have been looking for a jet trainer aircraft. I understand that global tenders were called some seven years ago. I think two companies were shortlisted. One of them has ceased to function. We are left with only one, and that is no competition. Seven years is a long time. Many jet trainer planes have come into the market. Some of them are very good and very cheap. Government would be well-advised to go in for global tenders again so as to have the best bargain. We have some aircraft carriers and we are thinking of adding another aircraft carrier. Aircraft carriers are very nice, impressive things. But Government should consider whether we should not go into defence-cum-commando vessels as these will be more defence effective and cost-effective. We can also strengthen our submarine fleet by getting some more diesel submarines from Russia. During the Gulf War, high-tech ammunition was used. I understand that our present guns can fire the new high-tech ammunition with minor adjustments or modifications. We should promptly go in for it. Actually we should have an electronic warfare battalion in each service corps. This is going to be for the war of the future. As regards missiles, Government has decided to deploy four missiles over the next few years, which is very good. But there is a question mark above Agni missile. The other day, when the Prime Minister was here, at that time also, this issue was raised. He was repeatedly asked whether it was a fact that the programme had been capped and that the request of Rs. 50 crores to carry out three more tests had been declined, but there was no answer. We do not know what the Government wants to do. There was a press report today where the Government seemed to have said that it was firm in its decision, that it would make the necessary funds available, that the tests would go on and that the distinguished team of scientists and technicians led by Dr. Kalam would not be disturbed. I hope that the report is correct. We would like the Hon. Minister to make clear what the position is. This is very important because things done at the right time will be of great value in

the years to come. I am reminded of something that happened 30 years ago. Dr. Homi Bhabha was addressing a press conference in Delhi, he said that ever since 1959, we had had the capacity, the potential, to produce a Hiroshima-type bomb. And a correspondent asked him, "Sir, we are peace-loving people. We don't want a bomb. But if the Government were to ask you to make a bomb, how long will it take?" Dr. Bhabha said, "We are peace-loving people. But if the Government asks me to make a bomb, I can make it in two years". Another question was: "Sir, we don't want a bomb. But if the Government were to ask you, how much will be the cost of a bomb?" He repeated, "We don't want a bomb. And the Government has not asked me for it. But if it were to ask me, it will cost only Rs. 5 lakhs. Just think of it. If the Government had taken this decision of having a small nuclear arsenal in 1959 itself, when we had developed the capacity, we would have had a few nuclear bombs in our arsenal in 1961-62 and most probably, there would have been no India-China war of 1962 and no Indo-Pakistan war of 1965. Even now it is not too late though I can say we have been late by 32 years. If we mean business, if we really mean security for India, we must go nuclear. It will be the only effective deterrent. We are prepared to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty as a nuclear-weapon power. We cannot stand nuclearly naked in the world. The world is a kind of jungle and you cannot carry on in this manner. The worst part of our situation is that when we have not signed the NPT, we are being blamed for not signing it and at the same time, we are also being accused of secretly making nuclear bombs. We must have some guts to go in for nuclear armaments openly.

In conclusion, I will deal with the third part of defence and, that is, defence planning and administration. In India, the planning staff with which the civilians of the planning. But it is blissfully innocent of anything concerning defence. Perhaps, they could consider having a defence wing and a defence dimension. Right now, all planning relating to defence is being done by the defence planning staff. I feel that it will be better to have a joint planning staff with which the civilians of

the Defence Ministry can also be associated. Many distinguished defence experts feel that they are not being taken into full confidence by the Ministry of Defence. I am sorry to say this. They think that our friends belonging to the Indian Administrative Service are bossing over defence. There must be civilian control. There is civilian control. The Minister is a civilian. Even the Secretary is a civilian. Then, how is it that Defence people are never appointed even as Additional Secretaries or Joint Secretaries? All this talent, all this expertise, is available. Why not avail of this? Why not make them available to the Defence Ministry?

A few years ago, the then Prime Minister, Shri V. P. Singh, had announced the constitution of a National Security Council. After that, we have not heard of it. I think it will be a very good idea to have a National Security Council. Government would be very well advised to have a Council of this kind which can take a long term over view of things. In conclusion, it is a matter of happiness that the Prime Minister himself is holding the Defence portfolio. But I think his hands are too full with too many things that it may not be possible for him to give as much attention to matters of Defence as that serious subject calls for. Perhaps, he may consider appointing a full-time Cabinet Minister for this Ministry.

Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH) IN THE CHAIR

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA (RAJASTAN): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to offer a few comments on the working of the Ministry of Defence. To begin with, I would like to state that I associate myself with most of what Shri Suresh Kalmadi has said. But I would certainly like to add a few points more.

To begin with take the case of the Budget provision. The total provision for the year 1994-95 for the Defence Ministry is Rs. 23,000 crores. The revised provision for 1993-94 was Rs. 21,500 crores. Thus, there is an increase of only 7 per cent so far as the Defence Budget is concerned, compared to the revised provision for the

year 1993-94. If you take into account the double digit inflation through which the country has been passing, the provision for 1994-95, in real terms, is less than what was provided for the year 1993-94 according to the revised estimates.

In the normal circumstances, if the Defence expenditure is reduced, it should be a matter of satisfaction for every one. If the Defence Budget is reduced and that money is diverted for productive purposes, everyone will feel happy. After World War II, Germany and Japan made tremendous progress towards rehabilitation of their countries. How could they do it? The fact is that their Defence Budget was reduced almost to zero. Whatever savings were there, whatever money was there, it was diverted for building up their countries. Our aim should normally be the same in normal circumstances.

But, I am afraid that it is not possible to do so at the present time. It is not possible because Pakistan is continuing its proxy war against us and the arms race continues to be there. In these circumstances, we cannot lag behind. Secondly, if Pakistan does not stop encouraging militancy in Kashmir, then there is no alternative left for India but to combat it with arms. Sir, with Pakistan increasing its militancy and sending its mercenaries to fight, what options are we really left with?

Then, Sir, we hear about the American intention of arming Pakistan with 38 F-16s. And that they are doing, in spite of the Pressler Amendment being there. They are saying that this is a one-time exemption which they propose to seek, and then supply these F-16s to Pakistan. That will be most unfortunate, and India obviously cannot sit as a mute spectator to what is going on in its neighbouring country. India, Sir, under those circumstances, will be forced to strengthen its Defence. And if it has to strengthen its Defence, it will be forced to go either for M-29s or any other aircraft which may be comparable to F-16s in quality and in excellence. Sir, let us all hope and pray that our Prime Minister, who is shortly visiting the United States, will be able to make them realise the great harm that is likely to be caused to the cause of peace in this part of the world by the United States supplying F-16s to Pakistan.

Sir, I believe, the Defence Ministry's request for the Budget was in the vicinity of Rs. 25,000 crores. Now, Sir, that is higher than Rs. 23,000 crores which has been provided in the budget only by a marginal amount. And, I would under the circumstances, state that careful consideration should be shown to the Defence Ministry's request. If, by merely sending an additional amount of Rs. 2,000 crores, we are able to keep our armaments, our tanks, our aircraft, and our naval ships in a tip-top condition, that is certainly something which we should not mind, which we should not grudge.

Sir, Defence expenditure, I may mention, as percentage of GDP has been reduced in recent years. In 1987, the figure was 4.9 per cent. In the next three years, it came down from 4.9 per cent to 3.83 per cent, 3.57 per cent, and 3.20 per cent. And in 1993-94, the year which has just completed, the amount was 2.50 per cent. And in the Budget that has been presented now for 1994-95, the amount is only 2.40 per cent. Sir, against this, Pakistan is spending something like 7 per cent of its GDP on Defence. This, Sir, at least, will show that India is a peace-loving country and that India has exercised some sort of self-restraint over the military expenditure which is laudable. But side by side, I would also like to mention that our military machine should be kept in a state of full modernisation. Our Army, Navy and Air Force do have a feeling of the effect of the prevailing resource crunch. Some time back, I understand, an Air Show was held in Bangalore, and our Air Chief Marshal was there at that time. And after the show, he held a press conference, this was something in the month of December last year. And he said that managing the Air Force with the prevailing resource crunch is a tough job. I believe the matter needs serious consideration. Most of the experts advocate that there should be a quick arrangement, a quick procurement, as far as items of Defence are concerned. To cite a few instances, take the case of advanced jet trainers which is the basic need of our Air Force. This has been in a state of indecision for quite sometime. I hope an early decision will be taken on this. It is also necessary to expedite purchase of advanced light

helicopters. In the case of the Main Battle Tank, Arjun, I believe some type of project is coming up. I was told that some experiments were made in the Thar Desert and it was felt that either the weight of the tank should be reduced or the engine should be improved. The feeling is that with the present weight and with the present engine, they find a certain lacuna, otherwise it is a nice and a beautiful tank.

There is also a demand for Light Combat Aircraft which issue has been pending for long time. I would submit that quick decisions should be taken in respect of all these items. My impression is—and that is the impression which many of the journalists carry, that India's Air Force can perform very well if it is kept in a fighting-fit condition. Sir, the aircraft can play a very important role in modern warfare and that is one lesson which we have to learn from the Iraq war, or the Gulf war where importance of the Air Force was proved compared to any other force. Of course, all the forces are important but Air Force has played a very important role in all these countries. Its modernisation in our country has become long overdue. Mig-21s need replacement—if not replacement, at least a thorough upgradation and modernisation. Likewise, our tanks T-55 and T-72, have become outdated. Our Navy needs more submarines. As I mentioned, our Indian Air Force needs AJTs very badly. India today needs a modern Air Force with modern electronic equipments and better air defence ground environment systems in order to perform better for our defence. In case we have all these equipments and a proper control room, much can be achieved. I shall explain its importance. In case we have all these equipments and proper control room, if any missile is fired against us by any neighbouring country, we can see in the graph or in the chart and find out the precise time when the missile was fired and we can immediately take corrective steps to intercept that missile. Therefore, this type of modern equipment is very necessary.

Experts feel that in the present-day mechanised warfare, more machines are needed than men. It is again a contro-

versial matter. From enquiries made by me, it appears that we have got to strike a fine balance and have a mix of both. After all, we have along border facing an unfriendly neighbour and our boundaries are to be meticulously guarded by our Army and Air Force.

I would not like to say about the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Much has been said about it. Many replies have been given to the United States by a larger number of our Ministers and even by our Prime Minister. I am happy that the entire country is solidly behind the Prime Minister and I hope when he goes to the States, he will be able to sort out this problem also. Sir, regarding the missile technology, I would, certainly, like to state that India has made a tremendous progress. We are indebted to our scientific community. Our scientists in the Defence Research and Development Organisation, D.R.D.O. under the leadership of Dr. Abdul Kalam, have propelled India into the comity of Great Powers. We are proud of them.

On one point, I do not agree with Mr. Suresh Kalmadi. This is regarding the cantonments. I think before anything is done regarding the cantonments, we should give full consideration to the matter, listen to the views of the Army so that their importance in maintaining the cantonments is not reduced.

Sir, lastly, I would say that more than anything else, what we need is more strategic thinkers to constantly review our requirements and the position of our Army, Navy and Air Force. Thank you.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the areas of defence and foreign policy have been, fortunately, areas of national consensus in our country during the last four decades. All parties in this House vie with one another in lending support to our Armed Forces, of whom we are justifiably proud. But this is not enough.

Sir, we will have to take a close look at the state of our defence preparedness. When the Budget was presented, the banners in the front-page of the newspapers screamed that there was an increase of 20 per cent in the outlay for Defence

during 1994-95. But the fact of the matter is, as has been pointed out by Mr. K.K. Birla, the real increase is only 7 per cent as compared to the revised estimates of 1993-94. This means, the level of expenditure during 1994-95, in real terms, would be lower than that during 1993-94. You may turn round and say that the revised estimates of 1994-95 would be higher than the Budget estimates and that, therefore, we should not jump to this hasty conclusion. Even if the Government spends Rs. 25,000 crores, eventually, our real expenditure on Defence would be on the same scale as it was during 1993-94. There is, therefore, no increase, whatsoever, in terms of real Defence expenditure.

What about the capital expenditure? The capital expenditure is Rs. 6,831.13 crores, as against the revised estimates of Rs. 6,563.43 crores during 1993-94. There is hardly an increase of Rs. 300 crores. This represents an increase of just about 5 per cent. As has been mentioned by Mr. K. K. Birla himself, we have once again, got into the vicious circle of double-digit inflation. But quite apart from all this, we must see as to how this capital expenditure is getting incurred. If we take a close look, we find that out of Rs. 6,800 crores, more than Rs. 3,000 crores, would go towards debt repayment. What is the real expenditure on capital items? We are left with less than Rs. 4,000 crores. This represents the present situation. If we take a perspective view of the defence expenditure, the situation is far worse. I would say, with all the responsibility at my command, that in the last seven years the defence preparedness and defence capability of the country has suffered considerable erosion, may, serious degradation. On what basis do I make this very serious statement?

Sir, in 1986-87 our defence expenditure constituted about 3.5 per cent. It was never more than four per cent. I think the datum given by Mr. Birla on this count is not precise. But today it has come down to less than 2.5 per cent. That means, in the last eight years the defence expenditure, as percentage of GDP, has come down. That is not the whole story, because the GDP itself in this country has

been growing at a sluggish rate during these years. That means the real expenditure is even less than what the statistics in the abstract indicate. In 1986-87 the defence expenditure figure was Rs. 10,477 crores. I am confining my analysis to 1993-94. The budget figure for 1993-94 was Rs. 19,180 crores. This was not enough to offset the normal inflation rate. The inflation rate, as we all know, for defence equipment and machinery is much higher than the normal inflation rate, and the increase in the defence expenditure is not even as high as the normal inflation rate. That is how our defence preparedness got seriously compromised.

In these years, another setback befell our country. The Soviet Union disintegrated, which resulted in a disruption of flow of spares and maintenance of support equipment. As I said earlier, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the defence expenditure in 1986-87 was Rs. 10,477 crores. In 1993-94 it was Rs. 19,180 crores. In statistical terms it represents an annual growth rate of 9.06 per cent. But if you take these figures in terms of 1980-81 constant prices — I hope our Finance Minister is listening carefully — our defence expenditure declined at an annual rate of 2.04 per cent. There has been a net decline. The defence expenditure for 1986-87 in terms of 1980-81 constant prices would work out to only Rs. 6,579.08 crores. By the same standard, the budget for 1993-94 would work out to Rs. 5,660 crores.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra) : And what about 1989-90 and 1990-91? Did you check it up? Check up, please.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH) : Mr. Jagesh Desai, you are also going to participate in the debate.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I welcome the intervention of Shri Jagesh Desai. He is only trying to say that this indicator would be even worse in the case of 1989-90, 1990-91 and so on and so forth. I agree with him. He is intervening merely to strengthen my argument.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA (Bihar) : He is attacking the V. P. Singh Government.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : It does not matter which Government was there. We are all concerned with the defence of the country. I am not concerned with the defence of any government.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI : Yes, we are all one.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA : We do not defend any government.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : That is not my primary concern. My concern is the defence of the country.

Sir, even an analysis in terms of rupees is highly misleading because our capital expenditure is primarily meant for purchase of equipment, and this purchase mostly takes place abroad. Therefore, our foreign exchange fluctuations need to be taken into consideration. I have done my own little arithmetic, and I find that the value of the rupee has come down by 62.9 per cent since 1986-87. It was Rs. 11.6 per US dollar in 1986-87. Today, in 1993-94, on an average it is Rs. 31.3 per US dollar. What does that show? The effect of the foreign exchange fluctuations, as I said earlier, would be mainly on non-manpower costs. The non-manpower costs come to about 50 per cent of our defence expenditure. If you convert our rupees into the US dollars, you will find that the purchasing power of the defence allocations dropped from US \$3,043 million in 1986-87 to US \$974. Please note this.

I have cited all these cumbersome, irksome data, with which I have never been comfortable, unlike Dr. Manmohan Singh, because I am not a professional economist, only to prove that our defence capability in the last six or seven years has been allowed to be degraded. On account of this invisible, intangible degradation, the gap between Pakistan's defence capability and India's defence capability has narrowed down substantially during these years. I am not saying that the gap doesn't still exist. The gap is much less than what it was in 1986-87. The gap between China's defence capabilities and India's defence capabilities has widened much further during the same period. As has been mentioned by the previous speakers, both China and Pakistan have been spending larger amounts both

in absolute terms and also as percentages of their respective GDPs on defence.

One may wonder as to what I am driving at. I am sure Dr. Manmohan Singh must be squirming in his seat and he must be thinking that I am pleading for a quantum jump in defence expenditure. He is already bothered by the frightening fiscal deficit. I would like to assure him, I am not pleading for that in such simple terms. We must go in for a radical strategic doctrine by which we can optimise the effectiveness of our expenditure. We will have to balance the priority of defence expenditure with other priorities. But the problem is that our country has not believed in any defence doctrine whatsoever. There are always many components that go into a defence doctrine. If those components are put together, a clever man can see some implicit doctrine. But I am not able to understand as to why we are fighting shy of an explicit, clear defence doctrine. A layman like me would not be able to follow the doctrine behind the Government's approach. When one talks of security doctrine, it doesn't merely relate to defence of the country. There are many other components like speedy economic growth, like accelerated social justice and above all great genuine harmony among many groups in our country. In this connection, I would like to draw the attention of Mr. Malkani to the need for developing harmony among various groups in the country. That is one of the important components of India's national security.

Having stated this, we cannot do away with what may be called a defence doctrine. One can always obfuscate a discussion on this doctrine by getting into semantics. I do not want to get drawn into that.

The Rank study of the U.S.A. once stated, "India doesn't have a strategic culture." We do not have a strategic culture and you have of this, we often take recourse to a rash of reactive purchases.
5.00 P.M.

Every speaker before me referred to the acquisition of 38 F-16s by Pakistan, they did not refer to the three deadly helicopters which could trace out submarines and kill them. This will, no doubt, augment the defence

capability of Pakistan. This could, no doubt, induce Pakistan to think that it could indulge in a military misadventure as it did in 1965. I am not referring to that. I take China as an example in this regard. In the 60s and the 70s, China was an international 'pariah'. China was starved of defence supplies by both the Soviet Union and the whole of the western world. But it had a security doctrine. It might not have published that doctrine and got it distributed to all the chanceries. It did not have sophisticated aircraft. But it went nuclear. I went in for the Full Missile Development Programme. China even said that it could use the nuclear bomb as a first strike also. I am not in agreement with their theory. I am only stating this to say that they have had a doctrine. I have been studying the subject for a few years now as a Member of Parliament. The problem with Members of Parliament is that we are Jacks of all trades, with times we have to cross swords, with Dr. Manmohan Singh on Budget, sometimes with Mr. Pranab Mukherjee on GATT and sometimes, with the Prime Minister on defence, all the three of whom are considered experts in their respective fields. Well, Dr. Manmohan Singh has beaten the retreat from GATT. If we had a national security doctrine, this problem would not arise. When there was the National Front Government, they set up the National Security Council. I do not know what happened to it. It withered away. Nobody dissolved it.

SHRI P. UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh) : Like the National Front.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The National Front was not dissolved. Nor did it wither away. Mr. Upendra has withered away. I cannot help it. The point I am trying to make is that Governments wither away, political forces do not. Along with Mr. Upendra, Jaipal Reddy also may go. But the forces do not wither away. What happened to the National Security Council? Nobody has been able to give even a decent burial to it. Forget the fact that our Government did it. You can yourself do it now. There is a need for a National Security Council. You cannot form a National Security Council because you do not

know who should be made the Secretary. Since you cannot choose the Secretary for it or the personnel for it, you will not even form the Council. Earlier, before 1962, we at least used to have the Defence Minister's Committee. The Cabinet used to have a Committee headed by the Defence Minister. Today, we do not have even the Defence Minister's Committee. We have an omnibus, umbrella, Committee called the Political Affairs Committee. And this Cabinet does not even have the Political Affairs Committee. And I have no difficulty in stating that the Prime Minister should not be the Cabinet Minister for Defence at all. I do not know why Mr. Malkani used such euphemistic language when he referred to. There should be a full-fledged Cabinet Minister. It is no reflection on my good friend, Mr. Mallikarjun. If the Prime Minister likes, he can be made the Cabinet Minister for Defence. The fact I am trying to point out is that India needs a Cabinet Minister for Defence. How can the country do without a Defence Minister?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI MALLIKARJUN) : Quite a number of Prime Ministers were the Defence Ministers. Even V. P. Singh held this charge. It is not a new thing. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was also the Defence Minister, not once but thrice.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I agree with my friend, Mr. Mallikarjun. I am trying to say, irrespective of past precedents, it is not a good tradition.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA : You wanted to promote him.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Surely I have no objection. Sir, as I said earlier, we would be paying more than Rs. 3,000 crores this year towards past debt repayment. This would be the position for the next ten, fifteen years. Why should we go in for this foreign purchase? If we go in for foreign purchases, this will continue to be the perennial feature of our Defence budget-making. We should, therefore, lay great emphasis on indigenisation. We should, therefore, lay

great emphasis on research and development. In 1986-87, we were spending 0.17 per cent of the GDP on research and development. The expenditure on R & D also has declined in relative terms. In 1992-93, it came down to 0.12 per cent. My plea is that the expenditure on R and D should at least be increased to 0.25 per cent of the GDP in the years to come. Since I have laid emphasis on indigenisation, I would welcome the efforts made in building the Main Battle Tank Arjun. It may still have some teething trouble but there is no substitute to development of our own system. I would say the same thing about the Light Combat Aircraft. There are many people who are sceptical about our ability to develop the LCA. May be, their scepticism is well-founded. But I would say that it is worth trying. I recognise that many sub-systems do not belong to our country and we are importing quite a few of them. I do not want to bother the House with details. We are trying to produce some of the systems in collaboration with some foreign countries. Be that as it may, we must augment our efforts in producing the LCA. We must also try to see shortcomings in the MBT Arjun should be removed. Our friends have referred to the Advance Jet Trainer. In my view, the Advance Jet Trainer could have been produced in this country. I do not know who took the decision that the DRDO is very busy with the manufacture of LCA and their attention should not be distracted. I do not know whether the DRDO took this decision or the Government took this decision because a few decisions taken by the Government are owned up by our Defence establishments. I am saying this because I know the Government of India is trying to purchase AJT from the U.K. British Hawk. After all, the British Hawk has almost the same engine. (*Time bell rings*) Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would need some more time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH) : This is the second warning.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I know. You may kindly be more merciful in giving a third ring.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH) : But this is the last.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The point I am trying to make is this. The engine of Jaguar which is being produced in our country at HAL has a lot of common characteristics with the engine of British Hawk. The commonality between the two engines is extraordinary and yet, we did not go in for our own production. The tenders were called seven years back, two Jets were shortlisted four years back and this shortlisting was spurious. It was a case of contrived competitiveness because Alpha Jet of France, I am told, ceased to produce anything since 1991. So it is one horse race. It is one-eyed Government which is opting for one horse race. I, therefore, suggest that in case you decide not to produce yourself, in case you feel that it is urgently necessary, you can't wait for the production of our own AJT, go in for fresh global tenders.

Then, Sir, I congratulate our scientists on our successful missile development programme. This is one silver lining in the otherwise dark cloud of our Defence preparedness. But the problem, Mr. Vice-Chairman, is, we as a nation lack in killer instinct. We went in for implosion in 1974. We thought we were very clever, but in fact, we turned out to be being too clever by half. We thought we were deceiving others but we ended up in deceiving ourselves. We did nothing more. The same thing is happening to the Agni Test. I do not know why this beautiful name has been coined for Agni Test, a technological demonstrator.

I tell you, our Indians who do not know much English are great phrase spinners. Why can't this be productionised? Why are you hesitating to productionise? Induct it into our Force. I charge the Government with surrendering to the pressure from the U.S. on this count. Let the Government, let the Prime Minister tomorrow say that the Government is going to productionise Agni. We have the capacity for producing IRBMs in two years. We have the technological capability and know how for the same. But why are we holding back?

Now, Sir, one Committee headed by Arun Singh was appointed to see how the savings could be effected. That report is supposed to be classified. For what reason? Our Estimates Committee recommended that the Committee Report be made public. The Standing Committee on Defence last year recommended the same. But our Government can't make up its mind. This hush-hush approach to Defence must be given up. Nothing other than operational plans can be considered classified. There is nothing in the Arun Singh Committee Report which is not already not known. What is known to everybody else is withheld from Parliament. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, please give me a couple of minutes more. I would strongly plead for leaner and meaner forces. We need to reduce our forces and strengthen their effectiveness. Our Standing Committee recommended it as a long-term objective. I would plead for an immediate adoption of this doctrine because implementation of this doctrine will take its own time and the gestation period would be quite long. We know that more than one-third of the Army has been deployed for domestic duties, for low intensity conflicts and other emergencies. It is good neither for the Army nor for the country. I know that you have been developing *Rshatriya* rifles. This process must be accentuated and accelerated and the same must be made over to the Home Ministry. Why should the expenditure incurred on the Army, which is used for domestic duties, be shown as Defence expenditure?

Now, I come to Indo-Pak relations. Unfortunately, the Indo-Pak relations always have a tendency of getting transformed into Indo-American relations. Some time back, there was a proposal that there should be a five-power meeting to discuss NPT. Our Government rightly rejected that proposal. But this Government has swallowed the bait of a nine-power meeting which includes five permanent members of the Security Council and Germany, Japan, Pakistan and India. We swallowed this bait hook, line and sinker. If this nine-power meeting which is to be held in Washington tomorrow or the day after tomorrow for which our team is leaving today, is to discuss the universal non-discriminatory nuclear treaty.

it would have been all right. How can this nine-power meeting discuss the security relating to South Asia? What business do they have? In retrospect, it appears, that the costly certitudes of cold-war are preferable to the volcanic volatilities of unstable uni-polar world. We are being subjected to unremitting pressures. We have a tendency of projecting certain individuals as demons. I don't consider Ms Robin Raphel a demon at all. She represents the American view point. Mr. Mallot, who had come earlier, said the same thing. Mr. Talbott, who came later, also said the same thing. Ms Raphel may have an abrasive style. Mr. Talbott may have a persuasive style. But the substance and the sense are the same. Our Prime Minister is invited by the USA. Our relations with the USA must be friendly. You must make every attempt to see that our relations with America remain friendly. I am of the view that the Prime Minister must respond to the USA's invitation. But, I would like to enter a caveat. I would urge the Prime Minister to go to the USA but not in May because no preparatory work has been done in regard to the summit. We are aware from here what menu will be served to you in the White House—NPT, MTCR, Human Rights in Kashmir and what have you. Does our Prime Minister have the stomach to swallow this menu and survive? Then, why does he go? What is his plan? Why does he not take the Parliament into confidence? Sir, I would like to end my presentation by appealing to the Prime Minister to be more open. I know he is a wise man. But then, wisdom which is kept to oneself may not turn out to be wisdom. Let him share his wisdom, with all of us here. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH): Now, Shri Kishor Chandra Deo will speak. He is not a new Member. But this is his maiden speech.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, as my friend, Shri Jaipal Reddy, has put it, Parliament has always been united in lending its support to the defence services, for defence expenditure basically because this is a subject which

involves the security of our country, of our frontiers. At the very outset Mr. Jaipal Reddy reeled off a lot of figures regarding the inflation rate, the expenditure that has been involved towards allocation for defence purposes, and came to the conclusion that there has been a drastic degradation of our defence because the intrinsic value of money that has been spent has fallen in the last few years. I would very humbly like to submit that defence preparedness is not necessarily coterminous or proportionate or related to the money that is spent for that purpose. Many of us in this House, from all sides, would have liked more money to have been allocated towards defence expenditure. There are several areas where we would have spent more and where we can spend more. But there are a lot of constraints in this regard and I think it would be a travesty of truth to say that there has been a degradation because expenditure has not kept pace with inflation and other factors which my friend mentioned. He has also spoken of a strategic defence doctrine. A Defence doctrine is necessary. But I must also hasten to add that defence doctrine or a doctrine which will spell the strategy for defence matters also cannot be a static doctrine. You can have something very, very basic. But then situations have been changing so very fast especially in recent times that you will have to be dynamic in your response. In the last few years we have been sweeping changes the world over—from a bipolar world to a unipolar world. We have seen the dismantling of the Soviet Union and several other developments which have influenced international relations. Secondly, there has also been a tremendous advancement in science and technology and in the field of defence. We saw glimpses of this in the Middle-East conflict that took place in Iraq. Though conventional warfare will technically remain and will continue for a long time to come, today, this will have to be accompanied and backed up by electronics and modern technology. We have seen in the Middle-East and several other countries that along with precision we need to have a striking power. This has become the hall-mark of modern warfare. So development of technology and meeting these new challenges is something we

have to think about. We have to certainly modernise our Defence forces. But, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would stress upon another factor which concerns us along with many other countries in the world today. While the possibilities of inter-State conflicts and wars have, certainly, receded as compared to earlier times, a new situation has developed in many parts of the world today. The forces of disintegration, rise of sub-national forces, tendency of indulging in protectionism in one's own areas, ethnic conflicts, etc., are also threatening and affecting the integrity of the States. We all know what is happening in Bosnia, in Azerbaijan, in the borders of Afghanistan and Tajakistan. We are also not devoid of a similar situation in our country. Now, while talking of defence, as my friend has rightly put it, we have a tendency of concentrating on and talking more about, rather overreacting to the Indo-Pakistan situation. What is actually happening today is that Pakistan is fighting, what I would call, a low-cost proxy war. After all, what is Pakistan doing today? It is training, aiding and abetting terrorists who are, in turn, threatening to disintegrate the sovereignty of our country. These are the new threats that have emerged after various changes that have taken place and we have to react to it in a befitting manner. We have a similar situation on the East-Coast by way of influx of arms from Sri Lanka. Well, the LTTE, which has been active in the South, is also posing to become a bigger threat and there are also reports of a nexus being developed between the LTTE and the IS of Pakistan and the resulting danger is a threat to the integration of our country. Reports also say that China is aiding Sri Lanka in the procurement of arms. So, this is a very, very serious situation. And this is not the problem of the Home Ministry above. When you talk of security, it is not only in terms of sending your fighter planes, missiles and nuclear warheads across the border or across the continent, but it also involves the threat to security of our country from disintegrationist forces. And it is only the paramilitary forces which have been taking command of this kind of a situation, wherever it has erupted, be it in the North-East or Punjab or Kashmir or any other place, for that

matter. I would like to mention that we should take a fresh look at solving this problem. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, according to the report of the Ministry of Finance, every year, about 50,000 trained jawans/soldiers are relieved from Army and the report further says that they are of the age group of 32—42 years which means that they are still young and youthful. These people have already been trained in warfare. They are disciplined in certain aspects. I would like to suggest through you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, that we should, probably, form an auxiliary force, which many other countries have, to take charge of the situation in these areas. Secondly, the trained forces which are relieved every year may also cause serious problems on account of frustration and disgust and so, if their services are not channelised or utilised in the interests of the nation, this factor may also cause serious problems. Of course, there are other things like using them for ecological purposes and so on but their services have to be properly utilised. In many countries, they have this Liberation Army a parallel of what we call the Territorial Army. In other countries the ratio is 1 : 1. But here it is much less. The Territorial Army is a voluntary force and they meet once in a way. They probably have some battalions. We need trained men to protect, for example, our oil-fields. One of my friends, Shri Suresh Kalmadi, was talking about the money transactions between the Defence people and the petroleum people for safeguarding the oil-fields. It is not a question of expenditure alone. I think today most of our oil-fields are unprotected. After all, we need fuel. We need petrol to run our aircraft, armed vehicles, tanks, etc. In times of war, you all know that these are the installations which will be attacked first. Today, most of our oil refineries, most of the places where fuel is stored, are totally unprotected. We could have missiles. But missiles are very expensive. We have to have priorities. But, there should at least be some kind of air cover to protect these strategic places from enemy attacks if and when such a situation arises.

Likewise, as far as coastal area is concerned we have probably one of the

largest coastal area, extending from the west coast to east coast, encircling the sub-continent. We do have the Coast Guard. We have more vessels today than what we had earlier. But, to my mind, this is not sufficient. I was reading a report about Pakistan acquiring Harpoon missiles with three carriers which if acquired could cover our entire coast. The Navy is one of the three wings of our armed forces for which we should allot more funds. You go through the graph given here. I think here also we need to develop an auxiliary force to see that our maritime borders are well guarded. Therefore, I would make a strong appeal, through you, to the hon. Minister for Defence to see that the Army, the Air Force and the Navy utilise the services of these trained men who are released every year and form an auxiliary kind of force which could be used for the rear area defence purposes.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as far as Defence expenditure is concerned, though Parliament discusses every year when a report on this is placed before it, I think a certain amount of accountability should be ensured. There are certain matters which are classified in view of the security of the country. I am not referring to them. But there are many areas where I think a higher degree of accountability needs to be ensured. I do also feel that the amount of transparency should be increased considerably. These auxiliary forces should only help the Services so that the Services can function in a better way. The Services can get better suggestions from the specialists who can have a closer look at various factors.

As far as research and development is concerned, most of the speakers who have spoken before me, have raised this issue. I don't want to repeat what has already been said. But I must impress upon the need to allot more funds to better the facilities and to create a better infrastructure so that the research and development capabilities of our scientists can be put to optimum use.

Sir, I am one of those who feel that we do have talent, we do have expertise and we do have people who can produce what our Defence Services need. what

this country needs, to better our defence capabilities. But they should also be given a proper back-up. While doing research, we should look ahead and produce something which would be futuristic, which will not be outmoded by the time the actual product is available for use. And for this, we have to give the back-up by way of infrastructural facilities to these scientists that we have.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I just wanted to speak on a couple of points. I do not know whether there has been a proposal, but there has been a demand from people in the Armed Services to have special Courts for appeals by those who have been court-martialled. This kind of system does exist in several other countries. I think, Britain, France, Australia, Sweden and Germany have this. Of course, what they have is a summary trial. After a summary trial, it again goes back to somebody who is from the same Forces. So, many of these Services and officers feel that as far as the appeal from the court-martial is concerned, it should be given to a civil court with a time limit of, let us say, 60 days or 90 days, just like you have the Central Administrative Tribunal and other bodies to look into such cases. I think, the Defence Services also need to have Special Courts, at least, to enable these aggrieved officers or men to have a chance of a fair appeal.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, my predecessors have spoken about these Cantonment Boards. Well, from this side, Mr. Suresh Kalmadi said that the whole concept is to be changed. Mr. Birla said, 'no'. And I would like to mention that actually the concept of Cantonment Boards is outmoded and outdated today. Now you have a lot of civilians also living in the Cantonment areas. And there is a need to ensure their participation also to some extent at least in these Cantonment areas. Secondly, all of us have been talking about paucity of funds for defence preparedness. There are a lot of valuable properties, a lot of valuable lands, which are owned by these Cantonments. It has already been mentioned by somebody. But, probably, they could have a Committee to review this from the Defence Department and other Departments also, and to see that some kind of income or

return comes out of these valuable properties. I think, there are thousands of acres of land under these Cantonments. Some of it is, of course, occupied. Some is encroached, and some lying vacant. I think, proper use could be made of this. And that money also could be put into our defence preparedness. I think that will account for quite a large amount.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to mention that today our defence preparedness is inter-related or connected not only with the international situation abroad or with such new situations that may develop within the country, as I already mentioned, but it is also concerned, as many of us feel, with new developments that are taking place in science and technology. I do not know whether you have this already, but I would like to suggest, through you, Sir, to the hon. Minister that there should be a kind of co-ordinating committee, at various levels, of people from the Defence Ministry, from the Ministry of Science and Technology, and from the Ministry of External Affairs to co-ordinate and to see that the present requirements are met and also to keep ourselves abreast of developments that are taking place both outside and inside the country.

Lastly, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to mention that when we talk of Defence, let us not be carried away just by the Pakistan-phobia. We have to, after all, consider our place keeping in view the totality of the region that we belong to. And, therefore, apart from new threats that may be posed by the neighbouring countries such as Pakistan who have incidentally used most of the arms bought or supplied by others against India in the preceding decades, we should also not forget that we are a part of a larger region. And, I think, as the Prime Minister has also mentioned somewhere, what is happening in the Middle East, in China apart from the neighbouring countries like Pakistan, Bangladesh and now Sri Lanka is also our concern. We have to see it in its totality when we talk of a strategy on the new developments that are taking place.

I would not like to take any more time of the House and would conclude by paying my tributes to the members of

the Armed Forces, and to the scientists who have sacrificed so much for the cause of our Defence capability and served us so far. Thank you.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am not grudging this increase in expenditure suggested in the Defence budget. Obviously, any expenditure on Defence is a diversion from development expenditure. But at the same time the survival of the country is important. We do not want our defence to be compromised. That is a statement I would like to make at the very beginning.

At the same time, we can see some problems are there with Pakistan. Subversion is continuing in Jammu and Kashmir and some nuclear efforts by Pakistan. We also see that Americans are supplying F-16 aircraft to Pakistan—38 now and some more later, total 71 of them. All these are major problems and certainly, our defence should be strengthened. I have only one major uneasiness with this. I cannot say whether the amount suggested in the Budget is more than adequate or less than adequate. I do not have that kind of training to say about it. I would only go by the judgement of the experts. What I suggest is that there should be cost effectiveness of this amount. Whatever money is allocated must be properly spent and should be spent for the country and not for the individual benefit of some Generals or Ministers or some politicians. We should not allow any kickbacks. We should not permit money devoted to defence — which is a diversion from development expenditure — to be wasted and stashed away in some fund in Switzerland or other places. Let there be a proper scrutiny to see that our money is properly spent on defence.

Just now, some speakers from this side raised the question about our proposed agreement with Hawk for supplying AJT. This should be scrutinised. If it is true that tenders were called many years ago and on the basis of some cooked-up competition, the decision is going to be made, then it would be dangerous for the country. If it is true that Russians have come out with a new jet which would cost 8 million dollars

per piece compared to 20 million dollars as far as the Hawk jet is concerned, we should certainly think of floating another global tender to ensure that we get value for the money we spend. At the same time, we should not permit any Bofors kind of thing which happened before which not only is disgraceful from any point of view but it also means that our money is not properly spent for defence.

Another problem I find is in the thinking of Defence Ministry. What is the global policy? What is the policy of India as far as defence is concerned? There has to be a policy. We are all talking about the end of cold war and need for a new strategy. But what is the new strategy? What is India's new strategy to come to grips with the situation which has arisen over the last three years or so? I see no indication of it. Going by the Report of the Ministry of Defence, if you look at the first paragraph, it talks about the "world in a state of rapid transition". We all know it. Then it says something very funny. It says "there is no world-wide consensus on what the new world order ought to be." Why should there be a new world-wide consensus? This 'new world order' is being imposed by the U.S. There is only one Super Power in the world today and they are imposing this 'new world order.' Do they bother about consensus? And you talk about the consensus. The next sentence is still more puzzling. What is the analysis of the Defence Department at the very beginning? It says that "emerging fault line in the world appears to be the tension between the forces of integration on the one hand and forces of fragmentation on the other". I can understand the problem in regard to the forces of disintegration. For example, communal forces, divisive forces, forces working on the basis of religion, caste, etc. I can understand it. Such forces are there worldwide. This is a global phenomenon. There are fundamentalist and other forces. This I can understand. But it appears from what is stated in this paragraph that the Defence Ministry is very much keen about this other part; not the centrifugal forces, but the centripetal forces. Therefore, you want integration regarding defence. Do you want global integration of defence?

You have already the global integration of the Indian economy under the new economic policy which, I should say, is suicidal for the country. Now, you want to go in for global integration of our defence. Is that what you want to take up from others? Do you think that this is something which is good, that everything is being centralised and all that? Nothing can be more dangerous than this. I do not know whether the officials in the Defence Ministry are living in their own cuckooland. I do not know whether they are such simpletons that they do not understand the simple arithmetic of global politics in the world today. Otherwise, how can they forget the fact that the world, today, is still a dangerous place to live in.

Sir, it is true that now, there is only one global power. It has enormous nuclear capability. Its approach, its policy, which it calls a 'New World Order', only means domination by that particular global power. Sir, one of the major industries they have promoted is the armament industry. The armament industry is the most lucrative industry in the world. Who benefits from this? We are talking about the issue whether we should take Hawk from Britain or some other country, or Apollo from France.

Sir, take the case of the Iran-Iraq War. The Iran-Iraq War continued for nine years. During these nine years, both Iran and Iraq wasted their national resources on a futile and fruitless war. Who benefited from this War? The same European Consortium in the world trade of weapons the same armament manufacturers, benefited from it. They said to one another 'You supply machine guns to Iran and we would supply tanks to Iraq'. This way, the manufacturers wanted the War between Iran and Iraq to continue because if the War continued, even though Iran might be devastated, even though Iraq might be devastated, they would benefit from the continuance of the War and, therefore, they were happy with it. They did not want the armament industry to be crippled. They do not want a world without war. They want the world to remain under the shadow of war. They want the situation in the world to be such that the fear of

war, would remain. They want the neighbours to fight with one another.

Now, I entirely agree with the previous speaker that while we are evolving our defence approach, we should really take into account the various positions which have been taken by the military leaders in Pakistan. But at the same time, Why should we become victims of the Pakistan-phobia or, for that matter, the China-phobia? After all, who benefits out of this? It is only the armament manufacturers in the world who benefit out of it. You may take from Britain. Somebody may take from France. Somebody else may take from America. It does not make any difference. It is these countries which benefit. Therefore, the Third World countries must get out of the arms race. The arms race should be stopped.

Sir, in this connection, I would like to give an example. This is for the consideration of the friends on my right side too. Since Independence, in the forty-seven years of independence, there have been many communal riots in the sub-continent; in India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. How many people have been killed in all these communal riots taken together? The number would be some four-five lakhs; not more than that. This would include the riots during the partition days; the period of two months or so, when this may be two-three lakhs were killed. If you take them all, the number would be about five lakhs, probably much less.

Today, there is so much tension between India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. But take the case of Europe. In the two World Wars, the First World War and the Second World War, how many people were killed? About 100 million people got killed in these two wars. The comparison is: 5 lakhs against 100 million; it is 200 times more. Despite this, today, the European countries have become united. They are opening up their frontiers. People are moving from one country to another. They are even thinking in terms of having a common currency. Should we not learn something from them? Should we not establish a form of regional consolidation rather than this animosity between India, Pakistan and Bangladesh? Should we not have, at

least, a common understanding in respect of trade? Should we not establish regional co-operation, more or less in the same way Europe is doing? This would not only reduce tension, but it would also solve some of the economic problems and make it possible for us to handle the issues, to grapple with the issues, which have come up because of the imposition of the new economic and trade regime on us. I would say this very strongly. Maybe the military leaders of Pakistan are our enemies. The people of Pakistan are not our enemies. I was in England on 19th March. I joined a procession there. There were Indians, Pakistanis, Bangladeshis and Sri Lankans—all united against racism. I didn't see any animosity there. I remember, during my student days when I first went to England, in 1965 there was a war with Pakistan. I could see Bengalis of both sides weeping, Punjabis of both sides weeping. People here or people there are not different. Some rulers are misleading us, and that point should always be emphasized so that it does not lead to a kind of attitude which breeds hatred against Pakistanis or against Bangladeshis, because we want all these countries to live together happily and also to build their economy which the rich countries do not want. They want to keep us poor; they want to keep us agriculturally dependent; they want us to depend on them for everything. This is something which we should not allow to happen.

Mr. Vice-chairman, we must make a number of demands, more or less following the tradition of India from the days of the 1950s. We must make some very categorical demands when we go to the world arena. We should not be afraid of taking this position on the world situation. I remember, in 1953 when the United States wanted to impose a military pact on India—they wanted India to become a partner in a military pact—Pandit Nehru refused. At that time India was not very strong. Even now it is not very strong, but at that time it was weaker. There was no Soviet alternative. The Soviet Union was not very much in the picture. But Pandit Nehru took an initiative. He said India would not align itself with any military bloc, and India was not alone. Egypt, Indonesia, Yugo-

slavia and, later on, Ghana, all came together and the Non-alignment Movement was born. Eventually it became a very mighty force, a very important world wide force with which even the big powers of the world had to talk, negotiate and, come to some agreement. What I am saying is, let us revive this.

We should first of all demand that there should be complete demilitarization of the Indian Ocean. This is the Ocean in which we are interested. Why should there be a military base in an island in the Indian Ocean? Why should the Sixth Fleet or the Seventh Fleet be moving around in the Indian Ocean? Why can't we demand that no nuclear vessel should move there and no militarization should be there? This is the Ocean in which we are interested and we would not allow this to be vitiated. This is an old demand. This is not something new. Jaipal, will you please listen to me? This is not a new demand. We have been demanding this for a very, very long time. Now I suddenly see that the Government has lost its voice, the Government is not interested in it. Why not? Why should not the Government eloquently put forward the case, a case which has been put forward even in the past, in the 60s and the 70s, that the Indian Ocean should be a demilitarized area? At least this demand we must make, very strongly and very effectively, in the world arena.

We should also make this point that the NATO should be dismantled. Until 1991 they had some justification, if you call it justification—I am not going into the merits of it. At that time there was the Soviet Union. Now the Soviet Union is no more. Whom is the NATO fighting against? What is the rationale of NATO? On 10th January, in Brussels they had a meeting—they called it the NATO Summit. One would have thought that in that NATO Summit, now that they are talking of the end of the Cold War, they would announce that NATO would be, sort of, closed down. No, they are thinking of increasing the membership of NATO and they are talking of a new "Partnership for Peace" which is, in effect, a partnership for war! This is partnership of the warmongers and they want the coalition of the warmongers to

continue. What I am saying is this : Why shouldn't we take the initiative to raise this slogan that NATO has no relevance today ? This NATO is still there because it consolidates the military might of the West and it tries to intimidate the poor countries of the world, the Third World countries, to impose the sort of economic policy which has been imposed on us. So, this is a threat hanging over us so that we succumb to their pressure, not only the economic pressure, to which our Finance Minister succumbs, but also the military pressure, so that this fear is always there in everybody's mind. ... (Interruptions)

They don't want to antagonise the Americans.

Have we thought about it ? How many times have the Americans violated the international law over the last two or three years ?

The Head of the State of Panama was a crook. We know it. He was involved in drug trade. He was on the pay-roll of the CIA. This man was at least the President of the country. The Americans sent their army. They invaded Panama. They captured the President, brought him to their country and got him tried by their own court. Had there been another super power, could they have done that ? It is a gross violation of international law.

You see this again and again. Take what is happening in Bosnia today. The way the Muslim areas are being bombarded is a tragedy. It is very sad. On the other side, they are taking full advantage of this conflict among the Muslims, the Serbs and the Croats. Now they are mobilising the NATO. The NATO is bombarding some places there. What has the NATO got to get into it ? They were the ones who were responsible for the disintegration of Yugoslavia. This crisis has been created by them because they disintegrated Yugoslavia. Now they are using their military might to intimidate the people there.

Similarly, I find that in Somalia they are involved in the tribal war there. Why ? ... (Interruptions) Why do you need to do it ? It is a tribal warfare. Why did she get involved in it ?

Now they are the sole super power. Wherever they get involved in, the United Nations also gets involved in it. Earlier they were doing it in the name of the United States. Now they do it in the name of the United Nations because now the United Nations has unfortunately been reduced to a rubber-stamp of that world power.

We must raise the question why the NATO should continue.

We must raise the question of nuclear tests. It is a defence issue. We floated global tenders for the cryogenic rocket technology. Are they really interested in free trade ? I hope the Finance Minister will take note of it. The Americans don't believe in free trade. They believe in free trade as long as they win. If they don't win, they don't believe in competition. The Government of India did float global tenders. It was a fair decision that the tender was allocated to a Russian company on merit. They were cheaper. The Americans did not accept it. They forced the Russians to cancel that agreement. We must keep this in mind. We must be self-reliant as far as defence is concerned. We cannot allow this kind of a thing to happen.

At the same time, on the nuclear issue, we must demand that there should be complete ending of nuclear tests. You see the hypocrisy here. On the one hand, they are talking about a nuclear non-proliferation treaty. They are twisting our arms. ... (Time bell rings)

Another two or three minutes, Sir.

SHRI M. A. BABY (Kerala) : This is his maiden speech.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH) : He is one of the oldest parliamentarians. I know.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : They are twisting the arms of India also to force it to sign the non-proliferation treaty. I don't understand the hypocrisy. We may or may not make a bomb. That is another question. Why should there be this unfair distribution of nuclear power ? Just because they happen to have the monopoly, they want to sit on that

monopoly. If they really believe in world peace and if they really believe in a world without nuclear armaments, why don't they destroy their own nuclear arsenal? Why don't they say categorically that from today onwards there will be no nuclear test either on the ground or under the ground, that there will be no nuclear test even in a remote island? Will they make a declaration that there will be no star war and no production of highly murderous weapons which they are making by making use of their science and technology? Why can't we make this statement very boldly and say, this is what the third world countries want? Let us lobby the opinion among the third world countries and mobilise them to ensure that the world indeed becomes free of war and that these super powers do not get an opportunity to play one against another and to sell something to one country and to sell something else to another country, in that way keeping their armament industry growing. This is also something which we should seriously take up.

We have seen what they have done in case of Pakistan. Until now they applied the Pressler Amendment. Now they are saying that they will make a one-time exception to the Pressler Amendment in respect of Pakistan. They are never short of phrases or expressions like this.

6.00 P.M

They say that there should be a one-time exception to the Pressler amendment. They want to continue it for others but in the case of Pakistan there should be a one-time exception. Why should there be a one-time exception for Pakistan? We all know that Pakistan has been an ally of the U.S.A. for a long time.

They are browbeating North Korea. What about the development of bombs in Israel? What about the development of bombs in South Africa? What about the support they have been giving to Kim of South Korea? These issues must be raised with them. Unless you raise these issues with them, the defence problems would continue to be there; and our Finance Minister would be pressurised

before every Budget to make more allocation. We must have friendly neighbours. We must have a friendly world. Then only we can concentrate on the economic development of our country within our resources.

Lastly, I will make one point. Another example of this hypocrisy is that they talk about violation of human rights. I simply laugh, laugh and laugh at their concern over the human rights. The same Americans sponsor Suharto in Indonesia. * * They sponsor Mr. Pinochet.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH) : The reference to the President of the Republic of Indonesia, Mr. Suharto should be removed from the record.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : Why ?

SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH : I respectfully submit that it should not go on record. That is all.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH) : Don't worry, I will see the record.

SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH : He is the Chairman of the Non-aligned Movement. I request that it should be removed from the record because it is not in our country's interest.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH) : I will go through the record.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT) AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI RAMESHWAR THAKUR) : You should look into it and please remove it from the record.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : * *

There is no question of being soft towards Mr. Suharto. You may defend Mr. Suharto, and Mr. Pinochet. You may defend Mr. Mobutu who *

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

*You may condone them. But the history of human civilisation is not going to condone them. You may be unhappy with this. But I do not think that the people of India are unhappy with this expression. The point I am making is that the United States have no right to talk about violation of human rights, if they continue to back somebody like Mr. Suharto somebody like Mr. Pinchet and somebody like Mr. Mobutu who is still in power in Zaire or if they deny civil liberties to the Palestinians—until now they have denied democratic rights to the blacks in South Africa—and if they deny rights to their own blacks. Even today the infant mortality rate among the blacks in the United States is more than the infant mortality rate in Bangladesh. This is the situation. These things should be raised with them and we should point to their hypocrisy on human rights issue. You should tell them, "We know how much concern you express about the human rights. You better shut up. We do not believe in what you say" The time has come for us to say, "Enough is enough, we are not going to accept such hypocrisy."

Lastly, I will make a point that we must be self-reliant. We may not be self-reliant economically under the new economic policy. Our Finance Minister is here. As far as the economic policy is concerned, he will not allow us to be self-reliant.

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I would advise the Finance Minister not to be present in the House because the moment you are present here, he keeps on referring to you.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : I cannot help it.

Lastly, whatever you do with the new economic policy that is a subject for another discussion. As far as the Defence expenditure is concerned, we should be completely self-reliant. We should not depend upon the Americans, the British and the Germans. We should not allow ourselves to be played by one company or another foreign company and lured by their kickbacks. As far as defence is concerned, we must be completely self-reliant. That self-reliance in defence should never, never be compromised. Thank you very much.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह) : सदन की राय जानना चाहूँगा कि 6 बजे के बाद आपको बैठना है। सदन की राय क्या होती है ?

कई माननीय सदस्य : कल।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह) : सदन की कार्यवाही कल 11 बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned at four minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 27th April, 1994.