

do communicate to this House the names of the members so nominated by Rajya Sabha."

I am to request that the concurrence of Rajya Sabha in the said motion, and also the names of the members of Rajya Sabha so nominated, may be communicated to this House."

II

"I am directed to inform you that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on Friday, the 26th February, 1999 adopted the following motion:—

"That this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do agree to nominate seven members from Rajya Sabha to associate with the Committee on Public Undertakings of the House for the term beginning on the 1st of May, 1999 and ending on the 30th April, 2000 and do communicate to this

House the names of the members so nominated by Rajya Sabha."

"I am to request that the concurrence of Rajya Sabha in the said motion, and also the names of the members of Rajya Sabha so nominated, may be communicated to this House."

III

"I am directed to inform you that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on Friday, the 26th February, 1999, adopted the following motion:—

"That this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do agree to nominate ten members from Rajya Sabha to associate with the Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes of the House for the term beginning on the 1st May, 1999 and ending on the 30th April, 2000 and do communicate to this House the names of the members so nominated by Rajya Sabha."

"I am to request that the concurrence of Rajya Sabha in the said motion, and also the names of the mem-

bers of Rajya Sabha so nominated, may be communicated to this House."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES): Now there is a statement to be made by the Minister of External Affairs, Shri Jaswant Singh.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Prime Minister's Visit to Pakistan

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): Sir, the Hon'ble Prime Minister visited Pakistan on the inaugural run of Delhi-Lahore-Delhi bus service on February 20-21, 1999. This historic visit was the most significant engagement between India and Pakistan in over a quarter of a century. It was also the first visit undertaken by the Prime Minister of India to Pakistan in a decade.

Prime Minister Shri A.B. Vajpayee, conveyed to the people of Pakistan Indians abiding desire for peace and amity with them. A group of eminent Indians from all walks of life, who accompanied the Prime Minister to Pakistan, conveyed by their very presence in Lahore that in the pursuit of its policy of promoting peace and friendship with Pakistan, the Government of India was acting in accord with the wishes of its people. This visit also provided the Prime Minister with an opportunity to emphasise that India and Pakistan must, together work to build a comprehensive structure of cooperation, resolve all outstanding issues through peaceful and direct bilateral discussions and negotiations, and that the path of violence was futile and senseless. Let me emphasise the Government's resolve to uphold the Constitution, The unity and territorial integrity of India will never be compromised. The perpetrators of violence must understand this simple truth.

Mr. Chairman in the Chair

The Prime Minister's bus journey has captured the imagination of the people of India, of Pakistan indeed of the world I wish to state here that seldom has a leader

embarked on a journey with such support from his people and such goodwill for his success. His arrival at Wagah, with the Indian delegation, to be warmly received by the Pakistan Prime Minister was a defining moment in India-Pakistan relations.

During his stay in Pakistan, Prime Minister held discussions with Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, was accorded a civic reception by the people of Lahour; visited Gurudwara Dera Sahib; the Samadhi of Maharaja Ranjit Singh; the Mausoleum of Allama Iqbal and minare-e- Pakistan. From the Minar-e-Pakistan he assured the Pakistani people that a secure, stable and prosperous Pakistan was in India's interest.

Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif hosted a banquet for our Prime Minister at the historic Lahore Fort. The Prime Minister's discussions with the Pakistan Prime Minister were wide-ranging, covering the entire range of bilateral relations regional cooperation within SAARC and issues of international concern Prime Minister Vajpayee emphasised that the peoples of the two countries desire lasting peace and an environment where their security, progress and prosperity can be assured. For this purpose, he conveyed that it was essential that the forces of violence and terrorism were combatted, and the hands of the advocates of harmony, balance and realism strengthened for the development of good neighbourly relations between the two countries.

Prime Minister Vajpayee and Pakistan Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif signed the Lahore Declaration. This Declaration is a landmark for the peace and security of the two nations. The two Prime Ministers have in the Lahore Declaration agreed that the two countries will intensify efforts to resolve all issues, including the issue of Jammu and Kashmir, through the composite dialogue process; refrain from intervention and interference in each other's internal affairs; combat the menace of terrorism in all its form and manifestations; protect human rights;

take immediate steps to reduce the risk of accidental or unauthorised use of nuclear weapons and to discuss security concepts and doctrines with a view to elaborating measures for confidence building in the nuclear and conventional fields aimed at prevention of conflict. The two Prime Ministers also reaffirmed in the Lahore Declaration their commitments to the objectives of SAARC and to work towards the realisation of the SAARC vision for the year 2000 and beyond with a view to promoting the welfare of the peoples of their countries.

Pursuant to directives issued by the two Prime Ministers to identify measures aimed at promoting an environment of peace and security between the two countries, the Foreign Secretaries of India and Pakistan signed a Memorandum of Understanding on 21 February, 1999. Under this Memorandum, the two countries have agreed to abide by their respective unilateral moratorium on conducting further nuclear test explosions unless either side, in exercise of its national sovereignty, decides that extraordinary events have jeopardized its supreme national interest. The Foreign Secretaries agreed that the two countries would remain finally committed to undertaking measures to reduce the risk of accidental or unauthorised use of nuclear weapons under their respective controls; India and Pakistan will provide each other with advance notification in respect of ballistic missile flight tests and conclude a bilateral agreement in this regard. Similarly the two countries will engage in discussions to conclude an agreement on the prevention of incidents at sea, in order to ensure safety of navigation by naval vessels and by aircraft belonging to the two sides. The two sides would also periodically review the implementation of existing CBMs as well as the existing communication links at operational levels like the hotline between the Directors General of Military Operations, with a view to making these links fail-safe and secure. Further, the two countries would hold bilateral discussions on security, dis-

armament and non-proliferation issues, within the context of negotiations on these issues in multilateral fora. In order to reach bilateral agreements, experts of the two countries would meet on mutually agreed dates before mid-1999.

The Prime Ministers also explored avenues and areas for meaningful cooperation. They agreed on the need to enhance people-to-people contact, address humanitarian issues and to cooperate in technological as well as in economic matters. They agreed that the two sides should undertake consultations on WTO issues with a view to coordinating respective positions, determine areas of cooperation in information technology, particularly for tackling problems of Y2K and also to hold discussions on the liberalisation of visa and travel regime. Prime Minister Vajpayee proposed the re-opening of the check post on the Rajasthan-Sindh border.

Given the urgent need to address humanitarian issues, the Prime Ministers agreed to appoint a two-member committee at the ministerial level to examine matter relating to civilian detainees and missing Prisoners of War. An official level delegation will hold prior consultations and will meet very soon in this regard.

In order to undertake an overall review of the bilateral relationship, the Prime Minister directed me and my Pakistan counterpart to meet periodically to discuss all issues of mutual concern, including nuclear issues. We would like this meeting to be held soon.

Government's approaches to Pakistan are rooted in our national consensus. They derive their strength from our confidence as a mature nation dedicated to peace, democracy and freedom. To those that preach, practice and foment violence I would reiterate our Prime Minister's message: "Understand the simple truth of the path of peace and unity."

It is our earnest hope to build on the opportunities that are now available on

account of the Prime Minister's historic initiative and his commitment to put behind past contentions and think of the welfare of our children and their children. We trust Pakistan will walk with us down this path.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH (Assam): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we welcome the measures to develop our relations with Pakistan; The recent change in the Government's thinking, which I sincerely hope is a genuine change of heart, as only recently, some months ago, some very responsible Members of this Government had made some very highly irresponsible statements on this subject, after the Pokhran tests.

We welcome the Lahore declaration. But we must also recognise that strenuous hard work will be necessary on both sides if the Lahore Declaration is to go beyond a mere public demonstration, and is to be seen as a major change in the direction of India-Pakistan relations. To move beyond the symbolism of Lahore-Delhi bus service, we need an indepth discussion and resolution of some of the highly complex issues which have defied solution in the past. If a substantive progress is to be made, both the countries will have to control their extremist groups, and for this a firm political commitment is necessary on both sides.

We agree with the view that a strong, secure and a prosperous Pakistan is in India's interest. But the government will have to do a lot more to convince some of its allies in Maharashtra and some other members of the *Pariwar*.

We welcome the hon. Minister's assurance that the unity and territorial integrity of India will never be compromised.

Sir, in the Lahore Declaration, the two Prime Ministers have re-affirmed their condemnation of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, and their determination to combat this menace. Yet, on the eve of the Prime Minister's visit, terrorists' act claimed the lives of 27 innocent

persons in the Indian State of Jammu & Kashmir. Sir, I would like to know from the hon'ble Minister if the Prime Minister mentioned to Mr. Nawaz Sharif, unambiguously, that no progress would be possible in these negotiations, if Pakistan persists in aiding and abetting terrorist activities in Jammu and Kashmir and other parts of India? If so, what was the response of Mr. Nawaz Sharif?

Sir, the two Prime Ministers have reaffirmed their commitment to the goals and objectives of SAARC and to concert their efforts towards the realisation of SAARC vision for the year 2000 and beyond with a view to promoting the welfare of the people of South-Asia. We all know that until now Pakistan's role has been an obstructive one in promoting regional cooperation in Southern Asia. Pakistan has been insisting that no progress can be made in economic matters unless the core issue of Jammu and Kashmir is resolved. I would like to know from the hon'ble Minister if there has been any change of thinking on this issue on the part of Pakistan. I would also like to know, if the Prime Minister asked Pakistan to extend to India the most favoured nation treatment in matters relating to trade consistent with Pakistan's obligation as a member of W.T.O.? Did the Prime Minister discuss with Mr. Nawaz Sharif the free flow of trade between the two countries in which both the public and private sectors could participate on both sides? If so, what was his response?

Sir, the Declaration commits the two Governments to intensify their composite and integrated dialogue process for an early and positive outcome of the agreed bilateral agenda. I would like to know from the Hon'ble Minister if any time-phasing has been worked out in this regard. If so, can the Minister give us an idea of the mechanism that is being contemplated for this composite and integrated dialogue? Sir, we recognize that in the changed nuclear environment in South-Asia, it is necessary for the two

countries to take immediate steps for reducing the risk of costly or unauthorised use of nuclear weapons and discuss concepts and doctrines with a view to elaborating measures for confidence-building in the nuclear and conventional fields. I hope a credible mechanism will be evolved to implement this part of the Lahore Declaration. We have always believed that India and Pakistan can and should, through bilateral negotiations, resolve all outstanding issues in the spirit of the Shimla Agreement and that third party intervention has no role in this regard. There have been persistent reports that U.S. has been, behind the scene, very active in this process. Only this morning I saw a statement of the U.S. Secretary of State, which while welcoming the Indo-Pakistan Summit result, has stated that in the months ahead, we, that is, the U.S., would be pressing for further stabilizing actions in the South-Asian region. Will the hon'ble Minister tell us what these further stabilizing actions could be, as mentioned by the U.S. Secretary of State?

Sir, this year we will be celebrating the 300th anniversary of the founding of the

Khalsa Panth. The birth place of Guru Nanak, the founder of the Sikh faith, and many historic Gurudwaras lie in Pakistan. It is essential that the Sikh community should be involved in the administration and upkeep of these historic shrines and that the pilgrims should be able to freely visit these places. I would like to know from the hon'ble Minister, if the Prime Minister brought up this issue with Mr. Nawaz Sharif. If so, what was his response? Thanks.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would in part seek clarifications from the Minister and also through you inform the House of what I myself saw during this visit.

SHRI SURESH PACHOURI (Madhya Pradesh): Did you not discuss these points in the aircraft while returning from Pakistan?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I came by a separate aircraft. Some more investigative journalism is required on that side!

We are always taught that even if we disagree, we should do so agreeably. Listening to Dr. Manmohan Singh, I felt that sometimes, even when we agree, we feel obliged to do so slightly disagreeably. In the early 90's, I always felt it to be a curse of Indian public discourse that when, under the leadership of the then Prime Minister and Dr. Manmohan Singh, revolutionary steps were taken to rehabilitate our economy, many parties which, when they were to be in the Government, would lampoon those steps, many parties which were taking the same steps in the states and taking credit for taking the same steps in their States, were criticising the Central Government for taking those steps. I have the same feeling today when a historic step has been taken, many of us feel obliged to belittle it, to think of it as a mere symbolism. In fact, Sir, I was quite distressed during the course of the debate on the President's Address to hear it being belittled with levity in this very House in your absence.

Now I will come to clarifications.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): Sir, in the meeting we discussed that we will have it by five o'clock. Because of the extraordinary situation and given the nature of the statement, we thought that we would sit back. But let us limit it to issues of clarifications. I mean no reflections on the statement really.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, clarifications are required.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I will read them.

My first point is whether it is not the case that this particular event marks great advance on substance? Is it not the case that documents of this kind become points of reference to which you can hold the countries together in the subsequent rounds? Is it not the case that most of

us—that certainly includes me—could not have expected that a Government such as the one in Pakistan today, would have agreed to a document, in which it would have committed itself to non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries? Is it not the case that most of us would have wagered a great fortune in saying that the Pakistan Government would not commit itself to a document which would say that the two countries would cooperate in stamping out terrorism in all its forms, which is what this memorandum does? Similarly, Sir, is it not a fact that in our expectations voiced in this very House and the other House, just a few months ago, it was said that the Government of the two countries, especially our Government, because it was the initiator, had plunged this sub-continent in an uncontrollable arms race? It was said that we in South Asia are irresponsible people. Therefore, it was held against the Government for having done so. Yet, Sir, will the Minister not tell us that, in the case of the US and the USSR, it took them 37 years to come to any sort of accord on nuclear confidence building measures? Here, Sir, in just eight months, have the two Governments not come to a most far-reaching accord on that very matter—on advance information systems, on guided missile testing, on accidental explosions, on accidents at sea, on a very large number of things of this kind?

Even more important, Sir, it was just asked by the Leader of the Opposition whether it was not a fact that Americans etc. were very active behind the scene. My question to the hon. Minister would be the opposite. Is it not a fact that the Pakistan Government, the Pakistan Prime Minister in particular, has twice even during the last two weeks, stated his inclination to talk directly and to move away from this indirect talking through Washington? Is it not a fact that while talking of Indo-Pakistan relations in interview to the distinguished Editor of *Indian Express* he held Mr. Shekar Gupta "ए कि गल है? ओ आन्दे ने, यौ नु सवाल

पूछे ने। फिर साइडे कोल आन्दे ने। ओइ ओ सवाल सानू पूछे ने।" "Why can't we deal with each other directly? Why is that we always deal with each other—you Sir, being from Punjab, will see the significance of the remark—"always via Bhatinda!"

Similarly, Sir, will the Foreign Minister not tell us that in his speech at the Banquet in Lahore, the Prime Minister of Pakistan said words to this effect: we sing the same songs, we appreciate the same songs, we eat the same food, we talk in the same language, do we need for discovering some Columbus? He did not say Vasco de Gama; he did not say Sir Walter Rallieg. He said some "Columbus". That is the answer to what Dr. Manmohan Singh was asking. I would, in fact, ask: is it not a fact that, since the Shimla Agreement was signed, the central point of the Pakistani policy throughout has been since the Shimla Agreement was signed that there must be a third-party mediation. Is it not a fact that the British Foreign Secretary wanted to jump in saying it was a part of their imperial responsibility that the US was always trying to come in? Is it not a fact that in this agreement ... (*Interruptions*) Sir, you wanted me to seek clarifications. I am only seeking clarifications. Is it not a fact that after trying to bypass the Shimla Agreement for such a long time, they have agreed in this document to reaffirm the Shimla Agreement, the basic point of which was that we should talk on all matters to each other bilaterally and directly?

Sir, questions were asked just now, and I would supplement the clarification that Dr. Manmohan Singh asked on Kashmir, that 26 persons were killed even as the Prime Minister was there. All journalists there, including myself, learnt that this matter was explicitly brought up...

श्री नरेश यादव (बिहार): उस समय प्रधान मंत्री जी हिन्दुस्तान में थे जब लोग मारे गए थे।

श्री अरुण शौरी: नहीं, वे वहां थे। उस समय की प्रेस कान्फ्रेंस में भी यह पूछा गया था।

Sir, while it is true that Kashmir has become a verb in their every sentence, is it not a fact that the hon. Minister noticed—and we noticed—a great rejsidyopm on this very matter of Kashmir? Is it not a fact that now because of the victory that has been secured by successive Government since 1990 in Kashmir, by successive Governments in Punjab since 1984, that, while they keep on talking of Kashmir and solutions, which means 'give it to us', they now see that they cannot wrest Kashmir from India by force and they also see that whichever Government comes to power in India, it is not going to give Kashmir to them in a plate? Is it not a fact, Mr. Minister, that they see now that no third-party, not the Organisation of Islamic States, not the United States, not the UK,—all of which have tried—can get them Kashmir from us? So, is it not a fact that now it is a more repetition of the phrase? That this is the opportunity that we have been waiting for, and many things have helped, the victories ensured by our defence forces and para-military forces in these two States, where Pakistan has put in maximum efforts and also the successive Governments which came and went and this House, and the other House, have stood firm for the territorial integrity of the country. So, Sir, I would merely ask as to whether it is not a case that three things should be done now. Three things should be done. As has been indicated by the Minister in his statement on the matter of Kashmir, we must continue to be merciless in threatening every effort made by them to repeat the old policy. Is it not as much a part of the peace process? Because we have to convince them that there are two roads. One road is wide open, the road of peace. But the other road, if you try it will be completely blocked. Is it not as much a part of the peace process as any other thing? Simultaneously, is it not also a fact that, on all other matters, we should see what are the steps that we can take unilaterally to further the process?

There are several other clarifications, but I just want your permission for half-a-minute to pay my personal tribute to three sets of persons is differed on the very floor of this House. The first are our officers in this House and elsewhere, we often hear things against our officers. In regard to the present agreements, Dr. Manmohan Singh was saying that this diligent work should be continued in the future also. Sir, all of us can testify to the work that was done by the officers in this round. They worked up till 2.30 A.M. one day with their Pakistani counterparts; and the next day till 3.00 A.M. I pay my tribute to them. I would, through you, Sir, request the Foreign Minister to compliment the Foreign Secretary and other officials, including our High Commissioner and the officials of the High Commission, for the splendid work which they did.

Secondly, through you, Sir, I want to pay my personal tribute to Members of this House and to Members of the other House who went in the M.P.s. delegation to Pakistan. I had grave apprehensions about this visit. For personal reasons I could not join them even through my colleague, Mr. Malkani had been kind enough to ask me to join the tour. But, Sir, you would have been proud, as you are, of Members of your House had you heard what the Pakistani journalists and Members of Pakistan Assembly had to say about the manner in which our colleagues articulated our country's point of view. The sagacity of Mr. Jakhar, the emotional response that Mr. Malkani's intervention evoked, the extreme eloquence of my friend, Mr. Arif Mohammed Khan and of Shrimati Sushma Swaraj. These were mentioned to me by five or six persons who attended those meetings. I pay my tribute to them.

Finally, I would like to pay a tribute to the persons with whom I have differed sharply both in this House and outside, specially, my friend, Mr. Kuldeep Nayyar. Circumstances may well arise—as you know, our points of view have differed

on matters like Kashmir and Pakistan—and circumstances may soon arise in Pakistan when militant elements may overpower Mr. Nawaz Sharif and others and continue their activities and persons like me would again be pleading for firm steps against Pakistan, and persons like Mr. Kuldeep Nayyar would be saying, "No, persevere with peace." But in this consummation, at this moment, their role has been of considerable importance. It has been solid and their contributions specially valuable because they have been made in the face of criticism of persons like me. That is not a clarification, Sir, that is my request to you, as a tribute to all of them. Thank you.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA
(West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have no hesitation whatsoever in lending our unstinted support to the move that the present Government has taken, following the foot-steps of its predecessor in the direction of normalising, in the direction of improvement, in the direction of building up greater co-operation between our two great neighbours. What Mr. Vajpayee has done should have been done earlier. What he has done is definitely unique. What he has done has definitely contributed to the building up of a new political environment in this sub-continent. But they had moved in the direction the nation wanted them to move. There is a national consensus. And there had been some such efforts in the past also. From Pokhran to Bus Trip it is a dramatic, diametric, departure of policy. Whether it is accepted in the House or not, it is a sharp departure of policy undoubtedly, whatever may be the reasons for it. Let the hon. Minister looking after External Affairs also kindly state whether such an action is in consonance with some of the statements made earlier by some of his colleagues. We do welcome the departure. But let him identify the departure. We do welcome the change. But let it be said that there is a change. What could have been the reasons for it?

It is for the Government to say that. But there is definitely a change, I believe. Let the hon. Minister state frankly that the political conviction, political will, that is necessary to carry it further forward, will be there with the Government, whatever may be the situation. There has to be a political conviction, political will and the Government will need that to carry that forward because forces against Indo-Pak cooperation, forces against Indo-Pak unity, force against normalisation and stabilisation of relations are there not only in Pakistan but also in India. And the forces are at work—likely to work—to see that the process that has been initiated is not carried forward further. Therefore, political conviction is necessary. The Government will do well to commit that the Government will not be found wanting in building up that political conviction. Sir, the point ...*(Interruption)*. That is the clarification I seek of the Government. It is for the Government to clarify that it will not be found to be wanting in the political conviction to carry forward that initiative. That is the clarification, the most important clarification. I need to have. While welcoming unreservedly the change and departure that is there. I would like this Government to identify whether there has been a change from Pokhran to Bus trip. It has to be done. The country must be assured. And the country will feel assured.

The hon. Minister of External Affairs had a number of important parleys and talks with Mr. Talbott. My question is whether in the course of the conversation with the American representative, the question of our building up relations, improvement of relations, with Pakistan, had, at all taken place. If it had taken place, what is his impression about the role, the move, of the Government of America? I would like to know whether it, at all, figured there. This is the second clarification I seek.

The third and most important point is this. Pakistan is a poor country. The

problem of poverty, the problem of hunger, the problem of unemployment, is as much a national problem there—may be having a different magnitude—as the Indians are having, as the people of Bangladesh are having, as the people of Nepal are having. Therefore, we need a closer economic cooperation and the closer economic cooperation should follow a political cooperation. I would like to know whether, in the course of the discussion and dialogue, specific proposals of economic cooperation were discussed. If they were not discussed, have we found out any mechanism or system to discuss them on a future day? Are we thinking of putting in place some system which will carry forward the economic cooperation?

Fourthly, there is a need for coordinated economic development and progress. Pakistan imports coal from Australia whereas there is surplus coal in India. India imports cotton from outside whereas there is enough good cotton in Pakistan.

I would like to know whether a specific coordination about different commodities is being discussed or will be discussed; whether the question of exchange of more trade delegations, political delegations and cultural delegations is being envisaged to continue the process. Sir, if the defence expenditure is not reduced in the sub-continent—I do not know whether I am out of tune with many of my colleagues—if the defence expenditure is not reduced in India as well as Pakistan, always there will be a resource crunch. If we can reduce the defence expenditure, we will be able to find more resources for economic development. Reduction of defence expenditure in India as well as Pakistan depends to the extent we are able to reduce the tension depends to the extent we are able to coordinate with each other to combat insurgency, depends to the extent we are able to fight against intrusion. Therefore, it is not only a pious desire of building up friendship

between the two great neighbours; it is a question of economic compulsion, it is a question of social compulsion, and in order to carry forward that task, it is necessary that we will have to do that with political conviction, with unreserved initiative.

Lastly, the important question that arises is: "What stand has the Government of India taken with regard to the question of continuous inflow of insurgent elements into India? What stand has the Government of India taken with regard to the question of Azad Kashmir, their involvement, the role of the I.S.I. in a way which threatens the security, freedom and sovereignty of India? It is not a question of apportionment of blame, it is not a question of passing on the buck to them, it is a question of coordinated effort by the representative of the people of the two Governments to fight against extremists because it is well known that a small group of people was demonstrating while our Prime Minister was there. Therefore, it is a question of coordinated strategy. What about that strategy? Was it at all discussed?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I am expressing my happiness without any reservation on the visit by the Prime Minister, announced by the Minister of External Affairs. I will also express my delight on a number of points on which an agreement has been reached with the Pakistani counterpart. But I reserve my judgement as to whether it can be called a historic visit or not on what happens now. For example, whether there is going to be a correct follow up of the visit so that this visit is not taken as a flash in the pan, so that this visit is not taken as something the impact of which will fizzle out with the passage of time. So, this is what I am concentrating on in my speech. What measures are being taken to follow-up the visit which has made a certain impact? One point has already been touched by Shri Gurudas Das Gupta. But

I will elaborate that point a bit—that you see a change in rhetoric. The rhetoric which is represented here is miles away from the rhetoric which has displayed ten months ago in the aftermath of Pokhran blast. No longer you are talking of a proactive policy in Kashmir, no longer you are talking of a hot pursuit of the terrorists, no longer you are sabre rattling about our atomic power. You are now trying to treat Pakistan as another sovereign country. We are not saying that we have a big bomb and they have a small bomb. That realisation has dawned on us. After ten months, we are talking in a language that is sobre, that is wise and that can help is building bridges with Pakistan. But one is to recognise it explicitly, not implicitly. Now, what I am saying is implicit. But it has to be recognised explicitly that there has been a sea-change in the rhetoric, in our policy towards Pakistan. If it is not recognised by all the parties in the House, by the organisation which support various parties outside the House, then you will not be able to make much progress. It has to be recognised. We have a certain disquise about one or two things. One is this. It is true, what the hon. Foreign Minister said, that we have rejected third-party mediation; absolutely right, very good. When reading some of the reports and all that, there is a feeling amongst us—and I am sure, the Foreign Minister would be able to give us a sort of an assurance—that though the Americans were not physically present, their invisible presence was, somewhat, reflected in some of the reports which are coming out. For example, there is a word going round that the CTBT is going to be signed within one year. Some would say before May, before June, or before July. If this is the case, then we must be told about it. If, for example, the Government decides to sign the CTBT, then, it is imperative on the part of the Government, before it signs the CTBT, to maintain the consensus on Foreign Policy in the House, to come to this House, to get the opinion of the

Members of the House, to get the approval of the house first, and then to conduct the negotiations. There should not be any misapprehension in the mind of anybody that such vital discussions are going on, but we are not in the knowledge of what is going on. Unfortunately, when our dear friend, Jaswant Singhji, was having discussions with Mr. Talbott. Mr. Talbott is now coming out with all kinds of position papers. He is even appealing to the Indians, above the head of the Government, through the newspapers, putting out his policies; what is his agenda is very clearly stated. No such reaction is coming from our Indian counterpart. We know more about the American policy towards India, towards Kashmir, towards Pakistan, than our own policy. So, it is very important for us to be transparent and to be explicit so that whatever decision is taken, that becomes a national decision based on a national consensus, and not something which is first signed there and then brought to the House for *post facto* approval. That is a point which I am very seriously making.

A second point which I would like to make is in relation to defence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is the third one!

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: This is the third point. Thank you.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU (Karnataka): Sir, the second one was an invisible point!

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: The third point is about defence. Now, one of the things I am looking forward to is a severe cut in the defence expenditure in the coming Budget, without weakening the defence of our country. We can strengthen our defence in many different ways. One is by buying all kinds of armament and all that, which is done by many countries, and which benefits only the arms manufacturers in Europe, the arms manufacturers in the United States, and they gain at the cost of poor

countries like ours. So, the armament manufacturers have become one of the largest industrialists in the world because of the way in which they can—I use the cold war language—influence the opinion of many countries and make them spend money on armaments. Another way of reducing the defence expenditure is through diplomacy. Diplomacy can be a way of making it unnecessary for us to have a large army on the border, making it unnecessary for us to have sophisticated arms. In that way, there should be an important follow-up to ensure that we can actually withdraw a part of the army and divert as much expenditure for defence to developing schools, hospitals, colleges and so on.

Is it a fourth point, Sir? The fourth point is, there is a hint, in the Statement, about WTO, that we must work collectively in the forums like WTO. WTO is going to review its TRIPS Agreement within one year. There will be a Ministerial-level meeting by the end of this year. Now, we, in India, cannot do anything on our own. Our share in the world exports is only 0.6 per cent. Nobody will take notice of that. It may have gone down even further to 0.4 per cent by now. So, we can have a significant presence in the world arena in terms of negotiations, only if we form blocs. Unfortunately, if you see Europe, they have formed the European Common Market where anybody can travel from one part of Europe to another part of Europe. They have adopted the same common currency. They are liberalising now. The Americans have done that through NAFTA, but, in our country, we still have not taken any initiative for forming a bloc.

Now I know that Pakistan had some reservations earlier. But the success of our Foreign Minister will also be judged by the economic content, to what extent our Foreign Minister is capable of persuading Pakistan to join the rest of the South-Asia, and we can really have a powerful South-Asian Common Market. In Europe, during this century there were

two World Wars. In these two World Wars ten crore people died. Despite this, despite the animosity, hostility generated during the Wars, they have been able to come to an undertaking because they are mature countries and mature economies. That economic interest preceded other things, and they have come to form this Common Market. In this Sub-Continent, even if you take into account all the communal riots which took place during this century, the number of people who died would not have exceeded a few lakhs. If they can come to common agreement on economic issues despite this scar inflicted on them...

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not a clarification; you are making a point.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Priority should be given to the South-Asian Common Market.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it a point or a question?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: It is a question. I would like to know whether they are taking any initiative to implement this. Also, along with that we are building bridges with ASEAN and other countries. The next point would be terrorism. Again you know, terrorism is lined with our economy, whether in Kashmir or in the North-East. We have the same problems where terrorism is merged with drug trafficking. I would also like to know from our Foreign Minister, whether in the course of this discussions with his Pakistani counterpart, there was any chance of discussing this issue also. And I would like to know whether it has been put in the Agenda to be discussed some time in the future. These are some of the issues which have been there in the minds of the people and I would very much appreciate if these are answered. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now Shri Janeshwar Misra, not here. Shri Naresh Yadav, not here. Shri S. Viduthalai Virumbi.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we

have great pleasure when we find that new chapter has opened in the bilateral relations between India and Pakistan. Sir, we have differences....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't give a speech, only seek clarifications.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: I am coming to the clarifications. You have allowed other Members. I will take less time than the time taken by the other Members. Sir, as far as the social....

श्री नरेश यादव (बिहार): महोदय, मेरा नाम था।

MR. CHAIRMAN: I called your name, but you were not there.

श्री नरेश यादव: महोदय, दस वक्ताओं के बाद मेरा नाम था, इसलिए मैं चला गया था।

श्री सभापति: दस वक्ताओं का सवाल नहीं है।

We are not inviting everybody to seek clarifications, only one Member from each party. Anyway, that is all right.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Even though we are having differences on social, economic and political issues with the treasury Benches, as far as the unity and integrity of the country is concerned, cutting across party lines, we want to send the message to the world at large that we will stand united, and we will see that we are always united. Sir, when we go through this issue in the *suo motu* statement, we appreciate the actions as well as the decisions taken by the Government. We have to appreciate the actions taken by the previous Government also. In January 1994, Pakistan more or less stopped its relations with India. They did not want to have even the Foreign Secretary-level talks. But in 1996, in the month of June, the then Prime Minister of India wrote a letter to the Prime Minister of Pakistan to have at least Foreign Secretary-level talks. "Let us begin it." On such lines, he wrote a letter. It was responded positively only after the General Elections took place in Pakistan. After that in the second meeting at the Foreign Secretaries level, there was a joint statement. In that joint statement we had agreed for talks on several

areas. Some of the areas, like the Tulbul Navigation Project, Sir, creeks Project and other areas have not been covered in this particular agreement, that is, in the joint statement.

Therefore, I want to know whether the areas covered by the Joint Statement issued after the second meeting at the Foreign Secretary level on 23rd June, 1997 are covered by this agreement. I want to know that. This is the first point.

The second point is this. Before our Prime Minister proceeded to Pakistan, there was a Press report that the three service Chiefs of Pakistan would call on the Prime Minister, Shri A.B. Vajpayee, on 19th February, the first day of his stay there. But in this statement there is no mention regarding the meeting with the Service Chiefs of Pakistan. We want to know whether our Prime Minister had met the Service Chiefs of Pakistan. If he had met them, what was the interaction that took place; What was the outcome of their talks? When we meet the Service Chiefs of other countries, we may have to extend a reciprocal response to them. Suppose the Pakistan Prime Minister comes here. We have to allow our Service Chiefs to have talks with the Pakistan Prime Minister. I would like to know whether it would be a healthy practice for a democracy. That point has to be taken into account. Therefore, I want to know whether the Prime Minister had met the Service Chiefs of Pakistan. If so, what was the outcome of that meeting?

Regarding WTO, I want to say this. After this meeting, the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan met the Press in Pakistan and issued some statements. In that reported statement he had mentioned only about the defence issues and, particularly, Jammu and Kashmir and not any other issues. What he had said was that a Foreign Secretary level meeting was going to be held in the month of March or April. In that meeting only Jammu and Kashmir and defence issues are going to be taken up but one at the important

issues that is actually agitating our mind is the most favoured nation status. We have already given the most favoured nation status to Pakistan. But as far as India is concerned, it is still under the consideration of Pakistan. Why did not they give the same status to us when our Prime Minister had gone to Pakistan? Why do they want to keep it in abeyance? Why do not they come to some conclusion? It is a little bit agitating our mind. I would like to know when this issue is going to be taken up.

The Jamaat-e-Islami of Pakistan has actually announced some "crush India march". It has its own effect on Jammu and Kashmir. When we went to Pakistan to have some cordial talks to further the cordial relations, twenty of our people had been murdered. I am not saying that it was an act of Pakistan. But it was not a good augury for us. Therefore, how are we going to contain this thing? When we want to contain this thing, the Pakistan Government will also expect the same reciprocal response from us. Therefore, the atrocities on the minorities in India should be stopped for maintaining cordial relations.

Firstly, I want to know the outcome of the meeting that the Prime Minister had with the Service Chiefs of Pakistan. Secondly, I want to know about the most favoured nation status.

श्री सभापति: श्री नरेश यादव।

श्री नरेश यादव: धन्यवाद, सभापति महोदय। मैं आप का बहुत आभारी हूँ। पहले मैं एक स्पष्टीकरण दे दूँ कि मुझे टैबिल से बताया गया कि आप का नंबर...

श्री सभापति: यह कहने की बात नहीं है। ... (व्यवधान) ... देखिए, मेरे पास 20-21 नाम हैं और हम हरेक पार्टी से एक नाम बला रहे हैं। ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री नरेश यादव: महोदय, यह भारत पाकिस्तान का बहुत ही नाजुक मामला है...

श्री सभापति: मैंने आप का नाम बुलाया था। अब आप क्लैरिफिकेशन माँगिए, बस।

श्री नरेश यादव: मैं कैलेंडरफिकेशन ही मांगता हूँ। श्रीमन्, आप अभिभावक हैं, आप संरक्षक हैं और आप की अनुमति से ही हम बोल सकते हैं। हमारे सभी आदर्शों साथी कम-से-कम 15-20 मिनट बोले, आप हमें 5 मिनट नहीं देंगे? ... (व्यवधान) ... आप समय नहीं देंगे तो कौन देगा?

श्री सभापति: मैंने तो आप को बुलाया है।

श्री नरेश यादव: श्रीमन् मैं आप से परमीशन लेकर बाहर गया था। आपने परमीशन दी, मैं आप का बहुत-बहुत आभारी हूँ।
6.00 P.M.

सभापति महोदय, भारत और पाकिस्तान में मैत्री स्थापित करने के लिए माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बस से जो लाहौर की यात्रा की, मैं अपन पार्टी की ओर से आभारी हूँ और उन्हें धन्यवाद देता हूँ। उन्होंने दोनों देशों में मैत्री संबंध स्थापित करने के बहुत अच्छी शुरुआत की है।

श्रीमन्, भारत और पाकिस्तान के जन्म से ही एक विश्व के बीच को डाला गया और जिसके कारण वह बीच बढ़ते बढ़ते परमाणु के रूप में सामने आया, परमाणु बम बनकर जिसका विस्फोट हुआ। इसकी परिणति यह हुई कि दोनों देशों के बीच में नफरत बहुत बढ़ गई। परमाणु विस्फोट कभी भी परेम नहीं ला सकता, परमाणु विस्फोट मनुष्य को मार सकता है, इंसान को मार सकता है, लेकिन इंसान के बीच में संस्कार नहीं भर सकता, अच्छे विचार नहीं भर सकता। मैं आभारी हूँ हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के कलाकारों का, साहित्यकारों का और शिक्षाविदों का, जिन्होंने पाकिस्तान के जन्म से लेकर इस 20/21 तारीख तक प्रयास कर दोनों देशों के संबंधों को मधुर बनाकर ऐसी स्थिति ला दी कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनता और पाकिस्तान की जनता आज यह चाह रही है कि दोनों देशों के बीच में संपर्क स्थापित हो, दोस्ती स्थापित हो। इस दोस्ती को बरकरार रखना है, इस संबंध को बरकरार रखना है और इस बरकरार रखने की स्थिति को ध्यान में रखकर मैं एक दो बातें स्पष्टीकरण के रूप में माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ।

श्रीमन्, माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने अपने वक्तव्य के पैरा 5 में कहा है—प्रधान मंत्री नवाज़ शरीफ ने ऐतिहासिक लाहौर किले में प्रधान मंत्री को रात्रि भोज दिया। इस बात से भी हमें सावधान रहना है क्योंकि बहुत नाजुक मामला है भारत और पाकिस्तान का और आप जैसे विद्वान व्यक्ति को यह भार दिया गया है। मैं आपसे यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या नवाज़ शरीफ साहब ने आयोजित रात्रि भोज में अपने घाषण में कश्मीर

पर पाकिस्तान की घोषित नीति दोहराई? और, क्या यह कहा कि जैसा अंतर्राष्ट्रीय समुदाय से वायदा किया गया था कश्मीरियों को आत्म-निर्णय का अधिकार मिलना चाहिए? क्या नवाज़ शरीफ साहब ने भोज में यह कहा कि जम्मू-कश्मीर दोनों देशों के बीच विवाद में मुख्य धारा है और इस मुद्दे को यों ही नहीं छोड़ा जा सकता? कश्मीरियों के आत्म-निर्णय, कश्मीरियों के रेफरेंडम की यह बात बहुत पहले से ही हो रही है यू०एन०ओ० के माध्यम से और हमारा यह मानना है, हमारे देश का यह मानना है कि कश्मीर हमारे देश का अविभाज्य अंग है। इस नाजुक सवाल पर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने या जो हमारे सचिवालय के लोग वहां गए थे, उन्होंने इस वक्तव्य पर क्या स्पष्टीकरण दिया, जो कि रात्रि भोज में पाकिस्तान के माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ने दिया?

सभापति महोदय, दूसरी बात मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से आपके माध्यम से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि दोनों देशों के बीच संबंध और गहरे हों, मजबूत हों, यह संबंध कहीं छोटे-छोटे सवाल पर टूट न जाए, इसके लिए आप कौनसी कार्यवाही कर रहे हैं? क्या आप साहित्यकारों, कलाकारों या विद्वानों की एक टीम बनाकर वहां भेजेंगे, जैसे कि यहां से सौंसद लोग गए थे? क्या कोई ऐसी परियोजना आपकी है? इस बात को पूरा देश जानना चाहता है क्योंकि पूरे देश की जनता, भारत और पाकिस्तान की, दोस्ती के लिए तैयार है। आप इसके लिए ठोस क्या कार्यक्रम करते जा रहे हैं? वह कृपया बता दें।

माननीय सभापति जी, बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to seek clarifications on the statement. Sir, almost all the Opposition parties criticised the Government after the Pokhran issue. The present position of the country is, within eleven months of assuming office, our able leader, the hon. Prime Minister went to Pakistan by bus. Not only the whole country but the whole world appreciated it. Sir, I appreciate that the Foreign Secretaries have agreed that the two countries would remain firmly committed to undertaking measures to reduce the risk of accidental or unauthorised use of nuclear weapons under their respective controls and India and Pakistan will provide each other with advance notification in respect of ballistic

missile flight tests and conclude a bilateral agreement in this regard. We appreciate the hon. Prime Minister also for this. After the Pokhran issue, some criticisms were going on not only in our country but also outside. Now, the steps taken by our hon. Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretaries of the two nations, are very important. The statement says: "They agreed that the two sides should undertake consultations on WTO issues with a view to coordinating respective positions, determine areas of cooperation in information technology, particularly for tackling problems of Y2K and also to hold discussions on the liberalisation of visa and travel regime." I want to seek only one clarification from the hon. Minister. Terrorist activities are going on in Kashmir as well as in the border area of Pakistan. I would like to know whether any agreement has been entered into between these two countries to contain the terrorist activities. Now, I appreciate all the steps which were taken by our hon. Prime Minister through his visit to Pakistan. And this is a positive development between the two countries because after the Pokhran issue, the entire world has been criticising that a war was going to come between India and Pakistan. Now, the problem has been solved by our able Prime Minister by this journey by bus.

I appreciate our hon. Prime Minister for bringing about this good relationship between India and Pakistan. I am also feeling excited that not only within our country, but we can also now go outside our country by bus.

SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I personally feel very gratified—

"हम हुए काफ़िर तो वो काफ़िर मुसलमान हो गया"

— that such words should come from people who denounced me the other day. I think, committing mistakes is humanly, but admitting them in a God-like quality. I very much reciprocate the sentiments. I hope that Arun will also realise that the

Hindutva philosophy, which he upholds, is also wrong in the pluralistic society of ours. Some day he will tell me that he was wrong. As I crossed the border by that bus, you can imagine, — I had crossed the same border in 1947 on foot — so many memories came to me. At that time, I had left behind everything and I was on foot. I was a refugee. This time, I was in the bus of the Prime Minister of India with all the hopes, with all the position, which I had built here from the beginning like any other refugee. Now, when I look ahead, I feel very confident, very optimistic, about the relations between India and Pakistan. It is because when I left my home, I had turned to this straw-in the sea of discontent, and in the sea of hatred and distrust—with the hope that some day the walls of hatred would crumble. And I am very glad that that day something like that happened. The first clarification that I want to seek from the Foreign Minister is this. Before the Foreign Minister went there, he had said in a statement — if I recall correctly — that there might be something like a no-war pact. Was it discussed? Is there any hope that we might enter into some no-war pact with Pakistan? Secondly, was there an effort made to delink Kashmir from the nuclear issue? Was there an effort made that they should also announce no-first-use; I wish another thing was also done or it should now be done. the textbooks in Pakistan do not really tell the real history; they distort the history. I personally think that on both the sides, the books, theirs as well as ours, should be judged, and wherever history has been distorted, that should be corrected. Another thing that I want to point out is that even today, after this Lahore Declaration, some of the programmes coming from that side do not reflect that spirit of friendship. Couldn't we do something about the official media? I am not talking about the private media. Things have changed now. They should get reflected in the propaganda they are making or the propaganda that we are doing.

A question was raised by Dr. Manmohan Singh as to whether something was being done about the Gurudwaras. I was present at a meeting between our Chief Minister, Shri Prakash Singh Badal, and their Chief Minister of Punjab, Shri Shahbaz Sharif. Our Chief Minister did raise the point whether the Gurudwaras could be entrusted to somebody like the SGPC. Shahbaz said that that might not be possible but that they would constitute a joint committee in which there could be people from both the countries so that Nankana Sahib, Punja Sahib and other Gurudwaras could be taken care of and reconstructed wherever repairs, etc. are needed. He said that they would spend whatever money was needed. I did ask, "Will some of us get the opportunity to do the *kar sewa*", and he said, "Yes". So, since Shri Jaswant Singhji was not present there, and he might have or might not have got the record of that meeting because there was nobody from the MEA, I thought I would let you know that this question was raised.

Lastly, I want to say, Sir, that the relationship with Pakistan is a progress. Let us not be impatient. It will evolve. Lots of things have evolved already. Just see what was there a few months ago, a few weeks ago and what is there now. It was very courageous of our Prime Minister to have gone there. It was very courageous on the part of Nawaz Sharif to have invited our Prime Minister. Imagine that in the Lahore Red Fort, *Jana Gana Mana* was played for the first time in the last 51 years. The speech which Vajpayeeji made at the Civic Reception would do any Indian proud because he spoke very well; he spoke from his heart and he spoke not as a party-representative, but as the Prime Minister of a country. I am very happy that some of my effort—of burning candles on the border unilaterally—has borne some fruit. But let us be patient. I am sure, this relation is going to go from strength to strength.

श्री गांधी आज़ाद (उत्तर प्रदेश): सभापति महोदय, 20 और 21 फरवरी, 1999 को हमारे देश के प्रधानमंत्री ने लाहौर वस सेवा के उद्घाटन के अवसर पर पाकिस्तान जाकर शांति के प्रहरी के रूप में जो काम किया है, वह स्वागत योग्य है और इसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। साथ ही साथ मेरे छोटे-छोटे दो-एक प्रश्न हैं जो मैं मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ। महोदय, मंत्री जी के बयान में क्रमिक 8 पर अंतिम लाइन में कहा गया है कि—“प्रधानमंत्री वाजपेयी ने राजस्थान और सिंध सीमा पर स्थित जांच चौकियों को पुनः खोलने का प्रस्ताव किया”। मैं मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या पाकिस्तान के प्रधानमंत्री ने इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन किया?

महोदय, भारत और पाकिस्तान के बीच मैं मुख्य मुद्दा जम्मू-कश्मीर का है। दोनों देशों का जब बंटवारा हुआ था तो उस समय जम्मू-कश्मीर की जनता ने भारत के साथ रहना स्वीकार किया था, इसके लिए उन्हें हम आज भी हृदय से बधाई देते हैं। मैं मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि कश्मीर की जनता की आज क्या चाहत है? एक और छोटा सा प्रश्न यह है कि पाकिस्तान के प्रधानमंत्री ने कश्मीर में आए दिन हो रहे अधोषित युद्ध को समाप्त करने का आश्वासन दिया या नहीं?

श्री मोहम्मद आज़म खान (उत्तर प्रदेश): सभापति महोदय, किसी भी अच्छी शुरुआत के लिए और अच्छे नतीजे की उम्मीद के लिए शुक्रिया अदा करना, उसके लिए मुबारकबाद देना जरूरी है और यह बहुत ही कमदिली की बात होगी अगर इस मौके पर हम प्रधान मंत्री जी के इस अमल की तारीफ न करें और उन्हें इसके लिए शुक्रिया न करें। बल्कि मैं तो यों कहूंगा:

खल करदो गिले आज मिल कर गले,
खैर यों ही सही हम बुरे तुम भले।

लेकिन कुछ बुनियादी सवाल यहां साधियों ने भी उठाए हैं और कुलदीप नैयर जी के बाद जिन्हें मैं अपने तालिबइल्मी जिंदगी से सुनता और पढ़ता चला आया हूँ और वह सौभाग्य है कि ऐसे शख्स के साथ भी सदन में बैठने का मौका मिलता है। कुछ सच्चाईयां हैं जिन्हें नकारा नहीं जा सकता और वह यह कि जब तक कश्मीर का मसला जिया है, जब तक कश्मीर बजाते खुद एक मसला है उस वक्त तक हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच अच्छे रिश्तों का यकीन कर लेना सही होगा या नहीं होगा। कहीं ऐसा तो नहीं है किसी अपने बकती मसलेहत सौंटी-बींटी पर दस्तखत करने के लिए किसी के दबाव में या आरज़ी किसी सियासी फायदे और नुकसान के लिए कोई ऐसा समझौता कर बैठे या कोई

ऐसा नुकसान कर बैठें जो आने वाली नसलों के लिए नुकसानदेह साबित हो सकता हो। हमें इस सच्चाई से इनकार नहीं करना होगा कि कश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान के लिए भी और पाकिस्तान के लिए भी एक ऐसा जखम बन गया है जिसके लिए मरहम की उलाश दोनों तरफ से जारी है लेकिन यह मरहम हासिल हो सकेगा या नहीं हो सकेगा। गांवों के पाकिस्तान इस बात के लिए सन्न न करले कि जो मेरे पास है वह मेरा है और जो हिन्दुस्तान के पास है वह हिन्दुस्तान का है या हिन्दुस्तान इस बात के लिए तैयार न हो जाए कि हम आईदा के लिए आने वाली नसलों को लड़ने के लिए तैयार रहेंगे। मैं यकीनन इस मौके पर यह भी कहना चाहूंगा और जानकारी भी चाहूंगा भारत सरकार से और मंत्री महोदय से कि दिलों की कुरबत के लिए लाजिम यह है कि हम वहां की अवागम और यहां की अवागम के दिलों के अंदर गुंजायश पैदा करें। एक प्रधान मंत्री और दूसरे प्रधान मंत्री की मुलाकात से मुल्कों की नफरत खत्म नहीं हो सकती, कौमों की नफरत खत्म नहीं हो सकती इसलिए कि बंटवारा असूल की बुनियाद पर नहीं हुआ था। बंटवारे को आज भी 51 वर्ष के बाद भी पैदा होने वाला हिन्दुस्तानी बच्चा भी बंटवारे को गलत कहता है और हिन्दुस्तान में रहने वाला मुसलमान जो कि बहुत बड़ी तादाद में यहां है और मैं पहले भी इस सदन में कह चुका हूँ इस सदन में कि 1947 में जिनाह जीने नहीं थे जिनाह होरे थे, क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान से जाने वाले मुसलमानों की तादाद इतनी कम थी कि उससे पूरा पाकिस्तान भी मिला लिया जाए तो पाकिस्तान नहीं बन सकता था। आज हिन्दुस्तान में रहने वाले मुसलमानों की तादाद पाकिस्तान से कहीं ज्यादा है। उनकी खुशहाली, उनके गम, उनके त्यौहार, उनकी मज़हबी इबादतगाहें, उनके अहमियत, उनके पाकिस्तान और उनके पाकिस्तानी रस्मों-रिवाज से कहीं अहम हैं और हिन्दुस्तान में रहने वाला एक मुसलमान भी हरिगज यह नहीं चाह सकता, वह यह तो चाह सकता है कि पाकिस्तान खुशहाल हो, वह यह तो चाह सकता है कि पाकिस्तान फले-फूले क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान में रहने वालों की बहनें, उनकी बेटियां, उनके भाई, उनके छत्ता, उनके फूफा उसी सरजमीं पर हैं। लेकिन एक भी हिन्दुस्तानी मुसलमान या हिन्दुस्तान में रहने वाला यह नहीं चाह सकता कि पाकिस्तान का कोई बम दिल्ली के करीब गिरे क्योंकि यहां उनकी जाम-मरिजद भी है, वह यह नहीं चाह सकता कि उनका बम आगरा पर गिरे क्योंकि वहां ताजमहल है जो हिन्दुस्तान की शान, हुसन और उसकी इज्जत है। इसलिए हमें सिर्फ किसी सियासी फंदेबाजी के लिए या किसी सियासी

हेरफेर के लिए आज इस अमल को नहीं करना चाहिए बल्कि यह सोचना चाहिए कि दो प्रधान मंत्रियों के मिलने के बाद हिन्दुस्तान की करोड़ों अवागम और पाकिस्तान की करोड़ों अवागम अपने दिलों को करीब ला सकें या नहीं ला सकें। इसके लिए तरीका यह भी हो सकता है कि यहां की अवागम को वहां की अवागम को करीब किया जाए। हम बीजा की सहूलियतें उन्हें मुहैया करें, आने-जाने के रास्ते हम साफ करें और रास्ते में जो बड़े पत्थर और कंटे पड़े हुए हैं उन कंटों को निकालने का काम करें और जिस तरह सुझाव आया है हमारे बुद्धिजीवी वर्ग यहां के बड़े लोग वहां के बड़े लोगों से मिले, वहां के लोग यहां आएँ और इस तरह नफरतों के खत्म होने का एक रास्ता बन सके। यह भी हमें जानकारी होनी चाहिए कि हम जनता से जनता को मिलाने के लिए, अवागम को अवागम से मिलाने के लिए, भाई को भाई से मिलाने के लिए कौन सा ऐसा दरवाजा खोलना चाहते हैं जिस पर कोई ताला न हो, कोई चाबी न हो और वह किसी दफ्तर से मांग लाने की जरूरत पेश न आए। बहुत-बहुत श्रुतियां।

الاشرفي محمد اعظم خان "اتر پردیش" سے
مہوردے۔ "کس بھی اچھی شروعات کیلئے اور اچھے
نتیجے کی امید کے لئے شکریہ ادا کرنا اور اسکے لئے
مبارکباد دینا ضروری ہے اور یہ بہت ہی کم
دینی کی بات ہے جو کہ اکثر اس موقع پر ہم
پردہ حجاب منبری جی کے اس عمل کی توثیق دے
کر رہے ہیں اور انھیں اسکے لئے مشکور نہ کریں۔
بلکہ میں تو یوں کہوں گا کہ:

ختم کر دو گیلے آج ملکر گلے

نیز یہ بھی صحیح ہم بڑے کم جملے

لیکن کچھ بنیادی سوال بیان سماعتیوں نے

بھی اٹھائے ہیں اور کلاسیک نیز جی سکے۔

بعد جنہیں میں اپنی طالب علمی کی زندگی

سے سنتا اور بڑھتا چلا آیا ہوں۔ اور یہ

خوش فہمی ہے کہ ایسے شخص کے ساتھ
بھی مدد میں بیٹھنے کا موقع ملا ہے۔
کچھ سنجائیاں ہیں جنہیں نظام انہیں جاسکتا
اور وہ یہ کہ جب تک کشمیر کا مسئلہ زندہ
ہے جب تک کشمیر بذات خود ایک مسئلہ ہے
اس وقت تک ہندوستان اور پاکستان
کے بیچ اچھے رشتوں کا یقین بڑھنا عرصہ
ہو گا یا نہیں ہو گا۔ یقین ایسا تو نہیں
ہے کہ کسی اپنے واقعی مصالحت سے۔ ٹی
ٹی۔ پی۔ پر دستخط کرنے کے لئے کسی
کے دباؤ میں یا عارضی کسی سیاسی فائدہ
اور نقصان کے لئے کوئی ایسا سمجھوتہ
کر بیٹھیں یا کوئی ایسا نقصان کر بیٹھیں
جو ان کے دلی نسلوں کے لئے نقصان دہ ثابت
ہو سکتا ہو۔ ہمیں اس سچائی سے انظار
نہیں کرنا ہو گا کہ کشمیر ہندوستان کے لئے
بھی اور پاکستان کے لئے بھی ایک ایسا زخم
بن گیا ہے جس کے لئے مرہم کی تلاش دونوں
طرف سے جاری ہے۔ لیکن یہ مرہم حاصل
ہو سکے گا یا نہیں۔ تا وقتیکہ پاکستان
اس بات کے لئے صبر نہ کرے کہ جو مرہم پاس
ہے وہ مرہم ہے اور جو ہندوستان کے پاس ہے
وہ ہندوستان کا ہے یا ہندوستان اس بات
کے لئے تیار نہ ہو جائے کہ آئندہ کے لئے ان کے
دلی نسلوں کو مرنے کے لئے تیار رہیں گے۔
میں یقیناً اس موقع پر یہ بھی کہنا چاہوں گا

اور جانکاری بھی چاہوں گا بھارت سرکار
سے اور منتری چودے سے کہ دونوں کی قربت
کے لئے لازم یہ ہے کہ ہم وہاں کے عوام اور
یہاں کے عوام کے دلوں میں گنجائش پیدا کریں۔
ایک پردھان منتری چودے دوسرے پردھان
منتری کی ملاقات سے ملکوں کی نفرت ختم
نہیں ہو سکتی۔ اس لئے کہ ہندو اور انہوں
کی بنیاد پر نہیں ہوا تھا۔ ہندو کو آج بھی
۱۵ سال کے بچہ بھی پیدا ہونے والا ہندوستانی
بچہ بھی بھارت کو آج غلط کہتا ہے اور ہندوستان
میں رہنے والے مسلمان کیونکہ بہت بڑی قوم
میں یہاں ہے اور میں بچے بھی اس میں
میں کہہ چکا ہوں کہ ۱۹۷۹ میں جناح جیتے
نہیں تھے جناح ہارے تھے۔ کیونکہ ہندوستان
سے جانے والے مسلمانوں کی تعداد اتنی
کم تھی کہ اس سے پورا پاکستان بھی ملا
دیا جائے تو پاکستان نہیں بن سکتا تھا۔
آج ہندوستان میں رہنے والے مسلمانوں
کی تعداد پاکستان سے کہیں زیادہ ہے۔
انکی خوشحالی۔ ان کے غم ان کے تیوہار انکی
مذہبی عبادت گاہیں انکی اہمیت۔ ان کے
پاکستان اور ان کے پاکستانی رسم و رواج
سے کہیں اہم ہے اور ہندوستان میں
رہنے والے ایک مسلمان بھی ہرگز یہ نہیں چاہ
سکتا۔ وہ چاہ سکتا ہے کہ پاکستان خوشحال
ہو۔ وہ یہ تو چاہ سکتا ہے کہ پاکستان

بجائے ہوئے کیونکہ ہندوستان میں رہنے والوں کی بہنیں۔ انکی بیٹیاں۔ انکے بھائی۔ انکے چچا۔ انکے چھوٹے اسی سرزمین پر رہیں۔ لیکن ایک ہندوستانی مسلمان یا ہندوستان میں رہنے والے نہیں چاہ سکتا کہ پاکستان کا کوئی کم دتی کے قریب گرے کیونکہ یہاں انکی جامع مسجد ہے۔ وہ یہ نہیں چاہ سکتا کہ انکا ہم اکثر ہر گز کیونکہ وہاں تاج محل ہے۔ ہندوستان کی شان اسلام کا حسن اور اسکی عزت ہے۔ اسلئے ہمسایہ سماجی بھند بازی کے لئے۔ یا کسی سماجی باہر پھیر کے لئے تاج اس عمل کو نہیں کرنا چاہئے۔ بلکہ یہ سوچنا چاہئے کہ دو ہر دھان مغربیوں کے ملنے کے بعد ہندوستان کی کروڑوں عوام اور پاکستان کی کروڑوں عوام اپنے دلوں کے قریب لاسکی یا نہیں لاسکی۔ اسلئے یہ طریقہ یہ بھی ہو سکتا ہے کہ یہاں کی عوام اور وہاں کی عوام کو قریب کیا جائے۔ ہم وزن کی سہولتیں انکو مہیا کریں۔ لانے جانے کے راستے ہم صاف کریں۔ اور راستہ میں جو بڑی بے وقور اور کھانٹے بڑے ہوئے ہیں ان کانٹوں کو نلکے کا کام کریں اور جس طرح کا سچا اور آسان ہمارا دستور طریقہ۔ یہاں کے بڑے لوگ۔ وہاں کے بڑے لوگوں سے ملیں۔ وہاں کے لوگ یہاں آئیں اور اس طرح نفرتوں کے ختم ہونے کا ایک راستہ بن سکے۔ یہ بھی

ہمیں جانکاری ہونی چاہئے کہ ہم جتنا سے جتنا کو ملانے کے لئے۔ عوام کو عوام سے ملانے کے لئے۔ بجائی کو بجائی سے ملانے کے لئے۔ کونسا ایسا دروازہ کھولنا چاہئے جس پر کوئی تالان نہ ہو۔ کوئی چابی نہ ہو اور وہ کسی دفتر سے مانگ لانے کی ضرورت پیش نہ آئے۔ بہت بہت شکریہ۔

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMGOWALIA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I want to seek some very important clarifications from the hon. Minister. Does the Government know that when visas are issued to Pakistani people to visit India, particularly those who are to visit Punjab, have to face grave problems. Perhaps, he is aware and I will, through you, bring to his notice a few facts. Visas are issued in Islamabad to Pakistanis visiting India, particularly Punjab. They come to the border, they are packed in a train from Attari and they are then brought to Delhi first and then, after reaching Delhi, the Pakistanis apply for permission to go to Punjab. They are given two weeks' visa, a permission on stay in India. Sir, they apply from here, and then the papers go to Chandigarh and then they go to the districts, Sangrur, Gurudaspur or Amritsar, and then again the papers come back to Delhi. It takes fourteen days. Sometimes, only one day is left for the visiting Pakistani relative to go to Malerkotla, Sangrur or Gurudaspur. Papers go to these places and again they come back to Delhi. Then, they board the train from Delhi and then they go to Amritsar.

You are creating an atmosphere of great friendship, sobriety and cordiality, but you see how a visitor is told to go in a train and go to Delhi? I really do not want to mention these things: Before getting the papers cleared, to go to Punjab, they have to pay money at Delhi to the clerk saying, 'please send my papers to Chan-

†[Transliteration in Arabic Script.

digarh' and then the Chandigarh office gets money and then the district headquarters people get money, and, on their way back, money is to be given. You may please do one thing; keep two-three acres of land at Wagah border, make it a transit camp and tell their relatives to bring the clearance papers from Sangrur or Gurudaspur only to Wagah so that within two-three days, the papers are cleared and they are sent back. This is one thing.

Number two, Sir; a reference has been made about Gurudwaras; very good. For Punja Sahab and Nankana Sahab management is required, but there are very, very important Hindu temples also in Pakistan, particularly Kitashraj. It is a temple. Everytime, when Hindu brothers from Punjab or elsewhere apply to Pakistani High Commissioner for permission to go to the temples, usually, delaying tactics are adopted. You must take it up with your counterpart so that Hindu brothers are also permitted to visit these shrines. With regard to the Gurudwaras, already, some people from Great Britain, America and Canada have come forward; and they have some interest in the management. It is very good if the Punjab Chief Minister had taken this up and, through you the things can get matured. We also must advice on our part.

Mostly, the sufferers are writers. Arrangements must be made for them. A group of MPs can go there, as per the facilities available to us as a Member of the SAARC. MPs can go to Pakistan without visa and they can also come to India without visa, but the most unifying factor has been the cultural factor, the major role which has been played to bring both the countries closer during the last fifty years, despite the venom-spitting politicians, is by the writers, artists and singers. They have been playing their role very, very strongly. This is so particularly in the case of Punjab because Punjabis have a common language, common habits and a

common culture between Amritsar and Lahore, this Punjab and that Punjab. Sir, a provision must be made that whenever a group of ten artistes or ten writers or ten singers wants to visit this country or that country, they should also be permitted. I would like to have the response of the Minister on this issue. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI (Rajasthan): Sir, I join the other Members in welcoming the visit. I salute the Prime Minister for taking a very courageous and statesman-like action. I would like to get a clarification from the Minister. The Lahore Declaration and the memorandum of understanding refer to the Shimla Agreement which is now recognised internationally. Why has it not been mentioned in your statement? Was it a deliberate or was it a decided approach? Secondly, Sir, Pakistan extended an appropriate welcome. But, the absence of the defence heads and the hostile demonstrations somewhere in Pakistan created a trouble for us. Will the Minister try to explain as to what is the real situation with regard to defence officials not meeting and about the demonstrations which took place there? The fourth point is that our foreign policy is based on a national consensus. I am unable to understand as to why the Government did not think it prudent to include representative of the various opposition parties in the delegation. It is all right to include film stars, intellectuals and others. But a real consensus can be developed at the Government level if you include the opposition parties and others. There has been a lot of talk about no-first-use, no-war pact and all such things. But, they are missing in the joint declaration. I would like to get enlightened by the Foreign Minister on what those weighty words or sentiments were and what the outcome was. I welcome this approach of visiting shrines and temples. I would like to suggest one way in this regard. For example, in Burma we have the *kabbar* or Bahadur Shah Zafar which is being looked after by

the state representatives of both Burma and India. If you can think of such an action or an instrument like this, that will be a very nice thing. We can have a joint committee of representatives of India and Pakistan to look after the gurdwaras and temples as we have been doing for the last 50 years in the case of Bahadur Shah Zafar's *kabbar* in Burma.

SHRI K.R. MALKANI (Delhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is a matter of great joy that today all sections of the House are agreed in felicitating the Prime Minister's visit to Lahore. The hon. Minister of External Affairs has placed before the House an adequate and elaborate statement. What has happened is the best thing in Indo-Pak relations in the last 51 years. I also feel—it might sound ironic—if there had been no Pokhran, there would have been no Lahore. You will be surprised as to how and why it happened. It is the nuclear tests by India and the nuclear tests by Pakistan which convinced both the sides that they are nuclear powers; and now no old-style war is possible between them. The kind of war that we fought in 1965 and 1971 was out. Because, in a struggle like that, there is always a fear and threat of an escalation. So, as I said, out of evil, comes good. Here, there are two negatives which have resulted in a positive development.

It is often felt—today's statement has referred to it; and some friends have also referred to it—that Kashmir is the core issue. Sir, Kashmir is a very big issue. But, it is not the core issue. The core issue is the suspicion and hatred fostered in the forties. It is important that the External Affairs Ministers of India and Pakistan will meet periodically. I would beg of them to consider whether the history books in Pakistan, or, even in India, should not be looked into. Then, the PTV programmes, showing very lurid things from time to time. Whether something can be done about it or not? I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether something can be done about it

or not because, until and unless this suspicion and hatred are removed, things will not proceed. So, I consider that as the core issue. There has been a general agreement on living in peace and amity; amity; and on bilateral solutions. They are all excellent principles. There is no doubt about it. The principles are the main thing. They are the basic things. Fortunately, there are some specifics also. Bus service has started; it is very good. But there are other specifics about which the two countries have been exercised; people have been talking about. Things have been in the pipeline. Was there any progress this time, or, will there be any progress in the near future? Here, the statement says that Prime Minister, Vajpayee, proposed the reopening of the checkpoint on the Rajasthan-Sind border. I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to what was the response from the Pakistan side. Because, Pakistan's earlier response, when Zia-ul-Haq was President of Pakistan, was, "I will never open it." Is the present Government in Pakistan willing to consider this matter? It is good to note that there is a reference to the revision and liberalisation of visa rules. Under the present practice, every other day, people have to report to the police. It should be done away with. It should be looked into. We should, particularly, see that minor children, old people and women should not be asked to go to the police station. Something may be done about this. The bulk of the Mohajirs in Pakistan have gone from U.P. and Bihar. For them, the easiest way to come to this side—Mumbai or Lucknow—is, via the Rajasthan-Sind border. This should be opened, and, for that, it is also necessary that consulates should be reopened in Karachi and Mumbai. I would like the Foreign Ministers of the two countries to consider this matter in all seriousness.

Sir, free trade may take some time. I hope it does not take too long. But there is one thing; they do not know enough about us; and we do not know enough about them, because they do not get and

read our books and we do not get and read their books. Same is the case with newspapers. There is a lot of ignorance. Can we have a free trade in books and magazines between the two countries? When we Indian PMs met Mr. Nawaz Sharif, I made this suggestion and he said: "It is a good suggestion." The hon. Minister of Information and Broadcasting, Pakistan who was standing there, said, "From our side, there is no objection." I am sure, there will be no objection from the Indian side. The two hon. Prime Ministers could take this as a priority item. Only a few days before the Prime Ministers meeting, there was a conference of Members of Parliament of India and Pakistan. Both, the Prime Minister of Pakistan and the hon. Prime Minister of India welcomed it because the officials meet at official level; the Ministers meet at their level; and millions of people cannot meet. The best way is, the Members of Parliament and the Members of Legislatures from both the sides representing the millions, should meet regularly. May I request the hon. Foreign Minister to consider this matter whether we can institutionalise this thing? Every six months or so, a group of Pakistani MPs comes here, and after another six months, a group of Indian MPs goes there.

Sir, when I went there, there was a big surprise for me. I never knew that Lahour celebrates *Basant*, and celebrates it in such a fantastic way. There is no word for it. A group of Indians had gone there to take part in the *Basant* celebrations. I would suggest that the Government should consider inviting socio-cultural leaders from Pakistan to come over here. It can be any time. It can be Holi, it can be Diwali, or It can be any day. One of such days can be picked, so that there is a greater contact between the people of the two countries. Our good friend Ramoowalia referred to some ancient temples there. Many Sikh shrines are there. Temples are there. There are two temples which belong to the Sanatanis, that is, Katsaraja and

Hingraja. They are in an utter state of neglect. I had the good fortune of visiting the Katsaraja. It can be visited when one is coming by car from Islamabad to Lahore. The two External Affairs Ministers could go into this matter and see to it that these great religions centres are re-activated and renovated.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES (Goa): Mr. Chairman, Sir, as rightly mentioned by my colleague, no reference has been made in the Statement to the Shimla Agreement. May I know whether the contents of the Shimla Agreement were also discussed to see that the Kashmir issue is not raised at any international fora but only through the bilateral agreement between India and Pakistan? There is also no mention, in the Statement, of any meeting between the two Foreign Ministers of Pakistan and India. Did any meeting take place at the level of the External Affairs Minister of India and the Foreign Minister of Pakistan?

Then, an invitation was extended by the hon. Prime Minister to the Prime Minister of Pakistan and his Mrs. to visit India. Has that invitation been accepted? If yes, when are they likely to visit our country?

Thirdly, there is a hot line between the Prime Ministers of the two countries. I would like to know whether any hot line is also likely to be established between the Foreign Ministers of the two countries because, as stated by the hon. Minister, the Inter-Ministerial Committee is likely to meet. Then, have we signed any free-trade agreement with Pakistan also, as we have signed with Sri Lanka? At the moment, smuggling is going on across the border Pakistan imports tea from India through Dubai and Singapore, but not directly. Were there any talks on the CTBT because both of us are involved in the CTBT issue, and both are making statements that each one will sign only when the other will sign it? Was any decision arrived at on this matter? Finally, did we make any inquiry to

know as to where the nuclear command lies? Does it lie with the political leadership, as it is in our country, or, it lies with the Army leadership?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am very grateful to all the hon. Members who have lent their support and expressed their agreement with what our Prime Minister has done by undertaking this visit on the bus to Lahore. The gratitude that is expressed is in fact, not simply a personal gratitude on behalf of the Government, but it is a demonstration of the wide unanimous consensus that exists within the political bodies, not simply the political bodies, but, indeed, in the large masses of the Indian people, that the only path between India and Pakistan is the path of amity, peace and friendship. This has been an exciting journey. This journey from Pokhran to Lahore is not a departure. It is a development. Malkaniji is entirely right in observing that the linkage is direct, and the one has indeed led to the other.

So far as the symbolism of undertaking the journey by bus is concerned, the Prime Minister caught the imagination simply because he caught the mood of the two peoples. As he said, and I had an occasion to mention to the Press in Lahore, यह बस लोहे और इस्पात की बस नहीं है, यह जज्बात की बस है। Sir, I submit to the Leader of the Opposition that I recognise entirely the wisdom and the validity of what he says — that we need to go beyond statements is entirely right. We need to go beyond statements. One of the great misfortunes of the relations between India and Pakistan has been that we have made statements, taken tentative steps and then stopped at that. I am not here to seek credit or to take credit because credit is not by seeking or taking. The continuity of the policy is evident, but the excellence of the genius lies in catching the moment and utilising that moment for the benefit of the two peoples.

Sir, I will attempt to answer the clarifications of the hon. Members. Some have been repeated, which I will answer only once. Others, I will cover as extensively as possible because I believe that the whole subject of India-Pakistan relations merits this kind of treatment.

There is a question that has come up on a number of occasions. A number of hon. Members have referred to it, and it relates to terrorism. The reference has come in the form of the most unfortunate and ghastly killings just on the eve of the hon. Prime Minister's visit to Lahore. The killings were directed at sabotaging a much larger effort. The killings were directed at stopping this great journey which in distance is perhaps a journey only from Delhi to Lahore or Lahore to Attari-Wagah. But this journey is not to be measured in terms of the kilometres that we travelled. The great distance of mutual antipathy and lack of trust and belief was covered in that bus journey. This is my belief as one of the small players in this great drama that has been enacted. That is why it is a moment of history, and it is a defining moment.

So far as the Jammu killings were concerned, they were most unfortunate. They are to be condemned. Prime Minister Vajpayee did indeed raise it in his discussions with Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif. He did make it quite categorical and clear, even if in courteous language "There are just two paths. There is the path of peace and amity and friendship and accord, and there is the path of violence. Violence will not succeed." That is the message the Prime Minister conveyed in his bilateral discussions with his Pakistani counterpart. That is the message that he repeated in all his various speeches, wherever he was, be it the banquet in Lahore or be it the public speech that he made in Lahore. I do believe that he is the first Prime Minister of India to have had an opportunity to address the people of Pakistan directly in a public meeting. However small the public meeting was compared to the stan-

dards that we have in both our countries, he is the first Prime Minister after 1961, who had a chance to address a public meeting in Lahore. And there he spoke from no prepared text. He spoke from his heart. He spoke as a citizen of India and as a representative of this great country, which we have the honour to represent in this House.

I would like, for a moment, to dwell on the aspect of terrorism. There are two specific references to it. One is in the Lahore Declaration. I urge upon the hon. Members to read the three documents together. They are not separate documents. These documents do not divide India-Pakistan relations by three. They are to be read in unity and continuity. They complement and supplement each other. In the Lahore Declaration on Kashmir, they contain two very important elements. In the Lahore Declaration the two Prime Ministers: "...have agreed that their respective Governments shall refrain from intervention and interference in each other's internal affairs." The point that was made by an hon. Member earlier is clarified here, that they shall refrain from intervention and interference in each other's internal affairs. Thereafter, other points reaffirm condemnation of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations and their determination to combat this menace. These two read together are a clear enough enunciation of the position that the Prime Ministers of the two countries have adopted.

A number of hon. Members made a reference to the Shimla Agreement. It is axiomatic. It is self-evident and it stands as the corner-stone for the conduct of bilateral relations between India and Pakistan. This is brought out through prominent references to the Shimla Agreement in the Lahore Declaration and in the Memorandum of Understanding. The Lahore Declaration reiterates the determination of both the countries to implement the Shimla Agreement in letter and spirit. Likewise the Memorandum of Understanding reiterates the determina-

tion of both the countries to implementing the Shimla Agreement in letter and spirit.

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI:
It is not contained in your Statement.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I recognise it, Sir, because my Statement too has to be read with the three documents i.e. the Lahore Declaration, the Memorandum of Understanding and also the Joint Statement.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has spoken of SAARC. While making a reference to SAARC, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has stated that it is his experience that all along, in the evolution of SAARC, our good neighbour has stood in the way. Sir, it is my feeling that even within SAARC, particularly on the trade front, there is a movement. In SAARC, a preferential trade agreement has been signed; and SAARC has to move towards SAFTA. It is also a fact that within the SAARC, there is now a movement in its journey in advance of the other obligations, towards arriving at a free trade areas, rather quickly. An observation was made that there is an insufficient progress of trade. Considering the size of the two countries, and the potential for enhanced trade, I would agree that this is not enough.

जनाब मोहम्मद आजम खान साहब ने फरमाया कि हम सियासत की तज़वीज़ दे या कोई मोर्के का फायदा उठा लेने के लिए कर रहे हैं, ऐसा नहीं है। यह अपने आप में सारी दुनिया जानती है कि आज अगर पाकिस्तान के साथ चीनी का सौदा हुआ है या आज हम पाकिस्तान के साथ बिजली खरीदने की तज़वीज़ कर रहे हैं तो यह अपने आप में ट्रेड को बढ़ाने के लिए कुछ पहलू हैं। That there is a potential for a great deal more. I accept. It is a recognition of that potential that the two Prime Ministers have created an atmosphere, have created an ambience within which now developments have to take place. Therefore, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition is correct when he points out, "What is this dialogue process that you have set in motion?" But there are three

levels at which this dialogue has to take place immediately. There is the expert level at which we will meet. There is the Foreign Secretaries level where it would take place; and there is the Foreign Ministers level. A question was asked by him on the credible mechanism to be put in place on nuclear confidence building measures. I would like to dwell at some length and point out about the credible mechanism.

The first step has been taken; the two countries—post-May, 1998—have sat together and have said that we need to talk to each other; we need to reconfirm certain aspects. Those that they reconfirm have been stated in this, that they shall not resume testing is stated, unless and until national imperatives dictate otherwise. They have, on the front of ballistic missiles, committed themselves to concluding an agreement so that ballistic flight-testing by itself does not contribute to enhancing tension. This credible mechanism will be put into place through these agreements, through an expert level meeting between the two countries, through Foreign Secretaries meetings; and more particularly, the two Foreign Ministers have been entrusted with the responsibility of undertaking this. As I have said in my statement, we have been directed by the Prime Ministers to meet periodically. I will meet my counterpart. Even before I left, I was suggesting the dates on which we could meet. We are trying to work out a suitable date so that, immediately the Foreign Ministers level meeting could take place. In any event, in the middle of next month, because of the SAARC Ministerial level meeting which is to take place in Colombo—I am due to meet him. This is also a part of the agreement that whether we formally meet at the invitation of each other only in a bilateral manner or in a forum whenever an occasion arises in a larger forum we will, on the sidelines of that forum, engage with each other to review the progress and see what is happening or what aspects need to be discussed.

The honourable the Leader of the Opposition referred to the 300th Anniversary celebrations of the Khalsa Panth. I think, hon. Member, Mr. Kuldip Nayyar, also referred to it. When he said that I was not present at the meeting between the two Chief Ministers. The two Chief Ministers of the two Punjabs. 'ਦੋ ਪੰਜਾਬ' He was right. This matter was referred to by the Prime Minister. In fact, he directed me to raise this issue in the full-delegation-level meeting. If my memory serves me right, there were three aspects. One was that when the celebrations of the 300th Anniversary of the Khalsa Panth take place, visa restrictions should be so eased that pilgrims are able to move more easily. The second aspect was about the restoration, renovation and up keep of shrines, Sikh shrines, in Pakistan. The third was about the mangement of those shrines. All these three points were referred to by the Prime Minister at the full delegation level meeting. And a direction was given to the Pakistan Foreign Office that necessary action to taken in this regard. I did, Sir, also, in my private conversations and in the delegation level meeting, refer to the two places of Hinglaj Mata and also Kata Raj. I mentioned to them that, particularly for those of us who come from West Rajasthan and Kutch, Hinglaj has been a great pilgrim place. It is now completely denied to great many devout who would otherwise like to go to Hinglaj. Hinglaj lies in Baluchistan in an area of some sensitivity to Pakistan. But nevertheless, they have agreed to examine this; and should anyone wish to go to Hinglaj, it will be my personal endeavour to try and work this out. So also the maintenance and upkeep of those shrines.

My colleague and friend also referred to and wanted to know on the aspect of advancement of substance. This is a very valid point. I entirely share this. It shall be the endeavour of this Government and my endeavour, in the discharge of my

responsibilities, to see that we do advance on substance with the same sense of urgency that has been demonstrated by the two Prime Ministers. He referred to the speech, the moving speech, of the hon. Prime Minister of Pakistan at the historic Fort Lahore, about singing the same song. I repeated, not that phrase, but a phrase somewhat similar, to my counterpart. I do not speak Punjabi very well though I understand Punjabi. I told them that we have to move into a situation where—those that are fluent in Punjabi will forgive me—“येना भी सझा, ते हसत भी सझा।”

We will have to. There is no other way. We shall have to.

I wish to set at rest a doubt that has been voiced by a number of hon. Members relating to the role played, allegedly played, by the United States of America or any other country in this regard. This matter was clarified by me on a number of occasions. I have no difficulty in clarifying that whenever this suggestion was made or whenever this suggestion was even hinted at, I have rejected it outright because it is my personal belief—and I subscribe to it—that this Sub-continent has a natural balance.

7.00 P.M.

Any foreign intervention in this Sub-continent, in any form, destabilises the balance, whether it is in Afghanistan or whether it is elsewhere, and that destabilisation lasts for a very long time, and therefore, whenever this suggestion has come to me, be it from the United States of America, the U.K. or anywhere, and they have attempted to fish in troubled water, I have made it very clear that we are born of the same womb—India and Pakistan are born of the same womb—we talk the same language, we do not need interpreters to convey to each other what we are doing. In the initiative that was taken in this bus journey, in this TRIAD of declarations, at no point, directly or indirectly, was it

suggested or even by a hint was any foreign intervention accepted, or even, suggested because the dynamics of what has been done today is in itself so profound, that in it, there is no space left for any foreign intervention. The challenge is upon us now, the collectivity of the political class of both countries, to demonstrate continued follow-up action, so that, what has been demonstrated as possible, bilaterally, between India and Pakistan, does not run a ground on the sands of inaction.

Sir, my friend, Shri Gurudas Das Gupta, spoke of a departure from policy, which I, with humility, suggest was not. It is a continuation. He spoke for the need for political will, of conviction, of courage, to act. I endorse that entirely. But I leave a thought within that; in fact, the undertaking of this journey was an act of great political courage. This in itself was a demonstration of political courage that Main Sahab Nawaz Sharif should receive the Indian Prime Minister at Wagah. It was an act of political courage, and I recognise that. We shall continue to need further acts of political courage. But now, these acts of political courage shall have to come not simply from the leadership alone, they will have to come from the collectivity of the political class of India, and only then the leadership shall be further emboldened.

Shri Gurudas Das Gupta also spoke of economic cooperation to follow or precede. I believe, Sir, there is now recognition; and I have made this point repeatedly. In fact, Shri John F. Fernandes has put a question whether I had talks with my counterpart. Inevitably, there will be talks. But this is a statement on the Prime Minister's visit. We were just camp-followers. It is the glory of the Prime Minister. Sir, so far as the question of economic cooperation is concerned, whether it will precede or follow, I don't think that is any longer a debating point because, as I pointed out to my counterpart, I spoke to him in Hindustani.

हम एक दूसरे के दुश्मन नहीं हैं। हमारी एक दुश्मन है, जिसे गरीबी कहते हैं, बेरोजगारी कहते हैं। पचास साल बर्बाद कर दिए हैं। मालिक न करे, अगले पचास साल भी इसी तरह बर्बाद हो जाएं। हमारे एक दूसरे के साथ रिश्ते, सिर्फ सियासती रिश्ते नहीं, दूसरे रिश्ते नहीं, लेन-देन के भी रिश्ते होना पड़ेंगे। इसीलिए चीनी से मूंढ मोटा किया है, चीनी से वह शुरूआत हुई है। मालिक चाहेगा तो और रास्ता खुलेगा।

More delegation should go, was the suggestion given by Shri Gurudas Das Gupta. Yes, Sir, without doubt. Indeed, it was very heartening that without any suggestion from me, there was a delegation with FICCI representation on it. I only had to suggest: "Yes, we will stand by you. You go ahead and do it." ...upon which FICCI has taken an initiative to set up a joint body between India and Pakistan. It has already been launched. It only underlines the point, Sir, that if the leadership shows the way, provides the opportunity, the two people are ready to follow, and that is precisely what lies at the heart of the "great initiative that the Prime Minister has taken.

Sir, my good friend also referred to the follow-up, the additionalities. The additionalities I had already explained at the expert level, at the Foreign Secretary level, and at the Foreign Minister level. This is not directly linked, Sir, but he was good enough to enquire about the CTBT, and I have had occasion to verify this in the other House. If you want me to, I will take it up, but it is not directly linked with this subject. Sir, the position of the Government of India, as I said in the other House is categorical, explicit and unambiguous. So far as the Treaty on Comprehensive Test Ban is concerned, we stand exactly where the Prime Minister stands, or what he has stated in both Houses. I have stated the position of the Government in this House, and what I feel is we had a very good debate which the other House could not have. That is the position that is being stated in the U.N. General Assembly also. On a treaty on Fissile material cut off we are

committed to engaging in serious, meaningful, productive negotiations for a verifiable treaty on future production. On this, we will engage in negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva for which the process is set in motion, and an ad-hoc Committee is to be formed, and of which India shall be a member, hopefully.

On export controls, India's position and record is second to none. Indeed, it is better than some of the P-5 countries themselves. We are committed to further strengthening the export control mechanisms so that we are able to ensure that weapons of mass destruction or technology related to weapons of mass destruction is not unauthorisedly communicated elsewhere, and then there is a defence posture. It is a sovereign function. It is not open to negotiations. It is clear and explicit.

On terrorism, I have answered the points. On WTO, Sir, yes, Pakistan is interested. That is why there is reference. They shall consult with us. What else we have done about the WTO, is tendentious, but gets drawn into the discussions. In a very recent meeting at Montego, in Jamaica, India offered the proposal of hosting a conference on WTO in India, preparatory to the Ministerial level conference, which is to be held later this year. G-15 not only agreed to India's proposal but also welcomed this initiative of India, and we are going to host this conference. Now, the G-15 comprises three Continents. G-15 is no longer G-15 now because there are 17 nations. Seventeen nations will congregate. We have invited them. We

have informed Pakistan that we are ready to consult with them on WTO issues because our issues are similar. We will discuss WTO issues in the SAARC Ministerial-level meeting in the middle of next month in Colombo where again we will confer with Pakistan.

There was a question raised by two or three Members regarding Chiefs of the three Services of Pakistan—Army, Navy

and Air Force—meeting the Prime Minister. I think, that was a wholly misguided and an entirely tendentious report. The three Chiefs received the Indian Prime Minister as soon as his helicopter landed in the Governor's house in Lahore. Earlier, they were busy with another visit; not that they refused to come to Wagah. There was slight disparity in the timings. They were present when the Indian Prime Minister went there. They received the Indian Prime Minister with utmost courtesy. A gun salute was given for the Indian Prime Minister's arrival and departure; a courtesy that is not normally extended to Prime Ministers but is reserved only for Heads of State. A gun salute was given at Wagah. And a gun salute was given at the Lahore Airport before his departure. The three Service Chiefs called on him and received him when his helicopter landed. Then they separately called on him in the Governor's House, where he was staying. They spent some time with him. There were a number of meetings. And, because of courtesy to the host country, I am not free to divulge on all aspects of the discussion. But there is one aspect which I have no difficulty in sharing with you. The Indian Prime Minister suggested to the three Chiefs — because we were very interestingly poised on that particular day in a cricket match — that when we can play cricket, hockey and other games at this level, why can't the Services play with each other? Why can't the Service have an Inter-Services Cricket or Inter-Services Hockey match. This was suggested.

सभापति महोदय, श्री यादव जी ने भोज में जो भाषण हुआ उसके बारे में कहा। सही बात है, उनके प्रधानमंत्री जी ने जम्मू-कश्मीर की बात दोहराई। उन्होंने अपनी बात कही, हमने बात कही। या तो हम तय करें बातचीत के जरिए या एक-दूसरे का खून-खराबा करें। हमने 50 साल तक एक प्रयोग कर लिया है। अपने आप में यह एक नया प्रयोग है। बातचीत के जरिए मसले हल हो। वह अपनी बात कहें, उससे हम इतना चमकें क्यों? वह अपनी बात नहीं कहेंगे तो किसकी बात कहेंगे और हम अपनी बात नहीं कहेंगे तो किसकी कहेंगे? इसीलिए

बातचीत का सिलसिला खुला है, बातचीत कीजिए। पर मैंने अपने स्टेटमेंट में जहाँ तक स्पष्ट हो सके कहा है कि बातचीत का रास्ता खुला है। इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि भारत के संविधान को हम ताक पर रख देंगे या भारत की जो मान्यताएँ हैं, उन्हें नहीं माना जाएगा या हमारे जो कमिटमेंट्स हैं, उनको हम अलग कर दें, यह संभव नहीं है। बातचीत वैसे नहीं होती है, यह तो फिर कैपिटुलेशन होता है। वह संभव नहीं है। बातचीत का रास्ता तो होना ही चाहिए।

My senior, an advocate of amity between our two countries, spoke of a no-war propaganda through media and follow-up. I will come to the other points. Yes, we raised this point. We raised the point and I am very glad that this point has come from somebody who belongs to the media and represents the media. The vehicle for propaganda is the media. If, therefore, as a politician, I were to suggest to the media to please exercise restraint, all of you would be up in arms against me and say 'who are you to tell us about the media?' of 'What should do and how should we do?' There is need for the media to exercise a great deal of restraint on issues of high sensitivity like this. I did point out, it was pointed out in the dialogue that, at some stage, we have to stop this propaganda. It is destructive. It destroys the relationship. It sometimes destroys the nations also. It has been raised. There is follow-up needed on this, through television programmes and discourses. Of course, there is follow-up needed. As regards the question as to how soon we will act, well we will act as soon as we can. I cannot, however, impart into the process an artificial pace because when I impart into it an artificial pace at times I worry whether I might not cause a burn-out.

On the no-war pact aspect—this was a point made by somebody—statements have been issued from Pakistan that unless the core issue of Jammu and Kashmir is settled, the question of nuclear weapons cannot be addressed, etc. I will not go into any dialectical assessment of what they have said or

what we have asserted. These three statements, which are a triad, speak for themselves that the leadership of Pakistan and India have managed in their wisdom to arrive at these three documents and, notwithstanding what has been stated earlier, it is definitely a movement. Is it a movement towards a no-war pact? No, Sir, not yet. It is not. Is it a movement towards no war? Yes, definitely, it is a movement. I say it is a movement not simply because you are a part of the audience. At the Lahore meeting the hon. Prime Minister said, "हम जंग नहीं होने देंगे"

This was the statement being made by the Prime Minister of India in Pakistan and he said, "हम जंग नहीं होने देंगे". To achieve that a great deal needs to be done. Yes, a great deal needs to be done. We are moving towards that. How are we moving? We are moving towards that brick upon brick. Through the process of confidence-building measures we have to achieve it.

गांधी आज़ाद साहब ने राजस्थान और सिंध के बारे में पूछा,

This is a matter of some particular interest to me more directly, because I come from the western-most district of this country. My home is not very far from Sindh. My relations are still in Sindh. In fact, one of my relatives is a member of the Pakistan National Assembly. As far as I am concerned, the opening of Rajasthan-Sindh border by rail route is a matter of very parochial interest. I cannot cite that parochial interest.

उनको हमारा सुझाव रहा कि खेकरा पार और मनावो के बीच में जो रेलवे लाईन टूटी हुई है अगर उसको सुधार दिया जाए तो यह पुराना रास्ता है जो सीधा बम्बई से करांची पहले इसी रास्ते से आया करते थे लोग — हैदराबाद सिंध के रास्ते और अगर यह खुल जाएगा तो जिन दिक्कों का जिक्र गमूवालिया साहब ने किया है की आने वाले लोगों को दिक्कत होती है, हमारे यहां से भी शादी-विवाह के लिए लोगों को सिंध जाना पड़ता था और उनको बीजा लेने के लिए देहली फिर अपने गांव

जाना पड़ता है, फिर बीजा मिलता है, देहली से अमृतसर और अमृतसर से लाहौर और लाहौर से करांची और करांची से घूमो। यह जो रास्ता 30 किलोमीटर का है वह 3 हजार किलोमीटर का हो जाता है। हमने उनको जिक्र किया है कि अगर यह खुल जाए तो सहूलियत होगी। उन्होंने आश्वासन दिया कि इस बात पर विचार करेंगे।

श्री मोहम्मद आज़म खान साहब ने कश्मीर पर मरहम की बात कही। यह सियासी फायदे के लिए नहीं उठाया है। मैं सोचता हूँ कि ऐसे कदम का वक्त आ गया था जिसे उठाना लाजमी था। बीजा के बारे में आपने बात बताई। अपने भरे वक्तव्य में देखा है, बीजा और देवल की सहूलियतें बढ़ें। यह एक ऐसा मसला है जिसमें आम राय बन गई है। उसमें और क्या-क्या कदम उठाने हैं वह फरले सैक्रेटरी लेबिल वगैरह पर उठाए जाएंगे। गमूवालिया साहब हैं नहीं, उनके सवालों का जवाब मैंने दे दिया है। एक सवाल था, भुवनेश जी ने पूछा था।

He is not here. Two of his queries need to be clarified. There were some demonstrations in Lahore. These demonstrations, to my belief, were a part of the same kind of activity that was witnessed in the killings in Jammu. They were directed at thwarting this great historical movement, a movement towards amity. It goes to their credit and it speaks of the political conviction and the courage, of which you have spoken, my dear friend, of the two Prime Ministers. These demonstrations were limited to a handful of people and were more an aspect of a manifestation of Pakistan's internal politics, a manifestation of Pakistan's own internal political turnings, rather than a manifestation of an opposition to the Indian Prime Minister's visit. Those demonstrations were not permitted to thwart the entire programme from going through. The very next morning of the demonstration, the Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, asked me to accompany him to the Minar-e-Pakistan. My friend, Shri Arun Shourie, was also present there. We went to Minar-e-Pakistan — those of you who are familiar with Lahore know — it is very close to the area where the demonstrations took place. So the persistence on the part of peace and amity did definitely pay.

Shri Malkaniji made some very substantial points about the police and visa. The Prime Minister himself raised these points. We must ease the visa provisions. More than that, we must ease the oppression of the police in the management of visa. He stated that we should move towards opening a consulate. We will do so. He also mentioned that we should have free flow of books and periodicals. There is no doubt about it. On institutionalisation, we will provide the fullest possible support on behalf of the Government just as the meetings of Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry have been institutionalised. Would the hon. Members wish to set up a forum for peace and amity of Indian and Pakistani Parliamentarians? If you take such an initiative, certainly from the Government side....

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Sir, already there is such a forum. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande is not here. A joint forum has been formed. She had taken the initiative.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, appreciate the hon. Minister.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: If you do it, we will provide all the support.

I am sorry, Sir. I should address you. Sir, if you give your blessings to such initiatives, as your servants in the MEA, we will provide all the assistance that we can in this regard.

Sir, so far as socio-cultural exchanges and celebrations are concerned, as we saw there on *Basant*, Lahore is addicted to *Patangs*. Perhaps the only other city that I know which has a greater addiction to *Patangs* is Jaipur.

AN HON. MEMBERS: Ahmedabad also.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am glad to hear that there is a competition in this regard.

Shri John F. Fernandes talked about the Shimla Agreement. He also talked about Foreign Minister's visit and invitation to the Prime Minister of Pakistan. Yes, there is an invitation. He asked, "Has any date been fixed?" My answer is, "Not yet. It will be fixed." He asked, "Did we discuss trade?" Yes, we discussed trade. He asked, "Did we discuss nuclear issues like CTBT?" Yes, we discussed that. It will be discussed in totality. I think I have covered most of the points raised by the hon. Members.

Sir, we are a part of a great movement in history. It is entirely possible because we are the participants in that movement, we are unable to stand aside from this great movement and see for ourselves the enormity, not simply of the movement but the enormity of the responsibility that has now devolved not simply upon the Government of upon the Prime Minister, but I must, in my capacity as Minister of External Affairs, say that it has devolved upon the entire political community of India. It is a challenge. I beseech the political community of India to rise to seize this movement because down this path is the path of peace, amity and friendship; that way alone, we can address ourselves jointly to poverty, want and hunger, that which has split our two countries for the last 50 years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 12.30 p.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at twenty-six minutes past seven of the clock till thirty minutes past of twelve of the clock on Saturday, the 27th February,