

SHRIMATI JAYAPRADA NAHATA (ANDHRA PRADESH): Sir, I associate myself with this Special Mention.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI O. RAJAGOPAL): Sir, I would like to respond. I will bring the important issue raised by the hon. Member to the notice of the hon. Home Minister.

Restoration of Autonomy in Jammu and Kashmir

MIRZA ABDUL RASHID (Jammu and Kashmir) : I wish to invite the attention of the House to the fact that an elected Jammu and Kashmir Assembly with two-thirds majority passed a resolution for restoration of autonomy in the State and it was submitted to the Central Government. Sir, under Article 370 of the Indian Constitution, this special status has been extended only to the Jammu and Kashmir State and it cannot be equated with any other State of the country. The outright rejection of this resolution of restoration of autonomy without any deliberation has shocked not only a majority in the Assembly of the State but also 90 per cent population of the State, who acceded to India under the historical Instrument of Accession signed by late Maharaja Hari Singh of the State. This Instrument of Accession was supported and approved by the then elected Assembly of the State under the leadership of the great Sher-e-Kashmir, late Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah. Since then, the Jammu and Kashmir State is an integral part of India.

Restoration of autonomy, within the framework of the Indian Constitution, can de-escalate the escalated violence and can de-internationalise the baseless propaganda against India. This restoration of autonomy would be a befitting reply to the Pakistan-sponsored ISI nefarious designs and to the anti-India campaign of the separatist groups in the State. I urge upon the Central Government to review this issue for a discussion in the House, and a Committee of the constitutional experts from the Central Government as well as from the State Government be constituted for sorting out any objectionable clause, if any, in the Autonomy report. This is the only solution for confidence - building among the people and bringing back everlasting peace and prosperity to the State. I seek the co-operation of the House in this respect.

DR. Y. RADHAKRISHNA MURTY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the hon. Member, Shri Mirza Abdul Rashid.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, I also associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the hon. Member, Shri Mirza Abdul Rashid.

SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN (Nominated): Sir, I also associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the hon. Member.

DISCUSSION ON THE STATEMENT OF PRIME MINISTER

Recent summit-level talks held between India and Pakistan in Agra - contd

SHRI K.M. SAIFULLAH (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, with regard to the Indo-Pak Summit, there was a hot discussion in connection with its appreciation on the one side and its criticism on the other side. I would like to say that instead of appreciation and criticism of this Summit, there must be a common intention to safeguard Jammu and Kashmir. Whatever the Congress party has said, is not a wrong thing. They are also for the safety of J&K. They have pointed out some lacunae. So, I come to the conclusion that the entire House has a common intention to safeguard Jammu and Kashmir, which is part of India. Some people have appreciated the Indo-Pak Summit at Agra, some have criticised it. Whatever it may be, it was not that the Prime Minister or the Government of India had requested General Musharraf to pay a visit to India. He voluntarily came here. When he volunteered himself to come to India, the Government hesitated to some extent whether to invite him or not when terrorism is still existing. Finally, it looks that the Prime Minister was compelled to invite General Musharraf in order to send a message to the whole world that the Indians are not against the reformative theory. We not only stick to the deterrent theory but also ready to accept the reformative theory. There was nothing wrong in inviting him. The Prime Minister, on behalf of the Government of India, has invited General Musharraf with a bonafide intention. But General Musharraf has come here with a malafide intention for the Agra visit and other visits and has gone away after instigating the terrorists here. I would like to refer to what General Musharraf has said in India. He said: "It is not a dispute. It is a freedom struggle," and immediately he said, "let us forget it. It is not a post-mortem." When you say it is not a post mortem, you are not supposed to mention the earlier thing. He has gone a little further and said: "We are remembering Bangladesh. India has interfered in the internal matters of Bangladesh and supported them. We are hurt." That goes to show that he is still vindictive. He is not for a compromise. But we have