

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE:
The method of estimation by Planning Commission also.

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: I am coming to part (b). I will come to part (c) also. Now, part (b), Sir. As far as the employment generation is concerned, the Plan document is very clear. It is already there; the projections of employment in different sectors of agriculture, and different types of industries are already there. I don't think I have to go into those details. About part (c) that is making it compulsory through employment exchanges, at this stage we do not think it possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN- Question No. 363.

Agreement on a Treaty of Friendship and no war pact between India and Pakistan

*363. SHRI CHITTA BASU:
SHRI RAMKRISHNA
MAZUMDER:

Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 488 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 27th February, 1986 and state:

(a) the present stage of dialogue between India and Pakistan on the issue of a treaty of friendship and No War Pact; and

(b) the area of agreement and disagreement?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) and (b) Differences continue to persist on some important aspects.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Sir, may I know from the hon. Minister whether the Government have recently reviewed the different aspects of bilateral relations between India and

Pakistan—particularly we have in mind amongst others the following—namely the increasing arms acquisition by Pakistan from the United States of America, continuing arms infiltration across the border, continuing existence of the training centres in Pak-held Jammu and Kashmir and other places, and lastly the continuing anti-India campaign by Pakistan in different international forums, and if so, whether the Government have come to the conclusion that the bilateral relation between India and Pakistan has not improved "rather deteriorated in the recent years, and if so, whether the continuing stances of the Pakistan Government constitute unfriendly acts towards India?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Yes, Sir, the training camps in Pakistan of terrorists and their support to terrorists to infiltrate, particularly into Punjab and also other parts of North India—I agree with the hon. Member—do constitute unfriendly acts. Now, as far as the question of review, of bilateral relations is concerned, we maintain a constant review, a regular review of these relations and our broad objective and a long-term perspective is this that we must have good relations with Pakistan, that we must improve our relations with that country in the context of and keeping in mind, the sovereign equality of both the countries, non-interference in the internal affairs of either country and non-aggression, and, therefore, Sir, in this perspective and in this context the training of terrorists, raising of an anti-India campaign in international fora, as mentioned by the hon. Member does definitely constitute an unfriendly act and it definitely hampers our attempts at improving the relations between the two countries. In the context of the acquisition of arms by Pakistan from the United States, we have given the notice of the United States

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Chitta Basu.

tration at all levels and it is a matter of concern for us and we do concede that this money that we have to spend for defence, to safeguard integrity of this country, this money, but for the acquisition of arms by Pakistan and such similar acts, could be used for the development of our country, and, therefore, we view this with great concern.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Sir, the hon. Minister has been pleased to reply to my question as "differences continue to persist on some important aspects." Now, may I know from the hon. Minister what are those "some important aspects", and whether the Government would like to continue the dialogue on the issue of No War Pact and, therefore, of friendship in the context of these continuing difference on some important aspects.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Sir, we would definitely like to continue this dialogue because, as I have submitted earlier, we want to have the best of relations with Pakistan and, therefore, we do think that it is in the interests of the region to have a treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation. Now, Sir, as far as the question of the aspects of differences is concerned, I may put it this way. They are of two types. One is the question of bilateralism. By bilateralism I mean that we see that all the disputes between our two countries must be settled by dialogue between ourselves and ourselves alone, without the interference or intervention of any third party. The second aspect where there is a divergence of view is on the question of foreign bases. As the House is aware. It is our consistent policy not to have foreign bases anywhere. We are opposed to foreign bases anywhere. As far as we are concerned, we do not have foreign bases and we do not intend to have foreign bases and we have brought to the notice of the Pakistan administration that in the line suggested by them will have not much meaning so long as they do not give

a commitment that they will not permit their territory to be used for military bases or facilities by the great powers or any other powers. These are the main aspects where we differ out we want to have a treaty of friendship, co-operation and peace growing within the scope of the Simla Agreement and beyond.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mazumdar. absent Yes, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA: Would the hon. Minister kindly enlighten us about the public opinion in Pakistan? Has there been any review or monitoring done on behalf of the Ministry of External Affairs to find out the views of the people of Pakistan as favouring or opposed to the views of the Government? I would also like to know whether in the context of the formation of the SAARC the attitude of Pakistan with regard to bilateral relation has been known.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Sir, I have no doubt that the people of India and of Pakistan want to be friendly. They have a common cultural heritage and they want to be friendly. As far as the Governments are concerned, our Government is doing whatever is necessary and desirable in this direction. Now, it depends on the other Government also to act similarly, as I have said in reply to the earlier question.

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA: Sir, what about the SAARC?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Sir, in regard to the SAARC exercise, the first meeting at Ministerial level was actually held in Delhi and we are very much for this exercise in the regional cooperations.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: In the original reply of the hon. Minister of State as given to the House, had he been a little more forthcoming is that reply, as he is on the floor of the House, perhaps, we would have

been able to ask better supplementaries. I would like to take the opportunity to say that there might be a mistaken impression that the original reply, "that differences continue to persist in some important aspects", might have been given under an illusion, that the Foreign Office constantly suffers from, that it is a clever reply; it is a 'clever reply' bordering on an insult to Parliament.

I will come to the specific query that I have. The reply could be interpreted—the reply says "that differences continue to persist in some important aspects",—to imply that there are no areas of agreement. Therefore, I would like to seek two clarifications. Whereas you have been succinctly enough highlighted all the areas of disagreement that exist at the present moment, what are the areas of agreement on which progress has been made, firstly. And secondly, going back to terrorism, about which the hon. Minister of State made a reference, it is my understanding from the announcements made by the Government itself that lists of camps existing in Pakistan have been provided to the Government of Pakistan and whatever other details we have, have also been provided. What is the reaction of the Government of Pakistan to those lists that we have provided? And finally, has an offer been made by the Government of Pakistan for a joint Indo-Pak action against terrorism, whether in the form of bilateral treaty or under the aegis of SAARC?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO; As far as terrorists are concerned. Government of Pakistan has denied, obviously, that they are supporting them or training them. We do not accept this denial. We have evidence which we have submitted to the Government of Pakistan that they are training the terrorists, that they are having camps and that they are encouraging terrorism. However, all is not bad, though it is bad enough. There are some areas which I may also

mention in the context of the question of the hon. Member, in which some progress has been made, and progress has been made particularly within the framework of Indo-Pakistan Joint Commission. Now the significant results, if I may mention here, are, an agreement on agricultural cooperation has been signed; cultural cooperation agreement has been formulated and will be signed shortly; that booking facilities between designated railway stations in India and Pakistan have started from October 1985 and some travel facilities have been increased; in particular, businessmen and transit-visa holders will be exempted from the requirement of police reporting. Now, we do hope, more and more positive results would be coming through the Joint Commission in the days to come.

SHRI DHARAM CHANDER PRASHANT; Pakistan was not agreeing on a no-war pact but according to reports, it has changed its attitude. If so, what is the position of our Government in that respect?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO; I have already replied to this that we are all for no-war pact. Simla Agreement itself is a no-war pact. But there must be an environment. It is not merely the words alone; deeds must also go along with the words. And deeds of Pakistan Administration, particularly in the context of support to terrorists, do not go with the words that they utter regarding no-war pact.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA; Pakistan is playing a double game and following a double faceted policy. While on the one hand it is indulging in anti-India acts and hostile acts of helping terrorists, on the other hand, for consumption of world public opinion, it is talking of improving relations with India and they have even been asking for our Prime Minister's visit to Pakistan. I want to know from

the hon. Minister agree to what is the position of the visit. Has the Government of India told Pakistan clearly that it would not be possible for our Prime Minister to visit Pakistan unless it changes its policy on the question of terrorists and provide a ground work also for improving relations between the two countries?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Yes Sir. At the end of Gen. Zia's visit to New Delhi on December 17, 1985, it had been agreed that subject to concrete results having been achieved in different fields, it was to culminate in the visit of the Prime Minister to Pakistan in the first half of 1986. Unfortunately, there have been (some negative developments, which have made it difficult for the Prime Minister to visit Pakistan. Some of these developments are:—as I mentioned—Pakistan's assistance to the Sikh extremists is continuing. Secondly, the Joint Commission meeting which was to have preceded the Prime Minister's visit has not taken place as yet; Pakistan has been delaying the meeting of the two out of the four sub-commissions; Pakistan has not suggested any date for a meeting of the senior officials to discuss trade which had been agreed to during the visit of the Commerce Minister. Thirdly, while Gen. Zia said at the Delhi Airport on December 17, that Pakistan wants the Kashmir question to be resolved in accordance with the Simla Agreement, subsequent statements by Pakistani leaders, particularly, the resolution of the ruling Muslim League, have been at variance with Gen. Zia's Delhi statement. Some of the statements of the Pakistani leaders about our minorities have been unfortunate and constitute an interference in our internal affairs.

Per hectare yield of tea

*364 SHRIMATI SUDHA VIJAY JOSHI: Will the Minister of COMMERCE be pleased to state;

(a) whether it is a fact that the average per hectare yield of tea has

remained stagnant during the last 3-4 years;

(b) if so, what are the reasons therefor; and

(c) what remedial measures Government propose to take in the matter?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI BRAHM DUTT): (a) to (c) No, Sir. Average per hectare yield of tea in India has gone up from 1420 kgs. in 1982 to around 1650 kgs. in 1985.

SHRIMATI SUDHA VIJAY JOSHI: Sir, as tea is a very important item of our exports, if competitiveness in regard to prices is to be maintained, it would be necessary to ensure that our unit cost of production is as low as possible. For this purpose, a lot of research efforts in this field are necessary. In this connection, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether it is a fact that all is not well with research efforts in this regard and is it also a fact that the C&AG has made very adverse comments on the research organisation? If so, what steps Government propose to take to improve the working?

SHRI BRAHM DUTT: Sir, in fact, the achievement of India in the matter of production of tea is better than anywhere else. We are taking two types of measures, short-term measures and long-term measures and there is always scope for improvement in the research centres and in regard to activities like development and promotion.

SHRIMATI SUDHA VIJAY JOSHI: Sir, this is not the reply to my question. Anyway, I would ask my second supplementary. I would like to know from the hon. Minister the share of Indian tea in the world tea market and are our prices competitive with that of Sri Lanka?