12. Grant-in-aid to Orissa Agro Industries Corporation for Dehyderation, Pickling and Canning of Mushroom grown in the nearby areas. Rs. 21,14,940 Grant-in-aid to Government of Himachal Pradesh for assistance in mushroom 13. processing sector the Lahoul Potato Growers Cooperative Marketing-cum-Processing Society Ltd. Rs. 19.00 lakhs Grant-in-aid to Government of Karnataka, for Marketing assistance to the 14. Shimoga District Industry Supply & Marketing Society and the Chickmagalur District Industry Supply and Marketing Society. Rs. 2.20 lakhs Sanction to Orissa Agro Industries Corporation Ltd., for establishing a grown 15. centre-cum-nursery for Mango and Orange Planting material for meeting the raw material requirements of fruit processing unit at Jeerang and Ganjam district. Rs. 18.50 lakhs Sanction to Madhya Pradesh State Agro, Industries Corporation Ltd., as Equity 16. Capital for setting up/strengthening of fruit and Vegetable processing plant at Babai, district Hoshangabad. Rs. 45.00 lakhs Sanction to Kerala Agro Industries Corporation Ltd., as Equity Capital for setting 17. up and strengthening of fruit and Vegetable processing unit near Kochi. Rs. 6.375 lakhs Sanction to Haryana Agro Industries Corporation Ltd., as Equity Capital for 18. modernisation of fruit and Vegetable processing Plant at Murthal (Haryana). Rs. 65.38 lakhs Sanction to Orissa Agro Industries Corporation Ltd., to incurr an expenditure 19. towards advertising and publicity of Mushroom Production. Rs. 47,000 TOTAL Rs. 214.38 lakhs

## STATEMENT-IV

Number of new agro-based units established in SSI Sector

SI. No.	Name of State/UT		<b>1986-</b> 87	1987-88	1 <b>988-8</b> 9
1.	Andhra Pradesh	·	4898	4638	6952
2.	Assam		324	254	361
3.	Bihar		1336	1316	1275
4.	Gujarat		975	1175	1108
5.	Haryana		1280	864	802
6.	Himachal Pradesh		972	512	544
7.	Jammu & Kashmir		156	163	127
8.	Karnataka		2835	2014	1954
<b>P</b> 3.	Kerala		2267	3173	3471
10.	Madhya Pradesh		2359	2016	1747
11.	Maharashtra		3306	2620	2350
12.	Manipur		71	34	65
13.	Meghalaya		35	68	170
14.	Nagaland		339	345	429
15.	Orissa		17609	26115	21567
16.	Punjab		878	1052	1053
17.	Rajasthan		644	523	407
18.	Sikkim		29	8	19
19.	Tamil Nadu		1299	2554	2594
20	Tripura		165	133	118
21.	Uttar Pradesh		7185	7287	8176
22.	West Bengal		7772	8153	8508
23.	Andaman & Nicobar		15	12	7
24.	Arunachal Pradesh		44	26	27
25.	Chandigarh		2	1	3
26.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli		2	4	2
27.	Goa		5	5	87
28.	Mizoram		40	11	8
29.	Pondicherry		40	41	46
		TOTAL	56882	65147	63977

## Telecom gateway facility to calcutta

\*520. SHRI SUDHIR GIRI: Will the Minister of COMMUNICATIONS be pleased to state: (a) the places in the country where the latest international telecommunication services have been provided; and

(b) the reasons for not providing telecom gateway facility to Calcutta?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI RAJESH PILOT): (a) Sir, the international telecommunication services are provided by Videsh Sanchar Nigam Limited (VSNL) from Four Gateway exchanges in India at Bombay, New Delhi, Madras and Calcutta.

International Subscriber Dialled (ISD) Telephone service is available to telephone users with \$TD facility from over 1100 cities/towns in the country to 210 countries in the world. International Telex Service (IXSD) is available to 214 countries and is accessible to all the telex subscribers in the Indian telex network. International Telegraph facility is available to nearly the whole world from all the public telegraph offices in the country.

(b) The question does not arise. The International gateway telephone exchange at Calcutta is already operational since 3rd June, 1991.

## Statement on J&k in House of Commons

\*521. SHRI RABI RAY: Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether a statement on Jammu and Kashmir was made recently in the House of Commons by the Under Secretary for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the UK: and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

MINISTER THE OF **EXTERNAL** AFFAIRS (SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI) (a) and (b) The Parliamentary under Secretary for Foreign and Commonwelath Affairs of the UK. Mr. Mark Lennox-Boyd had made а Statement on Kashmir in the course of a debate in the House of Commons of Pakistan and Kashmir on 25th July 1991. The text of the statement is attached.

## STATEMENT

I note carefully what my hon. Friend said about Kashmir. We share his concern, that of the House and many other people in this country about the situation in Kashmir, not least the tension that it has caused between India and Pakistan, both good friends of Britain and concerns that have been expressed about human rights.

I assure the House that, far from sitting on the fence and ignoring the problems of Kashmir, we have been active in encouraging India and Pakistan to find a peaceful solution to the dispute. Both sides have appreciated our efforts. We welcome, in particular, efforts being made by India and Pakistan to reduce tension and reach agreement on various confidence-building measures through a series of regular talks between their senior foreign affairs officials. That is a process which we earnestly encouraged both sides to pursue in spring 1990. Both bilaterally and with our European Community partners, we have reiterated our concerns about tension between India and Pakistan, about the activities of terrorist groups and those who support them and about human rights abuses.

We are aware of Indian claims, and Pakistani denials, that Kashmin extremists are receiving support from Pakistan with training and supply of weapons. We have indicated to the Pakistan Government the concern that it would cause in Britain if official support were to be given.

My hon. Friend referred to some of the historical background to the Kashmir problem and to the United Nations resolutions on Kashmir in 1948 and 1949. Those resolutions, which were agreed to by India and Pakistan and supported by Britain, envisaged troop withdrawals on both sides and a plebiscite under United Nations auspices of all the inhabitants of the former princely state of Jammu and Kashmir on whether to accede to India or Pakistan. non-implementation of the resolutions was due, at least partly, to the failure of both sides to implement the provision on troop withdrawals.

Pakistan maintains that the status of Kashmir can be decided only by a plebiscite in line with United Nations resolutions. We believe that it is for India and Pakistan to decide how to resolve their dispute over Kashmir, one element of which involves disagreement over whether Kashmiries have been able to express their wishes fully already. or