

16.16 hrs.

Title: Further discussion on the recent summit-level held between India and Pakistan in Agra moved by Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav on the 24th July, 2001.(contd.)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI (RAIGANJ): Sir, in this discussion today, may I know at what time the Minister of External Affairs will intervene? We have a large number of speakers in the list. We may reduce that. We would like to know from the Treasury Benches at what time the Minister of External Affairs will intervene in the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: There are seven speakers and his name has been listed at serial number eight.

DR. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (SOUTH DELHI): Sir, the time was fixed according to the strength of the parties. If the time has already been taken, then the speakers should not be permitted to speak. Otherwise, the speakers would like to speak, but it should be according to the time that has been fixed.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Sir, we would like to know whether the Minister of External Affairs will intervene in the debate today or not.

MR. SPEAKER: We are well within the time. Maybe, around 5.30 p.m., the hon. Minister may intervene. Now, I give the floor to Shri Ali Mohd. Naik.

1617 hrs.

श्री अली मोहम्मद नायक (अनंतनाग) : ज़नाब स्पीकर साहब, जम्मू-कश्मीर के लोगों का जहां तक ताल्लुक है, वे वज़ीरे आज़म की उन कोशिशों की सराहना करते हैं जिनके द्वारा हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच दोस्ताना ताल्लुकात बनाने और भाईचारा बढ़ाने की कोशिशें की जा रही हैं। जम्मू-कश्मीर के लोग अमन के हक में हैं और वे इसलिए भी अमन के हक में हैं क्योंकि रियासते जम्मू-कश्मीर में रोजाना बेगुनाह लोग मारे जा रहे हैं और जो मिलिटेंट्स हैं उन्होंने रियासत के अंदर पिछले 10 वर्षों में जो बेसिक स्ट्रक्चर है, उसको डिस्ट्रॉय कर दिया है।

1618 hrs.

(डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह पीठासीन हुए)

उसके अलावा हमारे दो लाख कश्मीरी पंडित, हमारे हिन्दू भाई अपना वतन छोड़ने पर मजबूर हुए हैं। न केवल कश्मीरी पंडित, हिन्दू भाई बल्कि सिख और मुसलमान भी लाखों की तादाद में कश्मीर से बाहर आने के लिए मजबूर हुए हैं इसलिए कि उनकी जान और इज्जत को खतरा दिखाई दे रहा था। वे लोग अपने ही मुल्क में मुहाजिर हैं या रिफ्यूजी बनकर रह गए हैं।

स्पीकर साहब, तीसरी बात यह है कि जो हालात रियासते जम्मू-कश्मीर में चल रहे हैं उनमें मुकम्मल डिवेलपमेंट मुमकिन नहीं है। इसलिए रियासते जम्मू-कश्मीर के लोगों की बहुत बड़ी ख्वाहिश है कि पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान में अमन और दोस्ती कायम हो ताकि हम इज्जत और आबरू को सुरक्षित रख कर रियासत के अंदर अपनी गुजर-बसर कर सकें। जब मिलिटेंट्स की बात आती है, तो हिन्दू और मुसलमान की बात कही जाती है। मैं मुकद्दस ऐवान से गुजारिश करूंगा कि इन्नोसेंट किलिंग्स को आप हिन्दू और मुसलमान का सवाल न बनाएं।

मैं होम मिनिस्टर साहब से गुजारिश करूंगा कि वे यह बता दें कि पिछले दस सालों में रियासत के अन्दर कितने हिन्दू-मुसलमान मिलिटेंट्स ने मारे। वहां हिन्दू भी मरे हैं, सिक्ख भी मरे हैं, जो यात्रा पर गए, वे भी मरे हैं या उनके साथ जो मुसलमान मजदूर थे, उनको भी मारा है। मिलिटेंट्स के पास मजहबी लिहाज नहीं है, वे हर आदमी को मारते हैं, जो लगता है कि हिन्दुस्तानी है, चाहे वह हिन्दू हो, चाहे मुसलमान हो। अभी अमरनाथ यात्रा पर यात्रियों को मारा गया, हम पुरजोर शब्दों में मजम्मत करते हैं। हम यह मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान का मुसलमान इस्लाम नहीं जानता है, हम यह मानने को तैयार नहीं कि पाकिस्तान जेहाद कर रहा है। हमको जेहाद के मायने पता है, हम को यह भी पता है कि इस्लाम क्या है। इस्लाम कहता है कि बेगुनाह को मारना निहायत ही जुर्म है। जो कुछ इस्लाम में किया जा रहा है, इसके इस्लाम का नाम देकर इस्लाम को बदनाम किया जा रहा है। मजहबी दहशत पैदा करके मुल्क में अपने लोगों को मारा जा रहा है, बेगुनाह लोगों को मारा जा रहा है और इसको आजादी की लड़ाई का नाम दे दिया जाए। कौन सी आजादी, कैसा आजादी, आजादी तो हमें 15 अगस्त को मिली। हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हुआ, पाकिस्तान आजाद हुआ, हम आजाद हुए और 15 अगस्त के बाद जम्मू-काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान के साथ गया, उस समय हिन्दुस्तान में दो पोलिटिकल पार्टियाँ थीं, कांग्रेस और मुस्लिम लीग। मुस्लिम लीग हिमायत करता था कि जो राजा-महाराजा करेंगे, वह हमको मन्जूर हैं, लेकिन कांग्रेस का यह नजरिया था कि जो लोग करेंगे, वही मन्जूर है। इसलिए जम्मू-काश्मीर में नेशनल कान्फ्रेंस का कांग्रेस के साथ नजदीक का रिश्ता रहा। हमारे ख्यालात, जजबात एक जैसे थे और यही वजह है कि पं. जवाहरलाल नेहरू को जम्मू-काश्मीर के महाराजा ने कोहाला ब्रिज पर गिरफ्तार किया। यह तारीकी हकीकत है, इनको भुलाया नहीं जा सकता है। महाराजा ने हिन्दुस्तान के साथ जाने का फ़ैसला किया, जो पाकिस्तान के नजरिए के खिलाफ था, तो उनको मिर्चे क्यों लगती है। मैं सरकार से गुजारिश करूंगा कि आपकी जो पालिसी है, वह काश्मीर के बारे में कन्सिस्टेंट पालिसी होनी चाहिए। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए कि शाम को एक पालिसी, सुबह दूसरी और तीसरे दिन तीसरी, ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए। अगर मिलिटेंसी का मुकाबला करना है, तो इसको हिन्दू-मुसलमान का सवाल मत बनाइए। परसों दूरदर्शन पर मैं न्यूज सुनकर हैरान हुआ, काश्मीर में 13 यात्रियों को मारा गया, लेकिन उसने यह नहीं बताया कि मरने वालों में सात हिन्दू थे या पांच यात्री थे या एक जम्मू स्टेट का हिन्दू था। अगर इस तरह की खबर लोगों के सामने आती, मुल्क के सामने आती, तो लोगों को असली बात का बता लगता कि सिर्फ हिन्दू ही नहीं मारा जा रहा है, मुसलमान भी मारा जा रहा है। जम्मू-काश्मीर में हिन्दू भी मर रहा है, यह पता होना चाहिए। पाकिस्तान की पालिसी यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान में हिन्दुओं को मार कर, जम्मू-काश्मीर से हिन्दुओं को निकाला जाए। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वहां से हिन्दुओं को निकालना उनकी साजिश है, उनकी सोच है। हमें इसका मुकाबला हिन्दू-मुसलमान के नाम से नहीं करना है, बल्कि इसका मुकाबला सब हिन्दुस्तानियों ने मिलकर, चाहे वह इधर है या उधर है, सबने मिलकर करना है। काश्मीर में जब हिन्दू मरता है, तो सोनिया जी तशरीफ ले जाती हैं, कांग्रेस का डैलीगेशन जाता है, सरकार का डैलीगेशन जाता है, मैं इसको एप्रीशिएट करता हूँ। हमारे जाने से मरने वाले जिन्दा नहीं हो जायेंगे, लेकिन उन लोगों को लगेगा कि सारा हिन्दुस्तान हमारे पीछे खड़ा है। लेकिन मैं इस एवान से एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ।

1625 hrs.

(श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव पीठासीन हुए)

राजौरी में 15 मुसलमान बकरवालो को मिलिटेंट ने मारा, गर्दन काटी, फिर मकानों को आग लगा दी तो क्या इस ऐवान का कोई मुअज्जीस मेम्बर उसे देखने गया, कोई नहीं गया। **What signal are you giving to Kashmiri Muslims?** जिसकी वहां मेजोरिटी है, उसे आपने क्या सिगनल दिया? उसके बाद फिर राजौरी में मुसलमान मारे तो कौन गया? इस ऐवान का कोई मेम्बर नहीं गया। अलबत्ता बाद में अखबारों में खबर आई- आईजी, एमओएफ होम, मुझे उनका पूरा नाम याद नहीं। वह आठ दिनों के बाद तशरीफ ले गए। **What signal you want to convey to the Muslims of Kashmir?** खुदा के लिए आप इसे हिन्दू-मुसलमान का सवाल न बनाइए। मैं इसे कंसीस्टेंट पॉलिसी क्यों कहता हूँ। उन्होंने हुर्रियत वालों को बुलाया। प्रधान मंत्री जी और राष्ट्रपति जी ने मुशर्रफ के आने पर खाना दिया। आपने जम्मू-कश्मीर में जो हिन्दू-मुसलमान हैं उन्हें नहीं बुलाया। वहां कांग्रेस के बड़े-बड़े लोग हैं, जो गवर्नर भी रहे हैं और सेंटर में मिनिस्टर भी रहे हैं- गुलाम रसूलकार, सैयद मीर कासिम, शबीर कुरेशी गवर्नर रहे हैं, क्या आपने उन्हें खाने पर बुलाया? पाकिस्तान को पता लगता कि कश्मीर में मुसलमान कहां खड़े हैं। आपने मुझे नहीं बुलाया। **You called somebody but not me who is the representative of Jammu and Kashmir.** मौलाना इफ्तिखार हैं। हमारे मौलवी हैं, जो प्रो इंडिया हैं, जिनके पीछे लाखों लोगों की तादाद खड़ी है आपने उन्हें नहीं बुलाया। आपने केवल उन्हीं कश्मीरी पंडित को बुलाया जो कश्मीरी पंडितों के लिये अलग होम लैंड चाहता है, कश्मीर को तोड़ने की बात करते हैं। जनता दल के, कम्युनिस्टों के मुसलमान हैं, जो असेम्बलियों के मेम्बर हैं, आपने उन्हें नहीं बुलाया। आप पाकिस्तान को क्या सिगनल देना चाहते हैं? अगर आपने बुलाया होता तो हर टेबल पर कश्मीरी मुसलमान पाकिस्तान के साथ बैठता और हम उन्हें बता देते कि तुम कौन सा जेहाद चला रहे हो, हमें ये जेहाद मंजूर नहीं, इसे अपने पास रखो। आप लोगों को धोखा दे रहे हो। आप हुर्रियत के साथ बात करते। आप कभी कहते हो कि हुर्रियत ही सब कुछ है और कभी कहते हो कि वह कुछ नहीं। आपने हुर्रियत को पाकिस्तान भेजने की तैयारी भी की, पासपोर्ट इश्यु कराया। अगर वे गए होते, आप कहते हैं कि नहीं जाएंगे। हम इसके खिलाफ नहीं हैं। आप हरेक से बात करिए। कश्मीर में उन्हें घुसाने में हमें कोई नाराजगी नहीं है, लेकिन आपकी हुर्रियत से क्या बात हुई? वे कहते हैं कि कश्मीर को हिन्दुस्तान से निकाल कर पाकिस्तान ले जाओ। आप उन्हें पाकिस्तान भेजना चाहते हैं, क्यों? जम्मू-कश्मीर रियासत की ट्राइफरकेशन का एक नारा चलता है - जम्मू-कश्मीर को तीन हिस्सों में तकसीम करो- बौद्ध-लद्दाख, मुसलमान-कश्मीर, हिन्दू-जम्मू। कुछ पोलिटिकल पार्टी के लोग यहां भी बैठे हैं। यहां भी उनके लोकल यूनिट आज इसका सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं। लद्दाख-जम्मू को अलग कर रहे हैं। **Then, what right do you have to keep the Muslim majority area of Kashmir? Are you playing the game of Pakistan? You are playing the game of two-nation theory.** आप ट्राइफरकेशन कैसे कहते हैं? अगर आप ट्राइफरकेशन कहते हैं तो जम्मू में छः जिले हैं। तीन जिले मुस्लिम मेजोरिटी के हैं, आपको वे तीनों जिले छोड़ने पड़ेंगे। क्या आप डिवीजन करने जा रहे हैं?

मेरी गुजारिश है कि आपकी एक कंसीस्टेंट पॉलिसी होनी चाहिए। जितनी पोलिटिकल पार्टियां हैं उन सब ने प्रधान मंत्री जी को पूरा सपोर्ट दिया कि वह मुशर्रफ से बात करें। जब उन्होंने बात की तो सब पार्टियां थीं, मैं भी था। हमने कहा कि आप बात चालू रखें। अगर हमने प्रधान मंत्री जी को यह आथोरिटी दी तो फिर इस हाउस में किस बात पर डिसकशन हो रहा है। मैं खुश हूँ कि कोई ज्वाइंट कम्युनिके इश्यु नहीं होता, क्योंकि जब भी कोई ज्वाइंट कम्युनिके इश्यु होता है तो कश्मीर का आधा हिस्सा, कोई न कोई हिस्सा पाकिस्तान को दिया जाता है।

शुक्र है वह इश्यु ही नहीं हुआ और हम कुछ और देने से बच गये। लेकिन पाकिस्तान-हिन्दुस्तान की बात हुई तो किसको फायदा हुआ। उनको फायदा हुआ जो अमन चाहते हैं, जो दोनों देशों में दोस्ती चाहते हैं। आप पाकिस्तान से बात करने जा रहे हैं लेकिन आप कश्मीरियों से बात क्यों नहीं करते हैं? आपको जम्मू-कश्मीर के लोगों से बात करनी चाहिए, उनका एतराम आपको करना चाहिए।

इस 50 साल के अर्से में कश्मीर में जो एलीनेशन हुआ, यह किसने कराया? **Why are people alienated? I am not alienated. Why should people feel alienated?** आपने जम्मू-कश्मीर में जम्हूरियत को पनपने नहीं दिया। आपने वहां के वजीरे-आज़म, जिसको असेम्बली में अक्सीरियत हासिल थी, आधी रात में अंधेरे में पकड़ लिया और सुबह आर्डर निकाला, उसको डिसमिस किया और 22 साल जेल में रखा। बाद में बख्शी साहब को लाए। उसको भी डिसमिस किया, उसको भी जेल में डाला। फिर शेख साहब को दुबारा लाए। उनसे एग्रीमेंट हुआ। फिर 6 महीने के बाद वोट ऑफ नो कॉन्फिडेंस हुआ। शेख साहब ने इलेक्शन लड़ा। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि 1953 के बाद कश्मीर में मोरार जी देसाई जी ने सबसे बड़ा ईमानदाराना इलेक्शन कराया और उस इलेक्शन में जितने लीडर आज बने घूमते हैं इनका नामोनिशान ही मिट गया था, किसी ने उनका साथ नहीं दिया था, सबने नेशनल कांफ्रेंस का साथ दिया। आपने फारूख अब्दुल्ला को दो बार डिसमिस कर दिया। आज फिर आवाज़ उठती है कि फारूख साहब को डिसमिस करो। क्या उनके डिसमिसल से कश्मीर का मसला हल हो जाएगा। और मिलिटेंसी खत्म हो जायेगी तो मैं खुद उनको इसका मशविरा दूंगा। कभी कहते हैं कि होम-मिनिस्टर इस्तीफा दो। अगर उनके इस्तीफे से मसला हल होता है, मिलिटेंसी खत्म होती है तो मुझे उनके इस्तीफे पर कोई एतराम नहीं है।

तीसरी बात यह है कि आप पाकिस्तान के लोगों से बात करना चाहते हैं तो कश्मीरी लोगों से बात क्यों नहीं करना चाहते? हमारे अहसासात को देखें। यह कश्मीरियों के दिल की बात है जो मैं इस एवान में रखना चाहता हूँ। आपने कश्मीर में जम्हूरियत को पनपने नहीं दिया। आपने वहां की आर्थिक तरक्की नहीं की, बेरोजगारों को रोजगार नहीं दिया। आप देखें कि इन 50 सालों में आपने कितने मुसलमानों को सेंट्रल सर्विसेज में नौकरी दी। आपने उनको बिल्कुल नजरअंदाज कर दिया। मेरा कहना है कि आप उनको अपनी छाती से लगा लीजिए, वे आपके हैं। आप कश्मीरियों की आर्थिक तरक्की कीजिए, एम्प्लॉयमेंट दीजिए। आप हमको पैसा देते हैं और वह तब देते हैं जब सीज़न खत्म हो जाता है। आपने पैसा रिलीज़ कर दिया, अब वहां बर्फ होगी तो काम नहीं होगा। ऐसा कैसे चलेगा? प्लॉन सेंक्शन होता है तो चौथे दिन चिट्ठी पहुंच जाती है कि इतना रुपया कट गया। ऐसे नहीं होना चाहिए। यह मेरे और कश्मीरियों के दिल की बात है। मैं सबसे गुजारिश करता हूँ कि आपको कश्मीरियों के जो इश्यूज हैं उनको समझना चाहिए। जब हम आपके साथ आए तो आपने उसे कुछ गारंटीज दीं। आपने उसे इंटरनल एटानॉमी दी। बाद में आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता उसको खा गये। क्यों खा गये? आज होम-मिनिस्टर साहब कहते हैं कि जब हम स्टेटों को उनका हिस्सा देंगे, उस समय कश्मीर के बारे में भी सोचेंगे, कश्मीर के बारे में सैपरेट क्यों सोचेंगे? बाकी स्टेट हिन्दुस्तान के साथ मुदगम (मर्ज) हो गये, हम मुदगम(मर्ज) नहीं हुए। **We had acceded with India on an Agreement.**

हमने आपको तीन चीजें दी हैं। तीन चीजों के बाद बाकी चीजें हमने अपने पास रखीं है तो आपको क्या तकलीफ है यदि वे हमारे पास हैं। आप कहते हैं कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट जुरिसडिक्शन, इलैक्शन कमीशन जुरिसडिक्शन और उसके बाद बाकी जुरिसडिक्शन्स कश्मीरियों को सूट नहीं करती हैं। **It is to be decided by us whether it suits us or not. Let us be allowed to have our say.**

बात यह है कि आप हुर्रियत से बात करना चाहते हैं जो कश्मीर को हिन्दुस्तान से निकालना चाहता है। आप जेकेएलएफ से बात करना चाहते हैं जो आजादी की बात करता है। आप नेशनल कांफ्रेंस को इग्नोर करना चाहते हैं जो जम्मू-कश्मीर को हिन्दुस्तान में रखना चाहता है। हमने इलैक्शन लड़ा। हमने इलैक्शन में वहां के लोगों से साफ कहा कि हम इंटरनल ऑटोनॉमी दिलाएंगे। कश्मीर पाकिस्तान में नहीं जाएगा। हम उस नारे को लड़ कर यहां आए। आप दफ्तर में बैठ कर कहते हैं कि हमें आपकी बात मंजूर नहीं। **You discuss it with us. If they say anything that is against the interest of the country, then throw these suggestions into the ocean, if they say all the things that are for the interests and unity of this country, then why do you not agree to that?** आप इसे क्यों नहीं मानेंगे? आपको यह बात माननी चाहिए। आपको ऐसी कोशिश करनी चाहिए जिससे कश्मीरियों को लगे कि हमें अपनी छाती से ये लोग लगाने के लिए तैयार हैं। आज वहां मिलिटेंसी है। वहां सिक्योरिटी फोर्सिज काम कर रही है लेकिन वे बड़ी ज्यादाती करते हैं। **Kindly start this exercise.** वहां बेगुनाह लोगों को मारा जाता है। आज आप शोर कर रहे हैं। सिक्योरिटी फोर्सिज ने अनन्तनाग में 5-6 मुसलमानों को यह

कह कर मारा कि वे मिलिटेंट्स थे लेकिन जब पता लगा कि वे मिलिटेंट्स नहीं थे तो आपने उनके खिलाफ क्या एक्शन लिया जबकि कुछ मामलों में हाई कोर्ट की यह डायरेक्शन है कि उन अफसरों को पेश किया जाए लेकिन आपने किसी अफसर को पेश नहीं किया। इससे एक-आध अफसर बेइज्जत हो सकता है लेकिन कश्मीर के जहन में यह बात आएगी कि इतने बड़े मुल्क में हमें इन्साफ मिला। आप कश्मीरियों को यह यकीन दिलाइए कि आपको इस मुल्क में इन्साफ मिलेगा। इससे वे लोग बाहर कहीं नहीं जाएंगे चाहे 50 बार पाकिस्तान हमारे खिलाफ लड़े। इस चीज को आप देखिए। शाम के समय वहां से लोग गायब हो जाते हैं। उन्हें उठा लिया जाता है। फिर उनका कोई अता-पता नहीं चलता। ये चीजें बंद होनी चाहिए।

मैंने जैसा पहले कहा कि आप हमें एक पैकेज दें और हमारे मसले हल करें। वहां इन्वोर्सेंट किलिंग बिल्कुल बंद होनी चाहिए। सिक्कोरिटी फोर्सिंग मिलिटेंट्स से निपटे और उन्हें पनाह देने वालों के साथ निपटे। **Innocent people should not be harassed in any case** क्योंकि इससे बड़ी दिक्कत होती है। आप हमें लड़ने के लिए हथियार दीजिए। आप हमें हथियार नहीं देंगे तो हम कैसे लड़ेंगे? मेरी गुजारिश है कि आप कश्मीरियों के दिलों की आवाज को समझिए और सुनिए। दोनों तरफ के लोगों से मेरी गुजारिश है कि कश्मीर में दो लाख कश्मीरी पंडितों का होमलैंड कायम करने का जो नारा चला है, आप इसका साथ बिल्कुल न दें। **This is division within division. Nobody wants it.** कश्मीरी पंडित हमारे देश के पार्ट एंड पार्सल हैं। वह हमारे खून और गोश्त का हिस्सा हैं। यदि आप पाकिस्तान की चाल को डीफिट करना चाहते हैं तो आप कश्मीर से निकले हिन्दुओं को एडवाइज करिए कि वे वापस आ जाएं। यदि वहां 10 लोग मर रहे हैं तो वे मुल्क के लिए मर रहे हैं। मैं होम मिनिस्टर से पूछना चाहूंगा कि वह बताएं कि

कितने मुसलमान कश्मीर में मारे गए? क्या वे इसलिए मर गए क्योंकि वे हिन्दुस्तानी हैं। हमारे एक दर्जन एक्स एमएलए मारे गए, हमारा एक मिनिस्टर मारा गया। उन्हें कौन देखने आया? हम नहीं चाहते कि आप से इसके लिए पैसा मिले। इससे एक यूनिटी दिखाई देती है कि मुल्क हमारे पीछे खड़ा है। प्राइम मिनिस्टर की अमन की कोशिशों का मैं साथ देता हूं। मैं अपनी तरफ से, अपनी पार्टी जम्मू-कश्मीर नेशनल कांफ्रेंस की तरफ से शुक्रिया अदा करता हूं।

श्री हन्नान मोल्लाह (उलूबेरिया) : सभापति महोदय, अभी अभी खबर मिली है कि जबलपुर शस्त्रागार में भारी अग्निकांड हुआ है जिसमें काफी नुकसान हुआ है। इस सरकार के आने के बाद पिछले कुछ महीनों में यह सातवीं घटना घटी है। इस अग्निकांड से करोड़ों रुपये का नुकसान हुआ है। डिफेंस मिनिस्टर यहां बैठे हुये हैं, वे जवाब दें कि यदि इस प्रकार रोज़ आग लगती रही तो देश की सुरक्षा का क्या होगा?

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह (महाराजगंज, उ.प्र.) : सभापति महोदय, यह रक्षा से जुड़ा हुआ मामला है।

सभापति महोदय : आप अपना स्थान ग्रहण कीजिये।

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह : सभापति महोदय, यह बहुत ही गम्भीर मामला है। देश की सुरक्षा का सवाल है। (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : माननीय सदस्य को ज्ञात होगा कि किसी भी बात को उठाने का कोई नियम होता है।

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): Since the Minister of Defence happens to be in the House, he should apprise the House of the position....(Interruptions)

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह : सभापति महोदय, माननीय गृह मंत्री जी ने स्वतंत्रता संग्राम सेनानियों के सम्मेलन में खुद कहा था कि देश की सुरक्षा को खतरा है। इस गंभीर घटना के घटित होने से देश की आंतरिक सुरक्षा को खतरा पैदा हो गया है। आप रक्षा मंत्री जी को निर्देश दें कि सदन में अपना वक्तव्य दें। वे सदन को वस्तुस्थिति से अवगत करें।

सभापति महोदय : आपको मालूम है कि सदन का यह नियम है कि बिना नोटिस दिये कोई बात नहीं उठायी जा सकती। आपने इस बारे में कोई नोटिस नहीं दिया है।

(व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : आखिर इस तरह कैसे होगा? सरकार को सदन में जानकारी देने के लिये समय चाहिये और वह तभी वस्तुस्थिति से अवगत करा सकती है।

श्री बसुदेव आचार्य : सभापति जी, रक्षा मंत्री सदन में मौजूद हैं। वे बता सकते हैं कि वहां क्या हुआ?

डॉ. गिरिजा व्यास (उदयपुर) : सभापति महोदय, स्टेटमेंट बाद में आ सकता है। वे बता तो सकते हैं।

सभापति महोदय : आप कृपया अपना स्थान ग्रहण करें। सरकार जानकारी प्राप्त करने के बाद ही सदन में आयेगी।

(व्यवधान)

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHARY (BERHAMPORE, WEST BENGAL): I would like to know whether the Minister is at least aware of it or not....(Interruptions)

SHRI E. M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN (SIVAGANGA): The Government should make a statement....(Interruptions)

सभापति महोदय : आप लोग अपना अपना स्थान ग्रहण करें। सरकार जानकारी प्राप्त करके ही सदन में आ सकती है।

डॉ. गिरिजा व्यास : सभापति जी, ऐसा नहीं हो सकता कि रक्षा मंत्री जी को इसकी जानकारी न हो। वे चुप बैठे हुये हैं।

सभापति महोदय : आप सदन में गलत परिपाटी मत डालिये। आप पुराने सदस्य हैं। आचार्य जी, आप बैठ जायें।

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह : सभापति जी, माननीय मंत्री जी इतना ही कह दें कि तथ्यों की जानकारी प्राप्त कर सदन के सामने रखेंगे।

सभापति महोदय : माननीय सदस्य को मालूम है कि यहां कार्य संचालन नियमावली है जिसके तहत सरकार जानकारी प्राप्त करके सदन में आयेगी।

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह : सभापति जी, जब माननीय सदस्य को इस घटना की जानकारी हो गई है तो मंत्री जी को निश्चित तौर पर जानकारी प्राप्त हो चुकी होगी। जहां तक तथ्यों की जानकारी प्राप्त करने का सवाल है, हम उससे सहमत हैं लेकिन वे कह दें कि कल तथ्यों के साथ इस सदन में आयेंगे।

लेकिन मंत्री जी कम से कम सदन को आश्वस्त करें कि इस घटना से संबंधित तथ्यों को वह बाद में सदन को बतायेंगे। **â€¦**(व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : अखिलेश जी आप बैठिये।

विदेश मंत्री तथा रक्षा मंत्री (श्री जसवन्त सिंह) : सभापति जी, माननीय सदस्यों की यह मांग कि अभी जो घटना घटी है, सदन को उसकी पूरी जानकारी दी जाए, यह उचित मांग है और माननीय सदस्यों का अधिकार भी है। मैं इतना ही निवेदन करूंगा कि सदन के सामने सरकार की ओर से जब अधिकृत रूप से बयान दूं तो वह तथ्यों पर आधारित बयान दूं, सब तथ्य इकट्ठे करके बयान दूं। मुझे विश्वास है कि माननीय सदस्य अवश्य इस बात को मानेंगे कि जहां तक जायज है चाहे वह विदेश मंत्रालय हो या रक्षा मंत्रालय हो, जब-जब कोई घटना हमारे मंत्रालयों से संबंधित हुई है, हमने सदन में आकर स्वतः बयान देने में कोई कोताही नहीं बरती है। मेरा इतना ही निवेदन है कि मैं जो बयान दूं वह तथ्यों पर आधारित बयान दूं।

SHRI R.L. BHATIA (AMRITSAR): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the previous speaker, Shri Naik, in most of the part of his speech, was saying that so many Hindus have died and that so many Muslims have died. I want to assure him that any person who died in Kashmir was an Indian. It is not the question before us whether he was a Hindu or a Muslim. That is why, we are defending Kashmir for the last 50 years. He raised one more question which he should have asked the Government as his Party is also in the NDA. He has said that Shri Abdullah is our elected leader and that he is our leader in Kashmir. He should have been fully associated with the talks. He should also have been included in the delegation which the Prime Minister took to Agra. It is because he represents Kashmir. Kashmir is not represented by Hurriyat. He should have been fully associated. But Hurriyat has suddenly become very important. But they represent nobody. They represent only Pakistan. But the Press as well as the Government is trying to talk to them. The Government is sending Shri Pant to them. You are giving them importance. They are nobody. They should not be recognised. The only person in Kashmir who should be recognised is Shri Abdullah.

Sir, Agra Summit was a very important Summit in which Indian as well as Pakistani people were interested. Rather, I would say the whole world was interested and they were looking to the meeting of Shri Vajpayee and General Musharraf. They were looking as to what would be the outcome of that meeting so much so that 500 journalists from all over the world came to Agra to report the result of the meeting. In India all the Opposition Parties fully supported the Government to go for talks because we believe that ultimately dialogue is the answer to the disputes between the two countries. For that, India did make some preparations and I appreciate that. Those preparations were that they announced cease-fire. That was a good augury to create good conditions for the talks.

And they released some Pakistani prisoners. That was another step.

The third step which you took was the reduction of tariff on goods imported from Pakistan and the fourth step was that you offered scholarships for Pakistani students to come and study in India. The last one was that there was a relaxation in visas. These are the good things with which you tried to create an atmosphere but unfortunately, it was not considered important by Pakistan. There was no response from their leaders and all our efforts went waste.

I want to ask you a very important question. You have always been saying that there will be no dialogue with Pakistan unless cross-border terrorism is stopped. Prime Minister said it; you said it a number of times and the Home Minister also said it. What happened then that immediately, there was a U-turn in your foreign policy and you went for talks? The country does not know about it. And we are surprised as to what happened. While changing this policy, did you consult your colleagues? Was it discussed in the Cabinet? Was it discussed in the NDA? You have created a national defence security system. Could you talk to your Chiefs of the Army which has a direct bearing? These talks have a bearing on the Kashmir issue. Of course, when you want to change your policy, you may be aware that it has to be based on a national consensus. You should have consulted all of us. There are very good people in the Opposition who are interested and you should have consulted them so that a national consensus could have been built on this issue. What was the necessity of changing this policy? I would like to know whether there was a changed condition in Kashmir or military was reduced? Or was it that you got some kind of an information from the second track which the Prime Minister has started with Pakistan and you got information that some kind of a change is there in the thinking of the leadership of Pakistan?

Apart from that, America is taking a lot of interest in the negotiations. They are asking India and they are asking Pakistan about it. Their Minister came, went to Pakistan and came to India. They must have consulted you; they must have consulted them. Was there any indication from those talks that Pakistan has changed its mind and that they are ready to come to the table with an open mind and have a dialogue with us?

My complaint is that you talked to the wrong person. You talked to Mr. Musharraf who usurped power in Pakistan. He was a military general. He took over power in Pakistan. He was opposed by all the political parties there. Some people even went to the court to dislodge him. And Mr. Musharraf called a meeting of the Opposition leaders before coming to India. But they refused to talk to him. They said, "You have no status, you have no *locus standi*, you have no mandate of Pakistan. Then, why are you going there?"

About the international situation, America did not like the change in Pakistan. Similarly, Europe also did not like. They were hardly making up their mind as to how to deal with the situation in Pakistan and you invited him.

Sir, you must know that the Army in Pakistan has a vested interest.

Right from the inception of Pakistan, the Army is dominating there, whether it is a civilian power or a military power. The military people have dislodged the elected Governments for four times in Pakistan and usurped power. In Pakistan, military is above the Constitution, but in India, Army is under the President, under the Parliament and under the Prime Minister. But there is no such thing in Pakistan. It is a separate entity there and they do not agree with the civilian Government over there. So, our Government is dealing with an Army man and the hon. Minister of External Affairs also belonged to the Army. Therefore, he should have known their mindset and their way of thinking. They know only the barrel of the gun and they do not believe in negotiations. So, I believe that our Government is dealing with a wrong person.

Sir, what is the policy of the four military dictators who ruled Pakistan at different periods of time? Their domestic policy, their foreign policy and their military policy are all based on only one point, the unipolar point as to how to get Kashmir by aggression. They made three attempts for that earlier and for the fourth time, there was the Kargil conflict in the year 1999. This is their thinking and our Government has tried to invite him here for talks.

I would like to submit that our Government ignored the history also. When our Government decided to talk with the leader of Pakistan, they should have known the history of Pakistan in the last 50 years. At the time of Partition, they said that the Partition had taken place between Hindu India and Muslim India. We are not surprised about it, but they have been insisting on the two-nation theory. Secondly, they said that Kashmir is an unfinished agenda of Partition. They said that all the areas were divided, Kashmir remains to be divided and they have to make a decision whether Kashmir has to go with Pakistan or India. They were claiming Kashmir because it is a Muslim-majority State and they refused to believe that the Maharaja of Kashmir had acceded to India. So, our Government is dealing with that person who does not believe in all these things. Therefore, they have ignored the history.

Sir, at the time of Partition, I belonged to West Pakistan and when Partition took place, the Muslim League said: "हंस के लिया है पाकिस्तान, लड़कर लेंगे हिन्दुस्तान". That mentality is still there and even today, the Muslim League is saying the same thing over there. They say that first they will take Kashmir and then they will take India. That is their intention. They also said that one Pakistani soldier is equal to 10 Indian soldiers. Such is their thinking and if you recall Shri Bhutto's statement, he said: "we will have a 1,000 year war with India to take Kashmir". When this is their thinking, our Government is talking to a wrong person. I think they did not read the history and the background of the relations between our two countries.

श्री शंकर प्रसाद जायसवाल (वाराणसी) : आपकी क्या राय है। यह ठीक है जैसा आपने बताया कि दो पाकिस्तान का उनका सिद्धान्त है, चिन्तन वैसा ही है - हंस कर लिया है पाकिस्तान, लड़कर लेंगे हिन्दुस्तान। इस चिन्तन के अन्दर क्या करना चाहिए, वह आप बताएं ?

श्री आर.एल.भाटिया (अमृतसर) : मैं उसी पर आ रहा हूँ। मैं वही बता रहा हूँ। जो मैं अभी तक कह रहा था, वह तो आपको हिस्ट्री बता रहा था कि आपने गलत आदमी से बात की है। उसका स्टेटस नहीं है क्योंकि वह वहाँ का चुना हुआ प्रतिनिधि नहीं है और अब मैं अगले पाइंट पर आ रहा हूँ। अन्त में मैं उसी पाइंट पर आऊंगा जिसको आप पूछ रहे हैं।

Sir, Gen. Pervez Musharraf had declared some time back that he did not agree with the 1949 Agreement with India. He repeated the same thing about the 1972 Agreement also. He did not appreciate even the Lahore Declaration for which our Prime Minister went there to show the goodwill of India.

17.00 hrs.

We chose to bring this man to India. They say about 'two-nation theory'. We say that India cannot accept the two-nation theory. India is a secular country. Sixteen crore Muslims did not decide to go to Pakistan. That is the secular policy of India.

Their policy also failed when Bangladesh was separated from Pakistan. The Bangladeshi Muslims refused to live with Pakistan. In spite of the fact that their theory is wrong, their Army is still continuing to have their base on that theory.

I say that the invitation was also at a wrong time. You were talking to a wrong man. You did not understand the history. Now, I say that the timing was wrong. When Shri Musharaff took over - usurped power - as President, he dismissed Shri Tarar, the elected President of Pakistan. There was uproar in Pakistan. The Pakistanis turned against him. All political parties turned against him. When he asked them to give him advice and have a talk with them as he was going to Agra, they refused to talk to him. They did not talk. They said, "You have no *locus standi*." The people went to court. The international opinion was against him. But you invited him.

Nobody recognised him. India was the first country to recognise him - a man who did not salute Shri Vajpayee when he went to Lahore, a man who initiated trouble in Kargil. I do not know how you had faith in him.

The Government is silent on the fact as to why they changed that policy and why they wanted to have the talks. There have been a lot of articles in the Press. Many political people have been asking the Government. But the Government has been totally silent. The silence of the Government created much misunderstanding. There were a lot of speculations. You know that we have an independent Press. The people were having their own conjectures.

Some people said that it was America who was forcing the two countries to sit around a table and have talks with him. You never refuted it.

The Press in Pakistan was saying different things. They say that their *Jehadis* in Kashmir forced Shri Vajpayee to come to the table, and because they had created such a situation, he was forced to come to the table. Did you refute it? But there were Press reports from Pakistan.

Some Press people said that Shri Vajpayee was getting very unpopular. They wanted to divert the attention of the nation. They should say that it was all wrong. I believe that it is wrong. But all these things are appearing in the Press. You should come forward and say that they just tried luck. चलो चलकर देखते हैं, कौन बनेगा करोड़पति । बातचीत करने के लिए लक-ड्राई कर रहे थे या इस देश में पोलिटिकल एस्ट्रोलाजर बहुत हैं, जिन पर पोलिटिकल आदमी बहुत डिपेंडेंट हैं या किसी एस्ट्रोलाजर ने कह दिया कि वक्त बढ़िया है, बात करो।

Then, you did not prepare for the Summit. Before all Summits, a lot of preparations are made. You are a very competent Minister. I admit that you are a very wise person. All that process should have been gone through.

When Shri Rajiv Gandhi was the Prime Minister, I was the General Secretary of the Party. We decided to first send some communist leader, either Shri Surjeet or Shri Basu or someone else like that.

Well, when we sent the communist leader, he brought a very good report. He had a very good rapport and he reported that Chinese were ready to talk. Then we sent a delegation of Congress Party because it was a communist country and it is the party which is stronger than the Government. They plan, they make policies and the Government only implements them. I was also a member of that delegation. Then we talked to them and they were ready to discuss with us each and every affair. As a result, we prepared a ground. Then we sent our diplomatic officers, secretaries and others who made agenda as to what meeting will take place, what discussions will take place and so on. Then Shri Rajiv Gandhi went. There was a break-through in the relations and the Summit was very successful. If you remember, their President Deng Xio Peng did not leave the hand of Shri Rajiv Gandhi for five minutes and it was reported in the Press "the longest handshake in the world." This is how preparations should be made for a Summit. I do not know when the hon. Minister was there, why all these things have not been done.

Sir, now I come to the Agenda. We are not aware of what agenda they prepared, with whom they discussed, whether they discussed with the Chief Minister of Kashmir or the concerned people like Defence or their Cabinet. We are not aware of what the agenda had been. But there is an agenda of Pakistan. The statement of Shri Musharraf is there, the statement of Shri Sattar is there continuously telling the Press what their agenda is. But our agenda was not known to any of us, like BJP everything is hidden, so this agenda was also a hidden agenda.

All that we know is what MEA spokesperson said when it was asked from the MEA because no Minister was coming forward and no information was available. The spokesperson said that the agenda would be set by Shri Vajpayee and Gen. Musharraf. It is a Summit, it is a very important meeting. The whole world is looking at it and the MEA said that it would be set by Shri Vajpayee and Gen. Musharraf. This is the situation at our end, but at the end of Pakistan, they were using media in full stream.

Gen. Musharraf have had two conferences, meeting with the Press. One was Breakfast meeting in Lahore. They called Indians also and there was one meeting here also where they explained fully what their agenda was. Not only that, they tried to approach our intellectuals at the Tea Party of Shri Qazi, the High Commissioner of Pakistan here. Shri Subramaniam was there, Shri Dixit was there, Shri Nayyar was there and so many other people were there with whom he talked. They explained his point of view. But our Prime Minister and the hon. Minister did not take care to call the Press people or experts to discuss with them and give them a feeling that they are all being consulted.

Since there is no time, I am cutting short. Shri Qazi, the High Commissioner, said there were nine points which were discussed at Agra and six of them were agreed upon. The Prime Minister also in his statement has said that there were some points which were agreed upon. But there was some difficulty about the other as the talks broke. There was no joint statement, I do not know what was agreed upon and what was not agreed upon. I have not seen any Summit meeting, though I cannot say to the best of my knowledge that after every Summit there is a joint statement, where there was no joint statement after this Summit. It is further confusing.

Then Shri Vajpayee in his statement said that there was no failure of talks. It is also said by Abdul Sattar over there that it was an inconclusive talk.

Sir, what is the correct thing? What is चुपके-चुपके, चोरी-चोरी? What were the points on which you had agreed upon? We want to know what made you to go in for another meeting? What were the points that had been taken care of?

Sir, I would say that talks had miserably failed. It ignored the history. There was no compulsion for you to go ahead and jump for talks while the situation in Pakistan was not stable. Now again, we find that talks are going on, likely to

go. Sir, who were the beneficiaries of these talks? It was Gen. Musharraf. His position was not stable. People were against him. You made him stable. He had gone back as a victor और हमारा हाल यह है कि he became a hero and we became 'zero'. With the result, what we find are the consequences. *Jehadis* are very happy. They are in good spirits now. They say, 'we have won in Kashmir. That is how, the talks have come.' Now, there is further increase in their activities over there. The hawks in Pakistan are very happy. Today, my dear Minister, I want to tell you that people in Pakistan, *Jehadis*, hawks and the people of Pakistan are admiring him as their hero, he stood over there in India, and he stood by his position.

Now, the talks are again going on. I would only like to ask whether you have again, for God sake, prepared the home task, what about your second track, if it is going on and giving you right information or diplomatic channel, you may have to find out. We do not know as to what was agreed upon. As I told you, you want to go ahead further. We would like to know as to what are the situations in which you are going to talk. We have no objection and we would like you to talk. We are not against talks because this is our sincere belief. All the parties on this side are saying that you may have a talk and we have no objection but you must do the home task. But before you go there, Mr. Minister, my advice is that you must finish, fight out *Jehadis* and finish them in Kashmir.

What did we do in Punjab? It was the same Pakistan, same ISI and we lost 3,000 Congressmen, who fought in villages, and we drove them out. I was one of them. I got three bullets. My grandson was taken away by them and he was released after 34 days. My car was burnt. We fought over there along with Police, BSF and the Army. Please do something in Kashmir, co-ordinate with the Army, BSF, Police and all these forces, and finish them. After you finish them, you go to Pakistan. I assure you that you will be respected and something may come from your talks.

श्री प्रभुनाथ सिंह (महाराजगंज, बिहार) : सभापति जी, माननीय मुलायम सिंह जी ने यहां जो चर्चा उठाई है हम उस पर नियम 193 के तहत चर्चा कर रहे हैं। यह मामला काफी संवेदनशील है और इस संबंध में इसी सदन में प्रधान मंत्री जी द्वारा विस्तार से अपने बयान दिये भी गये हैं कि किन परिस्थितियों में वार्ता हुई और उस वार्ता के क्या परिणाम हुए। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने विस्तार से अपने भाषण में इसकी चर्चा की है।

सभापति जी, पड़ोसी देश से हमारा क्या रिश्ता है इसे हम सभी जानते हैं और इस रिश्ते में कुछ बदलाव लाया जाए, सुधार लाया जाए, वैमनस्य के रिश्ते में कुछ अपनापन कायम किया जाए।

इसी नीति और नीयत के आधार पर दोस्ती का हाथ आगे बढ़ाने के लिए कदम उठाए गए। वैसे हम सब जानते हैं कि पाकिस्तान भारत में आईएसआई के माध्यम से यहां की अर्थव्यवस्था पर हमला कर रहा है और आतंकवाद के माध्यम से देश को खंडित करने का प्रयास कर रहा है। यह कार्रवाई आज से नहीं, बहुत लम्बे समय से पाकिस्तान द्वारा एक साजिश के तहत चल रही है। हम यह मान कर चलते हैं कि वार्ता बड़ी विपरीत परिस्थिति में हुई। मैं ऐसा इसलिए कहा रहा हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी कुछ दिन पहले बस पर सवार होकर पाकिस्तान इस मंशा से गए थे कि हम दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाएं, पड़ोसी देश के साथ मधुर संबंध बनाएं और उसके साथ हमारे रिश्ते अच्छे हों लेकिन इसका अंजाम कुछ दिनों बाद कारगिल युद्ध के रूप में सामने आया। हमने कारगिल में विजय प्राप्त की। हम इसे लेकर विजय दिवस भी मनाते हैं लेकिन हमने वहां कुछ नहीं पाया। अपने सरहद की रक्षा के लिए हमारे जवानों ने कुर्बानी दी। यह बात ठीक है कि इसके पहले जो भी लड़ाई हुई, उसमें हमने सैनिकों ने कुर्बानी भी दी, हमने अपनी जमीन को भी गंवाया लेकिन वह विपरीत परिस्थिति रही। हम अपनी जमीन की रक्षा करने में इसलिए सफल हुए कि हमने अपने लोगों की जान गंवाई। हमने इससे ज्यादा कुछ नहीं पाया। जब किसी व्यक्ति से दोस्ती की जाती है तो मेरी नजर में तीन परिस्थितियां होती हैं - एक परिस्थिति तब होती है जब दोनों मानसिक रूप से मिलते हैं और दोनों दोस्ती चाहते हैं। दूसरी परिस्थिति तब होती है जब एक दुश्मन से दूसरा दुश्मन इतना कमजोर हो जाता है कि महसूस करने लगता है कि दोस्ती नहीं की तो काम चलने वाला नहीं है। एक और परिस्थिति होती है जब दुश्मन से दोस्ती यह सोच कर की जाती है कि आमने-सामने लड़ कर फँसला कर लें या फिर दोस्त बन कर धोखा देकर बदला लें। मैं यह महसूस करता हूँ कि भारत के साथ कोई ऐसी परिस्थिति नहीं बनी जिससे पाकिस्तान से मित्रता करके इतनी जल्दबाजी दिखाई जाती। हम बार-बार धोखा खाते आए हैं। धोखा खाने के बाद आदमी को चिंतन बढ़ाना चाहिए, सबक सीखना चाहिए, सतर्कता बढ़ानी चाहिए। आपने जब परमाणु परीक्षण किया तो ताकत बढ़ाई। आपने चेतावनी दी कि यदि कोई हमारी तरफ आंच उठा कर देखेगा तो हम लाहौर तक पहुंचने में देरी नहीं करेंगे। आपने ऐसा करके देश का सम्मान बढ़ाया लेकिन दोस्ती उस परिस्थिति में की, जब हम कहते हैं कि जब तक पाकिस्तान आतंकवाद पर अपना रूख साफ नहीं करेगा तब तक हम उससे बात नहीं करेंगे। कौन सी ऐसी परिस्थिति है जिस में पाकिस्तान ने इच्छा जाहिर की कि वह बातचीत करना चाहता है। हमने उसे बातचीत का निमंत्रण दिया और उसने इसे स्वीकार किया लेकिन जिस ढंग से बयान आने लगे और जिस तरफ पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति मुशर्रफ साहब का बयान भारत के मीडिया ने प्रमुखता से छापा, उसे देकर उन्हें हीरो बनाने का काम किया। कहा जाता है कि स्वायत्तता की बात है। देश की सुरक्षा और सम्मान के साथ क्या किसी को स्वायत्तता दी जा सकती है?

इतने दिनों के बाद बयानबाजी की जाती है और अखबारों में दिखाया जाता है कि स्वायत्तता के नाम पर चुप बैठते हैं और हम मानते हैं कि नहीं है। यह आपकी कमजोरी है और आप किसी पर नियंत्रण करने में अक्षम हैं। इसी कारण से हमारे देश में ऐसी परिस्थितियां पैदा होती हैं। पाकिस्तान के जनरल मुशर्रफ का पाकिस्तान में बैठकर बयान आता है कि हम खुले दिल से आ रहे हैं। इसका क्या मतलब होता है? फिर कुछ दिन के बाद बयान देते हैं कि कश्मीर ही वार्ता का मुख्य मुद्दा होगा। यह खुले दिल का बयान है जो भारतीय अखबारों में मुख्य पृष्ठ पर प्रथम लाइन में मोटे-मोटे अक्षरों में छप जाता है। हम कहते हैं कि हम संविधान के विरुद्ध कोई समझौता नहीं करेंगे, कश्मीर भारत का हृदय है। फिर समझौता किस बात पर? वे कहते हैं कि कश्मीर मुख्य मुद्दा है, हम कहते हैं कि कश्मीर हमारा हृदय है। इसके बाद हम समझौते के लिये परेशान हैं। किस बात पर समझौता और किस परिस्थिति में समझौते की बात करते हैं? पाकिस्तान से बैठकर जनरल बोलते हैं कि अगर भारत कश्मीर का अटूट अंग मानता रहा तो वार्ता बेमानी है। फिर भी भारत वार्ता के लिये बेचैन है। भारत कहता है कि वार्ता मुख्यतः आतंकवाद एवं अन्य बातों पर होगी लेकिन यहां तो स्थिति बिलकुल विपरीत है। इस तरह दोनों तरफ से बयानबाजी चल रही है। हम उत्तर कहते हैं तो वे दक्षिण की बात करते हैं, हम पूर्व कहते हैं, वे पश्चिम की बात कहते हैं। हम रात कहते हैं तो वे दिन कहते हैं और हम दिन कहते हैं तो वे रात कहते हैं।

सभापति महोदय, जब वार्ता की बात चली तो देश में दो तरह के लोगों की बातें आईं। गांव में रहने वाला कहता है कि इस वार्ता से क्या फायदा? बातों से मामला सुलझने वाला नहीं है तो दूसरी तरफ सीमा के समीप रहने वाला व्यक्ति, जो आतंकवाद का शिकार रहा है, न रात को नींद है और न दिन में चैन है और डर से जिन्दगी जी रहा है, उनके मन में इस बात का विश्वास जगा है कि अगर यह वार्ता हुई अगर इसमें सफलता मिली तो वह शान्ति से रह पायेगा।

सभापति महोदय, पाकिस्तान के जनरल जब इस धरती पर आते हैं तो उनकी तरफ से हुरियत के नेताओं को निमंत्रण जाता है। हमें उनकी नीयत को पहचानना चाहिये थे कि वे किस नीयत से भारत आये हैं? उनकी मानसिकता क्या है? लेकिन आपने उनकी नीयत को नहीं पहचाना। आपने दोस्ती के लिये हाथ बढ़ा दिये जबकि हमारी नजर में उनकी नीयत में बेइमानी थी। वे भारत आते समय दो-तीन बातें अपने मन में लेकर आये। एक तरफ कश्मीर में अलगाववाद से उनके भाव बढ़ाना, पाकिस्तान में कट्टरपंथियों की तुटिकरण और स्वयं राष्ट्रपति का पद लेने के बाद भारत की स्वीकृति लेना था। वे यही तीनों बिन्दु अपने मन में लेकर भारत आये। मुझे लगता है कि इन तीनों कामों में उन्हें सफलता मिली। हमारे घर में अतिथि बनकर आये और कहते हैं कि वे तय करेंगे कि उनसे बातचीत करने के लिये प्रतिनिधि कौन होंगे? वे कहते हैं कि हुरियत ही कश्मीर के असली प्रतिनिधि हैं। वे हमारे अतिथि बनकर आते हैं या मालिक बनकर आते हैं? अगर इस तरह की वार्ता करनी थी तो क्या फायदा?

सभापति महोदय, आगरा में क्या वार्ता हुई, हमें उन बिन्दुओं पर नहीं जाना क्योंकि प्रधानमंत्री जी ने यहां बता दिया है। मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी को इस बात के लिये बधाई देता हूँ कि जो हमारी पुरानी परम्परा है, उसके अनुसार हमने विश्व को शान्ति का संदेश देने का काम किया है। इतनी विपरीत परिस्थितियों में जहां शून्यता थी, हम समझते थे कि पाकिस्तान से वार्ता नहीं होगी।

उन्हें निमंत्रण देकर और उनके साथ वार्ता करके शून्यता को उन्होंने खत्म किया है। इसके लिए हम उन्हें बधाई देते हैं। लेकिन हमें सावधान रहना चाहिए। सावधान रहने की बात हम इसलिए करते हैं कि जिस दिन से पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति भारत आये हैं, उनके आने के मात्र दो घंटे के बाद कश्मीर में 15 लोग मारे गये। उनकी नीयत क्या थी कि जिस पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति भारत आते हैं और आतंकवादी जो उनके संरक्षण में पाकिस्तान में ज़िंदा रहते हैं, जो उनके धन पर इस देश में अलगाव फैलाना चाहते हैं, जिस दिन वह हमारे देश में आते हैं, उनकी सलामी में कश्मीर में 15 लोग मारे जाते हैं। जब वह वापिस जाते हैं, तब भी लोग मारे जाते हैं। आये दिन घटनाएं घटती हैं और हमारी सेना के लोग मारे जाते हैं। कश्मीर का एक भी नागरिक अमन-चैन की ज़िंदगी नहीं जी पाता है। **â€(‹(व्यवधान)**

सभापति महोदय : आप संक्षेप में अपनी बात कहिये, अब आप कन्क्लूड करिये।

श्री प्रमुनाथ सिंह : मैं अभी बोलना चाहता था, अब हमें लगता है कि फिर से शुरू करूँ तो वहां तक पहुंचूंगा। हम कोई लम्बा-चौड़ा भाषण करना नहीं चाहते हैं। लेकिन हम दो-तीन बातें जरूर कहना चाहते हैं कि हमें समीक्षा करनी चाहिए कि हमने क्या खोया और क्या पाया। इसकी जिम्मेवारी के साथ समीक्षा होनी चाहिए। प्रधानमंत्री जी के पुनः पाकिस्तान जाने की बात चल रही है, हम उसके विरोध में बोलने नहीं जा रहे हैं। लेकिन हम इतना जरूर कहेंगे कि हम सरकार के अंग हैं, हम सरकार को सलाह देंगे कि वार्ता के पहले हर बिन्दु की समीक्षा हो जानी चाहिए। सचिव स्तर पर, विदेश मंत्री स्तर पर वार्ता करके यदि किसी फार्मूले पर सहमति नहीं बन पाती है तो प्रधानमंत्री जी को पाकिस्तान जाने की आवश्यकता महसूस नहीं करनी चाहिए। हम ऐसा मानकर चलते हैं।

सभापति महोदय, इसके साथ हम यह भी कहेंगे कि सरकार में रहने वाले लोगों को अगर ऐसे मामलों में कोई बयान देना चाहिए तो बहुत जिम्मेदारी के साथ बयान देना चाहिए। हमने सरकार के एक मंत्री का बयान पढ़ा था - उन्होंने कहा था कि पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति जनरल मुशर्रफ बहुत ही खुले दिल के आदमी हैं, खुले इंसान हैं, मैं चाहता हूँ कि जिन्दगी भर उनके साथ रहूँ। **â€(‹(व्यवधान)**

श्री आर.एल.भाटिया : वह आपकी पार्टी के हैं, उनका नाम बताइये।

श्री प्रमुनाथ सिंह : मुझे नाम याद नहीं है, आप खुद पढ़ लीजिए। हम नाम नहीं जानते हैं। हम कहना चाहते हैं कि क्या वह मंत्री मानते हैं कि उन्हें श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जिन्दादिल इंसान जैसे नहीं लगते। हम जानना चाहेंगे कि अगर किसी विदेशी राष्ट्रपति को इस ढंग की भाषा बोलकर सम्मानित किया जायेगा तो हम समझते हैं कि देश के सम्मान पर आंच पहुंचेगी। क्योंकि हम श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी के नेतृत्व में सरकार चलाते हैं, श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी के नेतृत्व में हम आस्था रखते हैं, श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी के नेतृत्व में हमने कदम से कदम मिलाकर चलने का वायदा किया है और हम चल रहे हैं। इसके बावजूद किसी विदेशी राष्ट्रपति के लिए इस ढंग की भाषा बोलकर हम अपने प्रधानमंत्री के सम्मान पर चोट पहुंचाने का काम करते हैं। इसके साथ हम यह भी कहना चाहते हैं कि कभी भी कोई ऐसी वार्ता हो तो किसी को इस तरह से हीरो नहीं बनाना चाहिए। उसे अपने देश का हीरो नहीं बनने देना चाहिए।

श्री आर.एल.भाटिया : इन्हें मंत्री बना दीजिए, फिर यह अच्छा काम करेंगे।

श्री रामदास आठवले (पंढरपुर) : इन्हें मंत्री बना दीजिए।

श्री प्रमुनाथ सिंह : हम न तुम्हारी वजह से मंत्री बनेंगे और न इनकी वजह से बनेंगे। हम जिस दिन बनेंगे उस दिन देख लेना यह देश हम चलायेंगे। आप घबराइये मत। **â€(‹(व्यवधान)** हम न इनके भरोसे हैं और न तुम्हारे भरोसे हैं। आप इसकी चिंता मत करिये।

श्री रामदास आठवले : हमारी सपोर्ट से बनेंगे, उधर से कुछ लोग इधर आयेंगे फिर हम लोग उधर जायेंगे। **â€(‹(व्यवधान)**

सभापति महोदय : आप बैठिये, माननीय सदस्य बोल रहे हैं।

श्री प्रमुनाथ सिंह : हमारा अंत में निवेदन है कि देश हित में, देश के सम्मान में, देश की सीमाओं की सुरक्षा के सवाल पर न तो किसी को स्वायत्तता देनी चाहिए और न ही इन बिंदुओं पर किसी से समझौता करना चाहिए। हम प्रधानमंत्री श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी के नेतृत्व में आस्था व्यक्त करते हुए पुनः एक बात कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान जाने से पहले हर बिंदु पर समीक्षा करनी चाहिए। अंत में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ डोडा की घटना के संबंध में जिस ढंग से गृह मंत्री जी का बयान पाकिस्तान के बारे में अखबारों में आया है।

उस बयान को पढ़ने से लगता है कि जिस तरह से महाभारत की लड़ाई की शुरुआत नहीं हुई ती और कृष्ण पांडवों की माँ से मिलने गए थे तो उन्होंने पूछा था कि पांडवों के लिए कोई संदेश है, तो उन्होंने कहा था कि जाकर कह देना कि जिस दिन के लिए मैंने तुमको दूध पिलाया था, वह समय आ गया है और युद्ध के अलावा कोई और रास्ता नहीं बचा है।

हम कहते हैं कि जिस तरह से पाकिस्तान कूटनीति करके हमारे देश में अलगाववाद पैदा कर रहा है, जिस तरह से हमारी अर्थव्यवस्था पर हमला कर रहा है, जिस तरह से आई.एस.आई. के माध्यम से हमारे गांव-गांव में जाकर हमारे देश को तोड़ने का काम कर रहा है, अगर सीधे तरीके से पाकिस्तान हमारी बात को नहीं सुनता है तो जिस तरह से कारगिल में पाकिस्तान ने आतंकवाद फैलाया था, हमारे जवानों को जिसमें शहीद होना पड़ा था, अब समय आ गया है कि हमें लाहौर की ओर बढ़ना चाहिए और वहां पर तिरंगा फहरा देना चाहिए, रोज़ का विवाद समाप्त हो जाएगा, यही कहकर हम अपनी बात समाप्त करते हैं।

सभापति महोदय : अब माननीय मंत्री श्री जसवंत सिंह जी हस्तक्षेप करेंगे।

श्री जसवंत सिंह : जब सभी सदस्य बोल लें तो उसके बाद मैं बोलना चाहूंगा।

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Sir, it was decided by the hon. Speaker that the distinguished Minister for External Affairs shall intervene at 5.30 p.m. today and then other speakers would continue to speak and the hon. Prime Minister would reply tomorrow. That was the understanding between the parties.

सभापति महोदय : यहीं आसन से अध्यक्ष महोदय ने साफ कहा था कि 5.30 बजे माननीय मंत्री जी हस्तक्षेप करेंगे। इसीलिए मैंने उनका नाम कॉल किया था।

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR (AKOLA): Sir, I would like to request the hon. Minister that he hears the views of the other Members before he replies.

सभापति महोदय : आप एक मिनट बैठिये। Message from Rajya Sabha.

17.34 hrs.

डॉ.विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : जब तय हुआ था कि 5.30 बजे मंत्री जी बोलेंगे तो इन्हीं से बुलवाइए। **â€**(व्यवधान)

श्री जे.एस.बराड़ (फरीदकोट) : सभापति जी, मेरी आपसे एक विनती है। ऑनरेबल स्पीकर साहब के चैम्बर में 15 से ज्यादा सदस्यों ने जाकर विनती की थी कि यह महत्वपूर्ण विषय है और इसके ऊपर हमें बोलने की आज्ञा दी जाए। पिछले 15 दिनों से हम इस महत्वपूर्ण मुद्दे पर तैयारी कर रहे हैं और 10 लाख पंजाब के लोग माइग्रेट हुए हैं। **That was the biggest migration in the history of the world.** और हमें इस मुद्दे पर बोलने का मौका ही न दिया जाए तो इससे ज्यादा बदकिस्मती हमारी और कोई नहीं हो सकती। **â€**(व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : आप पहले मेरी बात सुन लीजिए, आपको बोलने का मौका मिलेगा। लेकिन अभी चूंकि माननीय स्पीकर साहब ने चेयर से स्पट कहा था 5.30 बजे माननीय मंत्री जी इंटरवीन करेंगे, आपको बोलने से हम रोक नहीं रहे हैं।

माननीय श्री जसवंत सिंह।

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR (AKOLA): Sir, it would be a bad precedent if the Minister replies before all the Members finish speaking.

MR. CHAIRMAN : This is not the reply.

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR : This is as good as the reply.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN): Sir, I would like to make it clear for the sake of records. This is the statement of hon. Prime Minister and hon. Prime Minister is going to reply tomorrow after the Question Hour. Hon. Minister of External Affairs is intervening in the debate, and he has the right to intervene at the time he thinks right. There is no insult to any Member in this.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am very grateful to all hon. Members that have participated in this very important discussion. It was my intention that when I intervene I will be able to address as many of the concerns as have been voiced by the hon. Members during the course of the discussion and endeavour to answer as many of the queries as are raised. It is with that intention that this discussion has gone on for, I think, already for three days. On the other evening we sat here until about 10 o'clock. Today also when the discussion was taken up, I was informed that there were only about seven or eight speakers left and that all of them would conclude whatever they had to say by 5:30 p.m. It is only for that reason that I had chosen and the recommendation was that I intervene at 5:30 p.m. It is not at all my individual, or the Government's intention not to take note of whatever the number of speakers that you finally permit, at whatever length, to participate in this discussion. Naturally, the issues they raise subsequently, if they have not already been raised by other Members, will have to be addressed separately.

Sir, hon. Mulayam Singh Yadav initiated the discussion, hon. Deputy Leader of the main Opposition Party Shri Madhavrao Scindia participated, and a number of other speakers have benefited the Government with their views. I find that in the intervention that hon. Madhavrao Scindia made, with scarcely disguised sarcasm he imputed that he was more in agreement with the visitor's views. Though somewhat subsequently he futilely attempted to correct that, I am sure that is not the position. If you distil what he said or what other hon. Members have said, they all fall into one or two broad categories. I must, however, before I proceed further, refer to one particular aspect of an observation made by the hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition—*...*

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair

The Government does address these issues in that fashion and if I share with the hon. House what have I to say? But broadly, the critical observations or otherwise, that have been made fall into four broad categories. There were observations about the preparation, home work and such like matters. Also, Sir, there were observations about the agenda, about the response of the media and how the Government responded to it and thereafter the assessment of the success or the failure of the Summit.

I do wish to make very clear at the very beginning that we wish to make a distinction here. I certainly do wish to make a distinction. There is no doubt, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition during his speech made that distinction. It will be worthwhile reflecting on it that there is a difference between history, hagiography and histrionics. Making that distinction when it comes to examples being cited to us about the preparation and the adequacy of preparation, a number of speakers from the principal party in the Opposition have pointed out a visit by the former distinguished Prime Minister of the country who during his visit to the People's Republic of China exemplified preparation by the duration of the hand-shake between him as Head of the Government and the Head of the State of the People's Republic of China. I have no doubt that it was a visit that was marked with certain developments which preceded it, and which then set a pattern of further developments between China and India.

It is a matter of some disappointment to me that the very same Congress Party do not refer to the advancements that were made in 1996 or earlier in 1994. I do also wish to point out the selectivity of the venerates that persuaded so many of them to repeatedly speak of the importance as it were and the examples of hand-shake denoted by way of preparation, forgetting the essence that indeed and in fact, the genesis, the root of the whole problem of Sino-Indian issue as it were at the border, lies at the doorsteps of the then Ruling party. I do not wish to go into the total examination of what preceded 1962 and how before 1962, the accounts of our history, the annals of our history were filled with what the Ruling party and others speak of the importance of preparation. Indeed, they are not simply that.

Also about the whole question of Jammu & Kashmir, starting from the very beginning, from the invasion of 1947, for all the subsequent steps that were taken by the then Ruling Party in 1948, I am sure, they were taken on account of preparations. Whether it was the 1963 late Sardar Swaran Singh and the late Zulfikar Ali Bhutto talks or it was the talks at Tashkent following the 1965 conflict, if it is the suggestion of the hon. Members from the principal Party in Opposition, that Tashkent exemplified preparations or indeed the Simla Accord of 1972 exemplified preparations, then it is a matter of considerable disappointment to me. In 1965, of course, I had the honour to be still in uniform. So, in 1965, it exemplified preparations, then, it is not for me to say that prior preparations resulted in such a thing. For example, it was for the first time when we accepted – not the first time, but yet another time – when the then Ruling Party accepted a third party 'not simply intervention', but a mediation.

The event, the whole question, the issue, the problem, or whatever you wish to call it, of Jammu & Kashmir was

discussed not here, not bilaterally, but at Tashkent. In Tashkent, what did the great preparation achieve for India? It certainly did achieve among other things, the handing back of Hajipir Pass to which a number of speakers have already referred. I will also refer to the preparations that were there in 1972 Simla Accord. No doubt, a great deal of preparations went into it. What did the preparation finally result in?

Firstly, a very important issue came up; that is, hereafter, Jammu & Kashmir, for its final settlement – it was still referred to as final settlement – as it was unresolved, would be dealt with bilaterally. But nevertheless, at that stage 93,000 prisoners were in their hands; hands were traded; prisoners were traded. Even before the ink on Simla Accord had dried up, the signatories of that Accord had resented. That too was a part of the example of preparations that our friends have referred.

I do not wish to go into the other examples of preparation, whether it is the misadventure of the IPKF intervention or other examples. There are many. But for all the hon. Members to speak of preparation, know for a fact the amount of preparation that went into this Summit and I will in a minute come to it again. I felt it necessary to place it, in its proper background, that preparation and the constant reiterating of this word that there was inadequate preparation therefore it happens, is, in fact, not an argument or an observation, leave alone the criticism that is able to stand on its own. We are informed, Sir, and I will answer all the questions from the very beginning, as to why it was post-Kargil, or the particular policy about not giving any quarter and not accepting cross-border terrorism; what preparations, what assessment, what appreciation led the Government to thereafter alter its stance and say we will have a talk with you.

Before I come to the key issue, I would like to share with the hon. Members of the House that on the question of fundamentals about India and Pakistan relations, there is in fact a little difference between what all sides of the House have been saying and what the Government continues to believe. It is my belief and let it be very clearly understood that so far as Pakistan is concerned – I have said so in public and I say so here again – the State of Jammu and Kashmir is not a cause but a consequence of this kind of approach or attitude that Pakistan continues to adopt. It is a consequence and it is the consequence Mr. Chairman, Sir, of a consistent and a deliberate policy posture by Pakistan of compulsive and perpetual hostility to India; the compulsive hostility as in means and methods of sustained nationhood which is born in hostility to India. It is in that compulsive hostility arising from the seeds of the two-nation theory that today or even earlier, all their actions in Jammu and Kashmir are attempted to be justified. I have said so very clearly, Sir, not here but in the United Nations General Assembly on behalf of the Government and I have no difficulty in saying so again that Jammu and Kashmir, therefore, is not the core issue as the President of Pakistan, General Musharraf Sahib is so given to repeatedly pronounce. Jammu and Kashmir is not the core issue. Jammu and Kashmir is not a cause but a consequence. It is the consequence of this policy, this approach of compulsive and perpetual hostility to India. Jammu and Kashmir and what it represents is at the core of the Indian nationhood because it represents rejection of two-nation theory. It represents that the division of this land on grounds of faith is not acceptable. It clearly exemplifies that India believes in and shall continue to believe in civic nationalism as against denominational nationalism which Pakistan openly subscribes. Jammu and Kashmir is not simply a State of the Indian Union but it is an example of the creed of secular India and, therefore, there is simply no question of this Government treating it in any other manner but that is its centrality. I must share this quite explicitly with the hon. Members.

I will not go into what the hon. Prime Minister said to the visiting dignitary, the President of Pakistan, that is, "You keep repeating that Jammu and Kashmir is the core issue, then I will have to go into the core of the core. Do you want me to do that? Do you want me to go into the core of what you call the core issue? Do you want me to go back?" Then, the visiting dignitary said, "No, we do not want to go back into history. I do not want to go back to 1947 or 1948". This is all very clearly and in unambiguous and explicit terms stated by the Prime Minister. Of course, he stated it with civility and courtesy that is due to a visiting Head of State. But there is absolute necessity, Sir, to understand that the kind of fundamentalism that Pakistan is structuring around hostility to India in addition, of course, to deluding and mesmerising its own citizens, is worrisome. That is the path which the hon. Members ought to reflect upon and that is the path which we all fully agree.

In inculcates a kind of self-induced cult of false glory about themselves. This is a deluding miasma that is being created by the leadership of Pakistan deliberately in its own citizens. This is a path that is full of peril much more so for Pakistan than for anybody else. I have had an occasion to repeatedly and on a number of occasions pointed out to the visitors from Pakistan that the path that you have chosen is ruinous. This path has no other alternative but to reject; else it will reduce Pakistan to a kind of social and political anarchy which is, of course, a matter of concern to us. But it is not in our hands to address. They have to address it themselves. It is these tendencies that we have always taken into account and we have always borne in mind. This is the reality.

Why is it that we said that we must continue to engage. It is because we believe in the challenge that India confronts, where it is a question of terrorism or challenging or questioning India's territorial or any other kind of integrity that our nationhood represents, then that challenge would be squarely met. It will be met; it will be

defeated; and it will be repelled each time and every time with no ambiguity and without exception. Kargil represented that in its essence. It was during Kargil that we first said that you must vacate your aggression.

Sir, I recollect that it was, in fact, on the 11th of June, 1999, on the eve of the then Foreign Minister of Pakistan's visit that in a Press Conference, I said: 'Aggression must be vacated'. I also said many other things because we had then six soldiers of ours returned in a mutilated manner. We had said that the validity of the Line of Control must be re-affirmed and we had said, quite clearly, that cross border terrorism must be rejected and stopped. That is where cross border terrorism started. That was the first time that we placed cross border terrorism squarely and firmly as an issue that must be addressed by Pakistan. In re-affirming the validity of the Line of Control, we were re-emphasising one of the principal attainments of the Shimla Agreement because the Shimla Agreement is a Treaty document. It is the Shimla Agreement that saw the conversion of the earlier cease-fire line into a Line of Control. That Line of Control was agreed to as a Treaty document by both sides and the designated officers of the military of both sides sat continuously and signed various maps and also descriptions so that the details of the Line of Control were in no doubt whatsoever. It is this, that was required to be re-affirmed. Therefore, when we speak of cross border terrorism, it is here that we re-affirm and re-emphasise that cross border terrorism is not acceptable to us. I really do not know how I should put it. Thereafter, the Government took it upon itself to create an international atmosphere about terrorism as not simply a challenge that India is facing but as something that the entire international community ought to wake up to because this menace is threatening.

18.00 hrs.

In fact, it threatens the civilised function of humanity in various parts of the world. It is a matter not of any false claim. It is a matter of objective reality. It is a matter that is now borne out by all the developments that have taken place that between Kargil and now, the manner in which terrorism was recognised by the international community was, in fact, clear denunciation of what Pakistan is doing and continues to do.

A number of hon. Members spoke aboutâ€¦...(Interruptions)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Would you please take the House into confidence on one point? We were told by the media – we may be totally wrong – that at one stage, your meeting with the Foreign Minister of Pakistan during the Summit almost clinched the issue and finalised the draft but later on, it could not get through. Is it because of the word, cross-border terrorism that they were not accepting or something else? Could you just elaborate as to why after your understanding with their Foreign Minister and the draft was ready, it could not get through?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I will certainly answer your question. This is one of the speculative items that is most unfortunately not only circulating in our media but has actively been put across - and this is a matter of some regret to me - by my interlocutors from Pakistan. But I will answer this question. Do please be patient and permit me to proceed with my intervention in the manner in which I have chosen to doâ€¦...(Interruptions)

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV (SILCHAR): Sir, would the time of the House be extended? ...(Interruptions)

सभापति महोदय : सदन की सहमति हो, तो सदन का समय जब तक यह चर्चा पूरी न हो, तब तक के लिए बढ़ा दिया जाए।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I will attempt to be as brief as possible I can, mindful of the concerns and sensibilities of the hon. Members. The subject is such, the speculations surrounding the issue have been such and the kinds of things that have been said have been such that I am sure that the hon. Members will give me an opportunity to explain the points. I will be mindful of your sense of time but please be mindful of my responsibility and explaining, as well as I can, what I have to explain. That is all the time which I am asking.

On the question of cross-border terrorism and on the totality of terrorism, I do agree that never before in international relations have we had such a situation in which terrorism has been put forth and frontally as has been Pakistan's role today. And I have repeatedly said that what is happening, the kind of anarchy that has visited Afghanistan.....(Interruptions)

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHARY (BERHAMPORE, WEST BENGAL): Sir, I would just ask one clarification. He has yielded, Sir. Has Mr. Musharraf's accession to power been legitimised by the Governmentâ€¦...(Interruptions)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: What the hon. Member wanted to know is that whether we are legitimising Mr. Pervez Musharraf's usurpation of power through military coup. I will attempt to answer it. I will answer all these questions. Please do not worry.

May I go back, with your permission Sir, to terrorism and how we approach the question of terrorism. It is a kind of social and political anarchy, which today visits the unfortunate land of Afghanistan, which is one of the

consequences of promotion of terrorism and cross-border terrorism.

In fact, it is an unleashing of a variety of medieval malevolence that I have cautioned my friends in Pakistan that if you do not curb, it will have very grave consequences for Pakistan. I have said so in public; I have said so here; in international gatherings that India has no illwill for the people of Pakistan, India has no illwill for Pakistan, as such. We do not covet even an inch of Pakistan's territory. India is on the move. We are not preoccupied with Pakistan. It is a matter of some regret and it is a matter of fact that all of Pakistan's policy is Indo-centric, not so with India.

When hon. Members and others find fault with us as to how we continue to observe certain proprieties and reticence in regard to exposure to media or of media or what we had to say to media, they should please bear in mind that India has not to deal with only one interlocutor or one country, but with the entire international community. When we deal with one country, and in a particularly irresponsible manner, in fact it is not how India will deal with other countries, but I will come to that later. It is because of that that we have a situation today in the form of a UN Security Council Resolution No.1333, to which the signatories were the two principal antagonists in Afghanistan, Russia and United States of America, which is jointly promoted with India and that is the Resolution on Taliban. This was done for the first time ever. It is a big warning. A number of Members have asked that if that is so, then why Pakistan has not been declared a 'terrorist State'. Let me make it very clear that India has the ability, it has the determination - and there is no question of India asking for anyone's help - to meet the challenge that has been posed to us through terrorism. We need nobody's assistance, we covet nobody's help and we do not have to knock on anyone's door as to how we recognise the reality of what is happening in Pakistan. I did say already that we covet not an inch of Pakistan's territory.

SHRI SHYAMACHARAN SHUKLA (MAHASAMUND): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Government of India held the basic position that unless cross-border terrorism is stopped, we will not have any talks with Pakistan. So, I would like to know as to whether the Government had any inkling or reason for changing that position.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I was just coming to that point in a minute or so because this is a question that has been asked by many.

Sir, the Government of India did not and has not changed its position in regard to terrorism. We will not change our position, but having internationally achieved what we set out to do after Kargil, which was to continuously bring the international community and as much of the totality of the international community to the point of accepting India's view point, a larger view point on terrorism, we took this decision. It was a conscious decision. I will address all the various descriptions that have been given about this decision like the sudden 'U' turn, change etc. It was a deliberate decision; it was a well thought-out decision; it was a decision that was a part of the whole; it was a decision that was not a turn, it was a decision that was a continuity, it was a continuity of a total approach and policy; it was not a decision that was an aberration or a departure or indeed even a turn away. It was a continuation because, so far as terrorism is concerned, no quarter will be given to it, no quarter is ever going to be given now or in future and Pakistan will have to continue to answer for every action of the terrorists that it continues to promote.

In the approach to the sole issue, it was the Government of India's considered viewpoint - having achieved what we set out - to achieve internationally. Having addressed the question internally, let me share it with the hon. Members. No doubt the hon. Members have appreciated that we addressed the question of terrorism. It was simultaneously being addressed internationally and internally through security forces on the ground and through various actions that were initiated almost simultaneously. Otherwise, you may say: Why was that action then taken? It was a deliberate step that was taken. It was thought out as a process of reconciliation, as a process of giving yet another opportunity for peace and normalcy to return. No doubt, the hon. Members recollect it. The first step internally was to release the people belonging to the All-Party Hurriyat Conference from confinement and let them go back to Jammu and Kashmir. For about four or five months thereafter, they were permitted to do what they wanted to do and to meet their people. It was a deliberate step. It was not in a fit of amnesia that the Government did it.

I am broadly categorising the chronology of how it went. If the hon. Members would recollect, thereafter there was the cease-fire - the cease-fire announced by Hizbul Mujahidin - which we encouraged. I would remind the hon. Members that the announcement of that cease-fire by Hizbul Mujahidin was very rapidly followed by statements from Salhaudin sitting in Pak-occupied Kashmir, induced and persuaded by Pakistan to give all kinds of conditions, to involve Pakistan, and to give your reply within eight days or this will happen or that will happen. That was again thwarted. We did not then give up. That was followed by the announcement - that was greeted by everybody - by the hon. Prime Minister on the eve of the holy month of Ramazan on 23rd November.

Starting from 28th of November last, we started a process of non-initiation of combat operations. We knew very well that each of these steps will be challenged and the process we endeavoured towards peace will be thwarted and defeated at all steps. For six months, we let it continue. In all these six months, the international efforts continued. It is during these months that the international community's attention continued to be limited upon the aspects of

terrorism that India continued to contend with. Internally, we made these efforts. Continuously from Pakistan's side, efforts were made to defeat these efforts. We did not make any departure. Despite this, we came to the conclusion about the logic of what the Government has done. Despite all this, not having succeeded entirely, it required that we carried the logic to its logical point. There was only one thing remaining thereafter. The logical point being that the President of Pakistan then as the Head of the Government – as its Chief Executive – made a constant reiteration: I am ready to talk at any time, at any place, etc., etc.

Consciously and deliberately we came to the conclusion. We wished to talk. We will talk. We will talk with civility. We will observe all norms. But in the process of talking, if it is your impression and it is the impression of anybody in Pakistan, including the President or the Government of Pakistan that India agreed to talk because it was not out of any weakness, India agreed to talk, it was not out of any fatigue, we agreed to talk, as has been suggested by somebody, because of the call - to my mind, it is completely an unsustainable call - that the *Jihadis* have now pressurised India that we are ready to have a talk.

These notions are so absurd, these notions themselves are so untenable that we said notwithstanding this kind of observation that will follow, let us give peace one more try. Let us give this try also because the objective is peace.

Let me share here itself, Mr. Chairman, with all the hon. Members. Firstly what was set in motion at Lahore was a process which was a continuation and it built up upon what had preceded earlier. We brought to the process of Lahore, the distillate of the experience of the past fifty years. We attempted to channelise that distillate into a process and the ultimate aim of that process is peace. The aim of that process is sustainable, amicable, good relations between India and Pakistan because as the Prime Minister has often said, "you can change friends in life, indeed in politics, but you cannot change your neighbours". Pakistan has come to learn to live in peace with India.

We said, "we will give this also a try." That is why, when I had occasion to meet people from Pakistan before Gen. Parvez Musharraf came, when I had the occasion to meet the Press, I continued to say, the decision that Pakistan has to take is as to what kind of long-term relationship it wants with India. The kind of long-term relationship that India wants with Pakistan is clear, we covet not an inch of territory of Pakistan.

We hope that Pakistan is able to so arrange its affairs that it is socially at ease, hopefully, politically, and democratically. But we are not going to dictate to Pakistan as to what you do with your internal arrangement. Indeed, we cannot dictate. You would wish that it were democratic. But if it chooses an alternative manner of governing itself, then good luck to them and good luck to the people of Pakistan.

We also said that if it is an economically viable Pakistan, then it is good for Pakistan, it is good for the relations between India and Pakistan and it is good for the region. But in achieving all these three, other than sitting with Pakistan and talking, I cannot do much more to help Pakistan move in the direction of coming to a determination of what kind of long-term relationship it wants. It is Pakistan that has to resolve the inner turmoil within its own society, the sectarian violence. It is Pakistan that has to realise that if it continues to promote the kind of fundamentalism that it is promoting, it is unleashing a variety of medieval benevolence that can only harm it. India will contend with it, it will confront it. I know, as a fact that India will redeem.

So, it was with this persuasion that we said, "all right, if now an effort towards continuing the process of Lahore requires, and I do believe it required, that we now sit with the Head of Government of Pakistan also. Let us sit and let us try and give this matter another chance because as was stated, the caravan of peace must continue." But in the movement of caravan of peace, Lahore was followed by Kargil. It was followed by Kandahar also. We handled both Kargil and Kandhar. You could be filled with bitterness on that account and the Prime Minister could have said, "on account of these I abandon all efforts at reconciliation." But he did not. It was a mark, not simply of an individual commitment towards peace and reconciliation, but also a mark of the innate cultural and civilisational ethos of what India is all about.

That is why, I kept saying, 'We do not covet Pakistan's territory'. We mean no ill-will to their people. We do want them to come to the path of peace. That is why, we said, 'All right, we will meet'. It is in this background, Sir, that we went, the principles were cleared, the pillars around which the talks were to take place were absolutely clear, had been made repeatedly clear. We were the first ones to point out when the Chief Executive Gen. Pervez Musharraf Sahib continued to say, I do not believe in Shimla and I do not believe in Lahore, when he continued to say and when he said it, we pointed it out to Pakistan.

यहां तो आप अपने पांव पर कुल्हाड़ी मार रहे हैं। सोच लीजिये, यह आप क्या कह रहे हैं? कुछ दिनों के बाद पाकिस्तान से बयान आते हैं और जनरल परवेज मुशर्रफ कहते हैं कि हम शिमला और लाहौर डैक्लरेशन दोनों पर भरोसा रखते हैं। इसलिये, हम आंख मूंदकर नहीं गये। हमें इस बात का पूरा ध्यान था, पूरी समझ थी। उसके बाद ही हमने यह कदम उठाया।

Now, Sir, I must address these four broad issues. About preparation, what were prepared and preceded with the invitation, I have just explained. In terms of hard preparation, I can tell you, Sir, that as the Ministry and as an

individual, the Prime Minister, though he was convalescing in the hospital bed, he had demanded from the Ministry all the way-back from all UN Resolutions on the subject to all the talks that the country has ever had with Pakistan, full details; he would like to study even while he was in Bombay convalescing in the hospital bed. This is not a small preparation. I do not wish to go back and dig into history or dwell of it. In the process of what the Prime Minister had demanded of my Ministry, I had occasion, Sir, to study at great length and in great depth, for example the 1963 talks that late Sardar Swaran Singh had with late Zulfikar Ali Bhutto.

I am sure, my friend from the principal party in the Opposition would not like me to dwell on those talks, what were offered and where they were leading up. I also studied at great length what my friends call preparations for Tashkent, for example. I do not want to dwell on that or Shimla. These are parts of the movement of history in the matter of India Pakistan relations.

In assessing the course of events, yes, do your judgement. But when judging, please do not tamper and moderate your views, that in passing the kind of comments that you do, what purpose it is being served. If you wish to find fault with me, my Ministry or with the Government, do find fault. In the process of finding fault, please do not find fault with the totality of the country's endeavour in this regard.

A great deal has been said that the talks were not accompanied by any agenda. Repeatedly there were four proposals for the agenda. They are already extant in India-Pakistan bilateral dialogue, the agenda that Shimla has bequeathed as a continuing process to both the countries. There was already, as a part of the continuing agenda, the Lahore Declaration between India and Pakistan.

We had repeated this to Pakistan. They knew very well that this was very much a part of it. Thirdly, the Composite Dialogue process that had set out and listed the issues on which subjects India and Pakistan will deliberate, was a fixed agenda. We had reiterated that agenda to Pakistan. And fourthly, despite Pakistan continuously saying we do not want any agendaâ€”I will come to the details of it in a minuteâ€”in writing, the Ministry of External Affairs, the concerned Division, proposed an agenda point by point that let this be the agenda on which Pakistan and India when President visits, the talks should take place.

It is not a serious observation to make that a country with this size, the maturity, the experience, finds fault with us--turned in the process of finding political fault with meâ€”finds fault with the systems of the country, and the systems had sub-served the country very well. These agendas were all there. What did the Pakistan establishment have? What did the President of Pakistan propose? The Pakistan establishment until the last was not clear itself because the establishment had not been taken into full confidence by the President of Pakistan himself. We had proposed that in addition toâ€”this is normally what does happenâ€”the one to one talks between the visiting Head of Government/State and the Prime Minister, there must be a full delegation level meeting. That was a prepared text which included all the points that India wanted to include in the Prime Minister's intervention.

I am not revealing any State secret. There was no prepared text on Pakistan side. The notes for the intervention by the visiting Head of Government/State by Pakistan were made on the table while the Indian Prime Minister was presenting. It was that kind of a situation. That was the kind of military simplicism if I might put it as politely as I can. The President of Pakistan never fights shy of extolling the virtues of soldierly qualities. He is not at all hesitant or inhibited in putting across that he has the attribute of soldierly directness. We all greatly admired the soldierly qualities.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : He forgot that you also have that.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I do not wish to say that.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please do not do cross talk.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: But as a country, India too is not absent of soldierly qualities. What was required at that dialogue between the two Heads of State Government was not an exposition on soldierly qualities or soldierly directness. It was to address the intricate complex issues that involve not territory, not land because Jammu and Kashmirâ€”let me repeat againâ€”is not a territorial dispute. It involves the complex sentiments of the peoples. We have to address the complexities of the mistakes of history. It was made very clear in the statement that the Prime Minister gave. Not being the territorial dispute, what are we talking of?

Are we simply talking of the Valley of Srinagar or Valley of Kashmir? The State of Jammu and Kashmir is as defined in Article I, Schedule I, which point I made clear in a Press Conference on the 11th of July, having made clear on the 14th of June. When I was asked, I said clearly, 'How do I negotiate? How do I compromise with the Constitution of India?' And, what does this Jammu and Kashmir comprise of? It comprises of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh and all that is described in Schedule I including Shakshgam Valley. Shakshgam Valley is a land territory of 380 square kilometres that was illegally ceded by Pakistan to the People's Republic of China. China does not yet fully confirm it,

leaving it for final settlement of the issue. How, therefore, are we to treat this issue? Are we to treat this as a territorial dispute?

I pointed out, 'Are you referring to this as a dispute simply because in the Valley of Srinagar the percentage of population of the citizens of India that subscribe to the noble faith of Islam is say 80 per cent or more? Then, I can cite you today', I told the visiting dignitary, 'the number of districts in India where the citizens of India subscribing to the noble faith of Islam have a similar population. What am I to do with those districts? You will claim those districts simply on the grounds of population of those districts. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : We all appreciate that you very rightly said that but why did you not react and tell it to the media when Mr. Pervez Musharraf insulted us by saying that the terrorists were freedom fighters? You too have soldierly qualities and all that. You could have said that to the media but you did not. Why did you not say that at that time? You allowed him to insult us.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I had said that – if you permit me – there were three or four broad issues: preparation, agenda and also the media. I was going to come to the media. I will attempt to answer as best as God has given me the ability to answer the question on the media also but because I was on the question of agenda, I must set hon. Members' doubts at rest.

It is not a territorial dispute. I said, 'What am I to do with these districts of India if your proposition be at all a tenable proposition? I have such districts in the heart of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. I have them in West Bengal; I have them in Kerala; I have them in Tamil Nadu. If your thesis or if your theory is accepted ever by anybody, what will I have to do with these districts? Will I have to put those districts on railway rakes and transport them to West Pakistan? How am I to do it? How can I?' It was almost in these words that I said it. It is totally unacceptable. This thesis or this theory that the Jammu and Kashmir is in a kind of a territorial dispute is not acceptable. There was no ambiguity about this; there is no ambiguity; there would be no ambiguity. But we are ready to sit with them. We will sit with them. ...(*Interruptions*)

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह (महाराजगंज, उ.प्र.) : माननीय मंत्री जी से मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आपने पाकिस्तान ऑक्युपाइड कश्मीर पर अपना दावा जताया था या नहीं?

श्री जसवन्त सिंह : सभापति जी, माननीय सदस्य की इस बात का स्पटीकरण मैं पहले दे चुका हूँ। क्योंकि आपने उतावलेपन में यह प्रश्न पूछा है, मैं उतावलेपन में उत्तर नहीं दूंगा पर आपको उत्तर जरूर दूंगा। जी, बिल्कुल स्पट रूप से मैंने अभी कहा था कि जब यह प्रश्न उठा, पाकिस्तान के सत्तार साहब जब फरमाने लगे कि जम्मू-कश्मीर कोर इश्यू है तो माननीय अटल जी ने कहा था कि कोर इश्यू है तो हमें कोर इश्यू में जाना होगा और फिर आपको हमें बताना होगा जम्मू-कश्मीर में पाकिस्तान ऑक्युपाइड कश्मीर, सन् 1947-48, सक्षगाम वैली, चितराल, ल्हासा, यह सब क्या मसला है? उन्होंने कहा कि यह इतिहास की बात है। कहने में, स्पट करने में उनको जैसा कहते हैं उनको शीशा दिखाने में कोई कमी नहीं रही। **â€¦(व्यवधान)**

I will come to the point, I am sorry. But I have to respond because this is the first opportunity that the Government is taking to make it as explicit, still with propriety, still with the sense of the confidentiality that high affairs of State must always have – some exchanges must never be made public.

First, please understand that the nature of the Agra Summit was a retreat. Normally, how retreat by its very word is described is a meeting where the visiting Head of State/Government and the receiving Head of State/Government meet in retreat quietly, away from Press, away from publicity so that complex and intricate issues are then enabled to be addressed by them in the privacy, and confidentiality of their dialogue quite often is maintained. This is the standard during such retreats and at one-to-one. At such retreats, even note-takers are not present when two Heads of Governments meet. The note-takers are not present so that the two Heads of Governments are then able to speak absolutely freely about things which they might not be able to say in public because naturally, on intricate issues, there are always high aspects not simply of State policy but public sentiments are also involved. This was the nature of the Agra Summit.

Sir, what preceded it? We suggested, and here again, I shall submit with due regard to confidentiality that it was suggested that for the sake of making this visit worthwhile, let us meet directly at Goa. It would be well away from the Capital. The Capital has its own convulsive dimensions, if I might so put it. In Goa, the two leaders then can be secluded and they can address themselves. Let us meet on 14th and 15th so that 16th is then available as a reserve. A direct request of the visiting dignitary, directly to the Prime Minister, was made 'I must come to Delhi.' It is not possible for the host, thereafter, to say, no, you cannot come to Delhi. With all due courtesies to a visiting Head of State, Delhi was fixed. Again, it was decided that after the arrival of the visiting Head of State, after the due ceremonials, Guard of Honour, a luncheon by the President etc., immediately the two Heads of Governments would retreat, withdraw to Agra for that retreat, so that we would have the balance of 14th, 15th and 16th of July. A request was made 'दिल्ली में एक रात रहना जरूरी है।' कोई मेहमान आ रहा है और अगर ऐसा होता है और वह कहता है, फिर क्या हम यह कहेंगे कि नहीं, दिल्ली में आप नहीं रह सकते।

Sir, what happened on the 14th July? We were not blind to what happened on the 14th, what was done with regard

to All Party Hurriyat Conference. They have no claim at all, no representational identity with Jammu and Kashmir. If they wish to have a representational identity with Jammu and Kashmir, of course, like any citizen of Jammu and Kashmir, they are free to contest elections.

SHRI R.L. BHATIA : Then, why did you send Shri K.C. Pant to talk to them in Kashmir, if you do not recognise them?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: The direction that has been given to Shri K.C. Pant is to not talk to only All Party Hurriyat Conference but to talk to any element and all elements in Jammu and Kashmir who wish to now come back to the path of normalcy and abandon violence, and a great many have come forward. It is the APHC which is under pressure from Pakistan. The nature of APHC is not hidden either from you or from us. They represent or speak for nobody but the APHC. They do not represent the will or the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. We were aware of what was happening, but ultimately because of courtesy, as the host demands that the visiting guest dignitary be permitted all access. This country is a free country. It is a country that exemplifies courtesy and hospitality. I do not have to cite अतिथि देवो भवः It was that kind of an approach to a visiting dignitary.

Thereafter came the 15th July. I wish to dwell on the timings of it. The 15th started somewhat late because the arrivals etc. were late. It was only after 11 o'clock or so that the one-to-one started. The 15th afternoon ended with an agreed text of a joint statement between India and Pakistan giving an account of the discussions till then.

On 15th evening, before the Banquet by the Governor of U.P., that Joint Statement was to be issued. It was our understanding that, that Joint Statement contained the essence of what had so far taken place and what the thrust of the discussions was, that there would be no departure. There was a very big media team. The hon. Minister for Information and Broadcasting, who is my valued colleague in the Cabinet, went to Agra because we in the External Affairs Ministry requested her to be there. I requested her. The Prime Minister advised her that she should be there. When she told the Press what she did, she told the Press what she was authorised to tell and she had the authority of the Union Cabinet to do so. To suggest otherwise at the behest of Pakistan that a member of the Union Cabinet had spoken out of turn is completely out of turn as they thought. It is not acceptable to us. There was no damage there. The damage is in your mind. There was absolutely no damage there.

The Joint Statement was the outcome of the 15th. It was decided that on the 15th we would attempt to produce a Joint Document. The proposals were either a Joint Statement or a Declaration. The proposal came, "Why not a Declaration?" India had prepared -- we had drafts of a Statement, which were a Press Statement, and a Declaration. To say that there was no such preparation, I am really amazed at the irony of it. If there was preparation, the preparation was actually from India's side. We had a possible draft, if it was only to be a Press Statement or a joint statement. We had a possible draft, if it was to be a Declaration. We had possible drafts ready, if it was to be something more than that. It all depended on how the visiting dignitary chose to address this task. We said, "Please let your officers be deputed to sit with our officers so that work can proceed on a draft." They were supposed to sit at 4.30 p.m. If my memory serves me right, it was either at 4.30 or 5.00 on the afternoon of the 15th. I am now talking of 15th. आगरा पहुंच गए। ...*(Interruptions)*

श्री रामदास आठवले : वह चर्चा दिल्ली में भी हो सकती थी।*(व्यवधान)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Ramdas, please take your seat.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It was suggested to the officials of the Pakistan team that let officials from the two sides sit together and start working on the document so that before the banquet by the Governor of Uttar Pradesh, some progress is made on the document. I do not find fault with them. But this is a fact. The officials from the Pakistan side would just not sit with our officials because they had no directions; they had no instructions and they had no document. It was after the banquet was over – by now we have reached 11 o'clock at night on the 15th – finally, at 11 o'clock at night, Pakistan officials said that they were then ready to sit with us. This was on the 15th evening. There was only half a day left.

श्री संतो मोहन देव : नमक खाने के बाद।

श्री जसवन्त सिंह : हम उस पर टिप्पणी नहीं करेंगे।

The officials, I commend their dedication to duty, I commend their hard work, they worked till 4.30 a.m. in the morning jointly. The possible outline was prepared. Yes, in that outline Draft there were, what in diplomatic parlance is called, a number of square brackets. Square brackets are areas where there is no agreement. That document was referred to the Heads of Governments on the morning of the 16th. Now, please reflect on this. The original schedule is that the visiting dignitary would depart Agra at 2.30 p.m on the 16th so that he was able to fly to Jaipur, thereafter be heli-lifted to Ajmer so as to be able to visit the *Dargah Sharief* at Khawaja Moinuddin Chisti. So, we

knew that we were now already very closely pressed for time. It was already 11 o'clock in the morning.

Sir, a number of questions have been raised. My friend, colleague and a distinguished member of the Congress Party asked me, was there any draft in which I made any corrections with my hands? I must tell you, Sir, there must not have been just one piece of paper. There must have been many pieces of paper on which I attempted to correct all kinds of things from the quality of Punjabi English and grammar to punctuation.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : To Jodhpuri English...(Interruptions)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: No. Therefore, I think, finding fault with me would not be a right thing.

Sir, I must also go and add little further because I must satisfy all the hon. Members. I am again sharing no State secret here. But I must share this with the hon. Members because it is the background in which the question of media management has come. The visiting Head of Government undertakes to start a drafting exercise with the Prime Minister. This, Sir, is not ever done. Not because the visiting Head of Government or State has subsequently in Islamabad made it clear - he said, 'what is a Declaration? It is after all only an exercise in English composition. I can do it in half-an-hour'. I am not saying this after an after thought. This is the statement he made after he had reached Islamabad and said that this is all that a Declaration is. So, when effort was being made by the visiting Head of State, of course, no doubt, he was inspired by military directness to correct or attempt to do a drafting exercise...(Interruptions) Then I suggested that this is not how it should be done.

But, the Prime Minister had said that even though it was a one-to-one, I had better go along because there were so many square brackets and that I would be better able to explain those square brackets. Then it was suggested that my counterpart, His Excellency Sattar *sahab*, should also be present. That was when it was suggested that the Heads of Government should not engage in any drafting. Even Foreign Ministers do not engage in drafting exercise. It is left to officials for very good reasons.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Ministers are only to sign.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Absolutely. The Foreign Ministers or the Heads of Government just simply do not do it. But if the visiting side says, 'this is how it should be done', we continue to gently say 'this is not how this is done'. And if the visiting side says, 'this is how we will do it', to the extent possible you guide them and say "इस तरीके से नहीं, यह बेहतर होगा, इसको ऐसे किया जाए। इससे ज्यादा और क्या गुस्ताखी होगी। " It was not possible beyond that. So, the drafting exercise went on. In the drafting exercise that went on between my distinguished counterpart His Excellency the Foreign Minister of Pakistan and I, just as I made pencilled corrections, no doubt he also made pencilled corrections. I have never up till now said, or produced, or pointed out to the press पाकिस्तान के फॉरेन मिनिस्टर साहब ने अपनी पेंसिल से ये अल्फाज़ लिखे।

As my very good friend and senior, the habited Barrister, Shri Somnath Chatterjee knows, lawyers have to correct so many things. He goes on correcting and changing until he, in his distinguished legal career, settles a brief that he puts his initial on. In the process of consultations and discussions, how can something be taken as 'the document'? There is no 'the document' until there is a document on which signatures of the two Heads of Government are put.

The rest is now history. The 12:30 deadline could not be met. It kept on prolonging. Every effort was made. What was holding it up? What was holding it up was what the Prime Minister had clearly said - Pakistan's continued emphasis and preoccupation that everything is dependent on Jammu and Kashmir.

A number of friends asked as to what were those nine items. They were all aspects and issues that were part of the composite dialogue process. It included nuclear confidence-building measures; it included nuclear risk reduction; it included discussions on Siachen, on Wullar, on Sir Creek, on commercial relations, on all kinds of things. I am not citing it because hon. Members would recognise it. We had said that on the 4th, on the 6th and on the 9th of July the Government had unilaterally announced a number of steps - economic, nuclear confidence-building, talks between Directors-General of Military Operations, 50 lines to be identified even though Pakistan does not give India the most-favoured-nation status, etc. All that had been done including opening Srinagar-Muzaffarabad highway, opening Monabau-Kokrabhar line, hopefully. This is not for any parochial reason that I recommended it.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Opening those roads to terrorists?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Terrorists do not go by roads that are officially open. Terrorists follow other paths and my friend also knows it.

These steps had already been taken. It is in this background that the question of media has been addressed to us, and a fault is found with us that we did not sufficiently keep the media informed. I have said what has happened. I must share with the hon. Members that whenever I felt it necessary that I must go to the press and make clear India's position, I did so.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : With the help of Sushmaji.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Yes, of course, she was obviously there. Without the help of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, how can I clear?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Did she clear the speech?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: No, that she did not .

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Do not blame my sister.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am very glad that she is not blamed. (Interruptions) It was found necessary that I meet the Press on the 14th of June which was well before the date of the visit because soon after the visit had been announced we were witnessing that His Excellency, General Parvez Musharraf went into a spree of interviews giving -- two, three, four. He went up to four a day. I really, in my judgement, did not think that it was necessary --of course, the Prime Minister can simply not do it -- that I also engage in four interviews a day. It was not necessary. We are not preoccupied, as I said earlier, with Pakistan. I recognise that Pakistan's policy is Indo-centric. We have a lot of other things to do. The country is moving. A lot of things were happening. So, I did not do so.

Thereafter, a lot of things were happening. We had come to the eve of the visit and I felt it necessary, on behalf of the Government, to restate the position and to make explicit that 'this is very unjust.' So, I went to the Press again on 11th of July. I had a full conference for one hour.

During the conference, I did not consider it right on my part to engage in exactly what Pakistan was doing. We do not follow the examples set by Pakistan. No doubt, they judge and choose what they do after deliberate reflection. We are not impressed that that is the path to follow.

I must also tell you, Sir, that on the 17th of July, the hon. General Parvez Musharraf left around midnight of 16th, and I did not think it proper that I go to the Press because there was nothing so catastrophic that it happened that I go to the Press at midnight. I chose to go on the morning of the 17th and I did explicitly, clearly re-enunciate India's position and exactly what had taken place. Now, the fault that has been found is that that while Pakistan was doing all this, why did we not do likewise. I will explain, Sir, why it was not possible to do so. India has to deal not simply with Pakistan but with the entire international community.

It is a matter of some regret to me that my friends from the Media were disappointed. The friends from the Media had, in their own persuasion, arrived at certain conclusions about this meeting between General Parvez Musharraf and the Prime Minister of India, and when conclusions, other than what they thought should be reached, were arrived at, we were informed that it was not a success. I beg to differ.

I must also share with you that what India has done is not because we work on that basis, it has been, in fact, so lauded by Capitals of the world because of the sense of responsibility and restraint we showed. That is not why we did it. Even during post 1998, these very Capitals (Interruptions)

श्री प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी : भारत आने से दस दिन पहले वह कह रहे थे कि हिन्दुस्तान में जा रहे हैं और कश्मीर मेरा मेन मुद्दा है लेकिन हमारी तरफ से दस दिन क्या पांच दिन पहले यह कहा जा रहा था कि वह दिल्ली स्थित अपनी नहर वाली हवेली में इस समय आ रहे हैं। आपने भी दस दिन पहले क्यों नहीं बताया?

सभापति महोदय : मंत्री जी, आपको अभी कितना समय और लगेगा?

श्री जसवंत सिंह : अभी पांच-सात मिनट में समाप्त कर रहा हूँ। मुझे बड़ा खेद है कि माननीय प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी जी फरमा रहे हैं कि उन्होंने यहां आने से दस दिन पहले बयान दिया और हमने क्यों नहीं अपना बयान दिया?

19.00 hrs.

महोदय, मैंने अभी दो मिनट पहले ही कहा कि 11 जुलाई को मैंने साफ बता दिया था कि टैरिज्म, जम्मू-काश्मीर और अन्य मसलों पर भारत का क्या रवैया है और क्या हमारी पोजीशन है। हो सकता है, माननीय सदस्य ने मेरा वह बयान न सुना हो, न देखा हो।

श्री प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी : लेकिन दुनिया को आवाज नहीं पहुंच पाई ।

श्री जसवन्त सिंह : अभी जो कहा है, वह भी न सुनें, तो यह मेरे साथ न्याय नहीं कर रहे हैं, यथार्थ के साथ न्याय नहीं कर रहे हैं और मुझे तो लगता है कि भारत के साथ भी न्याय नहीं कर रहे हैं।

I believe, amongst all the things, that we do live in a world of what is very broadly, but not inaccurately, called as 'information age'. Above all, I have had a great deal to do with the informatics, softwares and such other developments. I do also believe that this is an age of 'instant-everything'. I recognise that the factor of time in the sense of news particularly – because of the preponderance of visual media – has got to redefine. It is

instantaneous and the whole sense of visual media gets defused, if it is not instantly transmitted. Therefore, when you combine that with 24-hour news or when you combine that with the kind of build-up that had preceded General Pervez Musharraf's visit, then the compulsion was self-induced – that there must be some news all the time – all the 24-hours; otherwise, there is a failure. I submit to you, Sir, that in matters of 'High State Policy', where such issues are involved, it is simply not possible.

There are just one or two thoughts. Knowing all this – given the fact that we are a democracy, we are a free country, we respect and we will take into account what our visiting guest does – if the visiting guest violates the established conventions and norms of conduct of diplomatic behaviour, we, because of our openness and access to Press, will continue to permit him to do so because that, in a very real sense, is also India's strength. India is not diminished in the least of it, by what General Pervez Musharraf chooses to do here. We are not diminished because in fact, in substance, what after all, he has said here when he met our distinguished editors, without the knowledge certainly of some of them who went subsequently, - he had that broadcast - is against the canons of diplomatic conduct, particularly when it is a one-to-one meeting, it is a meeting of high importance, and when it is taking place at a 'retreat'. This was about media. Could we have done something better? Yes, no doubt we could have. Were we perfect in the media management? No. We were not. Whose fault is the failure of media management? It is my fault. As the Minister of External Affairs, it is my responsibility. The total meeting was my responsibility. How can you possibly put the blame on my dear colleague, the Minister of Information and Broadcasting or on anybody else? If there is any fault to be found, any deficiencies or shortcomings to be found there, of course, they are my shortcomings and I will address them.

We analyse every event of this nature in the Ministry of External Affairs, no matter what the outcome is. And from every event, we carry out an analysis and see what should have been done differently. In a similar fashion, we will do so here also.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Knowing his capacity, capability, his wide knowledge in diplomacy and media management, which is generally one of best projections of media in our country, I am sure he is right. But I could not follow it as I was also waiting for some news about the outcome. It was known that the talks had not succeeded. While our spokesperson gave a brief report on that night, I do not think we had behaved like a mature nation. What were you trying to keep away from the people? Nobody knew anything. It is right that in the next day morning you held a Press Conference. But you must understand and appreciate that the instant news has a value. The media hype was created on his visit not only all over the country but outside also. As I said, in my intervention that even getting an invitation to the tea party or the dinner was treated as the status symbol. Why could not the news be given little more explicitly than the briefest of the brief that was given? I know it was the handiwork of the Foreign Minister. I have no doubt about it. I could not understand it at all as to how that could be so brief. Not brevity has always the virtue, time remedy has lunched you, Mr. Foreign Minister.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I always take seriously what my senior and distinguished barrister, such a distinguished Parliamentarian, Shri Somnath Chatterjee says. I have taken note of this observation of yours, in any event, even if you have not repeated it. I know, Sir, that in your intervention you attributed the authorship, of what the spokesperson of the Ministry of External Affairs said, to me. But you were right. Of course, as the Minister I had to help her to say what she or any spokesperson had to say. What was being said was my responsibility. The only point remains is that instead of meeting the Press at 10 o'clock in the morning why did, at midnight, I not say more than just that one line? Yes, it was possible and we could have done it. In retrospect, I think that instead of meeting the Press at 10 o'clock and instead of just one line statement at midnight, had I said something more, perhaps the hunger...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : There was an impression that the Government had not made up its mind what to say.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: But that impression was not correct. I can understand that inadvertently that impression was created. The only difference that remains and I prefer to be wiser...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : There is some nodding of heads behind you.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Perhaps, if you go through the facts and the situation of the matter, I have in my hands a departing dignitary.â€¦ *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I give you the benefit of doubt.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Thank you. I will take only a minute or two to conclude. There were detailed observations and I must cover them. Otherwise, I have spoken on the schedule and programme -- of the foreign pressure. A number of hon. Members have said about it. I am disappointed that my distinguished friend and colleague Shri R.L. Bhatia should also say that. There is no question. It goes to 1998. Through conduct we have demonstrated that the

Government of India has not deviated from the path of central purpose, path of national interest no matter what country, which country. It cannot. Please believe me that in this particular instance there is no question of any foreign pressure. There will be no question of foreign pressure, foreign intervention, mediation, facilitation, no matter which country and how many countries wish to get into or to intervene or to facilitate or to help, or to mediate. It will just not work. It is clear, unambiguous and full stop.

Let this debate rest here because it is not a debate that is befitting the high status of this House. I have spoken on the issue of dispute. I have addressed the issue of I&B Minister speaking on TV. A question was also asked as to why General Musharraf spoke in the manner that he did about the Prime Minister and myself, and not about others. He did not have that much occasion to interact with the rest of the Indian delegation. The Indian delegation was chosen on deliberate purpose knowing that Pakistan delegation was limited. Even then the Prime Minister said that we will have a delegation comprising of the Minister of Home because terrorism is to be dealt with, Finance because we wish to talk economic issues, Commerce because we wish to talk trade and 'Yours Truly', because foreign relations were involved. It was a full delegation.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : But the others had no work to do.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Sir, on the question whether an agreement was almost reached, this is a statement somewhat like saying so and so is half pregnant. You cannot be half pregnant. You cannot almost reach. You can either reach or you do not reach. Either an agreement is reached or an agreement is not reached. In this case, an agreement was not reached. An agreement about what? An agreement that Jammu and Kashmir as the factor around which India-Pakistan relations must be held hostage to. We do not agree to that. That is why, we continue to say and we said then and we can say now that it is a broad based relationship that should guide us.

A question was asked whether the Government was willing to concede on the issue of centrality of Kashmir. Of course, we did not. Did we agree to abandon Shimla and Lahore? No, we did not. Were we willing to give our insistence about cross border terrorism? Of course, we did not. I made it quite explicit. What was the agreement over the eight items? I have explained them. Did the Minister of External Affairs correct a draft? Yes, of course, I corrected many drafts. My pencil notes must be there on many drafts which are with the Pakistan foreign office. But these are not things that are then subsequently presented.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Were they all in square bracket?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: They were in square bracket. In all, there were six square brackets. I do not want to go into all those square brackets. But with your sharp legal acumen, you will find fault with me that no, they were not six, they were only five. The whole purpose of negotiations then becomes a process to try and eliminate the square brackets by talking. Did I correct a draft? Yes, I corrected many pieces of paper. Some say that Kashmir has been put on top of the agenda. Even in the composite dialogue process, it is one of eight issue for discussion. It is listed at several place. I do not know how much more top you can get to. It is already there. It is existing. It is an issue that we have never been shy of addressing with Pakistan. We are ready to continue to address this. But it is not an issue which, in our view, should or can or will hold India-Pakistan relations as hostage.

A question was asked about SAARC. We had even before Agra Summit agreed that the SAARC meet should take place. The Foreign Secretaries were to meet. The process of SAARC is to continue. I believe on the 9th or the 10th, the Foreign Secretaries are due to meet and it is hoped that SAARC will continue. It was suggested that MEA remained silent. I had just explained that MEA was not silent. MEA was observing all due propriety. Yes, there are negotiations that the invitation goes to the Prime Minister or an invitation to me. The invitation had been accepted. It is a suggestion here that visits take place to Islamabad. These visits will take place.

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHARY : Sir, by virtue of your magnanimity, General Musharraf has got recognition...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I will answer what the hon. Member is asking. If I do not answer anything, then I am told that I am not answering anything. The hon. Member has asked whether we conferred any kind of legitimacy on His Excellency, the President of Pakistan. Please let me make it very clear. Sir, we do not confer legitimacy on the system of governance of Pakistan. It is Pakistan's sovereign decision. It is their determination. As the Prime Minister has said, we have to deal with the reality of Pakistan.

They are our neighbours. You can change your friends. You can scarcely change the neighbours. I have explained that for two years we did not change for very good reason. We did not change but we altered the road again for a very good reason because when we proceed down this path in quest of peace, it is not as if that quest must be pursued...*(Interruptions)*

सभापति महोदय : बैठे हुए सदस्यों के प्रश्नों का रिस्पॉंस न करें। अब आप कनक्लूड करिए।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: The meetings will take place. These meetings will take place on days and at venues that will be decided upon diplomatic convenience and calendars of the respective parties.

I must finally end by saying that I have given my best endeavour to answer all the questions put by the hon. Members. I do share with all the hon. Members that the caravan of peace is in motion. To cite a Shakespearean phrase, 'the dogs of war cannot deviate it from its path'.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Amar Roy Pradhan.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI E. AHAMED : Sir, I would like to have a small clarificationâ€¦ (Interruptions)

सभापति महोदय: अमर राय प्रधान जी के अलावा कोई बात रिकॉर्ड में नहीं जाएगी।

...(व्यवधान) ... *

SHRI E. AHAMED : I would like to know from the hon. Minister about the confidence-building measuresâ€¦...(Interruptions)

सभापति महोदय: अहमद साहब, आप आसन की इजाजत के बिना क्यों बोल रहे हैं?

...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Ahamed, please take your seat.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI E. AHAMED : The honour and dignity of a mature nation like India had been maintained in the Summitâ€¦...(Interruptions) The Pakistan President had not responded to our unilateral announcement of confidence-building measures. What is the stand of our Government in this regard?.....(Interruptions)

सभापति महोदय: अभी सूची में कई माननीय सदस्यों के नाम हैं। आप बैठिए।

...(Interruptions)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, the hon. Member, Shri Ahamed has asked whether we are sticking to the unilateral measures which we had announced on 4th, 6th and 9th July and whether we will be implementing them or not. Yes, we are sticking to it. We have said so. We have not rescinded from them. We can implement some of them only if Pakistan also can reciprocate. But the Government's position is very clear that having made the announcements, there is no withdrawing from them... (Interruptions)

* Not Recorded

SHRI AMAR ROY PRADHAN (COOCHBEHAR): Sir, I have given a patient hearing to the long and sentimental speech of the External Affairs Minister.... (Interruptions) I really thank him for giving the example of Tashkent, for speaking about the agenda, how it was happening and all those things. I do not want to go into the details of Tashkent. But it is clear from your version that you had a good exercise on the 15th and 16th regarding drafting. But the draft of the 16th did not see the light of the day. I must say that the Agra Summit is a miserable failure.

Mr. Bhatia is not present now. But I would like to tell him that it is Pakistan and the creation of Pakistan which is a curse on us. He said that today, Pakistan is saying हंस के पाकिस्तान मिला है और हिन्दुस्तान के लिए लड़ेंगे। But Mr. Bhatia has forgotten the role played by his party at the time of partition of India. It is definitely history. I must ask them to go through a book written not by others but by Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, Mahatma Gandhi, in his last 100 days.

In *Harijan Patrika*, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi said that there are a few friends among his affectionate party colleagues who are very much for power hankering and for that reason India was divided. He was at Calcutta on the 15th of August, 1947. But my friends on the Ruling Party side now also should not forget that there was no BJP at that time, but there was the Hindu Mahasabha and RSS. What was the role of the Hindu Mahasabha and RSS? In 1946, under the leadership of Dr. Munje, they took the decision that partition of India is the only alternative and there is no other way for achieving independence. So, Pakistan is a curse and for that reason we are suffering a lot now. This is history. How can we forget that?

Sir, we did not have much expectation from the Agra Summit. It is one of the colleagues of the External Affairs Minister who expressed through the media on the 15th of July that we can expect more than the expectations. So, naturally the people thought that the Kashmir problem would be solved. We want friendship not only with Pakistan, but also with Nepal, Bhutan, Bangladesh, China, Sri Lanka and other neighbouring countries.

Sir, in the All Party Meeting that preceded the Summit, we said that we should move forward in such a manner that the relations between India and Pakistan would be better in future. When the Government invited the President of Pakistan, Gen. Pervez Musharraf for talks for the first time after the Kargil war, we, the Opposition parties, all welcomed that decision because we thought that it is essential to have good relations with Pakistan. The Government has stated through the media that they have provided good and palatable dishes for him in the breakfast, lunch and dinner. We have no grudge on that because it is customary in Indian culture to provide our guest with good food.

Sir, the External Affairs Minister has said that they had four agenda points before the meeting. But we have clearly said that the Kashmir problem would not be solved in the Agra Summit. We expected that cross-border terrorism would be stopped, cultural relations would be developed further, trade relations would be improved and the threat of nuclear war would be eliminated. But the Agra Summit did not achieve anything of this. The killings in Kashmir are going on and terrorism is rampant in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. In the All Party Meeting, we said that the dialogue with Pakistan must be there on the basis of Shimla Agreement and Lahore Declaration. In this connection, I would like to say one thing here.

General Musharraf, President of Pakistan, has invited our Prime Minister. The Hon. Prime Minister has accepted that invitation. We thank him. We would like to have good friendly relations with our neighbours. So, you have to accept that sort of invitation. It is all right. I would like say one thing very clearly. Do not make haste. Do not say that tomorrow or day-after-tomorrow, you would go there, the Islamabad. Do not fix up the dates. You come forward with the dates. You fix up the dates diplomatically and not in a hasty manner. Before that, prepare properly. Have a

concrete agenda as to what would be discussed in that meeting. Do not move without any agenda. It is not a friendly discussion. It is a diplomatic discussion. It is a country-to-country discussion. The agenda must be a concrete one. You must know properly whatever may be the agenda. You would have to make preparations for that purpose. You shall have to be ready with proper homework.

I think, whatever dialogue there might be, it cannot be without taking into consideration the decisions arrived at Shimla and Lahore. After that, you need not worry about the Agra Summit. Nothing has been produced there. It was zero. From the Government's side, some Hon. Member quoted the comment: "India is zero and Pakistan is hero." I do not like to name it in such a manner. But I would like to say that ultimately the Summit at Agra is zero. So, we need not take up this instance for our future discussions. Let there be a dialogue after dialogue. It is the only solution. We would like to have good friendship with the Pakistanis. We would like to solve the problem regarding Kashmir. It is an integral part of India. There should not be any discussions. I know about my friends from the Congress Party. You may be angry over this because you have surrendered to Pakistan long back. Go through the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Act. After Supreme Court judgement on BERUBARI. It was an integral part of India. But with that Amendment, the then govt. have separated it from the Indian Territory. At that time, Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, was very much vocal when he was in the Opposition, fought tooth & nail against 9th Amendment. In this connection, I must name Shri N.C. Chatterjee. I must name Shri Tridib Chaudhury. I must name Shri Arvind Ghoshal, Professor N.G. Ranga, Shri Tyagi, Shri Subimau Ghosh who fought against this 9th Amendment. These stalwarts protested. They took a fight against this Amendment to the Constitution. At this juncture, whatever may have happened in the 50s, I must say that all the Members of this House should be consulted because Kashmir is an integral part of India. It cannot be separated from India. That should be the point. Just like BERUBARI the integral part of India, Kashmir should not be divided.

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR : Sir, I did not have any intention to speak after the hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs has spoken. But I thought it my duty to speak and address the nation as I see the situation that will develop in October. I am on a totally different line as far as the Agra Summit is concerned. In fact, the Minister of Foreign Affairs was very candid in accepting certain facts. With all the attempts that they made to prepare an agenda, they have failed.

Sir, I would not like to dwell on it but I will begin with what were the causes or reasons that the Hizbul Mujahedeen were the first to call for a cease-fire. Everybody accepted that the brain behind the Hizbul Mujahedeen is the Pakistan Government. May I ask the Government, and there they have failed to reply, as to what forced the Hizbul Mujahedeen, who have been leading, as they say a freedom movement in Jammu & Kashmir, to come around and say that we are ready for a cease-fire? What are those circumstances?

This House is entitled to know. The nation is entitled to know as to what forced the Hizbul Mujahedeen to come around and say that they are ready for a cease-fire unilaterally that they have declared. There lies the genesis of improvement of India-Pakistan relations. Had we waited for some time, I am of the opinion, that, the relations we are witnessing of going down in the Agra Summit, would have a better prospect have we taken this exercise about four or five months later than today.

I would just like to read one report, which has appeared in the Free Press Journal, Mumbai. This is not of today, but of 19th September 2000. This is very important because this has a bearing on the behaviour of President Musharraf during this visit to India. What does the report say? The report says:

"The country has to pay even more as foreign debt, which will increase by 100 million US dollars due to devaluation. Pakistan's external debt today stands at 29.5 billion dollars. The foreign exchange reserves are paltry and they are to the tune of 1.35 billion dollars against 1.72 billion dollars last year."

There is a further report, which says:

"The remittance from the overseas during 1999-2000 were only 9.83 million dollars against 1.6 billion dollars for the previous year."

Sir, this is as far as the economy of Pakistan in the year 2000 is concerned. Where is Pakistan's economic position today? Sir, the report further says:

"Pakistan debt has increased to 62 billion dollars and a foreign exchange reserve today is only 0.8 billion dollars. Pakistan has to make the short-term loan payments during September round about 10 billion dollars."

So, this is Pakistan's position today as far as the economic and financial side is concerned.

Sir, I come down to other aspect, which is more important and that is the food conditions in Pakistan as far as they are concerned. Pakistan's total production of wheat -- I will give only for one crop -- is round about 20 metric million tonnes per year. But what is the condition today? The *Dawn*, 13th March 2001 and this is what it has to report:

"The Provincial Authority has made it crystal clear to that the Federal Government, that irrigation water was set to damage approximately about 30 per cent to 40 per cent of the wheat crop due to drought conditions."

Sir, if we take into all this account, Pakistan has to import wheat this year, which they imported last year also.

Sir, there are other issues ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : You should come to the main point.

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR : Sir, coming to the other point, I am just laying down my views. This has not been spoken in the House. This is a line which has not been spoken in this House. Therefore, I request you that this is a situation which we are going to face in October. Sir, I just want to lay ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be brief.

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR : Sir, I know that there is a constraint of time. Sir, if you would have restricted the original speakers of each Party, I think, the last speaker would have got the time. Before reminding the last speaker of the time, I think, the Chair should also remind the former speakers that they should also restrict the time. Otherwise, there will be a situation where a few will speak and others will watch. I think, this should not be a situation in the House.

Sir, there is another important issue which we have to take into consideration. All of us consider China to be a friend of Pakistan. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Mr. Chairman, Sir, who is taking down the distinguished Member's views? There is no member in the Officers' Gallery. It is a mockery of the Parliament ...(*Interruptions*) Is this the way you treat the Parliament? ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister is sitting here.

...(*Interruptions*)

श्री प्रकाश यशवंत अम्बेडकर : सर, मैं समझता हूँ कि यहां सभी सदस्य हैं और अपनी-अपनी बात रख सकते हैं। (व्यवधान)

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह : सभापति महोदय, यहां न तो विदेश मंत्री जी उपस्थित हैं और न संसदीय कार्य मंत्री। इससे साफ-साफ परिलक्षित होता है कि आगरा शिखर वार्ता में भी सरकार देश के इस महत्वपूर्ण मुद्दे पर गंभीर नहीं थी। (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : अखिलेश जी, आप बैठिए। श्री अम्बेडकर के अलावा और किसी सदस्य का भागण रिकार्ड पर नहीं जाएगा।

(*Interruptions*) (व्यवधान)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Sir, this is most unfortunate. The Government is treating the House in such an undignified manner. I protest and condemn it. ...(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI T.R. BAALU): Sir, the hon. Minister of External Affairs has just gone out and he will be back shortly. ...(Interruptions)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : You must have respect for the Member who is speaking. ...(Interruptions)

SHRI J.S. BRAR : The hon. Minister of External Affairs has intervened and spoke for nearly two hours. It is his duty to hear what the other Members are saying. ...(Interruptions) We have great regard for you. There is no problem. This is adding insult to injury. This is such an important topic. ...(Interruptions) It is not an insult to any one political party. ...(Interruptions)

SHRI T.R. BAALU: I am taking the notes. The hon. Minister of External Affairs has just left and he will be back shortly. ...(Interruptions)

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह : सभापति महोदय, इस समय सदन में अत्यन्त महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर चर्चा हो रही है और यहां पर माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी उपस्थित नहीं हैं। इससे ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि सरकार इस पर गंभीर नहीं है। (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : अम्बेडकर जी के अलावा अन्य किसी माननीय सदस्य का भाग रिकार्ड पर नहीं जाएगा।

(Interruptions) (व्यवधान)

* Not recorded

श्री प्रकाश यशवंत अम्बेडकर : सर, मैं समझता हूँ कि इस सदन की जो गरिमा है, उसे इस सरकार के मंत्रियों को बनाए रखना जरूरी है। यदि ऐसा होगा, तो दूसरे मੈम्बर को कहेंगे कि जब मेन पार्टी का मੈम्बर बोले, तो सब को सदन से बाहर चले जाना चाहिए। सर मेरा सवाल यह है कि (व्यवधान) मेरा ख्याल है और मेरी चेयरमैन साहब से यही प्रार्थना है कि वे ऐसी परिस्थिति इस सदन में न आने दें।...(व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : अम्बेडकर जी, अब आप कन्क्लूड कीजिए।

श्री प्रकाश यशवंत अम्बेडकर : सर, जब तक मैं अपनी पूरी बात नहीं कहूंगा, तब तक कंफ्लीट नहीं करूंगा। (व्यवधान) This is what I am going to do now. There are only three speakers left. ...(Interruptions)

सभापति महोदय : ऐसा आप कैसे कह सकते हैं।

श्री प्रकाश यशवंत अम्बेडकर : सभापति महोदय, ...*. हम अकेले सदस्य आए हैं, तो इसका मतलब यह है कि...*

सभापति महोदय : अम्बेडकर जी, आप अनुभवी मੈम्बर हैं। आप ऐसा नहीं कर सकते हैं।

श्री प्रकाश यशवंत अम्बेडकर : सभापति जी, मैं यहां पहले भी सदस्य रहा हूँ इसलिए मुझे मालूम है कि यहां पर जो पार्टी स्ट्रेंथ होती है, उसके उम्र चलता है जिसको हम प्रौटेस्ट करते रहे हैं। हम अकेले हैं, तो इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि आप हमें बोलने का अवसर न दें। चेयरमैन साहब ने कहा था Everyone will be allowed to speak and then the Minister will reply and not before that.

सभापति महोदय : आप अकेले मੈम्बर के नाते ऐसी कोई बात चेयर की नीयत पर नहीं बोल सकते हैं।

श्री प्रकाश यशवंत अम्बेडकर : सभापति महोदय, अध्यक्ष महोदय ने आश्वासन दिया कि मुझे अपनी बात कहने का मौका मिलेगा।

सभापति महोदय : आपको अपनी बात कहने का मौका मिल तो रहा है।

श्री प्रकाश यशवंत अम्बेडकर : सभापति महोदय, यदि आप कहेंगे, तो मैं अपनी बात बिना बोले बैठने के लिए तैयार हूँ। उसमें कोई हर्ज नहीं है। आपकी अगर आज्ञा होगी, तो बैठ जाऊंगा।

सभापति महोदय : आपको बोलने का मौका मिल तो रहा है। आप अपनी बात कहिए।

...(Interruptions)

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair

सभापति महोदय : इस विषय पर काफी देर से बहस हो रही है। आप मेन प्वाइंट पर आइए।

श्री प्रकाश यशवंत अम्बेडकर : मैं अपनी बात कह रहा हूँ। यदि आप कहते हैं कि मैं रिपीट कर रहा हूँ तो मैं बैठ जाऊंगा। मैंने जो कुछ भी कहा है, उसे रिपीट नहीं किया है।

सभापति महोदय : आप अपना दृष्टिकोण बताइए।

श्री प्रकाश यशवंत अम्बेडकर : मैं दृष्टिकोण पर ही आ रहा हूँ।

Sir, China has been considered as a friend of Pakistan. In the year December, 2000, India, USA, Russia, Kazagisthan and others had moved a Resolution of arm embargo in the Security Council. I just read out the news that had appeared in the *Hindustan Times*.

"The Security Council Resolution co-sponsored by US, India, Russia, Kazakhstan called upon arm embargo against Taliban and a ban on import... Subsequently, the UN Security Council appointed a team for extensive control of arm embargo on Taliban. "

Sir, China also joined this move. By remaining absent, in the security Council on the date of voting and also by allowing their soil to be used by the United Nations' observers as far as implementing this Resolution is concerned. The IMF, World Bank, G-7 and P-5, all of them are not ready for either rescheduling the loans that have been given to Pakistan. So, Pakistan will land in a situation where either in September or in October, they are most likely to be defaulter. With the external balance of payment and just mentioned, situation of food conditions, what is going to be the situation in Pakistan? When the world is moving in a direction of caging Pakistan to see that cross-border terrorism or terrorism that is sponsored by Pakistan with the help of Taliban is stopped, India is moving in a different direction by giving not only legitimacy to General Musharraf but also making him the darling of the Generals and the hero of his country. The world is moving in one direction of caging Pakistan but on the other hand we are moving in a direction of giving legitimacy to General Musharraf. I would like to know this from the Government. Was it a proper time to call General Musharraf at this period when the Government of India is aware of the fact that during 90s, we were defaulter on the external balance of payment, the same situation is arriving for Pakistan some time in September or October when they are likely to be defaulter on the external balance of payment? Neither the IMF, neither the World Bank, neither the P-5 nor the G-7 nor anybody has agreed to the rescheduling of their loans. Within a short time, they have to pay 10 billion dollars by the end of September. A situation is arriving for Pakistan, which we faced in the 90s. When we were defaulters on external balance of payment we had to accept every condition put by the World Bank. As we know, along with China, along with US, when everybody is pressing Pakistan against terrorism, we are in a better position to bargain at that time. Why did we call it now? The point is, when requested, General Musharraf was not agreeing for an agenda, we could have easily postponed this Summit, and had it at a better time when it was suitable to India. When this was know to Hiz, was, not govt. of India aware of the fact.

I visualise it was and I think that the Government would agree with me – that there are nearly about one crore of Afghan refugees in Pakistan who have to be fed by the Pakistan Government. 44 per cent of Pakistan's population is below the poverty line, that all imports to that country would be stopped after September for non-repayment of loans and that there is a drought condition in Pakistan? Is it not a case where we would be expecting refugees from Pakistan towards India? Is that situation not developing in Pakistan? If it is so developing, may I ask the Government what forced it to hold the Summit in July without waiting for a situation where Pakistan would be declared a defaulter and then ask them to sit down for the Summit?

Hon. Minister of External Affairs, would you let us know whether there was a hidden agenda? Would you let us know whether you had a situation where Pakistan would be forced to accept cross-border terrorism and stop cross-border terrorism? If they accepted the existence of cross-border terrorism and stopped it, we would have a situation where we would have normality in Jammu and Kashmir and a normalisation of relations with Pakistan. As you very well said, Pakistan's total identity and integrity depends on its anti-Hindu stand and anti-India stand and that is the unifying force of Pakistan. But is it not the same case as far as your party is concerned? Is it not that anti-Muslim stand and anti-Pakistan stands are the bases of political servival of your party? Do you visualise that by normalising

relations with Pakistan those bases are going to be eroded? Did you therefore trap Pakistan in a situation where they would not be forced to have an understanding but where the Summit would fail?

Even if I might say that you have succeeded internationally, by meeting Mr. Talbott and putting across cross-border terrorism as the major issue as far as India is concerned, by the Agra Summit we have once again brought in Kashmir as the main issue. This, I say, has been the perception all around, of people I have met.

May I ask whether there was a local agenda before the Summit? If a local agenda was there why did you sacrifice the nation when as we know China is moving against Pakistan, the US has already started moving against Pakistan, G-7 has already started moving against Pakistan, P-5 has already started moving against Pakistan, the IMF and World Bank have started moving against Pakistan and they have all started squeezing Pakistan to accept the issue of cross-border terrorism? May I put it across that you had put your party agenda before the nation's as far as the Agra Summit was concerned?

डॉ. गिरिजा व्यास : माननीय सभापति महोदय, अपने आर्काक व्यक्तित्व और शब्दों के जाल से, माननीय मंत्री जी ने पौने दो घंटे तक अपने भाण के द्वारा, अपने जवाब के द्वारा इस हाउस को थोड़ा आश्चर्य किया और थोड़ा भ्रमित किया, थोड़ा संदेह के जाल से उठाया तो थोड़ा संशय और बढ़ाया। लेकिन सब कुछ मिलाकर शब्दों के जाल के अतिरिक्त कोई बहुत बड़ी बात माननीय मंत्री जी के संवाद के द्वारा निकलकर नहीं आई।

माननीय मंत्री महोदय से मैं आपके माध्यम से कुछ और प्रश्न प्रधान मंत्री जी तक पहुंचाना चाहूंगी, लेकिन पहले हम इस बात को कहना चाहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान की तरफ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाना और शान्ति की बात करना और शान्ति वार्ता की तरफ बढ़ना इस देश के लिए और खासकर आसपास के मुल्कों के लिए जरूरी है और भारत चूंकि वह सम्पूर्ण एशिया का एक बड़ा लीडर होने के नाते भी प्रतिनिधित्व करता है, उसके लिए बहुत आवश्यक है, लेकिन मैं आपसे निवेदन करूँ कि दोस्ती का हाथ जब इन्दिश जी ने पहली बार बढ़ाया था तो उन्होंने सावधानी बरती थी, लेकिन हमें दुख के साथ कहना पड़ रहा है कि दोस्ती के हाथ में, जो अब बढ़ाया गया, उसमें सावधानी नहीं बरती गई।

यही वजह रही कि इस वार्ता के पहले भी सभी समाचार पत्रों में और सब विचारों के जानकारों ने संशय से अपनी बात की शुरुआत की थी। उम्मीदें राजनीतिक दलों को भी नहीं थीं, किंतु कांग्रेस सहित सभी ने संवाद को आवश्यक बताते हुए अपना समर्थन दिया था। अभी यहां पूर्व विदेश मंत्री जी बैठे हुए थे। उन्होंने बहुत अच्छे शब्दों में भारत और पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्धों को एक्सीडेंट प्रोन कहकर व्यक्त किया था। यही बात अभी मंत्री जी ने भी अपनी वार्ता में कही। लेकिन उन्होंने दूरदर्शिता के साथ इन सारे विवादों को न सुलझा कर उसे और उलझाने का प्रयास किया है। पाकिस्तान की मानसिकता का पता 18 जून से ही लगातार लग गया था। माननीय मंत्री जी कह रहे थे कि हमने 14 जुलाई को अपनी बात को स्पष्ट किया। पाकिस्तान 18 जून से लगातार एक बात कह रहा था कि कश्मीर प्राथमिकता है, उसके एजेंडे से हम नहीं उठेंगे, कश्मीर तथा अन्य मुद्दों पर बात होगी। यही बात अनेक पत्रों में और इलेक्ट्रॉनिक मीडिया के द्वारा भारत में भी आ रही थी। उस बात पर कोई चर्चा भारत की सरकार ने नहीं की। हमें इस बात का आश्चर्य हुआ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी के कवि हृदय ने पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति जी को बधाई ही नहीं दी, बल्कि अपनी संवेदना को और आगे बढ़ाते हुए आनन-फानन में भारत आने का निमंत्रण भी दे दिया।

श्री जसवंत सिंह : मेरी पहली कांफ्रेंस 14 जून को हुई थी। उसके बाद दूसरी 11 जुलाई को और तीसरी 17 जुलाई को हुई थी।

डॉ. गिरिजा व्यास : आपने 11 तारीख वाली कांफ्रेंस का जिक्र ज्यादा किया था और 17 तारीख वाली कांफ्रेंस में बात स्पष्ट नहीं थी। 11 तारीख वाली कांफ्रेंस में था, हम इस बात को मानते हैं। लेकिन 11 तारीख को आपकी पहली कांफ्रेंस हुई थी। 11 से 18 जुलाई के बीच काफी लम्बा अंतराल है, जिसमें हमारी तरफ से कोई स्पष्ट टीकरण नहीं दिया गया और पाकिस्तान स्पष्ट: अपनी बात को कहता रहा।

मैं मंत्री जी को याद दिलाऊँ, अभी बहुत सारी बातें मणिसंकर जी ने और दूसरे साथियों ने कही थीं। लेकिन पार्थसारथी जी ने इस सम्मिट के पहले कुछ प्रश्न उठाए थे। उन्होंने कहा था कि दुर्भाग्यवश भारत यह मान लेता है कि हर पाकिस्तानी शासक अपने पूर्ववर्ती से अलग होगा और हम यह भी मान लेते हैं कि हमें अतीत को भूलकर नए मसीहा पर भरोसा कर लेना चाहिए, शायद इसलिए इस कदम को बढ़ाया होगा। लेकिन वाजपेयी जी से यहीं भूल नहीं हुई। इसके बहुत पहले भी लाहौर यात्रा के दौरान भी वे भूल कर चुके हैं। मैं याद दिलाऊँ कि 1993 में हुए मुम्बई बम कांड की योजना वालों में मुख्य रूप से शरीफ साहब और आई.एस.आई. के प्रमुख नासिर साहब थे। इस बात को हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी भूल गए थे। जनरल मुशर्रफ को भारत आने से पहले, उनसे बात करना, एजेंडे के बारे में बात करना जरूरी था। लेकिन पार्थसारथी जी आगे फिर लिखते हैं कि पाकिस्तान सीमा पार से आतंकवाद को कम करने के बारे में वादे से बचेगा और ऐसी स्थिति बनाएगा कि कह सके कि भारत कश्मीर मसले को हल करने के बारे में गम्भीर नहीं है। यही हुआ भी। पाकिस्तान अपने उद्देश्य में सफल होकर चला गया और हम लोग देखते रह गए। बिना तैयारी के बातचीत का खामियाजा हमें भुगतना पड़ा। इसको कुछ हद तक मंत्री जी ने भी माना है।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने एक ओर जब जम्मू-कश्मीर में युद्धबंदी खत्म करने की अप्रत्याशित घोषणा की थी, लेकिन तभी उन्होंने अप्रत्याशित ढंग से पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति जी को भी बातचीत करने का न्यौता दे दिया। सरकार के प्रवक्ताओं ने कई बार कहा कि वे कारगिल युद्ध को थोपने वाले के साथ बातचीत नहीं करेंगे। उन्होंने यह भी अनेक बार कहा कि जब तक पाकिस्तान सीमा पार से आतंकवाद को प्रशिक्षित करने और शस्त्र सज्जित कश्मीर की वादी में भेजना बंद नहीं करेगा तथा उसकी सेना गोलीबारी जारी रखेगी, तब तक भारत-पाक में बातचीत नहीं हो सकती। इस पृष्ठभूमि में श्री वाजपेयी द्वारा जनरल मुशर्रफ को निमंत्रण देना बहुत आकस्मिक लगा, इस देश को ही नहीं, बल्कि अन्य देशों को भी लगा। इसके साथ ही इस सारे मसले को समझने वाले लोगों को भी यह बहुत आकस्मिक लगा, क्योंकि न तो वे शर्तें पूरी हुई थीं और न जनरल मुशर्रफ ने सैनिक तानाशाह होने की अपनी छवि को बदला था।

जहां पंत जी की उठापटक भी व्यर्थ साबित हुई, अनिश्चय की स्थिति में जो आमंत्रण दिया गया, आमंत्रण के बाद भी बातचीत की पूरी तैयारी नहीं हुई, हालांकि माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि जितनी तैयारी होनी चाहिए थी, उन्होंने उसका स्पष्टीकरण भी दिया, लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री जी अस्पताल में थे, गृह मंत्री जी तुर्की में थे और विदेश मंत्री जी संभवतः आस्ट्रेलिया में थे। बहरहाल भारत सरकार का यह समझना कि कश्मीर विवाद पर बातचीत के बगैर आतंकवाद का खात्मा हो सकता है, साधारण स्थिति का निर्माण संभव है और व्यापार में भारी गतिविधि संभव है, केवल एक कपोल कल्पना ही थी, यह वास्तविक नहीं थी। मैं फिर इस बात को दोहराऊंगी कि आपके जवाब के बाद भी इस प्रकार की नाराजनीतिक वार्ता में जो प्रशासनिक स्तर पर की जानी चाहिए थी और एक लम्बा दौर चलना चाहिए था, उसकी कमी खली और इसलिए हम चाहेंगे कि आगे की वार्ता में कम से कम यह कमी न खले। पाकिस्तान अपने उद्देश्य की पूर्ति करके चला गया। मुझे कवि नीरज का यह गीत याद आता है जो इस सरकार पर पूरी तरह से लागू साबित हुआ: "कारवां गुजर गया, गुंवार देखते रहे।" अभी उस गुंवार की स्पष्ट व्याख्या करने की कोशिश भारत सरकार कर रही है।

पाकिस्तान यहां पर दोस्ती के लिए नहीं आया था, यह बात स्पष्ट है। वह यहां पोलिटिकल गिमिक्स के लिए आया था और जनरल मुशर्रफ अपने उद्देश्य में सफल होकर गये हैं। वह यहां पर शांति का मसीहा अपने आपको साबित करने आये थे। राष्ट्रपति पद पर छाप लगाने आये थे। लैजिटीमैसी उनको मिल गई। कश्मीर एकमात्र मुद्दा है, उसे उठाने आये थे और उसमें भी वह कामयाब रहे। हुरियत नेताओं से बातचीत वहां नहीं हो सकती थी लेकिन यहां पर, हमारी जमीन पर आकर बातचीत करके चले गये। कश्मीर को अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मुद्दा बनाना चाहते थे, वह उसमें सफल हुए और मीडिया का, प्रचार तंत्र का पूरा उपयोग करके वह चले गये लेकिन भारत की प्रचार तंत्र में करारी मात इस बात को दृटाती है कि हमारी पूरी तैयारी नहीं थी।

सभापति महोदय : आप इसे टेबल पर ले कर दीजिए।

डा. गिरिजा व्यास : मीडिया कम्युनिकेट करने की क्षमता में हम लोग आज भी विफल रहे हैं और कल भी, लेकिन दोनों देशों के लोग जहां इस वार्ता की सफलता की कामयाबी की खुशी मनाने के लिए बैठे थे, वहीं हमारा देश स्पष्ट मैसेज देने में भी असफल रहा कि वार्ता तोड़ने का जिम्मेदार वह नहीं है और भारत ने कोशिश की कि वार्ता आगे बढ़े, इस बात को हम लोगों तक नहीं पहुंचा पाये, जिसका दर्द हम सभी को है। इस बात में भी हमें दम लगता है कि दोनों देशों की अनेक समस्याएं थीं और वे उनमें उलझे हुए थे। उन समस्याओं से ध्यान हटाने के लिए संभवतः इस वार्ता को करना दोनों देशों के लिए जरूरी था। भारत जिस तहलका कांड से लेकर अर्थ व्यवस्था और यू.टी.आई. के मसलों में उलझा हुआ था, वहीं पर पाकिस्तान आर्थिक मंदी और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय दबाव के कारण इस वार्ता को करना चाहता था लेकिन पाकिस्तान ने चालाकी के साथ, इस वार्ता में जहां कामयाबी थोड़ी बहुत ही सही लेकिन हासिल की, वहीं पर भारत के हाथ कुछ नहीं लगा और यह सही है कि "न खुदा ही मिला और न बिसाल-ए-सनम्।"

माननीय मंत्री जी राजस्थान के हैं और आईएसआई की गतिविधियों से भी परिचित हैं। इनका इलाका वहां से बिल्कुल लगता हुआ है जिसके संबंध में वह स्वयं भी चिंतित हैं लेकिन समय से पहले आईएसआई के संबंध में कोई भी वार्ता की जाएगी, इस बात का कोई संकेत कहीं से भी नहीं मिला। सीमा पर आतंकवाद तो हमारा मुद्दा था ही, लेकिन उस पर भी लगातार बयान सरकार न दे सकी। उनकी सीमाओं पर भी ध्यान देना चाहिए था और इस पर बातचीत होगी, इस बात को सरकार न कह सकी। राजस्थान से लेकर कच्छ तक जो लम्बी सीमा है, उन राज्यों के मुख्य मंत्रियों से भी बातचीत करनी चाहिए थी जो सीमाओं से लगे हुए हैं, चाहे वह जम्मू कश्मीर हो, पंजाब हो, राजस्थान हो या गुजरात हो। अगर उसमें कोई संशय था तो केवल राजस्थान के बारे में हो सकता था जहां पर आप लोगों की एनडीए से संबंधित सरकार नहीं है, जहां पर कांग्रेस शासित सरकार है। लेकिन अन्य स्थानों पर या तो सरकारें आपकी हैं या आपसे संबंध रखने वाली हैं। उन लोगों से भी बातचीत की जानी चाहिए थी।

सांस्कृतिक घुसपैठ के संबंध में सरकार न पहले बोली और न बाद में बोली। सुमा जी बोली भी थीं तो उन्हें सांस्कृतिक घुसपैठ के बारे में भी बातचीत करनी चाहिए थी। पाकिस्तान अत्यंत चालाकी के साथ आतंकवाद को स्वतंत्रता का आंदोलन और आतंकवादियों को स्वतंत्रता सैनानी कहकर चला गया और फिर भी दोनों देशों के, विशेषकर हमारे भारत के मंत्री जी कह रहे थे कि आपसी समझ पैदा हुई है। पाकिस्तान के एक्सटर्नल एफैयर्स मिनिस्टर ने भी यह बात कही।

20.00 hrs.

हो सकता है, आपसी समझौता हो, लेकिन देश का समझौता वह नहीं बन पाया, यह बात स्पष्ट है।

मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी के स्टेटमेंट से दो-तीन बातें कहना चाहती हूँ। उन्होंने कहा कि शिमला समझौता और लाहौर घोषणा पत्र के आधार पर हमारी बातचीत का दौर शुरू हुआ, लेकिन अभी मंत्री जी ने स्पष्ट किया है कि पहले ही दिन से पाकिस्तान इन दोनों समझौतों की धजियां उड़ा रहा और उसे प्रासंगिक बताते हुए, चला गया। यात्रा से पूर्व आतंकवाद पर अपना मन्तव्य, वे कहते हैं कि स्पष्ट किया, लेकिन नहीं कर पाए। यह सीधी सी बात है और मीडिया पूरी तरह से अछूता रहा। राजनैतिक सम्मान जरूर उन्हें राजपथ पर मिला और कुछ प्रश्नों पर सहमति की बात इसमें कही गई है, लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि कितने मुद्दों पर सहमति हुई, यह हम जानना चाहते हैं। उनकी जेलों में बन्दियों की बात, कुख्यात आतंकवादियों को पनाह देने की बात, गुरुद्वारों या मंदिरों में, भारत की रक्षा की बात, परस्पर लाभ-व्यापार की बात, इन बातों के जवाब भी हम जानना चाहते हैं। ऐसा लगता है, स्पष्ट तौर पर डिलेमास और पैराडाक्स की कहानी कहते हुए सारा समय समाप्त हो गया। वार्ता के पहले संशय था, वार्ता के दौरान किर्कटव्य विमूढता और वार्ता के बाद आतंकवाद का नंगा नाच आज भी जारी है। जिसका साक्ष्य अभी डोडा का नरसंहार है। यह इस बात को दर्शाता है कि यह वार्ता पूरी तरह से असफल रही है। द्विपक्षीय वार्ता के जरिए वार्ता में विवादों को निपटाने की बात करते हुए, जिसमें संवाद का रास्ता खुला था। माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी सदन में उपस्थित नहीं हैं, लेकिन मैं उनकी ही बात उन तक पहुंचाना चाहती हूँ, अटल जी ने यहां बोलते हुए कहा, जब-जब पाकिस्तान कुछ लेना चाहता है, वह शांति की भाषा बोलता है। हम पूछना चाहते हैं, पाकिस्तान ने जो इस बार शांति की भाषा बोली, वह किसके कहने से बोली है ?

आखिर मैं, मैं कहना चाहती हूँ, उस दिन जो हुआ, उस पर रहस्य का पर्दा पड़ा हुआ है। उस रहस्य का उद्घाटन होना चाहिए और हम भी यह पूछना चाहते हैं कि वार्ता जो सुलझ रही थी, वार्ता जिस पर आखिरी नोट बन रहा था, वार्ता जिस पर कि दोनों हस्ताक्षर करने जा रहे थे, वार्ता सुलझते-सुलझते कैसे उलझ गई - इन प्रश्नों के जवाब भी सदन में आने चाहिए। मैं फिर सरकार से अपील करना चाहती हूँ कि वार्ता जारी रहे, लेकिन वार्ता के पहले पूरी तैयारी के साथ और भारत के गौरव के साथ, वार्ता को आगे बढ़ायें। यही हम उनसे निवेदन करना चाहते हैं।

श्री हरीभाऊ शंकर महाले (मालेगांव) : सभापति जी, आपने मुझे बोलने के लिए समय दिया, इसके लिए मैं आपका आभारी हूँ। मैं कड़े शब्दों में अपनी आपत्ति प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ। यदि इतिहास पर नजर डालें, तो श्री मोरारजी भाई, श्री वीपी सिंह, श्री देवेगौडा और श्री गुजराल, चार प्रधान मंत्री इस सदन ने दिए हैं। विदेश मंत्री और प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि सहमति लाने के लिए, शिखर वार्ता के बारे में, सभी पार्टियों को बुलाया गया। इस बात को मैंने पेपर में पढ़ा। मैं थोड़ा इतिहास दोहराता हूँ। जब शिवाजी महाराज पर आपत्ति आई थी, मैं तो आदिमजाति का आदमी हूँ और उनके वंशजों में से हूँ।

उनके साथ महाले जिवा था- "होता जिवा इसलिए बचा शिवा।" उन्हें विदेश मंत्री और संसदीय कार्य मंत्री भूल गए, यह बात ठीक नहीं है।

सभापति महोदय, कश्मीर और भारत का मसला 1940 से अभी तक चल रहा है। हमारे पाकिस्तान से ताशकंद और शिमला करार हुआ। इसमें कुछ जमीन गई लेकिन आगरा शिखर परिद में जमीन नहीं गई, यह बात सच है। जहां मुशर्रफ ने आत्मविश्वास पैदा किया वहीं भारत सरकार ने आत्मविश्वास खो दिया। आत्मविश्वास बहुत बड़ी चीज होती है। सब कुछ चला जाए परन्तु आत्मविश्वास नहीं जाना चाहिए। भारत का आत्मविश्वास चला गया, यह बात ठीक नहीं। कमजोरी से क्या-क्या होता है। चार-पांच बार युद्ध हुआ। कृष्ण की गीता दुर्योधन कैसे सुनेगा, यह सब को मालूम है। आगरा शिखर परिद में भारत सरकार ने आत्मविश्वास खोया और मुशर्रफ को आत्मविश्वास आया। पाकिस्तान को आत्मविश्वास पैदा हो गया।

सभापति महोदय, इस पर चर्चा होनी चाहिए, इसमें कोई दिक्कत नहीं है, लेकिन सावधानी से होनी चाहिए। मैं 375 वां के इतिहास की याद दिलाता हूँ। अफज़ल खां और शिवाजी महाराज की प्रतापगढ़ के नीचे मुलाकात हुई थी। उस वक्त शिवाजी महाराज की सावधानी से वह बच गए। उन्होंने अफज़ल खां को बड़ी होशियारी से मार डाला। 375 वां का राजनैतिक संबंध अलग था और अब अलग है। भारत सरकार के प्रधान मंत्री जी को पाकिस्तान से दोबारा वार्ता करने के लिए सावधानी से जाना चाहिए और चर्चा शुरू रखनी चाहिए। भारत को अपना आत्मविश्वास और आत्म सम्मान बढ़ाना चाहिए, यही हमारी विनती है।

श्री जे.एस.बराड़ : सभापति महोदय, बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद। आपकी संजीदगी और सब्र को देखते हुए, आपने जो मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया, उसके लिए मैं आपका

बहुत आभार प्रकट करता हूँ। यह डिबेट बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है। माननीय सदन के वरिष्ठ नेता मुलायम सिंह जी ने 24 जुलाई को जो मुद्दा उठाया, उसके बारे में मैं बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। दुनिया में बहुत चर्चित विदेश मंत्री साहब ने इंटरवेंशन के समय अपनी बात कही है। जो प्वाइंट्स कहे गए हैं, मैं उन्हें रिपीट नहीं करूंगा और थोड़ा वक्त लूंगा। जितनी बातें माननीय जसवंत सिंह जी ने कही हैं उनका अगर मैं सार और आगरा हिन्द-पाक शिखर वार्ता का निचोड़ निकालना चाहूँ तो मुझे दुनिया के महान शायर गालिब साहब का एक मिसरा याद आता है, जो उनकी तकरीर पर सही उतरता है। उन्होंने तीन शब्दों में कहा - "न गुले नगमा हूँ, न पर्दा ए साज़, मैं हूँ अपनी शिकस्त की आवाज़।"

आगरा में आपकी शिकस्त हुई है, इसे आपको मानना चाहिए और सारी दुनिया में इस शिकस्त की चर्चा है, इससे आप भाग नहीं सकते हैं। आपने बुचर ऑफ कारगिल को जिसकी जिम्मेदारी 600 से ज्यादा जवानों की है और हमारे वे जवान जिन्होंने देश की आने वाले दिनों में सेवा करनी थी, उनकी लाशों के उमर से गुजर करके और 1700 वे आदमी जो इस जंग में अपाहिज हो गये, उनको आपने प्रैसीडेंट बनने के बाद जो लैजिटिमेसी दुनिया में दी है - इस मुद्दे के लिए मैं आपको मुबारकबाद देना चाहता हूँ।

सभापति जी, मैं उन 10 लाख पंजाबियों की तरफ से भी बोल रहा हूँ जो 1947 में सबसे बड़ी ह्यूमन माइग्रेशन के शिकार हुए हैं और जिनकी मां, बाप, बच्चों को लाखों की तादाद में काटा गया। जिनके बारे में पंजाबी की महान शायरा अमृता प्रीतम ने कहा है कि "लखां धीयां रोंदियां तैनु वारेशा वे कहन, उठ दर्द मनाने हैं दर्दिया किथे कब्रान विचो बोल" आज मैं उनकी तरफ से खड़े होकर भी बोल रहा हूँ जो 1962, 1965, 1971 और 1999 में लोग शहीद हुए हैं और आपकी इस कार्रवाई के बाद भी जिनकी लाशें डबों में बंद होकर आईं। हमारा नेशनल एन्थम राष्ट्रपति भवन में और पाकिस्तान का नेशनल एन्थम जो हबीब जालंधरी नाम के शायर ने लिखा है गुनगुनाया जा रहा था और पालम हवाई अड्डे पर हमारे जवानों की लाशें राष्ट्रीय झंडे में लिपटी हुई इस देश में आ रही थीं, तब हमने इस डिक्टेटर को इतनी बड़ी मान्यता दी।

माननीय सभापति जी, मैं माननीय विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा जी की बात का जवाब देना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने कांग्रेस पार्टी को और कांग्रेस पार्टी की पुरानी बातों के बारे में कहा और श्री जसवंत सिंह जी ताशकंद और 1965 की बात कह रहे थे। लेकिन एक बात आप न भूलें कि इस क्रॉस बार्डर टैरिज्म की वजह से दोनों पूर्व प्रधानमंत्रियों श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी जी और श्री राजीव गांधी जी के चिथड़े-चिथड़े हो गये लेकिन इस मुल्क की आस्था और इस मुल्क की आजादी को बरकरार रखने के लिए उन्होंने बहुत बड़ी कुर्बानी दी है। - इस बात को आपको कभी भूलना नहीं चाहिए।

माननीय जसवंत सिंह जी, आपने कारवां ऑफ पीस का जिक्र किया है। यह कारवां ऑफ डैड-बॉडीज है और जो क्रॉस बार्डर टैरिज्म की वजह से हो रहा है। अमरनाथ की यात्रा में सौ आदमी मारे जाते हैं, चरारे शरीफ गिरती है, छत्तीससिंह पुरा की हत्याएं होती हैं, यह क्या है? यहां श्री क्लिंटन साहब जब आये थे और उन्होंने अपने भाषण में कश्मीर को डिस्प्यूटेड टैरिटरी कहा और हमारी तरफ से एक भी जिम्मेदार व्यक्ति ने यह नहीं कहा कि आपको ये शब्द नहीं बोलने चाहिए। मैं इस बात को रिकार्ड में लाना चाहता हूँ। हमें वैसे तो मौका कहां मिलता है लेकिन बाई-चांस जब इस दरवाजे से क्लिंटन साहब निकलने लगे तो मैंने उनको नमस्कार किया और पूछा कि ऑनरेबल प्रैसीडेंट साहब क्या आपको मालूम है कि आपकी विजिट के कारण छत्तीससिंह पुरा में एक दिन पहले कत्लेआम हुआ था और एक समुदाय विशेष के लोगों को मारा गया था। शायद उन्होंने मेरी बात को अंडरस्टैंड किया। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि किसी ने भी उस मौके पर कोई प्रोटेस्ट नहीं किया - यह अफसोसनाक बात है।

माननीय जसवंत सिंह जी सोल्जरली क्वालिटी की बात कह रहे थे और कह रहे थे कि वे उस धरती से आते हैं जिस हल्दीघाटी का इतिहास देश के लिए प्रेरणाजनक है और उन्होंने कहा कि हमने परवेज मुशर्रफ साहब को शीशा दिखाया है। शीशा आपने यह दिखाया है कि "क्या नाम पूछते हो अपने कारोबार का, हम अंधों के शहर में आईना बेचते हैं।" प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा कि परवेज मुशर्रफ साहब जब यहां से गये तो मुंह लटकाए हुए थे। उनकी कोई बात नहीं मानी गयी और हमारे मुंह कमल के फूल से खिले हुए थे। जब परवेज मुशर्रफ साहब यहां से गये तो सारे भारत का मुंह लटका हुआ था।

मैं चार मुद्दों पर प्वाइंटवाइज एक्सप्लेन करूंगा। 15 जुलाई की प्रेस कान्फ्रेंस में परवेज मुशर्रफ साहब ने स्पष्ट रूप से चार बातें कहीं। उन्होंने सियाचीन के उमर अग्रेशन की बात को लेकर गलत इल्जाम लगाया। उन्होंने कहा कि पाकिस्तान में टैरिस्ट्स को जो सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं, वे फ्रीडम फाइटर्स हैं। यहां जेहाद की भी बात हुई। जेहाद पर और किसी ने नहीं बल्कि श्री बलराज मधोक, जो जनसंघ के फॉर्मर प्रैसीडेंट थे, अपने आर्टिकल में लिखा है कि अगर भारतवा कश्मीर तश्तरी में रख कर उन्हें दे दे तो भी जेहाद बंद नहीं होगा। जेहादियों के लिए किसी की औरत का अपमान करना, किसी की जायदाद पर कब्जा करना, क्या ठीक है? जेहाद के मायने जो वह निकाल रहे हैं, वह इस्लाम के अनुकूल नहीं है। आपके नेता श्री बलराज मधोक ने लिखा है कि भारतवा को बहुत सम्भल कर कदम रखना चाहिए और यह लड़ाई हमेशा जारी रहने वाली है, आप इस बात को मन में रखें। मैं आपकी कद्र करता हूँ लेकिन सारा मुल्क यह कहता है, चाहे आप उसे मानो या न मानो कि पाकिस्तान में डिक्टेटरशिप के खिलाफ हमने कुछ नहीं कहा। हमने उनको रीकॉग्निशन दिया। उनकी शायर, कवि, वाइस चांसलर, ह्यूमन एक्टिविस्ट्स जहांगीर यहां आईं। फ़ैज अहमद फ़ैज जैसे शायर को वहां के डिक्टेटर हुकूमत ने जेल में बंद किया। क्या आपको मालूम है कि उन्होंने क्या लिखा? जेल में जहां कलम नहीं थी, वहां उन्होंने लिखा :

"मताए लौह कलम छिन गई तो क्या गम है,

कि खूने दिल में डुबो ली हैं उंगलियां मैंने,

जबां पर मोहर लगी है तो क्या रख दिए हैं,

हरेक हल्काए जंजीर को जुबां पर मैंने "

इस तरह आपने वहां की तानाशाही को सारी दुनिया में रीकॉग्निशन दिया। इस तानाशाह ने हबीब जालिब जैसे उर्दू के शायर के हाथ काट दिए। जसवंत सिंह जी यहां कह रहे हैं कि सब कुछ अच्छा है। उन्होंने लिखा कि -

"फूल शाखों पर खिलने लगे तुम कहो,

और चाक सीने के सिलने लगे तुम कहो,

ऐसे दस्तूर को और सुबह के नूर को "

सुबह बेनूर का जिक्र ट्रेजरी बैंचिस की तरफ से किया जा रहा था। मैंने जसवंत सिंह जी की तकरीरें दसवीं लोक सभा में बोफोर्स के उमर सुनी हैं। आज वह नाअहलियत और नाकामी को छुपा रहे थे। मैंने उनको फार्मर प्राइम मिनिस्टर के उमर अग्रैसिव अटेक करते देखा है। अनसबरस्टैंटिएटिड चार्जिज हम वहां बैठ कर सुनते थे, जब यह लगाते थे। यदि आप कहें कि हमने इसमें फतह हासिल की है तो मुझे ऐसा नहीं लगता। इस देश के एक-एक बशर ने यह महसूस किया है कि आगरा में

हिन्द-पाक शिखर वार्ता से हिन्दुस्तान के सौ करोड़ लोगों की बेइज्जती हुई है, तौहीन हुई है, उसका जिक्र सभी अखबारों में हुआ।

सभापति महोदय, मैं केवल पांच मिनट में अपनी बात समाप्त करूंगा। मुझे एक बात का अफसोस है, अगर जसवंत सिंह जी इस बात को ध्यान से सुनें। जिन लोगों का पब्लिक लाइफ का 45 साल का तजुर्बा है, जिन्हें देख कर हम सिर झुकाते हैं, मैं यह बात पार्टी विचारधारा के तौर पर नहीं कह रहा हूँ **We bow before you.** आप पब्लिक लाइफ में रहे हैं जेलों में रहे हैं, सालों तक आपने संघर्ष किया, डेमोक्रेटिक प्रोसेस में अपना जीवन बिताया है। श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी, श्री लालकृष्ण आडवाणी और श्री जसवंत सिंह जैसे इतने शाईस्तां, इतने लायक आदमी इतनी बड़ी गलती करेंगे, यह हमने सोचा नहीं था। आप यहां प्रशंसा की बात कर रहे हैं। आपने कहा कि ताशकंद में हमारी तैयारी नहीं थी और जब स्वर्ण सिंह यूएनओ गए थे तब हमारी तरफ से तैयारी नहीं थी लेकिन आप अपनी नाअहलियत को क्यों छुपा रहे हैं? 2001 में, 21वीं सदी में और पिछले 54 साल में कूटनीति की इतनी बड़ी हार आज तक देश की नहीं हुई। ट्रेजरी बैंचिस की अगुवाई में यह सबसे बड़ी हार हुई।

मैं ज्यादा समय न लेकर एक बात कहना चाहूंगा कि भाजपा और अन्य पार्टियां जो इन्हें सपोर्ट कर रही हैं, अन्य 24 लोग जो इन्हें सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं,

यहां पर श्री उमर अब्दुल्ला साहब बोले। उन्होंने बहुत कुर्बानियां दी हैं। उन पर पांच बार अटैक किये गये। हम उनकी कद्र करते हैं। वे देश के लिये लड़ रहे हैं लेकिन वे क्या भूल जाते हैं कि वे उस बी.जे.पी. पार्टी और उनकी पालिसीज़ को सपोर्ट करते हैं जिनके वरिष्ठ नेता स्व. श्यामा प्रसाद मुखर्जी ने श्रीनगर जेल में अपनी गिरफ्तारी दी थी और उस आदमी की स्लो पायज़नस डैथ की गई क्योंकि उन्होंने आर्टिकल 370 के खिलाफ जद्दे-ज़हद का ऐलान किया था। आज उस भाजपा और उसकी पालिसीज़ के हक में जब डा. फारूख अब्दुल्ला और श्री उमर अब्दुल्ला जैसे लोग बोलते हैं तो मैं यह महसूस करता हूँ कि उन्हें इतिहास के फैक्ट्स के बारे में जानना चाहिये।

सभापति महोदय, मेरे दो पाइंट्स रह गये हैं। एक तो यह है कि कल अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति श्री जॉर्ज बुश का बयान छपा है :

"The MEA is not losing sleep over the reported statement of President George Bush, supporting "freedom" of people from "Kashmir to Kosovo". "

कश्मीर से लेकर कोसवो तक जो फ्रीडम स्ट्रगल है, उसकी हम हिमायत कर रहे हैं लेकिन हम सोचे हुये हैं और हम समझते हैं कि सारा मुल्क और सारी दुनिया इस बात को समझती है लेकिन वे इस बात को नहीं समझते है। यहां पर क्लिंटन साहब बात कर रहे थे :

"In a speech to US troops in Kosovo yesterday Bush said, "we will pursue a world of tolerance and freedom from Kosovo to Kashmir".

He repeated it again.

मैं सरकार से जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या मिनिस्ट्री ऑफ़ एक्सट्रनल अफेयर्स इस बात का नोटिस लेकर कोई कदम उठायेगी?

सभापति महोदय, मैं अब पाकिस्तान के नेशनल एन्थम की बात कहूंगा जिसे मैंने इंटरनेट के जरिये निकाला है। इसको लिखने वाले शायर जालंधर के हैं। दस हजार शायरों ने लिखा है जिसे टी.वी. पर इसे इन्कलूड किया गया है

पाक सरज़मीं शाद बाद, किश्वार-ए-शाद बाद,

तू निशान-ए-अज्म-आलीशान, अर्ज-ए-पाकिस्तान॥

यह पहली बार 54 साल के बाद हुआ है कि पाकिस्तान के एक डिक्टेटर, जिसने बूटों तले हमारे लोगों को रौंदा और मारा। अभी जिक्र किया जा रहा था कि हमारे आदमियों की म्युटिलेटेड बौडीज़ निकलीं। उनकी बोटी-बोटी काट दी गई। क्या आपको मालूम है कि उनकी विडोज़ ने क्या कहा है?

'Shrimati Vijay Kalia, mother of Capt. Saurab Kalia, Paramvir Chakra awardee, and Dr. N.K. Kalia, his father said it was his hunch that despite frantic efforts, the issue of human rights violation committed by the Pakistan forces during the Kargil conflict was not raised by the Indian leadership with Pakistan.'

यह परमवीर चक्र विजेता और उनके मां-बाप की बात कर रहे हैं जिनके लिये कहा गया था कि उन लोगों को पेट्रोल पम्प दिया जायेगा, उनके लिये बहुत से काम किये जायेंगे, लेकिन जो कारगिल के समागम में आती हैं, उनको पूछने के लिये कोई तैयार नहीं है।

माननीय सभापति महोदय, मैं यहां श्रीमती जया जेटली का नाम लूंगा जो समता पार्टी की पूर्व अध्यक्ष रही हैं। श्रीमती अस्मां जहांगीर, पाकिस्तान, नेशनल ह्युमन राइट्स कमीशन की चेयरमैन हैं तथा ऐसी कई औरतें हैं जिनके अंदर लड़ने का दम है और अपने मुल्क के लिये जिन्दगी देने के लिये तैयार हैं। जिस जनरल ने अपने बूटों तले हमारे जवानों को रौंदा, आप उसे रैड कारपेट वैलकम दे रहे थे। मैं उस बात का जिक्र करूंगा जब जनरल मुशर्रफ़ प्रेस कांफ्रेंस कर रहे थे। उनसे कहा गया कि कुछ लोग हिन्दुस्तान में जाकर आपके खिलाफ बात कर आये हैं, आप उनके खिलाफ क्या एक्शन लेंगे? उस जनरल ने इतनी खतरनाक बात कही कि मैं मौका देखूंगा कि जिन लोगों ने मेरे देश के खिलाफ बात की है, उनके खिलाफ मुझे क्या एक्शन लेना है?

"Jehangir's public reply to Musharraf can teach our democrats a thing or two. Her statement says, "General Musharraf does not have a monopoly on frankness and those who have struggled for democracy and the rights of civil society are equally entitled to air their views. I have struggled for a democratic system since the last 30 years and borne the brunt of four dictators."

सभापति महोदय, यह पांचवां डिक्टेटर है जिसे हमने दुनिया में बहुत बड़ा हीरो बनाकर भेजा है। मुझे हिन्द-पाक आगरा शिखर वार्ता पर बेहद एतराज़ है। माननीय मंत्री जी इस पर जवाब देंगे या नहीं लेकिन कल माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी जवाब देंगे। इसलिये कहता हूँ:

पत्ता-पत्ता, बूटा-बूटा हाल हमारा जाने है,

जाने न जाने गुल ही न जाने बाग़ तो सारा जाने है।

देश के सौ करोड़ लोग यह मानते हैं कि भाजपा और उसकी सहयोगी पार्टियों की कूटनीति में बहुत बड़ी शिकस्त हुई है।

सभापति महोदय, अंत में मैं यह कहकर कंकलूड करूंगा कि प्रैस की आजादी की बात करने वालों यहां पर किस तरह से प्रैस को मनीपुलेट किया गया है, उसका जिक्र किया गया है। मसूद मलिक जो नवाये वक्त के एडिटर हैं, उन्होंने जब पाकिस्तान में परवेज मुशर्रफ से डेमोक्रेटिकली और अधिकार के मुताबिक सवाल किया तो उस आदमी की क्या हालत की गई, यह माननीय जसवन्त सिंह जी जानते हैं। अंत में मेरा कहना है कि हिन्द-पाक शिखर वार्ता देश के 54 साल के इतिहास में हमारी सबसे बड़ी शिकस्त है और इससे देश का अपमान और तौहीन हुई है।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Hon. Members, the list of speakers is exhausted. The reply of the hon. Prime Minister will be tomorrow after Question Hour. आठ घंटे का समय तय हुआ था, अब तक 12 घंटे की डिबेट पूरी हो गई है।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : हमें तीन मिनट बोलना था, सूची में कैसे हेरा-फेरी हो जाती है।

सभापति महोदय : कोई हेरा-फेरी नहीं हुई है।