

13.34 hrs.

**CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF
URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE**

**Concentration of Pakistani troops close
to Indo Pak border in Chhamb sector**

[English]

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM (Salem): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Defence to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:—

"That reported concentration of Pakistani troops close to Indo-Pak border in Chhamb sector and the steps taken by the Government in regard thereto."

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (DR. RAJA RAMANNA): Sir, Government are aware that Pakistan has undertaken all measures to improve its operational preparedness. In particular, the Pak formations in the POK continue to be in a high state of alert. Airfields have been operationalised and increased radar activities have been noticed. Government have also seen reports regarding movement of tanks in the Chhamb sector as well as the movement of formations and units to their respective areas of operational responsibility. In the other sectors along the Indo-Pak border, units and formations continue to remain in a state of preparedness and are currently engaged in summer collective training.

Government are keeping a close watch on all such developments having a bearing on our national security and are taking appropriate measures to ensure full defence preparedness.

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM (Salem): Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, the Minister of

State for Defence, in his reply, has tried to be as precise as he could be in words, without crossing or infringing into, may be, revealing things which might, according to him, prejudice the situation. But I think that it is my duty to bring to his notice that his statement does not really suffice to the extent that it does not show the clear picture. The nation is worried. We are all aware of the fact that Mrs. Bhutto, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, not in one public meeting but in many public meetings, harangued, used her own strong terminology and had almost announced or declared a 'Jehad', a thousand-year war. I do recollect that in this very House, the Prime Minister, who is our Minister for Defence had come forward saying that they would not even last for thousand hours, let alone a thousand-year war. But I do not think that that is the answer which we are expecting today. It is very clear from the Statement of the Minister of State for Defence that increased radar activities and operationalisation of air-fields are not matters to be taken up lightly. The presence of Pak forces in the Pakistan—occupied Kashmir in a high state of alert is also not a matter to be taken up lightly. I do not think that it is sufficient for us to be satisfied with the statement that are taking appropriate measures to ensure full defence preparedness. We would like to know a little more specifically about this point. We would request the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister to take us and also the nation into confidence because the war hysteria is not only being built up in Pakistan but unfortunately, is also being built up, by reflection, in India. I am not pointing any accusing finger at anybody. But I think every citizen of India is eligible to know how prepared we are, what is the level of our alertness, whether or not our Army and Artillery have reached the border, can we face our enemy, what is the situation in monsoon, what happens, when the snow melts as the passes open us, what is the comparative strength, etc. so that the hysteria stems. There is no question of sudden unguarded situation arising. I would

[Sh. P.R. Kumaramangalam]

like to specifically know from the Prime Minister as to whether the situation in Kashmir reflects the ability of Pakistan to utilise under-hand techniques in crossing the border, arming the insurgents, financing terrorism and creating internal instability in Kashmir as part of their larger plan to really expand what is called Pakistan—occupied Kashmir and also to expand the line of actual control in their favour. I do recollect that one of the alliance parties or supporting parties of the Government, the BJP, had made an official statement that we must attack and raid the camps; I repeat, attack and raid the camp, in Pakistan occupied Kashmir, where the terrorists are receiving training. Then it was slightly amended later that if necessary. I do recollect that the amendment came after the Prime Minister made the statement that if necessary we will do it. I would like to know—is it necessary or not necessary? Is it going to be done or not going to be done? It is not necessary that you should reply specifically, but I would like to know in generality at least—is the Government of the opinion that terrorists are being trained in Pakistan occupied Kashmir—there are camps there—or do they feel that all these news which we see in the newspapers are not matters to be given much credence to, because your intelligence may have informed you that these are only stories that are being said to build the war hysteria, but actually the terrorists are not being trained in the Pakistan occupied Kashmir, they must be being trained deep in Pakistan? I would like to know at least to that level.

Then, there is another very fundamental issue. It was, in fact, yesterday—there is a report also in the Hindustan Times today and I saw it in the morning—that there was some firing from the Pakistan occupied Kashmir side on our picket in Poonch sector and I understand we retaliated and had to destroy the building on the other side. Fortu-

nately, no one was injured. How many of such skirmishes have taken place? Is it just one incident or are there many?

I would also like to know if the level of alertness is high in Pakistan occupied Kashmir as mentioned by the hon. Minister of State for Defence, what is our level of alertness. Is it low, is it at the middle level or is it at a red alert, or green alert? We, as citizens, as Members of this House and the nation deserve to know all this. Why should we be kept guessing? Is it that difficult for the Pakistanis to come to know with all the satellite surveillance that is available to them, with all the AWACS available to them? I am sure they are able to identify every single soldier wherever you place them. With all the modern technology, it is not very difficult to know, only it is difficult for us to know, because we are unfortunately used to getting information from the press and the Door-darshan and in this House sometimes when the Government deems it fit to come and tell us what is the situation, otherwise we do not know, or if we are lucky enough that some calling attention comes up, or discussion under Rule 193 comes up or the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker has been kind enough to permit us, otherwise we do not know the information. We are your subjects, we are the people of this country, we are the citizens of this country. We are according to the Constitution sovereign, but according to reality we know where we stand. But we would like to know if our borders are safe and how safe you have kept them. They know how safe you have kept them. Let us know also.

I would not take much of the time of the House, but it is my duty to bring it to the notice of the Hon. Minister for Defence that their attack on the question of our integrity and security is not one-sided, it is a multi-pronged attack. Pakistan is doing it at a very sophisticated level. On the one hand, they are ensuring that their army is on a total alert and

readiness. They are attempting skirmishes and minor provocations to test our readiness from the point of view of Army Armed forces, Air forces and navy. On the other point of view, it is an admitted fact—Government is aware, world is aware—that they are training terrorists and a very dubious, underground method of insurgency is being created in Kashmir to ensure that in the event of war our local forces would not get the amount of support which they should get from the local population and they would be able to carry out spy activities in full coverage. I am not sure that there agents are not there in Kashmir, whether it is in the garb of terrorists or whether it is hiding in the robes of the terrorists, but they are definitely present, according to the information received. What action are we going to take to ensure that we secure that side of area inside our border.

Third thing which I think is very important is the Islamic Conference that is to take place in Cairo. We know that Pakistan and Mrs. Bhutto had sent their Foreign Minister, Defence Minister and eight other ministers to all the 30 Islamic States to campaign among them that Kashmir should not be taken up as a self-determination issue. They are not taking up Kashmir as Kashmir alone. They are bringing in Kashmir as a trans-Caucasian area of the Soviet Union, portion on the other side of Asia, all in total from the view of the Muslims self-determination. If such a general term is brought into the U.N. Assembly, I think we would be running into trouble because there would be serious consequences internationally.

The Prime Minister assured that diplomatic efforts are being made but we would like to know what sort of diplomatic efforts are made. When their Prime Minister goes and speaks to the Saudi Arabian diplomats as well as King, it is flashed in our papers. But when our representatives go, we do not know much about it. We would like to know it because it gives us confidence. After all,

the morale of nation lives in its confidence and it is the duty of those who are in power to create that confidence.

[*Translation*]

SHRI YAMUNA PRASAD SHASTRI (Rewa): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the statement made by the hon. Foreign Minister just now is very brief but substantial. He has given us a clear picture of the threat we might be facing from Pakistan and simultaneously assured us that our armed forces are capable enough to safeguard our borders and successfully face any threat or repulse any aggression from other side of the border. Despite all this, the country is still anxious with regard to certain aspects particularly the movements of Pak army fully equipped with ultra-modern weaponry to take positions at strategic points. The Chhamb sector of District Jammu is a chicken-neck area. It is a very sensitive and dangerous area and it lies very close to our borders with Pakistan. Their army cantonment and supply line have an easy access to this area and they have already taken position there. This way, they will be able to make striding advances in their Radar systems and thereby increase the range of their radar. Besides, they have made all their air fields ready for operational action. They can attack from any angle or point. We are faced with such a grave danger today.

During 1971 war, our army had entered 10 kilometers deep inside the Pakistan borders through the chicken-neck area, but we had to beat a retreat in the Chhamb Sector which is very shameful for us. The line of actual control was pushed into our area to a certain extent. In view of this, we would like to draw the attention of the hon. Defence Minister to this aspect and want to know if our army is on a total alert and readiness? Have our armed forces reached alongwith their ultra-modern weaponry such strategic positions wherefrom they would be able not to allow the enemy army to cross even in inch into our territory?

This is very unfortunate that while there

[Sh. Yamuna Prasad Shastri]

is a worldwide campaign for arms limitation and which there were apprehensions of a war or cold war conditions prevailed; Russia, America, China, Britain and France are endeavouring to create an atmosphere of mutual amity free of an attitude of confrontation and an atmosphere of peace and security is being built all over the globe; but self-defeating steps in the shape of creating a war hysteria against India are being taken by Pakistan at such a time in the sub-continent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am confident even today that the people of Pakistan do not favour a war with India and we too should endeavour in the direction of averting a war. A security preparation rather than a war preparation is necessary. On the contrary, effective steps should be taken to avert a war. I would like to know, what steps have been taken in this direction till now?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the third point I would like to make is that a war is not won merely by the armed forces alone. During the second world war, Mr. Churchill was the Prime Minister of Britain. He was not a socialist yet he took three effective steps to win the war. Though his army was in a state of preparedness yet he took some measures. The very first step he took was to remove unemployment. Not a single person was left jobless and this gave an impetus and encouragement to the national morale and the people were all set for the defence of their country. The people should think in terms of sacrificing everything for the security and defence of the system they live in. Every child of the nation should be ready to lay his life for this cause. That is why Churchill provided job to unemployed. Secondly, he totally eradicated corruption from his society. And thirdly, he removed the economic imbalance and inequality. I would like to know what steps are we going to take with regard to our integral part-Kashmir-when we are faced with such a grave danger. Kashmir and Punjab being neighbouring States are connected with each other and we are facing a dangerous situation at both the places.

There is need to pay utmost attention towards the situation of these States today. We shall have to enthuse and instil a sense of patriotism in every child of Punjab and Kashmir and make them physically and mentally stout enough to guard every inch of our territory in the defence of the country. We shall have to boost their morale. What measures are we going to take to achieve this end?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it is an admitted fact that the people of Kashmir know that they have progressed more from economic point of view in India. A survey conducted three years ago revealed that per capita income in Indian Kashmir was Rs. 2100 whereas it was only Rs. 1800 in Pak-occupied Kashmir.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Shastri, you are deviating from the subject. You are taking up the economic aspect.

SHRI YAMUNA PRASAD SHASTRI: I am just concluding. According to our information, Pakistan is deploying its armed forces at strategic positions in Pak-occupied Kashmir, but two groups of youth in that part of Kashmir have made it clear that they are not going to participate in this war. Similarly, these youth have decided not to participate in the process of elections scheduled to be held on 21st May in Pak-occupied Kashmir. They have decided to boycott the elections. This war hysteria is being fiercely opposed there.

Keeping all these factors in view, I would like to know from the Government what steps are being taken to uproot the poisonous sapling of communalism the seeds of which were sown in the recent past though the situation there is improving for the last few days? What measures are we going to take to arouse faith and allegiance towards their country among Kashmiri people and to encourage their morale?

With these words, I would like the hon. Defence Minister to clarify these points in the

interest of the country and its units and security.

[English]

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Mor-mugao): I would like to thank the hon. Prime Minister for being present in this House, because his presence and his intervention in this debate will help a lot in clarifying issues which are really bothering the people of this country, and on which there have been very confused responses so far.

I will begin by saying that in substance and in fact, the statement of the hon. Minister of State for Defence is in contradiction to what the Prime Minister has been saying all this while. I will clarify what I mean. The hon. Minister speaks, in paragraph 1, that the Pakistani formations continue to remain in a state of preparedness and are currently engaged in summer collective training.' This is a routine type of training—every summer, this type of things happen; so they are happening this year; very very different from the imminence of war, to which I will come in a moment.

In paragraph 2, there is a stereo-typed reply. I have been for a few years. Every single question on Indo-Pakistan relations or Defence situation bears this reply, and this is the formulation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have to understand the meaning in between the lines.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: This is the meaning which has been there for 13 years since I am in Parliament; and I am sure this meaning has been there for 30 years before that. And this is the classic formulation always, in every single case. It says:

" Government are keeping a close watch..."

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH): The hon. Member must also be understanding the

real meaning behind the line because he knows it.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I am very happy that hon. Prime Minister is here, and I will accept everything that he says. The point I am making is this, that this reply does not show any difference in perception or any qualitative change in our perception on the situation or any qualitative change in our perception on the situation, on the Pakistani side. This is in sharp contrast to what the Prime Minister has been saying.

The Prime Minister has been saying this—not that they are engaged in summer collective training, nor that these are routine exercises which the Pakistanis are indulging in at this point of time. The prime Minister has been saying in so many words: 'Pak preparing for war'. This is not the first time that the Prime Minister has been saying this. I am quoting from the national Press of 15th April 1990. Before that there was an interview that he gave, on what is now routine for the Prime Minister, i.e. on board the aircraft, when he was travelling. He made all those speeches in the Lok Sabha.

I would like the House to appreciate how the words of the Prime Minister are being interpreted in this country, not just as some sort of routine exercises by the Pakistanis. An eminent political commentator of this country, writing in 'Times of India' of the 19th April 1990 has this to say, and it is important, just to show how the statements of the Prime Minister are being understood, totally differently from what the Minister of State has said in reply to this Calling Attention. This is what the political commentator says, and this is the understanding in the country, arising out of the statements of the Prime Minister. It says:

"There was a lot of difference between hearing the Prime Minister's speech in the Lok Sabha on Tuesday before last and reading it in next morning's newspapers. To be sure, many even among those who actually listened to him were startled by his stern warning to Pakistan

[Sh. Eduardo Faleiro]

and wondered whether he hadn't spoken a 'shade too strongly'. However, immediate reaction in the press gallery and the lobbies was nothing compared with the war scare that was later to grip those who learnt of what Mr. V. P. Singh had said from Doordarshan and newspaper reports.

For several hours news agency and newspaper telephones kept ringing, with anxious callers inquiring if the fourth India-Pakistan war was about to begin."

This is the way, Mr. Prime Minister, in which your statements are being understood. They are not being understood as routine summer operations, or routine situations. They are understood in the sense that the Prime Minister is saying that the war is imminent, because Pakistan is preparing for war.

14.00 hrs.

Will the hon. Prime Minister clarify the latest position about it? Is a war imminent? Is it what you wanted to convey to the world? If so, what is the basis of your assessment? Please say about it clearly because a statement has come from the highest level of this country which has been confusing, if I may respectfully say so in this regard? Please clarify this confusion and let the country know about it.

This type of statements are really dangerous. We have had three wars with Pakistan. It is a matter of record that no Prime Minister before any of these wars or even earlier had spoken that a war was imminent. The impression that this type of statements carry abroad is that we are the bully; that we are preparing for a war; that we are creating a situation like that. Now why am I raising this issue of international opinion? I am raising this issue because the Prime Minister of Pakistan has just embarked on a mission to mislead the world; because it is Pakistan

who is culprit in this exercise. They are arming the infiltrators; they are supplying weapons to them in Kashmir. But now their diplomatic mission of Mrs. Bhutto and many delegations including Pakistani MPs are going there. In your reply, you have to mention about it. Now my specific question is this. What happens to our diplomatic efforts? We had Mr. S. K. Singh as Foreign Secretary. He was specifically looking after Pakistan. He had gone to many foreign countries to canvass our point of view. He is a very able man; he is so able that this Government had offered him a post of Governor of Assam where there is a tricky situation. It shows the respect that he had commanded in the administration. Now this man, who had been our Ambassador to Pakistan just before he was the Foreign Secretary, was asked to resign. He was involved in this exercise. Was he asked to resign because there has been a change in our diplomatic approach to the Kashmir issue and Indo-Pakistan situation at that particular point of time? If not, why was he asked to resign? This was the second time that a Foreign Secretary was asked to resign. The first time was when Mr. Venkateswaran was asked to resign. Then the Prime Minister clarified what was the position. This is the second time. But we have nothing from the Foreign Office or from the highest level as to why was this done at that crucial point of time? Why was the Foreign Secretary, who is the most knowledgeable man, who is the most able man—as per your assessment, you had offered him a post of Governor of Assam, which is a difficult State—asked to resign? Will you clarify whether it has any import of our diplomacy regarding Indo-Pakistan attack?

There was a very good interview with the Prime Minister in the Far Eastern Economic Review, dated 17th May, 1990. That is a latest issue. A pointed question was asked from the hon. Prime Minister. This question is as follows:

"Do you fear the possibility of nuclear weapons being used if conflict breaks out?"

The Prime Minister did not reply to it. But it has been mentioned here as follows:

"We want to avoid conflict but if it comes we have nothing to fear."

Again it is a bit confusing, as far as this crucial issue is concerned. Why am I saying that it is a crucial issue because there is no doubt that the Pakistan is preparing for a war. Today, I have met the Minister of State for the first time. Perhaps discussion regarding this has been going on for a long time in the Consultative Committee under the Ministry of Atomic Energy. So, all of us know what is happening in Kahoota in Pakistan. How Pakistanis have been smuggling necessary material for making a bomb? How are they preparing? Has this been contemplated that a war may break out in view of our conventional arms superiority? This is a very real possibility, particularly keeping in view the specific situation, as far as military establishment in Pakistan is concerned. Pakistan is perhaps the only country in the world where there is a civilian government; and this civilian government is specifically told not to interfere in military matters; military decisions are taken by the military alone. In this set of circumstances—whether there is a Prime Minister or no Prime Minister—any use of the nuclear weapons is possible. Are you prepared for this eventuality? Please do not give us a stereotyped reply again "That nuclear option is always there; we are prepared for every eventuality." That time has passed and we want a clear statement and we do not want any more nuclear ambiguity, if I may say so, on this very important issue.

The last point and the last question. Mr. Gates and Mr. Kelly of the U. S. State Department are now, at the moment, if I am not mistaken, are on the way to Moscow. From Moscow they are going to Islamabad. It is very pertinent to note that when they are going to be in Islamabad on Sunday, the Prime Minister of Pakistan will not be there. And then they are coming here. But they are talking to the Defence people. The question is, what is the background of this visit? It is very clear from the statement of the spokes-

man of the White House that they are coming in connection with the Kashmir situation. Now, the question is what is the background? If USA and the USSR are taking interest in this matter, to what extent are they taking interest? That is the first question.

The second question is, what, is the purpose of the visit of Messrs. Kelly and Gates? Thirdly, obviously the Government must tell them. There is no question of India doing anything. They must tell Pakistan that they must stop infiltration, that they must stop this proxy war, that they are launching against us.

The USA has a tremendous leverage. It is the USA that has given them these arms. The USA has armed Pakistan and in many respects they have a tremendous leverage that they use for this purpose. Obviously, this is the purpose, namely, to tell Pakistan to remain cool and to tell them, "Do not do what you have been doing".

I would ask a last question. Is there any *quid pro quo* with the U. S. Administration on this that they are coming for cueing on the situation on the border? Are we thinking of some concessions or are we being mollified whether it is on Super 301 or other business and economic advantages? Thank you very much.

[*Translation*]

SHRI BANWARILAL PUROHIT (Nagpur): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this is a very serious situation and in view of the posture and attitude Pakistan has adopted for the last few months, we can only say that the way our Government is responding to it is, it is demonstrating a lot of patience. The High Commissioner of Pakistan, Shri Abdul Sattar came to India in January 1990. So far as my opinion is concerned, our Foreign Affairs Ministry displayed a high degree of politeness and courtesy to give him a 'red carpet welcome'. Subsequently, the Pakistan Prime Minister's envoy was also treated in the same fashion by our Foreign Affairs Ministry. Many rounds of talks were held but

[Sh. Banwari Lal Purohit]

the dialogue resulted in the futility of efforts in this direction. They showed a total disregard to Simla Agreement and its implementation in letter and spirit whenever a reference was made to it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, latest position in this regard is that Pakistan is leaving no stone unturned in its efforts to instigate the people of Kashmir. This is being done at every level so much so that a person not less than the Prime Minister of Pakistan, makes public statements with regard to their resolve to fight a thousand year war with India. The people of Kashmir are being instigated by propounding the Islamic fundamentalist precept that the fight for the cause of freedom and independence amounts to martyrdom and we shall do everything that needs to be done for its achievement. Two funds of Rs. 10 crores and 5 crores were raised one after the other for this purpose. Many groups raise funds by giving advertisements in Pakistan. In this connection, I had written you a letter stating that the people of India would contribute thousands and lakhs of rupees if only you took some initiative for the development of Kashmir, but it is a different thing that you paid no heed to my suggestion. We are today facing another pertinent question. We feel that the representatives of the Foreign Affairs Ministry and their envoys have utterly failed at many places to attract the world opinion in their favour. The way Pakistan is using its propaganda machinery in USA and other Muslim countries to win over their confidence and goodwill gives the apprehension of Pakistan attempting at unilateral publicity and propaganda. We seem to be too weak on this front. A statement in today's newspaper regarding the offer of Iran and Saudi Arabia to supply aircraft to Pakistan in case of such an emergency has caused concern. They are talking of allowing Pakistan to make use of their air space and airports. They are assisting Pakistan and it is a matter of concern for us. Everyday we read in newspapers that Pakistan is preparing itself for war whereas our aircraft are not ready as they could not be equipped with the

armament. Reports also appeared in some newspapers that we are lacking much needed ammunition for Bofors gun. On the whole the situation before the country is serious. The hon. Prime Minister, Sir, we cannot ignore these circumstances because it is the question of entire country. Though no country wants war because it shatters the national economy, yet if Pakistan creates war-like situation in the near future, there is no doubt that entire country would be behind the Government. Under such circumstances, on the one hand we have to give befitting reply to Pakistan and on the other hand every citizen of the country would like to protect the honour of the country at all costs. Therefore, I would request you to keep the morale of the people of the country high and keep them informed about the factual positions from time to time. Certain things appear in newspapers which demoralise the morale of the people of the country and for that no clarification is given from the Government side. It is true that the vital information about the defence preparedness cannot be given to the people, but any wrong information should be contradicted by the Government. I feel that it is not done by the Government. I would like to know about the naval aircraft carriers whether they are in working order or are lying for repairs, I would also like to know upto date position of our submarines because Pakistan have acquired big missiles. It is not clear as to how far our aircraft carriers can counter their attack. We have a big oil installation in the High sea on which our economy depends to a great extent.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I want that the hon. Members should speak in brief because Defence Budget has already been discussed. It would be better if he speaks on defence preparedness only.

SHRI BANWARI LAL PUROHIT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, regarding preparedness I would humbly say that if Pakistan starts war that would not be limited to Chhamb sector or to Kashmir only but it would be fought in sea, air and on land. Therefore we have to fully prepare ourselves. In this regard I have asked about the position of

armament and ammunition of our Navy, Airforce and Infantry. The Government should clearly tell the position of our defence preparedness to people. The Government should tell about the defence preparedness of Pakistan also because it has deployed its Army along the border. The people should know whether our forces are capable to counter their attack. Besides, Pakistan has sent 10,000 trained terrorists to Kashmir. So the Government should clarify its policy and tell as to what it is doing to check the intrusion.

We should be informed about the factual position. We share your concern and the Congress party or any other party will not lag behind in this matter. There is no question of party, we are all one. If war like situation is created, every citizen of the country would definitely be with the Government. The hon. Prime Minister should not divulge vital details of defence and we are also not asking for that, but we should get some information about the preparedness of our three defence forces. Pakistan has deployed its military and tanks equipped with arms and ammunition along the border. Then what we are waiting for? We have desert area along the border. So what is the position of our tanks and how efficient shall we prove in that area? If the Government could highlight these points, we shall be thankful to them.

[English]

SHRI BHOGENDRAJHA (Madhubani): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, as has been repeatedly emphasised by our Government, our goal is peace. We have been striving for it; we are striving for it; and we shall remain engaged in that effort. But we will have to think as to what are the factors which are tempting Pakistan to resort to the method of confrontation, etc. Do they think that we have a minority Government supported by Parties which do not participate in the Government and installed the biggest Party as the Opposition? Is that a factor? If it is so, and quite possibly it may be so, then this House unanimously through a resolution must express its voice that whatever differences

there may be, on this issue we stand united and 82 crores of Indian people stand united with one voice that we are one and there is no question of Government or opposition, this or that. Is it also a fact that Pakistan is thinking that during the last few years there have been problems of communal tension, sometimes on the Personal Law Bill where this Government surrendered to communalists and there was a shrilled reaction of communalism on this side and that side? Again, repeatedly, the demands are being made for demolition of a mosque here or construction of a temple there. And when we say, demolish this mosque at Ayodha, has it not got the repercussion or reaction 'leave India' among Kashmiri people? Encouraged by that, is Pakistan not thinking that this time it may get a better atmosphere among the people in Kashmir itself and it may get a slightly better atmosphere in Punjab, in western part? If that is so, than I think, all the patriotic forces, whatever attachment they may have to temple, mosque or gurdwara—must be asked in the name of national cause, in the name of patriotism to give us these things for the sake of the country. We should not give any handle to Pakistan to utilise these things to divide our people. then is it also a fact that Pakistan must be thinking that US, whatever it say, shall remain with it even in the worst conditions? Formerly there was a commitment made to us in the UNO and to the Government of India also that US arms will never be used against that they are meant only for the communist country. In violation of that commitment, those were used only against us and not against any communist country. At present we have not got even that commitment that those arms will not be used against India. Against whom will these be used? Pakistan denies that it has got any direct involvement in Afghanistan. Against China it cannot dare even to think of. Against Soviet Union, question does not arise. Then we are the only target. In such a situation, regular US supplies of most sophisticated modern offensive arms to Pakistan is an unfriendly etc. Not only USA but there are other western countries which supply these types of arms to Pakistan. Only yesterday, this House discussed Australian

[Sh. Bhogendra Jha]

supplies. Sometimes, some other countries also do the same thing. Will our Government determinedly make it clear to them that these are unfriendly acts not only from the war point of view but if we are compelled to match them, then our developmental work suffers and development of Pakistan suffers and the whole sub-continent becomes defence-oriented and not development-oriented? From that angle, can this Government pick up courage or the whole House can direct the Government to say that we treat any supply of offensive armaments to Pakistan as an unfriendly act against India, against peace in this sub-continent and in South Asia? Then what other things can be there? With regard to diplomatic offensive, Pakistan always tries and US never sits back. At present, the international atmosphere is such where for the first time in world history, most offensive parts of armaments have been destroyed. Rockets with a range of 5000 kms owned by USA and USSR have been destroyed to the satisfaction of each other. In such a situation, USA has also been compelled to say that these two countries should settle these disputes in accordance with the Simla Agreement. Naturally, in that agreement which was made in those conditions, we proved a friend of Pakistan. 93,000 prisoners of war were unconditionally released. Whatever parts we had occupied, we gave up our right to that. So we showed our friendship. Up till now, the Pakistani Government has not been sitting quiet. Now the voices are even officially raised—yes, Simla agreement but beyond that the international forum, beyond that the tripartite thing and above all war. So it is not limited to the Simla Agreement. Now, our Government is insisting on that, but the question is whether we are going to make it a condition, otherwise what will be the value of the future agreements. The Simla Agreement was signed by the father of the present Prime Minister, and she was also present at Simla and the people of Pakistan know how we behaved on equal footings. In such a situation whether we are going to insist on nothing beyond Simla Agreement and, bilateral talk. I may be satisfied, you may be

satisfied or dissatisfied and I think this satisfaction will continue. The seed was sown in 1947. I am not going to blame anyone here for that because I was one among them. On 15 August, 1947 when we were celebrating the Independence, I could not take my meal on that night, because from the childhood, I had been fighting, not-born in rich family, or even a well-to-do family. So, I did not take my meal on that night; only a few Congressmen know that, other did not.

Now, I want to say that whatever may be the conditions, neither we nor Pakistan can afford to violate or go beyond the Simla Agreement. In such a situation we have said no mediation but the US representative at the highest level is coming. They are coming to Pakistan, coming to India, only for Kashmir issue, and then they are regularly supplying the sophisticated weapons. These connections cannot be lost sight of. Our Ministers even our Prime Minister can go to any country of the world including USA. We have no objection. We can invite the representatives of USA. In this context whether our Government can pick up courage to say to USA you are going to Pakistan, coming to us, only for Kashmir, what the business you have got to do that? Kashmir is our internal affair, and I wish, today, the Prime Minister should tell this to them. We do not want any mediation by any third party, because we know once it was stuck in our leg, when we went to the UNO in 1947-48 and that cease fire line hangs over our head uptill now. So, we know what sort of monkey mediators they are. When there was a quarrel between the two cats, and the monkey became an arbitrator and devoured the whole bread. So, we got it from the Britishers, from the Americans. Now, Americans have been giving blow after blow in a friendly tongue repeatedly.

So, in the present circumstances, I think the hon. Prime Minister with all the modesty, the Indian people have, with all the sweet words, but nonetheless in a firm language, we have to tell the USA that no mediation, and this is nothing but mediation, going to Pakistan, supplying arms to Pakistan, and

coming to us only for Kashmir. All this has to be made clear to them.

Sir, with regard to diplomatic relations. Recently, there was Inter-Parliamentary Conference in Nicosia in Cyprus and there was a 7-Member delegation from our country from both the Houses and I was also there. There also the Pakistan delegate made a grave issue of Kashmir. But, there the dominant issue was Palestine. Naturally India played a important role in that. Pakistan could not secure the support from any country, when the Parliamentary Delegations from 107 countries were present there in Nicosia. And again I would like to say, that the Pakistan Prime Minister Mrs. Benazir Bhutto has been going to Arab countries, when we do not want anything from the Arabs. We are supporting the cause of Palestinian on principle, and we have been very firm, very consistent. Governments have been changing here, Ministers, Prime Ministers have been changing here, but naturally we have to tell the people in a friendly language, even to our Arab friends, and other countries, theocratic or whatever sort of Government they have got, that any interference with regard to internal affairs of Kashmir may boomerang. It may not confined to Kashmir only but, naturally it may have wider repercussions even if we do not try for that. This is because the world has become small and is becoming smaller due to scientific developments. We should continue with the policy of developing our friendship with our neighbors, particularly with the people of Pakistan, One thing I would like to say is this. I have been hearing the propaganda with regard to Kashmir. I think our views, our propaganda with regard to the entire people of Pakistan must be improved and we should tell them how the US arms and the US military supplies will hamper the developmental growth both in Pakistan and India. We should tell this to our friendly people of Pakistan and not the Government of Pakistan. We should tell the friendly people of Pakistan not to enter into war or defence preparedness, otherwise there will naturally be less development and less economic advancement. So, our propaganda must be some what improved. We

should appeal to the people of Pakistan, even to the soldiers of Pakistan, even to the rulers of Pakistan that willingly we accepted Pakistan. If you want to separate Kashmir from India, then Indian secularism will be at stake. That is why Kashmir has become the symbol of our traditional secular character of Indian nation. So, that is non negotiable, that is non-bargainable. No question can arise and no Government can afford to talk of that. They are making blind propaganda based on religion and utilising some riots here and some riots there. Of course, the Ayodhya issue is there. It is a dominant issue, which is used against India. I hope that my friends on my side will heed to it because I believe that we all love our country. On that point we all are one.

Then, Sir, as far as the question of war is concerned, Pakistan has got most modern weapons this time, as I think as in 1971. But they would be having much more now. They would like to hit our internal targets, not only on our border but on other sectors also. I don't want to know anything about the secret thing but something will have to be told to the House, to the nation by the Prime Minister whether we have got most modern developed radar production, rocket production and production of sophisticated tanks and aircrafts to match it and the modernised airports so that in the case of any eventuality, we can stand up to it and we can defend our peace. Even in order to defend peace, one must have the strength massive intelligence to mobilise all our forces and resources.

Sir, another danger is chicken-neck point. It seems that they want to break it so that Jammu & Kashmir can be isolated from the rest of the country. I would like to know whether any extraordinary effort is being made to defend that 'neck' because that is after all like any other 'neck'. In that case, I want to know whether any special efforts have been made or not, whether our Government is prepared if there is war thrust upon us. If war is thrust upon us, it will not remain one front war but it will become all-out war. If so, then we will see to it to ensure that never any aggression takes place again

[Sh. Bhogendra Jha]

from that side. Sir, I am disappointed with regard one sentence in the statement made by the hon. Minister. It is stated like this:

"Government have also seen reports regarding movement of tanks in Chhamb sector as well as the movement of formation and units to their respective areas.."

Sir, we have seen these reports in the newspaper. We have raised the question and the Government have also seen the report. Then what information they have got other than this report? If the Government will be depending only on these reports, then what information they have got from its own source which the House would like to know. Government should say whether they are factually correct or not. If they are factually correct, then we do not expect the Government to tell us that they have also seen the reports.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE: (DR. RAJA RAMANNA): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to support the statement I have made in connection with the Calling Attention notice. You were good enough to say that in such matters one has to read in between the lines. But it is obvious that for some people even reading the lines itself is not clear. So, I should have to explain this to them. However, I would like to start with the description of the present situation with respect to the Calling Attention motion and respect myself only to the military situation. The hon. Members have spoken on various other aspects, I will not concentrate too much on those aspects.

I would like to start from the very perceptive and deep speech which the Prime Minister made in this House some weeks ago. Long before the tanks were seen in Chhamb and long before you read in the newspapers the various reports which we also got to know separately so the reports must be true since both in the newspapers and what even

the information we have got describe the same thing. The Prime Minister gave a warning to the country to be in a state of preparedness and if I recall, it is with a sense of sadness he mentioned that a war like situation is developing and the country must be prepared for it. Now, people criticise on the basis of press reports that a hysterical situation has been created. This is a contradiction which I would like to point out to my hon. friend who has been showing contradiction in my statement. One is, 'being warned' is called "hysteria." If you are not warned, you say, 'What are you doing? You are not telling us anything about the real situation'. Now, the present situation is, of course, that Pakistan has moved her troops to some positions along the border particularly in some areas. When I said 'engaged in summer collective training', yes, of course, there has been summer collective training in other parts of the border. So, it is a quick way of passing on to you the fact that the whole border has to be defended. It is not simply a small part of the border, but right from the Rann of Kutch to the Siachin area. So, you see that the military situation calls for the same awareness which the Prime Minister mentioned some weeks ago. Here, he also did mention that the diplomatic efforts are in progress, in other words, telling other countries what the situation in respect of Kashmir is Now, everybody knows that Kashmir is an integral part of India, but people outside still require to be convinced and I am most surprised how well most of the countries in the world have accepted our arguments.

Hon. Members have mentioned about the Prime Minister of Pakistan going abroad and making statements, but I do not know whether the credibility of the Prime Minister of Pakistan still remains after the frightful speeches she seems to have made in Lahore and other places which were available to us on tapes. I must say that it was hysterical in the true sense of the word, Now, when that kind of hysteria is being spread in that country, surely our Defence Ministry is not that stupid as not even to take note of it. But the whole effort of the Defence is to make sure that your enemy does not know what

you are doing. I would love to tell you all the details of our strength but you will recognise that it is not really wise to disclose details because an element of surprise is probably even more important than the power to the gun, I am very glad that Mr. Kalpanath Rai is shaking his head in agreement because this is not a matter of party discussions, as was in the case of the debate in the morning. This is something which every person has to understand Defence is not simply a matter of the services taking part and that is all. Every citizen is involved; every industry is involved. Fortunately, India is an industrial country now. It is no longer a purely rural or agriculture-based country, which is of course is also good because we can feed ourselves. But we are an industrial country now. it has an important significance because we manything ourselves here which is of value to defence. We do not publicise this too much, but I think our enemies know this. This is an important aspect of defence. Now, we can make spare parts ourselves and a lot of things required for basic defence is available in the country. This makes a big difference to what is known as defence preparedness.

Then, some statements were made in respect of the internal situation. As I said earlier, when we are in difficulty practically everybody within the country cooperates. I have a feeling that even some of the misguided youth in the Kashmir valley will change over. There are already signs that the same intensity of opposing us by every person no longer holds. It is only a section of the population which needs to be educated. These are things that have been overlooked over the years and I think the need for a new kind of re-education of the population is beginning to be understood by the people who are governing it. I am sure they will join the mainstream and the same will happen in Punjab also. The talk that the internal situation would affect the war effort is something which I will take seriously, but not as to hamper our defence efforts.

There was a mention about camps in Pakistan Occupied-Kashmir. I think the hon. Member Mr. Kumaramangalam asked this

question. I do not know whether he asked it as a rhetorical question or if he wanted information. I presume he is too intelligent a man to make us believe that it was only a simple question. Of course, there are camps. This is a very important fact which we have to consider at the appropriate moment. I do not think the policy of the Government is to break the international border straightaway unless there are very good reasons.

SHRIBHOGENDRAJHA: Do you mean to say the ceasefire line or the international border?

DR. RAJA RAMANNA: I am not talking of the Kashmir border. But the policy of the country is not to go cross any international border without any reason. We have heard statements here that Pakistan is heavily armed. Some people asked: Is it even better than ours? Some fears have been expressed even in public. I would like to make a few statements on this. Pakistan has certainly improved its fighting capabilities because it has been receiving a lot of arms from outside on one pretext or the other. But we have not been just watching this happening. To some extent, we have been matching it. Our country has a strong industrial background which I specially mentioned, in times of war, however much storage of spare parts we have, there is always a difficulty when it comes from abroad. There can always be a control on you in the matter of availability of spares. This is something which a country that entirely depends on import has to take into account. Somebody has asked: Is Pakistan equipped with AWACs? As far as I know they do not have AWACs. These are only pieces of information I am passing on to you. Finally, there is the question of diplomatic initiative and—if the Prime Minister permits me as my boss in defence— I must pay credit to the External Affairs people of the Government of India, who really have convinced very large number of countries that Pakistan really has no claim to all that is making about Kashmir, and all agree that the Shimla Agreement should be the basis on which we should operate our future relations with that country. Mr. Gujral has made a strong statement.

[Dr. Raja Ramanna]

I only say this because a question has been raised, Have we made efforts to convince other countries. I must say with great emphasis, that we have greatly succeeded in doing this.

Just before I sit down, I make one comment on the nuclear question. Mr. Faleiro was good enough to refer to the discussion he had with me many years ago, as a Member of this House and as a hon. Minister. Since he referred to the conversation, I would like to say one thing. People do not fully appreciate the destructive and the distractive capability of a nuclear weapon. They think "It is like one more big weapon and we will use it when the time comes." I think, if nuclear weapons are used, they have the deepest consequences to the whole area, in the sense of environmental pollution of the worst type and they may destroy the environment for a longer period of time. That can be dreamt of even in Hiroshima sufficient destruction was there. Now with modernisation and all that, a weapon of this type can only be mentioned but to believe that people can use it in a sub-continent a land which belongs to all of us. We were one country at a time, I think, it is betrayal of the human spirit. But if our neighbour chooses to have it, then the answer which the Prime Minister gave last time in his speech, is fully operative.

I was surprised that somebody even suggested that we have a *quid pro quo* between two countries just to keep peace here. I never heard of that. But it is rather an interesting statement for the people who write academic notes in Defence journals about *quid pro quos* between U.S. and us. But I never heard of such a thing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, before I sit down, having been in the Defence Ministry, I would like to assure this House that Defence preparedness of this country is at the highest pitch that you can think of. We have not been sitting idle. I would have loved to share more details with you but the very nature of things forbids me to do that. But I

would say, whether it is the Army, or the Air force or the Navy, all the three forces are at the fullest pitch, to rise to any occasion that may come up. I will give credit to the people in the services for keeping us in the state of readiness.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: Many of the questions have remained unanswered. The Prime Minister is here. For the country, he will do it.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I am on a point of order.

Rule 197 speaks of classificatory questions in Calling-attention. The operative portion is this:

Each member may ask a classificatory question and the Minister shall reply at the end to all such questions"

It is sub-rule (2) of Rule 197. It says, the Minister "shall"—which is mandatory—reply at the end of all such questions. This is the point which Mr. Bhogendra Jha has also made.

I have the highest regard and sympathy for the Minister. But the point is, we are representing this country and these questions must be replied. The questions of mine which have not been replied are the following;

One, is the massing of troops mentioned in the Call Attention of such a scale that suggest preparation for aggression by Pakistan? This is Question No. 1 which is specific.

Two, Shri S. K. Singh was asked to resign. Was he asked to resign in the context of any change in our policy towards Pakistan?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please be brief.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Please do not cut out. We are not talking for my pleas-

ure. We are talking for the country. We want a reply for the country on these matters.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do it patiently.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I have all the sympathy and respect for the Chair. But intervening and interrupting the Members when they are making the points, is really unfair.

Third, what is the background of this visit of the US representative who are representing President Mr. Bush. What is the purpose of this? What is the background. Is USA and USSR trying some solution to this of pulling of? It is a specific question. If he would not reply, I will be grateful.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to say that when the situations are difficult and serious, we should ponder, plan and tackle the situation and do not just talk and talk in details in Defence matters. As far as your point of order is concerned, You called the attention of the Government to a particular situation. A statement is given by the Government on that particular situation. Any clarification has to arise out of the statement made by the hon. Minister. You are making this as the External Affairs Ministry debate and the Defence Minister debate. I do not think this arises out of the statement which is given by the hon. Minister. You had wanted to know whether the Government is prepared vis-a-vis the situation arising out of preparedness by Pakistan in certain areas and, I think, in a guarded and correct manner, the reply has been given.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I am very sorry. Why did you allow this question? when I put this question, why did you allow it?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If I had stopped you there, then you would have objected to me.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: We should not have Call Attention on this subject. We should not have a debate on this subject. I

have question which will upset the whole country. I have quoted specific questions on these matters.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to say that in deference to your enthusiasm, I allowed you to put the question. But, you would first of all not question the ruling given by the Chair. Secondly, you cannot have a debate on the Foreign Ministry Affairs as well as Defence. You asked the questions. They were pertinent in certain respects. But, you cannot force anything on the House like that. This applies to Shri Bhogendra Jha also.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM: I would like to make a request, not on your ruling, of course. I had made a request. I do not know, perhaps you have misunderstood it. People are generally very much worried. I was hoping and many Members were hoping that something would be said and I do not mean any illwill at all nor am I challenging the intelligence and ability of the Minister of State. All of us, as normal human beings, look up to the Prime Minister. This is a serious matter and we are looking to the Prime Minister to say a few words.

SHRI BHOGENDR JHA: I have a pertinent question to ask from this statement.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All of you have made very good point. I do not think the Call Attention Motion can allow the Ministers to explain all these things because it becomes a full fledged debate. Now hon. Prime Minister.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: There should be no Call Attention.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You will control yourself and not behave like that.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You can stop doing that.

(Interruptions)

SHRI DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now, matter ends there. Let us not prolong it now. Now hon. Prime Minister to speak.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH): Sir, you had already given your ruling that the Minister of State had fully replied to the main thrust of the question. But hon. Members feel that on certain aspects, they want a further clarification. May I say that now it is an established fact that Pakistan is interfering in the internal matters of our country by supply of arms, by fanning secessionist, by building up war hysteria. And as has been mentioned, we have also heard the hon. Member from Goa Mr. Faleiro, we were not building war hysteria, as has perhaps, been suggested that the Pakistan Prime Minister had made some statement. A thousand years of war was not our dialogue. And when there is also information of movement to the front, we have to view the total situation. And in defence preparedness, it is not all the time that you are trying to analyse intentions. Yes, intentions are part of the analysis. But the ground situation has to be assessed and all precautions have to be taken with regard to the ground situation, the possibility that can arise out of the ground situation. But when it has also been coupled with the intent of fanning secessionist and actually with the dialogue that we have been met with, while we wanted friendly relations with all our neighbors and we in right earnest started with Nepal, China and Sri Lanka. With China also, we have had a conflict. With china, we have got a problem. With China, there is also an issue of territory. But yet with those complicated matters, there has been a positive movement. I do not say that we have got solution. But still we have had a positive movement on both the sides because we do feel that in spite of that, you see this similarity. Though we have a conflict with China, though we have a border problem, though we have a territory problem, still we feel that it is not fanning insurgency within our country. It does supply arms to Pakistan, that is, in its own bilateral relationship. And it is with this perception that we could open a dialogue. And when we had this intention, there was

no reason why this Government would not have similarly taken initiative to improve relations with Pakistan. I think, the Pakistan Government has missed a very good chance with this Government which had come with this intention. That we had conveyed. Now, the ground language across the border is of anti-tank, of explosives. That is what is coming across the border, that is the real language. You should see what is the real ground language. The real ground language across Pakistan, to us is of anti-tank missiles, of sub-machine guns, of rocket launchers, of AK 47s, and according to some information, possibly surface to air missile launchers. Against our good will, this is what we are confronted with and then it was coupled with raising of mass hysteria, of funds at the highest level and then also forward movement of troops. No country can be oblivious to this situation and may I assure the House, we have taken all necessary steps, that our flanks do not remain open; in guarding the flanks, we have taken all precautions. I think, it is our duty. Nobody can tell us that we do not have a right to defend ourselves. Every country has a right to defend itself. And the steps we take are according to our light. Every country is free.

Now coming to the foreign affairs side, the diplomatic thrust, I think, I should pay compliment to the Foreign Affairs Ministry, for, really, it could convey to the various capitals the Indian point of view and quite a large number of capitals responded to the support of the Simla Agreement which was sought to be diluted and was being described as out of context. And I got it conveyed to Pakistan that if it is out of context, it will not be only one way out of context. So, please be serious when you say it is out of context. This is the framework by which we got peace for 18 years. Simla Agreement is a process of history. After several conflicts, the two countries had agreed on the Simla Agreement. It was not just that out of the Foreign Ministries; papers came and both signed them. And it gave a framework of peace for so many years. Why cannot it be continued? Why cannot Pakistan understand that not during the 15 years, but only during

*Pak troops in Concentration of
Chhamb Sector*

the last year, there have been trouble, insurgency and all that. Why those years were not worse of in our relationship? I think, some introspection is necessary on that side. I have also conveyed through various channels that good relations are not built by good arguments. Good relations are built by acts of good faith. And I have conveyed—to share with the House—that if Pakistan shows one act of good faith, we will show two. But just go on denying, while you are doing it, carrying on merrily, this is something which we are not going to accept. The very fact that the Prime Minister of Pakistan has to move out, is a proof of our diplomatic success. In fact, she was under pressure within her own circles that the Indian dilomatic offensive has been successful, so successful that they were virtually isolated from some countries. Therefore now she herself has to undertake the journey. It is a proof of our success and we are not complacent. We have had talks with various Arab countries and genuinely they want that no conflict does occur. And many have come out expressly in support of the Simla Agreement.

15.00 hrs.

May I add at this juncture—which I want to do specially I am grateful to the hon. Members that on this issue, they said, "All are one. There is no division among us. We sit here as Indians, not as party Members when it comes to this issue of national security." I am grateful to the House and this message coming today from the House will go a long way to strengthen because it is not only the Army but also the people and their morale.

In this, may I say, at the same time, it is very necessary—as I have rightly said—it is not only the Army that takes on the responsibility of security but the people? And in the people—if they are very strong there has to be harmony. Harmony and unity of the people is its great strength. Anything that would or could divide the minds or the hearts of the people or divert energies elsewhere it this juncture—not only at this juncture but for all time to come—is something which would

affect our security environment also.

I have confidently conveyed that if on this issue, Pakistan thinks that the people of India are divided, they are mistaken. Be it our Muslim brethren, be it our Sikh brethren, be it our Christian brethren, be it of any religion, caste or creed, they are all one and this is our strength. May I assure the House that this is the message I have and the confidence I have in meeting any situation? With these words, may I assure you that there is nothing to worry about? We are ready to face any challenge.... (*Interruptions*).... Now, Kashmir is an integral part of India. there is no question. We have always held it and expressed ourselves that any issue between India and Pakistan has to be bilaterally decided and we are not accepting mediation in these matters. However, even for putting our point of view and conveying our point of view, it is necessary to keep communication channels open. If we clog our communication channels, then our presentation of our views also gets clogged. I do not think we should stop communication channels but we have said firmly 'no' about mediation.

15.04 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Eleventh Report

[*English*]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS
AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINIS-
TRY OF TOURISM (SHR SATYA PAL
MALIK): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House do agree with the
Eleventh Report of the Business Advi-
sory Committee presented to the House
on the 16th May, 1990."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The ques-
tion is: