

- (1) Review by the Government on the working of the Smith Stanistreet Pharmaceuticals Limited, Calcutta, for the year 1984-85.
- (2) Annual Report of the Smith Stanistreet Pharmaceuticals Limited, Calcutta, for the year 1984-85 along with Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT—1993/86.]

12 08 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS

[English]

Sixth Report and Minutes

SHRI K. RAMAMURTHY (Krishnagiri) : I beg to present the Sixth Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Committee on Public Undertakings on General Insurance Corporation of India and Minutes of the sittings of the Committee relating thereto.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : It is my ruling. I have given my ruling.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Not allowed. I have given my ruling.

(Interruptions)

12.09 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

[English]

Reported statement made by the official spokesmen of a neighbouring country regarding recent disturbances in India

PROF. K.K. TEWARY (Buxar) : I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon :

“The reported statement made by the official spokesmen of a neighbouring country regarding recent disturbances in India and the reaction of the Government in the matter.”

MR. SPEAKER : My ruling is ruling. You cannot challenge this. Not allowed.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) : Will you ask the two Ministers who have resigned to make Statements ?

MR. SPEAKER : If they want, they can.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Why the delay ?

MR. SPEAKER : I do not know. Guptaji, I cannot force them.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura) : Sir, there is a convention in the House.

MR. SPEAKER : I cannot force them.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) : The Ministers have resigned, and they have their own... (Interruptions) The Ministers have resigned. How ? This House does not know.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : The House should know why they resigned.

MR. SPEAKER : Here and now I give my permission to them. No problem. Let them. I don't deny them this privilege. They are welcome. Anybody is welcome. And you are also welcome, if you like to do it. No problem.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY :**
(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER : Whatever Mr. Reddy says does not go on record at all.

[Translation]

Jaipalji, it is no use. It is immaterial whether the statement is made or not, there is also no use of getting agitated. (Interruptions). Please sit down, what shall I do if your blood pressure goes high or you develop some other trouble..... (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI AMAL DATTA (Diamond Harbour) : Whenever Government wants, they will bring out some thing...(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER : Not allowed.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER
OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE
— Contd.

*Reported statement made by the official
spokesmen of a neighbouring country
regarding recent disturbances in
India*

[English]

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B.R. BHAGAT) : In a statement made in its Senate on February 20, 1986 regarding some recent disturbances

in India the Pakistan Minister of State in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated that the people of Pakistan "cannot remain indifferent to the plight of human beings, particularly those with whom they share bonds of religion, culture and family ties". Similar statements were made by the Government of Pakistan in its National Assembly on June 12, 1985, and in their Senate on July 9, 1985. In addition there have also been other objectionable statements.

We have noted with concern the above tendency of the Government of Pakistan in recent years to make unwarranted references to and take an unhealthy interest in the minority communities in India. While professing adherence to the principle of non-interference, these references cannot but be regarded as a blatant interference in our internal affairs.

Honourable Members would also recall that in the historic Simla Agreement, India and Pakistan mutually agreed that adherence to the principle of non-interference in internal affairs is a pre-requisite for reconciliation, good neighbourliness and durable peace between them. While making a statement in their National Assembly of Pakistan in July 1974 when the Sadar Bazar riots took place in Delhi, the then Government of Pakistan stated that under the Simla agreement it would be treated as an internal matter. The attitude of the Government of Pakistan is now at variance with the earlier stand.

The Government of India have on several occasions made it clear to the Government of Pakistan that such statements are contrary to the Simla Agreement and not conducive to the promotion of harmonious and good neighbourly relations. On our part, we have refrained from commenting on reports of sectarian riots, denial of democratic rights and restriction on freedom of religious worship to minority communities including the Ahmadias in Pakistan even though there has been public concern voiced on these developments in India and elsewhere. It is our

hope that the Government of Pakistan will take due note of these facts and desist from such actions which cannot but adversely affect our efforts to develop friendly and cooperative relations with Pakistan.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am happy that the Minister has made a categorical statement. On earlier occasions, you had allowed 40 minutes ; sometimes one hour.

MR. SPEAKER : You are part and parcel of the decision ; you cannot violate your own charter.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : I will confine myself to the points which are directly relevant to the debate today. I am happy, as I said, that the Minister has taken a very categorical stand about the gross interference of Pakistani military junta in the internal affairs of our country. But this is perhaps at variance with the recent attempt of the Government of India to improve friendly relations with Pakistan. There have been spate of activities all along the line to improve our relations with the neighbours. But, in spite of all this, Pakistan has been adopting a very stubborn attitude and has been trying to exploit every conceivable problem that we face today as a country, as a nation.

12.16 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

I do not blame Pakistan as such, because Pakistan is at best a surrogate State, a vassel, a Trojan Horse, a cat's paw at worst. The people who are egging on Pakistan, to engage in this game of destabilizing our country are well-known ; and I would have been very happy if the hon. Minister would have revealed the links of Pakistan and the patrons of Pakistan who have been engaged in all kind of such activities in their global strategic and hegemonistic interest.

Recently, I came across a series of articles written by no less a person than a very important member of Zia-ul-Haq

think-tank, who is also by the way the Director-General of the Institute of Strategic Study in Pakistan ; and this gentleman, this Gen. Akram Khan—see how monstrously he distorts the history of this sub-continent that will reveal to us the ugly design of the military junta and their attempts to destabilize our country ; whether it is a question of minority or whether it is a question of the terrorists in Punjab. This spans the entire gamut and this makes a terrible reading, the statement, the article. I am quoting only extracts from a series of articles from Gen. Akram Khan. He says as follows :

“We regard ourselves as the successors of Muslim rulers of India who, in spite of being a minority, ruled over a large population of Hindus in the subcontinent. We claim the legacy of Muslim Sultans and Emperors of India and are not about to submit to the pre-eminence of Hindus. If Pakistan, as a smaller country, would not accept India as pre-eminent, then the rest of the world was not likely to regard India as such.”

This is the thesis ; this poisonous thesis, is propounded by rulers of Pakistan with whom we have been trying in recent months to have all kinds of relations including our offer of a treaty of friendship and cooperation. He further states and the design of dismembering India becomes crystal clear. He says as follows :

“India is not one country ; it has never enjoyed the unity which is the hallmark of a nation state. The people who can be regarded as being potentially separatists are the Sikhs, the Dravidians (the four southern States of the peninsula) and the north-eastern people who include the Nagas, the Mizos, Tripura and Assam.”

Again he says as follows :

“If the people of the sub-continent can comprise two nations, why not three ? Why not four or five or six ?”

This is the real intention of the junta ruling in Pakistan. And then, with a

sense of bravado and a sense of victory, he declares, I quote again :

“Time is in our favour because the problems which India is beset in the 80s, are becoming increasingly difficult to solve, and instead of going from strength to strength India is going from weakness to weakness.”

He pins his hope on our internal differences. In this connection, I refer to the patrons of Pakistan, the imperialist forces. We in India inherited a divided sub-continent ; divisions were created. Animosity as legacy were left and what the patrons of Pakistan sitting in Washington have been speaking about this scenario, this difficult and bizarre scenario on the sub-continent will be clear to us. There appears to be a convergence of strategic opinion between the American and the Pakistanis. Therefore, all along we have been emphasising that the forces are out to de-stabilise us and we cannot forget the harrowing experience we had to undergo—this nation had to undergo—for the last two years.

Mr. Richard Nixon, the ex-President of America and I hope the members in the House will look at this situation with utmost seriousness because what Richard Nixon seeks to convey to us is collective wisdom of the American people. It appears that the American administration, and the American people have been engaged all over the world in such ugly games of destabilisation, murders of political leaders, destruction of the unity of nations, and so on. Mr. Richard Nixon in his book, “*Leaders*” says, and I quote :

“For, as the Shah’s comments indicated,”

—he was referring to the Shah of Iran—

“it was no more in the natural order of things for all India to be one country than it was for all Europe to be one country ; linguistically, ethnically and culturally, India is even more diverse than Europe. But whether this accomplishment benefited

the Indian people is another question. Unity is sometimes more important to the unifiers than to the unified. If less energy had been dissipated in combating the country’s natural centrifugal forces, perhaps more could have been done to improve the people’s living conditions.”

Imagine this Satanic—I would say—observation of an ex-President of America about the unity of this country !

Therefore, the entire gamut of things suggests only one conclusion, that the forces of anarchy are abroad. The forces of anarchy have been engineered by outside forces, by outside powers and Pakistan is a surrogate, is a proxy of American imperialism—because there is total strategic consensus between the Americans and the Pakistanis.

I would like to put it to the Minister whether it is not a fact that the Punjab Chief Minister, Mr. Barnala has been crying himself hoarse about the Pakistani interference in Punjab. Now, the killings of innocent people of Punjab, the looting of the armoury, forceful occupation of the highest spiritual seat of the Sikhs has been done by a handful of people and behind all these activities is the discernible hand of Pakistan.

I would also like to draw the attention of the Minister to a similar statement only recently made by the same Chief Minister. They have been talking about the Simla Agreement. We should not forget that the author of the Simla Agreement was initially taken into protective custody by the present rulers and he was ultimately hanged. We should not put so much store by the Simla Agreement. While he has been talking of the Simla Agreement, in *Majlis-e-Shora* the Pakistan Parliament the same Minister said : The same Minister has said that ‘we do not finally rule out use of force for liberation of Jammu & Kashmir although we continue to explore the possibilities of an amicable settlement in international fora’. And we are harping on the point that Simla Agreement is all that sacrosanct, but Pakistan authorities, in flagrant violation of international norms and agreements

have been trying to internationalise every issue of dispute.

Till recently, Pakistan was fighting an undeclared war in Siachin Glacier. You were recently in the UN where I was also present....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please wind up.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : I am raising very important questions. You allow me to speak. Please listen to me.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I cannot go on listening to you indefinitely.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether Pakistani authorities have respected this agreement or understanding. Why was the question of Kashmir raised in the recent session of the UN Assembly both by the President of Pakistan and its Foreign Minister ? And I do not know what were the compelling reasons which prevented us even from using our right of reply.

Pakistani hand has been discovered from some of the papers recovered from the possession of some extremists in Tripura. Pakistan is getting involved not only on the question of disturbances on religious grounds or on other grounds in the country but they are directly supporting the 'Khalistani' terrorists.

I would like to know whether it is not a fact that under the covert operations of CIA \$400 million are being given to Mujahideen of Afganistan and training camps have been set up in Pakistan. The same training camps are being shared by Sikh extremists and Mujahideen and the same level of training is being imparted to 'Khalistanis'. Is it not a fact that Pakistan was receiving \$3.2 billion, now this has been enhanced to \$6 billion, as a package for military and economic support ?

Please enlighten the House about the recent visit of Zia-ul-Haq to Sri Lanka.

Is it not a fact that after the visit of Zia-ul-Haq to Sri Lanka, there has been spurt in genocide and terror in Sri Lanka against Tamilians. And on his return to Pakistan a similar wave of terror has been unleashed in Punjab also. Pakistanis in collusion with their mentors, the imperialist forces, are trying to create problems for us. We have been aware of this all along. I do not know why the country is not being taken into confidence...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : What is the clarification you want ?

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Two minutes more.

Therefore, in this background, the disturbances here in the country are the unfortunate legacy of colonial designs, colonial machinations and conspiracy. Unfortunately, we are still victims of this continuing division among our people. I would like to know as to what we have done to isolate such characters, such persons, such tendencies and such ideas. For this the unity of Indian people is important. What is happening in U.P. today ? What is happening in Jammu and Kashmir ? This is a clear attempt. For the last one year, preparations were underway for liberation of a particular temple. Now, in all this scenario the hand of Pakistani authorities, Pakistani Government in destabilising our country becomes very important....(Interruptions).

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : Sir, I am on a point of Order. I object to the words 'liberation of a temple'. It was a Masjid there, Babri Masjid, which is being taken over by them.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Did I talk anything about that ? I did not refer to that. Purposely I did not talk about that. You are too sensitive and you are protesting too much Mr. Banatwalla.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : You are travelling beyond the area of the Calling Attention....(Interruptions).

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Purposely I did not speak about that...(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now I am calling Shri Chintamani Jena....

(Interruptions)

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : You are covering such a large ground over there, so many other things, instead of restricting yourself to the subject of the Calling Attention....(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have called Shri Jena to speak. Mr. Tewary, please take your seat. I cannot allow you.....

(Interruptions)

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Why you cannot allow me ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You have taken too much time.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : How much time I have taken ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You have taken twenty minutes.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : You do not understand the importance of this question, that is why you are asking like this. I am sorry to say this that you are holding the Chair and if you do not understand.....(Interruptions). This is not *aalu bhanta ka daam*, this is a question of national security ..(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You are not specific. You are going on taking lot of time.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : How much time did I take ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You have taken fifteen minutes.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : You have allowed people to speak for 50 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have not allowed. Why you are saying that ? I have not allowed anyone. This is the decision that we have taken recently. We

have taken this decision. You go and read the rules.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : I have to put all the questions before the Foreign Minister. I have been very categorical in my questions but the kind of impatience that you are showing...(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have been patiently listening to you but be brief. That is what I am saying.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : I am very brief. It needs some prelude, some explanation from the Foreign Minister. In the light of all the questions that I have put, I think there should be no hurry in reaching any agreement with Pakistani authorities. Recently there has been an agreement in which it is said that India will not attack the nuclear installations of Pakistan and *vice versa*, as if India was preparing to launch an attack on Pakistani nuclear installations. The international-leverage available to us on the mechanisms of Pakistan is lost in the process if you show that you are over anxious. In spite of all the mounting evidence, we cannot go on brushing under the carpet. We have to confront this issue because the paramount question is of national security, its stability. The bigger forces are engaged in destabilising our country. Therefore, when we speak about Pakistan, we should also speak about all those who have been funding Pakistan, who have been supporting Pakistan, who have been arming Pakistan to destroy our unity.

SHRI CHINTAMANI JENA (Balasore) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the hon. Minister in his speech has referred to the Simla Agreement....(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : After the Members have put their questions, the Minister will reply at the end. He has to reply to all the questions.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Sir, this has been the convention in the House....(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You go through the rules. I may tell you that now we have changed the rules.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, you would have also seen in the Seventh Lok Sabha that the Minister replies to every Member's questions.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You go and read the Bulletin Part-II. Now we have changed the procedure, rules and everything. After the questions are raised by all the Members, finally the Minister will reply. Even your questions also.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : This is diluting.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There is no question of diluting. The Minister will take down your questions and then he will reply.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : This will result in the utter dilution of the replies.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now, what can I do ? This is the decision taken by everyone.

SHRI G.G. SWELL (Shillong) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, if there has been a change in the procedure, we are not aware....(*Interruptions*). Have patience for one minute. I say, if there has been a change....(*Interruptions*). If there has been a change in the procedure we should have been informed about it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Already informed. Every one has been informed about it.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : We don't know. Secondly, if there has been a change, it is a wrong change. Prof. Tewary has put certain questions. Everybody also will have to put his question. In the end the Minister gives his reply. It means that his reply to the questions will not be complete and the whole thing is diffused. This is not the purpose of the Calling Attention. I think we should have a change in the procedure.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : In the last session itself it was done. It is not a new thing. Last session itself it was changed,

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : You are forgetting. Never before had we done this thing.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Since November it has been going on. It is not a new thing. In the last session itself it was done. Everybody accepted. Mr. Tewary I don't know whether you were here at that time during the last session.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Numerous Calling Attention Notices were given and each one put his question and reply was given to each individual member.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, Shri Jena,

SHRI CHINTAMANI JENA : Sir, the hon. Minister in his reply to the Calling Attention Motion referred to the Shimla agreement. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to a news item published in the Hindustan Times on 10-2-86.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Chintamani Jena, you kindly take 5 minutes only.

SHRI CHINTAMANI JENA : I am taking 5 minutes only. I am putting only questions.

Pakistan's Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Zain Noorani said like this. I quote this portion. It says :

"Replying to another question, the Minister said, the Shimla agreement did not take away Islamabad's 'right' to raise the issue at International Forums."

My hon. friend Prof. Tewary has said that Pakistan has no respect for the Shimla agreement. I must say that our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi has extended his hands of cooperation and friendship to Pakistan but in return what is it that Pakistan is doing ? They have no respect for the Shimla agreement. Now, what is the attitude of this Government in this respect ? I would like to know this. May I know from the hon. Minister

categorically whether our Government has protested against this unwarranted action of Pakistan through diplomatic channels? If so, when, and what is the reaction of the Pakistan Government?

Regarding communal riots etc., I must say that these disturbances are being instigated by the Pakistan Government. I am just quoting what has appeared in several national newspapers of Delhi. It appears that Pakistan's actions are being ignored by our Government. I will quote from the newspaper *Hindustan Times* dated 2nd February, 1986. It has appeared only a fortnight back. The heading is :

“Pak. blue-print for anarchy in Punjab.” And then it says :

“A top Colonel of the Pakistan Army has prepared a blue-print for spreading anarchy in Punjab, to be followed by direct intervention by the Pakistan Army.”

So many other things are there. The hon. Deputy-Speaker will not allow me to speak more. But this is another thing which I quote from *Hindustan Times* dated 2nd February 1986.

“The blue-print, which prepared six months back is being implemented in phases.”

But my hon. friend, Prof. Tewary has already explained as to how Pakistan trains Punjab extremists. This has also come as a news item in *Hindustan Times* dated 11th February 1986. Similarly, other news items are also published in the *Indian Express* and similar such national dailies of our country.

So, may I know whether the Government is aware of this situation? If so, what is the action taken by the Government to protest against this before the Pakistan Government? Also, when they have no respect for Simla Agreement, what is the Government thinking alternatively to face the situation because these types of actions of the Pakistan Government and Pakistan people are creating strained relations between the two countries? I must

say that in respect of all these communal riots etc. there is a hand of the Pakistan Government and the Pakistani people. In support of this, the Pakistan Government is training the extremists and also sending them to our country where they are creating communal disturbances. In this connection, may I know from the hon. Minister what our Government is going to do to counter these types of actions of the Pakistan Government?

[*Translation*]

DR. G.S. RAJHANS (Jhanjharpur) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have to say many things but as you are allowing me quite short time, I would mention two or three points. There is a proverb in English—

[*English*]

One step forward, two steps backward.

[*Translation*]

There is one more which goes like this—

[*English*]

Blow hot, blow cold.

[*Translation*]

Pakistan is doing the same thing. For the past one year....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : This is a Russian proverb.

DR. G.S. RAJHANS : I do not know much about it. I am an illiterate person. I have just quoted the proverb.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B.R. BHAGAT) : You have a Ph.D. degree and you still claim to be illiterate.

DR. G.S. RAJHANS : We have been trying to normalise our relations with Pakistan for the past one year. Discus-

sions have been held at political level and Official level abroad. We were happy to learn that at the SAARC Conference in Dacca, the President of Pakistan had expressed his desire to improve relations with India and normalise relations with other countries of the region. I am happy that when Pakistan President visited India on 17th December, he expressed his desire to improve relations with India. I would like to quote from the Hindustan Times dated 18.12.85 wherein President Zia has said—

[English]

“In reply to another question, Gen. Zia said, the question of terrorism in Punjab had been discussed and he had assured Mr. Gandhi that Pakistan was totally against terrorism of any kind and vitiated the spirit of normalising.

“Asked about Kashmir, Gen. Zia said that the issue would be solved in the spirit and letter of Simla Agreement at an appropriate time”.

[Translation]

There is a proverb in Hindi which says—

*Tere vaade per jiye ham
To ye jaan chhoot jaye
Khushi se mar na jate
Agar aitbar na hota.*

General Zia painted a picture which indicated that enmity and conflict between the two countries would soon come to an end. Our hon Finance Minister went to Pakistan and signed a trade agreement.

[English]

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : But that Economic Minister was dismissed because he was favourable to the agreement and to India.

DR. G.S. RAJHANS : Yes, the Minister was dismissed.

[Translation]

I would say there is a vast difference between what Pakistan professes and what it practises. We had thought that relations with Pakistan would improve but it seems a far cry. A few days back the Pakistani Minister of state Shri Noorani said in the National Assembly that they would take up the Kashmir issue in the various international forums and reveal to the entire world, the way India is treating Pakistan. This statement came despite President Zia's assurance in the presence of Shri Noorani in New Delhi on December 17 that the Kashmir issue and other issues would be solved in accordance with the Simla Agreement. It was a big jolt. We thought that our relations were improving with Pakistan but it was not to be. I have to mention two points in this connection. I would like to ask the hon. External Affairs Minister about the outcome of his talk with President Reagan and Mr. Shultz of America, about the arms aid being given to Pakistan by America and whether they gave any assurance to India.

I would also like to know from the Government whether the proposed goodwill visit of the hon. Prime Minister in 1986 stands cancelled in view of a change in Pakistan's attitude and because of his utterances. It is a major question because President Zia said during his visit to this country that Hon Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi would pay a goodwill visit to Pakistan in the first half of 1986.

It is a well known principle in International politics that the Government of a country is considered distinct from the people. The American media explained to the American people how President Marcos turned despot and compelled President Reagan not to help him and now he is fleeing Phillipines. Did the Indian Government ever try to enlighten the Americans or Pakistanis about the activities of their Governments ? Has any effort been made at the diplomatic level to educate the Americans who believe in democracy through the media or Universities that the American military aid to Pakistan is against their interest ? Has any effort been

made to remind the Pakistani people that we are brethren and that their Government is trying to befool them? So far as communal riots are concerned it is really unfortunate. We have been able to check it. Sir, I would like to say that since independence Pakistan has become a constant source of trouble for us. We have tried our best to normalise relations. After the 1947 conflict with Pakistan, Pandit Nehru had appealed to them to sign a 'No war Pact' because once both were one country and the same blood was flowing in their veins as well. After the 1965 war, this was again repeated in the "Tashkent Agreement". Once again in 1971 when Pakistan invaded India the same offer was made at the 'Simla Agreement', but unfortunately Pakistan agrees to it every time and later on backs out. Some people believe that America is at its back. There are imperialist forces which do not wish to see India progress. The need of the hour is to realise this and convey it to the people of Pakistan as well that these imperialist forces want to keep both the countries in poverty. We have to realise that both the countries are being forced to spend huge amount on Defence budget which could otherwise be spent on economic development.

Sir, a very serious situation is erupting. It would not be wrong to blame the foreign powers for the riots and other violent incidents in the country. It has been observed in the past that in these riots there has always been foreign hand we would like to point out to the hon. External Affairs Minister most humbly that the diplomatic missions abroad, particularly in America do not ever try to educate the people in this regard. They are bureaucratic in their approach. They never want to reveal to them as to what India proposes to do in this respect.

Therefore, the need of the hour is to educate the people of Pakistan that their interest lies in friendly relations with India and not in what the National Assembly of Pakistan or the Ministers advocate.

I would like to know what the Indian Government proposes to do in this respect.

SHRI RAM PYARE PANIKA (Robertsganj) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the hon. External Affairs Minister's reply to the calling Attention notice is clear and correct and we have come to know of Government's opinion in this matter.

But, Sir, while agreeing with the opinions expressed by hon. Members particularly, Shri Tiwari and Shri Rajhans, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to another point. Recently, he said that he was to visit Pakistan in March but due to Budget Session he is not going there now. I am sure he would certainly go there and so would the hon. Prime Minister. The situation is extremely serious because on the one hand our Government and the hon. Prime Minister are trying to create communal harmony in the country, which has started yielding results, and on the other hand the statement by a Pakistani Minister of state in the Pakistani Senate at this hour has not only tended to deteriorate the relations between the two countries but also highlighted a fact which is most unfortunate and ridiculous.

Sir, just now the name of Mr. Shultz was mentioned. About two or three days back, Mr. Shultz had said in a statement that they were requesting Pakistan to withdraw its armies from the Indian borders and try to reduce their strength as far as possible. One fails to understand why on the one hand America gives military aid to Pakistan and on the other hand it speaks of giving directions to Pakistan. This is not a single instance which is detrimental to cooperation, trust and goodwill between the two countries but it has often been done by Pakistan.

Recently, President Zia-Ul-Haq, during his visit to this country, had assured that he wanted to follow the Simla Agreement in letter and spirit. But Sir, there is a wide gap between what he professes and what he practises. The hon. Minister has clarified the situation that Pakistan is trying to vitiate the relations by issuing such provocative statements time and again, whereas the government of India has never interfered in the internal affairs of Pakistan. If one goes through the history of Pakistan one finds that just after 38 years

of its coming into existence, it was fragmented into two parts. The entire world knows about the deplorable conditions prevailing in the erstwhile East Pakistan—now Bangladesh—and the policy of discrimination against that part of the country being followed by the Pakistani Government. The result was fragmentation of Pakistan.

In view of the above mentioned facts I would like to request the hon. External Affairs Minister as well as the hon. Prime Minister not to go on the tour to Pakistan until the Government is once again reassured by Pakistan that they would not only honour the Simla Agreement but also the trade agreement and the agreement on not attacking each other's places of strategic importance, which they signed here recently, in view of the wide gap between their practice and profession. The entire country is agitated over their behaviour. Our Government is continuously trying to improve relations with them but, unfortunately, whenever a cordial atmosphere is established a deliberate attempt is made by them to vitiate it. Sir, the entire world knows that terrorist training camps have been set up in Pakistan. Have they been set up for establishing goodwill? We often capture weapons with Pakistani markings from the extremists. Recently, the hijackers were found to be carrying a pistol made in Pakistan. We would like to give two or three assurances because we find that Pakistan has been indulging in these activities one after the other for long now.

The Indian Government should ask the Pakistani Government to assure in unambiguous terms that the Simla agreement and other agreements, which have been signed recently, would be followed in letter and spirit and no terrorist training camp would be run in Pakistan which were behind the terrorist activities in this country. What is happening in the Kashmir valley? Terrorist training camps are being run with the help of Pakistan and until an assurance to this effect is not given, the people would like to know whether the hon. Prime Minister would go on the proposed Pakistan tour. I would like to request that till these

important issues are not settled, the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister should not go on this tour. I wish to say this much only and thank you very much.

[English]

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : I am grateful to the hon. Members for raising some very crucial questions regarding our relations with Pakistan.

Shri K.K. Tiwari raised five questions. First, he said why Kashmir issue was raised in the UN by Pakistan. (2) Pakistan's deep involvement in Kalistani terrorists and Pakistan's continuous effort in training the terrorists and propagating the Kalistanis' philosophy to destabilise the country. (3) The aid package of over 6 billion dollars from the United States of America and (4) President Zia's visit to Sri Lanka.

13 00 hrs.

Hon. Member Shri Jena also referred to some of these questions and he asked if we had made a formal protest to Pakistan. He has also said that Pakistan is trying to foment anarchy in Punjab; he quoted from the *Hindustan Times*; this pertains to the same subject-matter which was raised by Prof. Tewari. He also referred to the extremist activity in parts of Punjab being helped by Pakistan. He also referred to Pakistan's hand in fomenting communal riots in India. He quoted some allegations that Pakistan was fomenting communal riots in India.

The last two hon. Members spoke in Hindi and I propose to reply to them in Hindi. The subject was, more or less, the same. Pakistan, he said, is blowing hot and cold and one step backward and two steps forward

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : That is referring to the hockey match ..

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : There we are equal : We are quits on that.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : Two steps backward and one step forward.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : I am quoting him. He said : one step backward and two steps forward.

Then he asked what assurance I got when I visited the USA and in my talks with the President and other leaders regarding U.S. arms aid to Pakistan. He and also Mr. Panika said that neither I should go to Pakistan nor the Prime Minister should go...

DR. G.S. RAJHANS : I wanted to know whether the Prime Minister would be going. I did not suggest that he should not go.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Another point made was whether we had made any effort at diplomatic level to educate the American and the Pakistani people about the nature of the regime in Pakistan.

I think, these are the questions that have been asked and I propose to reply to these...

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : You will recall, Sir, I had referred to a very serious matter. In the book of Mr. Richard Nixon, the concept of Indian unity, the concept of India as a nation-State, has been questioned. A similar thing has been said by Mr. Akram Khan, an official of the Pakistan Government. These are also important and he should clarify the position *vis-a-vis* these also.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : That comes under Pakistan's effort to destabilise India and foment other troubles.

Before I reply to these questions, let me put the whole question of Indo-Pakistan relations in a proper perspective and clear one or two misconceptions about the recent initiative that has been taken to promote friendly relations with Pakistan.

It is not true that I have decided to go in May. What I said was, Pakistan's Foreign Minister, Mr. Sahabzada Yaqub Khan, wrote to me to visit Pakistan in March, in the first week of March, to

attend the Joint Commission meeting which is held at the Foreign Ministers' level. Last time it was held in Delhi, and now it is their turn, it is to be held in Islamabad, and he asked me to come there in March. I wrote to him that, for two reasons, it was not possible to accede to his request to visit in March. Firstly, the preparatory work for that important meeting at the Foreign Ministers' level has not been done ; there are some Sub-Commissions' meetings to be held at the technical level and first those meetings should be held and their report should be available at the Joint Commission's meeting so that decisions can be taken at that level.

Secondly I said that the budget session of Parliament has begun or it was about to begin (because he wrote a few days back before the Parliament session) and I can only think of visiting after the budget session of Parliament is over *i.e.*, after May 7th. There is no commitment, but it depends because the Joint Commission meeting is an on-going exercise between the two countries and if the conditions are good certainly I would like to go.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : It will be a part of deficit financing.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Whose deficit ?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : His deficit.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : The question of Prime Minister's visit does not arise at the present moment because a lot of things are to be done. This visit was conceived as a culmination of the entire process so that at the end when the Peace and Friendship Treaty and the Non Aggression Pact that they have proposed, are finalised the Prime Minister's visit can take place as a major historic event of beginning a new relationship between the two countries. But still we are very very far away and we don't visualise an early visit of the Prime Minister to Islamabad for this purpose.

India and Pakistan are right from the beginning trying to build a framework of friendly relationship based on mutual trust and cooperation and in mutual interest.

As you know, we have been rebuffed time and again. The first breakthrough was in the Simla agreement and in the Simla agreement this principle was accepted between two Governments that all questions should be settled between the two countries peacefully, through negotiations bilaterally. All questions including the question of Kashmir were there. That was a major breakthrough. Pakistan, on all matters, accepted this principle since they had put their signature on it—bilateralism in the relationship between the two countries. But they have said and they maintain their right to raise the Kashmir question in the United Nations or in other international forums. We have not agreed to that. We have been saying that Kashmir question also should be solved and can only be solved in the same spirit bilaterally through negotiations.

Even today, because of this stand, may be because of their domestic compulsions they are saying it, but right from the beginning they are saying it. Even today President Zia, when he speaks on it, says that Kashmir question will be solved in the spirit of Simla agreement. The Foreign Minister Yakub Khan, when he refers to it, says that Kashmir question will be solved in the spirit of Simla agreement and in the light of the UN resolutions. He goes a step forward and the Prime Minister Junejo, when he speaks, altogether rules out the reference to Simla agreement. He says that Kashmir question can be solved only in the context of the UN resolution. (*Interruptions*).

I am putting this because they are not only blowing hot and cold ; but different people speak with different voices. It is their own problem.

In so far as India is concerned, we maintain that only bilateralism, bilateralism, bilateralism can be the basis of discussions and solutions of all problems between India and Pakistan. (*Interruptions*). In the same spirit the agreement was signed on 17th December. The six point agreement was signed in the same spirit in all respects. For the first time, the two Defence Secretaries met in Islamabad.

They discussed this question. They have agreed on two points. First, not to resort to force in settling the Siachen glacier problem. It was an important agreement that even in Defence matters not to resort to force. Secondly, to settle this question through dialogue and mutual discussion.

Similarly on trade question the Finance Minister went there. For the first time Pakistan agreed to open private trade. They were not agreeing to private trade so far. Trade from India was totally banned and they agreed to this principle that it will be in the framework of non-discriminatory pattern, that is, the trade on the basis of most favoured treatment. These are some of the bilateral achievements that have been made but still we have to go a long way to evolve a framework of cooperation. With Pakistan we are emphasising let us try to build confidence among the people and among the governments of the two countries. The confidence building measure is very important all these questions he said that Pakistan is motivated differently : Pakistan is egged on by certain outside powers in a different direction ; Pakistan has certain other evil designs ; Pakistan does not wish good of India and that even it is engaged in de-stabilising process and it does not stop short of fomenting the trouble when it wants to and, as such, our emphasis is on confidence building measures.

The subject-matter of Call Attention is important because the Minister of State, Shri Noorani, a junior Minister, making an important statement which is contrary to the statement made by either a senior Minister or by the President.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : It is done on the Floor of the House. It is government's statement.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : I am not questioning this. I am saying the propriety of the junior Minister making a statement because this is a matter...

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : The statements made outside have no value.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : I have said that in my reply. I said that contrary to the statement made by the senior Minister or even the President in July 1974 while making a statement in their national assembly of Pakistan when the Sadar Bazar riots took place in Delhi, the then government of Pakistan said that under the Simla agreement it would be treated as an internal matter. This was the Pakistan Government's own statement. That was an elected Assembly. This is a semi-elected Assembly. You can imagine that was an elected Assembly and the statement made by the President. *(Interruptions)*.

I am arguing a sensitive matter. Please don't try to disturb me as the chain of thoughts gets broken. I am saying that you see the peculiar situation. On account of the internal pressures in Pakistan here in the semi-elected Assembly a junior Minister makes a statement that the similar matter is not an internal matter.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Then by that logic Zia-ul-Haq is a dictator. He is not even semi-elected.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Let me complete the point that I am making. What I am saying is that this is a negative factor...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Mr. Tewary is pressurising him physically.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : Are you saying semi-elected or semi-literate ?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : I cannot use very atrocious words.

SHRI G.S. SWELL : I misheard you.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : The point I am making is that this statement is a negative factor and it goes contrary to the whole process of confidence building measure and this is a commitment. Now, President Zia came here and signed this agreement, 6-point agreement. He made a statement here. He addressed them :

He made a statement there in Pakistan that we want to build a friendly relationship and cooperation, firm relationship. He believes in trying to build confidence, build relationship with this country and after all these two neighbouring countries are in good high sentiments. But this statement and some other statements go contrary to this point of view. They create a wrong climate for processing, in trying to create good neighbourly relationship in Pakistan.

Another point in this particular connection, although a question was asked by more than one Member, is about Pakistan's involvement in the terrorists activities, encouraging terrorists. We have been telling them that this is a very crucial matter to create motivation, to create a proper trust and confidence. *(Interruptions)* I know we have hard evidence.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : You have said that you have got hard evidence. Why don't you ask them to hand over those people ? Why don't you demand from them to hand over them back ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar) : Have you demanded ?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : They are raining them. They have provided arms and other facilities to them and we have made it repeatedly known at all levels about this. They have been denying it and they are not doing anything. They have been denying it. But we have told them that we have got the evidence and we know about that. But their position is that they are denying it. I have said that this is very important and we know how far you are involved in this and if you say that you are not involved, as a measure of friendly relationship with us, good neighbourly relationship with us, we will know that and as long as you are involved in terrorists, we will keep a watch over them. This is a crucial matter and this process of friendship will not proceed further because it is a vital issue. You may say many good things openly, but really what you do at the grass-root level in crucial matter is very important and this is a matter in which we are very alert and we are aware of the statement by the

Chief Minister of Punjab, Sardar Barnala. Even in the recent happenings, they see the hand of Pakistanis there. This is a serious matter and this will bring completely negative process of friendship.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : What have you done about that ?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : We can't broadcast that. We can't do that. Everything is possible. Only this morning, the Pakistan Ambassador, Mr. Noorani was called in regard to the statement about this matter. We have made a statement, protested to them that this is wrong and this has been done which is objectionable. We protested that this is going to affect adversely our relationship. This is the strongest protest that we could make. *(Interruptions)*. We have said that Pakistan has been asked to return such extremists in Pakistan. Their names and details have been given to Pakistan Government. The number of such persons is 7.

SHRI AMAL DATTA (Diamond Harbour) : There must be many more. But the hard evidence that you have is only for seven.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : We have details for seven.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : How long ago have you given these names ?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : But they are denying.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : How long ago have you given evidence of these seven people ?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : I would not be able to tell you, but apparently some months ago. But they are denying all such things. But the point I am making is that we are aware of their involvement. We have told them that we are aware of this and we will judge them by their behaviour in this question. If they are not involved, only then we will trust them, not otherwise. There is no hanky-panky in this. As long as our assessment is that Pakistan is involved in terrorist activities in Punjab,

which they are, and which they deny, we will go by our own assessment, there cannot be any progress in the peace and friendship with Pakistan.

Now, about the American aid package to Pakistan. Pakistan has asked for increase in the economic and military aid to the extent of 6.5 billion dollars. This is the second instalment to begin after October, 1987. This is before the Congress. In my discussions at all levels, I have raised this question and the point I have made is that we know for what reasons they are giving aid to Pakistan. The American position is that they have a feel that Pakistan is seriously threatened with the events in Afghanistan and other places. And their strategic perception is that there also security is involved in this region and Pakistan being a frontline State in this area, they are giving this aid. But we have said that our experience with Pakistan which attacked us three times has been that they have used American weapons in the past, and we know that whenever a conflict occurs, they will be encouraged to use these weapons against us. And, therefore, we cannot lower our guard on our national security as long there is flow of arms, more of sophisticated weapons to Pakistan. It hurts us badly, because we have to divert very scarce developmental resources to defence. That is why we are seriously concerned ; firstly, it adversely affects our developmental efforts and secondly, we are forced to go into an accelerated arm race ourselves which we have to do by diverting our resources.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : What about the covert operations of CIA with 400 million dollars support for training of Sikh terrorists and mujahidins ?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Well, we are concerned with all this. I mentioned to you about the American's perception. To what extent, diversion of that aid takes place for Khalistan trainees, whether they are trained with that fund or with some other fund, it is all immaterial. What is important is that Khalistanis are trained and we have to take care of that and we are alert on that point.

13.25 hrs

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch
till twenty-five minutes Past Fourteen
of the Clock.*

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch
at twenty five minutes past Fourteen
of the Clock.*

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

[*English*]

Eighteenth Report

The MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-
TARY AFFAIRS AND TOURISM (SHRI
H.K.L. BHAGAT) : I beg to move :

“That this House do agree with
the Eighteenth Report of the Business
Advisory Committee presented to the
House on the 21st February, 1986.”

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The
question is :

“That this House do agree with
the Eighteenth Report of the Business
Advisory Committee presented to the
House on the 21st February, 1986.”

The motion was adopted.

14.27 hrs.

MUSLIM WOMEN (PROTECTION OF
RIGHTS ON DIVORCE) BILL*

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri A.K.
Sen.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Let him
move the Bill first. Then you can object.

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND
JUSTICE (SHRI A.K. SEN) : Under Rule
372, I have to move first. Then, if it is
opposed, the Deputy-Speaker would be
kind enough to give you a chance to make
a statement and then it is for me to make
a reply.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE
(Rajapur) : That is a very 'sane' attitude !

SHRI A.K. SEN : I beg to move for
leave to introduce a Bill to protect the
rights of Muslim women who have been
divorced by, or who have obtained divorce
from their husbands and to provide for
matters connected therewith or incidental
thereto.

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI (Adilabad) :
The point which I want to raise is this....
(*Interruptions*) I am not opposing the
introduction of the Bill.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will call
those members who are opposing the Bill
one by one and they may make their state-
ments. Shri Mool Chand Daga....He is
absent. Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary. Please
make a brief statement.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY
(Katwa) : I oppose the introduction of
this Bill. This is a black Bill. The heading
of this Bill is misleading. It says that the
Bill is to protect the rights of Muslim
women. Actually, the Bill is meant for
deprivation of their rights. The very
heading is a misnomer. This is not at all
in accordance with the teachings of Koran.
On that count, I do not want to go into
detail again because on an earlier occasion
when the Private Member's Bill was being
discussed in the House I made my views
clear and I stand by them.

This very Bill violates the Preamble of
our Constitution wherein we had resolved
that we shall strive to constitute India
into a secular country.

* Published in Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II, section 2, dated 25.2.1986.