

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA: I withdraw that remark...(Interruptions)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: The hon. Minister of External Affairs should apologise for what he has said.

MR. SPEAKER: Let me go through the records and find out whether that word is there or not.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: We have to see what is there on record. Please understand that.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (Mayiladuturai): Sir, he has used the word 'gali'...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Unless I look into the records, how can I say something?

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, please sit down.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR: This proves that he does not have the grace to apologise for his remarks...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing should go on record.

...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Prime Minister is going to reply. Please take your seat.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing should go on record now.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RASHID ALVI (Amroha): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we should first discuss the condition of Muzaffarnagar...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You can raise this issue after the reply in the Zero Hour.

* Not recorded.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the number of Members who took part in the discussion was around 30. Members who were not present in the House, were also interested in the discussion and were trying to witness and hear the proceedings of the House from wherever they were...(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the discussion was initiated by Shri Madhavrao Scindia...(Interruptions)

SHRI MULAYAM SINGH YADAV (Sambhal): It is not correct. You read the only newspaper in which the news has appeared. If you had read all other newspapers, you would have known the fact.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: What I mean to say is that the debate was initiated on behalf of the Congress Party. However, Shri Mulayam Singh ji had started the discussion and has made some important points but I want to start from the speech of Shri Madhav Raoji because he spoke in the capacity of the spokesman of the Congress Party. I quote here the first Para of his speech:

[English]

"The Agra Summit has left the country very confused. What is even more discomfoting is that even the hon. Prime Minister, the Government and the hon. Minister of External Affairs seem confused. They are not able to resolve this dilemma as to whether this Summit was a success or a failure."

[Translation]

According to him, all are confused, entire country is confused and he himself is confused of which he has given ample proof. There can be differences about that Summit. One may not be able to say as to what extent the Summit achieved its objective, but to say that the entire country confused and the Government is confused is far from truth. It is not doing justice to the nation and this House. All are aware of the circumstances under which the talks were held.

A question has been raised that we had not made preparations. Before that Lahore Summit had taken place. That Summit had its own importance in the relations between our two countries. What happened in Kargil after that Summit is another story. We need not link the two. The whole world talks about the Lahore Declaration. We also refer to it because it is an important link in our

[Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

relations with Pakistan. After this Summit, a final declaration was issued in which terrorism was denounced. Terrorism of every kind and in any form had been condemned in it. Pakistan was a party to this declaration. Sporadic incidents were taking place at that time. But after the change of power in Pakistan, the entire scenario registered a sea change. We could not persuade Pakistani delegation for a mention of across-the border terrorism. They moved a step ahead by dubbing it as a freedom struggle. It was totally unexpected and from that point of time the atmosphere for talks got vitiated. They were time and time again told that terrorism is no solution of the problems. Terrorism is a fatal tool. Terrorist incidents are taking place in Pakistan too which are creating difficulties for the Government there. So much so, that even General Musharraf had to say that if he had his way, he would shoot terrorism of that kind. Terrorism has become a problem even for them. Therefore, terrorism cannot be encouraged in any manner. Terrorism is neither a freedom struggle, nor can it be called *Jihad*. But the rub is that we continue to witness ups and downs in our relations with Pakistan. Sometimes we have an atmosphere congenial for friendship, sometimes we are at war and at other times, we have cease-fire. This has been going on for the last 50 years or so. Our policy has all along been directed towards improving relations with our neighbours, but not out of any weakness.

I was surprised to learn that some journalists from Pakistan we heard saying that the Kashmir Valley was going to fall in their lap like a ripe fruit, that Indian forces are tired and India has come to the end of its tether and is not likely to make any extra efforts to safeguard its interests in Kashmir. I fail to understand how this misconception gained ground and spread. Delegation keep coming and going. Some non-Government institutions are also active. This sort of propaganda might have had, most probably had its impact on the mind of the Pakistani President as well. Now, let there be no misunderstanding in the mind of anybody about us. India is very strong and its forces are fully prepared to face any attack and any internal challenge. These people have wrong notions about us. If they framed their policies and strategies on this premise then failure was sure. We can never tolerate terrorism. Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part. I told General Musharraf that Jammu-Kashmir may just be a piece of land for them. He hardly even uttered the word, Jammu; Laddakh he would leave out; he focussed only on Kashmir and said that our relations would not improve till Kashmir issue was resolved. I told him that India had always been willing to talk on Kashmir.

Even in 'Simla Agreement' we had agreed to hold further talks on Jammu-Kashmir. We are ready for talks and even in the Summit Conference, we had discussed Jammu-Kashmir issue alongwith Kashmir at some length and told Pakistani delegation that if they were eager to focus all their attention on Jammu-Kashmir then they would have to take into account the entire history of Jammu-Kashmir i.e. how they had launched an attack, how they prevented people of Jammu-Kashmir from merging with India as per their wishes and how the tribal invasion had taken place. Whenever Pakistan talks about Jammu-Kashmir, it thinks of weapons—I was really surprised to hear this. I take the House into confidence to confirm that they said that if the tribals had not invaded at that time, Pakistan would not have got even that part of Kashmir which is at present under their occupation. Where was the basis for talks? We could never agree to what they wanted and this is why we repeatedly invited them for talks to sort out matters and improve relations.

We gave them an agenda. We gave them the agenda twice and announced confidence-building measures on our own. We informed them we were prepared to implement it and hold talks on Kashmir but please do not harp on a complicated issue. For them, Kashmir may just be a tract of land; but for us, it is part of our life. The way incidents of terrorism are taking place and innocent people are being killed, it cannot be called a freedom struggle. It is a naked dance of terrorism and so long as it continues the situation is not likely to improve. I hope Pakistan will reconsider its attitude. I am sure it will bring about necessary change in its demeanour towards us. We shall continue our efforts in this direction. For me, friendship with neighbouring countries is an article of faith. When I became the External Affairs Minister in 1977, I had to improve relations with Pakistan, to make movement of people from both sides easy and to simplify the rules governing visa and passport. But later, violence came to dominate the scene. A journalist from Pakistan has endorsed this view in his article and I wish to quote a portion of his article here (Ayaz Amir belongs to 'Dawn'):

[English]

"The Stark truth is that *jihad* (a term being used loosely here) has no — future in Kashmir. This is a harsh thing to say given the blood split and the sacrifices rendered but, unfortunately, all too true. A continuation of the insurgency can bleed India, as it has done with creditable results over the past decade, damage Indian prestige and keep the valley unsettled. But it cannot secure the liberation of the state. This much should be clear from the history of the last 53

years. What the Pakistan army has failed to secure in full fledged battle, the jihadis hope to achieve with their hit and run tactics."

[Translation]

This is the statement of a Pakistan journalist. From the beginning Pakistan is trying to annex Kashmir by force. It has now taken recourse to proxy war and has given an impetus to terrorism. Schemes are being drawn up to create internal disturbances in our country. But these tactics will take Pakistan nowhere. We shall continue to strive for peace. A process has set in. If change of power had not followed the Lahore Summit, our relations in various areas would have improved and the dialogue on Kashmir would have continued on the basis of the agreement reached there. An important leader from Pakistan once told me that an issue which could not be resolved in 53 years cannot be resolved so soon. Laying bare his heart, he said, "We shall not give up our demand on Kashmir and we know that you will not part with Kashmir. Therefore, the better course is to continue our dialogue on Kashmir, but at the same time improve our relations and widen the areas of mutual cooperation. And if we have to fight, we should fight against poverty, disease and unemployment. The world has advanced beyond measures but we are engaged in a conflict. The solution of which does not seem to be in sight in the near future." But they changed their ways after the change of power. I remember that when the meeting was coming to close, Smt. Sonia Gandhi had said "You should bear in mind Shimla and Lahore". The President of Pakistan did not like the mention of Shimla. The very mention of its name was perhaps leaving a bad taste in his mouth. Leaving Shimla and Lahore he tried to make a new beginning, when Joint declaration was being drafted their emphasis was on not including Shimla and Lahore in it. We did not accept it. India has always been trying to improve its relations with Pakistan. We had wars with Pakistan, in which success evaded Pakistan. President Musharraf had said in Delhi that this issue cannot be solved by war; it would have to be solved through dialogue. But he omitted to mention that Pakistan had adopted a new technique of fostering unrest and waging a war in Kashmir in order to grab it, thinking that India would concede defeat in face of this new technique and agree to their demand.

I do not want to dilate upon the one-to-one talks that took place between us as they were held in mutual confidence. But I found that he did not have interest in any matter other than Kashmir.

We had announced confidence building measures. On going through them, you will find that it is a document covering relations between India and Pakistan. However, Pakistan did not accept it. A point was voiced during the discussion as to why we did not break-off the talks when Pakistan was not prepared to talk according to an agenda. Talks are not initiated or abandoned in this manner. How could we have broken-off the talks when in the all-party meeting held before the summit, no one took the view that if they were not agreeing to an agenda, then the talks may be postponed? However, at Agra the future of talks was jeopardised; but even then there has been accord on some issues and we will broaden this base. The process of dialogue would continue, but talks will be held on a firm basis, keeping the unity of the country in tact. I want to assure the House that I am thankful to all Members and parties for the support extended in the all-party pre-summit meeting. The tone was also positive in the meeting held after the summit talks, even though it was somewhat reduced tone. Perhaps, there is an element of politics in it. May be it is the result of the coming elections. But I welcome criticism.

Sir, the question of Kashmir is one on which we have to jointly carve out a single opinion and show to the world that our differences are only democratic in nature. There is no difference on the issue of unity and dignity of the country. Mani Shankerji said he was ready to support the Government. He claimed that he had the experience of summit meetings, we had not. I do not want to under-rate his experience, but his party is not taking much advantage of it. Whenever we invite the Congress Party for talks and think that we would have the occasion to meet Mani Shankerji and have some exchanges with him, we find him missing. He is not included in the Congress delegation. There might be some confusion behind it, but there is no confusion in my mind and we would like to avail of his services in future. He is a person with experience. I know him ever since he was working in Karachi. He admitted that a demand was made for initiating talks with Pakistan. Demand for summit talks was there, but climbing on the summit was never envisaged. Talks had already been going on; a break came after Kargil. There was change of Government in Pakistan. A meeting at officers level would not have sufficed. It was necessary to know the line of thinking of those who had come at the helm of power to find out what they really wanted. We were talking of friendship, but were not sure about the response we will get, whether we will get the right response or not. We were constantly emphasizing that an agenda should be prepared as a framework for talks. But General Musharraf came with a one-point agenda. I tried to make him understand

[Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

that Kashmir issue was not so simple. He wanted to start from Agra, we said a start had been made in Tashkent.

We have never refused to talk, but we have never talked under fear or for the sake of publicity. Even now we are prepared to talk on Jammu-Kashmir, but cross-border terrorism would have to be stopped. Terrorism is again appearing there in frightening dimensions. Are the massacres in Doda a fight for freedom? I am told that the External Affairs Ministry of Pakistan has condemned these happenings. It is my firm belief that Pakistan can stop these incidents if it wants to, and it must do so. It is a test. We want friendship, and this is the test of their friendship.

SHRI MULAYAM SINGH YADAV: What did you say to him about the part of Kashmir which is under occupation of Pakistan?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I was coming to that. I can anticipate what you are going to say.

SHRI MULAYAM SINGH YADAV: It is good that besides being a poet, you are an astrologer too.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I told General Musharraf that if he raised the issue of Kashmir, then we would have to go into its entire history. I pointed out that one-third of Kashmir was under Pakistan's forcible occupation, a part of which it had given to China, and there was no democracy in the portion that was under it. I also told him that while he talked of ascertaining the will of the people, the people's will in Pakistan was not ascertained while power was taken over by him. He was not expecting such frank talks. It was a redeeming feature that these talks took place in a friendly atmosphere. You might ask how is it possible? Everything is possible in diplomacy, and we will make possible what appear to be impossible. We will continue to improve our relations with Pakistan without sacrificing our interests. We have the support of the international community in this. People wanted us to talk, General Musharraf had himself said that he was prepared to go anywhere anytime for talks. Voices were being raised inside our country also that we should start talking, that we may not agree to their demands, but there was nothing wrong in agreeing to talk. A propaganda was launched in small countries that India was emerging as military power, which was the reason she was bent on refusing to talk. When we took the decision to talk, it was a right decision at that time. The period immediately following Kargil was not an

appropriate time for dialogue. Pakistan was defeated in Kargil...(Interruptions)

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHARY (Berhampore, West Bengal): Is the present atmosphere appropriate?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: No, I also pointed out to him that Kashmir was being mentioned ever since Tashkent agreement and asked why he had not referred to that fact. He said, that was exactly his complaint. The political leaders were not laying emphasis on Kashmir, but now that he had come, he would lay emphasis on it. I said that if this was his approach, the talks may not move forward. Kashmir issue was not that simple. It was associated with our sentiments, I told him. We do not accept the two-nation theory on which Pakistan was founded, but now that it has come into being, we wish it all the best. However, Pakistan must not take any attempt to partition India further. We will not allow such an attempt to succeed. Decision on Kashmir was taken by the constituent Assembly. In Pakistan, even elections were not held.

The people of occupied Kashmir have no say. Sometime back, there election took place, but the power was later on entrusted to a military commander. A part of it was given to China. Under what sanction it was done? He argued that if we arrive at an agreement, Pakistan would take back that portion from China. I said, nobody would believe it and Pakistan should better realise the truth and the reality and give up the hysteria. It must not resort to terrorism. India is a big country following liberal policies, and would continue to do so. But liberalism does not mean that we would not protect our important interests. We would protect our interests and try to find the way to improve our relations while protecting our interests. We want the support of the entire House in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was said that our publicity was inadequate. However, we cannot follow methods of publicity resorted to by our opponants, the Pakistanis. But now, on account of the electronic media, it appears that some small diplomatic change would have to be brought about. A summit meeting has a certain decorum. There is a method of carrying it on. Statements are not issued at every step. Things are not leaked to newspapers. All this did not happen in our summit with Pakistan at Lahore. But at Agra, it appeared that publicity was being used as a weapon of attack. It did not have a salutary effect on our people. They thought that we were not speaking out. I had made a statement before the delegation in the presence of General Musharraf in

which I said that we could not be cowed down by terrorism and nobody should under-estimate our capacity to crush terrorism. He was hearing all this and was taking notes. But we did not disclose anything to the Press immediately. We believed that they should be given a chance to think. A decorum must be observed. We showed firmness, but were courteous at the same time. We observed decorum throughout the talks. We suffered some loss as a result for which we will take necessary steps in future. But to say that our efforts failed as a result of this is baseless. Understanding is no more. There would be further talks on certain issues. We would remain prepared to talk on Kashmir issue, but we have made our point clear. Pakistan would have to make matching efforts. I hope the attitude of Pakistan would change.

[Translation]

KUNWAR AKHILESH SINGH (Maharajganj, U.P.): Mr. Speaker, Sir, you had informed....

MR. SPEAKER: I have the list, I will call you. Please sit down. Shri Madan Lal Khurana.

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (Delhi Sadar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the issue of CNG buses transport crisis has cropped up in Delhi.

Presently, the situation is such that only 50 per cent buses are being utilized in Delhi. Scooters and three wheelers drivers are forced to wait for six to twelve hours for CNG filling. Similarly, buses have to wait for 12 to 36 hours in the queue. As a result of this vehicles are not been fully utilized.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, just two days back one CNG bus caught fire in West Delhi in which five persons had been injured. It is because of this that a crisis like situation has arisen. Bhure Lal Committee was set up after the order of the Supreme Court. There are two dangerous points in the report submitted by the Committee. First thing is that only CNG buses should be permitted to ply and priority should be given only to CNG buses and second point is that the price of diesel should be increased. There is no developed country in the world where buses are run solely on CNG. Only a few CNG buses are there. The matter is subjudice in the Supreme Court. My submission is that the scooter and taxi operators of Delhi have announced to go on strike on 10th of this month. That day the transporters of Delhi are planning to march from Rajghat to the Supreme Court.

My submission is that the hon'ble Minister is rightly going to submit a affidavit, which is a positive step. The decision of the Government of India in this regard is correct. My submission is that if the Supreme Court gives the judgement as per the proposal then it is good. Otherwise the Government should promulgate the ordinance in this regard after seeking advice from the Law Department so that the justice should be done to the transporters...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Vijay Goel, you have also given a notice under the same subject; you can also associate with Shri Madan Lal Khurana.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI VIJAY GOEL (Chandni Chowk): Sir, I associate myself with this and would request the hon'ble Minister to give some statement in this regard...(Interruptions)

SHRI RAGHUNATH JHA (Gopalganj): Mr. Speaker, Sir eight innocent persons have been killed in the police firing on the mob protesting against alleged bungling in the distribution of relief materials of Aural block of Muzaffarpur...(Interruptions)

12.47 hrs.

At this stage Shri Raghunath Jha, Shri Sudip Bandyopadhyay and some other hon'ble Members came and stood on the floor near the Table.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing should go on record.

...(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI SAIDUZZAMA (Muzaffarnagar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I should also be given the opportunity to speak...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Please go to your seats first.

...(Interruptions)