



**REPORT OF THE MEETING BETWEEN THE SENATE
STANDING COMMITTEE ON DEFENCE AND DEFENCE
PRODUCTION AND THE UNITED KINGDOM HOUSE OF
COMMONS DEFENCE COMMITTEE HELD ON 3RD JULY 2006**

ON

ISSUES OF MUTUAL INTEREST

PRESENTED BY

**SENATOR NISAR A. MEMON
CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE**

**AUGUST 2006
SENATE SECRETARIAT**

**REPORT OF THE MEETING HELD ON 3RD JULY 2006 BETWEEN
THE SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON DEFENCE AND**

DEFENCE PRODUCTION AND THE UNITED KINGDOM HOUSE OF COMMONS DEFENCE COMMITTEE.

A ten member delegation of the UK House of Commons Defence Committee had a meeting with the Standing Committee of the Senate on Defence and Defence Production headed by Senator Nisar A Memon on 3rd July 2006 at 1500 hours to discuss issues of mutual interest between the two countries. It was the first ever contact between the Defence Committees from UK and Pakistan. The two sides, which met for about one and half hours, discussed a number of regional and bilateral issues pertaining to defence and security.

The following members attended the meeting:

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|----------|
| 1. | Senator Nisar A Memon, | Chairman |
| 2. | Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed | Member |
| 3. | Senator Kamil Ali Agha | Member |
| 4. | Senator Naeem Hussain Chattha | Member |
| 5. | Senator Mrs. Rukhsana Zuberi | Member |
| 6. | Senator Kamran Murtaza | Member |

The UK delegation comprised of the following:

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-------------------|
| 1. | James Arbuthnot | Chairman |
| 2. | David Borrow | Member |
| 3. | David Crausby | Member |
| 4. | David Hamilton | Member |
| 5. | Adam Holloway | Member |
| 6. | Kevan Jones | Member |
| 7. | Brian Jenkins | Member |
| 8. | Mark Lancaster | Member |
| 9. | Willie Rennie | Member |
| 10. | John Smith | Member |
| 11. | Sir Mark Lyall Grant | High Commissioner |

The verbatim proceeding of the meeting is given following the Executive Summary of this report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Pakistan attaches great importance to its deep rooted bilateral relations with the United Kingdom, which represents shared values and commonality of perceptions on many regional and global issues. Regular meetings of Pakistan-UK Defence Cooperation Forum (DFC) have been helpful in opening new vistas in the military and defence cooperation between the two countries as well as providing opportunities to the two sides to exchange views on the critical situation in the region and on strategic issues of common interest. The last meeting of the Forum was held in London on 12-13 June 2006.

The U.K House of Commons Committee led by its Chairman Mr. James Arbuthnot M.P had a meeting with the Senate Standing Committee on Defence and Defence Production in the Parliament House on 3rd July 2006.

Senator Nisar A Memon welcomed the visiting delegation and thanked the government and people of UK for extending valuable help to the people of Pakistan in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake that hit northern Pakistan in October 2005. He talked of the close defence cooperation between Pakistan and the UK highlighting the Defence Cooperation Forum (DCF), which meets periodically in Pakistan and UK alternatively. He also referred to the post 9/11 difficulties faced by Pakistan in importing high tech defence equipments from UK due to non-issuance of export licences by the British Government. However, that difficult period is over and currently defence equipment is being imported from the UK and hoped an Open General Export Licencing will be established. He proposed that Pakistan Government should identify the type and nature of high tech defence equipment that can be imported from the UK. Senator Memon invited defence experts from the UK to participate in the annual IDEAS exhibition to be held in Pakistan in December. He thanked the UK government for providing training facilities to the army and hoped there will be numerous defence training programmes such as the ones offered under Defence Related Activities Programme (DRAP). He also suggested that subsequent to the close links between the navy and the air force of the two countries meaningful discussions between the two armies should also take place.

Senator Nisar A Memon stated that Pakistan remains committed to democracy including freedom of expression. Previously there was only one state controlled television and radio but presently numerous TV channels are operating under the PEMRA laws, which are free to broadcast NEWS and current affairs programmes according to their priorities. The Parliament is functioning and so are the four provincial assemblies. The local government system has taken roots subsequent to the two, four year cycle elections, at that level. In this regard he referred to the presentation of the defence budget in the Defence Committee besides presentation and discussion on Pakistan defence policy and the impending visit to the Strategic Plans Divisions to discuss the nuclear issue. He stated that Pakistan remains committed to fighting international terrorism as it has suffered because of the same. Pakistan is also committed to non proliferation and transfer of sensitive technology.

Senator Nisar A Memon further stated that Pakistan continues to believe and strive for the peaceful settlement of outstanding issues with India including the Kashmir issue. Pakistan is cooperating with the coalition forces in Afghanistan and had facilitated the election process of the Afghan President by enabling three million Afghans residing in Pakistan to take part in the election. He also mentioned that Pakistan has contributed contingents to peace keeping forces around the world.

Mr. James Arbuthnot giving reasons for his Committee's visit said that the Committee prepared a report in April on the deployment of British troops in Afghanistan and to discuss Afghanistan without the obvious questions that arise in relation to Pakistan would not have been getting the point. His Committee wanted to understand the issues in the way that Pakistan is dealing with the problem on its side of the border and to see how well Pakistan is cooperating. He expressed satisfaction over Pakistan-UK cooperation in relation to Afghanistan. Regarding exports of defence equipment he said that the Defence Committee does scrutinize it but not in depth. However, another Quadripartite Committee, which comprises members of the Defence Committee, Foreign Affairs Committee, International Development Committee and the Trade and Industries Committee examines jointly whether rules should be tightened or loosen. He also desired to discuss the issue of Dr. A. Q. Khan as this caused great interest in the

House of Commons and the UK. He agreed with Senator Nisar A Memon that exchanges on training programmes should be intensified.

He also praised the freedom of press in Pakistan.

Mr. David Crausby stated that he was interested in the nuclear issue as it is the most important challenge facing the human race and suggested that the purpose of nuclear weapons should be reconsidered. He also showed interest in hearing about the threat faced by Pakistan, which required it to have nuclear weapons.

Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed dealt with the nuclear subject comprehensively and narrated the reasons which compelled Pakistan to go nuclear. He said that in 1971 Pakistan was dismembered as a consequence of external aggression when Indo-Soviet forces joined hands to partition Pakistan and create Bangladesh. Although our military regime of that period did make mistakes but no country has had to pay such a heavy price for similar mistakes. Pakistan had relied on the American factor in CENTO and SEATO since 1954 and also on the British, but to no avail.

The dismemberment of Pakistan in 1971 was the cost it had to pay for serving as a bridge between China and the United States, which caused one of the major realignments of the post cold war period. In 1974 the problem was compounded when Mrs. Indira Gandhi the then Prime Minister of India injected the nuclear factor into South Asia. At that point in time India had no threat from Pakistan and no direct military or security threat from China. So Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, the then Prime Minister of Pakistan took the initiative to have the bomb to serve as a deterrent against possible aggression. There was this element of suspicion of Indian intensions that Pakistan went nuclear. Citing example he said in 1962 when India was in trouble and was at war with China, Pakistan did not take advantage of the situation to open another war front for India but when Pakistan was in hot waters in 1971 India stabbed her in the back. Pakistan opted to become nuclear for purposes of security while India went nuclear for purposes of status. In 1998 the Indian Prime Minister in a letter to the American President pointed out that India faced threat from China and an unknown neighbour (undoubtedly referring to Pakistan), therefore it had conducted the nuclear tests. A scheduled G-8

Summit was held in Birmingham in May 1998 and Pakistan waited to be rewarded for its patience or India to be punished for proliferation but neither happened. On 17th of May the then Home Minister of India Mr. L.K. Advani made a statement on Kashmir saying Pakistan better change its Kashmir policy because the geo strategic scenario has changed. This statement was a direct threat to Pakistan so on 28th of May Pakistan detonated its nuclear device but declared to abide by CTBT with no intension of being aggressive. Senator Mushahid Hussain was of the view that nuclearization of South Asia had brought about a new balance of power in the region. He reminded that in 2002 there was a ten month long stand off between the troops of India and Pakistan but war was prevented because of the nuclear factor.

Referring to the Kashmir issue Senator Mushahid said that despite being a military man President Musharraf has shown flexibility and has gone the extra mile by proposing an out of the box solution for Kashmir. Within the country there is across the board consensus on the Kashmir issue. Commenting on the Indo-US nuclear deal he stated that this has violated the letter and spirit of the NPT and the American laws. Britain being part of the nuclear supplier group has welcomed this deal. Referring to the war on terror Senator Mushahid was of the view that if the Bush Administration had not gone into Iraq, which had nothing to do with terrorism, 9/11, Al-Qaeda or Taliban, the situation in Afghanistan would have been much better.

Senator Engineer Rukhsana Zuberi stated that nuclear technology initiative was taken during Mr. Bhutto's time so as to put up a nuclear deterrence and to explore peaceful use of nuclear technology and energy. The latter objective could not be sustained because of intermittent democratic and non democratic governments. Now it is time to look into this aspect as energy has become very expensive. The extra money that is being spent on high priced oil can be utilized on health and education sectors. She did not agree with Senator Memon on the quantum of information provided by the government to the Defence Committee on the defence budget or any other issue of strategic importance. She was of the view that the only recipe to our problems lie in having a truly representative government where all issues are placed before the

Parliament, which should be prepared and have the capacity to legislate and take decisions.

Mr. Kevan Jones disagreed with the perception that terrorism is connected to Islam and suggested that this perception should be cleared through the media, which at times does not help in removing such biases. He said that the 7/7 bombing in London were carried out not by terrorists from abroad but by people brought up in the United Kingdom.

Senator Kamran Murtaza talked about allegations on certain UK agencies allegedly involved in exploiting the situation in Balochistan. Sir. Mark Lyall Grant, the British High Commissioner stated that this impression came up because of a meeting in Karachi between the UK Counsel General and Senator Shahid Bugti, who has not been charged for any criminal offence. He was of the view that diplomats do meet with politicians even if they do not agree with their party's policies. Secondly, the BBC correspondent managed an interview with Nawab Bugti which led to the conclusion that perhaps this had something to do with the British government but since there is complete freedom of press in the UK, the question of British government's involvement in Balochistan does not arise. Thirdly, there are some exiled political leaders in the UK who are related to Sardars in Balochistan therefore this impression of the UK government's involvement in Balochistan.

Mr. David Borrow while replying to Senator Rukhsana Zuberi statement that governments do not provide adequate information to the Standing Committees stated that it is a common problem. He asked whether the Defence Committee of the Senate was engaged with its counterpart Committees in India and Afghanistan to which Senator Zuberi responded in the negative.

Mr. Brian Jenkins stated that in UK, Parliamentarians face the same problem whereby government departments do not give access or provide information and the

only source where members of Parliament do get information is by going through the books of the Audit office.

Senator Naeem Hussain Chattha stated that he completely agreed with Senator Mushahid Hussain Syed on the nuclear issue as it depicted the popular will. He said that India will never be used against China as India has only one enemy that is Pakistan. Kashmir is the only burning issue between Pakistan and India and as long as that issue is not resolved Pakistan would require nuclear technology. UK and US are aware of the background of the Kashmir issue and should help in its resolution only then Pakistan could shun nuclear weapons.

Mr. Jones Smith was interested to know the impact of last year's parliamentary elections in Afghanistan on the tribal areas of Pakistan and Pakistan's policy on elections in the Tribal areas.

Mr. David Hamilton stated that Scots and Irish were hassled in the UK for thirty years but they were not termed as terrorists and so the Muslims in UK should not be categorized as terrorists although the majority of his constituents who are Anglo Saxons believe so.

Concluding the meeting Senator Nisar A Memon responded to some of the points raised by members of his own Committee. He wished there was adequate time at the disposal of the two Committees to discuss all issues exhaustively. He thanked the members of both sides for their active participation in the meeting.

**VERBATIM OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING OF THE
STANDING COMMITTION ON DEFENCE AND DEFENCE PRODUCTION
WITH THE BRITISH HOUSE OF COMMONS DEFENCE COMMITTEE
HELD ON 3-7-2006 AT 3.10 P.M. IN COMMITTEE ROOM NO.1,
PARLIAMENT HOUSE, ISLAMABAD.**

Senator Nisar Memon: Let me first introduce my colleagues. On my right is Senator Naeem Chatha, who is a very prominent figure of Pakistan's politics. His family has been in politics and he has come from the grass root level. Currently he is Chairman of the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Overseas Pakistanis.

Next to him is Senator Asif Jatoi. His biggest qualification is that he is the youngest of the 100 Senators that we have and he is the son of Mr. Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi, former Prime Minister of Pakistan. On my left is Senator Kamil Ali Agha. He has also come from the grossroot level of politics. He has worked in the Punjab province and now he is Chief Whip of the ruling party in the Senate. A couple of months back he was sworn in as Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs. Then we have Senator Engineer Rukhsana Zuberi, who is one of the very prominent business persons in Pakistan and has been in politics as long as I know her, for the last 30 years may be and she is in fact a very active member of this Committee. Next to her is Senator Kamran Murtaza. He is also a very prominent and active member of the Senate. He belongs to the MMA.

This committee is multi-regional as well as multi-party. Senator Kamil Ali Agha is from Punjab and he is from the ruling Pakistan Muslim League and represents the Punjab Province. Senator Murtaza represents Balochistan and belongs to MMA. Then we have Senator Zuberi, who is from the Pakistan Peoples Party of Benazir Bhutto and represents the Sindh province. Senator Mushahid Hussain Syed is a very prominent figure of politics and is the Secretary General of the Pakistan Muslim League. He also has the distinction of being a former Minister for Information and presently member of the Commission of eminent persons of the OIC to which he was nominated by the President of Pakistan. He also chairs the foreign affairs committee of the Senate. He represents Islamabad in the Senate. I come from Pakistan Muslim League and belong to the Sindh province. Mr. Chatha is also from the Pakistan Muslim League and hails from Punjab and Mr. Jatoi who is also from Pakistan Muslim League, belongs to the Sindh province.

So, these are the people on behalf of whom I welcome you. I would also like to take a few minutes to briefly present to you some other thoughts

On behalf of the people, the government and the armed forces of Pakistan and on my own behalf welcome you and I am grateful to you for the support that was extended by your country in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake that hit Pakistan in October last year. Your NGOs, your army and the government extended full cooperation, which I think is because

of the deep rooted relationship that we have which goes back in history and the commonalities of views at the international and regional forums. I think this is very well demonstrated in the number of delegations and bilateral visits that we had. If I just look back in the last five six years alone, President of Pakistan has visited UK, Prime Minister of Pakistan has visited UK, and various delegations have visited United Kingdom and similarly there have been the visits of your government functionaries and your Prime Minister. Your first lady also visited Pakistan but I think what is important here for me to refer to is that in 2003 there was intelligence and security committee of the House of Commons that visited here and after that we had, in fact, the Royal College of Defence Studies, which came two years later and now we are very happy, in fact, to have what we call the counterpart of Senate Defence Committee from the UK.

So, I think all these visits and delegations not only indicate how closely we have been working but all this really sums up in the Pakistan and UK Defence Cooperation Forum (DCF) that we have for which, in fact, there have been eight meetings and the 8th one was held only recently in the month of June. It was headed from Pakistan by the Defence Secretary and from UK there was the Permanent Secretary of Defence. So, there has been discussions on strategic issues between the two governments and between the defence wings of the two countries.

We find that after 9/11 we had very difficult time particularly in defence exports from United Kingdom to Pakistan. You know our defence structure since the day of independence is of the UK model and there has been very close cooperation. Although there has been diversion, in the meantime, to the United States to China and to USSR also but there has been quite a bit of linkages and therefore, when export license issue came in we faced inconvenience however we are now happy that it is behind us and hundreds of licenses have been issued since then but I believe that this will be taken a step further for the very simple reason that one would like to see close relationship where there should be open general export license and we would like the executive branch to explore the type and nature of high technology defence equipment and its technology that can be opened for Pakistan.

There is Defence Exports Services Organization DESO and various other organizations, which are defence related organization between the two countries and they are in contact. We hope that at the end of this year when we have this annual international IDEAS exhibition, which is normally inaugurated by the President of Pakistan, Gen. Musharraf, we would have expert participation from your side. I would be pleased if the Defence Committee also participates in that event. We are also mindful of the fact that UK have been great help in

providing training facility to our army and we would like to see that there are greater defence training programme such as the ones offered by the Defence Related Activities Programme (DRAP) which is towards the peaceful support structure development in Pakistan. Now we would like to see that this is more in the technology related area also. There have been peaceful training programmes but we need far greater technology export and courses like NBCW would be useful.

It is also pertinent to mention that there has been very close talks between the Navy and the Air Force of the two countries but now discussions between the two Armies is also required. In fact, it will bring the entire general staff together in the two countries. As you know that two months back Pakistan assumed Command of the task force in the North Arabian Sea. We are very grateful for the support that has been extended but I think now this greater help should translate in building the reservoir of Pakistan's naval facilities here. Pakistan has played a role in anti-terrorism and Pakistan and UK held a joint counter terrorism session in the June, 2005 and there were meetings of the 16 subject matter related experts therefore some results should come out of these talks as experts have been meeting for the last couple of years now. When we open the discussions after your presentation then you will hear the ideas of various members.

I want to sum up by saying Pakistan remains committed to (a) democracy and when I say democracy the fundamental thing is freedom of expression. Since myself and Mr. Mushahid Hussain Syed have been former Information Ministers, we are more sensitive to anything which curbs the media's free expression. I am pleased that in 2002 I was associated as Minister for Information to bring laws which replaced the black suppressive law of the sixties. Please remember that this was the time when President Musharraf was the Chief Executive and elected government was not in place and we brought in those laws and the electronic media was opened up. Earlier there was only one state media which we called Pakistan Television and Radio Pakistan but now we have numerous channels because of the PEMRA laws. All these laws are all on the Pakistan web site. There is now freedom of expression, but at times it is felt that there should be a more responsible press. Apart from that institutions have come up and one of the institutions we are sitting here, the Parliament, is functioning and I am very glad to hear people from outside that the Senate of Pakistan has demonstrated maturity, which is expected of it. The provincial assemblies are also working in all the four provinces and also the Local Governments at the grass-root level that were introduced by President Musharraf in 2001. The local government system is in place and there have been two elections at that level. The institutions

and the political parties are freely operating and some of their leaders are outside the country but that is their decision and I am sure our friends will speak on that. I would say Pakistan remains committed to democracy because we believe that is the only way the will of the people could be exercised through the elected representatives. Pakistan remains committed to the war against terrorism as we also suffered because of this terrorism. Despite our own internal strife we remain committed to fighting terrorism and we continue to cooperate with the international community. We are also committed to non-proliferation and transfer of sensitive technology. When we talk of democracy let me also mention that for the first time the government presented the defence budget, which generally is a one line budget, in this Committee and we are proud of that. So we have made a beginning in opening some of the areas which hitherto were not open. We also had very open discussion on Pakistan's Defence policy, which was for the first time presented in this Committee, the same document which was presented to the Cabinet and approved by the President. On 7th July not only this Senate Defence & Defence Production Committee gets a presentation on the nuclear issue and what the command and control system is, but in that meeting the Defence Committee of National Assembly, which is headed by party President Chaudhry Shujat Hussain, Defence Production Committee of National Assembly, the Foreign Affairs Committee of Senate headed by Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed and Foreign Affairs Committee of National Assembly will be briefed jointly by the concerned quarters. Let me assure you that we are very mindful of the responsibility that goes with the nuclear assets. This Committee has also received presentation on procurement processes and there were questions by our members pertaining to procurement, which were answered by officials of the Ministry of Defence Production.

In closing I will say we continue to believe and strive for the peaceful settlement of outstanding issues with all the neighbours, particularly India on Kashmir. There were times when we could not visit India but in recent past I have gone to Bombay. We have taken a Pakistan Muslim League's contingent of hundred people on a chartered flight to Delhi led by our Party President. These are the efforts that we have made apart from the efforts made by the Government. So, there is this people to people contact, the diplomatic contact, the government to government contact, and the President's and, Prime Minister's contact. All these contacts are aimed at settling one basic issue, the core issue of Kashmir. We inherited a certain Afghanistan situation but now we are cooperating with the international forces including your forces and we look forward to a very friendly relation with Afghanistan so much so I am sure Mr. Karzai would be grateful to Pakistan for having facilitated his election process, not his

election but process whereby three million Afghans in Pakistan participated in the elections which resulted in Mr. Karzai election as President, thus we continue to cooperate. Of course, we have some rough edges which we can discuss.

In the regional context we continue to have close relations with Iran and we are discussing the Iran-Pakistan-India gas pipeline. We continue to work with the Central Asian States as Pakistan is member of the ECO. We have an observer status at the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, we also play a very important role in Organization of Islamic Countries and in the United Nations. We have contributed contingents to peace keeping forces around the world and have earned a good name for ourselves. We will be very open to discussing any of the issues relating to Defence and Defence Production.

I welcome you all, it has been a little longish introduction but that is the prerogative of the Chairman which I exercised today. I thank you and invite you to brief us on the mission of your team and your thoughts and then we will open the floor for discussion. I understand we will come to an end of this meeting at 4.15 pm. So we have something like 50 more minutes. Thank you so much. Now the floor is yours.

Mr. James Arbuthnot: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much indeed. I think that was well worth listening to, if I may say because you covered such a broad area very succinctly in lots of different ways and I cannot think to do the same because I suspect that I don't have the command of all these areas but I will like to begin by introducing the Defence Committee itself. You already know Sir Mark Lyall Grant the High Commissioner. I will go rapidly on to the Committee. We have a very experienced Vice Chairman David Crausby he has been on the Defence Committee for lot longer than I have, who has been here before on the Defence Committee. We have David Hamilton, he was the only representative of the Scottish region on the Defence Committee but now he has been joined by Mr. Willie Rennie, who is right at the end who won by election in February. We have Kevan Jones who also has deep experience of being on the Defence Committee for a long time. Then we have Mark Lancaster, who remains a serving territorial officer, who is likely to be deploying perhaps to Afghanistan when Parliament takes its recess next month. Mr. Willie Rennie as I have already said has won a by election in Scotland. John Smith represents a Welch constituency and he has deep interest in Defence and in his constituency. Now we move on to David Borrow whose constituency is close to the main Defence Company of the United Kingdom BAE Systems, the experience of

that is that he brings something extremely valuable to our Committee. Mr. Dai Havard has also been on the Defence Committee for a long time and who in the Parliamentary Scheme, Member of Parliament and actually joined the armed forces, he has been sent out to Afghanistan. There is Adam Holloway who has also been a serving soldier but has also been a journalist, he is a profoundly dangerous man and has been in Afghanistan. Then Brian Jenkins last but not least because he has served on the Senior Select Committee of the House Public Accounts Committee. His experience in asking questions about budget is something that we find extremely valuable. We too are all party and we have a labour majority. We have two liberal democrat members of them one Willie Rennie is here. I am a Conservative Chairman. As far as I can see we almost always speak with one voice as a Defence Committee and that I think makes us more effective because if you split as a Committee you find that people don't pay attention to any of the things you say while if you can manage to combine forces, people I think pay attention.

If I can just very quickly tell you why we are here and then if I may very briefly go through some of the excellent points that you made. The reason why we are here? We did a report which came out in April into the British deployment to Afghanistan. Its major commitment about troops, bear in mind please that our army is about a hundred thousand strong which is roughly the same number of people as you actually have deployed to your frontier so it is comparatively a tiny force. Its size about deployment into Afghanistan is proportionately very large and to discuss Afghanistan without the obvious questions that arise in relation to Pakistan as well, we just would not have been getting the point. We decided when we were going to visit the troops in Afghanistan we needed to come to see your understanding of the issues in the way that you are dealing with exactly the same problems on your side of the border and how well you are cooperating. And if I move on to what you said about our support for you in the earthquake, we were very pleased to be the first people on the ground during the earthquake and we have such close links between Pakistan and the UK. Many of us have a fairly large proportion of our electorates originating from Pakistan and with deep and close family links to your country continuing and we very much hope they will continue for ever and tie our countries very close together. And it's no surprise that we are operating well together in relation to Afghanistan. The issue of exporting things is something which we do look at a little bit but we also have another Select Committee, called the Quadripartite Committee and it is made up of the Defence Committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, the International Development

Committee and the Trade and Industry Committee and that looks at strategic exporting issues and whether the rules should be tightened or loosened and are they being properly enforced. We would very much enjoy the possibility of discussing that with you and also your own exporting issues and I understand what you said about the questions that you asked of your Ministry in relation to I think Dr. A. Q. Khan, it will be fascinating to discuss some of that because these were matters that caused great interest in the House of Commons and in United Kingdom. We have also on Friday last week produced a report on the issue of our strategic nuclear deterrent and we understand that there have been suggestions in the newspaper on these issues. It is a very interesting experience for our Committee because we have decided to do a series of reports and the replacement or the possible replacement of our strategic nuclear deterrent because we felt that there need to be a public debate and so far our Ministry of Defence has not taken very much part in it. We expect that they will. It is probably a matter of timing but we feel that it is necessary for us to exercise oversight over that as a very important area of our Defence policy.

Moving on to training. There is a training issue you raised. You would like to see greater programmes of linkage between our two countries. There are exchanges already, I suspect we would all like to see those exchanges widened and deepened. The trouble is that our training courses are so small because of the size of our armed forces and there is so much pressure from many countries to get on them but in order to keep them British Training Programs, which is why people want to get on to them, it is quite difficult to restrict. We have to restrict the number of people, who come from outside but I suspect we would very much like to see more interaction with Pakistan because as you say your armed forces are modeled on ours and yet our armed forces work with admiration the sort of work that your armed forces do. We can both learn from each other and we both work very closely together. Can I finish on one point which is the issue of the democratic freedom of the Press. You were right I think if I may diffidently say so. In your pride about the removal of the suppression of the Press. I think Pakistan has perhaps an admirable freedom of the Press. We have freedom of the Press in the United Kingdom as well. We are not surprised when there is irritation in Pakistan about some of the things that are said in the British press. I can assure you there is irritation in the United Kingdom about some of the things that are said in the British Press but in the long run one of the values that we fight for is the freedom to say what you believe and to be rejected by the people who read it and with the Internet and Websites being freely available around the world that is going to be the position we all take. Thank you very much in deed for your warm welcome. I think I have spoken for far too long and I apologize to my members for having done so.

Nisar A Memon: Thank you so much. I will be very happy if any of your members would like to make any further comment that they like to add if not I can tell you this side is waiting to communicate.

Mr. David Crausby: I will be brief because James has spoken for long enough. We want to hear about what you have to say. I think probably we get plenty of opportunities to hear what I and James have to say. I come from a constituency whose got quite a large community that is based in or has origin in Pakistan and we were very pleased to say that I am really proud of our local Pakistani community for all the work they did on the earthquake and I think that the real part of all that and we really did feel the need to do what we could. I am interested in the nuclear issues. I think it is the most important challenge to face all of us. We really know I think all need to rethink of what the purpose about nuclear weapon is. I should not comment or say whether we should or should not have one but just to comment to say that it is a very different world from the one that existed when we brought our present phase of nuclear weapons and our next one will need to deal with a different threat. So I am interested to hear what you think is the threat that faces you that requires you to have nuclear weapons.

Mr. Nisar A. Memon: I think there are no more questions and I would like to invite Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed to respond and throw light on some of the subjects particularly on the nuclear part and also the report that you have mentioned that you produced on Friday.

Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed.

Mr. Mushahid Hussain Sayed: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much and I think you have echoed the sentiments of most of us when you gave a very broad and comprehensive overview of a scenario in which Pakistan is a pivotal player because we are as it were in the eye of the storm, in the current regional and international scenario. First of all my sincerest condolences on the World Cup and we all felt that England side was a good side and it was just a stroke of bad luck I think in the end may be a loss of nerve but we have been enjoying watching the World Cup and we are sorry to see Mr. Beckham go but I am glad he will still remain in the side as a player. Coming to matters closer to heart and a couple of points before I give, as the Chairman has asked me to say something on the nuclear question. We think that the British

presence in Hilmand province close to our borders should be a positive development because the British have as compared to our American friends a greater experience and more sensitivity in dealing with Muslim peoples, Muslim cultures, historically speaking that is and we hope that the British presence would be a chastening experience for the coalition forces in Afghanistan. It will also help lower the rhetoric that is emanating from Kabul where unfortunately the blame is being apportioned rather wrongly on Pakistan when it should rightly belong to those who control and run Kabul that is the Kabul authority led by Mr. Karzai and his handlers in Washington. So, I think that is an important element because this is a common enemy, we have a common interest and if we start blaming each other then it will be counter productive and here I would like to reaffirm what the Chairman has said that not only did we promote the democratic process in Afghanistan but we also, may I add rather bluntly, were instrumental in the election of Mr. Karzai because there were almost three million Afghan refugees in Pakistan who were given the right to vote. They voted in peace, they were mostly Pukhtuns and they voted overwhelmingly for Mr. Karzai, but for the votes of the Afghans living in Pakistan he would not have been President. I think we facilitated his election as it were. So, if that is our objective, we certainly have no interest in undermining the very person we have propped up as President in Kabul. So, I think that should be very clear.

Secondly, I would say that we are close to the first anniversary of 7/7 which is very unfortunate and people in Pakistan across the board have condemned the 7/7 as a crime against humanity and we were very happy that there was no attempt to link it with Islam and Muslims. I might add that Sir Mark Lyall Grant is a good friend and we will miss him, I wish there was a system of extensions in Britain also, you should have been here next year to oversee the elections in Pakistan but I believe he will be leaving shortly before Christmas. We had a meeting in the Pakistan Muslim League headquarters for purposes of condolence and condemnation of that event and Sir Mark was the guest of honour and across the board there was this universal condemnation and revulsion at this because we as Muslims reject any form of terrorism as being linked to our great faith of peace and tolerance. Coming specifically to the nuclear question because the question was asked by the Vice Chairman as to what compelled Pakistan to go nuclear and I will give a very short 5–6 minutes capsule on that to get the facts right because there are a lot of misperceptions on that count. In 1971, Pakistan had the dubious distinction of being the first and the only country in the third world to be partitioned as a consequence of external aggression. The Indo-Soviet forces joined hands for the partition of Pakistan and the emergence of Bangladesh. That is not to say that our military regime of that period did not make

mistakes, they certainly did but no country has had to pay such a heavy price. Before that in Nigeria, you know in Biafra 1966 there was a civil war, the same Soviet Union helped the Nigerian military government of Yaquob Bogoven to quell that secession struggle, and here it fanned the flames. So, that aggravated the divide between Pakistan and India post 1971 and the Pakistani state and the people feeling insecure. In 1974 the problem was compounded with Mrs. Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India at that point in time, injecting the nuclear factor in to South Asia when she had no threat from Pakistan and I would say even at that point in time no direct military or security threat from China. Pakistan then had no other option, we had relied on the American factor since 1954, we were the most allied ally of America also Britain in CENTO, in SEATO bilateral defence agreement but when it came to the crunch we were on our own and military might had its full play in 1971 because we had to pay a price for serving as a bridge between China and the United States in one of the major realignments of the post cold war period. So, it was in that situation that Mr.

Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, the Prime Minister of that period took the initiative that Pakistan too must have the bomb because if the balance of terror can work in Europe after 1945, why should it not work in South Asia as well and that balance should serve as a deterrent against possible aggression. The impulses of the two are different because the question was asked why Pakistan had to go nuclear. What do you expect from a good neighbour? We expect that when there is a problem a neighbour will douse the flames not fan the fire. In 1962, when India was in trouble, and was at war with China, we did not back stab India. We could have done that but Field Marshal Ayub chose not to. We went along with that because India was in trouble but when we were in trouble even if it was self inflicted, India did the opposite. So, there was this element of suspicion of Indian intentions and a suspicion reinforced by the force multiplier of the nuclear weapon. So, Pakistan went nuclear for purposes of security while India went nuclear for purposes of status. I was Minister for Information when the Indians went nuclear on March 11th, 1998, Mr. Vajpayee wrote a letter to President Clinton pointing out the reasons why India was going nuclear. He mentioned the threat from China and a threat from neighbouring country unnamed of course i.e. Pakistan. At that time there was a G-8 Summit taking place in Birmingham and that was about 15th or 16th of May. We were told to show patience, we were told that we should have the moral high ground. We waited whether we would be rewarded for our patience or whether India would be punished for proliferation. Neither happened rather the rhetoric in India became harsher and in fact if I may say so bordering on arrogance. On 17th of May the then Home Minister of India, Mr. L. K. Advani made a statement on Kashmir and I

quote “Pakistan better change its Kashmir policy because the geo strategic scenario has changed”. The message was fall in line boys or else. So, on 28th of May we responded in kind, we also went nuclear but at the same time we declared that we would like to abide by the CTBT and we have no intention to be aggressive. I would submit that the nuclearization of South Asia is probably one of the best things that have happened to South Asia because it has brought about a new balance in South Asia. This peace process that you see between India and Pakistan, which now enjoys the support of all the political forces in Pakistan, the military establishment, the opinion leaders and the people of the two countries, that would not have been possible without Pakistan going nuclear and more importantly for a small medium sized state like Pakistan which has been subjected to three wars of aggression by India in the past. The nuclear factor has given Pakistan and its people and the state a great measure of national self confidence that okay size no longer equal strength and we can look the Indians in the eye and we don’t have to blink. If you remember in 2002 there was a 10 month long eyeball to eyeball confrontation, one million troops India tried to bully and browbeat Pakistan but failed. Why was war prevented because of the nuclear factor and I always say that this is the South Asia version of the Cuban missile crises of 1962 that they realized war is no longer an option and the only option is peace, negotiations and dialogue and that is what President Musharraf has done. I think that not enough credit has gone to President Musharraf despite being a military man, despite having a background from the armed forces that he has gone the extra mile in terms of flexibility, in terms of reaching out, and proposing out of the box solution for Kashmir and the people of Pakistan have backed him on that. I think no other Pakistani leader could have demonstrated such moral courage because these are issues which are very emotive. Governments could have toppled on that issue. So, I think on that there is an across the board consensus, we give credit to Ms. Benazir Bhutto also for reaching out and she has been doing that and also other leaders in the opposition. I think that is the crux of the matter. Today as things stand we still feel that if you want to have rapprochement with India without sorting out Kashmir is like staging Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark, it would not take place. So, Britain and other countries were pushed forward.

The Indo-US nuclear deal has violated the spirit and the letter of the non proliferation treaty, the NPT. This deal has violated the American laws and that is why they are being amended. Britain is part of the nuclear suppliers group and I was rather surprised that Mr. Blair has welcomed this deal. So, you are opening the flood gates of proliferation, you are weakening your stand on Iran and North Korea and frankly my own personal view is that this is perhaps

more about geo politics than about nuclear energy because only 7% of India's energy needs are met by the nuclear factor. It is more so perhaps to have India as counter weight to China or allow it to become a regional policeman of sorts, more pro active in Afghanistan and Nepal and perhaps as a counter weight to its so called Islamic radicalism. The biggest problem with the so called war on terror today is that it has been linked with one religion, one community. That has been a mistake on the part of Bush administration and had it not gone into Iraq which had nothing do with terrorism, 9/11, Al-Qaeda or Taliban, the situation in Afghanistan would not has been so bad. I thank you for your patience and we warmly welcome you again and I am grateful to the Chairman for organizing this interactive dialogue. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Nisar A. Memon: Thank you Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed for the very extensive comments that you made on the nuclear question and for a very appropriate historic perspective and the rationale for Pakistan to go nuclear. I would now like to give the floor to Senator Engineer Rukhsana Zuberi for her views and comments on any of the topics that have been discussed.

Senator Engineer Rukhsana Zuberi: Thank you very much. We welcome you all to Pakistan and to the Senate. I would like to briefly touch upon some of the points raised by honorable Chairman, Mr. Nisar Memon because I and Kamran Murtaza represent the Opposition here. The Chairman did mention about doing away with suppressive laws for media, I hope that this really comes true, there is always room for improvement and we don't say that we have reached an ultimate position whereby nothing is required to be done. Another point he made was that this is the leader's decision to remain outside the country I would like to take it as a government statement from him saying that leaders living outside are welcome to come back, if they want to. So, if that is the statement, I welcome it.

Senator Mushahid Hussain Syed: Most welcome. They should take the next British Airways flight from London to Islamabad.

Senator Engineer Rukhsana Zuberi: Okay. So, that is the statement. I wanted to clarify it because I couldn't get it very well. So far as nonproliferation is concerned our point of view is, as we are all aware that nuclear technology was initiated during Mr. Bhutto's days because (i)

it was a nuclear deterrent and (ii) the peaceful use of nuclear energy. This is one very big area which we feel should have been explored but intermittent democratic and nondemocratic governments put the issue on the back burner. And specially, now when after 9/11 realignments were being done there was an opportunity to put this issue in the fore front as today our energy is very expensive. We are mostly depending on expensive oil import which is keeping us as a backward nation. We are unable to spend on our health and education etc.

The last comment which Senator Mr. Nisar Memon mentioned was about the presentation of the budget to the Senate Standing Committee on Defence. My short remark about it is that today it worries me more if that was the document which was submitted to the cabinet because whatever was submitted in the Committee, was not enough. I feel that so far Defence Committee is concerned we would like to have our role like your Defence Committee is putting forward. Report on UK deployment in Afghanistan, whereby you are concerned about the welfare of troops, you are concerned about the helicopters they have etc. You are concerned about their families education, whether they are being given enough notice to be shifting and all those things because when you talk of defence, you are not only talking of missile or not only talking of F-16, there are people around, there are people who are managing defence, there are women who are suffering, there are children who are suffering. So, that is the kind of role whereby we could question. That is why we had similar observation in one of our committee but we did not get a response. In your system you get a report from the government, in our system we don't get a report from government. For instance, during the earth quake the helicopters which could provide logistic support were not available. So these are questions which worry us like any other representatives of the people, because when you talk of the representation of the people their troops are also being represented by this House. When we ask that okay you have Defence Housing Authorities with such big plots and lush green lawns but what about for the junior commanding officers, what plans you have. We don't get answers to our satisfaction. So, basically, we are at present part of a parliament which is having some debate but to be able to be involved in a meaningful way, we need to really go a long way.

The situation we are facing today is not hundred per cent. I would say that okay, this government has done this or that. I think, the reason being that we are having democratic governments intermittently. During undemocratic Governments this House is locked and everybody goes home for a couple of years and then there are exigencies of the West or international community thereby they accept, they give legitimacy to the non legitimate

governments also. So, I think, all these things are contributing and we feel that the only solution to all our problems is that we have a truly representative government that all issues come to the parliament, that parliament is prepared and has the capacity and is empowered to make legislation and I am sure, I will have support of all my colleagues on that. Thank you very much.

Mr. Kevan Jones: The war on terrorism was seen as connected with religion and pointing to one religion. Can I just say that unfortunately that is the case in the United Kingdom but I represent a constituency which has a very small ethnic minority population they are the lowest in the country and I am sure if you ask my white Anglo Saxon constituents where there is a perception that terrorism is connected to Islam which I totally disagree with and agree with the comments you made. But it is important that we try and combat that perception which the Chairman said earlier about the media sometimes not helping about bias in the media both in our country and abroad. A brief question really is what we can do to counter that and also probably which we have got in the United Kingdom whether we like it or not. There are sections of the ethnic minority communities, especially young people in some urban constituencies, they are feeling very disaffected with the system and are being radicalized by certain elements, who are quite clearly some of the people behind the July the 7th bombing. I think one of the things we as politicians in Britain found hard to come to terms with the facts that this was not terrorism from abroad. This was people who are actually born and bred in the United Kingdom (i.e.) United Kingdom citizens. I just want to take two points. One what we can do? I think in terms of intelligence some people have visited Pakistan. So, what we can do to improve the situation. But also it is more important that what we can do in terms of trying to get our message to those young people that whether you are second or third generation Pakistani living in Birmingham or somewhere else. Terrorism and the atrocism were seen is not a way forward.

Senator Nisar A Memon: Thank you very much. Mr. Kamran Murtaza you have the floor now.

Senator Kamran Murtaza: First of all, I welcome you on my behalf and on behalf of my party MMA. Sir, I have one question though it has no direct bearing with the Defence Committee. But members of parliament and Mr. High Commissioner are also here sir, I may

ask there are certain allegations of your agencies involvement in Balochistan, I want your comment on that.

Sir Mark Lyall Grant: Perhaps, I will quickly answer this question that there have been these allegations and of course, they are completely unfounded. I think, it is a number of factors that have been put together and the normal conspiracy theories that abound in Pakistan have kicked into play. This was a combination of a meeting that our Counsel General in Karachi had with the member of your House, Mr. Shahid Bugti, who might be considered a terrorist by some members of the military but he is also a member of the Senate, as far as I know there are no outstanding allegations or criminal proceedings against him. And as such diplomats do meet a wide range of politicians as you know from your own party sir, we don't agree with your party's policies but that does not mean we don't have interaction with representatives of your party and specially elected ones. Secondly, the BBC correspondent managed in an entrepreneurial fashion to get an interview with Nawab Bugti and it was told that may be this was something to do with the United Kingdom government but as our Chairman has rightly said, the press is completely free in the United Kingdom and there was no question of the British Government involvement in that.

And thirdly, I think it is perhaps because there are some exiled political leaders who are in London including some of those who are related to some of the Sardars in Balochistan and Britain is a home to great many number of exile political leaders and those who take sanctuary from around the world including of course, leaders of parties represented in the Opposition. And we welcome them provided that they stick to the laws of the land and if there are any suggestions that anyone sitting in London is not obeying the law of United Kingdom and he is brewing up trouble against the foreign government, that of course, would be illegal and action will be taken against him but we do not have any evidence of that being the case.

Now, I think those three facts put together have led some in the media to think that the United Kingdom has some sort of hidden agenda in Balochistan, nothing could be further from the truth. We have a great deal of interest in the stability and security of Balochistan, not least because that is linked very closely, we discussed earlier with the safety and security of the British troops deployed in Hilmand across the Afghanistan border.

Mr. Kamran Murtaza: Thank you. I think you did not mind what I asked.

Mr. David Borrow: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on the comments that were made about the difficulty of select committees getting information from governments and I think that is the common issue and I was totally surprised to turn on my car radio just over a week ago, to hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer Gordon Brown likely the next prime minister announced that we were going to have another generation nuclear weapons when the government refused to give evidence or answer questions from this select committee. To me it was an example of the government refusing to engage with parliament, the ministers feeling then they can make statements deciding policy without it being discussed, and I think it is a common problem. My second question is to do again with parliament. I just wanted to what extent your committee; Defence Committee of the Senate is actually engaged with politicians in the similar area in India and in Afghanistan, your two neighbors both of which you have got outstanding defence issues.

Senator Engineer Rukhsana Zuberi: So far, as I know, I don't think we have had any interaction with any of the two country's parliamentarians on the select committee issues.

Senator Naeem Hussain Chattha: First of all, as a member of this committee I welcome you, we are very glad to see you here under your able leadership and we always feel very happy to see people from Britain and when we go to England, we feel very homely, very friendly and very comfortable in England and London as we have got long mutual relations between British and Pakistan. My colleagues have said so many things on different issues but especially I endorse the views narrated by Mushahid Hussain Syed, the General Secretary of the ruling party. He has very rightly depicted the sentiments and the feelings of the public and you also know all these things better than us but still I must say that the need of nuclear technology and energy in terms of our inimical relations with India, that there is a need for Pakistan being smaller, poorer and a weaker nation that we have those weapons. As people say that America is building India against China but that is absolute baseless. India will never be used against China. India has got only one enemy that is Pakistan. We are always very much trusted and tested friend of America and Britain up to now, but we should not be given any tough time whenever we are in need. I always take the British as very fair and people of principles, who are very independent, as they believe in the rule of law, justice and human rights.

We have got a very burning issue between Pakistan and India that is the Kashmir issue. As long as that is not solved, nuclear energy and technology and everything are needed by Pakistan. UK is in a better position and has better sources to discuss all these things with America too. If you have nuclear energy it is not a good thing for humanity as well but we are in need of it. We should remain deterrent as my learned colleague Mr. Mushahid Hussain Sayed has depicted very thoroughly and, I fully endorse his views and that is in the interest of Pakistan. We also believe and we hope that Britain will step forward being old friend and having full knowledge of problems between the two countries – Pakistan and India. Then we will definitely not need nuclear energy and will not need such weapons as these are destructive for humanity. So, I hope that you will always be in this position to see and to solve these problems. Then we will be definitely thankful and grateful for your efforts. We hope that being old and tested friend of Pakistan you will do better for humanity and especially for Pakistan. Being a member of this Committee I again thank you.

Senator Nisar A Memon: Thank you Senator Chattha. Senator Mushahid Hussain has a short comment.

Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed: I will just say one thing, sir; somehow many in Pakistan by and large remember the British as good imperialists.

Mr. John Smith: Mr. Chairman, I welcome and I am sure we all welcome the comments made in relation to the commitment to democracy in Pakistan. I was also very interested to hear the point made about the three million Afghan refugees being allowed to vote to ensure fair presidential elections. I just wonder what have been the impact on the borders of Pakistan of the Parliamentary and provincial elections in Afghanistan last year especially in some of the eastern tribal regions and your Government's policy on elections in the tribal areas.

Mr. David Hamilton: Thank you Mr. Chairman. It is an observation as much as a question. Could I say first of all, I come from the nation of Scotland in United Kingdom? I think we have an experience within the United Kingdom as colleagues would understand we have 30 years of terrorism taking place with IRA. Throughout that 30 years period there were a lot of people

Irish and indeed Scots who were hassled within the United Kingdom, identified within the United Kingdom. To be a Scot and to be an Irish person was not to be a terrorist and that's going to be a same problem again being a Muslim. But to remind the honourable members also the West came to defend the Bosnians and Muslim nations, but in Bosnia not full arguments are being put forward but in my own constituency which has 99.2% Anglo Saxon. Therefore, as an issue where you have very many Muslims in your area and I remind people constantly what would life be for Irish people within the United Kingdom who were under coercion for 30 years and no one was convicted and should use our very good measures I think what happens at present thing.

Mr. Brian Jenkins: I noticed the comment that it was difficult to get information of the departments. We have the same problem. Departments do not want to tell you anything which is not doing right when there are no successes. The only opportunity we have, we have this brilliant situation where the National Audit Office which is independent of the government and they report back to the members of Parliament and they report to the tax payers. They order the books and if you are good enough and if you spend enough hours going through the books you can follow the money and all the trail and then you can ask the department what they spend this money on or why they spend this money and then you can make them accountable in that way and the same way accountable to the tax payer because through democracy you have to have accountability and you have to have organization in place. So, that is all I can suggest as that we do and we don't do it enough, we should do more is use enough of audit office to find that where the cash or the money goes.

Senator Rukhsana Zuberi: Unfortunately, in our case, we don't get details so far as the defence budget is concerned.

Senator Nisar A Memon: I want to thank you all for a very active participation. One would only wish, there was more time but I believe that tonight at the Defence Minister's dinner, there will be more time to discuss informally some of the issues that may be in our minds. I want to thank my colleagues also who have participated very actively. I would like to conclude by saying you speak with one voice, we speak various voices but at the end the objective is only one, to strengthen the Parliamentary Committee System and let me remind myself and my

colleagues that it was not the Government benches, it was not the treasury colleague but it was Senator Zuberi who pointed out that there were certain departments of the Defence Ministry (Pakistan Airline) which were selling aircrafts not following their laid down procedure and we brought it to the Committee and recommended actions to review it, which they did and as a result of that, not a big amount but 1.3 million dollars came into the treasury more than what they were offered for. I think what we really need to do is more involvement of the members also and we have always encouraged this. So, we really speak with one objective but different voices. I also want to remind you that there was probably a difference if could not be very clear. We had the defence policy of Pakistan which was prepared by the Defence approved by the Cabinet and then the President that was presented here. So, that is one. The Defence Budget was obviously not all the detail that one would expect but it was for the first time that it was presented. The percentage on Air Force, Navy and Army were given but this is not all, this is only a beginning because none of the Defence Committees in the past since 1973 ventured to even ask. I think, it is our own failing for not having done it. I agree that there is the Public Accounts Committee also in the National Assembly and this Committee looks into all the audited books of accounts including the Army and they do appear before the Committee and in fact just in passing I can say, I have a resolution proposed for the next session whereby the Committee should be expanded to include the Senators also to make it a Parliamentary Committee.

So we are really on to that course. There is a difference between treasury benches and the Government. We are treasury benches, yes, but we are not the Government. We look at the Government as an executive branch just like the labour in your Committee would look at the Government, we look at it that way but when the Iraq's situation came in Pakistan Senate voted unanimously that we should send the forces only if they were under the flag of the United Nations. Thereafter we did not send troops and Government changed course apparently because there were voices that it might send forces because Government was under pressure. Government was proceeding perhaps but it did not finally. So, the voice of the Parliament is very strong and I would say that this Quadruplicate Committee in the UK is a good idea and exactly we are following that. We have not formalized it. We issued invitations to three different Committees to discuss the strategic assets. On the 7th July we will do that but I think perhaps we could look into and in fact it is already part of some of the motions that we are moving that some Committees should be combined.

Let me also submit to you that there were voices that funds in the earthquake areas were not spent properly. We called joint meetings of the Committees of Defence and there was a presentation by a General of the Army, working on Rehabilitation & Reconstruction. He made a presentation to the joint committee of Defence of Parliament which means National Assembly and Senate. So, I would say some of the experiences we gain from your committee will be very helpful to us. In the Senate the tribal are represented. In the National Assembly the members from tribal area - Federally Administered Tribal Areas are voted through adult franchise and they then in turn vote the Senators. We must say that we do not have any contact at the moment with the Indian or Afghanistan Defence Committees but frankly, let me admit that today is a historic meeting. It is historic because this is the first time that a foreign Defence Committee is meeting our Defence Committee of the Senate. So, I think a historic beginning has been made and we will continue with this and certainly our first approach will be to get in touch with other foreign Defence Committees.

I would say that I myself am not satisfied with our media laws when we were implementing them but we said let us do it. Let us break the ice by moving forward, freedom of information, press councils, freedom of expression, media registration and all of those laws were made and certainly we will be moving forward. Now, I would like to have you say the final word.

Mr. James Arbuthnot: I am glad very much indeed for meeting here. As you say it is a historic occasion. Next perhaps when you come to United Kingdom the discussion will continue.

Senator Nisar A Memon: We accept your invitation and certainly we will find an opportunity to be there. Now, there is always a pleasant duty to present a gift of the Senate to the leader of the delegation.

Then the meeting adjourned with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

(IFTIKHARULLAH BABAR)
Secretary Committee

(NISAR A MEMON)
Chairman Committee