

MR SPEAKER We adjourn now for Lunch to re-assemble at 2 O'Clock

13 07 hrs

*The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.*

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

[Mr Deputy-Speaker in the Chair]

DISCUSSION RE INFLUX OF REFUGEES FROM EAST BENGAL—(Contd)

श्री रामदेव सिंह (महाराजगंज) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, बंगला देश की समस्या हमारे राष्ट्र की समस्या है। जो कुछ आज बंगला देश में हो रहा है उससे पूरे हमारे राष्ट्र का जन-जीवन प्रभावित है इससे कोई इकार नहीं कर सकता है। सत्तारूढ़ दल की नेता व देश की प्रधान मन्त्री श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने बारबार बंगला देश पर विरोधी दलों के नेताओं की बठक बुलाई और उनके विचारों को समझा और जाना। लेकिन इंदिरा जी जहा दो मास पहले थी आज भी वही है उससे एक कदम आगे नहीं गई है। कोई भी सक्रिय कार्यवाही उन्होंने नहीं की है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हू कि आज इंदिरा जी की सरकार भारत की यह सरकार एक बेधर्मी और राष्ट्रीय अपमान की सरकार है। वर्तमान भारत सरकार को राष्ट्र के लिए गौरव नहीं है। यदि उसे गौरव रहा होता तो जो नीति उसने आज अपनाई है वह नीति न अपनाई होती। उसके बदले में भारत सरकार ने कोई दूसरी नीति अपनाई होती।

मैं पूछना चाहता हू कि आप ने तिब्बत को गवाया, कैलाश मानसरोवर को गवाया और हजारों मील देश की जमीन को आप ने चीन के कब्जे में दे दिया तो यह राष्ट्र आप से जानना चाहता है और यह ससद् जानना चाहती है कि क्या भ्रष्ट जब इस देश को छोड़कर गये थे तो उससे से आपने कितना गवाया? आपने बराबर दम्बूपन की नीति और पाकिस्तान को कुछ करने वाली नीति अपनाई। कच्छ की खाड़ी में से भी और कश्मीर में से भी भारत सरकार ने कुछ अपना इत्का दिया, उनको चढ़ावा दिया लेकिन उसके बावजूद भी वह नहीं रोका जा

सका है। आज आपने अखबार में पढ़ा होगा कि पाकिस्तानी फौज द्वारा मेघालय की सरहद पर हमारे 9 सीमा सुरक्षा दल के जवानों को मार दिया गया और उनके साथ ही साथ 29 नागरिकों की भी हत्या कर दी गई। असम के मुख्य मन्त्री द्वारा भारत सरकार से मांग की गई है कि वह उन इलाकों से पाकिस्तानी फौजियों को खदेड़ने और उनकी टैरीटरी की पवित्रता को कायम रखने के लिए तात्कालिक कदम उठाये लेकिन भारत सरकार उसके बाद भी मौन है और भारत सरकार कुछ करना नहीं चाहती है।

आपको मैं बतलाऊ कि सन 1953 में डा० लोहिया ने लिखा था कि वह दिन आयेगा जबकि पूर्वी बंगाल पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ बगावत करेगा और उसके जुल्म, शोषण व भ्रष्टाचार का विरोध करेगा तो उस दिन भारत सरकार की क्या स्थिति होगी? डा० लोहिया ने उन दिनों जो बतलाया था आज ठीक वैसे आचरण का प्रदर्शन भारत सरकार कर रही है। भारत सरकार आज कहती है कि वह खतरों से खेलना नहीं चाहती है और वह राष्ट्र को युद्ध में घसीटना नहीं चाहती है। युद्ध छिड़ जाने से हमारी प्रगति रुक जायेगी, हमारा विकास रुक जाएगा। कृषि व अन्य आवश्यक वस्तुओं के उत्पादन की प्रगति रुक जायेगी और इस तरह देश को समृद्धि की ओर ले जाने वाली हमारी राह भ्रष्ट हो जायेगी। लेकिन मैं भारत सरकार से और उसके प्रधान मन्त्री से पूछना चाहता हू कि क्या इस देश को गवा करके वह यहा पर खुशहाली ला सकती है? आपने बराबर इसकी कोशिश की कि ससार के अन्य राष्ट्र आपके साथ रहे लेकिन आज कौन आपके साथ है? दुनिया का कौन राष्ट्र आपके साथ है जरा यह तो बतला दीजिये। आप कहते हैं कि बहुत सगिन तरीके से हम बंगला देश की सरकार को मान्यता देने के प्रश्न पर विचार कर रहे हैं। ज़रूर विचार कीजिये लेकिन हमको इसका विश्वास नहीं है कि आप बंगला देश की सरकार को मान्यता प्रदान कर देंगे। क्या आप बतला सकते हैं कि दुनिया के किस राष्ट्र को आपने अपना दोस्त बनाकर अभी तक रक्खा है? दरअसल आपको जो वैदेशिक नीति है उसका दीवालीयापन आज साफ-साफ नजर आता है। दुनिया का कोई राष्ट्र आज आपके साथ नहीं है। यहा तक कि पड़ोसी नेपाली भी आपके साथ नहीं है। जिस नजर से

आपको वह देखता है, पड़ोसी चीन को वह दूसरी ही नजर से देखता है। इसकी जानकारी आपको अच्छी तरह से होगा। मैं नेपाल की बगल में रहता हूँ। मुझे पता है कि वहाँ की सरकार दूसरों के साथ गलबहिया डालने के लिए तैयार है। मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि बंगला देश को याह्या खा की सरकार कभी अपने कब्जे में नहीं रख सकेगी। बंगला देश उसके कब्जे से निकलने वाला है। बंगला देश के निकल जाने के बाद क्या वह देश आपका दोस्त होकर रहेगा? क्या वह हमारे साथ रहेगा? हमारा कल का बिछड़ा हुआ हमारे खून से निकला हुआ हमारा कल का भाई, उसके साथ आपका जो व्यवहार चल रहा है, उस व्यवहार के चलते मुझे तो ऐसा लगता है कि वह आपका साथी नहीं होगा, वह दूसरे किसी के साथ चला जायगा। इस तरह की आशका आज इस देश में है।

आप कहते हैं कि पुज्य गाँधी जी कहा करते थे कि जो जुल्म और अत्याचार और अन्याय करता है वह जुल्मी और अत्याचारी तो है ही लेकिन उसके साथ-साथ एक कदम आगे बढ़ कर उनका कहना यह था कि वह भी जुल्मी है जो उसके जुल्म को सहन करता है जो उसकी जालीमाना हरकतों की बरदाश्त करता है। याह्या खा अगर बंगला देश का विनाश करने वाला है, खूनी है, कातिल है, नादिरशाही भी अगर आज उसके सामने भात खा चुकी है, तो वह तो जालिम है ही लेकिन उसके साथ-साथ जिस तरह से आप चुप्पी साध कर बैठे हुए हैं, निष्क्रिय बैठे हुए हैं, निक्ममेपन का सबूत दे रहे हैं, नपुंसक नीति भारत की सरकार ने अपना रखी है यह भी एक जुल्म है और जालीमाना हरकत है। आप भी बंगाल देश में न्याय की रक्षा में आगे नहीं बढ़ रहे हैं।

मैं प्रधान मन्त्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आपको इस राष्ट्र के गौरव का कुछ ख्याल है, राष्ट्र के सम्मान का ख्याल है? राष्ट्र के सम्मान को लेकर एक बात तो जरूर

कही जाती है। यह कहा जाता है कि जो रिपयूजी आ रहे हैं, यह हमारी परम्परा है, हमारी संस्कृति है, हमारी सभ्यता है कि उनका भरणपोषण हम करें और इस अपने कर्त्तव्य को हम त्याग नहीं सकते हैं और वह ठीक भी है। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की क्या यह परम्परा नहीं रही है कि न्याय की रक्षा के लिए अपनी गर्दन भी कटवा दी जाए, अपनी गर्दन कटवा कर भी दुनिया की रक्षा की जाए? मैं यह भी पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में कोई दल है, या कोई व्यक्ति आपको नजर आता है जो जो आप जो भी कदम बंगला देश की रक्षा के लिए उठाते हैं, उसके लिए आगे बढ़ाते हैं, उसके रास्ते में वह रोड़े घटकाए, बेड़ी डाले, कोई रुकावट खड़ी करे, आपके कदम को पीछे खींचे? इस देश में और इस सदन में बेशक के मासलो पर, राजनीतिक और आर्थिक मसलो पर हमारा आपसे विरोध हो सकता है लेकिन जहाँ तक देश की रक्षा का सम्बन्ध है, न्याय की रक्षा की बात है, सरहदों की रक्षा की बात है मैं इन्दिरा जी को विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के सभी राजनीतिक दल, हिन्दुस्तान का एक-एक नागरिक आपके साथ कदम से कदम मिला कर चलने के लिए तैयार ही नहीं है बल्कि आप से एक कदम आगे बढ़कर चलने के लिए तैयार है, आपके हर किसी कदम की वह सराहना और समर्थन करेगा और आपको हर प्रकार का सहयोग देगा।

लेकिन आप उसे कर नहीं सकती हैं। आपने एक नीति अपना रखी है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सीमा सिकुड़ती जाए आप कोई कार्यवाही नहीं करेंगे। आज तक आप ने नहीं की है। हा लका में हुए विद्रोह को दबाने के लिए आपने अपना फौजी बेड़ा भेजा आपने हवाई जहाज तथा दूसरा सामान पहुँचाया। लेकिन इन लोगों की रक्षा के लिए, आजादी के लिए लड़ने वाले लोगों के लिए, कल होने वाले लोगों के लिए, इन बहादुरों की रक्षा के लिए आप आगे क्यों नहीं बढ़ सकती थी? क्या वह अपना कर्त्तव्य नहीं था क्या आप

[श्री रामदेव सिंह]

दिल्ली में दुनिया के सभी उन राष्ट्रों की जिनकी सहानुभूति बंगला देश के साथ है, बैठक नहीं बुला सकती थी? आपको चाहिये था कि उनकी बानी पर विचार करके आप कोई निर्णय लेती और निर्णय लेने के बाद उसका कार्यान्वितन करती। आपने अपनी सारी शक्ति लगाकर विश्व राष्ट्र सभ से कहा कि वह आगे हैं और हथियार तथा सेना दूसरे मुल्कों से लेकर वहाँ शान्ति स्थापित करे और वही याह्या खा के जुल्मी कदम को रोकने के लिए, उसके खूनी पजों को रोकने के लिए आगे आए। आपके अपने सैनिक मरहदों पर बाटे जा रहे हैं? खाली प्रोटेस्ट कर रहे हैं। वे गोलिया चलाते हैं, बम फेंकते हैं, हमारी सरहदों पर हमारे नागरिकों को लूटते हैं, उनका खून करते हैं लेकिन हथक्या करते हैं, हम प्रोटेस्ट नोट भेज देते हैं। हमारी आकाशीय सीमाओं का तथा हमारी घरती का अनिर्क्रमण किया जाता है और हमें जवाब दिया जाता है कि जवानों को कह दिया गया है कि इसका जवाब वे दें। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि कितने उनके हवाई जहाज आपने मार गिराये हैं जब उन्होंने नभ का अनिर्क्रमण किया। कितने उनके सैनिक या दूसरे लोग आपने गिरफ्तार किये जब उन्होंने आपकी सीमाओं का अनिर्क्रमण किया? असम की सरकार ने कहा है कि उसमें शक्ति नहीं है लड़ने की। असम की सरकार ने युद्ध करने की शक्ति होती तो वह युद्ध कर लेती। केन्द्रीय सरकार के अनुशासन में उसको रहना पड़ता है, राज्य सरकारों को इस मामले में आप पर निर्भर रहना पड़ता है। मैं इन्दिरा गाँधी जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि आदमी जीवित रहते हुए भी मर जाता है और मर कर भी जीता है। बहादुर नौजवान जो बंगला देश की आजादी के लिए लड़ रहे हैं और जिन्होंने अपनी जाने कुर्बान कर दी हैं, वे मर कर भी जिन्दा हैं और इन्दिरा जी आपकी सरकार जिन्दा रह कर भी जिन्दा नहीं हैं, मर गई हैं। इस बात को

आने वाला इतिहास लिखेगा। सारा हिन्दुस्तान अगर भस्मीभूत हो जाता है, यदि इस भरती पर एक भी इसान नहीं रहता, हमारा मन दौलत और हमारी एक भी जान प्राहुति पर खड जाती और हमारी कार्यवाही से बंगला देश की रक्षा होती तो मैं समझता हूँ कि न केवल बंगला देश की रक्षा होनी बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान की भी रक्षा होती। आपने तिन्बत का खून किया। फिर आज हमारी आजादी खतरे में है। मैं इदिरा जी से निवेदन करता हूँ कि भारत की सरकार पर जो राष्ट्रीय अपमान और बेशर्मी के घबरे लगे हैं, उनको वह खो दे और कोई ठोस और सक्रिय कदम उठाये। असम सरकार की माग पर बंगला देश की रक्षा के लिए कुछ ठोस कदम उठायेगी तो हम सभी लोग आप के साथ होंगे।

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh)  
 Mr Deputy-Speaker the situation in Bangla Desh has really to be judged in the background of developments in the sub continent I am not referring to the historical background, to the past when the imperial power divided the sub continent and left behind a state from where they would be able to 'balance' India or to the subsequent developments where the colonial powers have consistently been helping a military build-up of Pakistan far beyond its requirements I am referring to recent events, to the elections in Pakistan, Ceylon and India where their peoples have unmistakably given their overwhelming support to three things to democracy, to change and to stability, and the parties and leaders they have supported are the people from whom they expect that democracy would be preserved, stability would be kept and rapid changes would be ushered in that the aspirations of the peoples would be realised

It was in this background, that when the expressed will of the people was attempted to be thwarted in Ceylon, that we went out in full support of the government established by overwhelming majority Therefore, it was only right, when a situation of the same kind was created in Pakistan, that we should have taken a similar stand.

It was in this background that I think this House unanimously passed the Resolu-

tion giving full sympathy and support to Bangla Desh. I welcome the statement that was made by the hon. Prime Minister the other day, which is a continuation of this sympathy and support that has been pledged by this House.

In talking about Bangla Desh we have generally not stressed the real situation in Pakistan. It is not only a question of the struggle of Bangla Desh, it is a question of the struggle of the people of Pakistan against the military rule, and it is a question of struggle for democracy and for establishing fundamental human rights. If you look at the figures of the elections, it will be quite clear that out of 320 seats, 169 in East Pakistan and 151 in West Pakistan, the Awami League of Mujibur Rehman commanded the support of 207. In the whole of Pakistan they had the majority in favour of democratic changes, and therefore it is not only a question of Bangla Desh. It is not a question of secession. In the six points that Sheikh Mujibur Rahman presented, they very first point talks of a Federation. Therefore, it is a question of the upsurge of the people of Pakistan against the military rule, and it is a question of our lending full support not to a secession as Pakistanis stryng to make out, but to the people of Pakistan in their struggle against the military dictatorship.

I would say that our support is in keeping with the traditional approach that we have had in international affairs, where we have always supported the people's effort for liberation from domination. And I think that never before, since independence, have our national interests and our ideals converged so closely as they have done in Bangla Desh. Therefore, we cannot be mute spectators of what is happening in Bangla Desh when we have supported the people of South Africa against the policy of apartheid; when we have supported armed intervention in the case of Southern Rhodesia, how can we sit back and not do anything when a serious situation has arisen just across our borders, when our brethren who are striving for the same values which we have supported in the international forum are asking for help. Therefore, it is a question in which the action taken by this House if I may say respectfully, and the Government is in keeping with our policies, with our national interests and the ideals that we cherish,

Then, we have this big question of refugees, 5 million today, 10 million tomorrow, nobody knows how many will come and how much we shall have to spend on them and for how long. Therefore, it is not an internal affair of Pakistan.

My colleague, Shri Asoke Sen and many other hon. Members in this House and friends out side have brought out legal support for any action that we may take for the recognition of Bangla Desh and for saying that Bangla Desh is not an internal affair of Pakistan, and therefore I shall not go into it. But when large numbers of people are forced out of a country's borders into another country, it is not a question of internal affair, but a question of aggression. It is a question of moving a large number of people across the border, so that they are really lightening the economic burden there, so that Pakistan can balance the number of people in West Pakistan and East Pakistan, so that Pakistan, military regime can say that they have solved the problem of Bangla Desh and create problems for us. Problem not only of large number of people but also the question of their hopes and aspirations as to what is to be done to them. There is the question of the trampling of human rights; there is the question of genocide there is also the question of uprooting of millions of people and millions more are being forced across the border. In these circumstances it is no longer an internal matter for Pakistan, nor is it an internal matter for India. It is really an international situation. If our efforts are to get the international community involved in it, we cannot say that it is an internal affair of Pakistan or of India; we shall then not be able to bring in the international community. It is essentially a matter in which the world as such has to take interest.

It is from this point of view and I think rightly that the Government is seeking international support. It is not a question of trying to get some little money from some country, although I should say that the response to the U. N. Secretary-General's appeal has been, if I may say so, shocking. But even so, it is really a question of getting other countries involved in the problems of Bangla Desh and the problems of Pakistan because Pakistan is bound to use every tactic to prevent those people from going back. Therefore, we shall have to involve the international community in a

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

large way if we want to lighten this burden.

There have been several criticisms about the functioning of Government and of the Ministry. I think it is a question of reflecting what we think, how we would have wanted it done, how the Government should or should not have done it. The real issue is : is the Government action supporting the *status quo* that the military regime of Pakistan want or is the Government action supporting a situation in which change will take place, democratic institutions will be restored ? It is for the people of Pakistan to decide what association there will be ; whether Bangla Desh should remain independent or whether they should follow any other courses. It is really for the people of Pakistan to decide. We can judge our course from the actions of the Government, the people and parliament can see whether we are supporting the *status quo* or whether we are assisting in the process of change.

One point is that we are losing time. In the first three weeks the newspapers were busy building up a euphoria. I am afraid that we did not take enough steps to correct it. Those were the days for action which the locusts ate away. We have therefore to redouble our efforts now and try to regain time and initiative that was lost in the first three weeks when we were reading in the newspapers of situations which were different on the ground than what they are today. Therefore, the efforts that have to be made now, have to be very much greater.

The question of recognition of Bangla Desh and the timing of it are really matters for the Government to decide. I am not concerned about the legality of recognition. Although there is no doubt in my mind that enough constitutional and legal points can be marshalled in support of recognition of Bangla Desh and if we were to recognise Bangla Desh to day there would be no international crisis. It will, in fact, give strength to the steps that we may inevitably have to take to try to redress the situation there.

But the real point is, what is it that we can do to reduce this pressure. If we had been able to assist and if the *Mukti Fauj* had been able to retain a large liberated area entirely and fully under their control, then these refugees could have been housed

there. Then it would have been a pressure on Pakistan to find a solution. To day it is a pressure on us to find a solution. If these refugees had been in Pakistan, most probably there would have been no refugees coming out. If some would have to move out from the areas in which the Pakistani army committed atrocities they would go to another section of Bangla Desh, and it would have been for the Government of Bangla Desh to seek international support. They would have internationalised the situation. Today it falls on us to try to internationalise the situation within our borders, and that is going to be a fairly difficult task.

Therefore, I would say that even at this stage, if the *Mukti Fauj*, if the Bangla Desh Government, could in some way re-establish complete control over certain areas, then it would be for the refugees to move into these areas and for some solution to be found. But we cannot just sit back and watch. There has to be some action. We cannot go to the international community and talk in negative terms of what Pakistan is doing. There has to be a positive idea for which we must seek the support of the international community and that positive idea has to be evolved quickly if we are to get the support of the international community before even the progressive section of the world community gets to accept a State of *status quo* as the imperial and commercial powers have got into supporting.

Only one point more. Whether this take two weeks or two months or two years, the people of Pakistan are bound to win in their struggle for freedom ; the people of Bangla Desh are bound to win in their struggle for independence, or any arrangement that they wish to establish. Therefore, it is for us to take this step ; that when the time comes, let the people of Pakistan, let the people of Bangla Desh, feel that we stood by them in this hour of need.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : As already announced, the Prime Minister would be called at 3.30. So, I would request hon. Members to try to be as brief as possible in their speeches.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, at the very outset, I

want to scotch the fallacious posture that has been put forth by the Government that the present confrontation between Bangla Desh and Pakistan will be converted into a confrontation between India and Pakistan if immediate recognition is given to Bangla Desh. Such a contention is either a comouffage for inaction on the part of the Government or it lacks assessment in depth. We are already in confrontation with Pakistan. Had it not been so, the Prime Minister herself would not have said that the problem of East Bengalees has become our internal problem. Has it not been a fact that Pakistan Radio is belching out accusations against India day in and day out? Had it not been a fact, our Government would not have gone to the door of the UNO and to the door of any other international forum. It is not only the issue of refugees but on other issues also, it has become a confrontation between India and Pakistan, because India is just going to uphold the ideals of Bangla Desh as also uphold the national interests of our country, because we are being imperilled, politically, socially, economically and militarily by the activities of the Pakistan army as also the Pakistan people there.

If we give them recognition, at the moment, probably there will be no qualitative change. May be there will be a little bit of emphasis in the degree of confrontation with Pakistan. But I do not understand why the Government is fighting shy in accepting or acknowledging the fact because already we have given *de facto* recognition to Bangla Desh.\*\*

Had it not been so, how did we get ourselves entangled, involved, in many ways, in the affairs of Bangla Desh and the freedom struggle of Bangla Desh?

DR. RANEN SEN (Barasat) : Sir, this statement made by Shri Samar Guha should not have been made in the House. This is not a fact and should not be mentioned in the House in this manner.

This is doing disservice to the cause of Bangla Desh.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Go through the language I have used.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA (Serampore) : You said\*\*

It is not a fact.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I have not said so. You have not heard me. You, gentlemen, are hard of hearing. I know what is to be said and what not to be said. I have gone to Mujibnagar and stayed there. I have not said what you are telling.\*\*

It is a fact that there has been a shift. First our Government was saying "East Pakistan". Then our Government changed the vocabulary to East Bengal. But yesterday, both the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister used not once but every time the words "Bangla Desh". So, it is a fact that we have already given *de facto* recognition to Bangla Desh. Had it not been so, why should they use the words "Bangla Desh"? If that is so, why is the Government fighting shy to give formal recognition. If formal recognition is given, it will mean a quantum jump for the freedom struggle in Bangla Desh. It will qualitatively change the whole character of the freedom struggle there. It will electrify the patriotic people of Bangla Desh with a renewed confidence in the ultimate success of their struggle. It will galvanise the fighting spirit of the *Mukti Fauj*. It will fatally demoralise the already disheartened Pakistani Army of occupation. It will frighten the Muslim League, the Jamat-E-Islami and other collaborators of the Pakistan Army, who are now engaged in savage atrocities against women, youth, intellectuals, Awami League men and minorities general. It will embolden the civil servants and Government employees in Bangla Desh to resolutely continue their non-cooperation with the Martial Law Administration. It will frustrate the nefarious game of Yahya Khan to foist a puppet Government in Bangla Desh. It will create a faith in the people of Bangla Desh not to leave their homeland and thereby it will reduce the problem of refugee exodus. It will raise a hope in the minds of the Bangla Desh refugees in India about their going back to that country and thus enable them to bear hardship and suffering as refugees. It will frustrate the communal strategy of Yahya Khan, trying to create communal trouble in India and in Bangla Desh.

Recognition is not an end in itself. It is just a means. It is a means to see that the freedom struggle is completed, and completed expeditiously and in the shortest

\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair—vide Col...

[Shri Samar Guha]

possible time. If the freedom struggle is protracted, the suffering of the people will increase and there is the grave danger of the communal war spreading. If in the communal war that is unleashed by Yahya Khan just to create confusion, if he wins in this communal war, the fate of India would be sealed. The politics of theocracy would be perpetuated not only in Bangla Desh but it will have its reaction in India also. If in this communal struggle Yahya Khan succeeds then not a single minority from India will go back to Pakistan. Already there are nearly 40 lakhs of refugees in India and I know from personal knowledge—during the last fifteen days I was in the border of Bangla Desh and I have entered Bangla Desh at many points, sometimes fifteen miles deep—that more than 50 lakhs of refugees are already on the run. They will be reaching the Indian borders within 10, 15 or 20 days. Then the volume of refugees would be near about 70 lakhs. If Pakistan turns to be a theocratic state, not a single refugee will return to East Pakistan. I also do not know the fate of the intellectuals and others who have taken shelter here. I know their nefarious game. According to today's papers thousands and thousands of people from West Pakistan are being transferred and transported to East Pakistan to fill the vacuum that has been created by the large-scale exodus of minorities to India.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He should try to conclude soon. There are other members of the House who would like their views to be recorded. He should try to conclude in another five minutes.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I will try to be as brief as I can.

If recognition is given, it will formalise and regularise our diplomatic relations with the Government of Bangla Desh and spare India accusation by Pakistan and other powers of clandestine involvement in the affairs of Bangla Desh. Secondly, it will formally enable India to give military, political and economic assistance to Bangla Desh freely and openly as between two independent countries under mutual treaty obligation. Thirdly, India will be able to give straightway military training to *Mukti Fauj* in Indian territory. Fourthly, India, if necessary, will be able to send military

experts, technologists and volunteer forces for directly helping *Mukti Fauj* in their liberation operations. Fifthly, India's decision will create international compulsion to initiate re-thinking in many world powers for giving recognition to Bangla Desh. Sixthly, it will give powerful impetus and freedom to the Government to start its political, diplomatic and military offensive against Pak army of occupation. Indian recognition to Bangla Desh will not automatically lead to recognition by UNO or other world powers but it is known that if India gives recognition it will certainly stimulate the process of recognition by other powers.

The question of legitimacy of sovereignty of Bangla Desh has been raised. I want to remind these experts on international law that no new nation was ever born in the dissertative theory of academicians in international law. All nations have been created by the suffering and sacrifice of the people and the blood of the martyrs with help from one or more world powers or under international compulsion. I say that most of the conditions for the legitimacy of sovereignty of Bangla Desh have been fulfilled. East Pakistan has been named as Bangla Desh with its own national flag, national anthem and national language. Also, the Government of Bangla Desh has been formed with the support of 99.6 per cent of the democratically elected representatives of the people.

In the last three months the civil administration of Bangla Desh has completely non-cooperated with the Pakistan authorities and has switched over its loyalty to Bangla Desh. The Bangla Desh Government has formally constituted itself on the soil of Bangla Desh on the 17th April last in the presence of International Reporters. Bangla Desh Government has organised its own civil and police administration and defence forces. The Pak Mission in Calcutta has switched over its loyalty to the Bangla Desh Government. The Pak Government has failed to run the civil administration in Bangla Desh. Out of 62,000 villages in Bangla Desh, 45,000 villages are under the control of the supporters and civil administrators of the Government of Bangla Desh, though from a distance. The people of Bangla Desh are wholly non-cooperating with the Pak authorities.

There is a talk of political solution. I want to warn the Government that they should not echo the word "a political solution" that has been coined by some foreign powers. The people of Bangla Desh have already made the political solution for their fate. I have already said that they have given the verdict of the will of the nation by electing 99.6 per cent of the representatives of the Awami League. They have declared war ; they have declared independence. Nearly half a million freedom fighters and the people of Bangla Desh have shed their blood and tears. They have sacrificed their lives not just for allowing the reimposition of the shackles of slavery of West Pakistan upon the people of Bangla Desh.

There is only one political solution. That political solution may be to enter into negotiations, through some intermediary, with the West Pakistan Government about the withdrawal of the army of occupation of Pakistan from Bangla Desh, the repatriation of Bengali civil servants, military officers and other Bengalis who are in West Pakistan, and allowing them to constitute a Constituent Assembly of the elected representatives of Bangla Desh to frame their own national Constitution.

There is a lot of talk of war if recognition is given. I want to know from the Government. Is it not a fact that China has given recognition to the Cambodian Government in exile ? Is it not a fact that China has given recognition to the PR Government of South Vietnam ? Has South Vietnam declared a war against China or has Cambodia or Laos declared a war against China ? Recognition does not automatically mean that India and Pakistan will be at war. At the moment because of military, political and economic reasons and also as a result of a adverse international reaction against their atrocities it will not be possible for Pakistan to make any misadventure against India.

About China, it is known to everybody how China is fighting in Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam. They will fight, if necessary, in Pakistan also with the last Pakistani. They will never be physically present anywhere. That is not unknown. The ping pong diplomacy of China and USA is also another factor that has to be taken into consideration.

But even if it means that as a result of recognition given to Bangla Desh there is

an armed confrontation with Pakistan, as a nation which has to live with self-respect and honour and which wants to defend and safeguard its future, we have to take all the calculated risks of entering into that confrontation.

The revolution in Bangla Desh is the greatest politico-military event after partition. It has revolutionary potentialities. I ask Shrimati Gandhi whether she has the guts to seize these revolutionary potentialities to undo and resolve for good the tragedy and misery of partition, whether she has the guts to wipe out the politics of theocracy from this sub-continent from Khyber of Kohima. Has she the guts to seize this revolutionary opportunity ?

If Bangla Desh becomes a settled fact, a revolutionary change will take place in Pakistan. Then, it will be possible for us to have an understanding with all the three units in the Indian sub-continent to change our defence expenditure to socio-economic development.

Sir, it is an acid test for Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Here is now an image of courage and decision. But if she fails in this fateful hour, I will say, posterity will draw out another image, an image of great lady who mastered expertise in cooking home politics quite well but failed to deliver the goods for the nation and for its future.

Lastly, these are the pictures of hundreds of thousands of mothers and sisters whose honour and flesh has been butchered by the Pakistani army. In the name of the mothers and sisters of Bangla Desh, I appeal to the Prime Minister to rise to the occasion and show her guts and take the fateful decision to save not only Bangla Desh but to ensure the future of India and seize this revolutionary potentiality to resolve the tragedies and miseries of the partition.

I will give these pictures to the Prime Minister.

DR. RANEN SEN : May I make a submission, Sir ? Again, I am going to request you to go into the record of the speech of Shri Samar Guha wherein he has mentioned\*\*

That should be expunged. I would request you to go through the records. (Interruptions).

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I have not said that. I have been wrongly quoted.

\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.



MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You have denied that. You say that you have not said anything like that. If there is anything on record which suggests that, we will go through it and we will expunge it.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : On a point of clarification. I said\*\*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Shri Shiban Lal Saksena.

PROF. S. L. SAKSENA (Maharajganj) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have known the Prime Minister since her childhood. I know hers is an image of indomitable courage, burning patriotism and quick decision. But I am very sorry to say that she has not risen to the occasion this time in this crisis. Her policy today is ostrich-like. She hopes that world opinion will assert itself and resolve the problem. She must know that no world opinion can influence Pakistan. When Pakistan has indulged in such a brutal carnage, how can it be influenced by any world opinion

I can appreciate her desire for avoiding war. But can she avoid it ? Today, we have got 4 million refugees ; tomorrow, we may have 10 million refugees and even more. Then, she will be forced to go to war against Pakistan. Can she avoid it ? If that is what has to happen, then why delay ? I think, she had a golden opportunity at the time we passed a unanimous resolution in the last session on 31st March to recognise Bangla Dosh and give all the help possible. If we had given recognition to Bangla Dosh immediately at that time and given arms and ammunition to the Mukti Fauj, Bangla Dosh would have been a reality.

At that time we would have driven the Pakistan army out of the Bangla Dosh in no time. Today you will have to make greater sacrifices. If you want to send back the refugees you must establish law and order there and provide security to the returning refugees. It is only possible when we send our forces to East Pakistan on a mission of mercy to end this continuing genocide and put Bangla Dosh Government in full power. You should not be afraid of sending the army. It should be done immediately. Otherwise it will become more difficult. What would have been much easier on the 1st or 2nd of April has become more difficult ; and if you delay further it will become still more difficult.

The great powers, Britain, America and China are against you. Russia is not openly coming to your support. You have to take the risk yourself ; it is your own concern. Bangla Dosh is your problem. If you have free Bangla Dosh on your eastern border you will be safeguarded. America and Britain created Pakistan to keep us down as a third-rate power. How can you think that they will help you ? You must not be afraid of sending your troops there on a mission of mercy. Whatever may happen, ultimately we will have to go to war ; therefore, why delay this ? The number of refugees will go on increasing and this problem will become more difficult in future if you don't act now itself. Therefore, I say, you should send your troops on a mission of mercy without further delay.

You should get rid of the illusion that the world powers will come to your help and be able to influence Pakistan to take back the refugees. The world powers cannot influence Pakistan. It is we, who have to act today. If you want to send all the refugees back and make Bangla Dosh safe for Bengalees, there is no way out except that you should send your troops on a mercy mission to end this genocide. You should not be afraid of sending your army, because you will have to send them ultimately.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY (Cooch-Behar) : Sir, we are very much concerned with the affairs of Bangal Dosh. It is not only Members of this august House and the people of India, but the whole world is very much concerned today about the affairs of Bangla Dosh.

While welcoming the Prime Minister's statement made the other day, I find that there are certain points of firmness and determination but followed by hesitation. I quote what she said :

"Conditions must be created to stop any further influx of refugees and to ensure their early return under credible guarantees for their future safety and well-being. I say with all sense of responsibility that unless this happens, there can be no lasting stability or peace on this sub-continent. We have pleaded with other powers to recognise this. If the world does not take heed, we shall be constrained to take all measures as may be necessary to ensure our own

\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair,

security and the preservation and development of the structure of our social and economic life."

15.00 hrs.

It is a very bold statement indeed but at the same time we cannot find out what positive steps we have taken.

Simultaneously, we find from the newspapers that President Yahya Khan has made a press statement, stating it very clearly that he is not going to take back all those Indian destitutes or refugees who have taken shelter on the Indian order, but only those people who are truly Pakistanis. I do not know how we have to reconcile the two statements from the two statesmen of the two sides. On the one hand, there is the determination of the Prime Minister, and I feel that it is the determination of the people of India to create conditions of peace; on the other, there is a strong statement made by the President Yahya Khan not to take all those Indian destitutes. I feel that it is really creditable that our Government are determined to create conditions of peace, so that all those Bangla Desh evacuees may go back to their homeland and live with peace, honour and with their fundamental human rights. Here seems to be an apparent struggle and confrontation between the two sides.

The question about what action should be taken by the Government has been well debated upon in this House and also outside. It is a crucial time that we are passing through; it is a very delicate issue. Naturally, we have to consider many facts.

The hon. Member who initiated the debate referred to what happened in Turkey and what action the big powers took in similar circumstances. I would like to add just one or two more such instances. What happened in Spanish Cuba in 1898? At that time, President McKinley took a very drastic step for the USA's self-defence. I may restate that President McKinley sent a message to the American Congress, saying, "I have exhausted all the measures to relieve the country of the danger due to the intolerable situation created by Spanish Cuba, and the dangers are at our doorsteps, I am obliged by the Constitution and the law of the country to take action. I await your action". That was the message that he sent, and the American Congress passed a unanimous resolution demanding that 'Spain

should and must withdraw from Cuba,' otherwise, 'the President was authorised to take legal action with the aid of the land and naval forces'. That was a similar situation.

Today, it goes without saying that what is happening in Bangla Desh is similar. Intolerable conditions have been created in Bangla Desh. Not only has it been an affair of Bangla Desh, but it has crossed the boundaries and become an internal affair of ours also. The hon. Prime Minister was very right in making a statement to this effect.

Today it is not merely a question of the domestic jurisdiction of Pakistan, according to International law, under article 2, clause 7 of the UN Charter, but it is an internal problem relating to us as well.

We know what is happening in Bangla Desh. Practically, a million persons or so have been butchered and murdered for no fault of theirs. Mothers, babies, intellectuals, doctors, lawyers, professors, peasantry, all alike were massacred, and nobody was spared. What was the reason? The reason was that the people wholeheartedly supported Sheikh Mujibur Rahman to uphold their fundamental rights, and to save them from the political and economic exploitation by the military rule of the Yahya Khan regime. That was their only fault.

It is not merely a problem before our people and before the hon. Members of this House, but it is a problem of freedom, morality and humanity. On many an occasion in the past, this Parliament had supported freedom movements and liberation movements in various parts of the world. Here is a fit case where we have to support the liberation movement and the support the cause of Bangla Desh, not only considering the facts of Bangla Desh but also our own self-defence and our own protection. Our economic life, our economic development and our planning, all seem to be affected very much by this.

The question of relief to the refugees has been well debated upon. It is not a question of spending a few hundred crores of rupees only, but it might go up to a thousand crores of rupees or even more.

If this goes on in this way, how will we be able to achieve our national objectives? How will we be in a position to solve our own economic problems? How will we be

[Shri B. K. Daschowdhury]

able to march ahead with our programme of *garibi hatao*? All these things seem to be in danger of being thwarted or stopped.

So it is the crucial time for us to consider what further action we should take. In a similar situation in 1958, both the US and Great Britain sent troops to Lebanon and Jordan, of course at the request of the respective governments. But the matter was raised in the General Assembly and it was found that 'it was not fair'. But they had to march their troops in to protect the rights of the people, those who were in Jordan and Lebanon.

What are the sanctions available under International law? I will quote a few lines from Oppenheimer in this regard:

"There is a substantial body of opinion and of practice in support of the view that when a state renders itself guilty of cruelties against and persecution of its nationals in such a way as to deny them fundamental human rights and shock the conscience of mankind, intervention in the interest of humanity is legally permissible."

The same view is upheld by many other jurists of international law, whom I would not like to quote now as it takes time.

What is the situation today? It is not only a question simply of helping the Bangla Desh refugees. It is also a question of the policy we have to pursue. It is also a question of evolving a policy with firmness and determination to see that conditions conducive to the return of these refugees to their homeland are created. But in what way? It is not enough to say that we should make sacrifices. We should do what we can to bring this about. We have to consider what other steps we should take. The whole world is looking to India to see what steps the India Government is going to take in this matter. I agree that the world powers are very hesitant to take any steps under such circumstances. I agree that may be because of their game of power politics. But can we not draw sanction even from the UN Charter and go forward? Can we not do so under international law? Let us come to this point that if the whole world hesitates to take drastic action even to uphold the sanctions and to discharge the obligations enjoined by the UN Charter, should we, as a member of the UN, not go forward, saying

that these steps are enjoined on us by the international body. Can we not go before the UN and say: 'What are we going to do? If you do not take this step under your own sanctions, in discharge of your own obligations, under your treaties and conventions, we are ready to take that action'.

I agree this may entail a confrontation. But what is going to happen? Unless we take very determined steps, unless we go forward, ultimately we are going to suffer. It is not just a question of spending Rs. 200 crores; for that matter, it may mean a thousand crores of rupees. But it also means something more than all that. What are involved are certain basic, fundamental human rights both in our own country and also in Bangla Desh. In such circumstances, what have we to do?

Mr. Dulles speaking on the Suez issue in the General Assembly debate in 1956 said that 'a condition of peace must be created.' He added that 'peace is a coin which has two sides to it, one the avoidance of the use of force, and the other, the creation of conditions of peace'. He further added 'one cannot expect to get one side of the coin without the other'. Here, our Government seems to be very much determined to create conditions of peace, so that all Bengal Desh evacuees may go back to their homeland and the Bangla Desh people may get their right of self-determination and fundamental freedoms, but how to create that? So, I would appeal to the Prime Minister and this Government to take further determined action, I dearly wish our Prime Minister will rise to the occasion and show her firmness, determination and statesmanship, as was shown by Bismarck in the recorded history, at least to save us from the intolerable situation with which we are confronted today.

SHRI KRISHNA MENON (Trivandrum):

It is now 60 days since the armed might of Pakistan has been unleashed on a people who are unarmed and who are in no position to meet it. Those 60 days have been days of slaughter of thousands and thousands of people and more numbers fleeing from there. There is no point in recalling these facts as everyone knows them. I only want to say that the first time when we had a debate in this House, I along with many others expressed the view that we must

recognise this new State, not because it has all the paraphernalia of a State, but in order to stop war spreading on this continent, in order to prevent imperialist Powers fishing in troubled waters. I say with great respect that those views are still widely held and they appear to be right.

I do not yield to anybody in conceding that the Government has difficulties which are not usually felt by Members of Parliament or people who speak on a platform, but all I want to say is that there is a great deal of talk about the law of recognition. Recognition is not really a legal matter. You call in a lawyer and say it should be done by the afternoon. It is a political issue, a political issue which is not prohibited by any canons of law. There have been the cases of Yugo-Croatians and others. I will not repeat them because I have not got the time. All those attributes and necessities of recognition exist, political compulsion and the rest. I think it is not correct to say in this House or anywhere else that our attitude towards Bangla Desh is governed by a desire either to rescind partition or to send people across without passport and things of that kind. We have not done anything of that kind so far, but everyday the Government delays recognition, it finds that it becomes more difficult. If you had done this before, people would have accepted it. After all, Pakistan has recognised what they call Azad Kashmir and nothing has happened very much. In the past we have been very particular, going out of our way, not to perform our obligations but to meet sensitiveness on the part of Pakistan. When some very over-zealous officials shut out waters many years ago, we not only apologised to them for something which we had not done, but even today we are supplying water to them to some extent.

This is a political issue. It is not a question of the Prime Minister's individual decision. What is to be done about it? There is no doubt that some progress has been made, not because the Prime Minister used the words "Bangla Desh". This is a terminology which has been very much in the forefront, but much does not turn on that. The fact is that there is no difference of opinion in this House or in the country broadly speaking in regard to the necessity of enabling the Bangla nation to attain its nationhood and express itself. Therefore, whether we have to say in criticism of the Government or by way of expressing minute

differences should not be used by other people to say that even in India there is no unanimity of opinion; there is the Parliamentary opposition whose business it is to oppose and, therefore, they are opposing the Government. This is not the position.

Therefore, I would say without moving an inch from recognition that if we do not recognise, who else do we expect to recognise? People say that the Government of India is sending delegations asking other Governments to recognise. With what face do we ask anybody else to do something which we do not do ourselves?

I was in Budapest last week. We found very few people knew anything about it. Generally it was regarded as a matter of internal affairs. How does it become an internal affair when three million people flee a territory, flee from a neighbouring country upsetting and changing the balance of economic, social, political and other factors, bringing the threat of war. Because the war machine that fights, the bombs and shells and everything else that are used in Pakistan are the same and are made in the same place, whether they are used in Pakistan or whether they are used in Viet Nam; there is only one place from where all these things come; the same biscuit factory send them out to every other place.

We found that there was very little knowledge about this matter. Nobody wanted to talk about it; they had not heard about it. There were a large number of people who thought that this was a matter between Pakistan and India. Fortunately we found it very easy to dispel their misbelief. I am not saying this for a moment by way of criticism of our publicity or anything of that kind. The time has come for us to recognise that we have a special responsibility in this matter. If we do not recognise or take steps towards recognition, nobody else will; they will say: India has not done and why should be rush into that position? They will be even more sensitive to the idea. The Soviet Union, for example, may quite well say: we do not want to create a situation which gives the Americans an excuse to do what they are doing in Viet Nam; they are quite right in that way.

The Prime Minister has said that we would recognise Bangla Desh at the appropriate time. Even while we let the world know that, I think the time is appropriate now and we should recognise them. At any

[Shri Krishna Menon]

rate we should take such steps as may not amount to recognition but will lead to recognition. I am not trying to water down the immediate necessity for recognition. But it is far better to get something done, that is to say, through information and other offices; these offices should be opened up not only in our country in a large way; we should offer facilities for them in other places because no one else would. That is the only way in which it could be known outside. I am glad to think that large sections of the American opinion mostly prompted by circumstances of the racial agitation and anti-war campaign against the war in Viet-Nam have been sympathetic on this question; they have said that slaughter anywhere is like slaughter everywhere; war somewhere leads to war everywhere.

I come to another aspect and I hope the Foreign Minister would not think that I am taking the attitude of I told you so. We should have withdrawn our diplomatic representatives long time back; but we waited to be kicked out. We could have walked out. Instead of that we were pushed out. The word reciprocity has been used by my good friend Mr. Indrajit Gupta. It is a dangerous word in this particular connection. Our people in Dacca are diplomatic personnel covered by the Vienna Convention but the Bengal people here who have defected from the Pakistani mission are people seeking asylum and they are entitled to be here. Pakistan has no right to ask them back under any international law. Under the law and practice of asylum they are entitled to be here. It is a great disgrace for our country to barter them away for that purpose. On the other hand we have a right to demand that those other people should be repatriated.

It is also important that in regard to the question of the so called refugees anybody who takes the attitude that we are providing succour to them is really getting away from the realities. What else would you do? The only way you deal with people fleeing from terror, fleeing from neighbouring country is: you let them in or shoot them. That is the situation that we were faced with in Goa and we decided to shoot the Portuguese rather than shoot our own people. There is no particular virtue in this matter. It has imposed great economic burden upon us which should be shared by

the world as a whole. I think the time has come for the Foreign Minister to summon all his ambassadors in sensitive countries for personal consultations so that his own personality could be impressed upon them to convey to the capitals our concern in this matter. This cannot be done merely by Morse messages or anything of that character. This is a time when it should be done even from the point of view of making a political gesture, making people believe that we are so concerned about it. Our ambassador in Washington, our High Commissioner in Britain and our man in Yugoslavia and Arab countries should be called—not every one of these people but those who are in sensitive areas—and Government's views should be deeply impressed upon them and they should know the Prime Minister's stand: we do not intend to keep quiet for ever.

Then comes the question; in what way we can assist them. Anything that we say here should not be used by the others, in the sense that one should not say in this House what is not a fact. Some say that these men are travelling on Indian passports. That is not true. Our passports are for our citizens. Even if we recognise them, we should not give them passports, because they are not our citizens; they are citizens of other countries. They may travel under papers given by any friendly Government; given by Afghanistan or given by anybody else. So they may travel on travel papers for those purposes. The size or the dimension of this aspect is important. It is not sufficient for two men who have defected from the Pakistan mission to say that there is some information in Delhi. It is good as far as it goes. But the dimension and the impact it makes should be sufficiently large and we have nothing to be ashamed about it in this matter.

A mighty army which is ruthless—not mighty in the context of the armed might of India—but mighty in the context of the defenceless people in Pakistan is acting. All this talk of war is there. If a war comes we take it; war is not a remedy. It is a calamity which we meet when it comes. There is no guarantee, there is no insurance, that if we do not recognise Bangla Desh, Pakistan would be at war or somebody else would not intervene. That has to be considered on its own. Therefore, no further time should

be lost in the recognition of these people, either fully diplomatically or step by step towards it. The Government must be aware and I speak with reserve in this matter—that it is partly due to the fact that were recognition possible and necessary, we have been playing slow as in the case of the German Democratic Republic and various other places.

Since my time is short, I do not dwell at length. If one's voice could be heard further than this chamber, in Bangla Desh, I hope there will be movement in that area also. It is quite true that the Awami Party has polled a large number of votes practically to the extinction of all others, but this is not a situation that arises out of the election. It is a national revolution, and the election was an incident in this matter. If they are to make any impact upon public opinion abroad, let us make it easier for the Government of India to come to a decision. I cannot advise them; I can only talk for myself. There should emerge in Bangla Desh without any further delay a government which would absorb in to themselves people who represent, or rather, not only represent but reflect in themselves the entire population; may be the communist party or Maulana Bhashani's party or may be the war leaders, because in a revolutionary government, war leaders are members of defence as in the case of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of Viet Nam. In South Viet Nam, for instance, there is no question of a liberation front. It is just the most overwhelming party. But still, they have come out to the world and said, we are willing to have a government composed of everybody except two or three men like Ky who have murdered those people and who are known collaborationists, and others with whom nobody can sit in the same room and so on. There may be individuals like that. But there should emerge in Bangla Desh some sort of government which can come and say to the people, this is a new revolutionary government that has come up, which would create a new situation with regard to some new States that have been coming out of the struggle, like Angola and some other States, Viet Nam and so on. It should come in the same line of thinking as such. That is another thing that could happen.

Then there is the question of our encouraging those who flee from terror, who are able-bodied, or persuading them to go

back, in order not merely that it must lighten the burden upon us, because the moral effect of able-bodied people staying away from the country fighting, is a thing to be considered. There are no refugees from South Viet Nam and some other countries. Therefore, those able-bodied persons should be told about the conditions of war and how they could go back and fight on as best as one can.

It is not for me to say in this House as to in how many other ways the liberation forces should be assisted. It will not be part of our duties so long as we do not recognise.

There is some doubt in Government circles whether recognition by itself offers any further assistance or further sympathy than this country is already giving. My submission is, once that country is recognised, then the question either of people going from here as volunteers or giving armed assistance, not in the sense of expeditionary force but in the sense of lending arms and giving other facilities—they become legal. Now it is a matter of doing it in some other way which is both inefficacious and which would not fit in with our ways of thinking. As I said, if we do not recognise, nobody else will.

Much has been said about danger to ourselves. So far as that is concerned, there are so many dangers and we have to face them when they come. I do not think our minds should be inhibited on this question by thinking that this balances or redresses the evils of partition. Nothing of that kind. I do not know if there is any responsible person in this country who wants that we should take over territories given at the time of partition. I remember Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru saying in this House, "I do not want and part of Pakistan. I have troubles of my own. I do not want to take theirs on." We as a large country have our problems and this is not an issue of annulling the partition or creating a counter-poise against communal ratios and things of that character. It is a question of trying to deal with the situation ~~as~~ far as the apparatus of war is concerned.

I think it is right and proper, appropriate and necessary, that our Diplomatic Missions should exert the greatest pressure that is possible on Britain on the one hand and on the United States on the other in the total stoppage of arms supplies, be-

[श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी]

गाली देकर होर्डर्ज को गाली देकर काम नहीं चला सकती है। गवर्नमेंट विल हैव टू बिहैव।

श्री शशि भूषण : अब बिल्ली थैले से बाहर आई है।

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : आज जो स्थिति पैदा हो गई उसको वार्ड आफ करने के लिए All essential commodities have to be made available through the fair price shops at the lowest cost to the common man.

यह मशीनरी गवर्नमेंट ने तैयार करनी है। तब जाकर कुछ काम होगा। लांग टर्म साल्यूशन की दृष्टि से केवल री-एग्जेल करने से काम नहीं चलेगा। हमें एक उत्साही मंत्री योजना के लिए मिले हैं। हमारी उनसे बड़ी आशाएँ थीं। लेकिन बैनिश पावर्टी वाला जो नारा था वह बैनिश मिनिस्टर्ज में तबदील होता जाता है। एक जाता है दूसरा आता है। इसलिए मैं सरकार से कहता हूँ कि उसको कम्प्लेसेंट नहीं होना चाहिए, उसको वाकई में सीरियस होना चाहिए। उसको ऐसे कदम उठाने चाहिये जिनसे देश के सामने जो एक बड़ी समस्या है, भुखमरी की जो सम्भावना पैदा हो गई, वह टल सके, वह दूर हो सके।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. R. GANESH) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, in answer to the questions raised by the hon. Members opposite, the Finance Minister will reply because this is a very serious debate and we are seriously concerned about this problem.

I have ventured to intervene in this debate because I have been sitting and listening to various speeches that the hon. Members have made. There are certain points raised which I wish to emphasize. We on this side of the House also share the concern which the hon. Members on the other side have shown about the rise in prices. We are also very conscious of the fact that we have made a pledge to the people that prices have to be kept a stable and it is necessary to save the vulnerable sections of society so that there is no erosion of the income that they are having.

There has been unanimity on various facts that have been given. The fact and figures that the hon. Members have placed before this House are drawn from Government documents. The Government itself has given these facts. There is no doubt that there has been rise in prices; there is no doubt that the country is concerned about it and there is no doubt that it is creating hardship so far as the vulnerable sections of the society are concerned.

It may also be necessary to state that for some time, between June, 1970 and May, 1971, there has been some stability in the prices. We have gone through the entire period of last year. It is now for the last two or three months that this problem of rise in prices has come in this accentuated and exaggerated form. For the last two or three months, this has become a very serious problem which is causing a very serious concern.

It also appears that a psychosis that is being created, a climate that is being created, a trend that is being given to the debate, which has some sort of a motivation behind it. Without in any way minimising the seriousness of the price situation, it looks as if that it happens whenever Parliament opens, in every session of Parliament, there is one issue or the other. The Simla Accord issue misfired; it became a damn squib and some issue had to be found on which to concentrate...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI : Where is the motivation ?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : Kindly do not attribute any motive. This is a serious debate; it is a serious issue.

SHRI K. R. GANESH : I am not imputing any motive...(*Interruption*)

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI : How can there be any motivation on such a serious issue ? (*interruption*)

SHRIMATI GAYATRI DEVI OF JAIPUR : I do not understand why he should attribute a motive to this particular debate ? Is it simply because members here felt that this issue should be discussed in this

I thank you for giving me this opportunity to participate in this debate.

MR. SPEAKER · The hon. Prime Minister

श्री जे० बी० घोते (नागपुर) · अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सदन में जो डिबेट चल रहा है उस में हिस्सा लेने के लिये मैंने अपने पक्ष की ओर से कल ही अपना नाम दिया था। इसके बाद-जुद भी मेरा नाम यहाँ पर नहीं पुकारा गया। इस सदन की कार्यवाही में हिस्सा लेने का मेरा अधिकार है और अपनी पार्टी को रिप्रेजेंट करने का अधिकार है। आप मुझको उस अधिकार से वंचित नहीं कर सकते। ऐसी स्थिति में मेरी आपसे प्रार्थना है कि इस हाउस की कार्यवाही में हिस्सा लेने का जो मेरा अधिकार है, और जो बंगला देश का सवाल है, जो हमारे देश का ही नहीं, बंगला देश का ही नहीं, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सवाल है, उसके ऊपर अपनी दलील पेश करने, इस सवाल के ऊपर अपने विचार प्रकट करने और अपने पक्ष को रखने का जो हमारा अधिकार है, कास्टिट्यूशन ने जो अधिकार मुझे दिया है, आप के रूलस ने जो अधिकार मुझको दिये हैं, उस अधिकार को आप मुझ से छीन नहीं सकते। मेरी आपसे दस्तावेज है कि आप को मुझे थोड़ा समय देना ही चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय · आपका अधिकार तो सब मानते हैं लेकिन कल जो समय रखा गया था उसको बढ़ाया गया। आज सुबह यह तय हुआ था कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर को 2 बजे बोलना है। उसके बाद डेढ़ घंटे समय और बढ़ाया गया और अनाउंस किया गया कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साढ़े तीन बजे बोलेंगे। (अधबचान) बहुराल जिन सदस्यों को आज समय नहीं मिलेगा उन को बजट के समय पहले बुलाया जायेगा।

श्री जे० बी० घोते : सदन में जिन मत-दत्ताओं ने मुझे चुन-कर भेजा है उन्होंने अध्यक्ष की शकल देखने के लिए नहीं भेजा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप अभी नये आये हैं ..

श्री जे० बी० घोते : मैं नया आया हूँ, यह मैं कबूल करता हूँ। लेकिन आप की शकल देखने के लिए नहीं आया हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय वह अच्छा भी नहीं है।

श्री जे० बी० घोते अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप की शकल से मैं खुश भी नहीं हूँ। आप खास तौर से इसको देखिए कि जब मतदाताओं ने मुझे यहाँ भेजा है तो आप की शकल देखने के लिए नहीं भेजा है। मैं नया आया हूँ, इसमें कोई शक नहीं, यह जाहिर है। इसके बाद-जुद भी मैं पहली बार ...

अध्यक्ष महोदय आप बैठ जाइये। शकल तो हम आपसे में किसी की देखने नहीं आए हैं। वह मेरी और आपकी मिलती जुलती है, इसलिए कोई खास बात नहीं है। एक दूसरे की शकल में कोई खास फर्क नहीं है।

श्री जे० बी० घोते · शायद एक दूसरे के दिल भी एक हो सकते हैं, लेकिन हम दिमाग एक कर ले और इन्साफ की बात करे। मैं नया जरूर आया हूँ लेकिन आप से कहता हूँ कि मैं आज आप का आदेश मानूंगा। मैं आपका आदेश मान रहा हूँ, लेकिन अगर इसके बाद आपकी ओर से ऐसा ही अन्याय होता आया, तो आप को हाउस में ला एंड आर्डर सिचुएशन फेस करनी होगी। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि बंगला देश के बारे में हमारी जो भूमिका है उसको मान्यता मिलनी चाहिये। आज आप गैर-इन्साफ की बात कर रहे हैं। यहाँ पर जो "सत्यमेव जयते" और "फर्मचक्र प्रवर्तनाय" लिखा हुआ है वह ढोंग है, वह एक स्वाग है। केवल आज मैं आपका आदेश मानता हूँ। उसके बाद जब भी अवसर आयेगा, नियम के अनुसार इन्साफ के अनुसार, आपको हमें वक्त देना होगा नहीं तो मैं आप की बात नहीं मानूंगा। आज आपका आदेश मानते हुये, आपका निषेध करते हुए, विकार करते हुए, मैं बैठ जाता हूँ। (अधबचान)



संभवतः महोदय : अब आप बैठ जाइये ।

श्री जे० बी० बोते : मुझे मासूम है कि किसी के नाम से पत्थर भी तैरते हैं। इस चुनाव में जो सारे पत्थर तैरें हैं और यहाँ पर मौजूद हैं, मैं उनकी परवाह नहीं करता। आज इंदिरा के नाम पर जो पत्थर तैरें हैं वे यहाँ क्या बात करते हैं? मैं फिर से कहता हूँ कि इंदिरा के नाम पर जो पत्थर यहाँ चुनकर आये हैं, मैं उनकी परवाह नहीं करता।

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (PRADHAN MANTRI, PRAMANU URJA MANTRI, GRIH MANTRI TATHA SOOCHANA AUR PRASARAN MANTRI) (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I express my deep appreciation of the sentiments voiced on all sides of the House in regard to the struggle of Bangla Desh? I fully realise that even though some hon. Members have used harsh words, they have done so out of deep emotion and feelings of concern. They have reflected the anguish which we and the entire country feels at the tragic and heart-rending happenings in Bangla Desh. My government and I share that anguish the deep concern.

It is only natural that with our own tradition of love of freedom, our involvement with the values of democracy and human rights, we should feel deeply concerned when these values are crushed.

We have heard much talk of democracy. The Allies claimed that the Second World War was fought to save democracy. But when democracy is so flagrantly and so brutally being destroyed, we do not hear much comment, nor do we see the sort of spontaneous strong responses which the situation warrants. Could there be a greater or a clearer expression of democracy than the one we witnessed in the elections in Pakistan? Let me remind the House that although the elections were held under the rules formulated by the military regime, immediately afterwards military repression was used mercilessly to halt the process leading to the formation of a democratically elected government in Pakistan.

We are told by some countries that while they may disapprove of what is being done by the military rulers, they cannot be a party to the disintegration of Pakistan. Is it suggested that we wish the disintegration of Pakistan? Have we not, as many Members have pointed out, at every step tried not only for propriety in our relationship but also for friendship?

If there is a struggle between the two parts of Pakistan, it is certainly not of our making but of the rulers of Pakistan. Is it anybody's contention that the methods being used today can achieve any integration or stability, worth the name, now or in the future?

The question of secession is also raised, if I may say so. This is a distortion of facts. It is conveniently forgotten that the majority of Pakistan's people live in the eastern region. In a democratic system, the majority does have certain rights. They cannot be accused of secession if they assert those rights. However, if today there is such strong feeling amongst our people, it is not merely because the democratic rights and liberties of 75 million people are being crushed but because of the damaging effect which this cruel tragedy is having on our entire country, economically, politically and socially.

This is the reality of the situation. It is not propaganda or the figment of anyone's imagination. Our experience of the influx of refugees and the preposterous propaganda by Pakistan has reinforced the fact that what is happening in Bangla Desh does have many sided repercussions on our internal affairs. That is why I have said that this cannot be considered merely as an internal problem of Pakistan. It is an Indian problem. More, it is a world-wide problem. The international community must appreciate the very critical character of the situation that has now developed.

Any failure to do so may well lead to disastrous consequences. For what is happening in Bangla Desh is not just a political or an economic problem. It is a problem of the very survival of the people of that whole area, the people of Bangla Desh.

It is a problem created by calculated genocide that is resulting not only in the murder of tens of thousands of men, women and children but also forcing many more to seek refuge and shelter in India. It is a

problem that threatens the peace and security of India and, indeed, of South-East Asia. The world must intervene to see that peace and security is re-established and maintained.

As hon. Members know, yesterday, there was a similar debate in the other House. I had to sit there also for a part of the time and, so, I could not listen to all the speeches which were made here. I was sorry, however, to hear some hon. Members take even this opportunity to cast aspersions on our Foreign Office. I must deplore this tendency to try and find an easy way out by blaming the services. I do not say that we have not made mistakes or that all our representatives are always upto the mark. When there is a mistake, we should certainly find fault. But constant criticism is disheartening and demoralising. We should not blunt the instruments with which we have to function. Our work here and abroad has to continue. We do realise that any help given to the rulers of Pakistan will be used against the innocent people of Bangla Desh.

On this occasion our representatives abroad have worked hard and have done excellent work. They have been as effective as they could possibly be in the prevailing circumstances. Some Governments have set views, and even if their sympathies are roused, they are not often willing to take a stand on a matter such as this. I would like to say that all our services engaged in dealing with the present situation have shown fortitude and a sense of dedication.

If it gives some solace to hon. Members to abuse the Government and blame them for lack of courage, for lack of direction and even of understanding, I certainly do not want to deprive them of this comfort. To some Members, guts are equated with voice-power and the use of passionate words. I wish life were so simple.

Now, this Government may have many faults; but it does not lack courage nor is it afraid of taking a risk if it is a necessary risk. As I have said many times over, we are not merely concerned with the legal aspect of this situation or, indeed of any situation. We are concerned with one thing and one thing only—our own national interest and security, and naturally that of the heroic people of Bangla Desh. That is

why it is important to act calmly. The situation is far too grave for anything else.

The word 'recognition' has echoed from every side, as if recognition by itself could solve the many difficulties which confront the people of Bangla Desh or the many difficulties which our country faces, especially our States on the border, that is, West Bengal, Assam, Tripura and Meghalaya. We have given deep and anxious thought to all aspects of this question. It is, as my colleague has said, constantly under review. We are not writing to see that what other countries will do in the matter. Whatever decision we take in this, or other issues is guided by our own independent assessment of the situation and how our interests in the broadcast sense are served.

Yesterday I spoke in very deliberately measured words of our present difficulties and of the likely dangers and burdens, not because I am or ever have been afraid of burdens or of danger, but because I want hon. Members to think deeply about all these matters.

Danger can be faced only when one is prepared for it. This,—as I said previously and I should like to repeat,—is no time for party rivalry. We must stand together; we must help one another in the economic and other tasks which confront us. Communal tendencies must be curbed. All parties, I think, must help to ensure that the question of Bangla Desh and of the refugees is not reduced to a communal level but is kept on its true level, which is a national and an international one.

I shall continue to keep in touch with the Leaders of the Opposition and with other Members of this hon. House on these questions and developments. I hope that Members will feel free to come to see me to express their view or whatever knowledge they have on the subject. In the meantime, there is not much else that I can say.

I would only say, let us not lose heart. Let us have faith in ourselves and in our people. Let us have faith in the courageous people of Bangla Desh and in their determination to fight for their rights. No great task is achieved without sacrifice.

There is an old saying :

"Is experience gained with a song ?  
No, it takes all that a man has."

Sacrifice and hardship there must be, for all who fight for freedom or for justice of

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

for a great cause. But I have no doubt that the spirit of man and the spirit of freedom cannot be vanquished. We must face this entire problem with confidence, and as I said, do what we have to do with calm and deep thought and with unity amongst ourselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

MR. SPEAKER : I shall allow just one or two questions.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : In terms of our own national security, there appears to have been a sudden accentuation of the crisis, in the light of the news that has come today from Assam. A statement has been made in the Assam State Legislative Assembly by the Chief Minister of that State wherein he has made serious revelations of large-scale Pakistani intrusions into Assamese and Meghalayan territory seizure of several villages and killing of several of our citizens as well as of the border security force personnel ; he has made an appeal in the State Assembly, as reported in the press, to the Central Government to take immediate action to see that the intruders are prevented and our own territory is properly defended. I would like to know what the latest position is and what we are doing in the matter.

MR. SPEAKER : I have already admitted a calling-attention-notice on that.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : This is a very urgent matter and, therefore, we want to know it. There is a general state of panic and a feeling of uncertainty has been created by the report of the Chief Minister for the first time in his own State Assembly, where he has been brought to a position where he has to make a public appeal.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : He has appealed to the Centre. It has come out in banner headlines in the newspapers.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : It is true that there was an intrusion in part of Assam, and the Chief Minister has phoned to me. But we sent immediate help, and the intruders were driven out.

The situation is under control. They were driven out by five O'clock the day before yesterday.

SHRI BISWANARAYAN SHASTRI (Lakhimpur) : I have seen personally the problems of the refugees. They have no proper shelter. Particularly in the Dalu area, there are more than 1,20,000 refugees, but there is shelter available only for about 40,000 or 45,000 people. I have learnt from the Relief and Rehabilitation Commissioner of Meghalaya that tents and other things would be supplied by the end of June. May I know whether Government's attention has been drawn to this matter and they are giving serious thought to this matter.

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRAM AUR PUNARWAS MANTRI) (SHRI KHADILKAR) : I had already made a detailed statement on this yesterday. We have already placed orders for 50,000 tents, and every week we get at least, 3000, and we have supplied these. In addition, about 10,000 tarpaulins have been ordered. I know that there are some places where the rush is so great and some people find some difficulty for two or three days in getting shelter.

If there is any deficiency and if it is pointed out, we shall certainly remove it. I am in constant touch with the Chief Minister of Meghalaya every day ; every day almost he is giving me a ring. We are in touch with him, and I have assured him that all these deficiencies will be removed.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO (Mahendragarh) : Since this problem of refugees is already colossal, and 60,000 are coming in everyday, do Government propose to introduce any family planning over there ?...*(Interruptions)* Secondly...

MR. SPEAKER : I am sorry. I do not think we should treat this subject so lightly. He had better practise it himself.

SHRI BIRENDRA SINGH RAO : Since there is no prospect of the refugees going back in the near future, what would be the position about citizenship of the children born to them in Indian soil ? This is a very important question.

SHRI A. K. SEN (Calcutta-North-West) : Let us not be frivolous.

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI (Gauhati) : There has appeared a newspaper report that an IAF officer has been arrested in Borjhar airport for passing on information to Pakistan. Is Government contemplating serious steps so that spying is not done in that most sensitive and strategic area of Assam ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Any case of spying is always treated with the utmost seriousness, whether in Assam or anywhere else in the country.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : There is a feeling among certain sections of the people that the India Government is not recognising Bangla Desh because it does not want confrontation with China or a war with Pakistan. What is the actual truth in it and is the Prime Minister going to declare here and how that India is not afraid of China or of Pakistan ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : This point has been answered on many occasions.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : She has said more than that ; that she is not afraid of Banerjee. What more do you want ?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : It has been reported in Calcutta that Mr. Mahdi Masud, former Dy. High Commissioner for Pakistan in Calcutta, is indulging in serious communal activities, instigating communal troubles there in collaboration with the Yahya Khan regime. Gen. Yahya Khan is trying to create communal troubles in India, in West Bengal in particular. What steps have been taken against Mr. Masud to prevent him from abusing his freedom in Calcutta ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : He should be arrested and all the communal organisations in India should be banned.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : On the other hand, he is being given VIP treatment.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Yes.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : The hon. Member told me about this yesterday. We are looking into the matter.

SHRIMATI BIBHA GHOSH (Nabha-dwip) : I come from the border area. As regards the refugees who are coming in, there is no proper authority to issue border entry slips to them, with the result that they are not allowed to get entry into the camps. They have been going from camp to camp. Most of them are women and children. Is there any arrangement there under which at the border posts there is a proper authority to issue to them these entry slips so that they do not have difficulty in getting admitted to camps ?

16.00 hrs.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : So far as I know, always all such entrants are being registered except some who manage to avoid registration. Although my colleague, the Minister for Rehabilitation, is doing all he can to provide tents, tarpaulins etc., there is no doubt that we are not fully equipped to deal with such a large influx. So, there is bound to be discomfort and hardship which we are trying to minimise to the extent possible.

16.01 hrs.

MOTION RE: ANNUAL REPORT OF  
UNIVERSITY GRANTS COM-  
MISSION FOR 1968-69

—(Contd.)

MR. SPEAKER : The House will now resume discussion of motion re: annual report of University Grants Commission for 1968-69.

Shri Dhandapani.

\*SHRI DHANDAPANI (Dharapuram) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, under Section 18 of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956 the Report for the year 1968-69 of the Commission is now under discussion and many hon'ble Members have referred to the valuable suggestions made by eminent educationists of the country.

\*The original speech was delivered in Tamil.