

That the Demand under the Head Foreign Trade be reduced by Rs. 100.

[Need to give incentive for silk production (65)]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The Cut Motions are also before the House.

SHRI S. R. DAMANI (Sholapur) : Sir, I rise to support the demands of this Ministry. At the very outset, I would say that this is one of the most important Ministries. It controls the exports of the country. It is also in charge of imports. Both account for more than Rs. 5000 crores worth of trade.

Apart from this, this Ministry is also in charge of many important industries like our traditional textile industry, jute industry, tea industry and many plantation industries. If you see the performance of the Ministry during the course of the year, I think it is very satisfactory. Our exports during the course of the year have touched new heights and our imports have also declined, thus narrowing down the gap by Rs. 100 crores, a record in the history, for the past ten years.

Sir, it is very easy to criticise but it is difficult to perform. During this year, the achievements of this Ministry are really credit able. On the export front, the exports of Rs. 1530 crores they were able to achieve, include export of many goods, of many finished goods. . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You can continue on Monday. Now, we take up private members' business.

14.59 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

THIRD REPORT

SHRI A. N. VIDYALANKAR (Chandigarh) : Sir, I beg to move :

"That this House do agree with the Third Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to House on the 30th June, 1971."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The question

"That this House do agree with the

Third Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 30th June, 1971."

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION RE : RECOGNITION TO BANGLA DESH—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now we take up further discussion of the resolution moved by Shri Samar Guba. Two hours were allotted for this. One hour and thirty minutes have already been taken. So, only 30 minutes remain.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I have an amendment which is just a formal one. I have given the date as 30th June 1971 thinking that the discussion would be concluded that day. Unfortunately, the discussion was not over. So my amendment that 30th June 1971 be substituted by 15th July 1971. It was circulated.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I think that is clerical. You have a fresh amendment ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I have tabled an amendment to my amendment.

15.00 hrs.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You have another amendment, No. 5. Are you moving it ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Yes, I am moving.

I beg to move :

That in the amendment moved by Shri S. M. Banerjee, printed as No. 2 in List No. 1 of amendments,—

for "30-6-1971"

substitute "15-7-1971"

SHRI H. M. PATEL : (Dhandhuka) : First we have to ask ourselves what is it that Government means when Government spokesmen keep on saying that the refugees who have come into India will have to be sent back, that they must go back, etc. How exactly do they propose to achieve this? Do they have in mind that they will have some kind of a political settlement? This can only mean

[Shri H. M. Patel]

settlement between the Government of Pakistan with Mujibur Rehman and his followers. Unless there is a settlement between these two, the establishment of some form of Government and administration which will inspire confidence in those who have come into India there can be no question of their going back. Because, it is quite obvious, we can send them back only when we are satisfied that they can live there in safety. What are the chances of such a political settlement? Who has implanted this idea of a political settlement? The world powers talk of it, it has been mentioned in the statement issued by them, that they would prefer a political settlement. Why is it that we ourselves are lending our support to such a proposition? Is it because we are satisfied that such a settlement is a practical possibility?

We have two alternatives. Either there is some settlement of this kind which they refer to, which will create confidence in the minds of refugees, or we shall go our own way, we shall take unilateral action. Now, what action is contemplated, we cannot understand. Why is this not made clear? Is it military action? If not what else have the Government in mind?

Their numbers are increasing. We have already in our midst 63 lakhs refugees and more are continuing to come. Within the next 2 months we shall have 8 or 10 millions. How do the Government propose to handle this large number? They create many problems. It is not merely a question of money, food or shelter alone. They create all kinds of problems. There is the problem of employment. We have our own enormous problem of unemployment. Officially we consider some 30 million people are unemployed in our country. Are we to add this large number to those unemployed already.

I will not refer to the other grim possibility and it is a very real possibility. As we disperse the refugees in to the country, they tell the tales of horror through which they have passed in Bangla Desh; that must arouse certain emotions in the minds of the people. Therefore, it is quite obvious that we cannot afford for long to allow things to drift as we are doing to day. I am afraid that it seems to me that

the only action we could take is that we could give concrete shape to what we are saying, namely that we shall act alone. Let the world powers also begin to believe that we mean business, and begin to believe that a point will come. and it will come fairly soon, when we shall act militarily, not because we want it, because nobody would be anxious for a war but because we have no alternative; and it will be a war on both fronts, inevitably. But what other alternative have we?

If recognition of Bangla Desh is suggested or proposed here it can only be as a first step: it can only be as a step whereby we can say that we do recognise the existence of a government which even if it is not actually in charge of the territory is a government which is recognised by the people who raised in that territory and who have been driven out of that territory; that recognition may give us a convenient handle in order to say that we shall act. But this can only be a prelude, a preliminary step to military action. Unless we have in mind some such determined action, there would be very little point in merely giving recognition.

When the Prime Minister moved in this House a resolution which was passed unanimously, what moved both the Government and the Members of this House to accept that resolution unanimously? It was only this, namely a generous feeling towards people who were being mercilessly treated because they had given expression to their feelings and to their views in a free election, and because we felt that by all democratic standards they were the people who should have formed a government. But they were being forcefully suppressed, and we felt that we should stand by them; but it has turned out to be a hollow standing by them. How do we propose to follow that up? At that stage, it may be that we thought that merely an expression of moral support might be enough. But when the refugees began to come in their hordes, it was obvious to everybody that it was no longer an internal problem of Pakistan, even if one wanted to be highly legalistic. It became an international problem and India was affected and India had to act.

It was suggested by many that we should have closed our Frontiers. How could we

close our frontiers except by ourselves acting in the same brutal manner as Pakistan was acting? Since we did not propose to act in that manner, we received them. But having received them, we also accepted the further responsibility for seeing either that we should keep them here permanently or that they should be re-established in their country in conditions which would ensure their safety. The only way in which we could ensure their safety in their country is either by the establishment of a government led by Sheikh Mujibur Rehman and his followers or by military action. Which of this is a practical proposition? This suggestion that we recognise Bangla Desh is and should be the first step, but it should be accepted as the first step, recognising that a military action is inevitable and must follow the recognition as quickly as possible.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : There are still quite a good number of Members who would like to participate in this debate, and the hon. Minister has to reply and the hon. Mover of the resolution has to reply to the debate. It would not be possible to contain all this in 20 minutes which is the time that we have still left for this resolution. So, I would like to take the sense of the House in regard to this matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Extend the time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : By how much?

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN : Before taking the sense of the House, I would like you to consider this request of mine. I have got a resolution which has secured the ballot and I want at least one minute to introduce the resolution, because one gets the chance in the ballot only once in so many months. Without that the resolution can not be even moved. That is very bad. Otherwise I have no objection.

PROF. S. L. SAKSENA : I have given notice of an amendment. Can I move it?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You should have done it before. We will see about it.

We have to conclude Private Business at 5.30. There is a half hour discussion after that. I think we should leave some time to Mr. Gopalan to move his resolution, because if he does not do that, it falls through and it may not come again unless he succeeds in the ballot.

Keeping that in mind, the House should decide by what time we can extend this debate. There are a large number of speakers yet to speak. The Minister has to reply and the Mover has to reply. We have to finish by 5.30 and extend the time for this debate to any time short of 5.30 to allow Mr. Gopalan sometime. We will go upto 5.25.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : There is a half-hour discussion in my name. If you like, it can be deferred to next week. It has been done many times in the past. Then we will get half an hour more.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : That cannot be done. The Rules do not allow it. Private Business is only for 2½ hrs. That can be done if it is Government Business, but there it is Private Business and the time is fixed. That is the difficulty.

श्री ज्ञानुवंत छोटे (नागपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, बंगला देश का विषय आज हमारे देश के लिए बहुत ज्यादा महत्वपूर्ण है और सौभाग्य से हम सवान के ऊपर सम्मानित सदस्य श्री समर गुहा का प्रस्ताव आया है। मैं आपसे दरखास्त करना चाहता हूँ कि इस महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर अगर बहुत कुछ ज्यादा देर तक चलती है तो उसमें कोई हर्ज की बात नहीं है। इसके लिए मैं एक रास्ता बताना चाहता हूँ कि सदन का टाइम 6 बजे के बाद आधे घंटे के लिये और बढ़ा दिया जाये।

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : We have taken a decision to extend upto 5.25. Let us see what happens.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS, AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR) : We may ask the Mover how much time he will require to reply as also the Minister. The remaining time can be given to the discussion.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH) : I will take about 15 minutes.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : We agree to 5.25. He is going to take only 15 minutes. He is going to say nothing about it. Let him at least make some statement on the recent statement of Yabya Khan. He is keeping mum on that.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I will require 25 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister and the Mover together will take 40 minutes. We have to adjust the debate in the light of this.

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMY (Gauhati): The issue of Bangla Desh is in the mind of every citizen in this country. Even in this House we found expression of various moods—moods of hope, anger, despair, frustration, indignation and what not. There has also been a feeling in this House—if I have been able to sense it correctly—that as the world powers have not come forward in the anticipated manner it is time that we take some drastic action unilaterally ourselves. I feel that such an approach will really frustrate the very purpose for which we are fighting. If the Western Powers have not reacted to the realities of Bangla Desh as we think they ought to have reacted, we should not be disillusioned because any person who is conversant with past history and with the present situation in Bangla Desh is well aware that it is the only thing that could be expected from the western powers.

Since 1953 there has been confrontation between the democratic forces and the totalitarian forces in Bangla Desh. These forces were evenly balanced. It is with the aid and assistance of the western powers that the totalitarian forces always crushed the democratic forces. It is because of this fact that in 1954 the political parties of East Pakistan adopted a resolution to do away with the alignment with the West so far as the foreign policy was concerned and advocate a policy of non-alignment. The western Powers have realised that if the freedom fighters of Bangla Desh are allowed to have their way, western dominance in that part of the country will come to an end. Therefore, in their own self-interest they are pursuing a policy which is not to our liking. It is because of this that even the British Government is saying that it is an internal affair of Bangla Desh.

Even so as early as 1968 the then Foreign Secretary of the British Government, Mr. Michael Stewart said that article 56 of the U. N. Charter makes it clear that no country can say that human rights of its citizens are absolutely a domestic matter.

Because of this reaction of the western Powers it will be a completely wrong approach to say that we should leave our efforts to have negotiations with the western Powers. After all we must realise there is mounting pressure in the world against Yahya regime and even in the U. S. Senate two senators Charles Mathias and Bradford Morse have introduced a Bill for the stoppage of arms shipment to Pakistan.

Because of the various moods and feelings some wrong approaches have also taken place. The first such approach on 'the issue of Bangla Desh'—some of us feel—is that a solution of the problem in its economic aspect will be a solution of the political problem of Bangla Desh. Secondly, there has also been a feeling current in this country that in regard to Bangla Desh problem we should take drastic feeling measures without taking into account how those measures are going to be accepted by Mujibur Rahman. There has also been a feeling that recognition is the only solution. So far as the first two approaches are concerned, if we feel that the solution of the refugee problem is by itself the solution of the problem of Bangla Desh, it is a completely wrong approach. That is why our Foreign Minister is asserting every time that we should try for a political solution of the Bangla Desh problem.

What is meant by political solution? A solution acceptable to Mujib and his followers. The third question is the one with which we are probably concerned in this debate. That question is whether we should grant recognition to the provisional Government of Bangla Desh? I am aware that recognition is not a matter governed by law, it is more a question of policy. It is also urged that recognition is the result of decision taken, not in the execution of legal duty, but in pursuance of the exigencies of national interest. But though it is a matter of policy, yet it cannot be gainsaid that international law lays down certain conditions upon which the grant of recognition can be based. These conditions are, firstly, an independent government; secondly, the effective authority of that Government, enjoying positive obedience of the bulk of the population. Thirdly, defined territory. To put it shortly, external independence and an effective internal government with a reason-

ably well-defined territory are essential. The internal government must have an operative executive machinery whose writ runs throughout the territory and which is capable of discharging its rights and duties. Unless these conditions are present, or in other words, if a community claiming recognition fails to fulfil these conditions of permanency and political cohesion, it is generally recognised in international law that premature recognition is more than an unfriendly act. It is even an act of intervention, sometimes international delinquency.

Therefore, we atleast in India who are saying that Pakistan has committed an act of aggression of international law, must not act in any manner which again may be thrown at us saying that we are acting against international law. Therefore, when we take a decision on the recognition, we must see that the primary factors which are necessary for recognition are present. Premature recognition will only give a handle to Pakistan to sway the importance of the problem of the freedom-fighters of Pakistan in an unwanted direction. By that, I do not mean that I am completely opposed to recognition, because I feel that if we are to grant recognition three purposes will have to be served. Firstly, it is to our national interests that we should put a stamp of legality on Mujibur Rehman and his party so that the undemocratic forces, internal and external, in Bangla Desh may be isolated. Secondly I am aware that the question of recognition will give a moral booster to the freedom-fighters. Also, it will to a great extent, directly and indirectly, blockade the deliberate design of Yahya Khan to set up an undemocratic regime in Bangla Desh.

So before we grant recognition, we must see that the conditions precedent for granting recognition are present,—and therefore, if they are not present, and as I feel that all the conditions are not present today—I consider that the time is not opportune to grant recognition. But we should try to create conditions so that these requirements may be fulfilled and our effort should be directed at those things.

With these words, I oppose this resolution.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) :
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this subject of

Bangla Desh has been debated at length here in this House last Monday. Today we are concerned with the specific question of recognition which has been brought up and has been pinpointed in Mr. Samar Guha's resolution.

First of all, I would just like to remind the External Affairs Minister that while we are very much benefited, of course, by this kind of reminders that one Member of his party has just given us—that there are certain technical norms which are generally accepted in the international community as the criterion for determining whether a particular government is worthy of recognition or not—we are not now at this stage nor are we in a mood when we would like this thing to be repeated *ad nauseam*. I am sorry to have to say this. But if one seeks to have one's argument on the standards and accepted canons of international behaviour, then the hon. Minister knows very well that actually the world does not move like that. A country which is smaller than Pakistan, Israel, has been asked by a unanimous resolution of the United Nations Security Council long ago to vacate the territories which they occupied by military action. But Israel has not taken the slightest step to carry out that decision of the United Nations Security Council. Has the world been able to do anything about it ?

The other day, the International Court of Justice the world Court—only last week passed a Judgement, sitting at The Hague, asking the South African Government to keep out of South West Africa and telling them that they have no business to hold on to that territory. Hardly had the news of the International Court's Judgement come out, Mr. Voerster, the Prime Minister of South Africa, issued a statement saying, "I categorically reject the World Court's judgment."

Can you do anything about it ? The UN has more than once recommended that nobody should sell arms to South Africa. The UK Government goes on blatantly selling arms to South Africa. Can you do anything about it ? So, let us be realistic and see the world we live in. It is no use trotting out hypothetical and theoretical canons and conditions to be fulfilled before you dare to give recognition. The world is not a place like that. You have to act according to your own national self-interest. It is not an act of generosity towards the people of Bangladesh. I do not want you

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

to look it from that point of view. I want you to look at it from the point of view of our own national interest. That is the only criterion and that is what our Government spokesmen keep on telling us. When we say that they act under pressures, they say indignantly, "We are never pressurised. We act according to our national self-interest". Now is the testing time for it. We want to see what they will do now.

Conditions have changed since last Monday. Two factors have emerged on the scene which have changed completely the line of thinking which the Government was pursuing so long. One is Yahya Khan's broadcast. I need not go into the details of it. So long, the line of thinking was, we must strive to bring about political settlement, rouse international public opinion and put pressure on other Governments, so that Yahya Khan is forced to come to a political settlement. Now he has given his reply to that in his broadcast. For an indefinite time, the military regime will continue. Martial law will continue. East Pakistan will be colonised. No political settlement of any kind is visualised by them. The general elections are practically going to be nullified. All Awami League people who have been elected are going to be disqualified and by-elections are going to be held. The Awami League will continue to be proscribed and banned. In all this business, there is not a single word—I regret to say in Sardar Swaran Singh's statement also which he made last Friday, there is not a single word—about the release of Mujibur Rehman. All this slogan of political settlement is dead as a dodo now. Please do not go on repeating it. Yahya Khan has told you bluntly in so many words that that is not the way he is going to go.

Secondly, almost before our Minister had set his foot on his native soil, the United States Government has come out openly in the last few days with repeated statements issued in America that they have not the slightest intention of stopping or restricting economic, military or any other aid to Pakistan. Why should not Yahya Khan take this stand? China is supporting him. The United States Government is supporting him. Sir, there is not much time and I want to ask just one or two questions. Our borders are being violated

every day both by incursions by the Pakistani army and by this new type of violation of our borders. This is also a form of aggression, because the Pakistani army is driving an entire nation before its guns and bayonets by the millions into our territory. This is not going to stop in the foreseeable future. What do they propose to do about it? How do we guard the security of our borders? That is the first question I want to ask. The minister has gone round telling the world that if the other nations do not do something about this, we will be forced to act on our own. Brave words! Please spell out now before your own Parliament whether that time to act has come or not and what you mean by this action. All this time we have been patting ourselves on the back because so many nations congratulated us for our policy of restraint. We were pleased when everybody said, "You are so restrained. We admire you." But in Washington or New York or some where, when that Under Secretary of State, Mr Sisco, delivered a sermon to Sardar Swaran Singh saying, "You are very good boys, acting in a restrained way. I would advise you and Pakistan to continue this policy of restraint", our minister got very angry and rightly so. He flared up and said, "Who are you to give me sermons and equate us with Pakistan?" Sometimes we are happy when we are praised about our restraint. Sometimes we flare up and we say, if it goes on too long, we will have to act on our own. At other times, you say, you are not going to recognise Bangladesh!

I want to say, Sir, that now after Yahya Khan's broadcast continued non-recognition of Bangla Desh as a sovereign entity amounts in practice to recognising the authority of Yahya Khan over East Pakistan. You can continue to non-recognise Bangla Desh, but it means, in effect, before the eyes of the world that you are declaring that the authority of Islamabad over East Pakistan is recognised by us and will continue to be recognised. Are you willing to take this odium? I say, all this business of their not having any territory where their writ runs and so on and so forth is besides the point.

Here is a Government which represents the elected representatives of the people of Bangla

Desh. That is the moral strength that we have got on our side. They won 98% of the seats in the elections. That Government even it does not have a square foot of territory under its permanent stable control is nevertheless the Government which represents the elected people of the country, but you continue to recognise the military regime which has no sanction behind it and which is now being exposed by the world press everywhere. Two days ago, the Guardian, writing editorially has posed more sharply a question which our Government refuses to answer.

I am quoting :

"And nowhere, in all the intellectual wasteland of Yahya's Master Plan, is the central question asked? Does Pakistan exist any longer? Does unity matter any longer? What precisely have the Punjabi legions achieved? Too much blood, to many refugees have flowed since Mujib disappeared for Pakistan to be magically put back together again".

This myth about Pakistan being one State and this being their internal affair, which is a theory peddled in many countries abroad and, therefore, we must continue to give recognition to the military regime and accept its authority in Bangla Desh is something which cannot be stomached now. I hope after Yahya Khan's broadcast there may be some shifts in the thinking of some other countries too, who were probably deluding themselves about the possibilities of political settlement I do not know.

I read yesterday in papers that Dr. Karan Singh had a talk in Sophia with the Prime Minister of Bulgaria. I do not know if he has been reported correctly. He has been reported having said that this can no longer be considered as an internal matter of Pakistan. If he has really said so, I take it to be perhaps a straw in the wind but even a drowning man has to clutch on a straw. I hope our Government which has now landed itself in a situation, cannot even protect our own borders, cannot stop the flow of refugees, cannot stop American arms going to Pakistan and cannot even take any effective steps by which we are able to save our own territory and our own economy and our own borders, will now think again. And Sir, as many responsible people have

told them, the time for action has come. Therefore, I request him to please declare in this House today that the Government of Bangla Desh which represents the elected will of the people and has been recognised as such morally by the entire international community should be recognised and you should make clear that the authority of military regime over East Pakistan is not recognised by us any longer and we will not recognise that. After that the way may be opened to take such type of action as would enable us to go ahead.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : This is a subject on which every Member feels legitimately involved. Unless Members cooperate by taking only five minutes, it would not be possible to keep to the time that we decided just now. So I would request Members to be brief.

SHRI NIMBALKAR (Kolhapur) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, as if anticipating my arguments in today's debate on the subject, the Times of India has printed a few lines from Goldsmith, which I would like to quote :

"True generosity does not consist in obeying every impulse of humanity in following life passion for our guideline and impairing our circumstances by present benefactors so as to render us incapable of future ones".

The question of the recognition of Bangla Desh is not one which can be solved immediately. It is the government alone which has enough accurate information to decide the right time at which this can be done.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : What right time ?

SHRI NIMBALKAR : It is for the government to decide. In fact, I would say that the visits that our Ministers made abroad to the different capitals will enable us to reach that time as early as possible.

Here I would like to refer to two Members of Parliament who were once sitting on the Treasury Benches. One of them, the former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Shri Dinesh Singh, said that the government lost a chance which it had, and I think he meant that our government should have acted on the 25th of March. Well, I am afraid, I do not agree with this view. Firstly because if we

[Shri Nimbalkar]

had acted the way Shri Dinesh Singh wanted—actually, he did not spell out what we should have done—then it would have become a conflict, not between the West Pakistan army and the people of Bangladesh but between Pakistan and India, and that is exactly what we wanted to avoid. If only we had done that and if Pakistan had gone to the Security Council asking that India be branded as aggressor, it would not have been difficult at all for Pakistan to achieve its object and that would not have been in the interests of India. I do not understand how Ministers, who are so responsible while in office, the minute the Ministry is taken away from them, start behaving in this manner.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, it is uncharitable to make such remarks and hit ex-Ministers below the belt.

SHRI NIMBALKAR : The opposition had also been hitting us below the belt... (*interruptions*). In fact, these ultimately interruptions from the opposition show that they do not know the right time to act. That is why they are acting in this way.

The second ex-Minister whom I want to refer is Shri Krishna Menon. Any person who has stayed in London before independence of India or immediately after it will not cease to have respect for Shri Krishna Menon. I want to say, however, that Shri Krishna Menon sometimes comes to conclusions too early and then, being a very able lawyer finds ways and means and arguments to justify those conclusions. You will find that as far as China was concerned his action was one such instance. If only he had thought about it first and then come to his conclusions, I am sure we would have been saved a lot of trouble. I do not understand him when he says that we should recognise Bangladesh straightway.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : It was Nehru who did all that. But he had the capacity to find out and sacrifice a scapegoat.

SHRI NIMBALKAR : The hon. Member says that Nehru acted the wrong way. In that case, it was the duty of the gentleman now sitting on that side to advise Nehru to take to the right path... (*interruptions*)

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : It was all due to Pandit Nehru... (*interruptions*).

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : We are discussing a very vital matter in which the whole nation is concerned. If the members of the treasury benches start attacking the opposition members and their views, I think they are doing a dis-service not only to the government but even to the country, I would say.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I think the submission is very valid. It is a question in which we are all involved. There should not be any mutual criticism.

SHRI NIMBALKAR : The journeys which our Ministers have undertaken are slowly bringing in a certain amount of success for us.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Arms to Pakistan.

SHRI NIMBALKAR : Canada has refused to export arms to Pakistan. I am happy about it because if you consider the present situation when Britain is joining the Common market at this time the Commonwealth will depend on the agreements or friendships between Canada, Australia and India. Under this circumstance it is quite correct and encouraging and diplomatically we are very happy. Good news have come from Sophia as well. Bulgaria was the only nation at one time which encouraged China or took side of China at the time when there was going to be break between China and Russia. This might also open doors for us to China. I recommend to the Foreign Minister to try ways and means if he can start talks with China as well.

15.44 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARI in the Chair.]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, there are moments in the life of a nation when the sovereign Parliament has to rise above the parties and partisan politics and project the conscience of nation. That is what we did during the Chinese aggression and repeated the same during the Pakistani aggression. Today is the occasion when that history must repeat itself and the Bangla Desh issue must not be talked about in terms of party politics but looked at from the national perspective without any mud slinging either on the Treasury or Opposition benches. Let us make it explicitly clear

that the issue of Bangla Desh recognition has become more sharpened and has been focussed to a very great extent especially after the recent arms aid that has been given by the United States of America to Pakistan at a time when Bangla Desh involved in a grim struggle against Pakistan. Here again it is not an isolated event and I would like the House to realise that it is the outcome of the politics of the world powers to see that the balance of power in Asia is maintained. That is their 'Asian strategy.' It is for this reason that America wants that there should not be an open war between Pakistan and India but continuing tension between them.

It is for this very reason that America does not desire the dynamic and virulent nation like Bangla Desh to come up. Bangla Desh is a potential ally of secular India and if Bangla Desh and secular India become allies, the entire balance of power in Asian politics is likely to be completely destroyed. It is this balance of power that they want to restore.

And it is not merely the strategy of America. There was a time when Soviet Russia gave strong support to India on the Kashmir issue. But when it realised that the sympathies of Pakistan were being monopolised by America only, they gradually adopted a non-aligned attitude on the Kashmir issue and at a certain stage extended economic aid to Pakistan. In 1969 USSR also extended arms aid to Pakistan. That is how the policy of USSR was re-framed.

That being the general pattern of the politics of world powers, we cannot expect that the world powers will take up an attitude of sympathy as far as this problem of Bangla Desh recognition is concerned. From the point of view their Asian strategy the entire policy regarding Bangla Desh has been projected by the world powers. As far as the United States of America and Pakistan are concerned, their policies and relations have been clear right from the beginning.

At the Bandung Conference, for instance, the then Prime Minister of Pakistan was asked by the Chinese Prime Minister Chou En-lai, "You are a part and parcel of SEATO and NATO, which are defence treaties directed against the Communist countries. Does it mean that you are directing your strength

against China?" The Prime Minister of Pakistan then assured Chou En-lai from the floor of the Bandung Conference, "If we are a part and parcel of SEATO and NATO, it is not because we have hostility against Communist China but because we want to strengthen our position *vis-a-vis* India;" This was confirmed by the speech delivered by Mr. Suhrawardy in the National Assembly of Pakistan when he categorically said, "We are in SEATO and NATO to strengthen our position *vis-a-vis* India. When we find that this particular purpose cannot be fulfilled, we will not hesitate to give up our associations with SEATO and NATO." That was the attitude taken by them.

On this background we must try to understand the attitude that the Indian Government has taken. Unfortunately, it is a fact that our country has miserably failed to mobilise international public opinion in favour of Bangla Desh. Our embassies have failed. Of course, there is one man who has put in a Herculean task and that is Jaya Prakash Narayan. He has remained not the ambassador of the Government of India but an ambassador of our people who are in favour of recognition of Bangla Desh. Tremendous effort has been put in by Jaya Prakash Narayan. We must try to appreciate the work done by him.

So far as the world powers are concerned, let us not take an attitude that unless some world power recognises Bangla Desh, we will not take that step. I can very well understand the position of our Government. Probably the Government must be frightened that if no world power comes forward to recognise Bangla Desh and only India does it unilaterally and further if China throws her lot on the side of Pakistan, in the event of a confrontation with Pakistan, with all the world powers, including America, remaining aloof in the face of the combination of Pakistan and China there will be a great disaster. Perhaps that feeling of fear might be lurking in the mind of the Government.

But I want to recall old history. When there was the 1965 conflict with Pakistan, let us not forget that this very China had given an ultimatum to India. There was the famous story of the goats. All the ultimata were given, but in spite of the combination of China and Pakis-

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

tan we could win the war. Of course, what our jawans won on the battlefield our negotiators lost on the diplomatic table. That is the tragedy of our country.

I will conclude merely by saying that at a time when Yahya Khan has threatened that he is going to impose his puppet regime, at this particular juncture we must recognise Bangla Desh. We must take a risk. No doubt, there are risks but the Prime Minister of our country has our sharp image. In internal politics the image of our Prime Minister is the image of a 'successful political gambler'. I would like her to retain that image in international politics also. Gamble with international politics; take calculated risks; recognise Bangla Desh; generate new forces on the issue of Bangla Desh and create a new atmosphere of secularism in India. This combination of Bangla Desh and India will tilt the balance of power in Asian countries and the imperialists will not be able to use Asian land as a pawn for their international conflicts and power politics. That is the approach that has to be adopted and this risk has to be taken. I hope, that attitude will be adopted and Bangla Desh will be recognised.

In the end let me express the hope that the Leader of the House will not come forward saying that Shri Samar Guha's Resolution is very pious, his intentions are very nice and laudable, he has done a very good task and, accepting the nobility of his Resolution, we request him to withdraw the Resolution. That type of an appeal should not be made, but Bangla Desh should be recognised here and now.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY (Cooch-Bihar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the spontaneous, massive and nation-wide demand for recognition of Bangla Desh has its own logic considering India's past tradition.

The matter has been placed before the House and the arguments have been advanced that there are certain basic criteria to consider recognition of any particular State. The logistic view and the theoretical interpretation does not make a State. One hon. Member from this side of the House clearly said that there are certain pre-conditions to recognise a country.

I would like to reply to those points first. He said that there must be a Government, there must be a territory and there must be viability. I would request the hon. Member to consider these three aspects in their true and proper perspective. The emergence of Bangla Desh as a sovereign independent republic is a fact and that has definitely and undoubtedly brought about a qualitative change in the annals of history of international politics. And it simply implies that it has given a serious blow to Pakistan in its known form based on its two-nation theory. It also shows that Pakistan in its known form of its two-nation theory has met its own death in East Pakistan which is now Bangla Desh.

Out of these three conditions nothing is lacking in Bangla Desh, that there is a Government, and this Government receives habitual obedience from the majority of 90 per cent of the people of Bangla Desh, in that case how one can say it does not satisfy the conditions necessary for recognition. Then, there is a question of territory. It is known to the world that at least a smaller portion of the territory is still under the control and guidance of Bangla Desh freedom movement and the 'Mukti Fauj'.

What about other consideration? The other consideration is whether it is viable. It is true, if Bangla Desh comes into being today, as the other hon. Member just now said, if Bangla Desh is recognised the relationship between India and the Government of Bangla Desh will create such a power which will definitely one day balance the world power politics.

Considering all this, I cannot understand why these sort of arguments are being advanced.

Another hon. Member advanced an argument that it is for the Government to decide. I would like to ask the hon. Member to consider this fact. We are living in a democratic institution. I would ask him to consider whether it is the monopoly of the Government to consider in their opinion or whether it is the duty of the Government, its democratic institution, to consider the consensus of the Members of Parliament, the views of the Members of Parliament and also the views of the Indian people at large.

In regard to the international laws, that argument was also advanced. I would ask the hon. Member to consider and study those international laws. Is there any basic framework of international laws? Is there any basic law which is always static? In the field of international laws, what we find is that in the exigencies of the circumstances, considering certain views and certain developments, the international laws and conventions are going to be accepted by certain political powers. On the contrary, there are certain laws and conventions which have been accepted as dogmatic norms. If that be so, if that is the case, I would appeal to the Government at least to consider, even in the eyes of international law, even in the eyes of the logistic views or theoretical views, there is no bar to the immediate recognition of Bangla Desh.

Not only that. In the past history, in 1903, Panama was recognised by U. S. A. even before an inch of the territory was under the control of the liberation forces of Panama. It was recognised by U. S. A. Even after the first World War, several other countries in similar situations were recognised. After the Second World War, some of the Governments in exile were recognised. What was the view expressed by the Government under the leadership of Norodom in the case of Indonesia? It is quite clear.

So, considering all these aspects, that West Pakistani military wants to place Bangla Desh as a colony for several years to come, it should be the duty of this Government to recognise Bangla Desh immediately.—And remember that, while you are committed to give all solidarity, all support, to the cause of Bangla Desh movement, your immediate recognition to Bangla Desh will not only give certain relief but it will be an achievement of the freedom movement. I would appeal to this Government that it is high time that this Government recognise Bangla Desh. At least for the moment, if the Government do not like to go, in for any drastic action which the Government will have to do in future, immediate recognition should be accorded as a step towards that end....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Krishna Menon.
SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURI : If this

Government fail to do that in time, assurances will turn to hypocrisy and failures will follow..

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, please take your seat.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURI : *

MR. CHAIRMAN : No please. You are always disobeying the Chair. It will not go on record. If you do not obey the Chair, it is very difficult to control. Mr. Krishna Menon.

SHRI KRISHNA MENON (Trivandrum) : It is my intention to confine my observations within the short time there is, to the restricted question of the imperative necessity of this country recognising Bangla Desh. And this, as so many have said, is not a Party question.

If I may say so, even if it was so some days ago it can not be the point of view of the Treasury Benches to day that recognition has become substantial matter in the problem. It is now 80 or 90 days since the war began and if Government think that time stands still, it will be a great mistake.

There have been observations on various other aspects of foreign policy both this afternoon and in the previous debate. I do not propose to touch upon them. There may will be an opportunity. I am telling the Foreign Minister now, that I propose to intervene in the Foreign Affairs debate on estimates if the Speaker allows me. That, perhaps is the appropriate occasion for me to say what I have to say in regard to the foreign policy. The moment, my position with regard to other matters does not come in.

It is imperative that we should recognize Bangla Desh, especially after the last shot has been fired by the President of Pakistan when he said, 'I will call together whom I like to be his Constituent Assembly or whether.' A command performance. Well, when even 280 Members of the Labour Party in the British Parliament can call for recognition, does it not look and sound odd incongruous that those opposite, which speak loud about Socialism and want to be thought they are Socialist Party, comprises at least some who join in the demand to recognise Bangla Desh? and now recognition does not necessarily mean sending

* Not recorded.

[Shri Krishna Menon]

out an ambassador. In this particular matter anyhow, it does not necessarily mean sending out an Ambassador. That may well not arise in this matter. It is not a question of sending an envoy. It is a question of recognising the personality of a Nation that has proclaimed itself so and is one. One-tenth of the people of East Bengal are in our country at the present time.

What are we doing in order to enable them, what do we do to assist them, that they may perform their duties and tasks when they go back? I don't say that we should smuggle arms in to Bangla Desh but we must help the Bangla Desh refugees to use the opportunities to enable them to meet the onslaughts of Pakistan aggression. I would not and do not say anything in the way of suggesting that we should wage war against Pakistan or in Bangla Desh.

I have heard a great deal in this House from the Treasury Benches about the question being one of an internal affairs of Pakistan. I have heard the Foreign Minister say that or similar things on many occasions. Now, even if we say that Pakistani actions may be or may not be an "internal affairs," can the question of our recognising a nation whom we deem to be such be an external affairs? Is it some external authority that should tell us? Should we reconcile ourselves to the position that other countries must tell us? I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is our own decision, our own decision alone and no country can, therefore, have the right to threaten reprisals, or war. No time can be lost in this matter because, as situations develop new positions arise. There would be set up other "governments" in the area. I want to say deliberately, and whatever some people may say about my thinking, after I speak, I will and want to say, that our Government is laying the foundations for Imperial interests seeking to convert East Bengal into another Vietnam. When I stated this on the first occasion when the matter of Bangla Desh was raised in the Chamber, many eyebrows were raised. I say frankly, that the United States pumping in arms into Pakistan not only when our Foreign Minister was there in the United States but even after he quits and continuity is blatant evidence of American intervention.

AN HON. MEMBER: Can you restrain China?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No interference please.

SHRI KRISHNA MENON: When arms which are not available to Pakistan's militarists otherwise, personnel which are not available to them otherwise, when they are made available for suppressing a government then there develops a situation same as in Indo-China. We are gradually drifting towards that. This country at present and for few years now,—I say this with all sense of responsibility has had no foreign policy worth mentioning. We drift from day to day into greater armlessness and peril. We seek to find out as to what is our position in this affair. We are neither for recognition of Bangla Desh nor non-intervention like Britain in the Spanish Civil War, holding the ring for the aggressor. But our policy or the lack of helps and abets the aggressor. Therefore, I appeal to this Government not to be imprisoned by its own folly. That is to say because they have said repeatedly by that they will not give recognition. It is not that they say that they will not recognise, but that "the time has not come or is not appropriate." To the Government time is not by the clock; time is not by the event; then what is time by? It is only to be measured by the pace of the drift, which appears to be the policy.

16 hrs.

One-tenth of the population of Pakistan—as Shri Indrajit Gupta has said,—has been pushed out of Pakistan. This is an indirect form of aggression. When a State does not allow people to live in its own home territory but pushes them out into another in this way Pakistan does, what is it? If the people of East Bengal came when there were no difficulties there, we could have pushed them back or put them in jail here or whatever we do in those circumstances. But, we don't and cannot do that, because the internal circumstances on their homeland are such, the happenings in Pakistan are such that she has created a situation where people flee from terror with a momentum that is ever growing.

Before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this: that the large numbers of people who have come into this country should not be treated as members of a concentration camp or a nursing home or anything of that kind. They

should be enabled to attain political, physical and other qualities which would enable them to return and resist the invaders. Resistance armies can be and have been built inside refugee (and even concentration) camps and can be done without our interfering with them. There is no reason why these able-bodied people, people who have abilities, intellectuals and ex-soldiers who have come over should not themselves be largely responsible for the organisation of these forces. So that when they are able to move out, to go out they will do so as a force of liberation.

We constantly here words and expressions used such as 'conditions must be created for them to return.' Who is going to create those conditions? Will it be the Government of Pakistan or the Imperialist powers of the world or the United Nations, which had made a mess of a similar matter in the Congo? What I say does not mean that the machinery of international cooperation should not be used. The personnel that has come over from East Bengal should be treated in such a way that both politically, mentally and in physical strength, they will be able to go back in order to add to the forces of resistance. That is what the position is which I would like to take at the present time. I do not wish to elaborate this further.

And, if this is done, he would have contributed somewhat to the victory of the forces for Liberation.

I also want to say that we are debating a Private Members' Motion. Nobody would have thought we are going to say anything wonderful or new today. The fact is this that even since we discussed this issue 3 or 4 days ago, new circumstances have arisen! We have also had visitors from other countries who have returned here from East Bengal. I believe the Prime Minister herself has also said, directly, or indirectly, there is no question of anybody thinking that Pakistan can go back to East Bengal. If they can say that Pakistan can not go back, that is to say, they think that Pakistan Government will not be there, again, what is the objection and what is the impediment to recognition of the revolutionary authority that is there? A vacuum has been created by our diplomats being displaced by Pakistan. It is not right that whatever is there, by way of factual existence should be

recognised. Recognition is only of what in fact exists.

It is pathetic that far more information of a factual character has been published in the British, American or French papers than ours. The Government relies on these newspaper items themselves and when they don't want to pursue the implications of the Reports they put a mystery around the whole issue and say this may not say anything about it for Government are doing... etc.

Finally, I repeat that this debate is on a Private Members' Motion. I hope the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs who is the chief whip of the ruling party would think it right not to put the whips on. The present issue is a matter wherein members should exercise their conscience and allow their votes be cast accordingly. This is far too important a matter to be ruled by party decisions alone. There is nothing lost, because Government is not going to fall even if this motion is carried. So, I appeal to Government not to put the whips on. Let there be a free vote so that the world might know what people in India think.

Let our friends opposite belong to the class of people about whom a seventeenth century philosopher said :

"Ignorance leadeth a man into a party ;
Shame preventeth him from leaving it."

Let that not be the position.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Not only ignorance.

SHRI KRISHNA MENON : Therefore, I hope, in this Parliament, with its traditions, it is possible on an occasion of this kind, where the vote is only a recommendation, it may express its will unhampered by a whip. I do hope that whips will not be put on and a free vote will be allowed. That would itself be a proclamation of the support of our democracy.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI (Calcutta South) : The discussion on the resolution on Bangla Desh has already reached a mature stage after the expression of views by many Member of the House. Many peculiar ideas also have been expressed by Members of our party and also by Members from the other side, but I do not like to go into the details of those ideas.

[Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsi]

I would like to express my views on two main aspects. The Government of India have already denounced the military junta and the military government headed by Yahya Khan. Thereby we have shown enough courage and to the world that we are not relying on any atomic power or military power but on the power of humanity. If we have had the courage and capacity to denounce and condemn the action of Yahya Khan junta on the patriotic people of Bangla Desh and we have also had the capacity to denounce the Nixon Government for the arms shipments that they have made to Pakistan, then surely we must have the courage based on humanity and we must have the capacity immediately to recognise or accept Sheikh Mujibur Rehman as the unquestioned leader of Bangla Desh and the head of government of the people of Bangla Desh.

Many Members have somewhat tried to confuse the issue. I have been seeing this for a long time. Many members have urged the sitting of the criteria of international law first so that we may decide whether it is fit and whether the time has matured to recognise Bangla Desh or not. I do not know why we should go in for those criteria. So far as I am concerned, I submit that democracy stands only on the people's verdict or the verdict of the electorate and on the choice of the representatives of the people by the people. 98 per cent of the representatives of the people of Bangla Desh have been returned in the elections not because of any favour of Yahya Khan or any other source of international power but through the expressed will of the people of Bangla Desh at the time of elections. Therefore, what is the harm in our recognising Bangla Desh immediately? We should recognise them immediately.

The Government of India have committed themselves many times before in this House and they have also committed themselves to the statement that the problem of the evacuees has become India's internal problem and they have also committed in the House that it is not possible for India to go on carrying the burden of expenditure on these evacuees for long, and, therefore, they should be the responsibility of the international community. In spite of all this, we are finding the evacuees are pouring into our country day after day, and

from the reports that pour in we find that the elected representatives of the Awami League are still in the evacuees' camps on the border facing the bayonet of the military junta of Yahya Khan. Still, we are considering the matter of recognition only. How long are we to continue like this?

If India has the courage still to stand on the power of humanity, let alone the question of international support coming in or not coming in, India should recognise Bangla Desh in spite of all the difficulties, and for this decision, the people of India would all be responsible. If Government are not able to recognise Bangla Desh, they should categorically come forward and say to the international powers that they are not able to do so. What is the point in going on prolonging the consideration for a long time? What is the point merely expressing sympathy and support to the struggle, sympathy to the evacuees and having discussions with international powers? After all, what have we got from the international powers? After the visit of our great Foreign Minister to the USA, how has the USA acted? Without realising the gravity and the reality of the problem of Bangla Desh, the US Government has gone on sending shipments of military hardware to Pakistan. Again, what is the attitude that the UK Government which is the head of the communal power has taken? Have they made any single political statement on the reality of the problem? Apart from sending a delegation of British Members of Parliament, have they expressed anything on the political aspect of the matter? Again, take the USSR? Of course, they are sending some aid and other things, but are they taking any serious step on the political objectives? I am sorry to say that even a progressive State like the Soviet Union has not yet taken any political step in regard to the reality of the problem of Bangla Desh. In the statement to the 24th Congress of the Soviet Union, I was trying to find a single line which would be in sympathetic tune with the aspirations of the people of Bangla Desh, but I could not see any. All the international powers are only wanting to see how India is dancing, in which direction it is moving its steps. If India dances towards Kashmir, they will say that the danger of America is there. If India dances towards NEFA, they will say that the danger

of China is there. But I find that both America and China have already made a trap in the Bangla Desh problem and they want that this should be India's own problem and India should die in it. If we have the capacity in this crisis of history, let the Government of India and the Members of this House commit themselves to this point. Either we stand by the power of humanity and recognise the electorate and the people of Bangla Desh or we categorically say that we are not doing it because still, inspite of the non-aligned forces, we are banking for something from America or the USSR.

So, I support the resolution because the time is ripe for recognition. If we fail to grant it, the younger generation of Bangla Desh, those who are spending their time in the evacuee camps will curse the history of India, the black pages that are being written to carve their fate. They are not ready to tolerate it, they are not ready to carry the black pages of Indian history with the glorious fate and commitment of their people.

श्री जगन्नाथ चट्टो (नागापुर) : महापति महोदय, बंगला देश का सवाल आज केवल बंगला देश का नहीं, संसार का नहीं, हमारे राष्ट्र का एक महम सवाल हो बैठा है। इन्सानियत के तौर पर बंगला देश को मान्यता देनी चाहिए,। इंसानियत के तौर पर पाकिस्तानी आक्रमण का निषेध करना चाहिए, यही हमारे देश की भूमिका रहनी है। लेकिन जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति है और इस अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति में जो आज के हालात जाहिर हुए हैं वह बहुत ही भयानक हैं। बंगला देश का सवाल न तो पार्टी इन पावर का सवाल है, और न यह अपोजीशन का सवाल है बल्कि यह सारा सवाल आज हमारे देश का सवाल है, और हम सब लोगों का सवाल है। इस भूमिका के ऊपर बंगला देश के सवाल पर सारा ही देश एक साथ खड़ा है। ऐसी अवस्था में हमारे लिए यही देखनी बहुत जरूरी है कि हमारी विदेश नीति क्या है और आज हमारी विदेश नीति कहां जा रही है? हम देखते हैं कि आज

हमारी विदेश नीति का दिवाला निकल गया है। बदकिस्मती से, हम को कहना पड़ता है कि संसार में आज हमारा कोई मित्र नहीं रहा है। आज कोई भी हमारा दोस्त नहीं है। यह बात सही है कि भिखारी का कोई दोस्त नहीं होता। आज हमारा देश एक भिखारी देश बनकर संसार के सामने खड़ा है। ऐसी अवस्था में हमारा कोई दोस्त नहीं है। दूर की बात छोड़िये, नेपाल भी आज हमारा दोस्त नहीं है। बर्मा भी आज हमारा नजदीक का दोस्त नहीं है। सोलोन भी हमारा नजदीक का दोस्त नहीं है। इतना ही नहीं बल्कि हमारे देश में भी ऐसी कुछ शक्तियां हैं जोकि हमारी नहीं है। ऐसी अवस्था में हमारी विदेश नीति किधर जा रही है, कौन सी कर्वेंट पर हम गिर रहे हैं, इस बात को भी हमें देखना चाहिए। आज चाइना ने बंगला देश को मान्यता न देकर, मैं समझता हूं हमारे ऊपर बड़ा अहसान किया है। यदि चाइना बंगला देश को मान्यता दे देता तो, हम कहीं के न रहते। संसार में हमारा कोई स्थान नहीं होता। आज हमारी खुदाकिस्मती से चाइना ने बंगला देश को मान्यता नहीं दी है। आज एक ऐसा सवाल हमारे सामने खड़ा है कि हम जायें तो कहां जायें। पाकिस्तान से हम आज तक बान करते आये, चाइना से हमारी लड़ाई हुई और हममें भी कोई शक नहीं कि सदियों से चाइना और भारत दो दोस्त रहे हैं भाई रहे हैं, लेकिन आज ऐसी अवस्था आई है कि फिर से हमको बंगला देश के सवाल पर चाइना से बात करनी चाहिए। संसार के किनारे ही देशों में हमारे प्रतिनिधि होकर आये हैं, इसलिए आज चाइना से बात करने के लिए हमें जरूर तैयार रहना चाहिए ताकि बंगला देश के सवाल पर चाइना हमसे सहमत हो सके। आज जो बर्बरतापूर्ण आक्रमण बंगला देश पर हुए हैं, जहां इंसानियत को कुचल दिया गया है, मरोड़ दिया गया है और बच्चे पीस दिये जा रहे हैं, ऐसी अवस्था में हम बंगला देश के पीछे खड़े हैं, हमारी प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी के पीछे इस मसले

[श्री जांबुवत घोटे]

पर सारा देश एक होकर खड़ा है, वह मसाल लेकर आये बड़ रही है—ऐसी तस्वीर हम सामने रखें और बंगला देश को मान्यता देने में अब कोई हिचकिचाहट नहीं होनी चाहिए, कोई भी वक्त नहीं गवाना चाहिए क्योंकि अब ऐसा वक्त हमारे ऊपर आ गया है कि बाद में हम फिर कहीं के नहीं रहेंगे और हम को कहीं का सहाय नहीं रहेगा, किसी का आसरा नहीं रहेगा और फिर हमको पछताना पड़ेगा केवल यही कहने को रह जायेगा।

सब कुछ लुटा के होग में आये तो क्या किया।

श्री शशि शूषण (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जिस स्थिति से आज हमारा राष्ट्र गुजर रहा है उसमें हमारे सदस्यों को बहुत संयत भाषा में इस स्थिति को लोगों के सामने रखना चाहिए। कुछ लोग है संसार जिनको दिन में भी बिल्कुल अंधेरा नजर आता है, चारों तरफ निराशा ही निराशा नजर आती है कि संसार में उनका कोई नहीं है और वह बिल्कुल डूब रहे हैं। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि जब हम कोई ऐतिहासिक कदम उठाने के लिए तत्पर हों उस समय इस प्रकार मायूसी की बातें करना देश को पीछे ले जाना है। मैं नहीं समझता कि संसार में हमारा कोई साथी नहीं है। जहाँ भी दुनिया में प्रगतिशील ताकतें हैं जो समाजवाद के लिए लड़ रही हैं वह आज हमारे साथ है। बंगला देश के मेम्बर पार्लमेंट के साथ मुझे कई समाजवादी देशों में जाने का मौका मिला है। वहाँ की जनता ने सहयोग दिया और वहाँ की सरकारों ने भी सहयोग तथा समर्थन दिया। यह कभी नहीं होता कि दो तीन महीने में ही किसी इन्कलाब को सारा संसार रिकग्नाइज कर ले। हमने भी आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी थी लेकिन दुनिया ने कितने दिन के बाद रिकग्नाइज किया? वियतनाम में तीन साल के बाद रिकग्नाइज किया। इसलिए यह बात कहना कि सारी दुनिया हमारे साथ नहीं है—मैं इस बात को नहीं मानता।

दुनियां की जो लड़ाकू ताकतें हैं, जो संघर्षशील ताकतें हैं, जो साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ, ताकतें हैं वह चाहे लैटिन अमरीका में हों या कहीं और—और अमरीका के अन्दर भी जो ताकतें हैं जो कि साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ लड़ रही हैं, पूर्वी एशिया में युद्ध पर जो सैनिक और हथियार भेजे जाते हैं उसके खिलाफ वहाँ के नौजवान गोलियां खा रहे हैं, लोगों को फांसी पर चढ़ाया जा रहा है—वे लोग आज हमारे साथ हैं और बंगला देश के नौजवानों के साथ हैं जोकि आज वहाँ पर शहादत दे रहे हैं। बंगला देश के लोगों ने आजादी के लिए जो प्रण लिया है, संसार की कोई ताकत भी अब उनको गुलाब नहीं बना सकती है। उनका एक एक नौजवान आज संघर्षशील है। आज हमारे ऊपर बड़ी जिम्मेदारी आई है। जो दुनिया की प्रगतिशील ताकतें हैं वे हमको मदद कर रही है उनके विश्वास पर तथा हम देश के सफल नेतृत्व पर तथा जितने हमारे प्रगतिशील दल हैं, तथा एक एक मेम्बर का विश्वास ही कि हमें बंगला देश को पूरा पूरा सहयोग देना चाहिए और मदद करनी चाहिए मफलता निश्चित है।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हमने उनको, बंगला देश भी सरकार की सहायता न दी होती वे दस दिन तक भी खड़े नहीं रह सकते थे। अगर उनको किसी पर विश्वास है तो वह महान यह देश है क्योंकि इस देश के 50 करोड़ देशवासियों ने दिल में उनको मान्यता दी है। संसार में किसी देश का इतनी बड़ी हृदय में मान्यता कभी नहीं मिली और अब सरकार की भी मान्यता देना चाहिए। हम इस बात के पक्ष में थे कि बंगला देश की जनता जिसने हथियार उठाये है, जिस तरह से वह लड़ रही है उसको भी अपने कदमों पर आगे बढ़ना चाहिए और हमें उनको मदद करनी चाहिए। मैं सरकार से प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि 9 अगस्त आने वाला है, तब तक अगर हम किसी निर्णय पर नहीं पहुँचते तो मैं इस बात को सदन में कहता हूँ कि मुझे चाह

आमरण अनशन करना पड़े, बंगला देश को समर्थन देने, मान्यता देने के लिए उस दिन सारे देश में नौजवान यह व्रत लेंगे बंगला देश की स्वाधीनता का। और तब तक जो बंगला देश के नौजवान तैयारी कर रहे हैं लड़ने के लिए उनको जो सहायता देश में बालंद्री तौर पर दी जा रही है उसको और मजबूत करना चाहिए। बस मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ।

श्री फूल चन्द बर्म (उज्जैन) : सभापति जी, मैं आपका आभारी हूँ कि आपने मुझे समय दिया। जहाँ तक बंगला देश की समस्या का सवाल है यह समस्या हमारे देश के लिये जीवन भरण का प्रश्न बन चुकी है। मैं नहीं समझ पा रहा हूँ कि हमारी सरकार इतनी बड़ी समस्या को हल करने के लिये, जो उसका हल है उसको निर्णायक ढंग से क्यों नहीं प्रस्तुत कर पा रही है। मैं मानता हूँ कि यदि हमारी सरकार ने बंगला देश को मान्यता नहीं दी तो इसका मतलब यह है कि आजादी के बाद यदि कोई सबने बड़ी भूल हमसे होगी तो वह यही होगी।

जहाँ तक बंगला देश का सवाल है आज जो वहाँ पर भीषण नरसंहार हो रहा है वह हमारी शताब्दी का सबसे बड़ा नरसंहार है। करीब 70,80 लाख लोग हमारे यहाँ आ चुके हैं। इनका आना जहाँ हमारे आर्थिक तन्त्र को बिगाड़ने वाला है, हमारी योजनाओं का रूप बिगाड़ने वाला है, वहीं साथ ही साथ ला एंड आर्डर की पोजीशन को भी खराब कर रहा है क्योंकि बंगला देश से आने वाले लोगों में बहुत से जासूस भी आ गये हैं। अभी अभी कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा कि ब्रिटेन की संसद् के अन्दर 216 माननीय सदस्यों ने बंगला देश को मान्यता देने का प्रस्ताव पेश किया है। मुझे दुःख है कि क्यों हमारी सरकार बंगला देश को मान्यता देने के लिये अग्रसर नहीं हो रही है ?

जहाँ तक बंगला देश और भारत का सवाल है, हमारा उससे चौली-दामन का संबंध

है क्योंकि ये वही भाई बन्धु हैं जो देश विभाजन के समय वहाँ गये थे। आज बंग बन्धु मुजीबुर्रहमान जनरल याह्या खान की कैद में हैं, उन्हें छुड़ाने के लिये सरकार ने कुछ नहीं किया।

जहाँ तक ब्रिटेन और अमरीका का सवाल है वह दोहरी नीति हमारे साथ अपना रहे हैं। एक ओर तो अमरीका पाकिस्तान को अस्त्र शस्त्र दे रहा है और दूसरी ओर हमारी पीठ थप थपाता है। इसी तरह से ब्रिटेन भी अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से पाकिस्तान को सहायता दे रहा है। आज के काल अटेंशन के माध्यम से हम कह सकते हैं कि ब्रिटेन हमारे सूती व्यापार को ठप्प करना चाहता है और इस प्रकार से अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से पाकिस्तान का समर्थन कर रहा है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं मंत्री जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि अब समय आ गया है कि इसमें बिल्कुल देर नहीं करनी चाहिए और हमें बंगला देश को मान्यता देने के लिये अग्रसर होना चाहिये।

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN (Madras South) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I consider that we have lost in war which we did not fight. It is an unfought war India has lost to Pakistan. Otherwise, how can we explain the terrific burden of eight million refugees on us? As Mr. Kriahna Menon has pointed out, one-tenth of the population of East Pakistan is living with us. Now, we are holding the baby without our knowing how it came about. We never expected such a situation when this rising passed a resolution in support of the up-House in East Bengal. We were in a jubilant mood then. We thought Bangla Desh would be a reality sooner than later. But we failed to know that was happening in Bangla Desh. We failed to give advice in time to our friends in Bangla Desh. We failed to guide even the Indian newspapers and Indian public opinion because in their over enthusiasm they published encouraging news.

Six days after the start of the genocide, our Parliament passed a unanimous resolution in

[Shri Murasoli Maran]

support of the historic upsurge of the 75 million people of Bangla Desh, but still we are to recognise it. Whatever it may be, we could have changed the history of this sub-continent. We could have saved millions of lives and homes. We did not do what was wanted. "Masterly inactivity" would be the correct expression to describe our attitude.

Finally, we felt the pinch of it with the onward march of the refugees. When we felt that we could not carry on without sufficient strain on our economy, we are sending one after another to all world capitals. There was a time when the entire world was looking to New Delhi for leadership. Then we were the leader of non-aligned group. Now we have lost that initiative, derive and leadership. As Mr. Menon pointed out, what is wanted now is a foreign policy. Our virile foreign policy is as dead as the students of the Dacca University. The touch stone of a foreign policy is to find out whether it would help our national interest.

How are we going to solve the refugees problem? What happened to the refugees of Palestine? Still that problem could not be solved. The question asked by the common man in street is how are you going to solve the refugee problem? The common man in the street tells us, "If you do not have a Bangladesh, if Bangladesh does not have a geographic territory, then it is the duty of India to create one". Israel marched upto the desert of Senai. China is still occupying thousand of square miles of our territory. The super powers will understand only if we speak in language which is understood by them. President Nixon and Mr. Rogers are not prepared to call murder by its proper name. When Tajuddin Ahmed declared the independence of Bangladesh, he said :

"Every day this recognition and assistance is delayed a thousand lives are lost and more of Bangladesh's vital assets are destroyed."

Not only the interests of Bangladesh but the interests of India will be affected. We do not want war, but events may derive us to that. That is what Shri Jayaprakash Narain said in America. The option of choosing the time and place will be left to our enemy. That is a pitiable situation. Today's *Indian*

Express carries a news item saying that Mujibur Rehman is critically ill at a hospital in Rawalpindi. Tomorrow a news may come from the army headquarters of Pakistan that Mujibur Rehman is improving. Day after tomorrow, another news will come that suddenly he developed heart attack and lost his life. That was what happened to Lumumba in Congo. The same thing may be repeated and Mujibur Rehman may be killed. The Government should do what all it can to save his life. Mr. Rogers is coming. Before that, Government should act. Recognition alone will not solve the problem. What is important is the follow-up action after recognition. I hope the Government will spell out its programme today.

श्री राम नारायण शर्मा (धनबाद) : सभापति जी, यह बंगला देश का जो प्रश्न है यह आज अपने मुल्क के सामने जीवन मौत का प्रश्न है। मैं इसलिये जीवन मौत का प्रश्न कहता हूँ कि इसके ऊपर जो पहला कदम हमारा हुआ उस कदम ने हमारे मुल्क में आज बंगला देश के 10 प्रतिशत लोगों को आमंत्रित करके ला दिया है, और न मालूम और कितने प्रतिशत लोग आयेंगे। तो ऐसी स्थिति में आज जो हम खर्च करते हैं दूसरे मुल्कों की तरफ भी नजर रखते हुए और यह आशा रखते हुए कि कोई हमारी मदद को आयेगा तो जिस तरह की मदद मिल रही है उसको देखने से यह जाहिर होता है मदद नहीं के बराबर ही है और आपको अपने कदम पर खड़ा होना है। मैं यह देखता हूँ कि आज जो 70 लाख लोग अपने मुल्क में पहुंच गये हैं अगर उनके ऊपर आप चार, पांच ६० भी खर्च करें तो वह तीन करोड़ ६० प्रतिदिन के हिसाब से होता है। अगर आप साल का बजट देखेंगे तो वह हजारों करोड़ खपे जाता है और इसी तरह से जो हमारा रख रहा, तो हमारे खर्च और बढ़ेंगे। हमारे देश के सारे साधन उसी तरफ लगे हुए हैं, सारे नेताओं का ध्यान उसी तरफ लगा हुआ है, सारे मुल्क का ध्यान उसी तरफ लगा हुआ है और यह समस्या कितनी बड़ी होने वाली है, इसका कोई ठिकाना नहीं है।

मेरी सुख्ख राय में इसका समाधान एक ही है। अब आपको दूसरे मुल्कों की तरफ देखने की जरूरत नहीं है और अब आपको अकेले चलने का फैसला लेना है। अब तक आप दूसरे मुल्कों की तरफ ही देखते रहे हैं। मेरा कहना यह है कि अगर वे आपकी सहायता को आवें तो आवें। अगर वे आपकी सहायता को नहीं आते हैं तो भी आपको अपना फैसला लेकर चलना है और वह फैसला आप का सिर्फ मान्यता देने के लिए ही नहीं होना चाहिए बल्कि इसका भी फैसला होना चाहिए कि बंगला देश पर बंगला देश के रहने वालों की हकूमत हो, बाहर की हकूमत बन्द हो और उसके लिये आपको इस तरह की स्थिति पैदा करनी होगी कि वहां से आये हुए लोगों को ट्रेनिंग देकर ही नहीं बल्कि आवश्यकता पड़े तो अपने मुल्क के भी फौजी जवानों को भेजकर, वहां के लोगों को मुक्त करना होगा।

सभापति जी, मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार बोर्डर को सीन करे। आज भी जो हजारों हजार की संख्या में लोग आते हैं उनको आने न देकर हम वही से उनको हथियार देकर लौटावे और इस तरह की परिस्थिति पैदा करें कि हम उनको न केवल हथियार ही दें बल्कि जरूरत पड़े तो रसद आदि से भी उनकी सहायता करें।

श्री इश्वरीत गुप्त : बूढ़े, बच्चों को तो आने दें।

श्री राम नारायण शर्मा : तो सभापति महोदय, मैं यह समझता हूँ कि मेरी राय में इस समस्या का समाधान एक ही है। अगर इस तरह की दुसमुख नीति हमारी चलती रहेगी, तो हमारा और भी खर्चा बढ़ेगा और हम अपने ऊपर मुसीबत लाने जा रहे हैं और सारी दुनिया के सामने, सारी दुनिया की नजरों में हो सकता है कि जो हैसियत हमारी पहले थी वह न रहे। इसलिए मैं सरकार से कहना चाहूंगा कि वह इस पर जल्द निर्णय ले।

PROF. S. L. SAKSENA (Maharajganj) : Sir, I have very great respect for our Prime Minister. She is known for her bravery and quick decision. But on this occasion her indecision and inaction has pained me very greatly. She missed the bus in the 1st week of April. At that time about a million people had been killed from 25th March to 1st April and the entire international press community which had been repelled from Dacca just then, had condemned the killings. If only we had then extended recognition to Bangladesh and sent our troops on a mission of mercy into that country, all this subsequent tragedy could have been avoided. Pakistani troops were then small in number and could have been easily defeated at that time. In that case today there would have been a Sovereign Independent Republic of Bangladesh with full authority and there would have been no problem. But we missed the bus at that time.

Now we are trying our best to move the world conscience. But we have not succeeded. Everybody is selfish. After the broadcast by Yahya Khan, I hope our Prime Minister will not allow the name of country to be beamirched like that, be it China, Pakistan or any other power. We have showed our strength during the Pakistan conflict. I hope our government will immediately send our troops on a mission of mercy to stop the genocide and the daily massacre in Bangladesh. We should not be afraid of China and Pakistan whom we defeated in 1965. Then there are millions of brave Patriotic youngmen among refugees from Bangladesh. We should train these youngmen and send them to fight their country by giving them arms. I am sure victory shall be ours and then everybody will support us, because nobody supports a coward nation. I, therefore, hope that we shall not be put in the list of cowards. The time has come to act and there is no other way. The Members on the Congress side are also of this opinion. I hope, the whole nation is of this very opinion. Therefore, I wish the Prime Minister to take courage and to announce the decision that we are going to recognise Bangla desh.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO (Karimnagar) : I am very sorry that this Government has miserably failed to do its duty. On 31st March this House had passed a unanimous Resolution asking this

[Shri M. Satyanarayan Rao]

Government to act quickly. But it has failed. It has no right to rule this country. One Member was saying because there was no territory or population so we cannot recognise. If that is the position then why then this Government mention Bangla Desh instead of East Pakistan. This Government has no business to call it Bangla Desh. When it calls Bangla Desh then it is its duty to recognise. Sir, only then we act when we are strong. Had we acted quickly, given military aid or sent our military to Bangla Desh then the whole world would have recognised that country. There is a saying : nothing succeeds like success. It is most unfortunate. The Foreign Minister happens to be a Sardar. He must be bold enough. Being a Sardar he could have taken the decision. We must take the decision here and now that we are going to recognise Bangla Desh otherwise all the opposition parties are going to give a call to the Indian people not to recognise this Government. I request to Sardar Swaran Singh to recognise Bangla Desh immediately otherwise you will be creating so many problems for us. We are going to spend crores of rupees on these people when we are not in a position to feed our own people. Please at least consider this matter and recognise Bangla Desh. Not only recognise Bangla Desh but send our Army there to rehabilitate the victims of this genocide.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, on an issue like this, this type of statement to say the least does not become the opposition. On an issue like this I do not want to enter into a debate of the type by giving reasons as to why at the present stage it is not possible for us to recognise Bangla Desh. We have stated this position quite clearly and I would request the hon. Members that they should also exercise some restraint in a matter like this.

So far as international affairs are concerned that is a different matter altogether. But this is an internal matter and we should not cause greater complications in this matter of international importance. If you do not want to exercise restraint, I can only say that this is not in our overall national interest. I am fully convinced of that.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : You do not

admit any change in the circumstances after President Yahya Khan's broadcast ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I will give my comments upon President Yahya Khan's statement and will also touch upon other aspects.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Why should he sermonise ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am not sermonising but, if I may ask in all humility and earnestness, why is he asking me to do or not to do a particular thing ? I do not want to sermonise ; this is not my way. But I would like hon. Members to think seriously that the type of consensus that we have been trying to build on an issue like this for realising our national objective should not be spoiled by indulging in this type of an attitude which does not at all help the cause for the realisation of which all of us should be united. If you use this type of an argument and try to start with calling upon me to do or not to do a thing of that nature, I am sure that you are losing the concentrated attention which all of us devote for realising that objective and we are unnecessarily wasting our energy on something which to my mind is peripheral.

The main objective which we have set before us is contained in our Resolution which we all unanimously adopted, in which we said that we support and have every sympathy for the cause of freedom in which the people of Bangla Desh are engaged. We are also unanimously pledged to support that cause. As to what should be done in pursuance of that Resolution, is a matter about which there can be a difference of opinion. But we should try to resolve that and should try to concentrate our attention for realising that objective, rather than on insisting that a particular step at a particular stage is the only way to resolve that problem. This is the crux of the entire matter.

Coming to the statement that President Yahya Khan has made, to a certain extent I had already touched upon certain features which I suspected might be contained in the statement that was expected to be made by President Yahya Khan. But I must say clearly that the statement that President Yahya Khan has made has created a situation where this action of President Yahya Khan alone will be mainly responsible for strengthening the resolve

of the people of Bangla Desh to carry on their determined struggle for their freedom and for getting rid of the military strangle-hold which the military regime of Pakistan had been trying to perpetuate.

PROF. S. L. SAKSENA : Without your help ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : If you examine that statement, the conclusion is irresistible that for all times to come he has negated any chance of reversion to the democratic way of life. Instead of the elected members of the Pakistan National Assembly being entrusted with the task of framing the Constitution, some experts will frame the Constitution. There are also several other highly obnoxious features in that statement which clearly show that a determined bid has been made by the military regime to perpetuate their own hold and the process of democratic emergence upon which the country, it appeared, had embarked after the last elections, which gave such outstanding victory to the Awami League led by Sheikh Mujibur Rehman, has been completely negated by the statement that President Yahya Khan has made.

The entire philosophy behind the election to the Constituent Assembly was that the elected representatives will have the right to frame their Constitution. Now, that is taken away from them. Then, again, what is most surprising is that the military regime will decide as to who loses the elective post. It is most surprising that the administration has arrogated to themselves the right to declare that a particular party or a particular individual has indulged in such activity which in their judgment has created a situation where the party would lose its recognition or the elected member will lose his seat. There cannot be any more cruel joke to their profession of still reverting to a democratic way of life if this power is sought to be assumed, as President Yahya Khan has tried to assume, by making the statement that the administration will decide as to who will remain a member or who will lose his membership because, they say, if any party is guilty of what they describe as indulging in secessionist activity, then they will decide as to whether they still retain the right to be the members of the National Assembly.

This is, to say the least, the complete negation of the democratic idea. There is another

highly unsatisfactory feature of the statement according to which it is said that regional parties as such may be called upon not to participate in the process of Constitution making or even in the matter of political functioning unless they are parties which have got branches all over the country. This is something which, I think, cuts at the root of any democratic process. There are far-reaching implications of this not only for Bangla Desh but even for different constituents in West Pakistan itself. This might mean that a party, for instance, consisting of Baluchis to respond to the aspirations of Baluchi people or a party which might try to project the aspirations of the people of North West Frontier Province can also, on this basis, be said to be not national parties but regional parties which can be superseded and their political activities curbed by depriving them of the right to contest National Assembly seats.

These are some of the features which are so patently objectionable judged by the standards of democratic ideals that any hope still left that there could be a possibility of the restoration of democratic rights of the people which, according to us, means entrusting the responsibility of administration to the elected representatives led by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, has been dashed to the ground.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : What are you going to do now ?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Have all your hopes gone now ? Have you still any hope of a political solution ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I never entertain the type of hopes which he wants me to say that I have got them.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : You tell us what are your hopes.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : We have to realize the implications of it. This means that this will be a long fierce struggle in which the people of Bangla Desh will have to carry on their fight and, in this struggle, according to the resolution unanimously adopted by Parliament, we are pledged to extend all possible sympathy and support to them.

So far as the question of recognition is concerned, I would like to say that this is a pro-

[Shri Swaran Singh]

position about which we do not take a negative view. We have always said that we are not opposed to recognition. This is a matter which is constantly under review.

DR. RANEN SEN (Barasat) : How long ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : And I would like to say that at the appropriate time if we find it is necessary to recognise, we will certainly recognise Bangla Desh. So at the present stage, I would appeal to the hon. Members that some new factors have also been introduced and we have to review our attitude in view of the completely negative statement that has been made by President Yahya Khan... (Interruptions). It will not be proper to hustle us to take a view. When we say that we are not opposed to recognition, it will not be quite proper for those who may feel strongly about our going ahead now and here with recognition to hustle us. They should realise that this is something upon which we do not take a negative attitude. We can certainly examine it, re-examine it and keep the position under review. So far as our efforts to help or support those who are engaged in the struggle, that is already contained in the resolution which has been unanimously adopted by this House.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : So, the only positive thing that remains is your continued recognition of Yahya Khan's authority in Bangla Desh. Bangla Desh means you are recognising them. You are recognising every thing that they are doing there.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Don't ask me to make a categorical statement which may not turn out to be...

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Why not ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Let the people of this country know what you are.

MR. CHAIRMAN : No personal aspersions please... (Interruptions).

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I have nothing against him personally, Sir... (Interruptions).

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I would only say that this type of thing does not at all appeal to me and it does not move me either.

I don't agree with that type of shouting.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : We don't care for you. You are Mr. Bhutto's friend. You are Yahya Khan's friend...*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Nothing of what Mr. Banerjee says will go on record. I appeal to you not to interfere... You are a very old parliamentarian. You should not interfere like this so often.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Sir, I won't like to prolong the debate. I want to say very clearly that at the present stage the stand of the Government—it is not my personal stand—is that the conditions are not at the moment either proper or—wise for granting recognition. We will keep this matter under review and we will take a decision at the appropriate time. This is our stand and I hope it will be appreciated and I request Mr. Samar Guha not to divide the House and the country on this issue because there is no disagreement on the substance and it should not be lost in these slogans and counter slogans in which I have a fear that the real problem will miss us and we will be involved in this type of alinging match which I do not want to participate in because I know more than the hon. Members the vital issues involved, the delicacy and also the risk. ... (Interruptions). It is, therefore, our responsibility...

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Say something about America. Why don't you say against your masters ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Let us not confuse one issue with the other.

So far as the question of arms supply is concerned, (Interruptions). I have already registered my strongest protest. (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : I will not allow anybody to get up as he likes. I am permitting hon. Mr. Indrajit Gupta to put a question. Mr. Bede, I am not allowing you. This is not the way of conducting the House.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Before the hon. Minister sits down, I would like to ask him to tell us, to give us, an assurance that this kind of reply which he is giving, whether we consider it rightly or wrongly, is

*Not recorded.

thoroughly evasive, is not being influenced by the fact that President Nixon's envoy, special envoy, Mr. Kissinger, is about to descend upon us. We should not be influenced by his visits. We should speak out boldly, in the interest of our country.

SHRI KRISHNA MENON : Before the Minister concludes his reply, would he say about this? He said, we should not be divided by slogans. Is the matter of recognition merely a slogan and not a matter of substance? Demands for international recognition is not a matter of slogan.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN : We have read in the papers that Shri Mujibur Rehman is critically ill...

MR. CHAIRMAN : No more questions.

SHRI SEZHIAN (Kumbakonam) : Shri Mujibur Rehman is reported to be critically ill. This is their usual practice. Whenever they want to do away with the life of a certain leader they may do this. Today it is said, Mujibur Rehman is ill. Tomorrow they may say, he is in critical condition. Day after tomorrow it may be reported that he is dead. I want to know what Government is doing in this regard.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I would like to say that this is the policy which we have been following which I have just outlined and we have all along kept the House informed both here and also in the course of the informal discussions with the leaders of the Opposition. I think it is not proper to suggest that this has got anything to do with the visit to India of the Adviser to President Nixon. That has nothing to do with this. There is no relation whatsoever. I would request the hon. Member not to see things which may not be there at all. I do not know what Mr. Krishna Menon wanted when he said he wanted to distinguish the slogan from the substance.

SHRI KRISHNA MENON : I said; you say the demand is one of slogan. I wanted to know whether you consider the demand for recognition as slogan or a vital matter which you have to consider. That is all I asked.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : On that I think I made the position quite clear and that is the Government position, that we are not

opposed to recognition; therefore, on this substantive question there is no difference. The difference is to the timing of it, when it should be done. So far as the question of recognition is concerned, it is not a question of slogan. What I said was with respect to the slinging match that was going on. The difference is only of timing when the circumstances are ripe for it. It is a substantive question. Therefore, I said, when there is hardly any difference between the two points, the House should not be divided on an issue like this when there is so little difference of opinion on the substantive question. That is what I wanted to convey.

About the last question, I fully share the concern expressed about the health of Sheikh Mujibur Rehman. In fact, on this issue Prime Minister herself and all of us have been impressing upon the Governments that they should take it up very strongly with Pakistan. Sheikh Mujibur Rehman is an outstanding leader who has won such outstanding victory and who commands the obedience and respect and confidence of such vast numbers of people in Pakistan. In fact he commands the majority if we take Pakistan as a whole. He is such an outstanding leader. We have said that every effort should be made by the international community, by the Governments and by others, to ensure about the safety of Sheikh Mujibur Rehman. Only this morning it is said that he is critically ill. Some days back it was reported that he was keeping indifferent health. This is one of the important points we have been highlighting with all Governments that they should specifically urge and impress upon the military rulers of Pakistan that the safety of a leader of this stature and of the popularity and type of confidence that he commands, as Sheikh Mujibur Rehman, should be ensured. In fact, we have also suggested that every effort should be made to see that he is released. Some hon. Member had said that we had not said that he should be released. I would like to submit that in fact I had gone much further and said that a Government which was headed or controlled by or which had the support of Sheikh Mujibur Rehman was the one condition which would create the type of atmosphere in which the refugees could go back, because he had the majority support behind him. So, we have always been in favour of Sheikh Mujibur Rehman being released, and we have urged all Governments...

17 hrs.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Does he know where actually he is being kept ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Our information is that he is still in West Pakistan.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : In jail ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : In which jail in West Pakistan ? West Pakistan is a big place. I know West Pakistan. In which jail is he being kept ?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : It is not proper to point it out at this stage.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Therefore, the question of Sheikh Mujibur Rehman's safety and the steps being taken to ensure that the military regime treats him well and releases him as soon as possible and starts further processes which should lead to the emergence of a democratic set up—these are the very points that we have been urging, and in the light of what I have said, I would request the hon. Mover not to press this resolution for a vote, because we should not divide on an issue like this.

DR. RANEN SEN : Absolutely hopeless statement.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I know I cannot please him.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : He cannot please anyone in India.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Our Minister of External Affairs has said that Government have not taken a negative attitude in regard to the immediate recognition of Bangla Desh, but unfortunately, they have not still indicated the positive attitude towards the question. Perhaps, Government did not expect that so soon and so crudely their pet hope of a political solution on which a lot of speculation was going on would be exploded by Yahya Khan. I do not know whether our Government still would like to continue to hibernate in a cosy bed of super-inaction. I do not know whether they will take any positive action. But I am really surprised to find that our Government have become a more knowledgeable expert on not only the question of Bangla Desh but on the interests of Bangla Desh when they claim that it will be unhelpful or harmful or it would not be proper to give the Bangla Desh Government recognition at the moment. When all

the people of Bangla Desh, their leader, their provisional government, and their Mukti Fauj and all their political leaders, not once or twice but repeatedly have been pleading not only with India but with the whole world that their government should be immediately recognised, I do not know how Government say that it will not be to their benefit or it will be unhelpful to them or that it will be harmful to them. I do not know whether our Government knows more about their interests than they themselves know.

I do not know whether I should use any adjective for our Minister of External Affairs. If he does not mind it, I may say he is really a misleading Foreign Minister, because he has misled us to believe on several occasions that if India gives recognition to Bangla Desh, no other country is going to follow us. But Shri Jaya Prakash Narain who was not bridled by any diplomatic inhibitions and who has had a free and frank talk with almost all the important leaders of 20 countries of the world during his 48-day tour of the world has made it clear in a public statement that if India took courage to give recognition, it will be followed by several other countries ; at least four or five countries will immediately give recognition, if India gives recognition. Only a few days before we have seen 216 British Members of Parliament issuing a statement in which they have said that their Government should also give recognition to the Bangla Desh Government

I do not know what more the Government expects about mobilisation of world opinion. Perhaps at no time, on no particular issue, has the whole world opinion, the press and public opinion been so unanimous as in the expression of their condemnation of Yahya Khan's regime and in support of people of Bangla Desh and their aspiration for freedom. I do not know how long the Government will go on sending missions abroad to mobilise world opinion.

One very important factor is the attitude of our friend, Soviet Russia, in regard to the issue of recognition. If we have a barometer to read the mind of Moscow in our country, that barometer is the opinion of our CPI friends in India. We find them so vigorously vocal in urging the Government to give immediate recognition to Bangla Desh. It would not have been possible if Russia was not willing to support the recognition of Bangla Desh. I

want to know from the Government whether it is a fact that our Moscow Mission informed Delhi that Russia had come to the conclusion that Bangla Desh had come to stay. If that is so, what is the political implication of this? The political implication of this is that if our Government takes a bold step to give immediate recognition to Bangala Desh, Russia will not oppose it. They will within a month or two also support India and give recognition to Bangla Desh.

I want to warn the Government that time is the most deciding factor in ultimately determining the fate of the people of Bangala Desh as also the fate of the seven million refugees as also the fate of India. I want to warn the Government that time is our enemy now and it is the best friend of Pakistan. We have already wasted very valuable initial time. For two weeks after the fateful day of 25th March, Pakistan did not dare to ship even one battalion of his army from West Pakistan to East Pakistan to crush the revolution of Bangla Desh because they were terribly afraid that if they shipped their army from West Pakistan, it would create a serious defence imbalance in the Western sector. After waiting for two weeks, when they found that India was not going to do anything, they shifted 2½ divisions of their army and that enabled Pakistan to crush the Bangala Desh revolution and killed ten lakhs of patriots there.

I also want to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that China did not utter a single word till 12th April. They were watching the reaction of India. Russia also initially took a very strict attitude because President Podgorny wrote a strong letter to Yahya Khan. Why was it not followed up? The reason lies not in Moscow, but in Delhi. Delhi did not react in time, properly, adequately and effectively.

I also want to draw your attention to the fact that the USA, UK, France and all other world powers kept completely silent after 25th March for about two weeks. What is the reason? They were carefully watching the reaction and action of India, whether India was going to take any positive action. As India failed to take any positive action, according to diplomatic practice, they did not want to annoy Pakistan unnecessarily.

Time is in favour of Pakistan and it is against us. We have made many assumptions. Our first assumption was that Pakistan would not dare to shift their army from the western to the eastern sector. It was on this assumption that we thought that the Bangala Desh revolution would be able to achieve its objective. That was proved wrong. Our second assumption was that not more than two million refugees would cross over to India. In one of the meetings in which the Foreign Minister was present the Prime Minister told us that about 15 lakhs of refugees came. Mr. Chavan was also present. The Defence Minister was sitting by my side and when I said that India should prepare to receive 80 lakhs, the Defence Minister ridiculed me that I was childish and I was saying something alarmist. He said not more than 20 lakhs would come. Now what is the position? Your second assumption has proved wholly incorrect.

Their third assumption is still going on. They assume that Pakistan will collapse from within due to economic crisis. Now a days no country collapse from within due to economic difficulties. There are the Middle Eastern countries, oil-rich countries. Even the consortium may refuse to give aid to Pakistan not for political reasons but because they are afraid that their loan may not be repaid and if they made additional payments of loans that will be lost. So only on economic grounds they are withholding aid to Pakistan. Perhaps Pakistan will get time to have unilateral discussions with foreign powers to get more aid.

If you give time to Pakistan what does it mean? I shall enumerate the consequences. Firstly, it will get an opportunity to raise and equip two new divisions of army with Chinese military hardwares. For finishing the task in the shortest possible time, Pakistan is making these divisions mixed ones, with 1/3rd of trained soldiers, 1/3rd with reserves and 1/3rd with new recruits. Secondly, Pakistan is getting two squadrons of fighter bombers from France in the shortest possible time. Thirdly, Pakistan is soon getting her fourth sub-marine. Fourthly, Pakistan is getting an opportunity to complete its shopping for arms and spareparts from the NATO market, USA, China, Iran and Turkey within the next two months. Fifthly, Pakistan is getting time quickly to replace Bengali personnel in her Air Force and Navy. These people constitute about 20 per cent of

[Shri Samar Guha]

these forces and most of them are technical personnel, navigators, etc. In the navy they were holding very key positions. Now they have given an advertisement in West Pakistan for recruitment of West Pakistanis in place of the East Bengalis. You are allowing them time to do so. It means that now their Air Force and Navy is short of trained personnel by 20 to 25 per cent and by allowing them time you are enabling them to make up this deficiency.

Sixthly, Pakistan is utilising time for raising armed militia, para-militia, police force and counter guerilla forces from among the non-Bengali elements in Bangla Desh. Seventhly, at present the water ways are the main supply and communications lines for Pakistan Army in Bangla Desh. They are making frantic efforts for restoring railway and land communications and if you give them time they will do it. Eighthly, Pakistan is getting time to bring Chinese gun-boats and coal from China. Ninthly, Pakistan is using the time politically also in mobilising the Muslim League, Jamaite-Islami and other puppets and quislings to support them in Bangla Desh. Tenthly, the increasing food shortage and near famine condition in Bangla Desh is giving opportunity to Pindi rulers to squeeze out more people from Bangla Desh into India.

Lastly, Pakistan is utilising the time to get money from oil-rich Middle East countries and also other countries.

That is why I say that time is now the best friend of Pakistan and the greatest enemy of India. I am sorry that the Government do not know how to deal with a dynamic situation of revolutionary national upsurge. I ask the Defence Minister to go through the history of Russian Revolution. Trotsky, who was the architect of that revolution says that the success of a revolution depends on determining the mood and spontaneity of the people. You must not forget that the Bangla Desh people had started the fighting one month earlier. For one month, there was the non-co-operation movement. And then after one month, for three months they have been fighting. It is four months now. Is it possible that the national upsurge, the energy and the mood of the people will remain as before? That is why I say that recognition of this movement is absolutely necessary; it will act also as a shot in their arm; it will change their whole

outlook and it will renew their faith in themselves, and create a new confidence in themselves and it would energise them to fresh action, a brilliant action.

If you really want to see that, you will find that during the monsoon the Bangla Desh fighters are fighting like lions. Wherever I have gone, I have seen their base of operations. The first question they used to ask us was, "When will you give us recognition?" Recognition means, they will have their political freedom for developing their own struggle. Recognition means that it will give us the freedom for helping them; no diplomatic bar will stand in our way.

I want to warn the Government. I am not in favour of those who advocate war with Pakistan. I feel that recognition is the only remaining alternative, at the moment, to war with Pakistan. Otherwise already war-cries have started, and many Members in this House have started talking about the struggle in Bangla Desh, about freeing Bangla Desh. What does it mean? It means war. There is no necessity for the Indian army to fight, Bangla Desh will have their liberation army; their guerilla fighters; they will be able to achieve their whole objective. If you give them arms and weapons, that will strengthen them and give them the diplomatic liberty to go along with the world. That will strengthen them. There is the only alternative to avoid a war with Pakistan; that is, to give immediate recognition to them. Then, on the basis of independent nations, on the basis of mutual relations, you can give arms to them; give them training, and give them everything they want; also give them the freedom to go round the world. That is what I would say. That is the only means to help Bangla Desh.

Before I conclude, I just say one word. What happened at the critical moment at Kurukshetra, as giving to us in the *Mahabharata*? Arjuna was lost in a mood of temporary torpor. It was Lord Krishna who lifted him up out of it. I do not know, there is no Krishna here to tell the Minister to act. You must act.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS, AND SHIPPING AND TRANS-