

**CALLING ATTENTION TO A MAT-  
TER OF URGENT PUBLIC IM-  
PORTANCE**

REPORTED FINALISATION OF PLANS FOR  
POSTING A LARGE TEAM OF U.N.  
OBSERVERS IN BANGLA DESH AND  
REACTION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF  
INDIA THERETO

**SHRI K. C. PANDA** (Orissa): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the reported finalisation of the plans for posting a large team of U.N. observers in Bangla Desh and the reaction of the Government of India thereto.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL  
AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN

## विश मत्री

SINGH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, hon. Members must have read press reports of the U.N. Secretary-General's memorandum to the President of the Security Council and his *Aide Memoire*, to India and Pakistan as well as our reply to the latter. Copies of these three documents are placed on the Table of the House.

As Hon'ble Members will see, we are totally opposed to the posting of any UN Observers on our territory. So far as the posting of observers on the Bangla Desh side is concerned, it is our considered view that the mere posting of observers in Bangla Desh, particularly in the border, is not likely to create the necessary feeling of confidence among the refugees who are now in India. What is needed is an immediate stoppage of the military atrocities so that the further influx of refugees may cease, and a political solution acceptable to the people of Bangla Desh through their already elected representatives is brought about.

The mere posting of observers will only create a facade of action as a cover for the continuation of the present policies of the military rulers of Pakistan and further aggravate the suffering of the people of Bangla Desh.

United Nations Aide Memoire

The repatriation of the refugees from East Pakistan now in India is a matter of the utmost concern and

urgency. The Secretary-General is anxious to do everything possible, in cooperation with the Governments concerned and complementary to their own efforts, to facilitate the voluntary repatriation of the refugees in a secure and orderly manner which takes due account of their welfare. One possible method of doing this might be to establish a limited representation of the High Commissioner for Refugees on both sides of the border. The High Commissioner for Refugees is already acting as a focal point for the United Nations effort on behalf of these refugees. The representative of the High Commissioner would be stationed at collecting points on the Indian side, at border crossing points on both sides, and in reception centres on the Pakistan side. It is the feeling of the Secretary-General that before attempting to make such an arrangement on a large scale, it would be desirable to test it in a limited way in order to ascertain whether in practice it would serve a useful purpose in facilitating the process of repatriation.

The Secretary-General therefore wishes to suggest to both Governments concerned that representatives of the High Commissioner for Refugees be accepted in two or three selected areas on both sides of the border, the areas to be suggested by the Governments in consultation with the High Commissioner. Were this arrangement to prove useful, it would then be possible to expand it gradually to include most, or all, of the repatriation point

The Secretary-General expresses the hope that the Government of India will be prepared to give the necessary cooperation to make this initial endeavour possible. A similar suggestion has been made to the Permanent Representative of Pakistan.

2nd August, 1971.

*Text of UN Secretary-General's Memorandum to the President of the Security Council*

For some months now the members of the Security Council and many

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

other members of the UN have been deeply preoccupied with developments in East Pakistan and the adjacent Indian States and their consequences or possible consequences. I myself expressed my concern over the situation to President Yahya Khan shortly after the events of March 1971 and have been in continuous touch with the Governments of Pakistan and India both through their Permanent Representatives at the UN and through other contacts. In these exchanges I have been actually aware of the dual responsibilities of the UN, including the Secretary General under the Charter, both to observe the provisions of its Article 2 paragraph 7 and to work within the framework of International Economic and Social Co-operation to help promote and ensure human well-being and humanitarian principles.

2. It was with this latter responsibility in mind that I appealed for assistance both for the refugees from East Pakistan in India and for the population of East Pakistan. In order to channel the assistance given in response to those appeals, I designated the UN High Commissioner for Refugees as the focal point for assistance to the refugees in India and appointed, with the agreement of the Government of Pakistan a representative in Dacca, in order to make effective use as possible as of the international assistance made available for the relief of the population of East Pakistan. Both of these humanitarian efforts have been reported upon in detail elsewhere, and the Economic and Social Council held a full discussion on both operations on 16-7-71 based on statements to the Council by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees and the Assistant Secretary-General, for Inter Agency Affairs. I take this opportunity to express my warm gratitude to the Governments, the United Nations Agencies and programmes and to the voluntary organisations which have responded generously to my appeals. I also wish to express my appreciation to the Governments of India and

Pakistan for their cooperation with my representatives in the field.

3. As the weeks have passed since last March I have become increasingly uneasy and apprehensive at the steady deterioration of the situation in the region in almost all its aspects. In spite of the generous response of the international community to my appeals for assistance for the refugees from East Pakistan now in India the money and supplies made available are still nowhere near sufficient and the Indian Government still faces the appalling and disruptive problem of caring for an unforeseeable period of time for millions of refugees whose number is still increasing. In East Pakistan International and Governmental efforts to cope with the results of two successive disasters one of them natural are increasingly hampered by the lack of substantial progress towards a political reconciliation and the consequent effect on law, order and public administration in East Pakistan. There is a danger that serious food shortages and even famine could soon add to the sufferings of the population unless conditions can be improved to the point where a large-scale relief programme can be effective. Equally serious is the undoubted fact that reconciliation and improved political atmosphere and the success of relief efforts are indispensable pre-requisites for the return of any large proportion of the refugees now in India. The situation is one in which political economic and social factors have produced a series of vicious circles which largely frustrate the efforts of the authorities concerned and of the International community to deal with the vast humanitarian problems involved.

4. These human tragedies have consequences in a far wider sphere. The violent emotions aroused could have repercussions on the relations of religious and ethnic groups in the sub-continent as a whole and the relationship of the Governments of India and Pakistan is also a major component of the problem. The conflict between the principles of the territorial integrity of States and of self-determina-

tion has often before in history given rise to fratricidal strife and has provoked in recent years highly emotional reactions in the international community. In the present case there is an additional element of danger for the crisis is unfolding in the context of the long standing, and unresolved, differences between India and Pakistan—differences which gave rise to open warfare only six years ago. Although there can be no question of the deep desire of both Governments for peace, tension between them shows no sign of subsiding. The situation on the borders of East Pakistan is particularly disturbing. Border clashes, clandestine raids and acts of sabotage appear to be becoming more frequent, and this all the more serious since refugees must cross this disturbed border if repatriation is to become a reality. Nor can any of us here in the UN afford to forget that a major conflict in the sub-continent could all too easily expand.

5. In tragic circumstances such as those prevailing in the sub continent it is all too easy to make moral judgements. It is far more difficult to face up to the political and human realities of the situation and to help the people concerned to find a way out of their enormous difficulties. It is this latter course which, in my view, the UN must follow.

6. I do not think that I have painted too dark a picture of the present situation and of its possible consequences. In the light of the information available to me, I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that the time is past when the international community can continue to stand by watching the situation deteriorate and hoping the relief programmes, humanitarian efforts and good intentions will be enough to turn the tide of human misery and potential disaster. I am deeply concerned about the possible consequences of the present situation, not only in the humanitarian sense, but also as a potential threat to peace and security and therefore it was a bearing on the future of the UN as an effective instrument for international cooperation

and action. It seems to me that the present tragic situation, in which humanitarian, economic and political problems are mingled in such a way as almost to defy any distinction between them, presents a challenge to the UN as a whole which must be met. Other situations of this kind may well occur in the future. If the organisations able to develop the new skill and the new strength required to face future situation of this kind.

7. It is for these reasons that I am taking the unusual step of reporting to the President of the Security Council on a question which has not been inscribed on the Council's agenda. The political aspects of this matter are of such far-reaching importance that the Secretary-General is not in a position to suggest precise course of action before the members of the Security Council have taken note of the problem. I believe however, that the United Nations with its long experience in peace keeping and with its varied resources for conciliation and persuasion must and should now play a more forthright role in attempting both to mitigate the human tragedy which has already taken place and to avert the further deterioration of the situation.

8. The Security Council, the world's highest body for the maintenance of international peace and security is in a position to consider with the utmost attention and concern the present situation and to reach some agreed conclusions as to measures which might be taken. Naturally it is for the Members of the Security Council themselves to decide whether such consideration should take place formally or informally in public or private. My primary purpose at this stage is to provide a basis and an opportunity for such discussions to take place and to express my grave concern that all possible ways and means should be explored which might help to resolve this tragic situation.

#### *Text of the Aide Memoire*

The repatriation of the refugees from East Pakistan now in India is a matter of the utmost concern and

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

urgency. The Secretary-General is anxious to do everything possible, in cooperation with the Governments concerned and complementary to their own efforts to facilitate the voluntary repatriation of the refugees in a secure and orderly manner which takes due account of their welfare. One possible method doing this might be to establish a limited representation of the High Commissioner for Refugees on both sides of the border. The High Commissioner for Refugees is already acting as a focal point for the United Nations efforts on behalf of these refugees. The representatives of the High Commissioner would be stationed at collecting points on the Indian side at border crossing points on both sides and in reception centres on the Pakistan side. It is the feeling of the Secretary-General that before attempting to make such an arrangement on a large scale it would be desirable to test it in a limited way in order to ascertain whether in practice it would serve a useful purpose in facilitating the process of repatriation.

2. The Secretary-General therefore wishes to suggest to both Governments concerned that representative of the High Commissioner for Refugees be accepted in two or three selected areas on both sides of the border, the areas to be suggested by the Governments in consultation with the High Commissioner. Were this arrangement to prove useful, it would then be possible to expand it gradually to include most or all of the repatriation points.

The Secretary-General expresses the hope that the Government of India will be prepared to give the necessary cooperation to make this initial endeavour possible. A similar suggestion has been made to the Permanent Representative of Pakistan on 19th July, 1971.

*Our Reply to the Aide Memoire*

Government of India share the view of the Secretary-General that the

repatriation of the refugees from East Pakistan, now in India, is a matter of utmost concern and urgency. Of even greater concern and urgency is the need to stop military atrocities in East Pakistan and the consequent daily flow of refugees into India at the rate of 40,000 to 50,000 a day. The refugees already in India are unlikely to return as long as this further exodus continues. Government of India have noted with infinite dismay and grave concern that far from encouraging return of refugees or stopping or reducing the further flow of refugees from East Pakistan to India, their number has increased by nearly four million since President Yahya Khan made his statement on the 25th May that he would agree to allow these Pakistani citizens to return to their own country.

2. The root cause of the inflow of over seven million refugees into India and the daily exodus that still continues can only be explained by the total absence of such conditions in East Pakistan as would encourage or enable the refugees to return to their homes. The chaos and the systematic military repression and the decimation of the Bengali-speaking people in East Pakistan continue unabated, as indeed is clear to any objective reader of the World Bank and the public statements of over 1,000 independent foreign observers who have visited East Pakistan and heard the tales of woe from the refugees themselves in their camps in India.

3. The burden on the Government of India in looking after millions of refugees, whose number is still increasing every day, has been recognised, by all. It has equally been recognised that in Pakistan efforts to cope with the results of two successive disasters, one of them natural and the other man made, are increasingly hampered by the lack of substantial progress towards political reconciliation and consequent effect on law and order and public administration in East Pakistan. An improved political atmosphere in East Pakistan is an indispensable prerequisite for the return of the refugees.

India has no desire to prevent the refugees from returning to their homeland, indeed we are most anxious that they should go back as soon as possible and as a first step, conditions must be created in East Pakistan to prevent the further arrival of refugees into India. In this context, the Secretary General must have seen the report and statement of 30th June by the UNHCR refuting Pakistani allegation that India is obstructing the return of refugees. Prince Sadruddin is further reported to have said there was absolutely no evidence for the host Government having obstructed the refugees if they wanted to go. Again in Paris on 10th July the Prince in reply to a question said that it would not be logical to say that India was in any way holding back their return. On July 19, at Kathmandu, two volunteers of the British organisation "War on Want" described as "rubbish" Pakistani allegation that India was holding refugees and preventing their return. At Calcutta on July 22 Mr. Manfred Cross, an Australian MP, described as "impossible" the Pakistani propaganda that refugees are being prevented in returning to Bangla Desh. Hon'ble Mr. Cornelius E. Gallagher, Member of the US House of Representatives, made a statement on the 10th of July in the House stating that "the response of the Indian Government to the crisis created by the action of the Government of Pakistan has been magnificent. They have demonstrated almost unbelievable restraint in view of the provocative effects of the army's brutal sweep, and they have shown inspiring compassion to the refugees. If it can ever be said that any Government is truly moral and humanitarian, the Government of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi has earned that distinction in the weeks since the first refugee crossed her border. The sheer number of refugees is irrefutable evidence of the brutal policies pursued by the Government of Pakistan to crush the people who won the election. Based on interviews I conducted with a cross-section of the refugees, I now believe that a calculated attempt to crush the intellectual

life of the Bangali community occurred because of mass killings of professors, students, and everyone of any distinction by the Army. This, in my judgement, gives credence to the charge of genocide". Apart from these and many other statements of this nature, not even a single responsible and reputable report has ever indicated that the return of refugees or their continued inflow is due to any other cause except the intolerable and tragic conditions prevailing in East Bengal.

7. In this background, Government of India must express their total opposition to the suggestion for the induction of a "limited representation of the High Commissioner for Refugees on both sides" and must categorically state that they resent any insinuation that they are preventing the refugees from returning to East Bengal. They allowed them to enter India purely on humanitarian grounds in spite of the most serious impact on her social, political and economic structure. Government of India are anxious that they return as soon as possible. The presence of the United Nations or UNHCR representatives cannot help in this. On the other hand it would only provide a facade of action to divert world attention from the root cause of the problem which is the continuation of military atrocities, leading to further influx of refugees and absence of a political settlement acceptable to the people of East Pakistan and their already elected leaders.

8. The UNHCR has a fairly strong team of senior officers located in Delhi and they have been given every facility to visit refugee camps. In fact, Mr. Thomas Jaimeson, Director of Operations of the UNHCR who is the Chief Representative of the UNHCR's office in India, has recently returned from a second tour of the refugee camps. He was allowed access to all the refugee camps and was given facilities to visit these camps including those in the border areas. Apart from this a thousand foreign observers have visited these refugee camps, and most of them have publi-

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

ely stated that the refugees have taken shelter in India from the military oppression in Bangla Desh and are not willing to return unless suitable conditions are created ensuring their safe return through a political settlement with Sheikh Mujibur Rehman the acknowledged leader of East Pakistan and his already elected colleagues. In the light of the information available to Government of India and to the interested Governments and organisations, they have painfully come to the conclusion that the time is past when international community can continue to stand by, watching the situation deteriorate and merely hoping that the relief programmes, humanitarian efforts, posting of a few people here and there, and good intentions would be enough to turn the tide of human misery and potential disaster.

9. While, therefore, the Government of India have no wish to lend their support to any proposal which will deflect attention from the basic problem or diffuse concern from the fate of the unfortunate refugees, they would welcome any action by the United Nations which would ensure and guarantee, under adequate international supervision, that the refugees' lands, houses and property will be returned to them in East Pakistan and that conditions are created there to ensure the safe return under credible international guarantees without threat of reprisal or other measures of repression from the military authorities of West Pakistan. It is painful to note that even the handful of refugees who ventured to return to East Bengal have not only been not allowed to go back to their homes and villages but have been subjected to endless indignities and inequities and even made to do forced labour and face many other difficulties. Government of India should like to draw the Secretary General's attention in this context to the New York Times report and photographs published on the 27th July, 1971 In these circumstances it is unrealistic to hope that these circumstances will begin to be

changed by the posting of any personnel on the Indian side of the border. The Government of India cannot support such a facade of action in the full knowledge that it is unrealistic, unhelpful and even dangerous. They find therefore the proposal totally unacceptable.

10. The crux of the problem is the situation inside East Bengal where an army from a distant territory is exercising control by sheer force and brutality. If the international community is serious about the need for return of refugees to East Bengal the first step that has to be taken is to restore conditions of normalcy inside East Pakistan through a political settlement acceptable to the people of East Bengal and their already elected leaders, and take such internationally credible measures as would assure the refugees their safe return without reprisals etc.

SHRI K. C. PANDA: Sir, the proposal to post United Nations observers even in Bangla Desh is mischievous and is motivated by considerations to help Pakistan. In any case, we are one with the Government of India in rejecting the U.N. proposals to post U.N. observers on the Indian side of the border. Such a proposal has to be rejected with all the emphasis at our command. No foreign observers, even if they are posted by the United Nations, will be allowed and must be allowed on our territory under any circumstances. In any case, if the UN observers are being posted in Bangla Desh with a view to improve the political atmosphere to create conditions for the return of the refugees and to check the activities of the Pakistan army which is exercising control over the Bangla Desh by sheer force and brutality, we may have no objection to the UN Observers earnestly working to try and restore conditions of normalcy inside Bangla Desh for a political settlement acceptable to the people of Bangla Desh and their already elected leaders, headed by Sheikh Mujibur Rehman and take such internationally credible measures as to assure the refugees their safe return without reprisal, as has been

stated in the Indian note to the UN Secretary-General, we may have no objection to the observers. However, if the observers were to interfere in the activities of Mukti Fauj, who are fighting for their freedom and independence, we have to take serious objection to the presence of UN observers in Bangla Desh. In this connection I want to quote from the note of the UN Secretary-General wherein he raises a controversial point. He says: 'The situation on the borders of East Pakistan is particularly disturbing...'

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you do not want to put a question, I will call some-body else.

SHRI K. C. PANDA: May I therefore know from the Minister whether the UN has informed the Government of India details of the functions and responsibilities of the UN observers in Bangla Desh and if so, whether a copy of the same would be laid on the Table of the House? Whether these functions confine only to put down repressive measures of Pakistan military junta and to look after and ensure that local people are no more maltreated and harassed by the military, their normal life not interfered with in any way and to ensure that there is no more influx of refugees to India from Bangla Desh and also ensure early return to Bangla Desh refugees from India to their homes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not done. You put your question. You cannot put a dozen questions.

SHRI K. C. PANDA: May I know whether the Government of India has any information that the UN observers are likely to interfere with the activities of the Mukti Fauj and if so, what is the reaction of the Government of India in this regard as such interference would make the task of freedom fighters difficult in fulfilment of their objectives? Finally, I would like to know whether Government has now reached a stage, specially in the face of activities of certain Super-Powers including the UN Secretary-General to give a formal recognition to Bangla Desh?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I have noted his views. He has not asked anything specific from me.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भट्टारी (राजस्थान):  
मंत्री महोदय ने अभी अपने दस्तावेज में 'बंगला देश' शब्द का उपयोग किया है। मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि एड मेमोयर के जवाब में वही एक भी जगह इस 'बंगला देश' शब्द का प्रयोग किया गया है? क्योंकि जो माग पोलिटिकल सैटिलमेंट की गई है वह पोलिटिकल सैटिलमेंट acceptable to the people of East Pakistan and their already elected leaders.

इस शब्द का इस में उल्लेख है। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि एड मेमोयर का जो जवाब दिया गया है उस में भी इस शब्द का उल्लेख है ?

The crux of the problem is the situation inside East Bengal where an army from a distant territory is exercising control by sheer force and brutality.

इसलिए मैं सरदार ने यह जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या भविष्य में इंटरनेशनल रिलेशन्स के सम्बन्ध में, या जिस किसी देश को पूर्वी बंगाल की परिस्थिति के बारे में अपनी राय जाहिर करना चाहते हैं क्या सरकार इस बात का स्पष्टीकरण देगी कि भविष्य में न इसे ईस्ट पाकिस्तान कहा जायेगा और न ही ईस्ट बंगाल कहा जायेगा। इस को बंगला देश कहा जायेगा। क्या सरकार इस संबंध में कोई स्पष्ट बात यहां पर कहेगी ?

मैं एक और स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूँ।  
यहां पर सरकार ने कहा है  
We are totally opposed to sending U.N. observers to India.  
लेकिन जो उन की एड मेमोयर की जवाब की भाषा है

The Government of India is not able to understand what purpose the posting of a few men on the Indian side of the border will fulfil.

मैं सरकार से चाहूंगा  
"What purpose the posting of a few men?"

[ श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारे ]

जिस शब्द का प्रयोग किया गया है उसको अधिक स्पष्ट करने का प्रयत्न करेगी और टोटली अपोज वाली भाषा क्यों नहीं व्यक्त की गई ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: With regard to the first question, while dealing with the international community we have to use expressions which are understood in the international community and therefore it is not possible for me to give the type of assurance that the hon. Member mentions. I bowed to the wishes of the House and agreed to use 'Bangla' Desh, on the floor of the House but I cannot use the same expression with the international community.

About the second question, if the hon. Member takes the trouble of going through the entire reply—he has read only one sentence—he will not feel the necessity of putting this question. That is clear rejection of the proposal; only the language that is used is polished but the meaning is quite clear.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: I would like that extract to be read because I specifically read the sentence and he wants to make out that what he means has been explained there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You wanted a clarification and he clarifies by saying that it is total rejection of the proposal.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: इसलिए मैंने पूछा All that the Government of India has expressed is "The Government of India is not able to understand what purpose the posting of a few men on the Indian side of the border will fulfil."

इतना ही इस में उल्लेख है। टोटल रिजेक्शन का उल्लेख इस सारे स्टेटमेंट में है क्या ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Now that the hon. Member has not himself taken the trouble I will draw his attention to paragraph 7:

"In this background Government of India must express their total opposition to the suggestion for the induction of a "limited representation of the High Commissioner for Refugees on both sides" and must categorically state that they resent any insinuation that they are preventing the refugees from returning to East Bengal."

Why did you not read this?

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: It was not available; he is only just now reading it.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Then don't put a question if you have not read it.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: Why not? It is my right.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): As you remember in the course of a question I asked the hon. Minister to say whether the note of the Secretary General of the United Nations to the United Nations Council President sought to equate India and Pakistan on the issue of Bangla Desh and he said in reply that there has been no equation in this particular case. Even a perusal of the note of Mr. U. Thant to the United Nations Council President would show that there has been a deliberate attempt on the part of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to equate the position of India and Pakistan on the Bangla Desh issue. If you permit me I will read out a certain portion which has appeared in the press and you will agree with me that there has been a deliberate attempt on the part of the United Nations to equate the position of India and Pakistan. I shall read a small portion. I quote:

I shall read a small portion. I quote:

"In the present case there is an additional element of danger for the crisis is unfolding in the context of the long standing, and unresolved differences between India



and Pakistan—differences which gave rise to open warfare only six years ago. Although there can be no question of the deep desire of both Governments for peace, tension between them shows no sign of subsiding. The situation on the borders of East Pakistan is particularly disturbing. Border clashes, clandestine raids and acts of sabotage appear to be becoming more frequent.”

Sir, this is nothing but the attempt of the United Nations to equate India with Pakistan, but in its reply to the note our Government has not dealt with the specific matter in which an attempt has been made to equate India with Pakistan. May I know what is the reason why the Government of India has not protested against this kind of stand taken by the United Nations? Is it not a fact that the posture and the stance taken by the United Nations has emboldened General Yahya Khan to give the threat of a general war against India? Is it also not a fact that this stance of the United Nations has emboldened General the pressure mounted by the United States of America on the United Nations Secretary-General? I want this to be clarified. Why did not our note express our protest at the endeavour being made by the United Nations Secretary-General to equate the position of India with Pakistan? My second point is why in the note given by us to the UN Secretary-General we have not raised the question of the release of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. In the note we have rightly pointed out that the problem can be solved by a political settlement acceptable to the people of Bangla Desh and their elected leader, but we have not mentioned in categorical terms the release of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and requesting the United Nations to exercise their good offices to secure the release of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, who is going to be court-martialled by the Pakistan Army junta.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: The hon. Member has no objection to what

I have said, but he asks why we did not say other things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Some omission he points out.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: We did not say any other thing. We dealt with the note as it was and gave a reply. I have placed a copy on the Table of the House. It is for him to form his judgment.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: In the course of his reply he said that the United Nations has not equated Pakistan with India. My point is that it has.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: In what respect? He is quoting from an earlier statement. Unless he points out the exact words of what I said in reply, I cannot answer that. I am not under cross-examination. If he wants any information, let him get the information.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: The text of U Thant's memorandum to the UN Council President is an attempt to equate India with Pakistan. What is his interpretation? My interpretation is that it does equate both.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: It is for him to make any interpretation. We have given our reply which is clear and categorical and I would request the hon. Member to deal with these important documents in greater depth, not take a superficial view of things. If he goes through our reply carefully, I am sure he will agree with me, in clame moments, that this was the best reply possible couched in dignified language, putting across our position in clear and unambiguous terms.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: He has not said anything about the release of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: It would be unfair on the part of the hon. Member to treat this as a complete document on the entire Bangla Desh issue. We were dealing with specific questions and raising points in this manner and treating it in this manner is not serving the cause

[Sardar Swaran Singh]  
which is dear to me and to him. We should treat it in the background in which this note was given.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

श्री राजनारायण : (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

यह चाहते हैं कि सारा बैकप्राउन्ड ही यहां रख दें। यह इंटरनेशनल प्रबलम है। यह लोग सरदार जी आप को परेशान करना चाहते हैं।

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : आप गुस्ता न हों।

श्री नैकी राम (हरियाणा) : उपसभापति जी, बिना लगाम के घोड़े छोड़े जा रहे हैं।

श्री मान सिंह वर्मा : (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

यह अस्तबल नहीं है, जहां घोड़े छोड़े जा रहे हैं।

SHRI DILKISHORE PRASAD SINGH (Bihar): Sir, the reported finalisation of the scheme to put and observers on either side of the border provides one more example and clearest proof of the fact that the United States is using the United Nations for the furtherance of its foreign policy. Either it be the Congo or Korea, it is the same thing and the same end is sought to be achieved. Now, this time you will see that the international community has been a mute spectator of the butchery committed by the mad regime in Pakistan, always aided and abetted by the military junta of the United States. Then, Sir, the following facts emerge, that at the crucial moment the United Nations failed to intervene, that the United Nations failed to react even at Pakistan's refusal to accept the Red Cross contingent which was willing to offer aid and relief, that the United States was able to manoeuvre the appointment of one person who was highly interested against India and holding a most partisan view—his brother was an Ambassador of Pakistan—that right through this period the United States has been supplying arms. Now, all these lead to the conclusion that the US has been trying to play the game and trying to use the United Nations

as an instrument or tool in the furtherance of its policy. Now, may I ask the hon. Minister what steps we are taking in the lobbies of the United Nations to counteract this vicious propaganda which might ultimately be extremely harmful to our national interest?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: By very clearly explaining our position to the member-countries of the United Nations.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: (Mysore): After having heard the replies to the various questions, I still feel that the reply sent by the Government is rather negative and defensive. Why should my friend, Sardar Swaran Singh, feel sensitive about it? I do not know why we should observe a sort of rigid framework in our reply to the letter of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and indeed this opportunity should have been taken by us to make our stand very clear. Sir, in this context, why has not the Government of India said that the letter from the Secretary-General has come very belatedly and so far the United Nations has not condemned the genocide, the atrocities, committed by the West Pakistani Armed Forces in Bangla Desh? And this should have been brought to their attention. And this is the first act of the United Nations; if the United Nations had to act, they had to act in this way, they had to take note of the atrocities committed by the West Pakistani Army in Bangla Desh. The Government of India has failed to take this opportunity of pointing out the lapse on the part of the United Nations.

The United Nations has not played any positive role, constructive role in these matters. Sir, I endorse the view expressed about the letter of the United Nations as "facade of action". If it is a "facade of action", is it not desirable, is it not necessary to say that the United Nations ought to play its role in a way as it has played its role in other parts of the world before? Mr. Swaran Singh has said that it is a fitting and an ideal reply.

I would like him to look into the letters written by the Government of India in respect of other crises, the language used at the time of the Suez Crisis, the language used at the time of the Korean crisis and so on. I would like him to remember all these things. What was the language used by the Government of India? It was far more positive. And at that time we were not very much concerned with those problems; they were distant problems. Still we took interest in them. But the language used was something different. Therefore, I say that he has not done justice to the letter he has received from the Secretary-General. Even now, may I ask him whether he would call the attention of the United Nations and the Secretary-General in particular to the fact that there is failure on the part of the United Nations, that we deplore it and we condemn it?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: (Orissa): Are you talking to them in Hindi?

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : किन को ?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: To the United Nations.

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : आप मुझ से हिन्दी में बात नहीं कर रहे हैं, मुझ से क्यों पूछते हो ।

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I do not think they understand our language.

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : आप ने बहुत ब्राइट बात की आज ता ।

All that I can say is that I have noted this dissatisfaction with our reply. He has not asked me to say anything more.

The language should have been taken note of by you. I know you are a studious person. If you carefully go through our reply, you will find that this is in reply to the memorandum that was given to us. There are two documents that the Secretary-General produced, one to

us and to Pakistan, exact copy, and the other is the letter that he wrote to the President. In this we are dealing with the *aide memoire* which was given to us. We have put forward our view in a very clear and unequivocal manner. And if he goes through it very carefully he will revise his opinion, I am sure.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, things may be going according to the plan, the plan of Islamabad and Washington. Therefore, it is necessary, Sir, to take a much more deeper view of what has happened and what has come to light so far, and much more, I believe, is in the offing. When the genocide was actually in progress in Bangla Desh the U.N. agencies kept quiet although Mr. Yahya Khan's actions amounted to or meant clearly a violation of the U.N. Charter, the Human Rights, the various Conventions on Genocide and various other Conventions also of International law and usage covering a situation of this kind. The U.N. agencies are completely silent. Even the Secretary-General did not indicate any kind of disapproval to what was happening except that he expressed some sympathy while it is a destruction of a nation. Sir, I find that periodicals like the News Magazine, Time, Newsweek have come out with bold caption at their top page, "Murder of the People", and yet in the very land from where these papers come, the U.N. authorities and the Americans do not take note of what their press has taken note of in telling the whole world. This is one aspect. Therefore, it is a deliberate plan.

The other aspect of it is—you will find that the whole thing is synchronising with a certain methodology. First of all, two memoranda were sent, one to us and another to Islamabad, as if it is an issue between India and Pakistan, or as if we are to be equated in his matter. And then copies of the same memorandum were sent to the Security Council. Sir, when the meeting of

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]  
 the Opposition leaders was held, I pointed out there, and I repeat it now, that this was a move for the Security Council's intervention under the aegis of the United States of America. Now, things have gone a step further. We find that the United Nations has endorsed the despatch or sending of the so-called U.N. Observers—actually American Observers—and America has pre-arranged this thing by offering one million dollars. It is estimated that three to four million dollars would be the cost of sending these observers. It will be much more. On Pakistan's side also, Yahya Khan says that he will wage total war against India. He says that if any part of East Pakistan or East Bengal territory is taken by India—how India comes in, I do not know—it will be total war; he has emphasised 'total war'. Knowing full well that Yahya Khan is threatening total war against India, this is being done. Now, Sir, it is significant that as the Mukti Bahini is advancing and actions are developing, this kind of U.N. move has been set in motion. Why? In order to intervene in the internal affairs of Bangla Desh struggle and create complications and also involve India in it and justify Pakistan's aggression against India, which Yahya Khan is clearly planning with American support and weapons, as an act of defence. (*Time bell rings*) Do not ring the bell. I am finishing. You tell me when you will ring the bell and I will arrange accordingly.

So, Sir, it is part of the plan for Yahya Khan's war against India and alternatively, it is in order to intervene directly and obstruct and thwart Mukti Bahini's operations there. This is how it should be viewed. If that is so, it is not enough to say that we have rejected it. Which Indian will accept this kind of decision to send U.N. Observers to Bangla Desh? Let us not talk about it. It goes without saying. But what steps are you taking

against the Americans? That is the issue. What is our diplomacy now, our political position in regard to America, at least to expose America before the world or at least to forearm our people politically and otherwise to meet a combination of that type which is developing? I should like to know why the Government is not still saying that the U.S. move in the United Nations is considered by India as a hostile action against our country, a deliberate attempt to utilise once again the U.N. institutions and agencies with a view to furthering the ends of aggression or an aggressive war or war-like action against our country, a peace-loving nation. Why is it not said that the U.N. move here is intended to come in the way of those people who are trying to honour the U.N. Charter of human rights and fighting for their freedom? Why is the Government not taking action against U.N. agencies in our country? They are sending observers there in 173 centres or so. What about the Americans in this country? Those who are functioning under the American Government here should be treated as enemy agents and they should be immediately interned, if possible. If we do not have the law, well, stop the functioning of their establishments. Ask them to withdraw. Cancel their visas and permits for staying in the country. Ask them to go home. Sir, it is a strange thing. The United Nations is sending Americans and the Americans have got people here also. They are spread all over the country. These two sets of observers, one official and another unofficial, will try to work in unison, as has been always seen in the past, in order to create great complications for India. This is a clear plan. Finally I would say that America is trying to internationalise the issue and make it an Indo-Pakistan issue rather than an issue between the liberation forces in Bangla Desh and those people who are trying to enslave them. Once

again we have the repetition of history. It is a serious matter. I regret our Foreign Affairs Ministry is not alive to the implications of this move which is planned with a view to preparing ground for something more drastic, something more criminal, against our country. We should pick up courage against the Americans and tell the Americans that we are not only protesting but we are taking action. I am sure the American people and the peace-loving people of the world will support us. Let us not talk about international community vaguely. I do not know the address of international community. Where is it? In this open international community there are people who are sympathetic to us, there are people who are provoking war against us, there are people who are supporting genocide. Let us not use this vague, sweeping, expression. Today draw a line and find out who are for us, who are against us, find out who are against the Americans and this plan of war and aggression against our country. This has to be borne in mind. Now all this talk of war by Yahya Khan is another significant thing. They want to create a war so that they can raise the issue of security of this region being threatened and therefore the matter should be discussed in the Security Council. Pakistan authorities, it is said, would welcome a discussion in the Security Council. The Americans have said in Washington, "We are very happy there is a ray of hope". Therefore, all preparations are complete. So I demand a radical and thorough revision or modification of our stand, political and diplomatic stand, with regard to the United States. We must pin down the real culprit in this matter internationally speaking, and that culprit is the United States of America. Actions call for diplomatic, political and practical action and we should start with practical action here by cancelling some of the visas of the Americans snapping some of the trans-

actions with the Americans and packing off home some of the Americans, and telling the world we are also ready to meet the situation, to meet the challenge, which the Americans have flung at us, at the security and sovereignty of our country.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** I have heard very carefully his views and his analysis of the situation. With part of his analysis I agree although I must say clearly that I do not accept the validity of the remedies that he has suggested. In this particular case our primary attention should be concentrated on dealing with the difficult question of Bangla Desh. And we are grateful to those countries which understand our viewpoint and we have mentioned it to them. Even with those countries that are opposed to us or which do not see fully our viewpoint, our effort at the present moment should be to explain our viewpoint and try to win them round to our view. And we must not start too many fronts and we should concentrate on the main problem that is before us. And in the United Nations we have always to distinguish between the actions taken by the United Nations organisations as such and the individuals connected with those organisations. We are a member of the United Nations. So are other countries which are friendly to us. Therefore, we cannot in a sweeping manner say that the entire U. N. is against us . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** When the U.N. Secretary-General acts on behalf of the authorities...., that is the question. Have you said that all these things are done illegally?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** The Secretary-General has given a memorandum to us and we have very clearly spelt out our position. Both the documents have been published and the entire international community can see our reaction to the suggestions made by the Secretary-

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

General. I would at this stage again appeal . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** The Secretary-General is not acting in his private capacity. He is acting in the capacity of Secretary-General and he is utilising the UN agencies, and also the UN is negotiating the financing of this thing. And the Americans will make over the money to the UN agency. How can you say that the U.N. is not being dragged into? I say that is illegal. So say that it is being illegally done.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** In the United Nations, if any moves are made, we have to tackle them vigilantly as we have tackled this move in a vigilant manner. The proposal is practically out. If there are any other moves, we should deal with them rather than adopting an attitude of condemnation in a sweeping manner to everything in which the U.N. expression is used. That, I am afraid, will not be a very wise approach and will not be in our national interest.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Shri Rajnarain.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** Where does our Party come?

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Why?

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal):** I do not mind Shri Rajnarain putting a question.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** I have called Shri Rajnarain. You will come after that.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** You should consult us at least.

**श्री राजनारायण :** उत्तरीय नारायण  
कि हम ने अपना नाम बरत पढ़ते दे दिया था ।

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** Under what convention you are doing that?

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** It is not that we have to call Party-wise.

This is Calling Attention. Please sit down.

**श्री राजनारायण :** श्रीमान, इनके अधिकार की रक्षा होनी चाहिए ।

सरकार ने यह कहा कि घर में तो हम बंगला देश कहेंगे और बाहर पूर्वी पाकिस्तान कहेंगे । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि ऐसा क्यों? घर और बाहर का यह फर्क क्यों? क्या घरेलू नीति से बिल्कुल भिन्न विदेश नीति होती है? दुनिया में कोई भी ऐसी नज़ीर है कि कोई सरकार एक देश को घर में कुछ कहे और बाहर कुछ कहे । एक अजीब-गरीब सी बात हम भारत सरकार के मुंह से सन रहे हैं । सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी बर्ज़ा आदमी हैं, पुराने आदमी हैं, ममझदार हैं और किसी बात को घमा कर कहने में बड़े माहिर हैं । गर इनको दिन भर बोलने दिया जाय तो भी उसमें से निकले कुछ नहीं ।

**सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह :** तो फर छोड़िए मत पूछिए ।

**श्री राजनारायण :** तो मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि घर में और विदेश नीति का फर्क कैसे हो पाय । हम घर में बंगला देश कहें और बाहर पूर्वी पाकिस्तान कहे ? तो भारत की सरकार अपने कर्म और कुंम डीड और मिम्डीड से तो दुनिया में बद्धि-विनाश पैदा कर रही है । भारत की सरकार लोगों को समझने नहीं दे रही है कि वास्तविकता क्या है ? तो मैं चाहता हूं कि हमारे सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य इस बात को गम्भीरता के साथ समझे जो हम ब्रिटेन को दोष देते हैं । अमरीका को दोष देते हैं—चलते-चलते हम को ऊशंट का लेटर मिला हमारे पत्र के उत्तर में हम उस को पढ़ते—उसके बजाय मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि भारत की सरकार खुद उसके लिये क्या अपने को जिम्मेदार नहीं समझती कि भारत की सरकार ही आज वह कारण है जो दुनिया में बंगला देश को मान्यता देने में सब से बड़ी बाधा पैदा कर रहा है . . .

श्री सीताराम केसरी (बिहार)  
गलन ।

श्री राजनारायण : क्योंकि भारत की सरकार ने किसी भी विदेश की सरकार को या यू.एन.ओ. में किसी भी "बंगला देश" शब्द नहीं लिखा । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि क्या तरदार स्वर्ण सिंह के पास ऐसी नजरोँ नहीं हैं, जिनके अनुसार याह्या और भुट्टो भी युद्धापराधी माने जायें ? याह्या और भुट्टो भी युद्धापराधी क्यों न माने जायें ? मुजोबुरहमान को युद्धापराधी मान कर उनको सजा की व्यवस्था क्यों हो, इस के बारे में क्या भारत की सरकार ने सफाई के साथ विश्व बन्धुत्व के नारे में कहीं कुछ रखा है या नहीं रखा है क्योंकि भारत की सरकार जानती है कि उसके प्रधान मंत्री के अकमर बयान होते रहते हैं कि याह्या ने जनतन्त्र का गला घोट्टा, वहाँ पर जनता की चुनी हुई सरकार थी, मुजोबुरहमान प्रधान मंत्री था और याह्या ने एक बार नहीं अनेक बार कहा था कि मुजोबुरहमान ही प्रधान मंत्री होंगे । तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि युद्ध का अपराधी मुजोब कैसे हुआ, युद्ध का अपराधी तो भुट्टो और याह्या होने चाहियें, जिसकी खुनी और शैतानी प्लटन ने बंगला देश में इतने बड़े पैमाने पर नरसंहार किया ? इस बात को भारत की सरकार ने सफाई के साथ कहीं भी किसी के सामने अपने देश के बाहर रखा है । एक अजीब व गरीब सी बात पता नहीं क्यों लोगों ने यहां मिस कर दी । जो सेक्रेटरी जनरल का खत है और जो उनका सुझाव है कि दोनों साइड्स में हमारे पर्यवेक्षक रहे उस को रिजेक्ट नहीं किया है । भारत की सरकार ने 'टोटल रिजेक्शन' का शब्द कही नहीं है । टोटल अपोजीशन का शब्द आया है ।

(Interruption by Shri M. N. Kaul)

श्री राजनारायण : अजीब आदमी है । इतने दिनों तक लोक सभा के सेक्रेटरी रहे और इतना भी नहीं जानते हैं ।

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated):  
How is that relevant?

श्री राजनारायण : मैं यह कौल साहब को बताना चाहता हूँ कि "टोटल अपोजीशन" भिन्न है और "टोटल रिजेक्शन" भिन्न है । अगर इन दोनों शब्दों का अर्थ वे एक ही समझते रहे हैं, तो लोक सभा में इतने दिनों तक जनता की गाढ़ी कमाई पर वे कैसे काम करते रहे । कहने के लिये भूपेश जी या कोई कह दे कि सरकार ने रिजेक्ट कर दिया, लेकिन "टोटल रिजेक्शन" शब्द का प्रयोग कहीं नहीं हुआ है । "टोटल अपोजीशन" शब्द का प्रयोग हुआ है यदि उस को गंभीरता से पढ़ा जाय तो यही पता चलता है कि हो सकता है कि धीरे-धीरे भारत की सरकार संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के इस सुझाव को मान ले । यह हम को डर है । अभी संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ या सेक्रेटरी जनरल यह उम्मीद लगाये हुए हैं, कि भारत की सरकार को दुलार करके, चुनकर करके, ले आया जायेगा, इसीलिये भारत की सरकार ने भी जानबूझ कर के "टोटल रिजेक्शन" शब्द का प्रयोग न कर के "टोटल अपोजीशन" शब्द का प्रयोग किया है ।

श्री उपसभापति : आपका सवाल क्या है ?

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, आप इतने समझदार आदमी हैं, फिर भी ऐसा कह रहे हैं । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि "टोटल रिजेक्शन" की जगह "टोटल अपोजीशन" शब्द क्यों लिखा गया । आज भी मैं चाहता हूँ कि भारत की सरकार कहे कि हम इस को टोटली रिजेक्ट करते हैं ।

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है, अब आप बैठिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : जरा धबराइये मत ।

श्री उपसभापति : आपने चार, पांच सवाल पूछ लिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, जो उन का खत आया है और जिस को माननीय मंत्री जी ने सदन में रखा है मैं उस को पढ़ कर इस नती

[श्री राजनारायण]

पर पहुंचा हूं कि भारत और पाकिस्तान दोनों की सरकारों को सेक्रेटरी जनरल का खत बराबरी पर रख रहा है। वे कहते हैं कि हम ने ऐसा ही खत भारत की सरकार को लिखा और ऐसा ही खत पाकिस्तान की सरकार को लिखा। तो भारत की सरकार ने क्या कभी भी सफाई के साथ इस बात को उठाया है कि इस मामले में भारत और पाकिस्तान को समान, समकक्ष रखने की धृष्टता कोई संस्था, चाहे वह विश्व की संस्था हो या कोई संस्था हो, न करें। आखिर में मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या भारत की सरकार ने कभी भी किसी स्तर पर अपनी इस स्थिति को साफ किया कि बंगला देश पर पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान का हमला है और हमला वहां से समाप्त किया जाय। आज बंगला देश की सीमा में याह्या खान की पल्टन है। वह विदेशी है और इसलिये यह विदेशों पल्टन फौरन हटायी जाय और बंगला देश की जनता ने जिनको शन प्रतिशत, 98 प्रतिशत मत दे कर, 99 प्रतिशत सीट दे कर बंगला देश में प्रतिष्ठित किया, उस मुजीब की सरकार को, अवामी लीग की सरकार को प्रतिष्ठित किया जाय, यह जनतंत्र का मूल है। लेकिन उस को याह्या खान ने पकड़ा, उस को कत्ल करना चाहता है। जहां देना चाहिए थी उसको सरकार वहां दे दी गेली। कभी भी भारत की सरकार ने जो पोजीशन ताजुद्दीन ने ली, जो पोजीशन प्रेजीडेंट ने ली, वकिंग प्रेजीडेंट ने ली, वहां की सरकार ने ली, वह पोजीशन भारत की सरकार ने क्यों नहीं ली ?

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है, अब आप बैठिये।

श्री राज नारायण : आप इतने बड़े सवाल पर हम को ही बिठायेंगे ? यह देश की खिदमत ही मैं कर रहा हूं कोई अपने लड़के के लिए लाइसेंस नहीं मांग रहा हूं। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या यह सत्य है कि प्रधान मंत्री ने कल यह कहा है जो आज अखबारों में मैंने पढ़ा कि मान्यता देने का प्रश्न अभी नहीं है प्रश्न है अधिक से अधिक सहायता करने

का। क्या यह सही है ? मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं। अगर स्वर्ण सिंह जी को इस की जानकारी न हो तो वह प्रधान मंत्री से पूछ लें, क्योंकि प्रधान मंत्री के कल के बयान को आज हिन्दी के अखबारों ने निकाला है कि प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि कुछ दल, कुछ लोग "मान्यता दो, मान्यता दो, मान्यता दो" चिल्ला रहे हैं। तो 'मान्यता दो, मान्यता दो' चिल्लाने का सवाल इस समय नहीं है, सवाल है अधिक से अधिक सहायता करने का। ऐसा क्यों ? भारत सरकार के प्रधान मंत्री ने ऐसी बात बाहर क्यों कही। इन तमाम बातों की रोशनी में हम देख रहे हैं कि संभव है कि जिस तरह से तिब्बत को भारत की सरकार ने गंवा दिया उसी तरह से स्वाधीन बंगला देश को भी यह भारत की सरकार गवाने का फैसला कर चुकी है केवल समय खा रही है और समय खाने के बाद हम लोगों को भी खाने की तदवीर में डालेगी।

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Sir, on the first question I have already given my comment. The words "Bangla Desh" will also get current in the international community and we are using it incur Parliamentary proceedings. Members have already taken up this expression. It will take some time before this expression becomes more current and more popular.

श्री राजनारायण : क्यों ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: We should continue our efforts. The hon. Member's intervention is also a contribution to a certain extent.

Now, Sir, about the second question my reply is an emphatic 'no', when he says that we are coming in the way of Bangla Desh being recognized by other countries. This is an absolutely unjustified suggestion and I do not know what is the basis of his making that insinuation . . .

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): If you do not recognize, who also will recognize?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: The question of recognition has been dis-



cussed so very often. I am not going to enter into a debate on that while answering this Calling Attention notice.

About our raising the question of genocide in the UN forum, I would like to inform the House that we have raised this question of genocide in the ECOSOC and we have made very clear statements about the culpability of the military rulers in perpetrating atrocities which amount to genocide. We have explained that position in the ECOSOC, which is the forum where the questions of human rights and these problems are discussed. This meeting was recently held in Geneva.

The fourth question is the ingenious distinction that he is trying to make between total rejection and total opposition. He forgets that total opposition in the context when Opposition parties oppose, is totally different from the implication thereof when a sovereign country opposes anything in the international context. This expression which is used in the context of internal matters in a Parliamentary set-up where Opposition parties oppose, I think, is not applicable when sovereign countries oppose any particular thing. It is another word for rejection. I would request the hon. Member to alter his vocabulary in this respect. I know he feels frustrated when his opposition is not yielding any results but a national opposition of a microscopic minority is naturally different from an opposition from a sovereign country. There is a great deal of difference.

Then, Sir, lastly he is in his traditional role, acting as a prophet of doom. He says that we will accept the induction of U.N. observers. I do not know why he should always import his pessimism when we have clearly said that we will not accept it, we are opposed to it and this is our position. He should also held us rather than create an impression that we are not firm on this issue. This is not helping us in continuing our resolve to oppose this.

Then, Sir, he has asked about the

Prime Minister's statement. I have also read a press report. It has got nothing to do with the present Calling Attention Notice.

**श्री राजनारायण :** श्रीमान्, एक सवाल का जवाब नहीं हुआ कि क्या मुजोबुरहमान के ऊपर जो मुकदमा चलाने की बात चल रही है, उसके विरोध में भारत सरकार ने यू० एन० ओ० को कुछ लिखा है। माननीय मंत्री जी ने इसके बारे में कुछ नहीं कहा। मुजोबुरहमान पर मुकदमा चलाने की जो बात चल रही है, उसके बारे में लिखा इसका जवाब दे।

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** We are at this moment discussing a memorandum that was given by the Secretary-General for locating his representatives on the other side of the border. This does not mean that our reply is comprehensive. But I would also like to take this opportunity of informing the hon. House that we have taken up the question of release of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman with several countries of the world and we have also said that any attempt to go through a force of trial will only make the situation even more complex and this will not be a fruitful way of dealing with the situation.

**श्री राजनारायण :** यह नहीं लिखा—  
लिंग शैन गेट की टालेरेटेड ।

**श्री उपसभापति :** राजनारायण जी  
पाप बैजि ।

**महन्तर स्वर्ण सिंह :** आपकी बड़ी मन्त  
लिंगुएज में इंटरनेशनल लाइफ में ऐसी  
लिंगुएज में इन्वेमाल करते ।

**श्री राजनारायण :** इंटरनेशनल लिंगुएज  
के चक्कर में आप देश को मत गवां दीजिये ।

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** Will the hon. Minister listen to me?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** Please address the Chair.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** Yes, through the Chair I am addressing you.

**Sir, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta** said certain things to the hon. Minister in his

reply said that he is with his analysis. Now the analysis that he made is that the U.S. Government is acting unfriendly towards our country. This proposal is a sort of hostile act. So, it is already settled that the hon. Minister takes this action of the U.S. Government as an unfriendly act. Now the question comes, you will remember, that the Calling Attention is regarding the posting of U.N. observers in Bangla Desh. In his reply, he has said about the posting of U.N. observers on the other side of the international border, but the Calling Attention is about the posting of U.N. observers in Bangla Desh. It is good that we have rejected any posting of U.N. observers on our side of the border. But the question what happens if observers are posted on the other side of the border and that is what precisely the Calling Attention refers to. The press reports are there that the U.S. Government has finalised unilaterally even the terms of observers, cost etc. Now, will the hon. Minister reply whether we accept the position that the Secretary-General can post a team of observers of his own in the name of the U.N. on the other side of the border because, Sir, such a team of observers is likely to give clearance to Gen. Yahya Khan on all subjects and will make observations against India. That is precisely the purpose for which they are being posted on the other side of the border. If the Secretary-General cannot act on his own, will the Government see to it that the UN Secretary-General does not accept such a proposal? In this connection I would also like to ask what is the position of the Soviet Union because I have seen reports that the Soviet Union, if it is sought to be pushed through the Security Council, is likely to nip the proposal in the bud but whether the Government will take us into confidence and tell us? We need the Soviet Union's help on this question because it is they, being a Permanent Member, even if the majority supports it, it can be voted out by them only. In the Secretary General's aide memoire a pernicious

thing has been brought in. The question of territorial integrity and self-determination have been counterposed. I have carefully seen the reply. So far as it goes, it is good but it embraces a larger question also about Portugal's claim on Goa. We took Goa as part of the country. Does the Secretary General mean that territorial integrity means that Goa, Angola, Mozambique or if any part becomes independent, then it comes a question of the territorial integrity of the State of Portugal? For him to suggest such a question on the guidance of the US is not correct. I would say that the UN Secretary General has not acted in his own wisdom. He has acted under the guidance of the US Government. Is it a fact or not? It is a shameful role in which the UN Secretary General has landed himself, because he could have asked the UN Security Council to take up the question of total suppression of the people in the world, genocide and total suppression of the people. The UN Secretary General could have taken up that question. Instead he is going on creating alibi at the behest of the US Government for the Pakistani aggression against Bangla Desh. It is a literal aggression, nothing else. That being the position, may I know if the Government would remember the dangerous connotation that is being sought to be given by U Thant by posing the question of self-determination and territorial integrity in this matter? All along the US is trying to dominate and is trying to just confuse the issue and just by pass the issue of freedom struggle of the people of Bangla Desh and put an iron curtain on it and to internationalise the issue in such a fashion that the people of India are put in the wrong and the freedom struggle is suppressed. So this position should be made clear and I would also like to know the position of the Soviet Union on certain of these questions if he could tell us.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I would like to say that the posting

of the UN Observers where the Observers may have some role other than purely humanitarian administration of relief for sufferers is a matter which will require the approval by the Security Council but the representatives of the UN High Commissioner for the Refugees can go to any country on a bilateral basis. As I mentioned in the House some time back, there are 5 representatives of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees and they are also in Delhi and they are the focal point for the relief that is given by other member-countries of the UN and they are helping in the transmitting of that relief to India. There are representatives of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees in Bangla Desh also. So even on a bilateral basis the representatives of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees can be located because their task will be purely humanitarian, administration of relief and also to ensure, in the case of Bangla Desh it can be that whatever relief is given to Bangla Desh does not go to strengthen the military regime but on the other hand is utilised for the genuine relief of refugees. But if the observers have any other role it will require the approval of the Security Council and this has not yet come up before the Security Council. We have explained our position to the member-countries of the United Nations Security Council that posting of observers on Indian territory will be regarded by India as an unfriendly act and this is the position that we have consistently taken with all countries and our assessment is that this is having its effect.

About the position of the USSR, I cannot spell out their position because everything will depend on the formulation of any particular Resolution or proposal in the Security Council and it is not customary for any country to announce their position on a hypothetical basis but we do presume that our viewpoint will be appreciated not only by USSR but by several other countries.

The next point that he has asked is, he has given his interpretation of territorial integrity. If this expression is stretched then it could also embrace territories like Goa, Mozambique or Angola. I would like to clarify if the hon. Member is not already aware that so far as these territories that he has mentioned are concerned, these are under colonial domination and there are several Resolutions of the United Nations clearly spelling out that a metropolitan country cannot purely on a legalistic or juridical basis befool the international community by saying that their colony is part of the metropolitan area. There are clear Resolutions of the United Nations and the United Nations have all along proceeded on this basis. There are very clear and unambiguous Resolutions and formulations in the United Nations in the General Assembly, in the Committee of 24 and in several other forums, where this position has been fully clarified.

I would at that end appeal to hon. Members that our attitude should take into Consideration the fact that we are also members of the United Nations, we should not take deliberate postures to denigrate the United Nations and the international civil servants. We may not always agree with what a particular international civil servant may have to say or with his assessment; in that case we will be perfectly justified in putting across our viewpoint but I would appeal to hon. Members to avoid mentioning in disparaging terms the action of international civil servants, particularly the person of such a high dignitary as the Secretary General. Every human being is likely to err we may not agree with his judgment but it will not be wise to say that the action that he is taking, is under the inspiration or guidance of some other country. I think this amounts almost to abusing the Secretary General and it is my duty to mention very clearly that this is not and cannot be the Government attitude because we hold

[Sardar Swaran Singh]  
the Secretary General U Thant in high respect, not only as the highest authority in the UN but also as a noted Asian. Therefore I would appeal to the hon. Members to show some restraint when they describe the actions of Secretary-General, U. Thant.

### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS (1969-70) OF THE CENTRAL INLAND WATER TRANSPORT CORPORATION LIMITED, CALCUTTA AND RELATED PAPERS

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND IN THE MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI OM MEHTA): Sir, I lay on the Table, under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956, a copy each of the following papers (in English and Hindi):—

(i) Third Annual Report and Accounts of the Central Inland Water Transport Corporation Limited, Calcutta, for the year 1969-70, together with the Auditors' Report on the Accounts and the Comments of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India thereon.

(ii) Review by Government on the working of the Corporation.

[Placed in Library. For (i) and (i) see No. LT-767/71.]

ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS (1969-70) OF THE INDIA TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED, NEW DELHI

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION (DR. SHRIMATI SAROJINI MAHISHI): Sir, I lay on the Table, under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956, a copy each of the following papers (in English and Hindi):—

(i) Fifth Annual Report and Accounts of the India Tourism Deve-

lopment Corporation Limited, New Delhi, for the year 1969-70, together with the Auditors' Report on the Accounts and the Comments of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India thereon.

(ii) Review by Government on the working of the Corporation.

[Placed in Library. For (i) and (ii) see No. LT-769/71.]

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER THE CUSTOMS ACT, 1962 AND THE CENTRAL EXCISES AND SALT ACT, 1944

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI-MATI SUSHILA ROHATGI): Sir, I lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications (in English and Hindi), of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Insurance) under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962 and section 38 of the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944:

(i) Notification G.S.R. No. 972, dated the 26th June, 1971, publishing the Customs and Central Excises Duties Export Drawback (General) 34th Amendment Rules, 1971.

(ii) Notification G.S.R. No. 973, dated the 26th June, 1971, publishing the Customs and Central Excise Duties Export Drawback (General) 35th Amendment Rules, 1971.

(iii) Notification G.S.R. No. 974, dated the 26th June, 1971, publishing the Customs and Central Excise Duties Export Drawback (General) 36th Amendment Rules, 1971.

(iv) Notification G.S.R. No. 975, dated the 26th June, 1971, publishing the Customs and Central Excise Duties Export Drawback (General) 37th Amendment Rules, 1971.

[Placed in Library. For (i) to (iv) See No. LT-851/71.]