

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Now he says that he did not talk of pressure.

MR. CHAIRMAN : He does not say, Mr. Arora, that he never talked of pressure he says that he never talked of pressure from you, Mr. Mahida and Mr. Krishna Menon. Mr. Arora. now I ask you to sit down.

श्री सीताराम केसरी (बिहार) : गोल्ड स्पाट ने जो कागज बटवाये थे उस पर आपने कहा था कि इन्क्वायरी होगी, तो उस पर क्या हुआ ?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: On the 26th he talked of pressures and today he comes to say that there are no pressures. He did mention pressures.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं व्यक्तिगत स्पर्शीकरण करना चाहता हूँ। श्री मोइनूल हक चौधरी ने मेरे सम्बन्ध में यह कहा कि मैंने उत्तेजित होकर उनसे नाम कहने को मजबूर किया। अगर मैंने उत्तेजित होकर या शान्तवस उनसे यह निवेदन किया था कि वे अपना नाम बतलायें, तो यह मेरे कहने का मतलब था कि वे सही नाम बतलायें। मैंने कभी उनको असत्य बयान करने के लिए नहीं कहा।

श्री सभापति : ठीक है, हम समझे गये हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं समझता हूँ कि उन्होंने उस बयान में भी असत्य कहा और आज भी असत्य कहा। मैं आज बंगला देश की कार्यवाही की वजह से इस मामले को पेश करना नहीं चाहता हूँ और मैं इसको मन्डे को करूँगा।

श्री सभापति : इस पर कोई बहस नहीं होगी।

श्री सीताराम केसरी : मैं बहस नहीं कर रहा हूँ। उस दिन मँम्बरों के पास कागज बंटे थे, उस सम्बन्ध में कहा गया था कि इन्क्वायरी कराई जाय।

श्री सभापति : अब आप रहने दीजिए, इसकी इन्क्वायरी की जरूरत नहीं है।

KESOLUTION URGING THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA TO RECOGNISE THE SOVEREIGN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF BANGLA DESH

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal) : I beg to move :

"That this House urges upon the Government of India to recognize the Sovereign Democratic Republic of Bangla Desh, to establish diplomatic relations with it and to make a declaration to that effect before the conclusion of the current session of Parliament."

Sir, the content of this Resolution is not new. in various forms, through Short Duration Discussions, through Calling Attention Motions and in various other ways we discussed the question of recognising the Sovereign Democratic Republic of Bangla Desh on many occasions in this House. If I remember correctly, on the 31st of March this year we passed a Resolution unanimously which was moved by the Prime Minister herself in which we said in the last pari :

"This House records Us profound conviction that the historic upsurge of the 75 million people of East Bengal will triumph. The House wishes to assure them that their struggle and sacrifices will

receive the wholehearted sympathy and support of the people of India."

The same Resolution was passed by the Lok Sabha as well. Since 31st March four months have elapsed and now it is high time for us to think what we have done actually for the recognition of Bangla Desh, for fulfilling our commitment, for given effect to the pledges we solemnly made in the Solidarity Resolution. We sent our Diplomatic Missions to the various countries and our Foreign Minister led the Delegations in some of the very important countries as it appears from the statement which he laid on the Table on 25th June, 1971. In the statement he had stated :

•Between 6th and 22nd June, 1971 I visited Moscow, Bonn, Paris, Ottawa, New York, Washington D. C. and London in that order."

What was the actual outcome ? He has supplied also, along with the statement the joint communique issued by the various Foreign Ministers along with Mr. Swaran Singh and from the contents of the joint communiques we find actually what we received for Bangla Desh for the evacuees who are coming to our country not in hundreds or thousands but in lakhs. In the statement the Minister has stated :

"I also clarified and it was by and large accepted that any military assistance to the military rulers of Pakistan at this juncture would have the effect of encouraging and sustaining them in their anti-people activity and any economic assistance to them would be tantamount to condoning their deplorable action in East Bengal."

This the Minister said on 25th June, 1971, and the joint communique was issued along with the Foreign Secretary of the USA on 17th June. He tried to impress upon the US and other foreign Missions that any military assistance even

at this juncture to Pakistan, to the military junta of Pakistan would be tantamount to the violation of the international law and principles of humanity and would help the military junta, the ruling clique of Pakistan, to perpetrate their barbarous activities against the civil population of Bangla Desh. The tragedy is this. Immediately after this joint communique issued by the Foreign Secretary along with our Foreign Minister, a ship-load of arms in Padma was sent to Pakistan. What was the outcome of the foreign diplomatic missions which he led only the Soviet Government assured the Government of India in the joint communique issued by them that they will keep in constant touch with the Government of India and will keep a watchful eye on the happenings in Bangla Desh.

What have the other Governments stated? What have other Foreign Ministers assured. They have assured their assistance for refugees of Bangla Desh. Sir, they talk of political solution; they express their desire that some sort of solution should be found out and the barbarities perpetrated on the civilian population of Bangla Desh should come to an end. Thus far and no farther. Mr. Chairman. Sir, since then, may I ask the hon. Foreign Minister, What they have done to reach a political solution of which they are talking so much ? May I know from the Government of India what positive steps, what concrete steps, they have taken to see that a real political solution in accordance with the will of the people of Bangla Desh is evolved and this large influx of refugees which throws a heavy burden on India came to the end ? If you look at the course of events the reply will be that the Government of India has done nothing so far. Mr. Chairman, it has been stated that the Government of India will take action at the appropriate time, they will recognise the Government of Bangla Desh at the appropriate time. What is meant by 'appropriate time' ? Which is the appropriate time? When will this appropriate time

Mr. Pranab Kumar Mukherjee come? Will it be appropriate time when the 75 million people of Bangla Desh are totally liquidated, when the one crore Hindus living in Bangla Desh will cross over and come to India, when every freedom loving person of Bangla Desh, when every politically-conscious young man of Bangla Desh, when every vestige of intelligentsia of Bangla Desh will be totally liquidated? Then and then only will be the appropriate time for them to accord recognition to Bangla Desh? Mr. Chairman, Sir, is it not according to the principles of the United Nations, according to the laws established by the international community, high time for the Government of India to accord recognition to Bangla Desh as a sovereign democratic republic? Sir, you yourself are an eminent jurist of high standing and you yourself know that according to international law all the conditions have been created for the recognition of the sovereign democratic republic of Bangla Desh. It has been pointed out by eminent jurists like Oppenheim and others that if a community renders habitual obedience to an established Government and occupies a definite portion of territory then that community is entitled to have recognition as a sovereign democratic entity. Mr. Chairman, Sir, on 14th April this year a full-fledged Government has been set up under the Presidentship of Mujib-ur-Rahman with an acting President, Mr. Nazrul Islam and that Government is now conducting military operations; it has named its military commandant and it has launched a liberation movement or freedom struggle in Bangla Desh. It has been admitted not by the Indian alone, not by the Indian politicians alone but it has been admitted by almost all foreign diplomats and by many foreign parliamentary delegations, and foreign journalists who have visited Bangla Desh that practically 90 per cent of the territory of Bangla Desh inhabited by 75 million people of Bangla Desh is under the actual control of the liberation army while 10 per cent of the Pakistan Army are occupy-

ing only certain cantonments and certain towns and cities where they are perpetrating all kinds of atrocities on the civilian population. The civil administration is practically run by the sovereign democratic Government of Bangla Desh headed by Mujib-ur-Rahman under the Chairmanship of Mr. Nazrul Islam.

Therefore, I do not know what prevents the Government of India from giving recognition to the Sovereign Democratic Republic of Bangla Desh unilaterally. Are we afraid of the Goebbelsian propaganda of Pakistan? Are we afraid that if we take action to recognise the Sovereign Democratic Republic of Bangla Desh unilaterally world opinion will go against us? I do not find any reason why the Government of India should be so shaky, should be so hesitant, should not speak in unmistakable terms. The Government of India should take a decision not keeping their eyes towards other countries, not looking to the Goebbelsian propaganda by the military junta ruling Pakistan.

There has been an attempt to show that what is happening in Bangla Desh is the creation of India. Pakistan did that in the past, They are doing it in the present and they will do it in the future. We cannot stop it. You cannot stop the Goebbelsian propaganda machinery of Pakistan, but what are the facts? Mujibur Rahman himself admitted, when he gave evidence in the Agartala conspiracy case, that it is Mujibur Rahman who was the first signatory for condemning Indian aggression in 1965 and that communique was issued by the Governor of the then East Bengal. Therefore, there is no point in saying that what is happening in Bangla Desh creation of India. Pakistan may say it and some of the camp-followers of Pal may believe it, but the bulk of the world community and most of the nations will not believe it. They know that Mujibur Rahman's aims are fixed by the Awami League, that the election was fought on that programme and they get the massive mandate of the people of Bangla Desh.

Thai is not the certain of India. That is not the creation of the Indian Government or of the people here. It is essentially a movement created by the people of Bangla Desh. It is essentially a movement which has its origin in the socioeconomic conditions of Bangla Desh. If we go through the six-point programme on which they fought there election, on which they got massive support from the people, we will find that in the six-point programme there is nothing which is pro-India. In the six-point programme on which they got their massive mandate from the 75 million people of Bangla Desh there is not a single word which can be interpreted, which can be accepted as pro-Indian. These people are not doing anything in favour of India. These people are not doing anything on being instigated by India. The six-point programme is entirely based on the socio-economic problems of Bangla Desh. They want to have autonomy. They want to have the right of self-determination. They want to get themselves freed from their economic exploitation. They want to have control over foreign trade. They want to have their own economic rehabilitation. They want to put an end to the exploitation committed by a small section of the West Pakistan people by keeping political power in West Pakistan. They want to have cultural emancipation. Is it wrong? Has it not been stated categorically in the Charter of the United Nations in article 1 that every nation, every group of people, which has a distinct culture, which has a distinct racial affinity will have the right to propagate its own ideas;? They will have the right to resort to all means of democratic practice to fulfil their desire. Has it not been stated in the Charter of the United Nations? Article I (2) says:-

"To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;"

It is not a fact that in the Charter of the United Nations the right of self-deter-

minations has been accepted? The very principle of the United Nations, the very convention of the world body is that the right of self-determination is the most important right. If the 75 million people of Bangla Desh want to assert their right of self-determination, want to have autonomy, want to control their own fate, to have mastery over their lot, what stands in the way? How does it become Indian propaganda?

How does it become an aggression by India? How does it become an attempt to secede from Pakistan? Mr. Chairman? I do not understand what prevents the Government of India from according recognition to Bangla Desh. There are ample instances in international law. Is it not a fact that in 1903 when Panama seceded from Columbia, within a week the United States recognised Panama? Within a week the United States recognised Panama and prevented Columbia from asserting its control over Panama. Is it not a fact that even before the formal declaration of independence the United States broke off from the motherland, the United Kingdom? Then in 1766 within one month of having a separate State France recognised the United States. Is it not a fact that when Greece declared its independence in 1827, within a week four European States accorded recognition to it? Is it not a fact, Mr. Chairman, that when Rumania, Bulgaria and Serbia seceded from the Ottoman Empire, within six weeks of its declaration of independence, they were accorded recognition by the European powers? There are ample examples in international law. Then I do not understand why recognition should not be given by us to Bangla Desh. It is on humanitarian grounds that we should accord recognition to them. Is it not a fact that brutalities, barbarities are being perpetrated on the people of Bangla Desh on the civilian people of Bangla Desh? There are ample reasons why the Government of India should come forward and accord recognition on humanitarian grounds. What happened in 1876.

[Shri Pranab Kumar Mukherjee Rumania, Bulgaria and Serbia seceded from the Ottoman Empire, within six weeks of its declaration of independence, they were accorded recognition by the European powers ? There are ample examples in the international law. Then I do not understand why recognition should not be given by us to Bangla Desh. It is on humanitarian grounds that we should accord recognition to them. Is it not a fact that brutalities, barbarities are being perpetrated on the people of Bangla Desh, on the civilian people of Bangla Desh ? There are ample reasons why the Government of India should come forward and accord recognition on humanitarian grounds, What happened in 1876 when Rumania, Bulgaria and Serbia seceded from the Ottoman Empire ? Civilian people were killed, they were butchered, massacre took place. And as a result of that almost all the European States took up arms against the Ottoman Empire and they gave recognition to those countries. Therefore I do not find any reason why the Government of India should feel hesitant. I do not know how much time they will require to come to a decision. On other occasions while we were having discussions on the refugee influx, it was stated—and the Government refused—that they were not prisoners of indecision. They might have a very clear opinion in their minds. Sardar Swaran Singh may be very clear about the stand taken by the Government of India. The Prime Minister may be very clear about the stand taken by the Government. But Mr. Chairman, I frankly admit my shortcomings. I fail to understand any clarity in the policy of the Government of India. How much time will they take ? How much time would they have to wait for before giving recognition to Bangla Desh ? What conditions have to be fulfilled, according to the Government of India, for determining that unless and until these conditions are fulfilled, we shall not accord recognition ? The Foreign Minister should say. The House should be taken into confidence, the people should be taken into confidence. In a democratic country

nothing should be done in secret, the people should be taken into confidence and here and now the Foreign Minister should speak to the House as to what conditions should be fulfilled under which the Government of India can give recognition to the people of Bangla Desh.

Mr. Chairman, I am not talking of intervention, though intervention is justified according to international law under similar circumstances. I am not saying that the Government of India should take up arms and stand up against the Pakistan military people there. I am not talking of that although there are sufficient reasons to say that it is high time that the Government of India took up arms and stood up against Pakistan. But I am not talking about that. What I want is, they should give recognition to Bangla Desh. Let the people of Bangla Desh fight themselves in their liberation struggle; let them encounter the military rulers. They are competent enough to do that. But we have to recognise them, we have to give them international status; we have to recognise it as a sovereign democratic republic and we have to give due weight, due consideration, to the people there, as revealed through the massive mandate in the elections that took place in December. Mr. Chairman, Sir, on many a time on the very floor of this House, it has been discussed how many times the intrusions took place on the Indian Border by Pakistani army.

12 NOON

Only the other day the Home Minister in reply to a question on the floor of this House stated the number of Pak intrusions in West Bengal was 13. Assam 3, Tripura 13, totalling up to 29. The number of firings by Pakistani Army into the Indian border West Bengal, Assam and Tripura came to 109, 28 and 104 respectively. The number of Indian citizens killed by Pakistani Army was : West Bengal 11, Assam and Meghalaya 31 and Tripura 30, totalling up to 77. The number of persons injured was 135. All these intrusions have taken place since May 1971. I am not talking of air

intrusions. Is it not sufficient ground for intervention on the plea of self-defence as prescribed by international law ? Still Mr. Chairman. I am not talking on intervention. My demand is very modest. I am very humble in putting my demand. Let us recognise the Government of sovereign Democratic Republic of Bangla Desh, give them assistance and establish full diplomatic relations. Let them conduct their own liberation movement for their freedom. Let us give them international status. That is what we want. Is it too much that I am asking for ? Then why did we pass the Solidarity Resolution ? What was the need of it ? Did we just want to give them a little hope ? Did we want to bluff them ? Did we want to hoodwink the real desire of the people of this country represented by this Government ? Will we not feel ashamed if the Bangla Desh people condemn us ? Will they not say, ' Well we are fighting against the military people of Pakistan, when we are fighting against one of the most powerful military personnel in the world, we have natural expectations that our neighbouring country with which we have cultural bondage, with which we have racial bondage, will come forward with assistance. Mr. Chairman, if any Bangla Desh freedom fighter, if any freedom fighter of Bangla Desh now feels that the Government of India by its dilly-dallying policy has deliberately forsaken its commitment, what is strange about it ? Mr. Chairman, again, I repeat that the Government of India is suffering from indecision. They are prisoners of indecision, and sometimes they are taking very wrong decisions. They say that these evacuees will go back if the normal situation is restored. I did not know how this normal situation will come back, how these people will go back. Is it a not lit case for the Government of India to place before the comity of nations the question of these seventy lakh refugees? We are passing Budgets and Supplementary Demands. But what have we done for the refugees, the evacuees of Bangla Desh ? The basic question remains. If these people have come to our country, it is not my fault.

They have come to this border not because of our fault. Can we not speak in unmistakable terms, can we not speak to the military rulers of Pakistan that if they propose to send refugees with the idea of destroying our economy, we shall not remain a silent spectator ? We must rise to the occasion. Cannot the Government speak in those terms ?

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am a simple man. I am a very common man. My language may be broken and my voice may be feeble. But why should the Government of India speak in a feeble voice and why should the Government of India speak in broken language, in a half-hearted language ? Why they cannot speak in unmistakable terms ? Since the very day of the Nehru-Liaquat Ali Pact the Government of Pakistan is flouting all sorts of international agreements.

They are perpetrating genocide. They are committing brutalities against the civilian people. At first, they did it on the Hindu population living there. Now they are doing it indiscriminately on Hindus and Muslims. Each and every Bengali is a victim of the military junta's barbarous atrocities in Pakistan. Therefore, Sir, we are disappointed. We feel extremely disappointed. We do not know what is in the mind of the Government of India. We have doubts that they may forsake their commitment. We are drifting from the commitment that we have made. The hon. Foreign Minister may deny it. He may say that we are still sticking to our commitment. But it is the apprehension of the common people that perhaps the Government of India will do nothing. When the emotional stage is over, the people who are now emotionally surcharged may forget it. Mr. Chairman, if it continues for days together, for months together, for years together, psychologically one is bound to forget it. Perhaps the Government of India is waiting for that moment. As soon as the emotional stage is over, as soon as the people forget it, the Government will cast its commitment to the winds. If the Government of India thinks so, if that is

IShri Pranab Kumar Mukherjeel what is in the mind of the Government of India, Mr. Chairman, Sir, as a very ordinary, common citizen of the country I can tell you and through you. this Government, that they are living in a fool's paradise. What is happening in Bangla Desh and what is happening in West Bengal and other eastern parts of the country will have a serious repercussion on the economy and politics of this country. We cannot let them loose. We cannot allow them to forget it, we must take a stand and that stand should be clear and it should be clear and it should be spoken in unmistakable terms, in unambiguous terms. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I do not understand what i he Government of India will do with this problem, with these refugees. The Government of India was saying at first that they would go back within three months. Now they have extended (he time to six months. Perhaps they will come forward with another extension of time for more than one year. It is not a question of six months, it is a question of how you deal with it. If you are convinced that until and unless there is a political solution, until and unless there is a non-communal Government and the people's desire is given effect to by the popular Government these refugees will not go back, what are you doing to get that situation created in Bangla Desh ? That is my question. And I have failed to get reply to this question as to what the Government of India is going to do to yet a climate created in Bangla Desh in which these people can go back. The Foreign Minister has expressed the hope that these refugees will go buck if favourable circumstances are created and normalcy is restored. But who is coming to your help? Who is taking your brief? What are the international organisations doing? (*Time MI rings*) I am finishing. The United Nations is trying to pose it as a matter between India and Pakistan. It is Hying to : end observer to both India and Pakistan. What business has the United Nations to send observers

here ? What was U Thant, the Secretary-General of United Nations, doing when genocide was taking place, when foreign delegations reported on it, when the labour Party leader in the House -of Commons in the United Kingdom described it as one of the most tragic happenings of this century, when the Canadian delegation said that there was hardly any precedent for such blood curdling atrocities committed on the civilian population by the military administration in Pakistan T What was U Thant doing then ? Why didn't he convene the General Assembly within 24 hours? If after the nationalisation of Suez Canal, if after the developments in Lebanon in 1958, the U.N. General Assembly could meet within 24 hours, why did not the General Assembly meet in this case ?

Why did not the General Assembly meet to pass a resolution condemning the barbarous atrocities of Pakisian ? (*Time-bell rings*) Sir, I know my time is limited. I am going to finish. I want to request the honourable Foreign Minister again, let not the policy of the Government of India be limited, let not the policy of the Government of India be delayed, let the Government of India speak here and now in unmistakable terms, in unambiguous terms, that we are committed to the people of Bangla Desh, not only in the interests of the liberation forces, but in the interests of ourselves.

With these words, Sir, I conclude. Thank you.

The t/ie. 'ion was proposed.

SHRI SITARAM KESRI (Bihar) :
Sir, I move :

I. "That in the Resolution—

for the words, 'to establish diploma-i ic relations with it and to make a declaration to that effect before the conclusion of the current session of Parliament' the words, 'at the appropriate time' be substituted."

SHRI J. P. YADAV (Bihar) : Sir, I move :

3. "That in the Resolution—
after the words 'to establish diplomatic
relations with it', the words 'to give
military and other assistance to it' be
inserted."

The Questions were proposed.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA (Maharashtra) :
Mr. Chairman, I think it is agreed on all
hands that what has been happening in
Bangla Desh is not only a crime but a tra-
gedy. History has known many dark ages.
History is full of deeds which make our
blood curdle. But I think what has happened
in Bangla Desh is practically unprecedented.
Every principle of international law, every
purpose that is writ large in the United
Nations Charter, every convention of human
rights, has been violated, crushed under feet,
deliberately without any compunction,
without any justification. I do not think
history records in the long period in which
history has been written, a spectacle so
horrible, so inhuman, so revolting, as the one
that we have been witnessing in Bangla
Desh. And the question I want to ask myself
is—I will try to be as brief as possible
because I know many want to participate in
this debate—how has India reacted to this
crime ? I will deal with how others have
reacted. But our interest and our concern is
to find out how India has reacted. When this
shocking crack-down as it is called was
reported to India the Prime Minister
instinctively reacted to it with horror and
disgust. I very often found that the
honourable Prime Minister's first instincts
are sound. But then something happens. And
in this case the instinct was converted into
hard thinking, into considering the pros and
cons, in balancing the interests of our
country, the prejudices of other countries,
and so on. I say this with respect to my very
great friend, the honourable External Affairs
Minister. This is what always happens when
the External Affairs Ministry gives advice. I
know the Ministry fairly well and I can say
that the officers of that Ministry are loyal,
devoted, able and competent. But—and this
is an important 'but'—the Ministry suffers from

the defect which every bureaucracy suffers,
and that defect is that they believe in the
status quo, they believe in precedents, they
believe in pouring over tomes of international
law, and so on. And they found there
was no precedent for what has happened.
Sir, how can there be a precedent of what
has happened in Bangla Desh ? What has
happened is that a lawfully constituted
Government, a Government elected through
the ballot box, has been subverted by a
minority by the most violent means that
history has ever known.

You will note that this is not a case of
secession. If anybody has seceded, it is not
Mujibur Rehman, but Yahya Khan because
as a result of elections Mujibur
Rehman would have been the Prime Minister
of Pakistan. But Yahya Khan could not
brook this. Therefore, the majority was
sought to be subverted by a wholesale
massacre or, what is known in the English
language, genocide. Even genocide does not
fully describe what happened in Bangla
Desh.

As was pointed out by the mover of the
Resolution, the Prime Minister rightly came
to this House and the other House and got a
Resolution passed unanimously on the 31st
March and wanted us to agree with the
government, to sympathise with what is
happening there and also to give support.
We have given full sympathy. Sympathy
does not cost us anything. All over the
country, there is a tremendous feeling that
we should sympathise with the suffering of
the people of Bangla Desh. What I want to
ask the Government and my friends is. What
have you done to support Bangla Desh . . .

SHRI AWADHESHWER PRASAD
SINHA (Bihar) : You do not know that,
Shri Chagla ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please do not
interrupt.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : I am sure my
hon. friend is wiser than I am.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD
SINHA : You don't know what support we
are giving. Being an ex-Foreign Minister,

[Awadheshwar Prasad Sinha]
 you are supposed to know better. Do not be partisan, Mr. Chagla. You should be impartial so far as facts are concerned.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : I do not know why interruption is called for. Have I misstated any fact ?

SHRI PITAMBER DAS (Uttar Pradesh) : Some people rush in where angels fear to tread.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: His question that I want to ask is this : Hither the hon. Minister or other hon. Members will answer that I believe. What have we done to support Bangla Desh effectively ? The only way to support 'Bangla Desh was to have immediately recognised their Government when it was formed. I say this with deliberation and with a sense of full responsibility that the failure of the government to recognise Bangla Desh at that time is the greatest blunder we have committed. I say, history will never forgive us for this.

Recognition of Bangla Desh would have meant first of all recognition of a government (as a neighbour) which was friendly to India. In the second place it would have undone much of the harms of partition. In the third place, it would have completely buried once and for all the two-nation theory which is one of the most evil doctrines that has been started before partition and which led to what we all know the breaking up of our motherland. Why was this recognition not given ? I want to examine the reasons, for it was said that internationally we could not recognise the government. I, Sir, emphatically differ from that view. As far as I know the international law- I do not pretend to be an expert—it is clearly established that whether to recognise a country or not is entirely within the discretion of the country which is to give recognition.

It was within our discretion either to recognise Bangla Desh or not. It would depend on our national interest. Second-

ly, Sir, it was said that there was no properly constituted government or that conditions did not exist with regard to the formation of the government which would justify the recognition of Bangla Desh. There again, Sir, I differ. One of the factors for recognition is legitimacy. A country has to ask itself, "Is the Government I am recognising legitimate ?" If it is, then that country has every right to recognise the other country.

Now, Sir, I ask this question : "On whose side is legitimacy ? Is it on the side of Yahya Khan or is it on the side of Mujibur Rehman ?" Sir, what has happened in Bangla Desh was not a military *coup* where a legitimate government was overthrown and till the government was properly established and people could give allegiance to it so that some sort of legitimacy is there. But, in this case, it is clear beyond doubt that the legitimate Government of Bangla Desh, even of Pakistan, was the Government constituted by Mujibur Rehman through democratic processes, through the ballot box. Yahya Khan was a rebel. Yahya Khan had no justification, legal or otherwise, to subvert a legal, democratic, government formed in Bangla Desh.

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal) : What about Gen. Franco ?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Yes, I would say that it is so. But even in Franco's case, he came as a sort of an outsider. But it is true that he tried to subvert the constitutional government of Spain in the unfortunate Civil war days. Sir, that was not a case again where a majority was trying to keep the minority within its fold, within the fold of the country. As I said before, Yahya Khan is representing a minority and it was the minority that was trying to subvert the majority, not by political means, but by the very simple means of massacring— as many millions of them as possible so that the majority should become the minority.

i
 Sir, the most important result of recognition of Bangla Desh would have been

that legally, legitimately under international law, we could have supplied arms to Bangla Desh, then Bangla Desh would have been in a position, if not com-to drive out the Pakistan army, but at least to keep a large part of Bangla Desh within its jurisdiction, within its domination, within its control. But, by not giving arms to Bangla Desh, by not recognising Bangla Desh, you have permitted a situation to arise in Pakistan which is disastrous for the country. Now what has happened? Sir the poor Bangla Desh has been swept by the Army. Pakistan is in military occupation of that country. These brave, gallant men -and my heart goes out to them and one is moved to tears when one thinks of what Bangla Desh is going through—are carrying on guerilla warfare there. But the Government should have foreseen and I accuse them of negligence, grave negligence. They should have foreseen that if they did not resist the Pakistani military machine, not by going there and fighting themselves. I am not suggesting that-but by recognising Bangla Desh and giving all arms to Bangla Desh, the result would have been that hundreds of thousands of these refugees would have come to India.

They have come to India. But this Government could have prevented it. I say it could have prevented this. These 6 million refugees would not have been here.

Now, Sir With regard to refugees, I wish to say something. Sir, I pay handsome compliments to the Government for what they done for the refugees. I think we should be proud as a country that we have taken upon ourselves the burden of receiving them, housing them and feeding them. It means a tremendous burden on our economy. Taxation is high enough but I see, my friend, the Finance Minister, is going to ask for Supplementary Grants in the Lok Sabha very soon. But, Sir, how long are we going to bear this burden? I wish to assure this House that the international community is not going to help us all the time. A

lot of money; has been given by some countries.

SHRI KALYAN ROY : Very little.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: But this is only for this year. If these refugees continue to come from year to year, we will not be able to get anything at all and if we have to maintain these refugees indefinitely, what is going to happen to our economy ? Six million people are to be absorbed,

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Nine million people .

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Already there are many unemployed people in our country. We do not give them subsidy. It is a shame .

But with regard to these six million people . . .

AN HON. MEMBER : More than six million. About 8 million refugees are there.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: With regard to these 8 million people, we will have to feed every mouth, we will have to shoulder the burden of everyone, we will have to clothe everyone and how long can India face this ? Sir, with great respect to the Prime Minister, she has been saying—and I have yet to see—that these refugees will go back. Will the hon. Minister, in heaven's name, tell me how they will go back. How is the Prime Minister going to see that the refugees will go back? She cannot drag them out. They are not dragging them out.

SHRI KALYAN ROY : After their death, they will go back spiritually.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : But six million people take some time to die and they will produce some children also. There is no way. I know that, Except that I am not going to suggest anything about sending these refugees back to Bangla Desh.

Now, Sir, we have to be strong. We forget that we are a great nation. We should be one of the big powers. But we act as if we are a second power.

SHRI KALYAN ROY : We are.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : I do not agree with that. I do not think so. Our country is the second largest in the world with a large population, with a great culture, with a great history. Why should we be a second class nation ? But, Sir, we make ourselves so. I tell you why. We never take the initiative. If a problem arises, we first think what China will do. We think what Pakistan will do, how Russia will act . . .

AN HON. MEMBER : . . . how Egypt will react.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : Yes, we think how Egypt will react. But I want to know whether Pakistan ever thinks how India will react. In this House also, what has been troubling the Government, my hon. friend may say it or not. but actually what has been troubling them is they are waiting for somebody to recognise it, they are waiting for Russia to do it for us. Why should Russia do it for us ? Why should we wait for Russia, why should we wait for any body ? Sir, in the past, on great many occasions, when Shri Jawaharlal Nehru was the Prime Minister, he has given the lead to Asia in the world, he has spoken with a voice which has been listened to by the whole world. In every case when liberty was endangered, where there was political corruption in the sense that certain important principles were violated, when there was tyranny, when there was injustice, he stood up, he raised his voice—not waiting to see what others will say—and his was the first voice and that voice was listened to and followed by whole Asia.

Sir, this is what we should do. Finally I will say about the reaction of the world. The resolution says that we should recognise Bangla Desh before the end of the session. I say : 'Recognise it now, this minute. It is late, it is very late'. It will be a belated action but even now we can do something. At least we can tell the world that we are taking the initiative in this matter. About the reaction of the world, I have never been more disillusioned, more disappointed, more

disgusted than to see the way the world conscience has reacted to what is happening in Bangla Desh. What has happened to the world conscience? It is muted, it is silent or it is dead. What has happened to non-alignment ? What has happened to Africa and what happened to the Arab World. Sir, I have stood here as Foreign Minister day in and day out and I was attacked for the Government's policy on UAR. I justified it because I said we must support Nasser who stood for secularism against Muslim fanaticism and I think I was right then, but to day I am sorry to say that the UAR has become as communal, as fanatical as any other part of Arab World. Sir, I do not want to tax your patience. May I conclude in one sentence? The Government must face the consequences of doing the right thing. If something is in the national interest, it does not matter what will happen. If Pakistan goes to war, we can take on Pakistan. We have taken her on before and we will take her on again and let the Foreign Minister remember that Pakistan has been and will always be our enemy. China I am not afraid of. China will make some noise as she usually does but I am not afraid of an attack from China. What the Government needs to-day is courage, a sense of national interest and I want to assure the Foreign Minister that if he were to take a referendum in India to day, 90% will ask for the recognition of Bangla Desh.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS (Assam) : The Developments in Bangla Desh which we have discussed several times in this House have to be recognised not as an internal affair of Pakistan. It has become an international question and therefore we have to examine this question not only on the basis of the issues involved in the struggle of the people of Bangla Desh but also in the context of the international implications.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

It is absolutely wrong for anybody to believe that Pakistan was created to serve the cause of Islam or the interests of the

Muslims. What has happened in Bangla Desh in the last four months has proved beyond any shadow of doubt that the life, honour and property of even the Muslims—millions of them—have become absolutely insecure in the hands of a Muslim Government, in a country claimed to be governed under Islamic laws. The extent of mass killing and mass murders committed by the Muslim Army on the Muslim population in Bangla Desh has thrown into pale# insignificance the extent of suffering caused to the Arabs by the Jews in West Asia over a period of 20 years of war. Pakistan sometimes—why some times, very often—accuses India of ill-treating the Muslims. It is now for the whole world to see which country, whether it is Pakistan or India which guarantees greater security to the life, property and honour of the Muslims. The happenings in Bangla Desh have not only exposed the myth of theocratic State but has also exploded the so-called two-nation theory itself.

The fact is that Pakistan was never created for the good of the Muslims. It was creation of Anglo-American conspiracy backed by the capitalist-landlord-bureaucratic combine of Pakistan for a free exploitation of the poor masses of Pakistan on the one hand and to build a military potential against India on the other hand. Neither Britain, nor the USA sincerely wants India to be prosperous or strong and they have always used Pakistan as an instrument to serve their own ends. I do not know if the ruling circles of Great Britain have started doing some kind of rethinking about their attitude towards Pakistan after what has happened in Bangla Desh. But let us not forget that it was primarily the British much more than the Muslim League itself which had planned Pakistan and till the other day they have always supported Pakistan as against India. Britain is no longer a great power and therefore the burden of the baby has been safely shifted to the care of the Americans. No other country has been so thoroughly exposed by the developments in Bangla

Desh than the United States of America. They talk of democracy, of human rights, of human values and so on and so forth, but still most shamelessly they are giving arms aid to Pakistan to continue to commit genocide on the people of Bangla Desh. The fact has been established beyond any shadow of doubt now that Pakistan is nothing but an American base in the sub-continent and the Pakistani rulers are acting as the agents of Pentagon and CIA in order to serve the interests of imperialist powers and never the interests of their people.

Sir, I am not at all surprised to see China also standing by the side of the military junta of Pakistan as against the people of Bangla Desh. Their move for a rapprochement with America makes their international character much more clear. That a communist country professing to stand by the side of the peoples struggling for freedom and social justice can go to the extent of supporting a regime engaged in acts of exploitation, mass murder, mass raping and even to the extent of moving closer to the greatest imperialist power on earth is a scandal of Himalayan magnitude. The real character and intentions of China have been thoroughly exposed today. The Sino-American rapprochement move may be an entirely separate development, but I do not think it is entirely unconnected with the issue of Bangla Desh, particularly when Pakistan has successfully played the role of a broker in this nefarious game of great power politics, politics of spheres of influence. It is in this context, Sir, that we have to examine the question of Bangla Desh and determine our course of action. The first thing that I would suggest is that our foreign policy needs an immediate reorientation, and before we find ourselves entrapped by the policy of encirclement pursued by China, USA and Pakistan combined against our country, we should take steps to see that any attempt at encirclement is broken through by counter-measures in the international field. I would strongly suggest that it is time we realised

[Shri Bipinpal Das the hard reality of the developing situation and built up much closer and much more intimate relations with Soviet Russia on one hand and Japan on the other in order to safeguard our national interests and national security. The foreign policy of a country does not depend on the ideals or ideological considerations or on the character of the social systems of different countries. It is based on and must be based on considerations of national self-interest and national security. It is for this reason that I strongly advocate closer relations with Russia and Japan. Such a policy will help not only this country but also the people and the cause of Bangla Desh ultimately.

The struggle of Bangla Desh is basically a struggle for democracy and human rights. We are not concerned with whether Pakistan remains united as one country or breaks up into two or more units. That is a question for the people of Pakistan to decide and find out. But we are certainly concerned with the values of democracy, with the values of secularism, with the values of human rights and with the values of socialism. It is from that angle, it is from that consideration that we have declared our support and sympathy to the people of Bangla Desh in their struggle against the Pakistani junta. The question has been raised : What have you done to translate your resolution into action ? I do not think this can be discussed in detail here in the public interest, But I am sure that most of the hon. Members are aware of what is actually happening. I believe the Government are doing their best to translate the Resolution into action in the way they have considered fit and proper. Now, Sir, one thing should be . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) :
Then, shall we stop the discussion ?

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : I am coming to that. I know you always talk for the American imperialists. One thing must be clearly understood. The people must fight

out their own war of liberation. Any liberation that is achieved by armed intervention from outside may lead to very dangerous consequences and, therefore, it is for the people of Bangla Desh and the Mukti Foj to fight out their own battle of liberation. In this connection while speaking in the last Session of this House I made one suggestion. Why not pick up at least a lakh of youngmen from out of the refugees, arm them and help them, so that they can fight out their own battle of liberation against the Pakistan junta ? I repeat that suggestion and I have reasons to believe that the suggestion i.e. I made in the last Session has not fallen on deaf ears. I cannot discuss the matter in detail here. As I have said, it will not be in the public interest. But what is actually happening in Bangla Desh today convinces me that things are going on on the right line in the sense that the Mukti Foj have been able to step up their operations and have been able to create serious difficulties for the Pakistan Army. It is for this reason that there is now a move for posting UN observers along the India-Pakistan border. It is a move to stifle the activities of the Mukti Foj or to blunt the operations of the Mukti Foj. It is a move to transform the whole issue — the issue of the Bangla Desh people fighting against the rulers of West Pakistan — into an Indo-Pakistan issue. This move is there only because the Mukti Foj has been able to step up its operations and create serious difficulties for the Pakistani rulers. We should beware of this. We should be on our guard regarding whatever action we want to pursue. We must not do anything which may cause any harm to the struggle of the Mukti Foj or give the impression that ultimately this is not a question of people of Bangla Desh fighting the rulers of Pakistan, but it is an Indo-Pakistan conflict. We must not give that impression. If Pakistan attacks us tomorrow, certainly we shall fight back and defend our country. But I am not in favour of doing anything on our own initiative which might lead to a direct armed confrontation between India and Pakistan.

Therefore our entire policy and approach should be to help those people, to help them to fight and fight their own battle to success. I have no doubt in my mind that ultimately the people of Bangla Desh will succeed, I have no doubt in my mind that ultimately the Mukti Foj will be able to liberate their country from the hands of the Pakistani Army, and to that end I think we should carry on our policy, pursue our policy in the matter of giving support.

Now, Sir, the question raised by this Resolution which is before this House is about recognition. I do not think there is anybody in this country who is on principle opposed to recognition. If I remember correctly, even the External Affairs Minister said that the Government is not opposed to recognition of Bangla Desh. The question is when. We say, people say, many Members have said, Mr. Chagla has said, it is already too late. Now, the question of recognition of Bangla Desh is a matter which cannot be dictated by anybody. It will have to be decided by the Government itself in accordance with their own judgement. They are the best judge of the situation, of the circumstances in which they have to act in this matter. Therefore I do not think that it will be advisable on our part or appropriate on our part, to try to force the Government regarding the time factor. We may be dissatisfied, we may think that it is too late and that things are developing in a direction which will ultimately harm our own interests. We may suggest, we may advise, we may put pressure, we may say anything. But the ultimate responsibility in this matter lies with the Government. And therefore it is for the Government to decide, it is for them to judge the circumstances, examine the circumstances, and then decide at what point of time they want to recognise the Government of Bangla Desh. It is for them to choose the appropriate time for this. Therefore I repeat that while the

policy of helping the Mukti Foj to continue their war of liberation must be continued, on the question of recognition of Bangla Desh, the entire responsibility lies with the Government and therefore we should leave the matter to the discretion of the Government so far as the choice of the time is concerned.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We are discussing a Private Member's Resolution, a very important Resolution, and naturally many members would like to participate in this discussion. Under the rule, every Member is allowed to speak for fifteen minutes. In view of the large number of Members desiring to participate in the discussion, it will not be possible for me to give any extra time to any individual Member. Therefore, I would like to appeal to all the Members to restrict their speeches to 15 minutes.

Mr. Biju Patnaik.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK (Orissa): We have had many clashes in this House between the very able and adroit Minister of External Affairs and other Members of this House. He is an able Minister, who can also be said as being a master of confusion. It is a credit, not a discredit, to him as Foreign Minister. I would merely restrict myself to certain facts, cold facts, brutal facts, which may raise a controversy, but nevertheless facts to be examined closely. All the statements made in this House from time to time on Bangla Desh are well known. The views of this House both from the Treasury Benches and the Opposition in record to this question are identical and well known. The views of the Government appear to change from time to time for reasons only known to themselves and that is what has wrought him further trouble, and further doubt and suspicion in the minds of the Members of this House.

[Shri Biju Patnaik]

We briefly talk of the word "genocide" the word, "oppression", about the unprecedented massacres, human atrocities, etc. As it was pointed out earlier by some Members, during the partition nearly 6 million Hindus were sent into this country. But during this holocaust the Government record says that as on the 1st of June this year, 7 million people, evacuees from East Bengal have come, of which 6.5 million people happen to be Hindus. When it is stated here in this House by the Government that the Bangla Desh question has exposed the hollowness of the two-nation theory, I humbly disagree.

In East Bengal there were about 10 million Hindus before partition. Let us take it that to this figure would have been added another 2 million by now. That means in all 12 million Hindus. Now six million of them came out during the partition. And 6 million have come out now. The result is that Mr. Yahya Khan and the rulers of Pakistan have decided to perpetrate the two-nation theory. We are a secular State who believe and have faith in secularism and make all-out effort to ensure that another secular leader like Mr. Mujibur Rahman or his party like the Awami League is installed in Bangla Desh. If the movement of Bangla Desh fails, it is not Pakistan which is going to be finished. It is India which is going to be finished. I repeat this with all sincerity, with all conviction that Pakistan will remain as a hundred percent Islamic State. The involvement of the Indian Armed Forces will be on both wings. Then, the records will show that of the 65 lakh Hindus that have moved over from East Bengal during this holocaust, women of the age-group of 15-25 are negligible. It is a known fact that during this time lakhs of young women are deported from there. They are either being placed at the disposal of the Pakistani Armed Forces or sold abroad in the Middle East. These are known facts of life.

We, Sir, have the habit of closing our eyes like *Kabootars* and think that all is well with the world. We only specialise in bluffing ourselves. The world studies India's history. The world has made a deep study of the Indian history. We call ourselves a great nation. We may be a most populous nation.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh):
We never said that.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK. : We are happy to call ourselves a great nation. Why do you not admit that ? It is a nation, one of the most populous nations, one of the most impoverished nations. Its total striking Power is only 4 million tonnes of steel with 9 million tonnes of capacity.

Japan with one-fifth of our population produces 92 million tonnes of steel, without having any iron or coal. This is the measure of our greatness, this is the measure of our great Government, this is the measure of our sovereign Parliament, in terms of international politics. We must admit what we are. But we must try and grow out of what we are. To-day I am sure Mr. Foreign Minister, you will admit that we are not even a nation to contend with in Asia, leave alone the world. With the direct link of America and China that is in the offing, with the economic union that is being planned of the South-East Asian countries, India will be relegated to the position of even Nepal in another two years. Comparatively, let us see the status of a little country called Israel. That country also is being ruled by a woman, but what a woman ! That country has produced a Defence Minister like Dayan who wiped off the so-called Arab forces whom we have been pampering all along and who have dropped us like a hot potato in this great issue which is confronting us. That country wiped off the entire air force of Egypt at the crack of dawn and Egypt could never raise its head afterwards. During

1965 in our confrontation with Pakistan, the External Affairs Minister would admit, two of our air force bases were wiped off at the crack of dawn—Kalai-kunda in the eastern sector and Pathankot in the western sector. They came and wiped off our fighter aircraft and we had no protection. We find the Defence Minister and External Affairs Minister making statements in season and out of season that we are prepared. How are we prepared, if you are prepared why are you so afraid ? A Resolution comes in the House that we should recognise Bang-la Desh only to be able to give them material support, to help them to fight their own battles legitimately, legally. Mr. Mukerjee said that it should be done before this session ends. Mr. Chagla improved on it and said that it should have been done yesterday and if it has not been done it should be done to-day. I wish to go on record in this House, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that this Government would never recognise Bangla Desh.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE
(Bihar) : Question.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK : I will tell you the reasons.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh) : We are already committed to recognise it.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK : We will never recognise Bangla Desh. The Bangla Desh movement of this gallant Mukti Fauj will be scotched and Yahya Khan's military regime will continue not only to-day but for the next 20 years. I wish to record it for historical purposes.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE :
You are wrong.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK : I will tell you why. I will tell you my assessment. This Government has developed cold feet.

This Parliament of ours sanctions Rs. 1,200 crores of expenditure for building up our armed forces, as against Rs. 350 crores of Pakistan. What are we prepared for ? What we are frightened about ? Our people get shot up on the ground day in and day out; as was read out on the floor of the House, by mortar fire. Yesterday, I was surprised to hear the Minister of State for Home Affairs saying that the BSF is in charge of our border. The BSF, the Border Security Force, does not have mortars. It does not have ground artillery. How is it responsible for long-range firing on our side ? Who is fooling whom I do not know. Rs. 350 crores as against Rs. 1200 crores in the direct Budget. Apart from this Rs. 1200 crores, we spend Rs. 300 to Rs. 400 crores in terms of BSF, SSB, Assam Rifles, feeding all the border posts by the Air-Force, building border roads with Rs. 500 crores in support of our defence effort. We have divisions as against Pakistan's 9. On 31st March if you had recognised and if you had supplied Bangla Desh with arms and ammunition, when Pakistan had only less than 2 divisions and its forces were in total disarray, the thing would have been completed in two days . . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN (Uttar Pradesh) :
Right.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK : And we allowed the Pakistani military force to go in for four divisions, we allowed them to raise two more divisions during the last six months, we allowed them to get extra divisions from the territorial force, and we have yet not considered it fit in this country to alert our armed forces, resulting in two intrusions and photographing and everything and aircraft encroaching and firing allround killing our people even in our side of the country. Therefore, I said 'never' our Government is frightened. Let what I say be recorded, it is frightened to engage Pakistan, it fears the 9-foot Chinese. I would like with all responsibility to state that the armed forces of India are frightened of the Chinese. I would like to say this. One day I shall

[Shri Biju Patnaik] ask a question in this House and the Minister of Defence shall reply : What is the calibre of our armed forces? What is the record in actual warfare of our command men, the Generals, the Commander-in-Chief and others ? The House will be surprised to know the result of that query.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : Sir, it is not fair for a responsible Member to cast aspersions on the army.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK. : I fought for the liberation of this country. I ran an underground movement. I went to British prison for four years. And I have the right to say this.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : We also know what Mr. Biju Patnaik did during the Chinese attack.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK : Ask Nehru for my record . . .

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana): On a point of order. Sir, we in this House are discussing a very serious matter.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : Yes.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : We are discussing it so that we can meet the situation that might arise, whatever situation which might arise. But no Member has got the right to create a situation, to create an atmosphere, in the country of demoralisation . . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN : On a point of order...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI (Rajasthan) : Sir, you must first hear all the things.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : We want to know everything.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK : Mr. Krishan Kant, what you are saying is not correct.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान् आन अ प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ, उनको बोलने का क्या हक है जिनकी वजह से भारत का हिस्सा चाइना को खो दिया, नेफा को खो दिया, कश्मीर को खो दिया। यह रबिश बोल रहे हैं।

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : No Member has got the right to create an atmosphere of demoralisation. The honourable Member. . .

(Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : मुल्क की आजादी को बेचने वाले आज यहां पर चिल्ला रहे हैं। दलाल कहीं के।

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Mr. Deputy Chairman, you are not only the guardian of this House, you are not only the guardian of the voice of this House, but you are the guardian of our national interests as well.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : What do you know of national interests? You have sold the nation.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY) : May I make a submission?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Let me come first.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : No, no. We are on a point of order . . .

SMRIBI.IU PATNAIK : Mr. Krishan Kant, Uie nation is bigger than the House.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Sir, no speech which denounces our armed forces or the ability i>f our people should be allowed.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : What is this?

SHRI RA.INARAIN : This Government has corrupted the armed forces.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Yes, yes.

(Interruptions)

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY (Tamil Nadu) : On a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please sit down. I base called Shri Gumpada-swamy.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Sir. I want.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : I have got to be called . . .

(Interruptions)

I have a point of order . . .

(Interruptions)

Such nonsense cannot go unchallenged.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: Your nonsense also cannot go on . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Will you please sit down?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : This is against the armed forces of the country.

SHRI I. N. MISHRA (Bihar): Please be a little generous.

SHRI GURUPADASWAMY : As I understand, the hon. Shri Biju Patnaik did not mean to denigrate or run down our Army.

AN HON. MEMBER : What else has he done?

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK : He said about the Commanders of our Armed Forces . . .

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order. Please sit down.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : I can understand what you are talking.

SHRI RAJNARATN : We have seen the history of Kaul.

SHRI L. N. MISHRA : He is no longer there. He has gone away.

SHRI AKBAR Ali KHAN (Andhra Pradesh) : He is a senior politician. I would appeal to him not to say anything against our Generals or our military.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: SI ri Akbar Ali Khan is one of our Vice-Chairmen. He at least should know that he slvuld not speak when I am standing.

Nobody in this House has any intention to denigrate or run down our Army. At the same time, as Member of this responsible House, we should also know the truth and with a view to know the truth certain things have to be expressed candidly. I take it only in that spirit. Shri Biju Patnaik has expressed certain things about the Commands in the Army . . .

AN. HON. MEMBER: About the Army.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: If he has mentioned about the Army. I am one with you.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: It is the Commander who has to inspire the Army under him. How can you denigrate the Commander ?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Do not put it in the proceedings . . .

(*Interruptions*) SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: I would like to know from you whether it is not the patriotic duty of any citizen of India, let alone Members of Parliament, to draw the attention of the House and the public at large to the hard realities. If the hon Member has certain knowledge of the functioning of the Army, he has got a right to say that. He is fulfilling his duty. He is rendering a service. Why should you not take it in that spirit ?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : That can be done by private discussion with the Defence Minister instead of saying something here which will go round the whole world . . .

(*Interruptions*).

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : Mere mention of one fact does not mean that he is denigrating the Armed forces.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY : This kind of talk will ultimately harm the security of our country . . .

(*Interruptions*). SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : If I may make a suggestion, Shri Biju Patnaik has made a point. The best thing is not to prolong it. Let him move on to the next point.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK : I must say that the hon. Members should go through the proceedings and see whether I have denigrated the Armed Forces of nation. What I said was that it is necessary for the House to know the record of the Army Commanders who are today in command.

AN. HON. MEMBER : They are among the best in the world.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: That is your opinion.

I again say that the charge of command of the Commanders has yet to be proved. They are not like that in Vietnam or like that of Dayan of Israel who have proved in action. What I say is that the Government must put our armed forces to test. What are they fighting for ? Why are they fighting ? Sir, I say, to go on record, . . . (*Interruptions*) . . ., that all our actions, in fact, all our inactions, are guided by this sub-conscious lurking fear of the Chinese involvement. I say this to go on record. I say this, Sir, that we have, in the last five years . . . (*Interruptions*) . . . Please listen to me now. We have, in the last five years, developed 9 mountain divisions for protection of all the Himalayan passes. Is it or it not a fact ? If that is so, with merely 13 to 14 divisions covering the area near Tibet, are we to be frightened of these Chinese ? If you are frightened sub-consciously about their guided missiles, that atomic war-head, I say, every missile that is released on India will lead to a conflagration, to an atomic war in the world and the Chinese are not fools and they will not do it. Therefore, nine divisions are there, and fourteen divisions it has and against a total of nine divisions of which 50% is nearly in East Pakistan, our policy should not be dictated by a position of fear or non-involvement unless there is no leadership in the Government or there is no leadership in the armed forces to take on a job for upholding the prestige and dignity of the nation which has now suffered bitterly. This is my point.

I would, therefore, want to know why it is that we do not recognise Bangla Desh. It only means recognition of this country and legitimate supply of arms, and ammunition. If you say that you are giving all that, I say, that is not the way of doing it. Why should India, which had at one time had moral influence in the whole world and which

has now declined, go in for clandestine methods? This was not taught by Gandhi-ji or Nehru. Why should you go in for clandestine methods, giving antiquated guns, teaching them guerilla business, and all that? . *(Interruptions)*... Mr. Swaran Singh; this is known to everyone in the world. This is entirely childish, if I may say so . . . *(Interruptions)*. It is entirely childish.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please conclude now.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK : Let me conclude, Sir..

The world forces know, the world agencies know and all I have to say is . . . *(Interruptions)* . . . that the House should know, because everybody in the world knows and the only secret is that it is kept from this House unfortunately. The only secret is that we have no courage. Then, Sir, I should say that guerilla action has never occupied territories, and guerilla action has never defeated the enemy. In that case, the North Vietnamese, who are now fighting the most terrible guerilla warfare in South Vietnam would have occupied it. It is the most acute, the most intensive, guerilla warfare that the world has ever known and they have not been able to occupy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: It is the other way about.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir. I want to correct him.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK : Yes, I stand corrected.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please conclude now.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK : I would take only two minutes.

Therefore, Sir, I say that this Government, by the sub-conscious fear of the Chinese, by lack of leadership, by not executing successfully the struggle, has not only

let this country down, but has also demolished the movement in Bangla Desh.

And I know that this would continuously be the policy. Today the refugees are seven million. Tomorrow there will be famine—I want to go on record for history—and another five or six million will move in.

(Interruptions)

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Tax dodger.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: Now, that is expected from your Ministers; ask your Finance Minister.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : That was amply brought out in the House.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK : Many lines have been propagated in this House. Why do you not raise a question of tax while I am here to defend myself?

Therefore, I say this Government, in spite of the resolution passed in this House, in spite of the demand of the situation, in spite of the fact that every day's delay is reducing its prestige to dust, has done nothing. And the Foreign Minister found out during his world trip that wherever he went he got sympathy; little crumbs; whereas Pakistan has got armaments and support. I say this and I wish to go on record : I shall feel proud to lie prostrate in this House if my prophecy is wrong—that this Government shall not recognise Bangla Desh tomorrow during this session or even during the next session of this House. I make bold to say so because I know that their mind functions in a tortuous way, that there is no leadership to execute a war if a war come. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I think this is a sort of provocation from you to recognise Bangla Desh.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI.
Are they at all provoked?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 2 P. M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at seventeen minutes past one of the clock.

2 P. M.

The House reassemble after lunch at two of the clock, the VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHAI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE FINANCE (No.2) Bill, 1971

SECRETARY: I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha :

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith the Finance (No. 2) Bill, 1971, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 31st July, 1971 .

2. The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 109 of the Constitution of India."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

RESOLUTION URGING THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA TO RECOGNISE THE SOVEREIGN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF BANGLA DESH,—continued

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA (Orissa) . Mr. Vice-Chairman. I would rather say that it is unfortunate that we have got this Resolution to discuss before the House. Not only in this House or in the other House but almost all the people living in India are agreed that Bangla Desh should be recognised by the Government of India. Now the question is whether it

should be immediately done, here and now, as Mr. Chagla has said or, as the Mover of the Resolution says, whether it should be done before the end of this session or whether it should be done at an appropriate time, as the Government says.

So there is no quarrel so far as asking for the recognition of Bangla Desh either from this side or that side. Mr. Chagla and others—not only they but even a school-child of the 5th or 6th standard—know the story of Bangla Desh—its inception "as last Bengal and the gradual development into Bangla Desh is a story of misery, horror, of brutality and of fire. So I am not going to cover those things which are already covered and described in detail by various speakers.

Sir, the question is, the recognition has to be accorded by Government. Now, Sir, there is a saying that you cannot conduct a war democratically nor can diplomacy be popular. These are very delicate things, want to conduct a war and if you want to deploy your armed forces you cannot take decisions about it in Parliament and say here that this commander should be sent there, that battalion should be moved to another place and so on.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDART: Is this a Military decision ?

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA: I am giving an illustration.. In the same way

diplomacy cannot be a popular thing. You cannot speak, out everything. You cannot keep all your books open because that is a game to be played with Govern-

with your own enlightened national interests in view. There are certain people in this country who are saying that immediate recognition should be given to Bangla Desh. Sir, I am for recognition because I suffer most when I see that the freedom fighters are suffering. Mr. Chagla has said that tears come to his eyes; I would in his position wipe out my tears and with a

>and collect the mind view the whole