

Page 3, line, 25,—after “shall” insert “not”. (12)

MR. CHAIRMAN: These amendments and the clause are before the House.

श्री शिवचन्द्र भ्वा : इस क्लॉज में कहा गया है कि कोई भी नामिनेटिड मेम्बर सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को राइटिंग में नोटिस दे कर अपने पद से इस्तीफा दे सकता है। चूंकि इस संस्था से राज्य सरकार का भी सम्बन्ध रहेगा, इसलिए मैं अपने संशोधन संख्या 11 के द्वारा चाहता हूं कि जो व्यक्ति अपने पद से इस्तीफा दे, वह उसकी एक कपी राज्य सरकार को भी भेजे।

इस क्लॉज में कहा गया है कि किसी आउटगोइंग मेम्बर को रिनामिनेट किया जा सकेगा। मैं समझता हूं कि यह एक गलत परम्परा है। यदि किसी व्यक्ति को दोबारा नामिनेट किया जायेगा, तो बोर्ड में वेस्टिड इन्टरेस्ट्स की भावना आ जायेगी और जो खराबी कई दूसरी संस्थाओं में व्याप्त है, वह इस लाइब्रेरी में भी आ जायेगी। जो विद्वान एक बार बोर्ड में काम कर चुका है, उसको दोबारा नामिनेट नहीं करना चाहिए। यही मेरे संशोधन संख्या 12 का तात्पर्य है।

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : I hope I am not making any mistake ; I am very anxious to accept something moved by Shri Jha, and the least harmful I can think of is to insert the words ‘and the State Government’. This means that every member resigning will have to write a letter both to the State Government and the Central Government. If this will satisfy him, I have no objection to accepting it.

Regarding the other one, it only says ‘shall be eligible for renomination’. It does not say that he will be renominated. I should retain the provision as it stands.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

“Page 3, line 16,—after “Government” insert—“and to the State Government”.” (11)

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. CHAIRMAN : I shall now put amendment No. 12 to the vote of the House.

*Amendment No. 12 was put and negatived.*

16 hrs.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

“That Clause 6, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

*The motion was adopaed.*

*Clause 6 as amended, was added to the Bill.*

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

“That Clauses 7 and 8 stand part of the Bill.”

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 7 and 8 were added to the Bill.*

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

MR. SPEAKER : The House will now take up the Adjournment Motion.

16.01 hrs.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT (*contd.*)

INDIA'S PARTICIPATION IN ISLAMIC CONFERENCE AT RABAT

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : I move :

“ That the House do now adjourn. ”

As we have already requested you, the time allotted for my opening speech may kindly be passed on to Acharya Kripalani and I will reserve for myself the right to reply to the debate.

MR. SPEAKER : I agreed to this request. It does not make any difference.

MR. SPEAKER : Motion moved :

“That the House do no adjourh.”

SHRI J.B. KRIPALANI (Guna) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am thankful to Shri Pilo Mody and the Swatantra Party for having allowed me to introduce this discussion. It also shows that even old men outside the party of the Prime Minister have some value.

It must be clearly understood that whatever I say and whatever anybody else says here is not in opposition to the Muslim kingdoms that took part in this conference, nor is it against the Arab League. They were all doing what they considered to be their religious duty. Our quarrel is with our Government. Was it doing its national duty ?

Let us look at the nature of this conference. It frankly says that it is a summit conference of Islamic countries. There is no qualifying adjective to this. It is an Islamic summit conference. Then, who was the moving spirit behind this ? It was Saudi Arabia. Naturally, because the sacred places of Islam are under its protection. And with it there were reactionary groups of kingdoms which even the Government of India will not have the audacity to deny. Among them was our neighbour Pakistan.

Who were invited to this conference? The Rulers of the Muslim States and also the Government of Islamic regions. Curiously enough, our Government has said that we belong to the Islamic region. May be, the Government belongs to the Islamic region but this country does not belong to the Islamic region. Supposing, there were a Hindu Conference in the neighbouring kingdom of ours, Nepal, will our Government send a delegation there? If not, can the Hindus insist that the Government should send a delegation there ? Even Muslim of India could not have insisted that the Government should take part in this Islamic Conference.

Who were invited? There were some non-Islamic countries that were invited. Among them was Yugoslavia. It had refused. Then, there was Nigeria. It refused. Tanzania had also refused. Then there were really Arabic States which refused... why, I know.— Syria and Iraq. Why did they refuse? I think they made a difference between their religion and their nationality. They stood for their nationality even though they had a common religion with the other countries. This shows that the Arab League is not a united body. Whom have we given representation here ? To a body of persons who are not united among themselves. This is an anachronism. Now who were those non-Islamic countries who were present. Senegal and Sierra Leon. They were small countries and they wanted

to make themselves important by being invited to this conference and by attending it. Were we going to make ourselves important by attending this conference ? I do not know. The Government of India might have gained in importance but so far as the country is concerned, it has been dragged down.

How was the invitation got ? We were not at first invited. Invitation was forced by approaching here the embassies of those countries that were invited. What did they (our Government) say, If India was not invited, it would feel unhappy. Then telegrams were sent to all those countries that were invited and our embassies there were asked to approach those Governments to get an invitation.

And then we approached the Arab League to get an invitation. What this Arab League is, only the Arabs know. We do not know. What did the host country say, Sir ? "India assailed us to get an invitation."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

SHRI J.B. KRIPALANI: This is what King Hussain of Morocco, our host, says. It is said that this invitation was unanimous. No votes were taken. How did they know that it was unanimous ? Acclamation. Any 10 people here can acclaim and it happens always in this House: there is an acclamation of clamorous persons and we might say that the House is with them. Acclamations are not valid in international conferences. Then was there any invitation sent to India ? In such conferences, if anybody is invited, the invitation is in writing. There was no invitation in writing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Invisible ink.

SHRI J.B. KRIPALANI: Only our ambassador was told that you have been invited. Whether he was told he was unanimously invited or not, that also we do not know.

SHRI PILOO MODY: If there is an invitation, put it on the Table.

SHRI J.B. KRIPALANI: If there is one, they can bring it out from their hats. Then, there were other things which are even

[Shri J.B. Kripalani]

more terrible than that. It is said that our representative at Jeddah gave an assurance to these Arabians that whatever resolution is passed in the conference, India will be bound by it. It takes my breath away that any country can bind itself to any resolution passed by international conferences. It is taking away our sovereignty; it is an invasion of our sovereignty. It is said that this was denied. Then what happened to the denial? It is said it was not published. You go to conference; you deny a thing and it is not published; And yet you go in this conference. It is very strange.

Then, our representative, Shri F A Ahmed was sitting with his Luggage ready. I do not know how many hours he took to fly. It is said that in 12 hours he was gone. Then what happened? He was not received according to the protocol, it is said. I do not know what their protocol is: I never dabble in these things. Then he was not put where other delegates were put up. He was put up in a separate place. He was advised not to go to the conference. Whoever may have advised him—I think Malaysia or somebody.

AN HON. MEMBER: Malaysia.

SHRI J.B. KRIPALANI: Malaysia advised him not to go. He said, "But I have been invited. I must go." That is what appeared in the press. and all of a sudden, he refused to go. If you said that "I must go." then you must go.

You carried out their instructions, but maintained your dignity by saying "I am not bound by your advice." This is a very strange thing. It is said that our poor representative did not get even hot water for shaving. In an Islamic country, why should a Muslim shave? He did not get his food in time. He did not immediately come back to India; he came *via* England.

It is said that we went to this conference because resolutions of a political nature may be passed, To how many conferences where resolutions of a political nature are passed do we go? Even if resolutions of a political nature are passed you remember that we are against all

regional pacts. We have declared from house-tops from the time of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru that we are against these regional pacts or military pacts. Was not this conference intended for military action against Israel? Because it was so intended, therefore, it also comes in the category of Warsaw Pact or SEATO or whatever those pacts are. Why did we not go into these pacts? There also political resolutions are discussed. I assure you that if we wanted to go to the Atlantic Pact or Warsaw Pact or CENTO and so on, they will welcome us with open arms. We will get hot water and food also.

Our representative made certain statements there and those statements show that he was insulted. He said it in London, I am told. In Delhi, he said both these things. He said, we have been insulted, but it is good that we went. Having said that it is good that we went, he also said that there must be a reorientation of our foreign policy. May I humbly ask, is it within the competence of this Industries Minister to say that there should be a reorientation of our foreign policy? He was at once pulled up, by whom? By a junior. These younger people have more authority than older people. They can pull up older men, because it is the age of youth

Our Foreign Minister pulled him up; then the Prime Minister pulled him up, saying that it is not his business.

When I am talking of this, may I know who decided that we should go to this Rabat Conference? I hope those who answer it will tell us by whom this invitation for an international conference was accepted? But nowadays the Cabinet does not count. There is a secret cabal where everything is decided. And of whom does this cabal consist? God alone knows.

AN HON MEMBER: Politburo.

SHRI J.B. KRIPALANI: May be. I do not know certain intimate things, as my friends there. There is at least one ex-Minister there, Dr Ram Subhag Singh. But you cannot trust him. He has left the fold. How can he be trusted? He said that this Rabat invitation was not discussed in the Cabinet.

DR RAM SUBHAG SINGH (Buxar) : Any body can get up and say whether it was discussed.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara) : It is a Cabinet secret.

SHRI J.B. KRIPALANI : If they do not tell us, silence is consent. So the cat is out the bag.

They say they have gained by this Conference. What ? They have defended the Arabs, as if the Arabs needed our defence when we cannot defend our own territory. They say: "by this conference we have gained". I am reminded of a story. When a man was beaten by a shoe, he began to laugh. The neighbours asked him; why are you laughing when you are insulted ? He replied: "Yes, I am insulted; but, don't you see that this shoe is torn ?" ;

Let us see the declaration. It says :

"The Conference is of those who have a common creed and that constitutes a powerful factor bringing the peoples closer together."

What people ? The Islamic people. Up to this time the Government has not published this document, the declaration. They have sent us everything except the declaration. What does the declaration again say ?

"That they are resolved to preserve the spiritual, moral, social and economic values of Islam, which remains one of the essential factors for the achievement of progress by mankind."

This useless United Nations does not make for peace and progress. And what do they affirm ?

"...the unshakable faith in the precepts of Islam. Their Governments will consult together with a view to promoting between themselves close co-operation and mutual assistance, inspired by the immortal teachings of Islam ?

Is there anything more than that to show that this was a communal conference, that this was an Islamic conference—its very name shows that—and that we had no right to be there and to go there as we did go ?

What did the Prime Minister say ? She says that our going to Rabat is equal to Gandhiji's participation in the Khilafat Movement. She earlier said that the step of nationalisation of banks was as world-shaking as Gandhiji's creed of non-violent truthful satyagraha which gave new values to the world in the political field. It has given a new morality, not morality of individuals but morality of groups. There has never been a politician and statesman whose centenary year has been celebrated by friends and enemies all over the world. Our nationalisation of banks will also have a centenary when it will be celebrated all over the world ! What is the meaning of these comparisons ?

How did Gandhiji take part in the Khilafat movement ? He said, "My neighbours are in trouble and it is my duty to help them." How did he help them ? He said, "I do not want to go into the historical background of the Khilafat movement, I take it from Mohammad Ali, Shaukat Ali and the Mussalmans ; they are my brothers, they will mislead me ; the fact is that they are feeling it and they are troubled." Also, Gandhiji said that the Prime Minister of England had said during the war that the Turkish Empire will not be dismembered and Khilafat will not be abolished. Gandhiji believed that a word given must be kept because he did not believe that a word given in politics may be violated the very next day as has been done the world over and as is being done here today. Today you find one man here and another man there, then another man this side and yet another that side. This Congress says that they are against this robbery or piracy of members but they are doing it from the beginning, from 1951.

How did Gandhiji take part in Khilafat ? They wanted him to lead them. He said, "I would lead you but on one condition." What was the condition ? It was, "You accept truth and non-violence, that this agitation of yours will be carried on through non-violence." Then, the Moulvis and Maulanas, with big beards, collected together, invited Gandhiji and said that in the Koran it is written that violence in a good cause is not taboo and asked, "How do you want us to taboo something which is not taboo in the Koran ?" What did Gandhiji, ever delayer that he was, tell them ?

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

He said that in Koran violence is permission but it is not binding. Ajmal Khan and the Maulanas were convinced by a Hindu giving interpretation of the Koran. It was that man. And our Prime Minister compares herself with that man ! She has only the name and not his virtue. This is how our country is being ruled and our reputation is put into the mud in the international world.

SHRI R. K. SINHA (Faizabab) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have heard the speech of the learned Acharya Kripalani and the running commentary of Mrs. Kripalani. Today there is an alliance in the offing between the Syndicate, the Swatantra and the Jana Sangh. This alliance was born in *Rahu Nakshtra*.

The learned Acharya said many things against the Congress but in the end, when he talked of the Khilafat Movement, he forgot the very basic principles and arguments put forward by him. If Gandhiji could lead a movement against injustice, a movement against colonialism, the Khilafat movement along with the Muslims, I do not understand why the Indian Delegation could not participate in the conference of Muslim countries. In India, it should not be forgotten that there are 60 million Muslims and there is nothing in this which is not a continuation of the policies that were enunciated by Maulana Azad and Pandit Nehru.

It is not for the first time that India has participated in such events. Let us look at the facts, Why do we want to encourage participation in such international conferences ? Pakistan on our borders is the biggest enemy that we are faced with today. Pakistan has been always attempting to develop pan-Islamic alliance against India in such conferences. When the Indian delegation participated in such conferences, they participated in order to see that Pakistan may not utilise such platforms for propaganda against India. There have been many such occasions. For example, when a non-official delegation led by Mr. Nuruddin Ahmed, the Mayor of Delhi, went to a Muslim Conference in Mecca, the Resolution against Indian position on the issue of Kashmir could not be passed. In the guidelines given by Panditji and Maulana Azad, it was also said that in religious conferences,

individuals should go but in other such conferences at State level, the official Indian delegations can also go and participate and utilise such platforms in the interest of India's image in the international field. (Interruptions) This alliance was born in *Rahu Nakshtra* and even the decision to appoint the leader of the Syndicate was taken in the same *Nakshtra*. (Interruptions).

Sir, the Indian participation in this Conference should be judged in the interest of the image of India in the international field. The northern Africa, the whole of West Asia and Asia right upto Indonesia constitute the Muslim world. In the United Nations and in other international forums, it is to our interest that we make friends with secular and progressive elements in the Muslim world and do not allow Pakistan to develop pan-Islamic alliance under its leadership. To that extent, I think, the Government of India should be congratulated in having tried to isolate Pakistan..... (Interruptions).

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): It is a national humiliation.

SHRI R. K. SINHA: I want to remind the august House as to where were these lovers of secularism when India participated in the 2000 Anniversary of Lord Buddha. The Prime Minister is the head of an institution which is going to celebrate 500th Anniversary of Guru Nanak. When Dr. Karan Singh participated in the Hindu Religious Conference, nobody in this House protested against it. Today, these people of the Syndicate, the Swatantra and the Jana Sangh are trying to blow it out of all proportion in order to deflect the country from its progressive economic policies. They want to isolate the people of the country from their genuine demands and thus consolidate themselves.

Then, the learned Acharya said that this was a Muslim Conference and we had nothing to do with it. How is it that Lebanon which has half Christian and half Muslim population with a Christian head of the State, Sierra Leone and other countries which have no Muslim majority were also represented in this Conference ? Why should you forget that it was Ahmedabad

riots which gave an excuse to Pakistan to heap insults on us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Shame, shame !

SHRI R. K. SINHA: I happened to be at that time representing the Indian Delegation in the United Nations. The Western press which is always interisled in running down the Government of India and India, were publishing stories about Ahmedabad and those stories about Ahmedabad were being used by the Pakistan representatives against us in Rabat and U. N. The Muslim Conference was nearly wrecked because two sessions were postponed and it met only for 15 minutes. That was the strength of our friends in that Conference. I want to present before you that this question of the Muslims of Ahmedabad is a very important question for us. The basic thing for Swatantra, Jan Sangh and Syndicate members is to run down the Government of India and tarnish the image of the country, Today in the international plane, what is the attempt of Pakistan ? Pakistan is attempting to make friendship with China, Russia and America. Pakistan is a member of SEATO and CENTO and would also like to participate in the non-aligned nations' conference. It wants to isolate us from every part of the world. These gentlemen who are the friends of Israel did not protest when in the *New York Times* a nefarious story was published about Gandhiji by Arthur Koestler, a Hungarian Zionist. It was published that Gandhiji used to experiment with sex.. (*Interruptions*) I was present in New York when that nefarious article was published in which it was said that if Gandhiji had not been there, India would have been freed much earlier, the British would have handed over the administration much earlier. The blood of these gentlemen does not boil when such insults are heaped on the Indian Union by known Zionists because they are all friends of Israel...(*Interruptions*) They do not stand here to condemn the burning of Al Aqea Mosque; they do not condemn the Israeli conquest of Arab territories...(*Interruptions*).

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI (Gonda): He cannot take Gandhiji's name like that. Please tell him not to use Gandhiji's name like that. Is he an Indian or not ? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI R. K. SINHA: I want to tell my hon. friends that if they continue to represent imperialism and capitalism, they would meet with the same fate which imperialism has received elsewhere in the world.

SHRI ASOKA MEHTA (Bhandara) : The Conference at Rabat was called the First Islamic Summit Conference. So we are discussing today not only what happened at that Conference, we are not only dissecting and deploring and perhaps denouncing the part that our Government may have played in that Conference, but we have also to guard ourselves against the danger that is looming ahead. We are told that the Foreign Ministers of the participating powers are expected to meet in March next year. Are we going to get involved in it ? So, this is not only a question of wanting to criticise or condemn the Government for something that has happened. Rabat, we are told, was a rebuff. The Prime Minister has said that other countries also receive similar diplomatic rebuffs, but here the point is that it was not only rebuff but a question as to what policy you are going to pursue and what policies you have pursued in the past.

Now what was this Islamic Summit Conference ? The criteria for participation in that Conference were two: the majority of Muslim population, if a country had a majority of Muslim population, it was entitled to participate. And Secondly if the Head of the State was a Muslim, that country was entitled to participate. Do we accept these criteria ? Because in our country people believing in a particular religion are in a majority in a State—as in Jammu & Kashmir Muslims are in majority, and in Nagaland, Christians are in majority—do they become Muslim and Christian States ? Even the States have no religion of their own. Is this the kind of description that we accept for ourselves ? Was there any other criteria ? There are the two sole criteria. According to these criteria, if this conference had been held a month or two earlier, the head of our State was a Muslim and we would have immediately been called a Muslim country ! Is the character of the country going to be determined by the religion of the Head of the State or what is the religion of the Majority of our people ?

Then, Sir, what was the agenda ? What

[Shri Asoka Mehata]

were the two main items that were to be discussed there? One was the damage that was done, the desecration brought to the Al Aqsa mosque in Jerusalem: We all recognize this is a holy place and I agree with what the Conference has said: It is a place holy to the entire humanity. And the other thing was the West Asian crisis.

As far as the Al Aqsa mosque is concerned, our friend, the Foreign Minister, the Rajasaheb of Kalakankar, had expressed the opinion of this House in the Parliament and I believe every one here has condemned in no unmistakable terms what had happened there and each one of us shared the sorrow that was felt—it was not a question of only the Muslims sensing a feeling of sorrow on what had happened in Jerusalem—every one of us shared that sorrow because to us it is not a question of a particular religion. Al Aqsa mosque to us is a place of pilgrimage. Therefore, when a place of pilgrimage, a holy place, was desecrated by some one, surely the entire House condemned it and India's voice in condemnation was raised in an effective manner in the United Nations.

As far as the Arab-Israeli dispute is concerned, our position is clear. Have we not repeatedly made our position very clear in the United Nations? What was the Conference going to do that has not been done by the United Nations so far? What was the new suggestion that you or your friends were going to bring up there in that conference? You must come and tell us that something wonderful was going to be discussed there. What is that? What new sanctions are going to be enforced there? Would you want to participate in a conference which is going to enforce new sanctions, as Acharya Kripalani said, without letting us know what kind of sanctions we are going to be involved into? Therefore, the utmost you could have done there was to reiterate the resolution that has been passed by the United Nations. I presume that if a resolution was adopted by the House, it is far more important than a resolution passed by a committee of the House or a few members of the House getting together and adopting a resolution. The United Nations is in a sense an organization that is attempting to be the conscience of the world, a kind of world Parliament in the making where not only we have stated our views but a resolu-

tion has been passed and every effect is being made by all concerned to see that the resolution is being implemented. At this conference at Rabat was there any possibility of finding out some other solution? Was this conference in a position to put teeth in the resolution which even the Soviet Union and the United States of America, Great Britain and France are not able to do. Therefore, let us not be hoodwinked by this kind of argument.

Then we are told that we had to go because the Arab countries are our friends. We have been with them. They wanted us to come. There are progressive Arab forces. I really do not know as to who are the progressive Arab forces. As was pointed out earlier, Iraq and Syria did not participate, but then they are not progressive according to the yardstick of the Prime Minister.

According to the yardstick of the Prime Minister the touchstone of who is progressive and who is not depends upon who are willing to stand shoulder to shoulder with her and who will not do so.

Those who disagree with her, even though they may be more progressive than her, are, of course, all dubbed 'reactionary'. This interesting yardstick of Madam Gandhi which she is applying to politics and parties in this country is now being applied to politics of this world. It is on this basis that we are told that the progressives were inviting us.

Anyway, what did these progressive forces decide at the Conference? What was the declaration?

As Acharya Kripalani pointed out, the declaration, *inter alia*, said:— 'We are convinced that their common creed constitutes a powerful factor bringing the people closer together and fostering understanding between them'. Wonderful progressivism! Wonderful progressivism of those of my friends who not only attended this conference and put their seal of approval upon this declaration but wanted you to join and put your seal of approval.

There were 19 Republics and 6 kingdoms present at the Conference. This Conference was called by the Kings and, as Dada pointed out, this conference was initially objected

to by the Republics. But the Republics were drawn into it because the Kings' pressure was irresistible. That happens in our place, too, whether the Kings are able to draw even the Republicans into their net !

Therefore, this was not a progressives' conference at all. This was a conference convened by the Kings, the privy purse holders of the Arab world, to impede that intiation that the progressives and the Republicans are anxious to evoke and adopt.

Then what happened ? At this conference, while the declaration is signed by the representatives of the 19 Republics and 6 Kingdoms, India is associated with it in the name of the Muslim community of India'. Shri Fakhruddin was there as the spokesman of India's delegation. He became in the Orwellian sense an 'unperson' and his presence became an 'unpresence'. Did anybody sign the document on behalf of the Muslim community of India ? Who among the Muslim community of India represented India at that conference ? Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed alone can tell us. Was he there as a Muslim?

What did the king of Morocco say ? He 'prayed for the safety of Muslims in India and Palestine'. Wonderful !

AN HON. MEMBER : What about Gujarat ?

SHRI ASOKA MEHTA : Gujarat—I will come to Gujarat now. What has happened in Gujarat, is a matter of profound shame and sorrow for everyone of us. It is not that the people of one community or another community were killed (*Interruptions*). Whatever carnage took place in Gujarat is a matter of the deepest sorrow and profoundest shame to everyone of us in this country.

May I point out that at this very time when the leader of the Nigerian delegation and the leader of the Malaysian delegation were coming to persuade Shri Fakhruddin to do this or do that, in Nigeria Muslims and Christians were being slaughtered, and are being slaughtered? Almost a million people have died in Nigeria.

And what about Chad ? My other

friends may not know, but the Raja Shaib knows what is happening in the Republic of Chad today (*Interruptions*). As the Foreign Minister knows, the government of the Republic of Chad is in the hands of the Negroes and they are today slaughtering the Arabs of Chad. This is happening in many countries of the world. We are sorry, we are distressed, we are unhappy, we are willing to proclaim from the top of the world that it is our shame, our sorrow, our discredit, but this is happening in many countries of the world. but I do not think they were being driven out of the Conference for that. What happened in Malaysia ? Were not the Malays, Chinese and all kinds of people killed there ?

We have shown our deepest concern for the Arab refugees. I believe there are about 800,000 or a million Arab refugees. About them we are very concerned, but I want to know, when India has 15 million refugees, who has shown any concern about them among the friendly countries. The presence of refugees is not a problem peculiar to only one country. We have 15 million refugees, but we do not demand that the friendship for India must be tested by what they talk about our refugees. Therefore, what happened in Gujarat is a matter, as I said, of shame and sorrow but no body has a right to link it up with the Conference. Do you think that because there is some trouble somewhere in India we should allow foreign powers to sit in judgement over us ? Are we going to permit them the authority and the power to discuss what the Government did or failed to do ?

What is happening in Kenya ? The tribes are fighting among themselves. What is happening even in highly developed countries like Belgium and Canada ? This is not something peculiar to India. We are determined to see that these things are stopped, but I think it is a matter again of regret that even the Prime Minister and the Treasury Benches seem to hide themselves behind what happened in Ahmedabad. We denounce in unmistakable terms what happened in Ahmedabad or Ranchi or anywhere else, but hide behind it in an effort to substantiate a policy which is patently wrong.

What about the Arab-Israel conflict ?



We have made our position clear firstly, that we are against Israeli aggression, we condemn Israeli occupation, then, we demand that Israeli occupation must be vacated. At the same time we say that Israel, within its old boundaries, has a right to exist. But the wonderful policy of our Foreign Minister is that of running with the hare and hunting with the hound, not just in West Asia but also in South-East Asia. One morning he says that he is going to appoint an Ambassador to North Vietnam. Next morning he says that both South and North Vietnam should be admitted to United Nations. The result is that we alienate many sections of world opinion and infuriate those whom we want to support. In the same way, while his heart bleeds for Vietnam, as ours, he has no tears to shed about Laos and Cambodia, *i. e.* the Indo part of the old Indo-China. The neutralist Prime Minister of Laos came here. We do not know what assurance, what help, what support was given to him. Neither the Prime Minister nor the Foreign Minister had time to say a word about the neutralist Prime Minister of Laos who came here to seek our help. The Prince of Cambodia says that the only friend he has is France, the former colonial power in Indo-China. Of course, we are all for Vietnam, I am for Vietnam, because we want the people of Vietnam should be given the opportunity to decide their future freely and without interference of outside forces. The people of Laos have the same right. If the American troops have no business to be in Vietnam—and I agree that they have no business to be in Vietnam—the North Vietnamese troops have no business to be in Laos. (*Interruptions*). I can understand You, the Communist gentleman, because for you the world is divided only between those with whom you sup and those with whom you quarrel. If that is the philosophy of the Prime Minister also, let her say so and then the nation will know what to do with her.

What does Al Fatah want today ?

Al Fatah wants that the whole of Palestine should be recreated and Israel should disappear. Is that our policy ? Do we want to see that Israel disappears ? We may like or we may not like Israel. But so long as it is a member of the United Nations, what should be our policy.

I think we have said non-interference and all the other things that we say about the right of every country to exist. While we denounce—Israel's aggression, as we denounce Israel's occupation, are we willing to say that Israel must be wiped out of the map of the earth ? That is what Al Fatah wants to do. They as people of Palestine have a right to say what they want. But are we going to be involved in it ? Then it is argued what about Pakistan ? Pakistan has got military presence in Jordan. Is the Prime Minister instructing the Defence Minister whoever he may be tomorrow, to insist on our military presence in a friendly Arab States and send out our share of military advisers to go and assist the Soviet advisers in the UAR ? Must we compete with Pakistan all the time everywhere ? May be Pakistani troops will go and fight Israel in order that Israel is throttled. Should we go and fight to throttle Israel as otherwise Pakistan will steal a march over us ? Why this obsession with Pakistan, preoccupation with Pakistan ? The Foreign Minister goes to the United Nations, has discussions with all kinds of people such as the Secretary of State of the United States of America, the Foreign Minister of Israel and also, I believe, the Information Minister of Pakistan and comes back and says: we had very interesting talk with them, very useful talk with them; the possibilities of useful negotiations with Pakistan are now open.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : (Barh) : Actually he expressed a desire to meet the Foreign Minister of Israel.

SHRI ASOKA MEHTA : He did the right thing. I should like to congratulate him on wanting to meet all Foreign Ministers no foreign minister is an untouchable to us unless we are at war with that country. But he comes here and says : there are possibilities of discussion. Within one week, when he found that the Rabat rug was being pulled from under his feet, he denounced Pakistan. Here was a possible opening which he had worked out. I was looking forward to congratulating him on the aperture he was trying to open. But the Rabat rug was being pulled under him and he has not had courage and steadiness. His feet were not firm so that he could stand up and say : I shall defend Rabat or I shall disown Rabat but I shall not miss the chance of discussion with

Pakistan. Instead he threw the whole responsibility on Pakistan but decided to punish poor Jordan ! It is a peculiar thing. The responsibility is Pakistan's but little Jordan is being penalised for it. Whether Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed got into hot water or into the cold waters is not a matter of much importance. The point is that this was a mistake and whatever happens we cannot be involved in this kind of thing in the future.

We have the deepest sympathy and goodwill for our Muslim fellow citizens. We venerate the Prophet. We are inspired by the holy Koran. All the sacred places of Islam are equally holy to us. Muslims in India are as much part and parcel of this country as any body else. We have elected them to the highest position; we shall continue to elect them to the highest position in our country. Let it not be misunderstood that there is any question of any kind of dissociation with the feelings and sentiments of Muslim friends. May I say that once we get involved in this kind of conferences, secularism of India will suffer; the unity of India will suffer and what we hope and strive for will be in jeopardy and in danger. Therefore, the adventure of Rabat was a serious mistake; the adventure in Rabat was not merely a rebuff it was a serious mistake and the Government should admit the mistake. We have no desire to pass a censure vote on the Government. We do not even want to disturb the Government but the Government should have the honesty to admit that a mistake was made and that mistake will not be repeated.

17 hrs.

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH (Fatehpur) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is a hard thing indeed that I should stand up to speak immediately after Shri Asoka Mehta. It is fortunate that we are not still exactly on the opposite side. I was very impressed with the lot of passion that Shri Asoka Mehta exhibited for a number of just causes. It was an impressive performance, but I had expected much more. I who have been his follower, I who have learnt a number of things from him am afraid that at the end of it, neither did Shri Asoka Mehta deal with Rabat clearly, nor did he come out with any positive statement as to what the foreign policy should be in context in which our country finds itself.

Shri Asoka Mehta had some quips, some stray statements which do not bear out if all the facts are gone into. For instance, Shri Asoka Mehta has said that the absence of Iraq and Syria had something to do with our decision, or their absence made a change in the nature of the items that were discussed, or in the character of the conference. Iraq did not go, let me remind Shri Asoka Mehta, because of Iran's presence. Syria was not present because of the Palestine Liberation Organisation was left out. Shri Asoka Mehta again referred to the fact that Ahmedabad was a shameful thing and tried to justify it by the murder, carnage and fratricide that existed in other places. He mentioned Nigeria.

May I be permitted to point out to him that Nigeria is still one country ; there is not a Nigeria ; there is not a Biafra, and if Nigeria and Biafra were two countries what Pakistan tries to do to us might have been in the picture.

What this House has to bear in mind about Rabat is that India is surrounded by a great many Muslim nations, right from Mauritania to Malaysia. There are our own Muslim brethren. As Acharya Kripalani pointed out, Gandhiji advised as that if I see my brethren suffering I do not enquire further. And anyone who has been present in this country will bear out the fact that the burning of Al Aqsa had caused a tremendous amount of pain in this country. May I also say that when India's representative on the 10th of September, in the Security Council mentioned that the burning of Al Aqsa was not merely a religious matter, there was nobody who stood up and tried to deny it. When the invitation came,—it was unanimous not deniable because somebody would like to see it as a printed wedding card. It was unanimous, as is clear from the fact that Sardar Gurbux Singh, our ambassador, went to the hall where all the Islamic Heads of States were present and made a statement. Among the people present was also present Mr. Yahya Khan of Pakistan. At that stage there was nobody to shout here that we should not have participated in the conference.

Let it be remembered that right from the time when this country was partitioned in 1947, Pakistan has been trying to have Isla-

mic conferences and trying to use Pan-Islamism against India. Whenever a conference is held, whether it be called Islamic or Non-Islamic, Buddhist or non-Buddhist, if under the garb of a religious name, it tries to discuss political issues, issues which are of extreme relevance to us, I would say that the Government of India will certainly consider an try to participate in these conferences. We know in West Asia for a long time, there have been attempts to organise conferences on a religious basis. Soon after the Russian Revolution, the Soviets themselves called a conference of Muslim nations at Baku. The west tried to encourage the same sort of efforts. It might be of interest to my friends in the Swatantra Party to remember and refer to the Memoirs of Oen. Eisenhower where he says that in 1957 the State Department attempted to set up King Ibn Saud as Pope of the Muslims. These attempts have been there.

There are two kinds of forces in the West Asian world. There are the forces of communalism and reaction. There are the forces that are secular and progressive. Those countries we shall certainly strengthen. So far as Rabat conference is concerned, it should be remembered that to the communique which was issued at the end of the conference, we were not a party. As many of the Arabic papers and western papers have pointed out, India's exclusion was a misfortune for the progressive forces in West Asia. It was a misfortune for the progressive forces here and it was an encouragement only for those who have tried to make Hindus and Muslims into different communities when dealing with social, economic and political problems.

It has not been that India's secular nature has prevented her from taking a stand on issues that are religious. It should be remembered that when the Pope came to this country, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri with his entire Cabinet went to receive him. Buddha Jayanti will be celebrated on a governmental level. Guru Nanak Jayanti will be celebrated on a governmental level. In the United Nations, in December, 1965 the Government of India delegate, who was a Muslim, spoke of the desecration of Tibetan monasteries. Whatever concerns our national interest, there we will certainly make an effort. The fact that

India succeeded, in spite of the efforts of Pakistan and CENCO countries, in being invited and the fact that our Sikh Ambassador addressed what was called an Islamic conference, is a great vindication of India's success. (*Interruptions*). What President Yahya Khan and other Pakistani leaders were afraid of was that India's presence in the conference would contribute to non-communalism and would strengthen secularism. For the ill-considered behaviour of some people and the others who fell in with them, are we to be held responsible? Are we to be held responsible if the Chinese misbehave with diplomats? When Krishna was dishonoured in the court of Duryodhana and when Ravan insulted Angad—Lord Rama's emissary—who stands condemned by history? If persons behave wrongly, who is to be blamed? The person wronged or the wrong-doer? I think what India did was right in the circumstances. It will have to be borne in mind that even if a particular situation is not comfortable to face, we will have to face it and we will never be prevented from taking the right step and justifying the correct cause.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, रबात में हुए राष्ट्रीय अपमान के लिए देश की जनता से क्षमा याचना करने के बजाय सरकार जले पर नमक छिड़कने का काम कर रही है। इस बात से कोई इन्कार नहीं कर सकता कि रबात में जो कुछ हुआ, वह हमारी अपनी नीति के कारण हुआ, उसको हमने आमन्त्रित किया था। रबात का सम्मेलन इस्लामी देशों का सम्मेलन था, वह इस्लामी देशों द्वारा बुलाया गया था और उसमें इस्लामी देशों की समस्याओं पर विचार होना था। भारत, जो एक इस्लामी देश नहीं है, ऐसे सम्मेलन में सरकारी तौर पर जाय, इसके औचित्य का समर्थन नहीं किया जा सकता। इससे पहले भी दुनिया के अनेकों देशों में इस्लामी सम्मेलन हुए थे और भारत से कुछ प्रतिनिधि गये थे। लेकिन यह पहला अवसर है कि जब भारत सरकार ने एक सरकारी प्रतिनिधि मंडल भेजा। प्रतिनिधि मंडल के नेता मंत्री-स्तर के एक मंत्री थे। प्रतिनिधि मंडल में विदेश मंत्रालय के राज्य मंत्री भी थे। रबात में

हमारे राजदूत को भी प्रतिनिधि मंडल में शामिल किया गया था—एक बड़ा उच्चस्तरीय प्रतिनिधि मंडल था। क्या सरकार इस बात को स्पष्ट करने की तकलीफ़ करेगी कि हमने इस तरह के इस्लामी सम्मेलनों में गैर-सरकारी प्रतिनिधि मंडल भेजने की नीति को क्यों छोड़ा ?

भारत में मुसलमान रहते हैं, उनकी काफ़ी संख्या है। वे समान नागरिकता के अधिकारों का उपभोग करते हैं। उन्हें राष्ट्र के प्रति समान कर्तव्यों का पालन करना है। मजहब के आधार पर हम अपनी जनता में कोई भेदभाव नहीं करते। हमने भारत में एक असांख्यिक राज्य स्थापित किया है। मुसलमानों की मजहबी समस्यायें हो सकती हैं, जिन पर वे देश के भीतर विचार कर सकते हैं, देश के बाहर भी विचार कर सकते हैं, लेकिन ऐसे सम्मेलन में सरकारी प्रतिनिधि मंडल भेजने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, 1955-56 में स्वेज़ नहर के संकट के बाद काहिरा में आयोजित इस्लामी सम्मेलन में जब भारत का प्रतिनिधि मंडल भेजने का सवाल आया, तब पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू जीवित थे और मुझे बताया गया है कि उन्होंने कहा था कि हमें सरकारी प्रतिनिधि मंडल नहीं भेजना चाहिये। क्या वर्तमान विदेश मंत्री ने वह फाइल देखी है, जिन पर हमारे स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री ने नोट लिखा था ? कहा जाता है कि उस फाइल में से वे कागज़ गायब कर दिये गये हैं। तब से लेकर अब तक अनेक सम्मेलन हुए—1965 में मोगादिसू में, 1965 में बाण्डुंग में, 1965 में मक्का में और 1969 में कुआलालम्पुर में। कुआलालम्पुर के सम्मेलन के लिए मुझे याद है, मलेशिया के लोग हमको निमन्त्रण देने आये थे, उस समय डा० जाकिर हुसैन हमारे राष्ट्रपति थे, उनसे कहा गया था कि आप भारत के राष्ट्रपति हैं, आप मुसलमान हैं, आप अपना प्रतिनिधि मंडल भेजिए और मुझे यह भी याद है कि डा० जाकिर हुसैन ने उनसे कहा था—मैं मुसलमान ज़रूर हूँ, मगर

मैं भारत का राष्ट्रपति हूँ, हम एक सैक्यूलर देश हैं और मुसलमानों के सम्मेलन में बुलाकर आप हमारी बेइज्जती कर रहे हैं। कुआलालम्पुर के सम्मेलन में कोई सरकारी प्रतिनिधि मंडल नहीं गया—मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि अब इस नीति को बदलने का निर्णय क्यों किया गया ? क्या मंत्री मंडल में इस पर विचार हुआ था ? क्या कैबिनेट के लिए कोई मैमोरेण्डम तैयार किया गया था ? जब नीतियां बदलती हैं तो कैबिनेट के लिए एक मैमोरेण्डम तैयार किया जाता है। वह मैमोरेण्डम क्या है, किस आधार पर नीति परिवर्तन का निर्णय लिया गया ?

हमारी नीति गुटों से अलग रहने की है। न हम सैनिक गुट में फंमना चाहते हैं और न हम मजहबी गुटों में अपने को बांधने की गलती कर सकते हैं। रबात में इस गुट निरपेक्षता की नीति का भी परित्याग कर दिया गया। हमारी नीति रही है कि एक इस्लामी गुट न बनने पाये, परन्तु अब कहा जा रहा है कि हमारी नीति यह है कि अगर गुट बन जाय तो ऐसे गुट में हम घुस जाय। हमारी नीति है कि सैनिक गुट न बनें, लेकिन क्या सैनिक गुट बने तो हम उनमें घुस जायेंगे ? इस्लामी गुट के बनने से रोकने की हमारी नीति विफल हो गई। हमारी गुट निरपेक्षता की नीति, सैक्यूलरवाद की नीति भी विफल हो गई, जब इस सरकार ने भारत के सम्मान को ताक पर रख कर रबात के सम्मेलन में जाने का फैसला किया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, अब तक जो सम्मेलन होते थे, उनमें शामिल होने के लिए हमारे पास बुलावे आया करते थे, उनमें शामिल होने के लिए हमें दावत दी जाती और हम जाने में संकोच करते थे, गैर-सरकारी स्तर पर जाने की बात करते थे, लेकिन रबात में हमें निमन्त्रण की भीख मांगनी पड़ी। पहले निर्णय किया गया था कि हमें नहीं बुलाया जायगा। फिर हमने उन देशों के दरवाजे खटखटाये, हमने भारत में नई दिल्ली स्थित दूतावासों की देहलियों पर माथे टेके और हमने कहा कि हमें भी बुलाइये। कहा जाता है कि हमें सर्वसम्मति से बुलाया गया था। मैं

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह सर्वसम्मति रात ही रात में कैसे बदल गई? इसका उत्तर यह दिया जाता है कि पाकिस्तान के प्रेजिडेंट पर वहाँ की जनता ने दबाव डाला और पाकिस्तान से तार गया कि अगर आप भारत को शामिल करना स्वीकार कर लेंगे तो आपकी खैर नहीं है। पाकिस्तान में लोकतन्त्र नहीं है, डिक्टेटरशिप है। हमारे यहाँ की लोकतन्त्रीय सरकार तार से नहीं हिलती, श्री फेरूमान मर जायें तो यह टम से मस नहीं होती, तेलंगाना की जनता गोलियाँ खाती रहे, इस सरकार के कान पर जू तक नहीं रेंगती, हम हज़ारों लोगों को प्रधान मंत्री के दरवाजे पर ले जायें और त्याग-पत्र मांगें, लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री हमें अनुगृहीत नहीं करतीं। अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह लोकतन्त्रवादी देश का हाल है और हमसे कहा जा रहा है कि आप यह मान लीजिये कि पाकिस्तान के डिक्टेटर को कुछ तार मिले और पहले जिस पाकिस्तान के डिक्टेटर ने हमारे राजदूत से हाथ मिलाया था और सर्वसम्मति से हमें बुलाने का फैसला किया था, रात ही रात में उनको इल्हाम हुआ कि अगर सबेरे भारत आ गया तो उनकी तानाशाही खत्म हो जायगी ये हारयास्पद बातें हैं, अपनी बुद्धि को ठीक रख कर कोई भी इन पर विश्वास नहीं कर सकता।

मैं तो एक ही निष्कर्ष पर पहुँचा हूँ— भारत को सर्वसम्मति से बुलाने का निर्णय एक चाल थी। यह एक जाल था हमें बुलाकर अपमानित करने के लिये और हम उस जाल में फँस गये। इसके लिये पाकिस्तान को दोष देने का कोई अर्थ नहीं है। पाकिस्तान हमारा विरोधी है, अपने जन्मकाल से ही हमारे प्रति शत्रुता का व्यवहार कर रहा है, हमारी भूमि पर आक्रमण करके बैठा है, देश के भीतर गड़बड़ डालना चाहता है, भारत से बाहर कोई भी ऐसा अबसर नहीं छोड़ना चाहता, जिस पर हमें वदनाम न कर सके। लेकिन हम पाकिस्तान की चाल में क्यों फँसे? हम न जाते तो हमारा

अपमान न होता। यदि गैर-सरकारी प्रतिनिधि मंडल जाता, तो वह पाकिस्तान के आरोपों का उत्तर दे सकता था।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक बात और कही जाती है कि अगर अहमदाबाद के दंगे न होते तो रबात में हमारा अपमान न होता। अहमदाबाद के दंगे हुए—19 तारीख को और जब 25 तारीख को रबात में एकत्र देशों ने सर्वसम्मति से हमें बुलाने का फैसला किया था, तब वे दंगे दबाये जा चुके थे, शान्त हो चुके थे। क्या 25 तारीख को अहमदाबाद के दंगों के बारे में उन्हें खबरें पता नहीं थी? क्या रातों-रात सारा प्रचार कर दिया गया? पाकिस्तान ने अहमदाबाद के दंगों का उपयोग करने की कोशिश की होगी लेकिन इसके कारण सारा सम्मेलन हमारे खिलाफ हो गया, मैं यह मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ। इस बात को भी ध्यान में रखना होगा कि अहमदाबाद के दंगों की जांच हो रही है, मैं ज्यादा कुछ कहना नहीं चाहता लेकिन क्या यह नहीं हो सकता है कि अहमदाबाद में उन तत्वों ने दंगे कराये हों जो रबात सम्मेलन में भारत की स्थिति को बिगाड़ना चाहते थे? ऐसे तत्व हमारे देश में हो सकते हैं, उनको घेपदा किया जाना चाहिए। लेकिन रबात के अपमान के लिए हम अहमदाबाद के दंगों को दोष देकर अपनी जिम्मेदारी से नहीं बच सकते हैं। अगर दंगे होते और हम न जाने का फैसला करते तो हमें अपमान नहीं सहन करना पड़ता।

सबसे बड़ी दुख की बात यह है कि उस सम्मेलन में, जो हमारे बड़े मित्र बनने का दावा करते हैं और जिनके साथ मित्रता निभाने के लिए हमने अपने निश्चित मार्ग से अलग जाकर भी नीति अपनाते में संकोच नहीं किया, वे भी रबात के सम्मेलन में हमारी मदद के लिए नहीं आये। जाईन से हमें शिकायत नहीं है, जाईन तो सैनिक गुट का सदस्य है। जाईन तो अभी साम्राज्यवाद की चौकी है। हमें टर्की और ईरान से भी शिकायत नहीं है। हमें सऊदी अरेबिया से भी अधिक

आशा नहीं है। लेकिन हम अपने विदेश मन्त्री और प्रधान मन्त्री से पूछना चाहते हैं कि रबात के सम्मेलन में यूनाइटेड अरब रिपब्लिक ने क्या किया ? क्या कभी उन्होंने एक बार खड़े होकर कहा कि जिस देश को सर्वसम्मति से बुलाया गया है उसको बाहर नहीं निकाला जा सकता है और अगर आप बाहर निकालेंगे तो भारत के साथ हमको भी छोड़ना पड़ेगा और फिर यह सम्मेलन नहीं हो सकता है। मित्र वही है जो जरूरत के समय काम आता है। मगर यूनाइटेड अरब रिपब्लिक ने हमारे साथ मित्रता का निर्वाह नहीं किया। यह बात मैं गुस्से में नहीं कह रहा हूँ, बड़े शोक में कह रहा हूँ। हम जानते हैं कि पश्चिम एशिया में प्रतिक्रियावादी ताकतें और प्रगतिशील ताकतें लड़ रही हैं। लेकिन हम अगर प्रगतिशील ताकतों को बढ़ावा देना चाहते हैं तो उन प्रगतिशील ताकतों को भी हमें बढ़ावा देना चाहिए।

17.22 hrs.

[SHRI M.B. RANA in the Chair]

प्रधान मन्त्री ने कहा कि रबात का मामला वही उठा रहे हैं जो अरबों से दोस्ती नहीं करना चाहते। मानो प्रधान मन्त्री अकेली हैं जिन्होंने अरबों से दोस्ती का ठेका ले रखा है। सारा देश अरबों से दोस्ती चाहता है लेकिन उमका मतलब यह नहीं है कि इजरायल से दुश्मनी की जाये। अगर अरब देश हमारे और पाकिस्तान के एक साथ मित्र हो सकते हैं, अगर अरब देश पाकिस्तान और चीन के एक साथ मित्र हो सकते हैं तो फिर भारत अरब और इजरायल का एक साथ मित्र क्यों नहीं हो सकता। हम कहना चाहते हैं कि अरबों के जिस इलाके पर इजरायल ने कब्जा किया है वह खाली कर दे लेकिन क्या वे भी इस बात को कहने के लिए तैयार हैं कि पाकिस्तान और चीन ने हमारे जिस इलाके पर कब्जा किया है उसे चीन और पाकिस्तान खाली करके चले जायें ? दोस्ती कोई वन वे ट्राफिक नहीं है। मित्रता के लिए ताली केवल एक हाथ से नहीं बजती। मित्रता परस्पर के हितों और सम्बन्धों पर आधारित होती है।

इस्लामी गुट में शामिल होने की कोशिश करके हमने यूनाइटेड नेशन्स को कमजोर किया है। हमने अफ्रीकी और एशियाई देशों की एकता पर चोट की है। हमने अरब देशों की एकता को भी भंग किया है। यूनाइटेड नेशन्स के चार्टर में रीजनल ग्रुपिंग की इजाजत है लेकिन मजहबी ग्रुपिंग की नहीं—मजहब के आधार पर बने हुए गुटों की नहीं। अफ्रीकी देशों का एक संघटन है, अरब देशों का एक संघटन है। लेकिन अब एक नयी हवा चली है जिसके अन्तर्गत मजहब के आधार पर गुट बनाने का प्रयत्न हो रहा है। इस हवा का हमें विरोध करना चाहिए था लेकिन हमारी सरकार उस हवा में उड़ गई, उसके पैर उखड़ गए और अब उम गलती को मानने के बजाय उस पर लीपा-पोती की जा रही है। ... (व्यवधान) ...

यूगोस्लाविया के एक अखबार का उदाहरण देकर मैं अपने भाषण को समाप्त करना चाहता हूँ। यह "रेड्यू आफ इन्टरनेशनल अफेयर्स" है जोकि फेडरेशन आफ यूगोस्लाव जर्नलिस्ट्स के द्वारा प्रकाशित किया जाता है। इस अंक में यूगोस्लाविया के एक बड़े तत्वज्ञ लगीमिर मनोविच का लेख प्रकाशित हुआ है। हमारे विदेश मन्त्री रबात सम्मेलन के पहले यूगोस्लाविया गए थे और वहां पर जो वक्तव्य प्रकाशित किया गया उसमें कहा गया कि हम परस्पर हितों की बातों पर और पश्चिम एशिया के सम्बन्ध में जो भी निर्णय होंगे उनके बारे में चर्चा करेंगे। मैं श्री दिनेश सिंह से पूछना चाहता हूँ क्या उन्होंने यूगोस्लाविया से पूछा कि क्या आपको रबात सम्मेलन में बुलाया गया है और क्या आप जा रहे हैं ? यूगोस्लाविया में भी मुसमलान रहते हैं। ... (व्यवधान) ...

एक माननीय सदस्य : 13 परसेन्ट।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : भारत से ज्यादा मुसलमान रहते हैं।

बंदेशिक कार्य मन्त्री ( श्री दिनेश सिंह ) : ज्यादा नहीं हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आप पता लगाइये ।

श्री मनोविच लेख में लिखते हैं—मैं उद्धृत कर रहा हूँ :

"If a gathering of Muslim countries is called to deal with questions of a religious nature such as the violation of a holy place like Al Aqsa or the international status of holy places like a section of Jerusalem, such a conference is logical. But the logic involved is not clear when a conference is convened on the basis of religion to deal with political problems."

मेरी सबसे बड़ी शिकायत यह है—मुझे एक मिनट और दीजिए । सैकुलरवाद का मतलब है देश के भीतर सभी धर्मों को समान समझना और मजहब को राजनीति से अलग रखना । प्रधान मंत्री कहती हैं कि हम रवात में इसलिए गए कि वहां पर राजनीतिक मसलों पर चर्चा होने वाली थी । ऐसी स्थिति में हमारे वहां जाने पर तो और भी आपत्ति होनी चाहिए थी । उस सम्मेलन को इस्लामी देशों ने बुलाया । एजेण्डा में इस्लामी देशों के सहयोग की चर्चा थी और बाद में जो घोषणा प्रकाशित की गई उसमें इस्लामी देशों का नाम लिया गया । जब इस्लामी देश राजनीतिक सवालों पर चर्चा करते हैं तब हम वहां पर नहीं जा सकते—यह हमारी सैक्यूलरिज्म की नीति के खिलाफ है । वे इस्लाम की चर्चा करें तो हमारे देश के मुसलमान प्रतिनिधि बनकर जा सकते हैं लेकिन जब वे राजनीति को मजहब से मिलाते हैं, इस्लाम को राजनीति से मिलाते हैं तो हमारे लिए अपने दरवाजे बन्द कर देते हैं । लेकिन हम रवात दरवाजे तोड़कर घुस गए और बेआबरू होकर वहां से निकले । इसके लिए माफी मांगने के बजाय सरकार गलती दोहरा रही है और मुझे डर है भविष्य में ये विदेश मंत्रियों के सम्मेलनों में भाग लेंगे । जो सचिवालय कायम किया जा रहा है उसमें मदद देना यह हमारी गुट-निरपेक्षता और सैकुलरवाद की नीति के खिलाफ

होगा । अगर सरकार ने सारी नीतियों और राष्ट्रहितों को ताक पर रखकर अंधेरे में छलांग लगाने का फैसला कर लिया है तो हम उसे एक धक्का और देने के लिए तैयार हैं । लेकिन देश की जनता इस अपमान को कभी सहन नहीं करेगी । घन्यवाद ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. F. A. Ahmed.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT, INTERNAL TRADE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI F. A. AHMED): *Rose—*

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi): He went and stayed with a murderer. Does he know that the King of Morocco murdered Mr. Ben Berka? Does he know who Mr. Ben Berka was? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI F. A. AHMED: May I begin with the observation that when the hon. members Opposite were talking and were dragging in all kinds of irrelevant matters we did not disturb them in the least. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: You have insulted this House. Come to the point. Do you deny that you insulted this House and the country?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: There must be a limit.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi): He is saying that it is irrelevant.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: He was kicked out of Rabat. Does he deny that he insulted this country? We too have wisdom. Why should not he apologise? He is insulting our flag.

"झंडा ऊंचा रहे हमारा, नेताजी सुभाषचन्द्र बोस जिन्दाबाद"

Why should he start with insinuations?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: The manner in which the hon Member is behaving.

SHRI M. L. SONDHİ: You behaved in a worse manner (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: Sir, you must make him behave.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: The hon Member should give us a patient hearing and also try to understand the large number of questions which are involved so far as this matter is concerned.

It has been said that what we have done in going to Rabat is something contrary to the policy which we have been pursuing in the past. (*Interruptions*) I would like the hon Member to consider that our foreign policy has been framed on only one consideration and that is the consideration of national interest. (*Interruptions*) In order to serve this objective of national interest we have been pursuing a number of basic objectives. I would not narrate all of them, but so far as the relevance to the matter under discussion is concerned, two basic principles are important and should be taken into consideration. (*Interruptions*) One of the basic principles has been that we must separate religion from politics both internal politics as well as in our international relationship.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: You have done it in Rabat.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: Second is; Wherever an aggression has been committed by any power, we should not hesitate to condemn that aggression.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Except in the case of Tibet.

SHRI M. L. SONDHİ: What about Czechoslovakia ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: Therefore, the policy which we have been pursuing is a policy which is not a new policy. It has been pursued by us not only since we became independent but that is the policy which we had been pursuing even before we became independent.

I would like hon. members to remember that when the first non-co-operation movement in this country was started by Gandhiji, it

was on no less a question than Khilafat, and it was for this Khilafat Movement that Gandhiji suffered incarceration. He did not do it because it was a religious question or had a religious aspect but because of the humanitarian aspect. Therefore, he stood by it and he wanted his countrymen to support that policy. Similarly, we have been pursuing this policy.

My hon. friend, Shri Vajpayee, said that on a number of occasions in the past we had participated in religious conferences, but he did not object to such participation because that was at the non-official level. Here I would like to inform hon. members that so far as this conference was concerned, first of all an assurance was obtained whether...

AN HON. MEMBER: When ? Date ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: Before the invitation was sent.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar): Where was the invitation ? Can he lay it on the Table ? Your Minister does not know whether you received the invitation or not. He told me, 'I do not know'.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: May I say that an assurance was obtained...

AN HON. MEMBER: By whom ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED :...that if an invitation was given, the Government could participate at the government level, because this was a conference which was being held in which heads of state and Prime Ministers of the countries represented were present. They did not want to associate any delegation which was not of an official character. Therefore, for the hon. member to say that we could only have participated in this conference as members belonging to one particular community and not as representing the Government is a misconception because of the lack of information he has.

SHRI NARAIN SWARUP SHARMA (Domariaganj): Let him give us the information.

SHRI M. L. SONDHİ: What does the final declaration say ?



MR. CHAIRMAN: He is giving the information, but you are not listening.

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI: He is an authority on industry and commerce. But on foreign affairs, I know something.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI (Gonda): If heads of government were attending, why did not the Prime Minister lead the delegation? It was only befitting that the Prime Minister should have gone. why was he selected? Was it because he is a Muslim?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: It was up to the Prime Minister to decide whether to go herself or to send someone else on her behalf.

SHRI BALRAJ MADHOK: Who gave the assurance? Was it in writing or was it conveyed orally? He talked of an assurance having been given. Could it be laid on the Table?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: So far as these specific matters are concerned, I think the Hon. Minister of External Affairs will be able to give the information (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER: Let him give it.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: I will also give it.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: was the invitation in writing or was it oral?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you have any question to ask, you can ask later.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: The honourable Member can ask questions or clarification after I have finished.

Therefore, this was a conference which was held at the Government level. The other question which has been raised is what business we had to participate in a conference which was to discuss religious matters. As the honourable Members may have seen from the agenda which was before the conference, no religious matter were to be discussed at this conference. They were only discussing the question of the burning of the Al Aqsa Mosque and the change status of

Jerusalem. I do not know how these two issues can be regarded as religious matters.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Please do not mislead the House. There were seven items. Here is the agenda. Why say only two?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: Yes there were a few others which they were going to discuss, whatever may be the agenda, these are the two important questions.

SHRI HARDAYAL DEVGUN: (East Delhi): Place it on the Table of the House.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: I can say categorically that except these two matters no other matter was discussed in this conference. I was there I know what happened.

So far as the question of improper treatment being given to me is concerned, raised by Kripalaniji. I am sorry to say that he has raised this because he had no information or he did not want to take the information regarding the matter. I can say categorically that all the honour and welcome which is given to the head of a state were given to me when I reached there.

SHRI BALRAJ MADHOK: Is the House not entitled to know what the agenda was, what the invitation was? He is beating about the bush.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You ask him whatever you want afterwards.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: He said that I was confined to a house. May I inform him that houses were placed at the disposal of all the heads of States. Other members of the delegation were accommodated in hotels. Heads of delegations were given villas, and the same facility was provided to me. So, I do not know what objection my honourable friend has to my being in a house.

The hon. Member says that we were denied a house, that we were denied water facilities etc. I do not know how and wherefrom he got that information.

SHRI PILOO MODY: *Times of India*.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : It is very unfortunate that we are discussing such an important matter involving the country's honour and we bring in other remarks light-heartedly. There is no truth in such statements; there is no basis for that and I categorically deny that such a thing as mentioned by the hon. Member had ever happened. They say that water was denied to me and food was denied to me and also that no house was placed at my disposal. These are not facts and no discourtesy was shown to me.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH BHADORIA (Etawah) : \*\*

MR. CHAIRMAN : That will not go on record.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : It must be expunged; it is unparliamentary.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have said that it will not go on record.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : Mr. Kripalani referred to the statement which I made after returning from Rabat and he wanted to point out that there was some difference between my view and the views of Mr. Dinesh Singh and that he being a younger man imposed his policy on me. There was no difference of opinion between the foreign policy pursued by Mr. Dinesh Singh and what I stated. I said that we should not take any decision in anger. So far as our basic policy is concerned we must pursue it, and must not give it up in anger. As regards Rabat, I said that we must take into consideration the behaviour of some countries and make a reassessment of our attitude towards them. That is not contrary to the policy which we have been pursuing or contrary to the statement made by Mr. Dinesh Singh. Therefore, to say that there is any difference of opinion between what I said and the policy pursued by the External Affairs Ministry is not correct. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : You said that we must reorient our foreign policy. What is the meaning of it.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I used the word "reassessment". You cannot read only one

part of my statement. I said that we must not take any decision in anger. So far as our basic policy is concerned, that does not call for any change. But having regard to what has happened at Rabat, we must reassess our attitude towards some of those countries. I stand by that statement. I think it is not different from the foreign policy we have been pursuing.

It is wrong on the part of hon. Member to say that I was anxious to go there or that somehow I got this invitation for going there. In fact, when I was asked at the last moment to go....

AN HON. MEMBER : By whom ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : By my colleague.

AN HON. MEMBER : He was not there.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : He was very much there.

May I just say that they would not even accept what I say; that they would not even except what Shri Dinesh Singh says; but they would want us to accept what they say!

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: What the country says; the Nation says.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : You are not the country; you are not the nation. When I was asked by my friend—

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Friend on the right or on the left?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : On the right.—the Minister in charge of External Affairs, I hesitated to go because it was a long journey and according to the doctor I was not supposed to undertake it.

SHRI PILOO MODY : So you went to Rabat at great personal risk.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : After I went there, I can say this much : that I think it was a good thing that I went there, and if I had not gone there, it is very likely that a large number of things against India would

\*\*Not recorded.

[Shri F.A. Ahmed]

have been said, and then what happened at Ahmedabad would have been exploited. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order. Please listen.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : In all fairness, may I say that UAR stood by us. (*Interruptions*) May I just say, because some charge has been made by even our friends,—(*Interruption*).

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli): Let them not disturb. We want to hear and understand the views of the Government. Every minute there is a disturbance. There must be a limit.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : May I just say that this conference met on the 22nd of that month, and on the first day, except that they discussed the agenda of the conference, they did not transact any business and they adjourned. The next morning, when they assembled, they unanimously took the resolution inviting India to this conference and this invitation was conveyed to our ambassador.

SHRI C. C. DESAI (Sabarkantha) ; You were already there. Was it given in writing?

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali) : Will you place it on the Table ?

SHRI C. C. DESAI : Was the invitation given in writing to our Government.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH : Did you receive it in person ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : It is not a question of my receiving it.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH : I mean the Government.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : The Government received it.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH : Will you place it on the Table of the House ? Please say 'Yes' or 'No.'

SHRI F. A. AHMED : On the very day, when I went there, and when I was first approached by the Minister of the king of

Morocco, that I should not participate in this meeting, and when the delegation was sent to me on behalf of the king of Morocco in which delegation there was also a representative of UAR, when they came and told me on behalf of the King of Morocco, both the Prime Minister of Afghanistan and the Vice-Premier of UAR made it clear that they had come not on behalf of the conference but on behalf of their host, the king, to make those requests to me.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : What are those requests ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : First of all, they said that I should voluntarily withdraw from the participation in the conference.

The second proposal was that if I go there at all, I should go as an Observer. The third was that I should fake illness.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Shame !

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : He is an honest man. (*Interruptions*).

श्री रवि राय पुरी : यह अच्छा है कि आप सच बोल रहे हैं ।

हमेशा सच बोला है ।

SHRI F. A. AHMED : The fourth proposal was that they had no objection if I attended as a representative of the Muslims. I said that none of the conditions was acceptable to me. I told them that the invitation was sent to the secular Government of India and if the invitation was refused let that resolution be adopted by the conference as a whole. The King or a few people had no business to tell me that I should withdraw voluntarily. After the UAR representatives had communicated this desire or wish on behalf of the King, they told me that they were not making any request personally nor this request was made, on behalf of the conference ; this was made on behalf of their host and it was left to me to take a decision. I told them that the whole matter should be placed before the conference. But the matter was not placed before the conference at all. If the matter had been placed before the conference, they would have opposed this move by Pakistan

and a few others by an overwhelming majority.

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK :** Did UAR press in the conference that the matter be placed there ?

**श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :** रबात कांफ्रेंस के फाइनल डिक्लेरेशन में, जिसको सारी कांफ्रेंस ने एडाप्ट किया, "इंडियन मुस्लिमज़" की बात कही गई है। क्या यू० ए० आर० ने इस पर विरोध किया ?

**SHRI F. A. AHMED :** After the UAR representative came, soon after, at about 3 PM on that day, they met for half an hour. The Vice-Prime Minister of UAR had left the place in disgust. He was not present when this resolution was adopted.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :** But the other members of the delegation were there.

**SHRI F. A. AHMED :** He left it in disgust and this resolution was passed in about 15 or 20 minutes without even informing us.

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK :** Is UAR a party to the resolution or not ? Let him say yes or no.

18 hrs.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** You cannot ask him a question in the middle of his speech. You can do so at the end of his speech.

**SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH :** What is the use of making a speech if he is not saying anything at all ?

**SHRI F. A. AHMED :** Therefore, so far as my knowledge goes, the UAR Vice-Premier who came to see me was not present when this resolution was adopted.

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA :** Did he sign it later ?

**SHRI F. A. AHMED :** After that, what explanation has been given by UAR, that only the Foreign Minister will be able to

place before you. Therefore, I submit that there is nothing about which we need be ashamed of. Because, our presence there prevented them from discussing our internal affairs, from taking advantage of what has happened at Ahmedabad.

**SHRI NARAIN SWARUP SHARMA :** Will you go to SEATO and CENTO to prevent Pakistan from raising any of these problems ?

**SHRI F. A. AHMED :** It is a hypothetical question. So, how can I say whether I will go or not ?

**SHRI PILOO MODY :** So is your assertion poythetical that if you had not gone there they would have discussed all manner of things. It is a complete hypothesis.

**SHRI F. A. AHMED :** Therefore, when the unanimous invitation came it was decided to accept it. Our External Affairs Minister is not a prophet to know that after inviting us we will not be allowed to participate in that conference. If he had any such prophesy he would certainly have asked me not to go there. When you accept an invitation, you do so on the understanding that it is sincere, genuine and unanimous. It is only after we received the invitation that a decision was taken that a Government delegation should go there.

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA :** What about the furture ? Will you attend such conferences or not ?

**SHRI F. A. AHMED :** I cannot say that off hand. A decision will be taken after taking into account all aspects.

Finally, I submit that there was nothing wrong in our going there and there is nothing wrong for which an apology is called for. I am glad that my hon. friend, instead of moving a vote of censure, has asked only for an apology from us in which case he will withdraw his motion. I submit that we have not done any wrong for which an apology is called for.

**MR CHAIRMAN :** Shri Manoharan.

**SHRI D.N. PATODIA (Jalore) :** Sir, you have stated carlier that after his speech

[Shri D. N. Patodia]

is over, we will be permitted to ask questions.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : No. I am not allowing any questions now. We are already behind the schedule. Members may raise their points during the course of their speeches. The answer will come from the Minister of External Affairs when he speaks.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : Sir, I rise on a point of order. Apparent contradictory statements have been made by the Minister in the course of his speech. When we wanted to point it out, you were pleased to say that it can be done at the end of his speech. Now it is not fair to deny us that right. For instance, he said that India could not send a non-official delegation because there was a demand from the other side that only an official delegation would be accepted. On the other hand, he said, when the King of Morocco approached him, he requested him that he will be permitted to attend the Conference if he represented Muslims. How does he explain these contradictory statements? Let him reply to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The point of order is not replied to by the Minister. That is decided by the Chair.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : How can he make contradictory statements? Let him reply to that. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : The reply will be given by the Minister concerned. Now, Shri Manoharan,

SHRI MANOHARAN (Madras North): Sir, on behalf of the D.M.K. Party, I want to make some observations regarding the points that have been arising out of the adjournment motion.

I have heard with rapt attention the speeches made by Acharya Kripalani and my hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta. I also have heard the speeches made by my hon. friend Shri Vajpayee and others. At the outset, let me point out clearly that I have

no axe to grind nor I am motivated by any extraneous considerations. After having heard their speeches, I am convinced that they are allergic to certain expressions, Islamic or Muslim summit. I am sorry for that. After having heard Shri F. A. Ahmed's speech, I am convinced that some diplomatic..... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam) If you interrupt like this, nobody else can speak.

SHRI MANOHARAN: After having heard Shri F.A. Ahmed's speech, I was about to say, I am convinced that some diplomatic bungling took place at Rabat. So, on the basis of that, I want to analyse the whole thing. The main objection raised here was that that was an Islamic or Muslim summit and, therefore, a secular nation like India should not have attended the Conference at all. But I have got a different point to make about this proposition.

India is a secular nation and, as Acharya Kripalani said, the name 'Islamic summit' was a positive proof that it was a communal body. Sir, in my State, there are hotels that are called Brahmin Coffee Hotels. But non-Brahmins like me are not prevented from taking coffee there. What was the purpose of that Conference? (*Interruption*)

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Was the Rabat Conference a hotel?

SHRI MANOHARAN : I am meeting the point of Acharyaji. What I say is, let us not be carried away by the names of conferences and the styles of conferences.....

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: You are allowed in a Brahmin hotel but they were not allowed there.

SHRI MANOHARAN: The question is, whether the invitation was extended to the Government of India by the Conference...

AN HON. MEMBER : Or it was extracted.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: Did the hotel invite you ?

18.8 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the chair.]

SHRI MANOHARAN: I have heard your speech with rapt attention. I can understand your antics of age.

What I want to stress here is that the Conference extended an invitation unanimously to the Government of India.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who says ?

SHRI MANOHARAN: That is the claim of the Government. When the Conference began, I quote:

"The Chairman, the King of Morocco Welcomed the Indian Delegation most cordially and said he was happy to see India's Ambassador representing his country pending the arrival of the full ministerial Delegation from New Delhi."

that itself shows that an invitation had been extended to us on the basis of which our Ambassador first attended the function followed by Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed. It is perfectly in order. We can attend the Conference. Now what was the agenda before the Conference ? My hon. friend, Mr. Vajpayee, pointed out four things. At first the issues to be discussed at the Conference were confined to the burning of Al Aqsa Mosque and status of Jerusalem, but when the Conference met, the agenda was revised to include the following items: the withdrawal of Israel from all occupied territories; restitution of the rights of the Palestinian people; implementation of the decision of the Conference; adoption of a unified position on these questions besides co-operation among Islamic countries; and the next meeting of the Foreign Ministers. So, it is very clear. We are interested in certain points of the agenda. We have been championing the cause of West Asian politics; we have been championing the cause of the Arab rights. These were the points that came up before the agenda for discussion at the Conference for which India was wrong in not accepting the invitation or India was wrong in accepting the invitation.

The second point is this. (*Interruption*) A point has been raised whether a written invitation was sent to the Government of India by the Conference. Claims have been made by Government that the invitation was there. Counter argument has also been advanced that there was no invitation. May I ask the Government of India whether there is any possibility of producing the letter before the House ? (*Interruption*)

SHRI PILOO MODY: Let them do it. Even a post-dated copy will do.

SHRI MANOHARAN: I want to know this from the Government Here is a point that is written in the Book.....

AN HON. MEMBER: which book ?

SHRI MANOHARAN:... 'Rabat Before and after', that our Ambassador took the floor and made the following preliminary remarks, 'Mr. President, Your Majesties, Your Highnesses, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen'.....

SHRI PILOO MODY: There were some gentlemen also !

SHRI MANOHARAN:...as if this was spoken by the Ambassador at the Rabat Conference. But I was told by one of my colleagues who also attended the Rabat Conference, the Rajya Sabha Member, Shri Abdul Samad, that our Ambassador did not make any speech at all. If this is true, it is highly objectionable. How did these misleading statements appear in the press and escape the contradiction of the Government of India ?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : It is a serious matter.

SHRI MANOHARAN: As I have said, everything went off well, but after Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed arrived at the spot, the trouble started. Why the trouble started is the question. I was told that

[Shri Manoharan]  
 televised communal riots had been shown to all the countries that participated in the Conference. The BBC Radio and the French Radio came out every half an hour with news about the human slaughter and the annihilation of minority communities at Ahmedabad.

How could we say that it was a mistake on the part of the Government to accept the invitation to attend the Conference? Who were the real people who were behind all these communal riots is the question. I am not attacking any political Party for that. But I have read speeches made by some responsible Members of Parliament that the Muslim people should be driven out from India. I have read some responsible Members of Parliament talk like that. (*Interruptions*) and I have read speeches made earlier also from Srinagar some months ago by one top ranking Parliamentarian speaking and saying that if the Muslims of this county are not loyal to India, they must be driven out from this country. (*Interruptions*)

So day in and day out such kind of speeches are made and irresponsible utterances in the political arena which resulted in the actual killings and the breaking out of communal riots. That was utilised by Pakistan at Rabat. So my humble submission is that India is perfectly justified in attending the Conference. There is no doubt about it. But India could have avoided attending the conference also. But, unfortunately, having decided to attend the Conference, it is the duty of the Government of India to explain the stand on behalf of the Government of India as well as the people of this country.

Then, Sir, here people are angry. I think my friend, Mr. Vajpayee, is still more angry that it is an Islamic conference, it is a communal body and what use it is for a secular nation like India to participate in that conference. Which we are arguing here and submitting our reaction that the secular concept of India was a casualty in Rabat and we are attending a conference which is cent per cent pucca communal, fortunately or otherwise, the reaction of Pakistan is entirely different. I would quote what Pakistan newspapers had to say. MORNING NEWS of Pakistan says:

"The seating of India at the Islamic summit has shocked the people of Pakistan beyond words."

There is another paper, DAWN, of Karachi which says:

"India apparently persisted in its endeavour to gain admission to the Conference in order, among other things, to strengthen its efforts to penetrate the Muslim world economically, politically and win over new allies in its bid for the leadership of the third world."

Is it a condemnation or is it a compliment given by Pakistan press to India?

SHRI SHASHI BHUSHAN (Khargone): It is Mr. Vajpayee's statement.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: It is Mr. Shashi Bhushan Vajpayee's statement. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANOHARAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have read the reactions of all the Press. No doubt, this subject has created tremendous emotion in the country. Now I am convinced who has created the emotion. I request each and every political Party of this country to behave properly and in a responsible manner. Let us not utilise the communal instinct for political purposes. There are Parties who style themselves as political purposes but who are out and out communal and they are exploiting the situation. I wish my friend, Shri Vajpayee, should not be in that terrific field because I like Mr. Vajpayee. He is a reasonable man, having sobriety despite his age and all that. But there are some sections in his own Party and I am very sorry to say that their speeches have created communal tension all over the country. I do not like to mention names, but these are people who can search their hearts and talk to the world as to who are responsible for the communal trouble in the country.

AN HON. MEMBER: Fakhruddin Ali.

SHRI MANOHARAN: Whether it is Fakhruddin Ali or any other Ali Khan, what

I say is that communal harmony in this country cannot be sacrificed at the altar of political vandalism, the machinations of certain political elements.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: We agree.

SHRI MANOHARAN: I am very happy he agrees. He should put it into practice.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: They went to Rabat in order to placate the Muslims in India. That is their communal approach.

SHRI MANOHARAN: I cannot convince my friend.

Let me conclude on this note. We have got our moral, political and constitutional obligation to safeguard not only the interests of the minority communities but to respect their feelings and political viewpoints. It is high time for all political parties to sit round a table, whether under the auspices of the National Integration Council or any other body. They must meet, discuss and see that communal harmony is maintained in this country.

For example, we have in India 6 crore-Muslims who are proud to say that we are the country with the third biggest Muslim population in the world. They have got every right to say so.

But what is happening in this country is humiliating. We look small in the eye of the nations of the world. What happened at Ahmedabad, Jamshedpur, Jubalpur, places where innocent people have been killed, women have been dishonoured, should be a matter of shame for us, for any country. The image of this country abroad has shrunk, for which we all must take the responsibility.

In conclusion, let me repeat what I have been persistently advocating for the past so many years, that it is high time the foreign policy of the Government was reappraised.

SHRI SHEONARAIN (Basti): Reoriented.

SHRI MANOHARAN: I do not mind the words. I want to speak the truth. It must be reappraised. The time has come for it, I am glad that the present Government of India is trimmed in that matter. I am very happy that the trunkated syndicate is somewhere else now. This is a good augury. I declare our faith in the Prime Minister's Government, not because of anything else, but because of its socialist programme (*Interruptions*). These members are thoroughly impatient. They do not hear me.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: He has given one certificate.

SHRI MANOHARAN: The second certificate is this. She has had the guts and courage enough to dissociate herself from the handcoots of the syndicate, who are representatives of vested interests and toadies of capitalists (*Interruptions*).

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: We have got the country's interests in view; they have got no policy, no principle, no programme.

SHRI MANOHARAN: I sympathise with him. He is a good man. Our support to this Government is conditional, qualified hedged.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: Make it unconditional.

SHRI MANOHARAN: He is not our political guru. If the Prime Minister deviates from her path, the DMK will withdraw its support fully and completely. If any political party tries on the basis of the Rabat debacle or rebuff to topple her Government, it means people are trying to topple a socialist Government (*Interruptions*). On that note, I conclude.

MR. SPEAKER : The time allotted was three hours. The time allotted to Jan Sangh was seven minutes; they have already taken more then double that time...(*Interruptions*) I am very sorry that the timelimit has not been strictly adhered to. I shall now mention the time allotted to the various other groups...(*Interruptions*.) My only point is that if we could avoid long speeches and give only the points, more Members can be accommodated.



SHRI M. R. MASANI (Rajkot) : Could you indicate the time approximately when you will call the hon. Member to reply ?

MR. SPEAKER : I shall call him around 7 p. m. I am told that the hon. External Affairs Minister would need about half an hour. In that case it is impossible to finish it by 7 p. m. we shall see. Once again I request hon. Members to be brief.

श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव (आजमगढ़) : माननीय अध्यक्ष जी, रबात सम्मेलन में भारत ने सबसे भाग लिया और भारतीय प्रतिनिधि मंडल के साथ जिस प्रकार का व्यवहार रबात में किया गया उसके बाद से यह विषय देश में एक विवाद का विषय बना हुआ है। सारे देश में इस बात की चिन्ता प्रकट की गई है कि हमारे राष्ट्रीय सम्मान के ऊपर, हमारी प्रतिष्ठा के ऊपर, हमारे सरकारी प्रतिनिधि मंडल की प्रतिष्ठा के ऊपर रबात के अन्दर आंच आई और उस पर हमारे देश के लोगों ने चिन्ता प्रकट की। मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि आज हमारे देश के अन्दर इस प्रकार की चेतना है कि लोग यह महसूस करें कि यदि हमारे राष्ट्रीय सम्मान, हमारी राष्ट्रीय प्रतिष्ठा के ऊपर किसी प्रकार का आघात होता है तो लोगों के दिलों पर ठेस लगती है ताकि हमारा राष्ट्रीय सम्मान और प्रतिष्ठा विदेशों में बना रहे। रबात के अन्दर जो कुछ हुआ है, हमारी प्रधान मन्त्री जी ने अपने भाषण में कहा है कि वह एक बड़ी दुखद घटना हुई है—हमें इस बात का दुख है कि हमारे प्रतिनिधि मंडल के साथ रबात में इस प्रकार का व्यवहार किया गया। भारत को एक राय से निमंत्रित करने के बाद जिस प्रकार का व्यवहार वहां पर हमारे प्रतिनिधि मंडल के साथ हुआ—यह सही है कि वह हमारे लिए क्षोभ और दुख की घटना है। लेकिन मुझे इस बात का दुख होता है कि हमारे देश के कुछ राजनीतिक दल इस सवाल को एक राजनीतिक हथकण्डे के रूप में, एक राजनीतिक हथियार के रूप में इस्तेमाल करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। सदन के सामने दो सवाल उठाये गए हैं। पहला

सवाल यह है क्या भारतीय प्रतिनिधि मंडल के लिए, भारत सरकार के लिए जरूरी था कि हम रबात के सम्मेलन में जाते ? दूसरा सवाल यह है कि हमारे प्रतिनिधि मंडल के साथ जिस प्रकार का व्यवहार वहां किया गया क्या उससे हमारे राष्ट्रीय सम्मान को आंच लगी है या नहीं ? सबसे पहले मैं दूसरे सवाल को लेना चाहता हूँ, और मैं उन लोगों के साथ अपनी भावना को जोड़ना चाहता हूँ जो यह महसूस करते हैं कि भारतीय प्रतिनिधि मंडल के साथ जो व्यवहार रबात के अन्दर हुआ वह अपसोसनाक है और हमारे राष्ट्रीय सम्मान के खिलाफ हुआ है। उससे हमें अपने अन्तराष्ट्रीय व्यवहार के सम्बन्धों के अन्दर एक धक्का लगा है। इस भावना को मानने के बाद मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह एक घटना हुई। लेकिन किसी भी राष्ट्र के जीवन में सरकारी कामों के अन्दर इस प्रकार के भी अवसर आते हैं और जब इस प्रकार की बातें होती हैं तब उनके ऊपर हमें निरपेक्ष रूप से विचार करना चाहिये।

एक प्रश्न उठाया गया और मुझे दुःख है कि कुछ ऐसे लोग जो राष्ट्रीय सम्मान को दुहाई देते हैं, ऐसे लोग जिन को राष्ट्रीय प्रतिष्ठा के ऊपर आंच आने से तकलीफ होती है, वहां पर ऐसे देशों की वकालत करते हैं जिन के खिलाफ भारत सरकार कदम उठाती है। रबात के अन्दर जो हुआ, उस में भारत सरकार ने महसूस किया कि वहां कुछ ऐसी शक्तियां थीं, कुछ ऐसी सरकारें थीं, जिन्होंने एक राय से हम को निमन्त्रित करने के बाद हमारे साथ सम्मानपूर्वक व्यवहार नहीं किया। इसीलिये भारत सरकार ने इस बात का निर्णय लिया कि जार्डन और मोरक्को के साथ हम अपने डिप्लोमैटिक रिलेशन्स को खत्म करें। जब श्री वाजपेयी हमारे सम्मान की रक्षा करने के लिये खड़े होते हैं, जब अशोक मेहता साहब इस बात की दुहाई देते हैं तब यह दोनों आदमी इस तरह की भावना व्यक्त करते हैं कि जार्डन एक गरीब, छोटा सा मुल्क है, भारत सरकार ने उसके उसके खिलाफ यह कार्रवाई क्यों की ? जार्डन

वह देश था जिस की भूमि पर यह सम्मेलन हुआ, जार्डन के किंग उस सम्मेलन के अध्यक्ष थे ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : मोरक्को ।

श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव : मोरक्को के किंग उसके अध्यक्ष थे, इस लिये हमने मोरक्को से अपना सम्बन्ध विच्छेद किया । जोर्डन वह देश था, जिसने पाकिस्तान की हठवादिता का समर्थन किया था । जब पाकिस्तान ने इस बात का विरोध किया और कहा कि भारत को वहाँ नहीं बैठना चाहिए तब वह देश जार्डन ही था जिसने पाकिस्तान का समर्थन किया । इसी लिए भारत सरकार ने जार्डन के साथ अपने सम्बन्ध को तोड़ा और मोरक्को के साथ अपने राजनीतिक सम्बन्धों का विच्छेद किया । यह कोई साधारण बात नहीं है । किन्हीं देशों के साथ राजनीतिक सम्बन्ध को विच्छेद करना हमारी डिप्लोमैटिक हिस्ट्री के अन्दर एक असाधारण बात है । यह सबसे कड़ा कदम है जिस को भारत सरकार ने इस लिए उठाया कि उसी ने महमूस किया कि उन्होंने हमारे साथ उचित व्यवहार नहीं किया ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : सम्बन्ध नहीं तोड़ा है, खाली मुंह मोड़ा है ।

श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव : ठीक है, वह भी गम्भीर कदम है जो उठाया गया है ।

दूसरी बात जो इस सम्बन्ध में कही गई वह यह कि हमारे बहुत से मित्र देश थे जिन्होंने वहाँ हमारा साथ नहीं दिया । मैं बड़ी नम्रता पूर्वक कहना चाहता हूँ कि श्री वाजपेयी इस पर विचार करें । जिस नीति से पाकिस्तान ने जिद की कि भारतीय प्रतिनिधिमंडल नहीं आ सकता है उस के बाद सम्मेलन होना असम्भव हो गया । केवल पन्द्रह मिनट के लिए सम्मेलन हुआ और उसमें भी विवाद होता रहा । अरब देशों में जो भारत के मित्र थे वह इस बात का

दबाव डालते रहे कि हमें एक राय से बुलाया गया है और भारतीय प्रतिनिधि मंडल को वहाँ रहना चाहिए । इसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि वह सम्मेलन नहीं हो पाया । केवल पंद्रह मिनट के अन्दर आखिरी कम्प्यूनिक् इश्यू हुआ ।

यहाँ पर संयुक्त अरब गणराज्य पर भी आक्षेप किया गया । लेकिन राष्ट्रपति नासिर ने खुद इस बात को महमूस किया और उनका प्रतिनिधिमंडल इस सम्मेलन के समाप्त होने के पहले ही चला गया । उसके बाद राष्ट्रपति नासिर ने अपना एक विशेष प्रतिनिधि भारत भेजा और भारत सरकार से उन्होंने अपना क्षोभ, अपनी चिन्ता और अपना दुःख प्रकट किया कि इस प्रकार का व्यवहार भारत के साथ किया गया ।

इस सम्मेलन के लिये कहा गया कि भारत की सरकार ने गुट-निरपेक्षता की नीति को खत्म कर दिया है और एक सैनिक गुट वाले देशों के सम्मेलन में शामिल हुआ था । यह बात सत्य से परे है । वह सम्मेलन किसी सैनिक गुट का सम्मेलन नहीं था, कोई सैनिक गुट बनाने का सम्मेलन नहीं था, और भारत सरकार आज भी अपनी नीति पर अटल हैं । जब अल अक्सा मास्क पर अटक हुआ था तब भारत सरकार ने कहा था कि किसी भी धर्म के प्रतीक के ऊपर, किसी धर्म के देवालय के ऊपर, अगर आक्रमण होता है तो भारत सरकार उसकी निन्दा करती है, उसको गलत समझती है । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश के अन्दर 6 करोड़ मुसलिम हैं, अगर 6 करोड़ मुसलमानों की मस्जिद पर हमला होता है, जिसका संसार में तीसरे नम्बर का स्थान है—मक्का मदीना के बाद इस मस्जिद का तीसरा स्थान वह मानते हैं—6 करोड़ क्या अगर इस देश में 6 मुसलमान भी हैं और उनकी भावनाओं को चोट लगती है तो भारत सरकार का कर्तव्य है कि वह उनकी भावनाओं का आदर करे, और यह जो हमारी नीति है उसका मैं समर्थन करना चाहता हूँ ।

[श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव]

बदकिस्मती इस देश की है कि यहां ऐसी साम्प्रदायिक ताकतें हैं जो साजिश करके कहीं इजराइल का नाम लेकर, कहीं मुसलमानों का नाम लेकर सारे सवाल को साम्प्रदायिक फिर्का-परस्ती का रंग देने की कोशिश करती हैं। यह ऐसी ताकतें हैं जिनको किसी बात की चिन्ता नहीं होती। मुझे श्री अशोक मेहता की इस बात से तकलीफ़ हुई, दुःख हुआ जब वह तुलना करते हैं कि मलयेशिया के अन्दर क्या हो रहा है, केन्या के अन्दर क्या हो रहा है, और दूसरे देशों के अन्दर क्या हो रहा है, धर्म के नाम पर, रैस के नाम पर अटक हो रहा है ? और इसलिए वह अहमदाबाद से उनकी तुलना करना चाहते हैं। (व्यवधान)

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : मैं आप से कहना चाहती हूँ कि यहां अशोक मेहता साहब का नाम लिया गया। चूँकि श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद ने खुद इस बात का ऐलान किया है कि चाहे गौहाटी में रायट होता है, तेल के कारखाने के लिये या तेलंगाना में आन्दोलन होता है तेलंगाना के लिये (व्यवधान) इसी तरह इनकी बात है। अशोक मेहता साहब ने जो नाम लिये उस पर ऐतराज करने वालों को मालूम होना चाहिये कि फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब ने क्या कहा था।

MR. SPEAKER : You have started interrupting without may permission when the hon. member is speaking. You are a senior member of the House.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : I had to interrupt because he was taking the name of Mr. Asoka Mehta and quoting him in the wrong context.

श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव : इसलिए मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि हमारे देश के अन्दर यह ऐसे लोग हैं जिनका दृष्टिकोण इन सबालों के ऊपर बहुत ही संकुचित है। साथ ही मैं एक और बात करना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसी ताकतें जो रबात सम्मेलन को लेकर भारत की वैदेशिक

नीति पर आक्रमण करना चाहती हैं वह हैं कौन लोग ? यह वही लोग हैं जिन्होंने भारत की वैदेशिक नीति में शुरू से लेकर आज तक विश्वास नहीं किया है चाहे वह अशोक मेहता साहब हों चाहे आचार्य कृपालानी हों चाहे वह श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी हों या चाहे पीलू मोदी साहब हों। यह वह ताकतें हैं जो इस देश की वैदेशिक नीति को शुरू से लेकर आज तक मुखालिफत करती रही हैं, और यही वह ताकतें हैं जो इस अवसर का इस्तेमाल करके भारत की वैदेशिक नीति में परिवर्तन करना चाहती हैं। इसलिए मैं आखिर में कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत की वैदेशिक नीति, जो हमारी विश्व-क्रांति की नीति है, हमारे पड़ोसी देशों के साथ मित्रता रखने की नीति है, दूसरे देश जो आक्रमण करते हैं उसकी निन्दा करने की नीति है। अगर श्री वाजपेयी कहते हैं या अशोक मेहता साहब कहते हैं कि हमारी हमदर्दी क्यों केवल अरब देशों के साथ होती है तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह इसलिए होती है कि चाहे जो हो, हमने एक सिद्धांत बनाया है। यह बात सही है कि हमारे काश्मीर का एक अंग दुश्मन के कब्जे में है, लेकिन इसका यह अर्थ नहीं होता कि अगर दुनिया का कोई देश इजराइल अरब देशों के ऊपर कब्जा किये हुए हैं तो हम उसकी निन्दा न करें, और हमने इजराइल की निन्दा की थी। हम इस सम्मेलन में इसलिए जा रहे थे कि वहां पर एक बड़ा भारी प्रश्न यह भी था कि एक आक्रामक अपने आक्रमण का लाभ न उठा सके, वह आक्रमण वापस ले। हम इस लिये पड़े अरब देशों के साथ कि हमारे मैत्रीपूर्ण सम्बन्ध उनके साथ हैं और हमें एक राय से निमन्त्रित किया गया था। अगर पाकिस्तान की हठवादिता से हमको चोट पहुंचती है तो यह कौनसी देशभक्ति है कि हम पाकिस्तान की निन्दा न करें। हमें भविष्य में इस बात पर ध्यान रखना चाहिये कि पाकिस्तानी हथकण्डे के शिकार हमारे दूसरे मित्र देश न बन जायें। बजाय इसके कि हम पाकिस्तान की निन्दा करते, बाज भारत सरकार की निन्दा करने के लिए

जो ताकतें उठ रही हैं वह अपने बेश की प्रतिष्ठा और सम्मान की रक्षा इस प्रकार से नहीं कर सकतीं ।

इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस सवाल के ऊपर सरकार की निन्दाप्रस्ता करने का व गलत है और उसको सदन को ठुकरा देना चाहिये ।

SHRI SWELL (Autonomous Districts) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the course of the last four months two things have happened in this country that have shook it to its very core and drawn and involved the entire country such as no other thing has done in the past. One was the presidential election last August and the other is this question of our participation in Rabat. I thought that this House, being the highest body in the country, should be in a position to shed light and guidance to the country, as a whole by a more purposeful discussion of this question. I wish that we have had more time to consider it. If my hon. friend, Shri Piloo Mody, instead of moving an adjournment motion, had moved an outright motion of no-confidence in the ministry this House might have had a little more time to discuss this question. Howsoever, within the very limited time at my disposal, I will try to put across what I think about this question.

As you know, I belong to the Independent Parliamentary Group, and one of the tenets of this Group is to view every question on its merits. So, what I say here is an impartial assessment of the situation on its merits. I would declare here that as a Group we do not bind ourselves to any line for all times to come. We shall assess every situation on its merits.

I would begin from where my very honoured friend, Shri Kripalani, had started. He found fault with our participation in this Conference on one main ground, that the name of the Conference was Islamic Summit Conference. With all my respect to him I would remind him at this time of the words of Shakespeare 'what is in a name'. What is important is to look at the content, whether this Conference, which was called an Islamic Conference, was really an Islamic

Conference in the sense in which Acharya Kripalani had taken it to be.

In the first place, I would draw your attention to the agenda of this Conference. The four main items of the agenda are : (1) burning of the Al Aqsa mosque ; (2) the status of Jerusalem ; (3) the withdrawal of Israel from all occupied territories ; and (4) the restitution of the rights of the Palestinian refugees. I would leave it to the good sense of the House to consider whether these questions which from the agenda of this Conference are purely religious questions or they are political questions. I leave it to the wisdom of the House.

To help the House to understand the situation I will remind the House of a conference with a similar name that was held in Kuala Lumpur in April of this year, which was styled "International Islamic Conference". The items of the agenda of this conference are : (1) fasting a common Islamic practice ; (2) observance of Id-ul-Fitr ; (3) Islam and usury ; (4) Islam and medical practices such as transplanting of eyes, heart etc. and family planning ; (5) commandments of the Hadis.

I would like everybody in this House to kindly see if there is any difference between these two conferences. The one of April, 1969, it is seen from its agenda, it is a purely religious conference. We have no right to be there and rightly we did not send any official delegation to participate in this conference.

But the Rabat Conference had nothing to do with any religious question. It dealt with purely political questions. Here I would refer to what my hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta had mentioned. He had said that for an invitation to this Conference there were two criteria, namely, that the country should have an Islamic head of State and, secondly, the country should have a Muslim majority population, and that if we go by these two criteria, we have no right and no place in this Conference.

SHRI ASOKA MEHTA : I said, we reject these two criteria.

SHRI SWELL : That is your subjective opinion, whether you reject or not is another question.

**SHRI ASOKA MEHTA :** The nation has rejected these two criteria. If you want to quote me, please quote me correctly.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :** That was the decision of the preparatory committee.

**SHRI SWELL :** What I want to say is this. The preparatory committee of this Conference had decided on these two criteria. But the plenary session of the whole Conference which met on the 23rd September of this month had changed all this and decided unanimously to send an invitation to India. I would like to mention in this regard that it was not only India that was invited but also many other countries.

**SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI :** Not many.

**SHRI SWELL :** I would name the countries invited by this Conference which do not have a Muslim head of State and which do not have a Muslim majority population. I would name Nigeria which has a Christian head of the State and only 41 per cent of Muslim population. Then, you have Lebanon which has a Christian head of State and only 33 per cent of Muslim population and you have Chad which has a Christian head of State and only 43 per cent of Muslim population. My learned friend Mr. Kripalani also mentioned that an invitation had been sent to Yugoslavia and Tanzania and other countries which were not Muslim countries. To say that because we did not have a Muslim head of State and not a Muslim majority population and, therefore, it was improper for us to be in this Conference, I am sorry to say, is entirely untenable.

The next point which I would like to make is this. I would ask my friends to look at the map of Asia and the map of the world and consider for a moment the geographical position in which we are. Look to the West and you have the serried ranks of Muslim countries. Look to the East and you have Malaysia and Indonesia. Look to the north and you have Pakistan and certain areas of China inhabited by Muslims and certain parts of Russia inhabited by Muslims. Look to the South and there also you will find that. I would ask this question of my friends, whether it is a serious proposal that we in this country should isolate and insulate ourselves that we should not care what hap-

pens in the countries around us. I would like them to be reminded of their own history. During the days of Emperor Ashoka, when we took a lively interest in the countries around us, we used to send missionaries and people around and that is how Buddhism was taken to the Far East and the Far West. I would ask them to consider seriously the proposal that we should not take any interest in any affairs of the countries around us which happen to be preponderantly Muslim countries.

Lastly, I would like them to analyse the situation that took place in Rabat. I would ask them to see whether it is true or not that in the Rabat Conference there was a rivalry, a struggle, between secular progressive Arab countries and the feudal obscurantist Arab countries. I would like them to consider Saudi Arabia, Morocco and some other countries on one side and countries like U.A.R. and other countries on the other side.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :** Which are the other countries ?

**SHRI SWELL :** I would then like them to consider whether we are for progressive forces and secularism, or not. If we are for progressive forces and secularism, I would like to ask them whether it is not right to try to help the secular and progressive forces in the countries around us. This is the main question. If we are for secularism and progressive forces, it is our duty and it was right that we went to Rabat and help these forces.

**श्री गुलाम मुहम्मद बख्शी (श्रीनगर) :** जनाबि वाला, ऐवान में जो बहस हुई है, उसको मैंने बगौर सुना है। यह सही है कि ऐवान के मुस्लिफ़ मेम्बरों ने इस बारे में अपने-अपने खयालात का इज़हार किया अपने-अपने नुक्ता-ए-निगाह से। लेकिन उन खयालात के सिलसिले में मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है।

कुछ मेम्बरों का खयाल है कि रबात कांफ़रेंस में जाकर हिन्दुस्तान ने ग़लती की। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि रबात जाने में हमने ग़लती

कोई नहीं की, बल्कि हमारा वहां जाना अच्छा रहा और उसके मिलसिले में मैं आपसे अर्ज करूंगा।

एक एतराज यह किया गया है कि वह एक इस्लामिक कांफ्रेंस थी और इसलिए इस मुल्क को उसमें शामिल नहीं होना चाहिए था। अगर सिर्फ नाम पर एतराज है, तो मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि इससे पहले भी हम चार बार इस्लामिक या मुस्लिम कांफ्रेंसों में जा चुके हैं और आफ्रिकन तरीके पर गये हैं। हम 1965 में बल्ड मुस्लिम कांफ्रेंस, एफ्रो-एशियन इस्लामिक कांफ्रेंस और मुस्लिम बल्ड लीग में और 1969 में इन्टरनेशनल इस्लामिक कांफ्रेंस में शरीक हो चुके हैं।

जैसा कि फ़ारेन मिनिस्टर साहब ने अपने स्टेटमेंट में बताया है, हिन्दुस्तान को उस कांफ्रेंस में आने के लिए युनेमिस दावत दी गई थी और हिन्दुस्तान वहां गया। यहां पर हमारे साथ किये गये सलूक के बारे में यहां पर जिन सेन्टीमेंट्स का इज़हार किया गया है, मुझे उनसे इत्तिफ़ाक है। बदकिस्मती से उन लोगों की नियत में कुछ खलल था। इतने बड़े शानदार मुल्क के साथ जो सलूक करना चाहिए था, वह उन्होंने नहीं किया और उसका एक परो-मग़ज़र है। इसके लिए मैं मोराको और दूसरे मुल्कों को उतना दोष नहीं देता, जितना कि पाकिस्तान को।

यह ठीक है कि उन्होंने हमारे जज़बात को ठेस पहुँचाई—यह जानते हुए भी कि हम वहां उस काज़ को सपोट करने जा रहे थे, जो शुरू से ही हमारी फ़ारेन पालिसी के साथ वावस्ता रहा है। सिर्फ आज ही नहीं, सिर्फ आज़ादी के ज़माने में ही नहीं, बल्कि जब हम खुद आज़ादी के लिए लड़ रहे थे, उस वक्त से हम बिल्कुल कानसिस्टेन्सी के साथ उस काज़ की हिमायत करते आये हैं। हम यह भी जानते हैं कि जिस तरह काश्मीर के एक हिस्से पर, और दूसरे इलाकों पर, चीनियों ने जबर्दस्ती कब्ज़ा जमाया है उसी तरह इम्पीरियलिज़म ने अरबलैंड में

इज़रायल को खड़ा किया, जिसने अरब टैरीटरी का एक हिस्सा अपने ज़ेर-दस्त किया है। हम उसके खिलाफ आज से नहीं, बल्कि बहुत पहले से प्रोटेस्ट करते आये हैं।

रबात कांफ्रेंस के एजेंडे पर पहली बात थी, “दि बरनिंग आफ्र दि अल अक्सा मास्क।” अल अक्सा को जलाये जाने के खिलाफ सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान के मुसलमानों ने ही नहीं, बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान के साथ करोड़ इंसानों ने—हिन्दू, मुसलमान, सिख और ईसाइयों ने—प्रोटेस्ट किया है, मीटिंगज़ और मार्च किये हैं। इससे पता चलता है कि जब ऐसी कोई बात होती है, तो हिन्दुस्तान किसी से पीछे नहीं रहता है।

एजेंडा का दूसरा आइटम था, “दि स्टेट्स आफ्र जेरुसलम”। हम हमेशा से यू० एन०, सिक्वैरिटी कौंसिल और सारी दुनिया में यह कोशिश करते आये हैं कि जेरुसलम का स्टेट्स रेस्टोर कर दिया जाये। उस बान से भी हमारा इत्तिफ़ाक-राय है।

एजेंडा का तीसरा आइटम था, “दि विदइज़ाल आफ्र इसरायल फ्राम आल आकुपाइड टैरीटरीज़”। शुरू से ही हमारी यह पालिसी रही है कि किसी भी मुल्क को दूसरे मुल्क के इलाके पर कब्ज़ा रखने की इजाज़त नहीं दी जानी चाहिए।

उसके बाद कांफ्रेंस का चौथा आइटम था, ‘रेस्टीट्यूशन आफ्र दि राइट्स आफ्र दि पेलेस-टाटनियन पीपल’। जैसाकि मैंने अर्ज किया है, हम शुरू से ही इसके लिए लड़ते आये हैं और जो कुछ भी हम से हो सका है, हम करते आये हैं।

कांफ्रेंस के एजेंडा का आखिरी आइटम था, “कोआपरेशन एमांस्ट इस्लामिक कन्ट्रीज़”। अगर हमारे नुमायंदों को वहां जाकर बोलने का मौका मिलता, तो मुझे यकीन है कि वे लाज़िमी तौर पर इस बात से इत्तिफ़ाक न करते—हमारे सैकुलर कैरेक्टर को मद्दे-नज़र रखते हुए, क्योंकि यह उन मुल्कों की अपनी बात थी।

[श्री गुलाम मुहम्मद बख्शी]

कांफ्रेंस के एजेंडा पर तीन चार बातें ऐसी थीं, जिनके साथ हम हर साल-हा-साल से बराबर इतिफाक करते आये हैं, उनके लिए लड़ते आये हैं और उनके लिए स्ट्रगल हुई हैं। अल अक्सा तो मुसलमानों का किब्ला-ए-अव्वल है। उसके जलाए जाने के खिलाफ मुसलमानों ने तो प्रोटेस्ट किया ही, लेकिन उसके खिलाफ सबसे ज्यादा शोर और प्रोटेस्ट हिन्दुस्तान के हिन्दू और सिखों और दूसरे नान-मुस्लिमज ने किया और यह बात वायसे-मुबारकबाद है।

हमारा दुश्मन पाकिस्तान इन्तदा से ही अरब वर्ल्ड, में इस्लामिक कन्टीज में, अपना मुकाम बनाने और हिन्दुस्तान को बदनाम करने की कोशिश कर रहा है। यह तो एक ट्रूप था। अगर हम रबात कांफ्रेंस में न जाते, तो वह कहता कि देखो, हिन्दुस्तान नहीं आया। हम वहां गये और हमने पाकिस्तान की तमाम कोशिशों को फस्ट्रेट किया, नाकाम किया। अगर हम वहां न जाते, तो हम डिफ्रेंसिव पर होते। लेकिन चूँकि हम वहां गये, इसलिए उस कांफ्रेंस के तमाम पार्टिसिपेंट्स आज डिफ्रेंसिव पर हैं और वे महसूस करते हैं कि इतने बड़े शानदार मुल्क के साथ ऐसा सलूक नहीं होना चाहिए था। उस से हम कम नहीं हुए, हमारी इज्जत कम नहीं हुई, बल्कि हमारी इज्जत दोबाला हुई और उन लोगों का छोटापन जाहिर हो गया।

अगर सिर्फ "इस्लामिक" लफ्ज पर एतराज किया जाता है, तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर सऊदी एरेविया, ईरान और अफगानिस्तान में हम क्या करते हैं, जो फुल-फ्लेज्ड इस्लामिक स्टेट हैं। उनके साथ हमारे रिश्ते और ताल्लुकात कायम हैं। हम उनको अपना दोस्त मानते हैं और वे हमारे दोस्त हैं। एक दूसरे के यहां हमारे एम्बेसेडर और नुमायंदे मुकर्रर हैं। हमने उन्हें यह तो नहीं कहा कि पहले वे सिकुर हो जायें और फिर हम उनके यहाँ अपने नुमायंदे भेजेंगे। वहां पर जो कुछ माहौल है, उसी के मुताबिक हम अपनी पालिसी बनाते हैं।

फारेन पालिसी को मोल्ड करते वक्त यह लाजिमी हो जाता है कि वहां पर किसी एक स्पेसिफिक चीज पर न चलें, हालात के तकाजे के मुताबिक, मुल्क की ख्वाहिशात के मुताबिक, मुल्क के तवक्कात के मुताबिक उसको मोल्ड किया जाय और आगे बढ़ावा जाय। मुझे यही चन्द बातें अर्ज करनी थीं। लेकिन यह कि मैं किसी को यह कहूँ कि आपने यह कहा, तुम्हारा कहना गलत है, यह ठीक नहीं होगा। यहां हर एक शख्स अपने मॅटीमेंट्स का इजहार कर रहा है। फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद का जाना कोई गलत नहीं था। अगर चह्वाण जाते तो वही होता, या दिनेश सिंह जाते तो वही होता या गोबिंद मेनन जाते तो वही होता क्योंकि पाकिस्तान वहां बैठा हुआ था और उसे ऐसा करना था। इससे कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता था। गवर्नमेंट ने जिसको समझा उसको वहां भेजा। लेकिन हम यह कहे तुम क्यों गए, यह उचित नहीं है। मैं तो समझता हूँ जहां तक उनके फैचुअल स्टेटमेंट का ताल्लुक है, मैं कहता हूँ कि उन्होंने बहुत से फैक्ट्स हमारे सामने रखे और जहां तक उनके कदम का ताल्लुक है उसके साथ हमें इत्फाक करना चाहिए।

[تسرى غلام محمد بخشى (سربراہ) جناب رابا۔ ایوان میں جو بحث ہوئی ہے اس کو میں نے بغور سنا ہے۔ یہ صحیح ہے کہ ایوان کے مختلف ممبروں نے اس بارے میں اپنے اپنے خیالات کا اظہار کیا، اپنے اپنے نقطہ نظر نگاہ سے۔ لیکن ان خیالات کے سلسلہ میں مجھے کچھ نہیں کہنا ہے۔

کچھ ممبروں کا خیال ہے کہ ربا کا نفرنس میں جہاں ہندوستان نے غلطی کی۔ لیکن میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ربا ط جانے میں ہم نے غلطی کوئی نہیں کی۔ بلکہ ہمارا وہی جانا اچھا رہا اور اس کے سلسلے میں آپ سے عرض کروں گا۔

ایک اعتراض یہ کیا گیا ہے کہ وہ ایک اسلامک کانفرنس

تھی اور اس لئے اس ملک کو اس میں شامل نہیں ہونا چاہیے تھا۔ اگر صرف نام پر اعتراض ہے تو میں بتانا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس سے پہلے بھی ہم چار بار اسلامک یا مسلم کانفرنسوں میں جا چکے ہیں۔ اور آفیشل طریقہ پر گئے ہیں۔ ہم ۱۹۶۵ میں ورلڈ مسلم کانفرنس، ایفرود، ایشین اسلامک کانفرنس اور مسلم ورلڈ لیگ میں اور ۱۹۶۹ میں انٹرنیشنل اسلامک کانفرنس میں شریک ہو چکے ہیں۔

جیسا کہ فارین منسٹر بنا صاحب نے اپنے سٹیٹمنٹ میں بتایا ہے۔ ہندوستان کو اس کانفرنس میں آنے کے لئے یونینیس ڈی گنٹ ڈی گنٹ بھی اور ہندوستان اس کانفرنس میں گیا وہاں ہمارے ساتھ گئے گئے ملک کے بارے میں یہاں پر جن سینیٹس کا اظہار کیا گیا ہے۔ مجھے ان سے اتفاق ہے۔ برقی سے ان لوگوں کی نیرت میں کچھ خلل تھا۔ اتنے بڑے شاندار ملک کے ساتھ حواس کو کرنا چاہیے تھا وہ انہوں نے نہیں کیا۔ اور اس کا ایک پس منظر ہے۔ اس کے لئے میں مراکو اور دوسرے ملکوں کو اتنا دوش نہیں دیتا جتنا کہ پاکستان کو۔

یہ ٹھیک ہے کہ انہوں نے ہمارے جذبات کو ٹھیس پہنچی۔ یہ جانتے ہوئے بھی کہ ہم وہاں اس کارڈ کو سپورٹ کرنے جا رہے تھے جو شروع سے ہی ہماری فارین پالیسی کے ساتھ وابستہ رہا ہے۔ صرف آج ہی نہیں۔ صرف آزادی کے زمانے ہی میں نہیں۔ بلکہ جب ہم خود آزادی کے لئے لڑ رہے تھے۔ اس وقت سے ہم بالکل کانسٹیٹس کے ساتھ اس کارڈ کی حمایت کرتے آئے ہیں۔ ہم یہ بھی جانتے ہیں کہ جس طرح کشمیر کے ایک حصے پر اردو کے

علاقوں پر۔ چینوں نے زبردستی قبضہ جمایا ہے۔ اس طرح امپیریلزم نے عرب لینڈ میں اسرائیل کو کھڑا کیا جس نے عرب ٹیریٹری کا ایک حصہ اپنے زیر دست کیا ہے۔ ہم اس کے خلاف آج سے نہیں بلکہ بہت پہلے سے پروٹسٹ کرتے آئے ہیں۔

رباط کانفرنس کے ایجنڈے پر پہلی بات تھی "دی برنگ آف دی الاتھلی ماسک" الا قسلی کو جلائے جانے کے خلاف صرف ہندوستان کے مسلمانوں نے ہی نہیں۔ بلکہ ہندوستان کے ساتھ کردستانوں نے — ہندو — مسلمان — سکھ اور عیسائیوں نے پروٹسٹ کیا ہے۔ مینگز اور مارچ کئے ہیں۔ اس سے تہ چلتا ہے کہ جب ایسی کوئی بات ہوتی ہے۔ تو ہندوستان کسی سے پیچھے نہیں رہتا ہے۔

ایجنڈا کا دوسرا آئٹم تھا "دی سٹیٹس آف جبر و مسلم" ہم ہمیشہ سے یو۔ این۔ سیکوریٹی کونسل اور ساری دنیا میں یہ کوشش کرتے آئے ہیں کہ جبر و مسلم کا سٹیٹس ریٹور کر دیا جائے۔ اس بات سے بھی پورا اتفاق رہا ہے۔

ایجنڈا کا تیسرا آئٹم تھا: "دی ورڈ رال آف عزرائیل فرام آل اکیو پائیڈ ٹیریٹریز" شروع سے ہی ہماری پالیسی رہی ہے کہ کسی بھی ملک کو دوسرے ملک کے علاقے پر قبضہ رکھنے کی اجازت نہیں دی جانی چاہیے۔

اس کے بعد کانفرنس کا جو تھا آئٹم تھا "ریٹورن آف دی رائٹس آف دی پبلسٹائن پپل" جیسا کہ میں نے مذکور ہے۔ شروع سے ہی اس کے لئے لڑتے آئے



ہیں اور جو کچھ کبھی ہم سے جو سکا ہے۔ ہم کرتے آئے ہیں۔ کانفرنس کے ایجنڈا کو آخری ایٹم تھا۔ گوآپریشن ایماگسٹ اسلامک کنٹریز۔ اگر ہمارے نمائندوں کو وہاں جا کر بولنے کا موقع ملتا۔ تو مجھے یقین ہے کہ وہ لازمی طور پر اس بات سے اتفاق نہ کرتے۔ ہمارے سیکور کیریکچر کو مد نظر رکھتے ہوئے۔ کیونکہ یہ ان ملکوں کی اپنی بات تھی۔

کانفرنس کے ایجنڈا پر تین چار باتیں ایسی تھیں۔ جن کے ساتھ ہم ساہا سالہ براہ اتفاق کرتے آئے ہیں۔ ان کے لئے رٹے آئے ہیں اور ان کے لئے سرنگلڑ ہوئی ہیں۔ الاصل تو مسلمانوں کا قبلہ اول ہے۔ اس کے جلائے جانے کے خلاف مسلمانوں نے تو پروٹیسٹ کیا ہے۔ لیکن اس کے خلاف سب سے زیادہ شور اور پروٹیسٹ ہندوستان کے ہند اور سکھوں اور دوسرے نان مسلمز نے کیا۔ اور یہ بات باعث مبارکباد ہے۔

ہمارا دشمن پاکستان ابتدا سے ہی عرب ور لڈ میں اسلامک کنٹریز میں اپنا مقام بنانے اور ہندوستان کو بدنام کرنے کی کوشش کر رہا ہے۔ یہ تو ایک ٹریپ تھا۔ اگر ہم رباط کانفرنس میں نہ جاتے۔ تو وہ کہنا کہ دیکھو ہندوستان نہیں آیا۔ ہم وہاں گئے اور ہم نے پاکستان کی تمام کوششوں کو فرسٹریٹ کیا۔ ناکام کیا۔ اگر ہم وہاں نہ جاتے تو ہم ڈیفینسو پر جوتے۔ لیکن چونکہ ہم وہاں گئے۔ اس لئے اس کانفرنس کے تمام پارٹیسپنٹس آج ڈیفینسو پر ہیں اور وہ محسوس کرتے ہیں کہ اتنے بڑے شاندار ملک کے ساتھ ایسا سلوک نہیں چونا چاہئے تھا۔ اس سے ہم کم

نہیں ہوئے۔ ہماری عزت کم نہیں ہوئی بلکہ ہماری عزت دو بالا ہوئی اور ان لوگوں کا چھوٹا پن ظاہر ہو گیا۔

اگر صرف "اسلامک" لفظ پر اعتراض کیا جاتا ہے۔ تو میں یہ جانتا چاہتا ہوں کہ آخر سعودی عرب، ایران اور افغانستان میں ہم کیا کرتے ہیں۔ جو نل فلجیڈ اسلامک کنٹریز ہیں۔ ان کے ساتھ ہمارے رشتے اور تعلقات قائم ہیں۔ ہم ان کو اپنا دوست مانتے ہیں اور وہ ہمارے دوست ہیں۔ ایک دوسرے کے یہاں ہمارے ایمبیڈ اور نمائندے مقرر ہیں۔ ہم نے انہیں یہ تو نہیں کہا کہ پچھلے وہ سیکور ہو جائیں اور پھر ہم ان کے یہاں اپنے نمائندے بھیجیں گے۔ وہاں پر جو کچھ ماحول ہے اس کے مطابق ہم اپنی پالیسی بناتے ہیں۔

نارین پالیسی کو موافق کرتے وقت یہ لازمی ہو جاتا ہے کہ وہاں پر کسی ایک سپیسفک چیز پر نہ جلیں حالات کے تقاضے کے مطابق ملک کی خواہشات کے مطابق ملک کے توقعات کے مطابق اس کو موافق کیا جائے۔ اور آگے بڑھایا جائے۔ مجھے یہ چند باتیں عرض کرنی تھیں۔ لیکن یہ کہیں کسی کو یہ کہوں کہ آپ نے یہ کہا، اس نے یہ کہا، تمہارا کہنا غلط ہے۔ یہ ٹھیک نہیں ہوگا۔ یہاں ہر ایک شخص اپنے سٹیمنس کا اظہار کر رہا ہے۔ نوزائید احمد کا جانا کوئی غلط نہیں تھا۔ اگر چہ وہاں جاتے تو وہی ہوتا یا دینش سنکھ جاتے تو وہی ہوتا یا گوڈ منین جاتے تو وہی ہوتا۔ کیونکہ پاکستان وہاں بیٹھا ہوا تھا۔ اور اسے ایسا کرنا تھا۔ اس سے کوئی فرق نہیں پڑتا تھا۔ گورنمنٹ نے جس کو سمجھا اس کو بھیجا ہم یہ کہیں کہ تم کیوں گئے

یہ اچھا نہیں ہے۔ میں تو سمجھتا ہوں جہاں تک ان کے ٹیکٹوں کی تعلق کا تعلق ہے۔ میں کہتا ہوں کہ انہوں نے بہت سے ٹیکٹے، چارے ساٹھے رکھے اور جہاں تک ان کے قدم کا تعلق ہے۔ اس کے ساتھ ہیں اتفاق کرنا چاہئے۔

MR. SPEAKER : The Congress Benches have almost exhausted their time except for a few minutes against which I am calling Ch. Randhir Singh. Then I will move to the other side.

19 hrs.

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कांग्रेस दल की संख्या कम हो गई है, ताकत घट गई है तो उम्मी के दिग्गव मे उनका समय भी कम होना चाहिए ।

श्री रणधीर सिंह (रोहतक) : स्पीकर महोदय, मैं कोई शेखचिल्ली तो हूँ नहीं और न कोई मैं किताबी कीड़ा हूँ। मैं अमली आदमी हूँ। हिन्दुस्तान अपना देश, जहाँ हिन्दुओं का देश है, वहाँ मुसलमानों का देश है, सिखों का देश है, बौद्धों का देश है, ईसाइयों का देश है। अगर कोई मुसलमान भाइयों के साथ हिन्दुस्तान में या उसके बाहर मस्जिद की बेहरमती होती है या उनके जजबात को ठेस पहुँचती है, या ननकाना साहब में कोई ऐसी बात सिख भाइयों के साथ हो जाती है या लन्दन में किसी टेम्पल के साथ हो जाती है या अमेरिका में किसी गिर्जा के साथ हो जाती है तो मैं उन आदमियों में से हूँ जो अपनी सारी हमदर्दी उनके साथ जाहिर करेगा और न सिर्फ एक सेक्शन का बल्कि सारे देश का सवाल उसको बनाएगा। पहले जब अल अक्मा की मस्जिद को आग लगाई गई तो यह सारे देश का सवाल बना और हर शहर-शहर में जुलूस निकले। एक महीने के बाद क्या मक्की छोड़ी कि रबात में क्यों गए? यह बिल्कुल फिरकापरस्ती, तंगनजरी, तंगदिन्नी की बात है

कि यह मामला सियासी मामला बनाया जा रहा है, एक राई को पहाड बनाया जा रहा है। मैं जो अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ वह यह कि यह जमाना बड़ा अजीब है। अगर जनसंघी भाई यह बातें कहें तो मेरी समझ में आता है क्योंकि उनका दिमाग ही इतना काम करता है। अगर मेरे भाई मधोक यह बातें कहें तो मुझे कोई हैरत नहीं, मेरे भाई वाजपेयी कहें तो कोई हैरत नहीं लेकिन हैरत यह देखिए जमाने की कि जनसंघी तो इन्वलाबी सोशलिस्ट बनने जा रहे हैं और तरक्कीपसंद या सोशलिस्ट जो हैं वह जनसंघी और तंगनजर बनने जा रहे हैं। मैं किसी पर ताना नहीं करता, मैं यही कहता हूँ कि आखिर हो क्या गया है? जो तरक्कीपसंद बातें कही जायें, जो कौमपरस्ती की बातें कही जायें, जो मुल्क के मफाद की बातें कही जायें, वह उन भाइयों को सूभती ही नहीं। अन्धे को तो सारा अन्धेरा ही अन्धेरा नजर आता है। उनको तरक्की का कोई कदम ही नजर नहीं आता। प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने जो इतने तरक्कीपसंद काम किए वह इनको नजर नहीं आए और मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि यह इन्वलाबी इतने जल्दी कैसे हो गए? आप भी दस दिन पहले उधर ही बैठते थे... (ध्यबधान) ... उधर जाकर आपने दूसरी बात शुरू कर दी।...

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : जब तोता बनाए जाएंगे तो और क्या होगा ?

श्री रणधीर सिंह : मेरी बहन जो कह रही हैं, उनके ऊपर भी ताजुब हो रहा है, आपने भी जबान बदल ली है... (ध्यबधान) ...

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ जब कि दुनिया के आम मुसलमान का सवाल था और हिन्दुस्तान के 6 करोड़ मुसलमान जिनकी तादाद दुनिया के कुल मुसलमानों की एक तिहाई है उनके जजबात का सवाल था तो अगर यह एक ही आइटम होता तो भी जाना चाहिए था। इस बास्ते जाना चाहिए था कि हमारे 6 करोड़ भाइयों के जजबात को ठेस पहुँचती है तो हर एक हिन्दु-

[श्री रणधीर सिंह]

स्तानी के जज़्बात को ठेस पहुँचती है। लेकिन यह ट्वल्ड वाटर में फिश करना चाहते हैं। अपनी सियासत चलाना चाहते हैं। हमारे मुल्क के जो हालात हैं हर पालिसी पर उमका असर पड़ेगा। मेरे भाई जरा अक्ल में काम लें। पाकिस्तान हर मोर्चे पर हिन्दुस्तान को नीचा दिखाना चाहता है चाहे जंगी मोर्चा हो, चाहे सियासी बात हो चाहे डिप्लोमेटिक बात हो। जंग में तो हमने पिछली बार उसका कचूर निकाल दिया। सियासत में और डिप्लोमेसी में और उसका कचूर निकालना है। लेकिन जहाँ फूल होते हैं वहाँ कांटे भी होते हैं।... (ध्वज-ध्वान) ...अरे, हँसते क्यों हो? अध्यक्ष महोदय, पाकिस्तान की यह चाल है कि किसी मुसलमान देश को हिन्दुस्तान के नजदीक न जाने दिया जाय और बीस, पच्चीस या तीस ऐसे देश हैं जिनका पान-इस्लामिक ब्लाक बनाकर हिन्दुस्तान से उन्हें दूर ले जाना चाहता है। मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जिन देशों के साथ अरब या 30 और 40 करोड़ साल की तिजारत है, जिनके तीस या चालीस वोट यू० एन० ओ० में हैं, हम उनको अपना दुश्मन बना दे सियासी तौर पर, डिप्लोमेटिक तौर पर अपने आपको खत्म कर दें, यह आप चाहते हैं? लेकिन नहीं, यह सवाल इनके दिमाग में नहीं आता है। सियासत यह समझते नहीं हैं। मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि यह बिल्कुल ठीक बात है कि हम गए। एक दो बातें जरूर ऐसी हुईं जो हमें भी महसूस होती हैं लेकिन जब ओखली में सिर दिया तो फिर मूसलों से क्या डरना। जहाँ फूल हैं वहाँ कांटे भी हैं। मैं आपसे पूछता हूँ एक भाई के घर में आग लगी हुई है कोई भाई वहाँ आग बुझाने की नीयत से जाय तो आग बुझाने समय थोड़ी बहुत आग की आंच भी आ सकती है। अगर वहाँ हम गए हैं तो थोड़ी बहुत रिबफ भी हो सकती है। प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने ठीक बात कही कि जहाँ नेशनल इंस्टेरेस्ट है वहाँ थोड़ा रिबफ भी हो जाय तो हमें वह रिबफ भी सहन करना चाहिए। देश के हित में जो बात होगी वह हमें

करनी है और इसी बात पर हमें अपनी फारेन पालिसी तब्दील नहीं करनी है। मैं तो यहाँ तक कहूँगा कि अभी जो फारेन मिनिस्टर्स कान्फेंस जेद्दा में हो रही है वहाँ भी हमारे लिए जाना जरूरी है और पाकिस्तान को सबक पढ़ाना जरूरी है। हमें उस फारेन मिनिस्टर्स कान्फेंस में भी जाना चाहिए। इन लोगों ने तो अपना हलुवा माँड़ा सीधा करने के लिए यह सारा ढोंग चला रखा है। सियासी मसलों को इन्होंने एक मामूली छोटा-सा मसला बना लिया है। मैं इनसे यह कहना चाहूँगा कि हमें जो दावतनामा मिला वह हाथ जोड़कर मिला है कि जनाब जरूर आ जाइए और फारेन मिनिस्टर ने बुलाया। यही नहीं पाकिस्तान के याह्या ख़ाँ ने भी हमें बुलाया। लेकिन जब याह्या ख़ाँ को धमकियाँ आईं, तार आए कि तुम्हें एसेसिनेट कर देगे, तुम्हें इम्पीच करेंगे, पाकिस्तान में घुसने नहीं देंगे तब आखीरी दिन उसने यह कह दिया कि मैं मर जाऊँगा, एक दिन के लिए मेरे पर रहम कर दो। यह बात हुई। लेकिन यह ख्वामख्वाह मामूली किम्से को अफसाना बना रहे हैं। मैं निहायत अदब से कहना चाहूँगा कि सियासत में छोटी-छोटी बातों का असर नहीं पड़ता। अरे, सियासत तुम्हें आती नहीं। सियासत में बड़े-बड़े हादसे होते हैं, बड़ी-बड़ी चोटें आती हैं, उनको बर्दाश्त करना पड़ता है। चीन ने रूस के राजदूत के साथ, यू० एन० के राजदूत के साथ कैसा बर्ताव किया? राजदूत को पकड़ कर किडनेप कर लिया और फिर भी उनकी सियासत चलती है। इन्होंने विदड़ कर लिया, मैं तो कहता हूँ यह जरूरी नहीं था। हमने पाकिस्तान से विदड़ नहीं किया, चीन से भी विदड़ नहीं किया जिसने हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण किया। उन्होंने तो माफी मांग ली और माफी मांगने के बाद में तो कत्ल भी किए होता है आदमी तो उसे भी छोड़ देते हैं। तो मैं यह कहता हूँ कि हमारी फारेन पालिसी एक कामयाब पालिसी है और यह जो थोड़े से भाई बैठे हैं इनका हलुवा माँड़ा इसी पर चलता है, इनकी दूकान इसी पर चलती है, इसलिए यह इस तरह की बातें करते हैं। इन

चन्द शब्दों के साथ मैं इसकी मुखातिफ करता हूँ।

SHRI S. A. DANGE (Bombay Central South) : Sir this Adjournment Motion is being debated in a very unusual sitting, and under some extraordinary circumstances which are going to continue, I think, for a long time. Therefore, the reality of the matter is more or less being lost. What is the unusual circumstance? We on the left had been expecting for a long time to break the monopoly of power of the Congress party at the Centre. We were trying for that. Since 1967, that thing seemed to be coming nearer. And today we are meeting in conditions when the number of Opposition Members is larger than the number of Members sitting on the Treasury side. This is one element which is pouring something new in the Rabat resolution. (*Interruption*) That is the thing. I am saying only the Treasury Benches. I do not say on which side which party is. Under such circumstances, this Motion has got a semipolitical character though really this Motion is being pursued and will be pursued to further the development of communalism in this country. I would have requested all the secular parties in this House not to have pressed their debate on Rabat, but really to have done it on the question of foreign policy or some other issue. Anyway, since we are here now, let us look into the question.

They are challenging the foreign policy of this Government, and the question of national dignity has been brought in. The most eloquent gentleman who spoke on national dignity was my friend Shri Asoka Mehta. When the Government of India was asked by the Americans not to sign a treaty with Cuba and give up trade with Cuba—they wanted aid—was our national dignity and sovereignty violated or not? The gentlemen, whether on this side or that side, whoever they may be, did they acquiesce in that or not? When West Germany threatened to cut off credit if you recognised GDR, was your national dignity violated or not? When you wanted to raise the consulate in Vietnam to ambassadorial status, objection was raised by the Americans: was the dignity violated or not? Any yet those who speak on foreign policy have referred to defending national dignity. (*Interruption*) I am talking of national dignity and not the dignity of Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: You are not guarding my dignity. You say you are the guardian of the nation's security or dignity. Why not ask the Foreign Minister as to why he went to Washington and discussed about Hanoi with the Washington people? Ask them. You are very concerned about the security of the Prime Minister. You are not the guardian of my dignity. (*Interruption*)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. The Members are rather sensitive about it. Please try to avoid it.

SHRI S. A. DANGE: Let me proceed. Let me thank the hon. Member for the attention she has given to me.

MR. SPEAKER: If you address the Chair rather than the Members, it will be better.

SHRI S. A. DANGE: Yes, Sir. I was saying that those Members are challenging Rabat because of their factional quarrel and their desire to form a new triple alliance in order to topple the Congress ministry that exists on the other side. We certainly have differences with them but we do not want them to be eliminated by more reactionary alliances. Therefore, I am here standing in order to say that there may have been some bungling in the whole handling of the Rabat affair.

This is not a resolution which any body should support today. It is not based on defence of national dignity. They do not know what resolution they have drafted. They were asking, "Where is the proof of the invitation" But in the resolution, the draftsman admits "extracting a last minute invitation". He admits there was invitation, but it was last minute and not 100 minutes before.

They talk about humiliation. Their objection is not to humiliation, as such but to "needless humiliation". The resolution says, "needlessly inviting humiliation". You could have a needful humiliation according to your fashion, say from America, as for example, my friend going to America for offering India's womb for American fertilisers. That was the slogan raised then. Was not national dignity violated at the time? That gentleman talks about foreign policy. Because he could now sit in a front seat, instead of being a back-seat driver as then he becomes an eloquent critic of the foreign policy of

[Shri S. A. Dange]

this country. In spite of its pitfalls and shortcomings, our foreign policy is based on friendly relations with socialist countries, peace and non-alignment. This policy shall be pursued as far as we can help it and not a foreign policy surrendering India's womb for fertilisers. Let the Syndicate go to America if they like. This was the most humiliating thing in this House.

We know why you are quarrelling. It is because you want to seize power in alliance with the Jan Sangh, Swatantra and Syndicate. We, the progressive forces in this country, are going to draft this conspiracy, whatever the cost we may have to pay. (*Interruption*).

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : We are for defending the national honour and national dignity.

SHRI S. A. DANGE : If there was a real anxiety for national honour, the resolution should have contained something like this : Who kicked us ? Who kicked the nation ? Did the Foreign Minister kick the nation and humiliate the country ? It was the king of Morocco. It was Pakistan. They humiliated us. Instead of being angry with those who humiliated us, they are angry with this minister or that minister. If they cared for national dignity, they should have censured the King of Morocco in this resolution.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Dissolve your party and sit with them!

SHRI S. A. DANGE : Even now they can add a censure of those who humiliated us. Now, utilising the humiliation of our country, they are passing the censure motion on somebody else. Is this their concept of national honour?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Our national honour is in danger in your hands.

SHRI S. A. DANGE : Our national honour is in danger in the hands of those who threw us out of the Rabat Conference. They are to be censured. I agree with him there. The national honour has to be defended. Acharya Kripalani ought to have said that we will censure those who have thrown us out of the conference. Whether we went with invitation, without invitation, last minute invitation or hundred minute

invitation they had no business to throw us out. We are a great country and its Minister had gone there. This country should give some dignity to its own Minister when he is attending a conference on our behalf in some other country. Instead of showing that minimum sense of dignity to the country to this House and to the Minister, whether on this side of the House or that, we are censuring ourselves, this House and the Minister and not a word about the King of Morocco.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : If I may interrupt him for a minute he says that there was humiliation for us. But do the government feel humiliated? No, they feel exalted. They do not feel humiliated. They do not say that they were humiliated.

SHRI S. A. DANGE : The question is not what the Government says but what we say as the House. Are we going to defend this humiliation at the hands of those foreign powers ? It is said that 16 kings were present there. Do not forget that we are in a Commonwealth which is headed by a Queen and whenever we make the demand for quitting the Commonwealth they do not support it. Now, suddenly, they discover the whole thing is undemocratic because 16 kings were present, completely forgetting that we are ourselves presided over by a Queen in this Commonwealth. What a strange logic !

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : You are supporting the Government.

SHRI S. A. DANGE : I am not supporting; only you are doing it.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : No, I am not.

SHRI S. A. DANGE : We will find out.

SHRI PILOO MODY : It will be known in one hour as to who is supporting the Government and who is opposing it.

SHRI S. A. DANGE : I support the Government on this question and I will not support the adjournment motion.

SHRI PILOO MODY : It will be so on many other questions also.

SHRI S. A. DANGE : I will not support them on other grounds. I have my quarrel with them but so far as the motion on Rabat

is concerned, it is a political motion to capture power for the disgruntled syndicate. Therefore, we are not going to vote for it. This is a political fight that is being fought in the name of Rabat. This is communalism that is being spread in the name of Rabat and every progressive force must try to defeat this.

**SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY :**  
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have heard with rapt attention the speeches made from the Treasury Benches.....

**AN HON. MEMBER :** Treachery ?

**SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY :**  
... in defence of the most indefensible action. Shri F. A. Ahmed appears to me to be a truthful person. He has admitted facts and said how really he was humiliated and how the whole country was humiliated. He has given the facts as they have happened. Except him, all the other members from the other side who have spoken have brought in the question of Syndicate, Indicate, Swatantra, Jansangh and so on. My hon. friend, Shri Dange, who was the last person to defend the Treasury Benches, without going into the merits of the question said that he sees political motivation behind it and, therefore, he is prepared to swallow this humiliation.

I do not except this position at all. That is why I wrote to the Prime Minister much earlier that this was a national humiliation which should exercise every citizen of the country and that, when the Parliament meets, let us not make it a party issue of toppling the Government or supporting the Government. Let us not confuse the issue. This is a national humiliation: After 1962 NEFA debacle, I think, there is no parallel to the humiliation that we have received now. If we had taken note of this humiliation, then the whole Parliament should have devoted its entire attention to it as also how we should behave in future so that the country's honour is not disgraced. That is what I want to point out here.

I can understand that today the Government is very much afraid, that whatever question comes up, since the majority is in the Opposition, the Government can be toppled. So, they may be committing any error and it would be forgotten on this excuse. The whole situation is going to be

confused in this House and I do not think, in such a situation, any worthwhile discussion is possible.

I also told the Prime Minister personally how her father Pandit Nehru had risen to great heights. When NEFA debacle occurred there was no adjournment motion like this. Nobody said that the entire Government should go. The country demanded that the person responsible for debacle must resign and must quit. And he accepted that. Here is the Prime Minister who wants to defend her foreign Minister.

Now, the hon. Minister, Shri F. A. Ahmed, has admitted that he asked him to go and he has said, "I had this humiliation; I want reassessment of the entire policy." Here is a shameless Minister who comes and says, we have achieved positive gains. This is a statement that he has made. Therefore, if this adjournment motion is aimed at anybody, it is aimed at the entire Congress party, whether Syndicate or Indicate. Whatever may be the cause of the resignation of Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, whatever the statement he may be making after coming out of the Cabinet, whether he was dismissed or he came out himself, whatever may be reason, the fact remains, however long speeches they may make, now, that they are all responsible. The entire Congress party is responsible for the humiliation.

The Congress Working Committee, after all this happened, overnight realised that there had been the humiliation and passed a resolution. They should condemn themselves. They should apologise to the nation for bringing the humiliation to the country.

Very able speeches have been made in this House in which every aspect of the question has been discussed and I am surprised, on every question, the question of Swatantra, Jana Sangh and Syndicate comes in. I do not want to go into details. I would only quote some of the statement which, I hope, my friends in the Treasury Benches, Indicate Section, would not say that they are either of Syndicate or of Jana Sangh or of Swatantra.

To begin with, I would quote what has been said by Mr. R. K. Nehru, the former Secretary-General of the External Affairs Ministry, who has also been the Ambassador in many countries and, I think, sometimes

[Shri Surendra Nath Dwivedy]

he has also been accused of being a fellow traveller.

I want to refer to this. He has said in his speech :

"We deviated from it, may be due to opportunistic reasons by going to attend the Rabat Conference."

Again, discussing about our relationship with West Asia, Mr. Nehru said :

"Whatever immediate gain might have weighed in favour of attending the Rabat Conference, it was not consistent with the dignity and basic principles of the country."

I hope, it will not be said that he belongs to Swatantra or Jan Sangh or Syndicate.

Mr. Dange was Waxing eloquent that by discussing the matter here we would actually incite communal hatred in the country. I accuse them of this. By going to Rabat, they have shown that their motive was communal and they have brought in communal politics dangerously. We want to clarify the position. Parliament does not approve of it. Parliament warns them that in future they should not do such things.

I will now quote Mr. Chagla. I hope he will not be accused as a Swatantrite or a Jan Sanghi. I will not quote all that he has said. I have just read in the PFI news that he has resigned from the membership of the Congress Parliamentary Party. He has said :

"...In my humble opinion this is the wrong way of going about it. Every thing that emphasizes the separateness of the minorities, every encouragement to communal aspect of public affairs will divide..."

Mr. Dange will please note this.

"...will divide rather than unite. If the Government thinks that by its action it will placate a section of Muslim opinion in our country, it will be doing so at the sacrifice of the larger interests of the country."

This is what Mr. Chagla has said.

Much debate is taking place and arguments are advanced about the invitation. We

have yet to know about this. I think, Raja Dinesh Singh...

AN HON. MEMBER : Raja or Maharaja ?

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : If this is objected to, I will say 'my hon. friend, Mr. Dinesh Singh; I think, he will come forward and say whether there was an invitation or not; I think, he will come forward and say what is the actual position.

Now I will quote no less a person than the Prime Minister of Malaysia.

"The Prime Minister, Mr. Tunku Abdul Rahman, in a report to the Malaysian Foreign Ministry, is believed to have said that India tried to 'force herself' on the recent Islamic Summit regardless of the consequences just because an invitation had been extended to her by King Hassan of Morocco."

So, this 'unanimous' invitations came on the 23rd. When did the Ahmedabad riots actually start ? My hon. friend, Mr. Monoharan, was saying that the riots were 'televised' and all that. Was that televised only on the 23rd or 22nd when these people realised, 'Oh ! In Ahmedabad a riot has taken place and so India cannot take its place in the Conference.' I do not know whether this invitation, which is said to be unanimous, was oral or written or through telephone or through the Ambassador here of Morocco ; It is not yet clear. It happened much earlier to that ! If more humiliation has been brought by such actions of such communal elements in the country, why did they go there ? If they are not in a position to safeguard the security of the minority community, what business did they have to go and attend the Islamic conference ?

If that was the excuse, it happened earlier, one month before. There is no excuse so far as that is concerned. I do not again want to repeat the points that have already been raised. But the Prime Minister says that instead of hampering, it has really helped us. There cannot be any more nonsensical statement than this.

Again, Sir, I will put to you and I will ask my friend to clarify the question repeatedly put here as to whether the final resolution that was adopted was signed by UAR. Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed says that the

Vice Prime Minister came for tea where he was explaining or some Minister was sent. That is not the question. After being a party to the humiliation and after not opposing the stand taken by Pakistan to oust us from the conference, in the conference itself, to send one Vice Prime Minister much after the incident to explain to us "We are good boys. We are all with you" is of no use; and he was explaining something private to you which we do not know, but the fact remains that he has signed the final document.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : He has signed,

SHRI SURENDRANATHI DWIVEDI : In this connection, let us not close our eyes. I think the Government awoke suddenly. This is the statement given by our Ambassador in the United Nations. They suddenly awoke when in the United Nations at the instance of the Moroccan Government a document was circulated about the Rabat conference in which it was stated "Muslim States and representatives of the Muslim community of India". Immediately this Government also circulated a document saying that this was not a fact. I want to bring to your notice what the King of Morocco said about Rabat and India's stand on 27th September, or to be exact, on the 26th September which appeared in Indian papers on the 27th September. I will read out the last few sentences :

"The Indian delegation was barred after objections were made by Pakistan's President, General Yahya Khan. He said he had understood it had been intended to invite representatives of the Indian Muslim community and not of the Indian Government.

The King said the final declaration issued by the conference was in the name of 25 Muslim countries and of the Muslim community in India to avoid a legal insanity".

"To avoid a legal insanity"—I do not know whether Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed was really insane or the Government itself is insane. I know Mr. Ahmed is a nationalist to the core. He has been in the Freedom Movement all along and also with the nationalist Muslims of which we see a sorry spectacle in both political camps. He

is being used as a tool both for internal politics and for outside politics posing him as a communal figure and as a representative of the Muslims. (*Interruptions*) I could have understood if not Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, if somebody else, even Mr. Gujral could have been sent to Rabat Conference. He was ill. He was advised by doctors not to go. In spite of that, because again the communal character has to be maintained, poor Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed has to be made a scapegoat for that purpose and dragged for such positions.

Further the King of Morocco says :

"As the declaration was in the name of chiefs of State and representatives of Muslim countries, it was realised that the Indian delegation did not fit this description".

"Nevertheless, the Conference had decided to make it possible to associate Indian Muslims with the declaration. King Hassan said India should make up its own mind whether to take part in future Muslim conferences".

They cannot now put up a defence after saying what they said about Rabat that if such conferences are held in future, the same question will arise, there will be nobody to defend ourselves, so should we go or not. Actually when a London report appeared that Shri Dinesh Singh had said that he would attend the next conference wherever it is held, and when it was published in Indian papers, some of our colleagues in the House pointed this out; Shri Dinesh Singh said, 'I have not made any statement that India is going to attend the next conference'. Now the King of Morocco has raised this question. The House should be interested to know, in order to safeguard the interest of the country and not being further humiliation to us, whether they propose to attend in future such religious conferences wherever they are held. What we have understood about our foreign policy was that we are against military block and against religious blocs. That is the independent policy we are following. Shri Dange may be against it; he may say that we are more friendly towards the socialist countries, therefore this is a good foreign policy'. I want the Government to be clear in its enunciation. Where do they stand ?



SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: Where is the Government ?

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: Whatever be the government, it is existing here. If the Government is not toppled, it remains as the Government; however truncated it may be, it remains; it has not disappeared.

I do not think this Government should have invited itself to such a conference in the belief of some illusory advantage to the country. Therefore, it needs to be censured. Therefore I make this request of the prime Minister: even at the last moment, let her come forward and say that 'it is an error of judgment; I apologise to the House and the nation for what has happened'. Then I am sure the country will appreciate it. This should not be mixed up with the toppling of the Government or upsetting it. That is a different question. That was why I stood up against any no-confidence motion at this hour when the whole picture is so confused.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Prakash Vir Shastri.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री ( हापुड़ ): मैं कोई लम्बा चौड़ा भाषण करना नहीं चाहता हूँ । मैं केवल तीन-चार प्रश्न ही विदेश मंत्री से पूछना चाहता हूँ—

SHRI NAMBIAR: What has happened to our Party ? This is not proper. This is surprising. Our representative character must be recognised.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai): You tell us beforehand what is our position.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not being ignored.

SHRI NAMBIAR: After every Dick and Harry, you are calling us ?

SHRI SHEO NARAIN: He should not behave like this.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: He should withdraw it.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It should be expunged.

MR. SPEAKER: I have got names here.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: I have an objection. He has called Shri Dange 'Dick and Harry'. What is the meaning of this ?

SHRI NAMBIAR: I protest. There is some procedure in the House.

SHRI BALRAJ MADHOK: Will it be expunged or will it remain on record ?

MR. SPEAKER: It is my discretion; I will accommodate them all. But this is not the way of asking for time.

SHRI SHEO NARAIN: What about his remark ? He must apologise or withdraw it.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी मेरी बगल में बैठे हुए एक मित्र श्री नम्बियार ने जिस प्रकार की एक टिप्पणी की है, मैं समझता हूँ कि आपके द्वारा तथा सदन के हर पक्ष की ओर से उसकी निन्दा हो जाने के बाद उस पर मुझे अधिक कुछ कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। मैं केवल इतना ही इस सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ कि जैसा जिस का मस्तिष्क होता है, वह दूसरों को भी उसी दृष्टि से देखता है। इससे अधिक मैं कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता।

रवात के सम्बन्ध में अभी मैंने आप से कहा कि मैं कोई लम्बा चौड़ा भाषण देने के लिए खड़ा नहीं हुआ हूँ। मैं तीन चार प्रश्न ही केवल विदेश मंत्री से समय की बचत की दृष्टि से आपके माध्यम से पूछना चाहता हूँ।

पहला प्रश्न यह है कि जिस समय यह रवात सम्मेलन का निमंत्रण हमें प्राप्त हुआ क्या विदेश मंत्रालय ने या भारत सरकार ने इस बात की जानकारी कभी ली कि इस सम्मेलन की जो विषय सूची है या इस सम्मेलन ने जो एजेंडा तैयार किया है, क्या उसके अन्दर अहमदाबाद के साम्प्रदायिक उपद्रवों को प्रत्यक्ष या अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से किसी प्रकार की चर्चा का विषय रखा गया

या ? और अगर नहीं रखा गया था तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार जो बार-बार इस बात को कहती है कि हमारे प्रतिनिधि-मंडल का इसलिए वहाँ जाना आवश्यक था कि पाकिस्तान जो अहमदाबाद के उपद्रवों को ले कर भारत को अपमानित करता, उसका उत्तर देने के लिए हम को वहाँ उपस्थित रहना चाहिए था, इसका क्या आधार है ? कहीं ऐसी बात तो नहीं थी कि यहाँ के कुछ व्यक्ति इस प्रकार के थे जो उनके इशारे पर भारत सरकार को इस बात के लिए विवश कर रहे थे कि पहले आप हम को वहाँ पर बुलाइये और बुलाने के बाद फिर अहमदाबाद के साम्प्रदायिक दंगों के सम्बन्ध में हमको लक्ष्य बना कर उनकी निन्दा कीजिये । क्या इस प्रकार के मिले जुले तत्व कोई तो नहीं थे जिन्होंने विदेश मंत्री को इस बात के लिए विवश किया और लिखित रूप में इस प्रकार का आमन्त्रण मंगवा लिया । यह मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि विदेश मंत्री का एक इस प्रकार का भी वक्तव्य समाचारपत्रों में देखने को हमें मिला था जिसमें कहा था कि हम को कुछ लोगों ने इस प्रकार के पत्र लिखे हैं जिनसे विवश होकर हमें अपना प्रतिनिधि मंडल वहाँ भेजना पड़ा ।

दूसरा प्रश्न रबात सम्मेलन के निमंत्रण पत्र से ही सम्बन्ध रखता है । मैंने यह भी मुना है कि भारत सरकार प्रारम्भ में इस बात के लिए तैयार नहीं थी कि इस्लामिक कांफ्रेंस के अन्दर हम को भागीदार होना चाहिए या हमें वहाँ जाना चाहिए लेकिन मिश्र के कुछ लोगों ने भारत सरकार को राय दी कि अगर आप वहाँ नहीं पहुँचेंगे तो यह आपकी दृष्टि से भी अच्छा नहीं होगा और हमारी दृष्टि से भी अच्छा नहीं होगा । मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सचमुच में यू० ए० आर० के किन्हीं लोगों ने आपको इस प्रकार की राय दी थी ? अगर दी थी तो आपने अपने विवेक को गिरवी रख कर उनकी राय से सम्मेलन के लिए निमंत्रण जब मंगवाया और जब आप वहाँ पहुँचे तो जिस समय आपको वहाँ

अपमानित होना पड़ा उस समय मिश्र के प्रतिनिधि या मिश्र ने किसी प्रकार का विरोध किया ? होना तो यह चाहिए था कि वह सम्मेलन से उठ कर बाहर चला जाता भारत की सहानुभूति में । यहाँ पर मिश्र के प्रतिनिधि आए और आकर हमारे जख्मों पर मरहम लगाने लगे और कहने लगे कि आपके साथ बहुत बुरा हुआ, आपको अपमानित होना पड़ा । जब उसने ऐसा कुछ सम्मेलन में नहीं किया और हमारा वहाँ अपमान हुआ तो इसका तो यही मतलब हुआ कि पहले तो किसी की नाक काट दी जाए और फिर रुमाल लेकर उसका खून पोंछा जाए । मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इसके अन्दर वास्तविकता क्या है ।

इस सम्मेलन के सम्बन्ध में मोरक्को के राज्याध्यक्ष ने जो पत्र भेजा था उसमें विशेष रूप से यह लिख दिया था कि इस सम्मेलन के अन्दर उन राष्ट्रों को आमन्त्रित किया जाता है जिनके राष्ट्राध्यक्ष या तो मुसलमान हों या जिनके अन्दर बहुसंख्या में मुसलमान रहते हों । मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि निमंत्रण स्वीकार करने से पहले क्या इस प्रकार का निमंत्रण पत्र जब आपको आया तो इन दोनों कैटेगरीज में से भारत कोन सी कैटेगरी में आता है, क्या इसका निर्णय भी आपने किया ? किस आधार पर आपने इस निमंत्रण को स्वीकार किया ? यह मेरा तीसरा प्रश्न है ।

चौथी बात पर मैं आता हूँ । गांधीजी के नाम का उपयोग यहाँ किया जा रहा है । उन्होंने खिलाफत आन्दोलन में भी इस प्रकार से भाग लेने के लिए भारत को विवश किया था । आचार्य कृपालानी मौजूद हैं । उस समय के पुराने कांग्रेसी भी मौजूद हैं । उनको याद होगा कि उस समय हमारे देश में गाय को ले कर कुछ गरम हवा चली थी । जिस में अकबर जैसे शायर को यह लिखना पड़ा था, "अच्छा यही है फेर ले आंखों को गाय से, क्या रक्खा है रोज की इस हाय हाय से ।" उस समय शौकतअली और मुहम्मद अली खिलाफत आन्दोलन में भाग

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

लेने के लिए गांधीजी को विवश कर रहे थे। जब लोगों ने गांधीजी से खिलाफत आन्दोलन में भाग लेने के बारे में पूछा, तो उन्होंने सार्वजनिक रूप से स्पष्ट उत्तर दिया। भारत सरकार ने गांधी वाइमय में उसे प्रकाशित किया है मैं शौकतअली और मुहम्मद अली की खिलाफत मीया का इसलिए साथ दे रहा हूँ कि वे मेरी गाय मीया को बचायें। अगर गांधीजी ने खिलाफत आन्दोलन में अपना साथ देना चाहा, तो उन्होंने उसका एक उचित मूल्य भी समझाया। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या भारत सरकार ने रबात कांफ्रेंस में भाग लेने के बारे में उसी प्रकार उस के मूल्यांकन के बारे में कुछ विचार किया। क्या उसने सोचा कि हमारे भारत को क्या मिलने वाला है। मेरी राय में भारत को उस का मूल्य तो क्या मिला, उल्टे उस को अपमानित होना पड़ा और दुनिया में हमारी साख गिर गई।

जिस समय श्री फ़ख़रुद्दीन अहमद दिल्ली के हवाई अड्डे पर उतरे, तो उन्होंने दिल्ली के पत्रकारों से कहा कि भारत सरकार को पश्चिमी एशिया के सम्बन्ध में अपनी नीति में परिवर्तन करना चाहिए। अगले ही दिन सायंकाल उन्होंने यह वक्तव्य दे दिया कि मैं अपने पहले वक्तव्य को वापिस लेता हूँ। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या ऐसा करने के लिए उन पर विदेश मंत्रालय की ओर से दबाव डाला गया या प्रधान मंत्री वी ओर से। विदेश मंत्री महोदय इस सदन को बतायें कि आखिर इस में क्या रहस्य है कि सरकार का कैबिनेट रैंक का मिनिस्टर आज एक बयान देता है और अगले दिन एक दूसरा बयान देता है।

मुझे आशा है कि विदेश मंत्री महोदय मेरे द्वारा उठाये गये इन प्रश्नों का समुचित उत्तर देंगे।

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : Sir, I want to correct a misstatement.

MR. SPEAKER : You cannot get up at any time and intervene like this.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : I want to correct a misstatement—historical about Gandhiji. It is this : that some Hindus said that the Muslims should give up cow-slaughter for the help that the Hindus would give in the Khilafat movement. The Muslims themselves consented that they would give up cow-slaughter if the Hindus helped them in the Khilafat movement.

MR. SPEAKER : You are a very senior Member and you should have asked my permission if you wanted to make some explanation.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : I am going to finish it in a second if you have the patience. If a historical statement is allowed to pass like that unchallenged in this House, it is very unreasonable and it will be putting Gandhiji's position in a very awkward light. I do not want Gandhiji's position to be compromised like that. Gandhiji said it is not dignified.

AN HON. MEMBER : We are short of time.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : Gandhiji has said that it is below the dignity of the Hindus to say that they will help the Muslim brethren only when the cow-slaughter is stopped. And he said to the Muslims it is below your dignity to have such a kind of contract. That is all that I have to say.

MR. SPEAKER : But please whenever you get up, ask my permission also. You cannot intervene any time you like. Now Shri Madhu Limaye is not here. Shri Ramamurti.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I having listened to the arguments in favour of attending this conference, I must confess that I am not convinced about the advisability of having attended this conference.

Considering the nature of the conference and the nature of the representation first decided upon, even though at a later stage, the entire conference might have decided to call India, I am quite clear it was not advisable to go there. It would be compromising our secularism to such a great extent. I believe the

Government of India has bungled in this matter.

Nonetheless, if the purpose of this debate was to see that the Government of India mends its ways, I am sure they would not have thought of this adjournment motion. They would have sought a discussion on this question without tempers on either side, in a cool and calm atmosphere. But we saw how in these discussions have been raised that the dignity and honour of our country have been compromised. The people who raised this question were not bothered about the honour of the country when one gentleman went to America as a minister and asked the big monopolists there to come and have back-seat driving in this country. When two or three years ago, there was a statement in a circular issued by the then Finance Minister about the devaluation of the rupee, the honour of the country was the compromised! Therefore, these arguments do not cut much ice with me. I know these people did not raise a little finger when the American imperialists interfered with our internal affairs and you cannot raise the status of our Consul in North Viet Nam, because it would be an unfriendly act. As far as America is concerned, they can do anything. Therefore, it is not the honour of the country that has motivated them. If that is so, what happened in Ahmedabad where is the honour of the country before the entire bar of public opinion? When the Muslims in Ahmedabad were butchered, there are people in this country who are prepared to find justification for that. I would have to take your solicitude for the honour of the country with not one pinch of salt but with tons salt.

What is the real motivation behind this resolution? We know the genesis of this. We know the entire history of what happened during the last 2 to 3 months. We know how during the last Presidential Election, some people were anxious to get somebody of their choice and for that purpose, they were willing to join together. Unfortunately, they did not succeed and they were angry. Then they thought another opportunity would come. Rabat has provided them that opportunity. That is why they wanted to bring a motion of no confidence on this question. If it is only a discussion on merits and correcting the Government, they would not have thought of a non-confidence motion. They gave notice of a no-confidence motion

and then, finding that some of their friends were not prepared to go that far, they said "in that case, let us have an adjournment motion". After all, they know that an adjournment motion is a motion of censure. I am not concerned whether any particular Minister is responsible or not. After all when the government comes and owns up that it is the decision of government and the entire government is responsible for it, we have got to be satisfied with that. It is not necessary to say which Minister took the decision. Are you angry with Shrimati Indira Gandhi that she has not made anybody a scapegoat for that? Is that the reason why you have brought this?

20. hrs.

AN HON. MEMBER : She has made many scapegoats.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : I am not concerned with that. Neither am I one of those who believes that the policies of Shrimati Indira Gandhi are going to be extremely progressive. Nonetheless, what is the choice before us? Whom do the Jansangh-Swatantra-Syndicate combine represent in our country? What is it that they have been pleading for? (*Interruptions*) Everybody in this country knows that these people represent extremely reactionary vested interests, the big monopolists of this country. These are the people who want our foreign policy to be changed. I have my own differences with the foreign policy pursued by this government. But, then, these people want our foreign policy to be changed in a particular direction in favour of the American imperialists. They are in favour of more and more aid from our foreign masters. This is the type of policy that they want our government to pursue. So, we all know what is in store for the country if they come to power now.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Do not forget that China is also a big world power now.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : Our relations with China are well-known to all. Therefore, what we see to day is a fight to remove this government by trying to rope in as many people as possible. My hon. friend, Shri Dwivedy, is a gullible person. He has been told that this is not a motion of censure, but

[Shri P. Rama Murti]

only an adjournment motion and if it is carried to the government need not resign.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI: I accept that.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Taking into consideration the circumstances in which the entire debate has taken place, how the country was worked up on this question, it is absolutely clear that having failed in their earlier attempt to bring in a vote of non-confidence, this is a vote of no-confidence by the backdoor. They do not have the courage, they do not have the guts to bring in a real vote of no-confidence because they know that they cannot succeed in that. Therefore, by the side door, by the backdoor an attempt is being made to topple the government. I would therefore, request my hon. friend, Shri Dwivedy, not to talk into their trap. We can correct this government. (interruptions) ...if it does not correct itself. As a matter of fact, even the SSP cannot get the entire 17 members to vote for a vote of no-confidence. I know that 9 of their members would not agree to that. (Interruptions) That is their position. One member may want it but his party will not support such a stand.

Under these circumstances, I do not want to be a party to this resolution. I would oppose it tooth and nail and defeat their machinations.

श्री मधु लिमये : (मुंगेर) अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे उम्मीद है कि राममूर्ति साहब कम से कम मुझे को गालिबल नहीं कहेंगे क्योंकि मैं एक बात स्पष्ट कर देना चाहता हूँ --चाहे स्थगन प्रस्ताव हो, चाहे निन्दा प्रस्ताव हो, अविश्वाम का प्रस्ताव हो या सरकार की किमी नीति के साथ असहमति प्रकट करने का प्रस्ताव हो, अगर वह प्रस्ताव पारित हो जाता है तो इस सरकार को सत्ता में रहने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है। इसलिए गालिबिलिटी की बात करना बेकार है। आज रवात को लेकर इन की जो नीति है इस नीति से असहमति प्रकट करने के लिए हम लोग खड़े हैं। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि दिनेश सिंह साहब को अब भाषण देने की कोई जरूरत

नहीं है क्योंकि सरकारी दल से सबसे बढ़िया भाषण डांगे साहब ने किया। अब यह सदन का समय अगर नहीं बिगाड़ेंगे और मुझको कुछ समय दे देंगे तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा।

इस विवाद में अपमान की ओर बेइज्जती की बड़ी चर्चा की गई। दूसरे वक्ताओं ने भी की और डांगे साहब ने भी की। लेकिन डांगे साहब का यह कहना था कि जिनकी नीति के कारण अपमान हुआ उनकी निन्दा मत करो, जिन्होंने अपमान किया उनकी निन्दा करो। यही फर्क रहा। लेकिन मैं यह अपमान और बेइज्जती की चर्चा ज्यादा नहीं करना चाहता। इसका एक कारण तो यह है कि अपमान, बेइज्जती किसकी होती है? जिन को आत्म-सम्मान होता है, उनका अपमान होता है। इस सरकार को कोई आत्म-सम्मान ही नहीं है तो कोई भी इसका अपमान नहीं कर सकता है। क्या इस सदन को पता नहीं है कि पिछली बार हमारे श्री बली राम भगत भारत सरकार के प्रतिनिधि बन कर केन्या में गए। उनका स्वागत करने के लिए कोई कुत्ता भी नहीं आया ... (व्यवधान)

श्री रणधीर सिंह : वह आपके लिए आता है।

श्री मधु लिमये : हमारे लिए कौन आता है वह आप भी जानते हैं। आप के लिए कुत्ता भी नहीं आया। अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह टोकेंगे तो मैं जवाब दूंगा। मैं मना नहीं करता। यह खूब टोकें।

क्या हुआ वहां पर कि जोमो केन्या का राष्ट्रपति जो था उस ने भारत के प्रतिनिधि से मिलने से भी इनकार किया। यहां पर हमने पूछा कि क्या यह भारत का अपमान नहीं हुआ? बली राम भगत जी ने कहा, इन्दिरा जी ने कहा कि कोई अपमान नहीं हुआ। इसलिए इन का कोई आत्मसम्मान है ही नहीं, इसकी चर्चा छोड़ दें।

दूसरा कारण यह है, मैं यह मानने के लिए तैयार हूँ कि अगर अच्छा काम करने के लिए जाते हैं, दरवाजा खटखटाते हैं और आपको धक्का मार कर निकाला जाता है तो मैं यह मानने के लिए तैयार हूँ कि उसमें अगर आप धक्का भी खाते हैं तो राष्ट्रीय हित में आप ने ख़ाया। उसका एक उदाहरण मैं देता हूँ। इंग्लैंड के दोनों दल समझते हैं कि कामन मार्केट में जाना उनके हित में है। वह दरवाजा खटखटाते हैं। फ्रांस उन को ना कह देता है। तो उनके ऊपर आलोचना नहीं की जा सकती कि उनका अपमान किया जा रहा है क्योंकि वह यह समझते हैं कि कामन मार्केट में जाना राष्ट्रीय हित में है। वह दरवाजा खटखटाने रहेंगे।

इसलिए यह बुनियादी मवाल उठाता है—  
क्या खान सम्मेलन में जाना मुनासिब था...

कई माननीय सदस्या : था, था।

श्री मधु लिमये : हमारी नीति में... (व्यवधान) ...मैं मवाल उठा रहा हूँ आप जवाब न दीजिए। क्या खान सम्मेलन में जाना हमारे बुनियादी सिद्धांतों के अनुसार था? क्या वहाँ पर जाना हमारे राष्ट्रीय हित में था... (व्यवधान) ...इस देश के क्या बुनियादी सिद्धांत हैं? मैं उस का जवाब चाहता हूँ। क्या धर्म-निरपेक्षता की नीति यह हमारे गणराज्य की बुनियादी नीति नहीं है?... (व्यवधान) ...अहमदाबाद की बात क्या कहते हैं? इसलिए तो सबेरे मैं ने आलोचना की कि धर्म-निरपेक्षता की नीति जब अन्तर्गत राजनीति में टूटेगी तो मैं सरकार की धजियाँ उड़ाऊँगा, वह चाहे गुजरात की सरकार हो या इनकी हो। अन्तर-राष्ट्रीय राजनीति में भी धर्म-निरपेक्षता के खिलाफ करेंगे तो उसका भी मैं डट कर विरोध करूँगा। जब तक आप गन्दा काम करते रहेंगे तब तक अकेला भी रह कर मैं विरोध करता रहूँगा। हमेशा किया है।

डांगे साहब ने यहाँ पर इस प्रस्ताव के रखने वालों के उद्देश्यों की चर्चा की कि उनकी

क्या भावनायें हैं, उनके क्या उद्देश्य हैं। मैं चर्चा करना चाहूँगा कि रबात सम्मेलन जिन लोगों ने बुलाया, उनके उद्देश्य क्या थे? उनकी राजनीति क्या थी। मानी हुई बात है कि इसे अरब गणराज्य ने नहीं बुलाया, सीरिया ने नहीं बुलाया या ईराक ने नहीं बुलाया। अरब राष्ट्रों में जितने लोकसत्ता राज्य हैं, उनकी इसमें पहल नहीं थी—यह बात राजा साहब भी मानेंगे। पहल किन की थी? राजा-राजा मिल गये, मराको के राजा और नकली राजा मिल गये, सऊदी अरब के राजा और नकली राजा मिल गये तथा अरब राज्यों में जो लोक-सत्ता वाले इस्लामी देश हैं, जो अपनी अर्थ-व्यवस्था और समाज का आधुनिकीकरण करना चाहते हैं, जो पश्चिमी एशिया में साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ लड़ते हैं, जैसे नासिर साहब ने स्वेज का राष्ट्रीयकरण करके अंग्रेजों के प्रभाव को खत्म-किया, इन लोगों की पहल नहीं थी। पहल किन लोगों की थी मराको की, सऊदी अरेबिया की, उस में ये लोग भी थे जोर्डन तो था ही, लेकिन तुर्की, ईरान और पाकिस्तान, जो सेन्टो के सदस्य हैं, फौजी करार के सदस्य हैं, ये सब लोग उसमें शामिल थे।... (व्यवधान) ...अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अर्ज कर रहा था कि इस दिखर सम्मेलन में पहल करने वाले लोग दकियानूमी थे और इन लोगों का उद्देश्य था कि पश्चिमी एशिया में प्रगतिशील आन्दोलन आगे न बढ़े, इनकी गद्दियाँ सुरक्षित रहें, इनके स्वार्थ सुरक्षित रहें। इस में क्वैत था, ईरान था, सऊदी अरेबिया था, कौन नहीं जानता कि विदेशी-आयल-कार्टल के साथ इनका गठबन्धन है। ये लोग चाहते थे कि पश्चिमी एशिया के मुस्लिम राष्ट्रों में प्रगतिशील आन्दोलन न चले, प्रगतिशील आन्दोलन को न चलने देने के लिए मंच तैयार किया गया। अगर गुट निरपेक्षता के आधार पर आप नान-एलाइन्ड सम्मेलन करते तो मैं समझ सकता था, प्रादेशिक हितों की रक्षा के लिये आप प्रादेशिक एशियाई देशों का सम्मेलन करते हैं, तो मैं समझ सकता हूँ, आप अफ्रीकी देशों और एशियाई देश सम्मेलन करते हैं, मैं समझ सकता हूँ, आप

[श्री मधुलिमये]

उपनिवेशवाद के खिलाफ लड़ने के लिए, डग रंगीन दुनिया के लोगों को संगठित करने के लिए, जिनके जीवन स्तर में और उत्तरी गोलार्ध में रहने वाले सफेद मुस्कों में रहने वाले लोगों के जीवन स्तर में जो अन्तर है, उस सम्बन्ध में आप सम्मेलन बुलाते, वहाँ धक्के खाकर भी आप आते तो मैं नहीं छेड़ता, क्योंकि आप एक अच्छे काम के लिए जाते, लेकिन मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रहा है कि अच्छे आन्दोलनों को, आधुनिकीकरणवाले आन्दोलन, प्रगतिशील वाले आन्दोलन, उपनिवेशवाद को समाप्त करने वाले आन्दोलन, राष्ट्रीय आजादी का आन्दोलन, इनको बढ़ावा देने के बजाय, इनको खत्म करने वाला जो आन्दोलन है, ऐसे आन्दोलन में आप जाते हैं।

पाकिस्तान की नीति और हमारी नीति में बुनियादी फर्क क्या रहा है? बुनियादी फर्क यह रहा है कि इस्लाम खतरे में है, यह नारा देकर एक इस्लामी गुट बनाना चाहते थे और हम लोग क्या चाहते थे हम इस राजनीति को नहीं चाहते थे, हम नहीं चाहते थे कि एशिया और अफ्रीका में धर्म के आधार पर राजनीति चले। इसीलिए हमने गुट-निर्पेक्षता की, प्रगतिवाद की, उपनिवेशवाद के विरोध की कल्पनाओं को आगे बढ़ाने का प्रयास किया। लेकिन आज भारत के ऊपर, भारत की नीति पर आप लोगों ने कलंक लगाया।

मेरा यह कहना है कि यह पाकिस्तान, ईरान, तुर्की और अरब राज्यों में जो प्रतिक्रियावादी राज्य हैं, उन्होंने एक प्रतिक्रियावादी ब्लाक तैयार किया है, एक गुट खड़ा करने का प्रयास किया है जो स्थायी रूप लेने वाला है, एक परमानेंट सेक्रेटेरियट बनने वाला है जिससे एशिया और अफ्रीका के राज्यों में राजनीति धर्म के आधार पर चले, राज्यों के आधार पर चले, आयल - कार्टेल्ड के आधार पर चले। इसलिये हमारा प्रयास होना चाहिए था कि हम सीरिया के साथ मिल जाते, ईराक के साथ मिल जाते, यू० ए० आ० से कहते और

इन लोगों से मिलकर इस सम्मेलन को खत्म करने का पहले से प्रयास करते, न कि उसमें जाकर, धक्के खाकर, नाक कटवाकर वापस आते।

इसलिए मैं आज यह धोपणा करना चाहता हूँ कि यह परमानेंट सेक्रेटेरियट बन रहा है, जिससे हमारी नीति मेल नहीं खाती। हमारी नीति अलग है, हम अपनी नीति को घूमिल न करें। इसलिए मैं कहूँगा कि इन्होंने जो कुछ किया है, उसके लिए ये माफ़ी मांगें और सदन को आश्वासन दें कि आइन्दा इस तरह की गलती नहीं करेंगे। अगर ये ऐसा नहीं करते हैं तो आज वोट होगा और हम लोग वोट देकर रहेंगे। गैलिविलटी की इसमें कोई बात नहीं है। हम चाहते हैं कि मराको के राजा और राजा दिनेश सिंह का यह गठबन्धन टूटे।

20.14 hrs.

[SHRI P.K. VASUDEVAN NAIR in the chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Sulaiman Sait. He is not here.

The hon. Minister.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI DINESH SINGH) : rose.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT : I am here. Sir and I want to speak a few words.

MR. CHAIRMAN : No. I have already called the Minister.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Sir, it cannot be our desire to conceal our disappointment, resentment and an anguish at what happened to the Indian Delegation at Rabat. We have been deeply distressed to see how against all the established norms of international conferences, this conference adopted a unique pattern of denying a delegation which had been invited unanimously to participate in the final acts of the conference and we have not hesitated to express our disappointment to all countries concerned and to the world at large. And the action that we had reluc-

tantly to take against some Governments which, we felt, owned a greater responsibility to what happened to our Delegation, is already known to the hon Members. And we had to take this action because we wanted it to be known, whatever the merits or demerits of a conference are, that when a country and a country like India is invited unanimously to participate in that conference ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI : No.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order please. Mr. Sondhi, will you please resume your seat. I am on my legs.

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI : Where is the invitation ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : I want him to resume his seat.

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI : I will, but kindly convey to him my question, where is the invitation.

MR. CHAIRMAN : He should resume his seat first. The hon. Minister has just started. Members desiring to ask questions might reserve them till the end of the speech. I am prepared to permit some pertinent questions if the House has the patience left. I would request my most dear friend, Sondhi, to co-operate with the Chair and with the other members. Every minute he cannot just get up and ask a question. If he is not satisfied on some points, he should wait till the end of the speech. I make this request in all earnestness and hope he will co-operate.

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI : I will co-operate. But let him not refer to something which he is not prepared to place on the Table. Let us steer clear of each other.

MR. CHAIRMAN : He will agree that neither he nor I can prevent the Minister from saying something he believes to be true.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I am most grateful to you for giving me the protection that is due from the Chair.

As I was saying, what was most extraordinary in our view was that one country should be allowed to behave in the manner Pakistan had behaved at Rabat against all established norms in internal conferences to prevent not only the participation in the final act of India but also to prevent the conference from discussing the issues for which it was called and for reaching conclusions which we thought would be useful not only in relation to some countries which participated but in relation to all the countries of this area.

The hon. member, Shri Asoka Mahta, came out with an astounding theory that if we are going to discuss anything in the UN, we should not discuss it in any other conference. I can think of so many conferences in which he participated. I take it that they discussed issues which were also taken up by rather higher or bigger international conferences, and I did not find him ask 'Why are we going to this conference because the matter may come up in a bigger conference?' Now perhaps when the opportunities are less, he feels that others should not have gone to such a conference.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : Was going to Rabat such an opportunity ?

श्री मधुलिमये : मुसाफिरी करने के लिए ही आप सम्मेलनों में जायेंगे ।

श्री विनेश सिंह : यह आप जानें---उन्होंने आपको छेड़ा, आपने उनको छोड़ा... मैं क्या कह सकता हूँ ।

A question was raised by some hon. members about the invitation and I shall dispose of it first because otherwise that will keep agitating the minds of some hon. members, specially a dear friend of yours. I should not like to cause them any concern.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Yours also.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Yes.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : Dear friend of the House.



**SHRI DINESH SINGH:** I should like to read out a portion from the Press Conference which was addressed by the Foreign Minister of Morocco, who is now the Prime Minister and who at that time was the official spokesman of the Conference.

**AN HON. MEMBER :** Is that the invitation ?

**SHRI DINESH SINGH:** I am sorry that the hon. Member is so anxious for an invitation I can send him an invitation if he likes. It says;

"After consultations among the Heads of States it has been decided that the Conference should address an official invitation to India to be represented at the Governmental level. The ambassador of India was received yesterday morning and he will assume leadership of the Indian delegation while waiting for the arrival of the ministerial delegation which will be here tomorrow morning."

This is the statement issued by the then Foreign Minister of Morocco.

I do not think that some of our hon. Members should be such sticklers for procedure. Many of them talk about the red tape and cutting out delays and all that and they should not say that the invitation in writing should have been sent, sealed and delivered to us. Let us see what an invitation means. Invitation is to do something, to participate in a conference. Our ambassador participated in the conference. If he did not have an invitation how could he have been admitted there ?

**SHRI C. C. DESAI:** Did you receive any letter ? The correct procedure is for the Moroccan ambassador here to call at our foreign office and hand over aide-memoire containing an invitation. That is a proper invitation. What you say that is not an invitation.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH:** I know that the hon. Member had the opportunity of serving our country as a diplomat. But I do not think that he was so unaware of international practices.

**SHRI C. C. DESAI:** You do not know them; I know them.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH;** I should like to quote two more passages.

**AN HON. MEMBER.** But where is the invitation ?

**SHRI DINESH SINGH:** My difficulty is that I cannot oblige Members by saying what they expect me.

**SHRI S.K. TAPURIAH:** Say the truth.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH:** I am glad sometimes he talks about truth. If he listens to this truth, he will learn some more truths. The hon. Member Mr. Dwivedy quoted some statements made by the Government of Morocco. I should also like to quote from a newspaper what the King of Morocco has said;

"We refrained reluctantly from inviting India which possesses neither a Muslim Government nor a majority. In so doing we agreed not to invite the Muslim community of China, the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia or Albania."

"During the conference we held consultations and come in favour of inviting a country which has 60 million Muslims.

This is the King of Morocco saying. He does not deny that we have not been invited and we have pressed our invitation which Mr Dwivedy has tried to make out. (*Interruption*)

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** Why is he afraid of giving to this House the actual text of the invitation ? Why is he fighting shy of it ?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are you making a speech now ?

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** It is a practice to make pertinent interventions; it is not unparliamentary. We want to know the text of invitation; it is a very pertinent request. He is making an edifying speech without giving us the text.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH:** I have also a card that was issued for participation in

the conference, and the hon. Member is still asking for it.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI : May I ask the hon. Minister, what is the other part of the invitation ? We would like to know whether you have said that you are bound by the decision of the conference if you are invited ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: I am very glad that the hon. Member has brought up this point and I would be in a position to clear it at the earliest stage of what I have to say.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: That card which you showed is a car-pass; it is not an invitation.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: No condition to attend this conference was asked of us and no guarantee was given by us of any kind. This was made very clear by us on a number of times and I am sorry that some doubts still linger. We made no agreement.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) : May I ask one question ? This is a very important point. We do not want to interfere, but this is a very important point. The Foreign Minister of Morocco who has now become the Prime Minister of that State has stated that "we invited India because the Indian Ambassador to Saudi Arabia promised the King of Saudi Arabia that if India is invited, India undertakes that any decision that the conference takes will be binding on India." It is the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Morocco who has now become, according to our Foreign Minister, the Prime Minister of Morocco.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : All that appeared in the newspaper. I am sorry that the hon. Member has thought it fit to say that. (*Interruption*)

AN HON. MEMBER : You were also quoting from newspaper reports.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : It was this very story that we have contradicted and contradicted in some depth : that our Ambassa-

dor. as soon as he came to know of it in Morocco, was ready with a contradiction himself, to be issued there, when the Foreign Minister mentioned to him that it might be checked up and we checked up here also, and no such undertaking was given by our Ambassador either in Morocco or in Jeddah or anywhere else.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : Why was he not allowed to issue the contradiction ? Was Mr. Singh allowed to issue a contradiction.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I thought I could reply to all the questions at the end. But if you wish me to answer the questions as and when they are put. I have no objection. If the House can spare the time, I am willing. I went into this matter with the hon. lady Member concerned and explained to her all this. Yet, if she was to raise it, I am willing to answer the question all over again as many times as you would wish me to.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : There were many blank gaps.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : What the hon. Member Shri Madho Limaye said was that he has no quarrel about what happens to us in Rabat but asked whether we were right in going to participate in the conference in Rabat or not. And that, I would say, is the focal question that we have to consider here.

When Mr. Limaye spoke about various pulls and pressures in this part of the world, I had some suspicion that perhaps he was listening to what I was saying to some of my friends in the Congress Party the other day. But he said he did not hear it. I am glad there is at least some common thinking, even if it is on a very limited issue, with the hon. member.

It is these matters to which we have to address ourselves. Acharyaji referred extensively to what happened during the Khilafat movement. He said many things about India's participation in that movement. I take it he was with Gandhiji and supported this movement. This is what Gandhiji had said about the Khilafat movement :

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

"we talk of Hindu-Muslim unity. It would be an empty phrase if the Hindus held aloof from the Muslims when their vital interests were at stake. Some have suggested that we, Hindus, can assist our Muslim countrymen only on conditions. Conditional assistance is like adulterated cement, which does not bind."

SHRI J.B. KRIPALANI : That is exactly what I also said.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : You did not say it.

It is not a correct question that our secularism implies that we have nothing to do with any religion. Some hon. members have already quoted Government's association with celebrations and participation in affairs which can be termed religious. We are not barred from that. Secularism implies that we shall not take sides in these issues and that we shall not judge any citizen by his religion, but shall give him equality. It is this effort that we have been making consistently in our national life before independence and after independence to separate the issues which are religious and issues which are political. Any foreign policy which is born out of national interest, as our foreign policy is, must consider the projection of this idea abroad.

We have Muslim countries along the western borders on the shores of the Atlantic. Can we completely remove ourselves from what happens in this part of the world? Have we not a share in that? Have we not been dominated by colonialism? Do we still not suffer in many ways from the economic domination that exists? Is it not in our interest to align ourselves with the progressive movements in a large part of the world and to keep alive to the situations that develop there?

It is not a secret that we have been against the mixing of religion with politics. We have always stood against the concept that religion should be the motivating factor that should guide political issues. We have been against the concept of Pan-Islamism, the idea that Islam should form the basis for consideration of political issues. But, at the

same time, we have got to keep ourselves alive to the political situations, to the political developments that take place all over the world. Just because they carry some banner, just because they carry some label we should not fight shy of taking part in them. Our secularism is not going to be destroyed by our participation in a political conference which may have some religious label. Our secularism has to be fought for in our country, whether it is Ahmedabad, Ranchi or any other place. Here is the test. If we want to be secular, then we have to make ourselves secular first. If we are not going to be secular at home then we cannot talk of secularism outside. The world is too small. People know what happens in this country. We know what happens in other countries. Therefore, we may talk tall of the secularism outside but until we are able to give complete protection to our minorities in our country and give them complete equality which the constitutional law has guaranteed, nobody is going to be fooled by our secularism.

It is in this background that we have to look at this participation. The hon. Member, Shri Vajpayee, read out from a Yugoslav journal, which is a very good journal, and he said that this was a political conference. Then he says that we should not have participated. Let us not be so touchy about these things. Let us not consider them in the unfortunate context in which we are discussing them in the House today. Let us judge the issue of participation in Rabat on its merits.

The Agenda of the Rabat Conference has been read out to the House by many hon. Members. It shows that the items in the agenda were political issues. Whether they have a label or not is a different matter. I say that our policy of participating in this conference is not a new policy. Many Muslim conferences have taken place in the past. I leave out the historical ones that took place, the *Khilafat* and the earlier ones. I am referring to those which took place after our independence. In 1949, 1951 and 1955 Pakistan had been holding Muslim conferences, trying to mobilise Muslim opinion against us, bringing issues which would fan religious sentiments. We did not participate in them. In 1955 there was a consideration of this policy. When we referred to our old papers we found that there was a file in

which the late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, had written something about our participation. I would like to say here that I am not in a position to give any quotations because it is a secret file. But I am not taking refuge under it. I am giving the policy as such.

I am not in a position to give the exact words because the file cannot be quoted in the House. The criteria for our participation in these conferences were laid down there. After discussion in the Ministry and also consideration by the late Maulana Azad the late Prime Minister Nehru thought that if religious conferences are held then it would be in our interest if people from India participated in these religious conferences.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : When have we attended in such conferences in the past at the governmental level ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : If the hon. Member would like to make it a question and answer session, then I shall stop saying what I am saying. Otherwise, I would beg of him to follow the trend that I am projecting before him.

It was decided that if there was a religious conference we should not keep away, we should let our people participate in that because it would be right for them to project the position as it exists in India and to demonstrate to the world that in India they enjoy religious freedom and equality with other citizens.

I am happy to say that our people who have participated in these conferences have been able to project to the world that Muslims in India today enjoy more freedom, more equality, than Muslims in Pakistan under Martial Law.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : He must respect the intelligence of the people. He is referring to the guide-lines laid down by Pandit Nehru. He says that the people are allowed to attend such conferences. The question was whether we have participated in such religious conferences. (Interruption.)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I will not allow you like this. If I allow you, I have to allow

other Members also, No interruption please.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I was trying to answer a point that was made by the hon. Member, Shri Vajpayee about our policy as laid down by Pandit Nehru. I do not know the question that Shri Madhok is raising. Pandit Nehru had said that when political or economic conferences are held and they may be held under the label of Islamic conferences, then we should judge each conference on its merits and decide whether we should participate in it or not. I would like to submit to you, Sir, and, through you, to the House that there has been no departure in our policy and practice as laid down by Pandit Nehru.

The hon. Member, Acharya Kripalani, had raised certain other questions of Cabinet decisions and other things. As I submitted, in the continuing policy, it is not necessary to consult the cabinet each time nor is the Cabinet consulted in normal participation in conferences or in the selection of the members of the conferences.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : What about the kitchen Cabinet ? Was the kitchen Cabinet consulted ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Are you feeling hungry ?

Sir, I heard the speech made by my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta. I have watched his speeches and his performances in the House and outside. At one stage, I fell into the trap of even admiring them. But I must say I was not only disappointed but pained at his performance today. I did not realise that he would go down so much to mislead the House in giving facts which are far from correct. I had taken the trouble to note down some of the points. With your permission, Sir, I would like to show to my friends and even to Mr. Vajpayee who looks so surprised how there has been a total misstatement of facts.

SHRI PILOO MODY : It is your private business.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Unlike the hon. Member, I have no private life.

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

In his enthusiasm to blame us for everything, the hon. Member, Shri Asoka Mehta said that Nigeria came to persuade Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed. Where was Nigeria at the Conference? I think, he must have taken Nigar for Nigeria. What am I to say? Such a deliberate attempt is made to change the name of the country only to try to prove the point that because there are internal conflicts in Nigeria, therefore, we justify the conflict in Ahmedabad.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE :** He did not justify,

**SHRI DINESH SINGH :** Let the records prove what has been said. I am not going to be guided by one hon. Member or other. I was also here, I do not know whether the hon. Member was here.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE :** He did not justify the Ahmedabad riots. This much I can say.

**SHRI DINESH SINGH :** He talked of our policy as a senseless policy. When he was in Government, it was a very sensible policy; he never opposed our participation. But now it has become a senseless policy. *(Interruption)*

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवायः जब आप सरकार से बाहर आयेंगे, तब आप भी ऐसा ही करेंगे।

श्री दिनेश सिंह: ऐसा दिन नहीं आने वाला है।

He said that he was unable to distinguish between progressives and non-progressives. A number of times he has changed between progressives and..... *(Interruptions)* Naturally he has difficulty in recognising not only progressives and others but friends and others.

So far as this Conference is concerned, I have submitted to you that what happens in West Asia is a matter of very great importance to us. We are deeply concerned not only in the conflict that exists between Israel and some Arab countries but in the whole trend of development in West Asia, because we are closely connected. Large

numbers of those countries are non-aligned; they all belong to the developing world and we would wish to develop even closer relations than what exist at the moment. And I would like to tell the House that it has been our constant endeavour to try to strengthen our relations with the countries in West Asia, in North Africa and other parts of Africa just as it is our desire to strengthen our relations with countries in South and South-East Asia. This is an area where we have to work closely together with all other countries to forge not only close political alliances but also close economic working together because of the pressures that are continuing to mount from the developed countries, and India's position in the world is going to be judged by how much of co-operation we have been able to project and strengthen in this part of the world rather than going and talking about it in the United States or in Europe...

**SHRI PILOO MODY :** Is he going to conclude?

**SHRI DINESH SINGH :** I am glad that it hurts the hon. Member so much when I tell the truth that he wants me to finish quickly.

About our participation in the Conference, here is a statement that appeared :

"Islamic Conference invited the Indian Government on Tuesday to send representatives to the three-day parley. Pakistan President, Mr Yahya Khan, helped to swing the decision in India's favour following a private talk with King Faisal."

This is quotation from the *Pakistan Times* and not newspaper that I may have any influence over. *(Interruptions)*

This was the day that we had been invited. What happened the next day? I think, it was the hon. Member who read out the headlines, how people in Pakistan got agitated that India had been recognised by countries, Islamic countries, on which Pakistan felt that it had a particular affinity and some kind of a hold, how they had unanimously to fall in line with them. This has been admitted by Pakistan's own news-

papers that it projected how India's policy had been recognised in this world, ow importance was given to India. Some of my hon. friends mentioned that there were no friends to India. If there were no friends, why would India be invited unanimously to this Conference when Pakistan had opposed it ?

Now, I think, it was Mr. Manoharan who had asked me whether our Ambassador had really made a statement in the conference. He had made a statement and I thought the hon. Member was going to read out from it and there also he thanked for the unanimous invitation and informed them that the Minister would be coming to participate. But what started appearing in the Pakistan press put pressures on the President of Pakistan largely because, as they say, after what happened in Ahmedabad, they admitted the opposition. The Islamic Summit Conference's last minute decision to invite India to Rabat came as a great shock. This is what PAKISTAN TIMES says :

"It is incredible that Pakistan should have been a party to this. Strangely enough India has been invited not only as an observer but as a full-fledged member. Thus India's presence at Rabat is designed to weaken the Islamic Conference's utility, detract from the Muslim people's resolve and freedom of concerted action which Pakistan would like to be achieved."

Therefore, here is something we should take into consideration and to these conferences whether we go in future or not is a matter to be decided when a conference comes up. But I have no hesitation in saying to the House that it is not our desire to participate at a Governmental level in any religious conference. But when political issues are to be discussed, we should not be too touchy about these labels. We have got to see what is in our national interest. If we consider going to a Particular conference is not in our national interest, we would not hesitate to keep away. At the same time, if it is clear that it is in our national interest, then you would agree that it would be our duty as a Government to go to these conferences to uphold our national interest.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, many questions have been raised and I have taken the trouble of

nothing them down as mentioned by different hon. Members, If you would wish me to go into detail.

SOME HON MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Then I would conclude by saying one thing. Hon Member, Shri Vajpayee, has said : why are we inimical to Israel ? Why cannot we be friendly to Israel ? It is not ? Mr. Chairman, Sir, we bear no animosity to Israel. We have made it abundantly clear in this House and elsewhere when the occasion arose that we have recognized Israel, that we are not in favour of elimination of Israel but we are opposed to the policy of Israel....(Interruption).

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Why do you allow anti-semitic propaganda here ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Sir, it was not my intention to touch the sensitive spots and I have been avoiding the issue of the West Asia policy which, I know, some hon. Members on the other side feel very sensitive about and which has been reflected in this debate. But it would be my duty to say that we cannot support the policy of Israel when it occupies lands of other countries. We in India have ourselves seen that two countries are occupying our territories and we are fighting against that. So, we are against the retention of fruits of aggression. How can we support that in West Asia ? We are in favour of progressive Arab policy and progressive Arab States and it is necessary to support them and to work closely with them if we wish to develop a society which will be free from domination of influences from outside.

21 hrs.

May I conclude by saying that in the long march of a nation towards progress there will always be many hurdles and many pitfalls ? It is for those entrusted with authority to see that the hurdles are crossed smoothly and the pitfalls avoided. But it is not always possible, and no government, no individual, can claim that he has always succeeded; but it is our endeavour to do so. If you judge our record, you will come to the same conclusion that we have in fact done better than some of the expectations of hon. members on the other side.

**SHRI ASOKA MEHTA :** The Foreign Minister has charged me with distorting facts and deliberately misleading the House. He promised to give a number of instances. But he gave only one instance. He gave the instance that I cited of Nigeria. It is very interesting that all of us have received a publication on Rabat by a very distinguished journalist, Mr. Pran Chopra. In this on page 28, he has mentioned Nigeria. I have no secretariat at my disposal, but I thought that what is stated in this particular pamphlet which is priced at Rs.1.75 and so widely distributed and has the patronage of the Foreign Minister was factual and can be relied upon. I had no intention of misleading the House. I thought he would not have fallen so low as to make this charge of distorting facts and misleading the House. I challenged him to produce evidence further. Why is he running away from it ?

Further, the Foreign Minister says, 'Mr. Asoka Mehta has been moving between progressives and unprogressives'. I am very happy to find that the Foreign Minister believes that Mr. Jawahrlal Nehru's Government and Mrs. Indira Gandhi's Government are unprogressive, and I am glad to be rid of them.

**SHRI PILOO MODY:** I have waited so long to be able to reply. I wished to take a few digs at the Prime Minister and thought she should at least have an opportunity of having a few digs at me first. But I see that she has not only missed the opportunity but shirked the duty.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** He should be taken as spoken.

**SHRI PILOO MODY:** Believing in protocol, I shall take the Maharajah first. Dinesh is very distressed; he has expressed great disapproval against people who have so insulted his delegation at Rabat. His only argument was—he said it quite clearly, quite apart from the merit or demerit or going there the thing that was wrong was—that having been invited, he was not treated well. I should like to assure the entire house on behalf of this Government and of the Opposition that no invitation in the formal sense was received.

This is a categorical assertion which this Government has been refusing to give in spite of the very best efforts of my friend Mr. Sondhi. I do not blame them; there is no invitation to give. The only thing that one can very possibly say is that the Government of India did receive a circumstantial invitation inferred from newspaper reports, collected from foreign countries through the mouths of foreign spokesmen and may be, some of the enormous staff that it has posted abroad. As for Mr. Dinesh Singh's concern for secularism, I should like to know: why was it that it was decided to send Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed to Rabat ? What are his qualifications for the job ? When we hear a lot of utter non-sense, a lot of platitudes about secularism, I really feel that I have had enough. Talk about secularism ! what happened at Ahmedabad ? It was this Government that not only invited but welcomed—gave it almost a hero's welcome—that delegates from the *Al Fatah* For what purpose ? To come and recruit members in India. If I were to recruit you for a particular purpose such as this, what is the virulent muck that I will have to persuade you with in order to come all the way to the Middle-East and fight ? Would it not spread the communal virus which is the very basis of the Ahmedabad riots ? Yet this Government did precisely that. I do not want to hear about secularism from you people; I have had enough of it.

We say we have been invited. Let me give you a little background. Most of it has been said. We were invited and Pakistan took umbrage. From that very moment, it was no longer a sane discussion. Sanity was thrown overboard and the game of one upmanship started. It was a game of one upmanship—we wanting to go there in direct proportion to their wanting to stop us from going there. The Ministry of External affairs was divided, very strongly divided, and advised against participation. But there was no sanity; it was ejected and excluded out of all discussions. No one bothered; on one even gave a cursory thought to secularism that had been nurtured by the Prime Minister's father, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru in making this decision. There is a great deal of talk that he had even left a note in which he had specifically said that this sort of participation on an official level by India in conferences such as this should never be permitted.

Shri Maulana Azad had written a note saying that "I entirely agree". Yet, Mr. Dinesh Singh in trying to refute this said it was a secret, confidential note, etc. Having said that, he would not go further and why he went and participated at Rabat.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Probably you wrote this note before I spoke, because I did say. (*Interruption*) I was trying to say that probably the hon. Member had written this note before I spoke, because I had explained the details of the policy in that connection.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I am glad to say that he has explained it to his satisfaction. Syria refused. Why? They are vitally interested, yet they refused on the ground that they are a secular State. Wisdom that floats around in Delhi cannot be matched with the wisdom that there is in Syria—Damascus. They are so wise and we not wise at all that they will refuse to go on the ground that they were a secular State. Talk about Soviet Union and China: there are sizeable Muslim populations in those areas, and yet, they did not start fishing for an invitation even after the rules had been relaxed for Mr. Dinesh Singh and Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed to participate in the conference.

Nasser, somewhat cleverer than the people sitting across from me, deliberately held his position and quietly stayed away because he was afraid of the religious overtones of the summit, but not us who are a non-denominational democracy: we must participate in all these things in keeping with the great delusions of grandeur that we suffer from.

This was a Muslim summit, but I would like to make it clear to this entire House that had it been a Hindu summit, I will oppose it just as much, and in fact twice as much, or nine times as much because there are nine times as many Hindus as here are Muslims in this country. If this Government wishes to placate the Muslims, they have succeeded in doing exactly the opposite because, more than anything else, more than this Government or even country, the rebuff at Rabat has insulted the Muslims of this country because it has said categorically in

so many words at the Islam summit that "we have no use for the 60 million Muslims of India". This is what the Islamic summit has said. This has been the verdict of the Islamic summit: that we have no use for the 60 million Muslims of India. Moreover, we do not even consider their sympathy is necessary for our cause. This is what they said. To day, if I feel so unkind about the insult hurled at my country it is because, what had happened at Rabat primarily affected my Muslim brothers because they have been insulted the most.

This Government had better learn first of all to protect its minority; it must start by protecting its minority at home, and arrest the communal riots that have been going on in this country with everincreasing frequency, and give our Muslim brothers complete sense of security and belonging.

I would like to know what this Government could have done had an Islamic summit been held when the Hazratbal incident took place. I see a great similarity between the two incidents. And the Muslim countries of the world could easily have been led to condemn India for the sacrilege committed on such a holy relic. But then, the Government of India's reaction would have been entirely different.

It would have been entirely the opposite. It is not difficult to expect double standards from this Government!

But who cares in this country?

For what reasons did we have to go to Rabat? As far as I can see, the Indicate wanted to increase the value of its stock at home. What international objectives could we have achieved? (a) To woo Arabs, because they have a great many votes in the UN and (b) to counter Pakistani anti-Indian propaganda. This has been said in a hackneyed manner for five hours. Yet, there must be an assessment as to how far did they succeed. Take Pakistan. It has created the exact opposite effect. If we had ignored Rabat, even if Pakistan would have started its anti-Indian propaganda, we would have got the sympathy of the other countries present there. Instead, we have permitted Pakistan to have a victory at



[Shri Piloo Mody]

Rabat which we denied them at Khem Karan. As for wooing the Arabs, if at the end of the conference, you have to recall two of your ambassadors from two of the countries you are trying hard to woo, I hardly consider that as a success. That conference has ruined our relations with Iran, which we have been trying to build up on half a dozen other fronts. You call this a success? How far you have succeeded and what ends you have achieved baffles the imagination.

What have we gained? Mr. Ahmed had two, not one, ministers to receive him at the airport! He had a motor cycle to escort him all the way into the town! On his return, in the cooler and more secular atmosphere of London, Mr. Ahmed had some second thoughts and on his return clearly said, "re-appraisal of the country's foreign policy". But the Ministry of External Affairs, dominated not only by the Raja but other Bourbons, refused to change. I would like to read to you some of the headlines that appeared:

"Rabat Rebuff will not affect Delhi's policy—PM."

"India Still Member of Islamic Summit—Dinesh"

"No change in Foreign Policy—PM."

"No re-appraisal is called for—Dinesh".

"India defends Rabat Missions"—nameless, again from one of those Bourbons.

"Incident at Rabat did not call for any basic re-thinking of our Foreign Policy"—I think that was from the Prime Minister.

"Pak's fanaticism exposed at Rabat—Dinesh."

"Pak's move to malign India at Rabat had failed"—

This is also from Dinesh. He talks too much.

The prize excuse all the time given by Shri Dinesh Singh is, we went there for political reasons. What he did not specify is

whether they were international reasons or domestic reasons.

On the question of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's policy and that very precious note, I would like to ask a few fundamental questions.

Did such a note exist? Did it carry Azad's endorsement? I hope the answer to both is "Yes". Was it placed in the Rabat file? I take it that he has read it. Was it ever removed from the file by any interested parties by any chance? If so, who had the audacity to do that? We will never find out. What were the motives? We can only suspect. Did the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister know about this removal? That also we might never know. If so, does that mean any change in foreign policy? If there is any change in foreign policy I want to know the reasons for it.

A lot many arguments were put forward whether Rabat was a religious, neo-religious, semi-religious or politico-religious affair. Others have talked about secularism and the unsecular character of the Government action. But the pertinent point is that the foreign policy of the Indicate has been a complete flout, a monumental blunder, starting with the snub received by our Foreign Secretary when he was told to keep his nose out of Hanoi, then the grand illusion of Raja Dinesh Singh whose statement about our close relations with Nepal and Pakistan was so promptly contradicted with a sharp rap on his knuckle, the defeat of our nominee, Dr. Nagendra Singh, to the International Court, the discourtesies heaped on our representatives in Canada and in Moscow on our railway delegation for whom they did not extend the VISA even by a couple of days and then the Indian walk-out from our own non-aligned meeting in New York. Strange things are happening. The stray thoughts of Shri Dinesh Singh regarding the recognition of Hanoi have earned for us the hostility of half the world!

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Your half.

SHRI PILOO MODY: None the less half. My half or your half is still half.

It is some diplomacy—of fools rushing in where angels fear to tread.

But who cares ? No one cares.

But all these are merely symptoms of a widespread disease that has overtaken the country, particularly the Congress Party.

AN HON. MEMBER : Which Congress Party?

SHRI PILOO MODY : The old Congress Party. During the past few months politics has intruded into every sphere of life and whether it is education, literature, art or sports the ordinary values of citizenship have been completely lost ; in fact, they have been cast on the dung heap. The presidential election wiped out all measure of respectability that the politicians enjoyed in this country.

During the last few months the standards of public life and decency have reached a new nadir with cheap slogans, breach of faith, stabbing in the back, political defections, smearing of opponents, false charges of conspiracy and a determined effort at destroying the freedom of the Press, with a view to falsifying all means of mass communications, including All India Radio, which has now become the instrument of the inner coterie of the Government. The result of all this been it brings the administration to a standstill with no thought being paid to the problems facing the people and no efforts being made to ministering to their needs.

But who cares ?

This Government, or at least what is left of it, and this party, or at least what is left of it, have actively sought the support of and connived with the Communists to stay in power. The Prime Minister is very touchy about it and she never tires of asserting that she is a democrat. Let me appeal to her democratic instincts. Let her declare before the vote is taken on this motion that she will resign if she cannot sustain a majority of votes of this House without the help of the Communists. I am challenging her to do so and I shall be gratified if she accepts it.

It was all right for Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed to have grown a beard and run incognito to Rabat as the head of some delegation of private institutions. If he had done that, he would not have needed the shaving water which he has been denied ! But unfortunately, he wanted some votes here for which reason the Rabat Conference became indispensable.

Rabat has been a rub out. It is a rub out for Mr Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed; it is a rub out for Mr. Dinesh Singh. it is a rub out for Mrs. Indira Gandhi. It is a rub out for India.

We grovelled at the gateposts of Arab Embassies. We were reluctantly invited at the eleventh hour and we accepted the invitation with relish. We rushed out in indecent haste by altering plane schedules. We were spurned and refused admission when we arrived. We were insulted and asked to pretend indisposition. We were kicked out when we refused. Then we justified our humiliation and bragged about our success. Then we praised our persecutors and reaffirmed our friendship. Then we falsified the evidence to cover up our blunders. And then we promised to accept the conclusions of the Conference in advance if allowed to participate. It is a criminal series of self-generating blunders which have heaped monumental shame on this irresponsible Government.

My hon. friend Mr. Dange does not seem to think that this is a sort of thing that should arouse our passions. I do not expect that he should know anything about invitations. His tribe has never waited for one. For example, the so-called Czechoslovakian invitation to the Soviets to send their tanks. It is a very similar sort of invitation and humiliation. Many examples can be quoted. After all, he thinks that this Parliament is not here to censure the Government and that we are all here to play a game of musical chairs so that we can go on hopping from one chair to the other.

But who cares ? Does this Government care ?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Do the Ministers care ?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Does Mrs. Indira Gandhi care ?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Do her followers care ?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Does this parliament care ?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Do the people care ?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Find me an Indian who cares, and we can save this country.

If the people cared, this shameless Government would not have been here for a day. If the press cared, it would not have supported this Government for an hour. If our intituitions of public media like All India Radio cared, would you have been here for a minute ? If our politicians and, particularly, those assembled have cared, would they have supported this Government even for a second ?

Nobody cares.

And it has been left to me today to arouse the conscience of the country. Let me assure you that by conscience I do not mean convenience; I do not mean cowardice; I do not mean conflict.

By conscience, I mean the inner voice of God that resides in every heart. By conscience, I mean the inner voice described in the Gita, the Koran, the Bible, the Granth Sahib and the Khorde Avesta.

Unlike the Prime Minister, I will not trifle with the language. I do not specialise in the alchemy of word transformation. We have returned from Rabat, not like conquering heroes—not even like defeated heroes—but like worms. Our retreat was no Waterloo. Rabat was no Dunkirk for us. It was not

even Haldighat, or Stalingrad. It was the shameful, ignominious retreat of those who did not even fight but fled like cowards. Because they knew that nobody cares. Because they knew they can continue in office. Because they knew that the poor, the oppressed and the ignorant masses of this country have no voice, no vision, no struggle after 22 years of self-Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude, You have already taken thirty minutes.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I will finish in two minutes.

I can visualise the newspaper headlines tomorrow. They will say, 'Adjournment Motion Defeated', and they will heap praises on the Prime Minister and say, what a smashing victory it was for Mrs. Indira Gandhi.

The fiasco at Rabat will be a victory of historic proportions of the Prime Minister. It is only her conscience that can digest this sort of victory.

But what about her supporters ? Let me appeal to them with every vein that I have. There is a price that we have to pay. It is an immutable law of nature that demands its price; men are willing to pay it mice will retract and refuse.

And if the price is Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed's head, it is to be paid; if it is Mr. Dinesh Singh's curls, it has to be paid; if it is the Prime Minister's chair, it has to be paid. I am today demanding that price, I am today demanding that price from my fellow human beings, from my friends and colleagues, in the name of justice, in the name of fairplay, in the name of humanity,

Find me an Indian who cares !

With these words, I appeal to the House to support my motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is. "That the House do now adjourn."

*The Lok Sabha divided.*

Division No. 1]

AYES

[21.37 hrs.

Agadi, Shri S. A.  
Amat, Shri D.  
Amin, Shri R. K.

Anjanappa, Shri B.  
Arumugam, Shri R. S.  
Ayarwal, Shri Ram Singh

Bajaj, Shri Kamalnayan  
Berwa, Shri Onkar Lal  
Bhadoria, Shri Arjun Singh

- Brij Bhushan Lal, Shri  
 Chauhan, Shri Bharat Singh  
 Dandeker, Shri N.  
 Das, Shri N. T.  
 Dass, Shri, C.  
 Deb, Shri D. N.  
 Deo, Shri P. K.  
 Deo, Shri R. R. Singh  
 Desai, Shri C. C.  
 Desai, Shri Morarji  
 Devgun, Shri Hardayal  
 Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath  
 Fernandes, Shri George  
 Ghosh, Shri Bimalkanti  
 Gowd, Shri Gadilingana  
 Gowder, Shri Nanja  
 Gudadinni, Shri B. K.  
 Guha, Shri Samar  
 Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal  
 Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan  
 Hari Krishna, Shri  
 Hazarika, Shri J. N.  
 Jai Singh, Shri  
 Jena, Shri D. D.  
 Joshi, Shri Jagannath Rao  
 Joshi, Shri S. M.  
 Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand  
 Kapoor, Shri Lakhnan Lal  
 Katham, Shri B. N.  
 Kedarai, Shri C. M.  
 Khan, Shri H. Ajmal  
 Kothari, Shri S. S.  
 Koushik, Shri K. M.  
 Kripalani, Shri J. B.  
 Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta  
 Krishna, Shri S. M.  
 Kundu, Shri S.  
 Kunte, Shri Dattatraya  
 Kushwah, Shri Yashwant  
 Singh  
 Limaye, Shri Madhu  
 Madhok, Shri Bal Raj  
 Mahadevappa, Shri Rampur  
 Majhi, Shri M.  
 Mandal, Shri B. P.  
 Masani, Shri M. R.  
 Masuriya Din, Shri  
 Meena, Shri Meethalal  
 Mehta, Shri Asoka  
 Mehta, Shri P. M.  
 Misra, Shri Janeshwar  
 Misra, Shri Srinibas  
 Mody, Shri Pilo  
 Mohamed Imam, Shri J.  
 Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati  
 Molahu Prasad, Shri  
 Mondal, Shri Jugal  
 Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri  
 Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda  
 Murti, Shri M. S.  
 Muthusami, Shri C.  
 Naghnoor, Shri M. N.  
 Naidu, Shri Chengalraya  
 Naik, Shri G. C.  
 Nath Pai, Shri  
 Nayar, Shri K. K.  
 Nayar, Shrimati Shankuntala  
 Nayar, Dr. Sushila  
 Nihal Singh, Shri  
 Onkar Singh, Shri  
 Padmavati Devi, Shrimati  
 Pandey, Shri K. N.  
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath  
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai  
 Paswan, Shri Kedar  
 Patel, Shri J. H.  
 Patel, Shri Manubhai  
 Patel, Shri N. N.  
 Patil, Shri S. K.  
 Patodia, Shri D. N.  
 Pramanik, Shri J. N.  
 Rajasekharan, Shri  
 Raju, Shri D. B.  
 Raju, Dr. D. S.  
 Ram Charan, Shri  
 Ram Dhani Das, Shri  
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.  
 Ramamoorthy, Shri S. P.  
 Rane, Shri  
 Ranga, Shri  
 Ranjit Singh, Shri  
 Rao, Shri V. Narasimha  
 Ray, Shri Rabi  
 Reddy, Shri P. Antony  
 Saboo, Shri Shri Gopal  
 Sanji Rupji, Shri  
 Santosham, Dr. M.  
 Sapre, Shrimati Tara  
 Sarma, Shri A. T.  
 Sen, Shri P. G.  
 Sethuraman, Shri N.  
 Shah, Shrimati Jayaben  
 Shah, Shri Shantilal  
 Shah, Shri T. P.  
 Shah, Shri Virendrakumar  
 Shalwale, Shri Ram Gopal  
 Sharda Nand, Shri  
 Sharma, Shri Beni Shanker  
 Sharma, Shri Narayan  
 Swaroop  
 Sharma, Shri Ram Avtar  
 Sharma, Shri Yajna Datt  
 Shastri, Shri Parkash Vir  
 Shastri, Shri Shiv Kumar  
 Sheo Narain, Shri  
 Shiv Charan Lal, Shri  
 Shivappa, Shri N.  
 Singh, Shri D. N.  
 Singh, Shri J. B.  
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari  
 Solanki, Shri S. M.  
 Somani, Shri N. K.  
 Sondhi, Shri M. L.  
 Supakar, Shri Sradhakar  
 Suraj Bhan, Shri  
 Tapuria, Shri S. K.  
 Thakur, Shri Gunanand  
 Tyagi, Shri O. P.  
 Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari  
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.  
 Vidyarthi, Shri R. S.  
 Xavier, Shri S.  
 Yadav, Shri Ram Sewak

## NOES

- Abraham, Shri K. M.  
 Achal Singh, Shri  
 Adichan, Shri P. C.  
 Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram  
 Aga, Shri Ahmad  
 Ahmad, Dr. I.  
 Ahmed, Shri F. A.  
 \*Ahmed, Shri J.  
 Anbuezhian, Shri  
 Ankineedu, Shri  
 Anthony, Shri Frank  
 Asghar Husain, Shri  
 Atam Das, Shri  
 Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri  
 Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha  
 Babunath Singh, Shri  
 Badrudduja, Shri  
 Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar

\*Wrongly voted for 'NOES'

- Bakshi, Shri Ghulam Moham-  
 mada  
 Banerjee, Shri S. M.  
 Barrow, Shri  
 Barua, Shri Bedabrata  
 Barua, Shri R.  
 Barupal, Shri P. L.  
 Basu, Shri Jyotirmoy  
 Basu, Dr. Maitreyee  
 Basumatari, Shri  
 Baswant, Shri  
 Besra, Shri S. C.  
 Bhagaban Das, Shri  
 Bhagat, Shri B. R.  
 Bhagavati, Shri  
 Bhakt Darshan, Shri  
 Bhandare, Shri R. D.  
 Bhanu Parkash Singh, Shri  
 Birla, Shri R. K.  
 Birua, Shri Kolai  
 Bist, Shri J. B. S.  
 Biswas, Shri J. M.  
 Bohra, Shri Onkarlal  
 Bose, Shri, Amiyana  
 Bramhanandji, Shri  
 Burman, Shri Kirit Bikram  
 Deb  
 Buta Singh, Shri  
 Chakrapani, Shri C. K.  
 Chanda, Shri Anil K.  
 Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna  
 Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri  
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri  
 Chatterjee, Shri N. C.  
 Chatterji, Shri Krishna  
 Kumar  
 Chaturvedi, Shri R. I.  
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh  
 Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar  
 Chavan, Shri D. R.  
 Chavan, Shri Y. B.  
 Chittybabu, Shri C.  
 Choudhary, Shri Valmiki  
 Dalbir Singh, Shri  
 Damani, Shri S. R.  
 Dange, Shri S. A.  
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas  
 Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.  
 Deiveekan, Shri  
 Doeghare, Shri N. R.  
 Deshmukh, Shri B. D.  
 Deshmukh, Shri K. G.  
 Deshmukh, Shri Shivajirao S.  
 Dhandapani, Shri  
 Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri  
 Dinesh Singh, Shri  
 Dixit, Shri G. C.
- Durairasu, Shri  
 Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar  
 Ering, Shri D.  
 Esthose, Shri P. P.  
 Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri  
 Gandhi, Shrimati Indira  
 Ganesh, Shri K. R.  
 Ganga Devi, Shrimati  
 Gautam, Shri C. D.  
 Gavit, Shri Tukaram  
 Ghosh, Shri Ganesh  
 Ghosh, Shri P. K.  
 Ghosh, Shri Parimal  
 Girja Kumari, Shrimati  
 Gopalan Shri A. K.  
 Gopalan, Shri P.  
 Gopalan, Shrimati Suseela  
 Gounder, Shri Muthu  
 Govind Das, Dr.  
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit  
 Gupta, Shri Lakhan Lal  
 Hajarnawis, Shri  
 Haldar, Shri K.  
 Heerji Bhai, Shri  
 Hem Raj, Shri  
 Himatsingka, Shri  
 Iqbal Singh, Shri  
 Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas  
 Jadhav, Shri V. N.  
 Jaggaiah, Shri K.  
 Jagjiwan Ram, Shri  
 Janir, Shri S. C.  
 Jamana Lal, Shri  
 Janardhanan, Shri C.  
 Jha, Shri Bhogendra  
 Jharkhande Rai, Shri  
 Kahandole, Shri Z. M.  
 Kalita, Shri Dhireswar  
 Kamalanathan, Shri  
 Kamble, Shri  
 Kamla Kumari, Kumari  
 Kandappan, Shri S.  
 Karan Singh, Dr.  
 Karni Singh, Dr.  
 Kasture, Shri A. S.  
 Kavade, Shri B. R.  
 Kesri, Shri Sitaram  
 Khadilkar, Shri  
 Khan, Shri Latafat Ali  
 Khan, Shri M. A.  
 Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali  
 Khanna, Shri P. K.  
 Kikar Singh, Shri  
 Kinder Lal, Shri  
 Kiruttinan, Shri  
 Kisku, Shri A. K.  
 Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
- Krishna, Shri M. R.  
 Krishnamoorthi, Shri V.  
 Krishnan, Shri G. Y.  
 Krishnappa, Shri M. V.  
 Kuchelar, Shri G.  
 Kureel, Shri B. N.  
 Kushok Bakula, Shri  
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati  
 Lalit Sen, Shri  
 Laskar, Shri N. R.  
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati  
 Lutfal Haque, Shri  
 Madhukar, Shri K. M.  
 Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.  
 Mahajan, Shri, Vikram Chand  
 Maharaj Singh, Shri  
 Mahato, Shri Bhajahari  
 Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh  
 Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini  
 Malhotra, Shri Inder J.  
 Mandal, Dr. P.  
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad  
 Mane, Shri Shankarrao  
 Manoharan, Shri  
 Maran, Shri Murasoli  
 Marandi, Shri  
 Master, Shri Bhola Nath  
 Mayavan Shri  
 Meghachandra, Shri M.  
 Melkote, Dr.  
 Menon, Shri Govinda  
 Menon, Shri Krishna  
 Menon, Shri Vishwanatha  
 Minimata Agam Dass Guru,  
 Shrimati  
 Mishra, Shri G. S.  
 Misra, Shri S. N.  
 Modak, Shri B. K.  
 Mohammad Ismail, Shri  
 Mohammad Yusaf, Shri  
 Mohammed Sheriff, Shri  
 Mohsin, Shri  
 Muhammad Ismail, Shri M.  
 Mukerjee, Shri H. N.  
 Mukne, Shri Yeshwantrao  
 Mulla, Shri A. N.  
 Murthy, Shri B. S.  
 Nahata, Shri Amrit  
 Nair, Shri N. Sreekanth  
 Nambiar, Shri  
 Nanda, Shri  
 Narayanan, Shri  
 Nayanar Shri E. K.  
 Nirlep Kaur, Shrimati  
 Oberoi, Shri M. S.  
 Oraon, Shri Kartik  
 Pahadia, Shri Jagannath

Palchowdhuri, Shrimati Ila	Rao, Dr. V. K. R. V.	Shastri, Shri Ramanand
Pandey, Shri Sarjoo	Raut, Shri Bhola	Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani	Reddy, Shri G. S.	Sher Singh, Shri
Pant, Shri K. C.	Reddy, Shri Ganga	Shinde, Shri Annasahib
Pakai Haokip, Shri	Reddy, Shri M. N.	Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri
Parmar, Shri D. R.	Reddy, Shrimati Sudha V.	Shukla, Shri S. N.
Partap Singh, Shri	Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila	Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
Parthasarathy, Shri	Roy, Shri Bishwanath	Sidayya, Shri
Patel, Shri Manibhai J.	Roy, Shrimati Uma	Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
Patil, Shri C. A.	Sadhu Ram, Shri	Singh, Shri D. V.
Patil, Shri Deorao	Saha, Dr. S. K.	Sinha, Shri Mudrika
Patil, Shri N. R.	Saigal, Shri A. S.	Sinha, Shri R. K.
Patil, Shri S. B.	Sait, Shri Ebrahim	Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
Patil, Shri S. D.	Sulaiman	Sivasankaran, Shri
Patil, Shri T. A.	Salcem, Shri M. Yunus	Snatak, Shri Nar Deo
Pradhani, Shri K.	Salve, Shri N. K. P.	Solanki, Shri P. N.
Prasad, Shri Y. A.	Samanta, Shri S. C.	Somasundaram, Shri S. D.
Puri, Dr. Surya Prakash	Sambandhan, Shri S. K.	Sonar, Dr. A. G.
Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shaffi	Sambhali, Shri Ishaq	Sonavane, Shri
Radhabai, Shrimati B	Saminathan, Shri	Subravelu, Shri
Raghu Ramaiah, Shri	Sanghi, Shri N. K.	Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
Rajni Devi, Kumari	Sankata Prasad, Dr.	Sursingh, Shri
Rjaram, Shri	Sant Bux Singh, Shri	Suryanarayana, Shri K.
Ram, Shri T.	Satya Narayan Singh, Shri	Swell, Shri
Ram Dhan, Shri	Savitri Shyam, Shrimati	Tarodekar, Shri V. B.
Ram Sewak, Shri Chowdhary	Sayeed, Shri P. M.	Thakur, Shri P. R.
Ram Swarup, Shri	Sayyad Ali, Shri	Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Ramabadran, Shri T. D.	Sen, Shri A. K.	Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Ramamurti Shri P.	Sen, Shri Dwaipayan	Tripathi, Shri K. D.
Ramani, Shri K.	Sen, Dr. Ranen	Tula Ram, Shri
Ramji Ram, Shri	Sethi, Shri P. C.	Uikey, Shri M. G.
Ramshekar Prasad Singh, Shri	Sezhiyan, Shri	Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra
Rana, Shri M. B.	Shah, Shri Manabendra	Umanath, Shri
Randhir Singh, Shri	Shambhu Nath, Shri	Verma, Shri Balgovind
Rao, Shri Jagannath	Shankaranand, Shri B.	Verma, Shri Prem Chand
Rao, Dr. K. L.	Sharma, Shri Madhoram	Viswanatham, Shri Tenneti
Rao, Shri K. Narayanan	Sharma, Shri Naval Kishore	Viswanathan, Shri G.
Rao, Shri Muthyal	Sharma, Shri Yogendra	Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra
Rao, Shri J. Ramapathi	Shashi Bhushan, Shri	Yadab, Shri N. P.
Rao, Shri Thirumala	Shastri, Shri B. N.	Yadav, Shri Chandra Jeet
	Shastri, Shri Ramavatar	Yadav, Shri Jageshwar

MR. CHAIRMAN: The result\* of the division is : Ayes : 140; Noes : 306.

*The motion was negatived.*

**KHUDA BAKHSH ORIENTAL  
LIBRARY BILL—Contd.**

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION  
AND YOUTH SERVICES (DR. V.K.R.V.  
RAO): I move that we may now resume

further consideration of Kudha Bakhsh Oriental Public Library Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We may take it up tomorrow. The House shall stand adjourned till tomorrow.

21.40 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, November 18, 1969/Kartika 27, 1891 (Saka).*

\*The following Members also recorded their votes :

**AYES :** Sarvashri K. Kamaraj, Abdul Ghani Dar, Pashabhai Patel, Shri Chand Goyal, N. Sanjiva Reddy, J. Ahmed and Shrimati Gayatri Devi.

**NOES :** Sarvashri Swaran Singh and K. Anirudhan.