12 NOON

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

RBPORTED WITHDRAWAL OF TRADING LICENCES OF THE PEOPLE OF INDIAN DESCENT IN AFRICAN COUNTRIES

MR. CHAIRMAN : Without reflection against any party or any leader of the different affiliations certainly not any reflection towards the Swatantra party, I would like to make an appeal to Members in connection with Calling Attention matters that they should ask about clarifications of matters rather than make speeches. There is a tendency to make speeches instead of asking for clarifications. I would beg of hon. Members, I would appeal to Members of all the sections of the House to remember this fact and try to remember this always when they get up and not lose themselves by making speechees. This is for leaders, Members and everyone including myself. Mr. Patel.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat) : Sir, I rise to call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the report that people of Indian descent, traditional shopkeepers in many parts of Africa, are being stripped of their trading licences and asked to hand over their business to Africans and thereby forced to quit Africa.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH) : Sir, as the House is aware, some countries in East Africa are trying to ensure tbat their nationals play an increasing part in the control and development of their economy. With this objective in view, these countries are taking legislative and other measures to restrict the role of aliens in commercial and industrial activities. This question has been discussed on the floor of this House in the past also.

According to our information, about 3,000 British passport holders of Indian origin in Kenya will be affected in the first half of 1969 by the restrictions imposed by the Government of Kenya on renewal of trade licences to foreigners. Further, according to information received by the Government, about 700 licence holders of the same category arc likely to be affected by similar measures adopted by the Government of Zambia recently. The Government of Uganda is also reported to be contemplating some steps for giving preference to their own nationals in the issue of trade licences and certain categories of jobs. Tbe number of persons who are likely to be affected by these measures is not known. With a few exceptions, the persons likely to be affected by these measures are holders of British passports.

As the House is aware, in the case of Kenya an arrangement was entered into with the Government of United Kingdom on July 27, 1968 under which that Government has agreed to give endorsements on the British passports of persons of Indian origin ensuring them the right of entry into the U.K. The Government of India on their part agreed to provide visas to such persons who are compelled to leave Kenya and who desire to come to India for permanent settlement.

As has been made clear on earlier occasions, we feel that the people of Indian origin settled overseas who hold British passports are primarily the responsibility of the Government of the United Kingdom. We have always impressed this upon the U.K. Government. The Government of India on their part have been giving and will continue to give, on humanitarian and compassionate considerations, such facilities as are possible to persons who are compelled to leave the countries of their domicile.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Is the Government aware that recently the Government of Zanzibar has asked the people of Indian origin, even though they hav$_e$ taken Zanzibar citizenship, to hand over all the title deeds of their properties to the Government before 28th of this month and whether this does not mean practically confiscation of their properties ? We have heard the reiteration of the Government's stand on this matter repeatedly in this House

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel]

and repeatedly we have told the Government that they have given bad advice to the people, that the Government of India has failed to protect the people of Indian origin and that they are in this predicament because of the bad advice given by the Government of India and what does the Government think of doing now and whether this matter was raised by the Prime Minister at the recent Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference ?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRl DINESH SINGH) : The hon. Member is aware that we have had a number of occasions to discuss this matter and we shall have an opportunity to discuss this. It is difficult to go into a complicated matter like this in reply to a question but so far as the Government of India is concerned, their position has been made very clear. The people of Indian origin are people who have been living in the foreign countries where they have had property, and where they have been working. The choice was clear to them whether they would wish to continue to live there. If they wished to continue to live there, then they will be citizens of those countries or as aliens or perhaps they would wish to come to India. About those who wish to come to India, I do not recollect our having placed any restrictions on the coming back of Indians there. So far as those who were to live in those countries are concerned, the option was clear, whether they would wish to adopt the nationality of that country or whether they would live as aliens. Of course it has been our advice to them that if they wished to live in a particular country, they must be willing to take their due place as citizens of that country and as such if they acquired the citizenship of the country, they would have a direct stake in the country but it is a matter for each individual to judge and decide what he would wish to do. About those who are citizens of the country, I feel it would be quite wrong of us to interfere in tie internal affairs of a country by talcing any special interest beyond what may be necessary on human grounds which has been mentioned because it will then create complications and we shall be held responsible for discrimination. They will be discriminated for looking beyond their borders for any protection. So far as those who are Indian citizens are concerned, we naturally try to protect their interests recognising the fact that each country has a right, when its own development has been held back by colonialism, to have an accelerated basis of development and to show special interest to the development of its own nationals. We have done so in our country, we have also tried to Indianise and given more facilities for the development of our industries and what we have done in this country is naturally something which we are not in any way regretful about. So far as the people who hold British passports are concerned, we have been impressing on the British Government—because there is a danger of their large-scale uprooting—that the British should take the responsibility for its own nationals and try to act in their interests and this again is on humanitarian grounds.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Tamil Nadu) : I would like to know from the Minister whether the representatives of Indians in England and also the Immigrants' Committee in London met our Prime Minister recently during her visit to the Commonwealth Conference ? Did they place before her any specific suggestions and whether the suggestions have been forwarded to the Ministry for examination ? I would like specific answers from the Minister.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I am afraid I cannot offhand answer this. I am sure the Prime Minister met some people of Indian origin and also Indian citizens in the U.K. but what representations they have submitted is not readily available with me here.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : I can help the Minister because there is an important point in this. Some time before, one of the British Ministers, I believe it was the British Foreign Minister, had made ^a statement in the House of Commons which has been published in the Hansard, that if Indian citizens

are thrown out from any country, if they are being sent out from the original country and if they go to some other country and they are expelled, then the British Government would not stand in their way to come to Britain.

So th$_e$ Indian representatives who met our Prime Minister suggested to her that they must be taken to India and afterwards expelled from there so that they can come back to England based on the assurance of the Foreign Minister. That was a specific suggestion given to our Prime Minister. I wonder whether that suggestion has been forwarded to us, to our Government, for examination.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I am afraid the hon. Member has mixed two issues. This does not concern the Indian citizens as such; for the Indian citizens their home is India and they are always free to come here.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : I am talking about the Indians who are holding British citizenship.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : Then they are British citizens.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Therefore we should not tend to confuse these issues because this is where the whole complication arises, when we tend to confuse the issues about nationality and origin. Now so far as the agreement, so-called agreement, my friend has been talking about, is concerned—he says that there has been an assurance given by the British Government—to people in Kenya who wish to come to India we have said that we shall give them visas to come here provided Britain also gives an assurance that there wiH be no restriction on their going back to the U.K., because they are holding U.K. passports, and we do not want that there should be discrimination against people of Indian origin and that they should be forced to corae here when they hold foreign nationality. It was on that ground that this does not concern Indian citizens as such.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): We are glad that the present Government of India has still some humanitarian attitude towards certain things left yet, and it is because of that, as th$_e$ External Affairs Minister said, they have allowed people of Indian origin holding British passports to come to India. It is no fault of theirs because they wanted to relieve the population pressure in India and therefore they went abroad to earn something. That way they relieved the Government of India of th$_e$ population pressure and the Government of India must be thankful to them. Now, Sir, the question is that having conceded that they have a humanitarian attitude towards them and they allow them to come, and they having lost all their immovable property because of the order of the Zanzibar Government to surrender everything that they had in the immovable property that they had, now, whatever movable property they wanted to bring in, they are prepared to pay the customs on it, but I am told that the Government of India is making it a condition that whatever they bring in here from those countries must be surrendered to the State Trading Corporation herei—another surrender, it is a surrender there and a surrender here. Is it a fact that they have been asked to surrender every movable property even after paying th$_e$ customs duty on it, to give it to the State Trading Corporation and get some compensation for it ? Is that so ? And if that is so, can anything be done to remedy this particular predicament of theirs ? **And** number two, may I know whether it is a fact that two of these representatives wanted to meet Mr. B. R. Bhagat in company with a Member of Parliament, a Member of this House, and that Mr. Bhagat said that he had no time to meet even Members of Parliament in this connection ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Sir, so far as the earlier question is concerned, I ask the hon. Member to give some thought to it himself and say whether any Government—and certainly not this Government—would ask a person coming back to India to hand over all tis immovable property, his clothes and

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

everything. Now can anybody be expected to hand over all his movable pro-' perty to the S.T.C? Now the whole question has been that some people coming over to India brought their stock-intrade; they brought certain goods which they wished to sell here; they brought some machinery, and there, so far as I recollect, some criteria were laid down. If it was a machine that they were going to use here directly for their business, that was permitted. If it was a stock that they could easily dispose of and it was in connection with their trade, that was allowed. But some of them brought over large slocks including certain items which were of a sensitive nature and which if sold would fetch, them high profits, and therefore we said that those items which would give undue profits should be sold in this country through the State Trading Corporation and they should get reasonable remuneration for them. And that was arranged.

SHRI M. K. MOHTA (Rajasthan) : May I ask the hon. Minister whether a study has been made by the Government of the steps taken by the British Government in respect of the holders of British passports who were white men apart from the holders of British passports who were of Indian origin ? It has been reported in the press that the British Government has made an offer to the whites that if there were any immovable property left behind by such persons, against such immovable property they would be compensated in England. Are the Government of India thinking of taking any such steps in respect of people of Indian origin in India because, even though they may be holders of British passports, they do have some affinity with us, and whether it is on humanitarian grounds or any other grounds, it is our duty to help such people.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: And that is what I said, Sir, that on humanitarian grounds we were helping them. So far as paying compensation and other things is concerned, that is a slightly different matter, because that will involve certain payments and it will also set in motion certain trends which may create more difficulty for those who are already there and are trying even in somewhat difficult conditions to continue to say and make a living there. But we have on a number of occasions informed the House of the measures that we have taken to give assistance to those people who have come to India and I think, by and large, those people who came to India have been able to find some rehabilitation.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : (Nominated) : Sir, while I must congratulate the new Foreign Minister on the clarity with which he has given the elucidations, there is one matter on which I would like to put a question to him again. This matter in Africa is not going to end where it is today. More and more countries which become independent, zealous of their own internal interests will push out our people. Now is it possible at some proper time for the Ministry of External Affairs to convene a conference in Africa where this question can be discussed and a general policy laid down, so that once it is laid down we know where we stand ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: There is the whole point in this question; the hon. Member mentioned 'our people'. Are we willing to accept the responsibility for all people of Indian origin settled all over the world ?

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : No.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : And if we are willing to accept that, we can convene any conference anywhere. But the question in all these conferences and other tends to create an impression that we are going to do something. It raises false hopes. It makes their own absorption and working there difficult, and I would beg of the hon. Members to give some thought also on humanitarian grounds whether it would be desirable to disturb a pattern that is being set there.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra) ; Sir, as has been rightly pointed out by the External Affairs Minister, with the new countries which have become free national tendencies are developing and naturally, one day or other, in the case of our countrymen who have settled abroad, tbe question of rehabilitation will come. But in this connection I want only to plead for them and make some suggestions for their benefit, on which I would like to know the views of the Government. Apart from rehabilitating and helping our nationals coming from abroad—that we will do; they are our own brothers—the other point is that in the case of those who have settled abroad, they must be educated how to absorb themselves mentally in the newly rising free countries. There is the difficulty. From what I learn from certain persons residing in Africa, in Kenya, in Zanzibar, there the Africans have a feeling that Indians are not behaving properly towards them. That is why may I know whether the External Affairs Ministry has got any programme with them whereby our countrymen who are residing there would be properly educated to respect the new freedom achieved by those Africans and mix with them on equal footing and take them into confidence in their usual and routine behaviour and in commercial transactions ?

A

SHRI DINESH SINGH: I take it that the hon. Member is referring to Indian citizens abroad. So far as the question of Indian citizens is concerned, they are aware of our policy and also of our desire to respect the newly won freedom of the African countries, and it is their desire to develop their countries rapidly. And we have on a number of occasions tried to bring to their notice that they must be willing partners and live jn friendship there and not attempt to exercise any rights, which may give an impression of domination, and our Missions in those countries take particular interest to keep in touch with our citizens and others and give them advice as and when they seek it. L5RS(Py69—4

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh) : I would like to know whether the Government has considered the possibility o'f this kind of situation arising in countries other than Africa also because persons of Indian origin are all over the world right from Hong Kong to Gibraltar. I would also like to know whether the Government raised this question at the recent Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference and sought from Britain some kind of an assurance with regard to such problems if and when they arose because apart from the fact that they are of Indian origin, ultimately these people do look up to India for support in their predicament. Therefore I would like to know from the Government what they would do in case some of these people like to take Indian citizenship and return to India as Indian citizens and whether the Government would encourage them to come back because that would also mean some kind of foreign exchange accruing to India.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : So far as Indian citizenship is concerned, that is governed by law and those who are entitled to claim Indian citizenship can do so. We place no restrictions on that. So far as the question of encouragement is concerned, would the hon. Member honestly consider it desirable for us to give encouragement to people who have settled in foreign countries, who have made a living and who have got adjusted to a certain pattern that we must consciously make an efTort to bring them back to our country? I think it is this kind of statement that creates quite a lot of problems for those people in those countries. I think what is essential is for us to accept that many years ago a number of our people very close to us, even today, emotionally went out of the country to make new livings abroad. They have made a living there and if many of them have now to readjust themselves to new conditions why should they not be able to readjust themselves to new conditions ? Those who come into any special difficulty we can look at it but highlighting arid bringing up this matter and talking of all sorts of difficulties

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

creates in their mind a doubt; should they stay there and face these difficulties ?

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : The difficulties have already arisen.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : And it is in this context that we have to look at this problem. Let us try to help them by discussing this among ourselves but not talking about it in a manner which would create difficulties for them.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI: Sir, he has not answered my question as to whether this problem was raised in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : To my mind the whole question is, it is for those people to make an adjustment where they are living. This has nothing to do with the Commonwealth Conference.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : Not that we are inviting these people to come to India. If these persons of Indian origin are thrown out from those countries I would like to know what steps the Government is going to take to secure adequate compensation for them from those countries from which they are thrown out either directly or through the British Government. I know it is the moral and legal responsibility of the British Government to give these people of Indian origin who hold British passports all protection and in view of the fact that stringent immigration laws are being passed by the U.K. and they are not welcoming—even though it is their responsibility—these persons of Indian origin who are thrown out of Africa to settle down in the U.K., may I knew whether the Government of India is going to bring pressure on Great Britain to see that their responsibility is discharged failing which they should pay adequate compensation to them so that they can be settled in India ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Sir. this time I am seeking your protection. This is exadtly what I have been saying. As the hon. Member has suggested to we become the self-appointed guardians of all people of Indian origin all over the world? This is exactly the kind of approach that has created this problem.

SHRl DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Yes: we must be.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: The hon. Member may but I do not think that we should do so. This is what is creating all the trouble. Tt is really for them to ask. This is the kind of problem that gets created if we want to become the self-appointed guardians. Let those people raise those questions. If they need our assistance on humanitarian grounds and that sort of thing, we shall give it. But if we start like this and create the impression that we are going to look after all people of Indian origin wherever they are, then they will all get disturbed in those countries. Their countrymen will begin to doubt them as to whether they are looking for a future, in those countries or whether they are looking for our interference, and I would beg of the hon. Members to bear in mind that they are already passing through difficulties; let us not try to create more difficulties for them.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: We are not creating difficulties. The point is, the British Government is evading its responsibility, is escaping its responsibility, to provide protection to those persons of Indian origin who are thrown out of Africa and is it not our duty to see that they are protected ?

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI: Sir, I am amazed at the hon. Minister's answer. He says that the Commonwealth Conference is not concerned about this but this problem is nothing but the problem of the Commonwealth. This is the creation of the Commonwealth.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I did not say that. If the hon. Member would only carefully listen to what I say perhaps all these doubts will be removed

I

ibut because he has already thought of something he would not listen. I said to my mind this question is a matter .of adjustment between the people living in those countries and their colleagues and I would place more emphasis on that than on discussions in the Commonwealth.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: He is avoiding an answer.

डा० भाई महावीर (दिल्ली): मैं विदेश मंत्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि जब वह यह कहते हैं कि हमारी कोई लीगल रिस्पांबिलिटी नहीं है तो क्या वह बिल्कुल एक टेक्निकल ग्राउंड के पीछे अपने आप को छिपाने की कोशिश नहीं कर रहे क्योंकि जो लोग भारतीय आरिजिन के हैं, इंडियन आरिजिन के हैं, वह भारत की तरफ देखें और अगर दिक्कत के समय, कठिनाई के समय, किसी नैतिक सहायता की अपेक्षा रखें तो भारत सरकार क्या वह सहायता देने से भी संकोच करेगी। मुझे याद है कि कभी-कभी हमारी सरकार की तरफ से यह भी कहा गया कि पाकिस्तान में जो लोग रह गए उनकी भी मारेल रिस्पांसिबिलिटी या लीगल रिस्पांसिबिलिटी हम नहीं लेते। तो क्या सरकार यही दृष्टि ले कर चलती है कि जितने भी हमारे प्रवासी दूसरे देशों में बसे हैं उनकी कोई नैतिक जिम्मेदारी हमारी सरकार पर नहीं है? क्या सरकार यह नहीं समझती कि हमारी दुर्बल नीतियों के परिणामस्वरूप उन्हें सब कुछ भुगतना पड़ रहा है। एड्जस्टमेंट की बात विदेश मन्त्री ने कही, उन्होंने कहा कि एड्जस्टमेंट की बात है। जब दक्षिण अफ्रीकी के किसी देश में कुछ फ्रीडमफ़ाइटर्स फांसी पर चढ़ाए जाने लगे तो वहाँ पर हमने नैतिक सपोर्ट को हमेशा दिया, उसमें भी हम कह सकते थे।
It is a matter of adjustment between the hangman and those who are to be hanged.

लेकिन वहां पर हमने समझा कि हमारा कुछ नैतिक कर्त्तव्य है।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Dr. Mahavir, you are going against my appeal by making a speech. All others have gone on wonderfully and I am most grateful for the way they have put their questions.

डा० भाई महावीर : मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि इसमें सरकार अपनी नैतिक जिम्मेदारी क्यों नहीं समझती? प्रश्न नम्बर दो यह कि क्या सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में कोई अध्ययन किया है कि आने वाले वर्षों में कितने प्रवासी भारतीयों को अपने स्थानों से उखाड़े जाने की सम्भावना है और हम उनकी कोई सहायता अगर कर सकते हैं तो क्या कर सकते हैं? बर्मा से जब लोग उखाड़े गए तो हमारी जिम्मेदारी बन गई...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Again you are making a speech.

डा० भाई महावीर :... तो वहां के लिए भी बन सकती है।

श्री दिनेश सिंह : सभापति महोदय, माननीय सदस्य ने अभी यह कहा कि मैंने कहा है कि कानूनी कोई हमारी जिम्मेदारी नहीं है, आपके रिकार्डस मौजूद हैं, मैं चाहूंगा कि माननीय सदस्य कल खुद मेहनत कर के देखें कि कहां मैंने यह कहा। वह खुद अपने लफ्ज मेरे मुँह में डालना चाहते हैं और इसी तरह से दिक्कत आती है। यहां समझने का सवाल नहीं है कि मैं क्या कह रहा हूं और अपने शब्द माननीय सदस्य मेरे मुंह में डालना चाहते हैं। यह मैंने कभी नहीं कहा...

डा० भाई महावीर : आपने कहा ह्यूमेनेटेरियन।

श्री दिनेश सिंह: जरा आप सुनें। मैंने कभी यह नहीं कहा कि हमारी कानूनी जिम्मेदारी नहीं है और हमने शुरू से कहा कि ह्यूमेनेटेरियन ग्राउंड्स पर हम उनके लिए जो कुछ कर सकते हैं कर रहे हैं, फिर इसमें झगड़ा किस बात का है।

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : The hon. Minister has said that on humanitarian grounds we are trying to take interest. Now do these humanitarian considera-tions mean legal responsibility in the view of the Minister ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I should have thought it is more than legal.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : The hon. Minister for External Affairs has been taking a purely legalistic and technical line all along. Does he not believe that the question is not whether they hold British passport, Indian passport, Tanzanian passport or Kenyan passport ? All people are being persecuted because they belong to a different race, because they are Indians or Asians. Does he not realise ihat even those people who are of Indian origin and have legal passports are meeting the same fate ? In view of these things, can we take shelter under the legal thing and that we cannot do anything ? We did something in Burma and we got some relief for the people when they were driven away from Burma. We are having conference afier conference as regards our citizens in Ceylon and I think that it is proper. In this case I really fail to understand how the Government can say that they chose to be British citizens, they chose to be local citizens and they chose to be Indian citizens. If that is the situation, you cannot ihave any respect in the world. Indian people do feel about the treatment that our people are getting elsewhere. *{Interruptions).* If that is the situation. Indian people would not appreciate the stand taken by the Government. I feel that the Government of India should take a strict view. Otherwise, they will be failing in their duty. We are all great believers in Afro-Asian solidarity. Do you think that the action of these four or five Governments leads to solidarity? Can you persuade Indian people to have any sympathy for those who are driving out their people, not on technical grounds of this passport or that, but because they are Indians and they are Asians. The Government snould realise that this is the issue. May I know whether the Government will cease to have a persistently legalistic and technical view of it ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : The hon. Member is very much elder to me and 1 greatly value his advice. I have already indicated that where the need came, the Government took action to give assistance. Why should he doubt now that if there is any need in futute we will not do so ? But I do not hope that he expects me to function beyond tbe law. We are a legally constituted Government and we have to function according to law.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): I would express this opinion before I ask a question of the hon. Minister. As far as this question of persons of Indian origin in Africa is concerned, it is certainly delicate and the delicate question has been made more delicate by the fact that the persons of Indian origin have refused to integrate themselves—I am using a strong word in the African community. I fail to understand how persons of Indian origin, for example, in Kenya, could look up to Britain for passport and they really sought the UK passport, thus refusing to absorb themselves in Africa. Was it because they considered themselves to be a kind of Brown aristocracy side by side with the White aristocracy and thus they alienated themselves from the African community ? In any event, my question to the hon. Minister is this. Is the hon. Minister taking steps to induce the minds of these persons of Indian origin, if not directly, at least indirectly, wherever there may be our people in various parts of the world, that actually their fate lies with the people of the country where they have been earning their living and if they cannot absorb themselves, if they cannot integrate themselves wi5h the communities of those countries where they are making their living, they will render, themselves liable to great catastrophe and calamity ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : What am I to do? The hon. Member makes one suggestion and then the hon. Member

has accused me of making it, I leave it to the House.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): May I just explain this point? A distinction wiH have to be made between a legal responsibility and moral responsibility. Indirectly we might be causing injury to the interests of those who should identify themselves with those countries, whether it be Ceylon, whether they be African countries or any other country. There is an established international law. People have gone from the UK to Australia. Can they say they are all of British origin, if there is some difference of policy between Australia and the UK and that they should, support the UK Government ? Let us understand the international position. Neither by this debate we are folk

(haa ruptions I.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Will you kindly put a question ?

SHRl ARHAR ALI KHAN : i am just asking what is the international position regarding those who have established themselves in other countries i>izcns. That is No. 1.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Tamil Nadu): Is the hon. Member clarifying on behalf of the Government or asking for clarification ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : If you have any question for clarification, kindly put it.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : 1 am asking the hon. Minister to let me know what is the legal, international position regarding those who go out and establish themselves and acquire the nationality and citizenship of those countries generally.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I think he has explained his view quite well. Mr. Kaul.

DR. B. N. ANTANI (Gujarat) : Learned people have put their questions. How long should I wait ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : I made a promise that I will call you.

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated) : This should not be dealt with as a legal or constitutional question. Wherever the welfare of Indians and people of Indian origin is concerned, this House and I think the Government also is unanimous that it is Uic moral and humani-tarian duty of the Government of India to look after their welfare. There cannot be any dispute on this question and I do not think the Government have taken any other stand. I had occasion, in another capacity, to see some papers and I think the hon. Minister will'please consider my suggestion to lay on the Table of the House all the representations the Government of India have made to the Kenya Government all these years. It will speak very well of the Government of India. They have done all that is possible. Perhaps that is not published by the Government of India for diplomatic reasons. The real trouble is with the Government of Kenya. The Government of India have told them, have represented to them. The House should apply its mind and the Government should apply its mind as to what is to be done in such a situation. They have represented everywhere, at the Commonwealth Conference, and in every other place, where this question has been raised. They have done their utmost to put forward the Indian case, but the trouble is that the Government of Kenya has turned a deaf ear. What is to be done ? That is the problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN : He has already answered it.

DR. B. N. ANTANI : I am one of those who appreciate the difficulties of the Government of India in this ' very delicate question, with which I have been associated for the last sixty years. Possibly the hon. Foreign Minister was not born on that day. I am happy today that we .have got a Minister who has, from one step to another, gone to the top of the ladder so far as the Foreign Ministry is concerned. So, he knows the question. I will, therefore, ask him one question about Indians, particularly in Zanzibar and Kenya. Is *it* not a fact that when some of the Indians visited last month—the question put by

[Dr. B. K Antani]

my friend, Mr. Lokanath Misra, was not properly understood—when some representatives of the Indian National Association of Zanzibar of which I have been President for forty years—visited Delhi during November they wanted to see the hon. Foreign Minister, Shri Bhagat, who was refused even to enter the cottage or house or the palace of my friend, Mr. Jomo Kenyatta ? He was not available to meet us. Then we enquired for the hon. Deputy Minister. He was on tour and he was not available. Then we went to some Section Officer. With the technicalities of a Pandit he started quoting to me some articles. The question was this. There is; a notice by the Government of Zanzibar asking all Indians—whatever my learned friend says, Indians of Indian origin, Indians of Indian nationality, Indians who have accepted their citizenship, it is a broad question—to surrender their title deeds of all immovable properties up to 28th February. We know fully well that with all their lip sympathy the Government of India will ultimately be able to do nothing because they have not done anything, they have not got the will; they only show lip sympathy "we are with you"; if I weep, the Prime Minister begins to weep with me; that is the ultimate of it. Knowing that fully well we found out a solution. I proposed that those people whose properties would be ultimately confiscated virtually and would be given no compensation—I am a poor man; I am a simple man; I cannot think of international organisations, etc., etc.; if I brought some stocks here and pay you duly, shall I be allowed to dispose of thoae stocks in the open market ? I was denied that. I must submit to the mightiest of the mighty and the corrupt of the corrupts, the State Trading Corporation. Why is that ? That is number one.

The hon. Foreign Minister has been in the past very sympathetic. When ihere was Zanzibar revolution, he went out of his way. He took personal pains. He showed sympathy with us and those who brought Zanzibar cloves were allowed some sort of facilities whereby those poor creatures were able to rehabilitate themselves. This is denied to them today. I ask one question. One man called Mr. Jatta, who was a refugee from Kenya, came here three years ago and he wanted to rehabilitate himself in Delhi. The hon. Minister of Information and Broadcasting and the hon. Prime Minister herself wanted to help him and ordered 1000 T.V. sets Ior our broadcasting system. The poor man brought them here and tbe result was that Rs. 5 lakhs had been locked up up to now and he is not yet paid on account of ihe redtapism and other complications. In view of all this what shall T say and how many calling-attention notices shall I give, except weeping at your doors ? I made some practical suggestions. I had asked a few questions in this House. At that time the External Affairs Minister had no information. Three months after I got one paper in which information was given in which the External Affairs Ministry had admitted immense loss of properties, that millions and millions had been lost. Will the hon. Foreign Minister instead of being agitated and trying to weep with me see one thing that their High Commissioner in Dar-es-Salaam is a supine creature, that he does not help them ?

SHRI, DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : He has always been like that.

DR. B. N. ANTANI : Not only that but he hardly can visit or ever visits Zanzibar. I would not weep that way. What happened ? I myself met my friend, the Deputy President of Tanzania, Dr. Karume. He said, "Your High Commissioner never comes here, never visits me". Then I requested the Government of India to create a post because Zanzibar is a separate State which has for certain purposes merged with Tanzania. I requested that there should be at least one Deputy High Commissioner, Resident High Commissioner, to help the Indians in Zanzibar.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You have stated enough of the troubles of the Indians, You put a question.

DR. B. N. ANTANI : Now I will ask my questions. I will be very brief. Firstly, will the hon. Foreign Minister, in view of their plight, allow them to bring their stocks and dispose of them in the free market ? Secondly, will the hon. Foreign Minister enquire in the Information and Broadcasting Ministry and see that the case of the poor man who has been suffering for the last three years is expedited ? Thirdly, what has happened about appointing a Deputy or Resident High Commissioner in Zanzibar who can be in day-to-day contact with the suffering few that have remained there ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I am grateful to the hon. Member for Ihe kind references he made about me. I can only say that I shall be very happy to discuss all these matters with him.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश): श्रीमन्, थोड़ी सी हम को कंफ्यूजन है । इस सरकार को और प्रश्नकर्ता को सुनने के बाद और इंडियन ओरिजन सुनते-सुनते में परेशान हो गया हूं।

श्री दिनेश : भारत मूलक कहिये।

श्री राजनारायण : क्या सरकार को और जो प्रश्नकर्ता महोदय हैं उनको यह पता नहीं है कि विश्व में जितने प्राणी हैं .... जब मैं प्रश्न कर रहा हूं तो मिनिस्टर को इधर-उधर बात नहीं करनी चाहिये और मेरी बात को सुनना चाहिये ।

श्री दिनेश सिंह : सुन रहा हूं।

श्री राजनारायण : पहले पार्लियामेंटरी एटीकेट जानिये। श्रीमन्, यह पार्लियामैन्टरी एटीकेट नहीं है कि जब हम प्रश्न करें तो मिनिस्टर बात करें।

श्री दिनेश सिंह : सभापति महोदय, माननीय सदस्य मुझ से बहुत बुजुर्ग हैं लेकिन मैं उनसे पहले पार्लियामैन्टेरियन हूं।

जनारायण : जरा समझ लिया जाय। संसदीय प्रश्न जो जानता है वह नहीं कह सकता है कि मैं पहले से पार्लियामैंटेरियन हूं। लोक-सभा या राज्य-सभा का मैम्बर होने से कोई पार्लियामैंटेरियन नहीं हो जाता है। असम्बली का मेम्बर होने से भी कोई पार्लियामैंटेरियन हो सकता है। वे पार्लियामेंट में हम से बाद में आये और वे अभी बच्चे हैं।

MR. CHAIRMAN : You put a question.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : He is a blue-eyed boy of Nehru.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि मनुष्य का मूल एक है और यह बात पहले समझ ली जानी चाहिये। चाहे कोई मनुष्य जर्मन हो, भारतीय हो, कोई अफ्रीकी हो या किसी देश का हो, पहले मनुष्य का मूल एक है, यह बात श्री दिनेश सिंह जी को अच्छी तरह से समझ लेनी चाहिये। मनुष्य का मूल एक है, इस बात को समझ कर सरकार को उत्तर देना चाहिये। अब सवाल यह है कि सभी मनुष्य एक हैं और नारी तथा मर्द मानव समाज में हैं।

श्री दिनेश सिंह : एक नहीं अलग, अलग है।

श्री राजनारायण : अगर दिनेश सिंह जी नहीं मानते हैं तो उन्हें भारतीय दर्शन का ज्ञान समझना चाहिये। भारतीय दर्शन या कोई भी दर्शन हो, अगर आप ध्यान से पढ़ेंगे तो मूल एक है।

"नारी एक पुरुष दुइ जाया
बूझ पंडित ज्ञानी,
पाहन फोरि गंग एक निकली,
चहुं दिशि पानी पानी ।"

तो एक नारी और एक पुरुष के योग से सारा मानव समाज बना है ।

श्री ए० जी० कुलकर्णी : राजनारायण जी, अंग्रजी में इसका मतलब समझाइये ।

श्री राजनारायण: नारी और पुरुष से ही सारा मानव समाज बनता है, यह बात सब को समझ लेनी चाहिये। अब ओरिजनल की बात हो गई। अब प्रश्न यह है कि जो भारतीय मूल है क्या उनको भुलाकर अफ्रीकन मूल ले लिया जाय। अब प्रश्न यह है कि जब ब्रिटिश साम्राज्य छिन्न भिन्न होने लगा तो अफ्रीका में जो भारतीय मूलक लोग रहते हैं, सरकार ने उन्हें सलाह दी कि आप जहां हो वहां के नागरिक बन जाओ या फिर ब्रिटिश नागरिक बन जाओ। अब सवाल उठेगा, कहां। श्री दिनेश सिंह के दिमाग में उठे या उनके पैर में उठे, लेकिन सवाल उठा है। ये कहते हैं कि यह एक बड़ा कम्पलीकेटेड मैटर है और इसमें एडजस्टमेंट करना होगा। इस समय जंजीबार और केनीया में जो वहां के नागरिक हैं, वे वहां 28 फरवरी से हटाये जा रहे हैं और उनकी सम्पत्ति छीनी जा रही है और इस तरह से वे त्रिशंकु बन गये है। वे आकाश में और ज़मीन के नीचे त्रिशंकु बन कर लटकेंगे या उनकी समस्या का कोई समाधान होगा। श्रीमन्, मैं आपको बिल्कुल स्पष्ट कहना चाहता हूं कि मैं तो विश्व की नागरिकता का कायल हूं। मैं तो चाहता हूं कि हर नागरिक विश्व का नागरिक हो। विश्व की नागरिकता जब तक नहीं चलेगी ऐसे सवाल चलते रहेंगे। विश्व का नागरिक समान होगा। जब वहां पर कामनवेल्थ कान्फ्रेंस हुई थी और प्रधान मंत्री वहां गई थीं तो प्रधान मंत्री का परम पुनीत कर्तव्य यह होना चाहिए था कि जो इस तरह के प्रश्न हैं, मानवीय कहो···

MR. CHAIRMAN : I quite understand. I am one who believes in a World State. There is no question about it. You and I agree. Now, I want you to make a suggestion. Otherwise, you go on making a long speech how we can rebuild the whole world.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं आ रहा हूं सुझाव पर। पहले विषय समझ लें, विषय क्या है तो सुझाव समझें। प्रधान मंत्री महोदया जब वहां गई थीं तो इतने अहम प्रश्न को उन्हें उठाना चाहिए था। चाहे यह मानवीय प्रश्न कहा जाय, चाहे संवैधानिक प्रश्न कहा जाय, चाहे विश्व का एक अंग कहा जाए, मगर यह प्रश्न है, कीनिया जंजीबार से लोग हटाए जा रहे हैं, अब उनकी समस्या का समाधान कौन करेगा अगर वे इंडियन आरिजिन नहीं भी हों तो। आज इंडियन आरिजिन की जो परिभाषा की जा रही है उसको मैं पसन्द नहीं करता। जो कहीं का आरिजिन नहीं, जो कहीं का सिटीजन नहीं, वह सब इंडियन आरिजिन हो जाय। जो कहीं का सिटीजन नहीं वह इंडियन सिटीजन है, मूल में डाहया भाई जी यही कह रहे हैं। मैं यह मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूं। भारतवर्ष में ही देखा जाय। बिहार को ले लीजिए। जो आदिवासी क्षेत्र में गए हैं उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार के लोग उनको वहां के आदिवासी दिक्कू कहते हैं, हमको दिक करने के लिए आए हैं, उनको वह हटाना चाहते हैं। वैसे ही जो भारतीय अफ्रीका में दिक्कू बनेंगे···

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Rajnarain, I tell you, you have already taken ten minutes. Kindly put the question. In fact, I would like to tell you this. Already 22 Members have taken part in this. T am going to refer this matter to the Business Advisory Committee for it to say what it is that I have to do— where five names have been put in, whether I have to allow all those Members. 1 am going to put it to the Committee. And this is an example where nothing can be done. A Calling Attention Motion becomes almost a debate and goes on for two hours. I think I may have to suggest that in half an hour a Calling Attention Motion has to he over; I will also see how best wc can restrict the number of speakers. T am only allowing this as a trial and error method. I can be as soft as butter but I can also be as hard as steel. But I am going to refer this question *io* it. It has become impossible for me. In the matter of questions, we have nicely come to a conclusion that more than 10 minutes are not to be taken tip for any question. That is going on all right. And

this matter also should be decided. I am exercising as much patience as possible in trying to give an opportunity to many. But this will not occur hereafter.

श्री राजनारायण : अच्छा, श्रीमन्, आखिर में मैं सुझाव कह देता हूं आपकी आज्ञा को शिरोधार्य करके। अब सवाल आएगा कि किसके पास इतनी शक्ति है, कौन किसको निकाल सकता है। तो मेरा मुख्य रूप से यह सुझाव है कि यह सरकार फौरन एक-दो दिन के अन्दर अंग्रेज सरकार से जाकर कहे, जो इस समय कामनवेल्थ की सर्वेसर्वा बनी हुई है कि जो भारत के मूलतः रहने वाले लोग थे, जिनको नागरिकता प्राप्त होते हुए भी 28 फरवरी को हटाया जा रहा है, उनकी सम्पत्ति, उनकी जान और माल की हिफाजत करे, वरना भारत सरकार, सभ्य होने के नाते और अपनी इज्जत को रखने के लिए, इतना तो आगे बढ़े कि कामनवेल्थ से अपना नाता तोड़ ले क्योंकि यह सहन नहीं किया जा सकता कि हम कामनवेल्थ में रहें और हमारे मूलतः भारतीयों की, जिनका प्रश्न एक मानवीय प्रश्न है और विश्वव्यापी प्रश्न है, ऐसी दुर्गति हो। एक मनुष्य की कहीं भी दुर्गति हो उसको बर्दाश्त नहीं करना चाहिए, चाहे इंडियन आरिजिन मानें या न मानें, भारतीय सिटीजन मानें या न मानें। लेकिन जब वहां के सिटीजन होने के बाद भी उनकी सम्पत्ति छीनी जा रही है, उनको रहने की जगह दुनिया में नहीं मिल रही है तो हम अगर भारतवासी हैं और वास्तव में भारतीय संस्कृति और सभ्यता को जानते हैं तो दुनिया में जितनी अधिक से अधिक ऊंचाई पर जाकर इस सवाल को उठा सकते हैं हमें अविलम्ब उठाना चाहिए।

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

AUDIT REPORT (CIVIL), ON REVENUE RECEIPTS, 1968 (IN HINDI)

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI): Sir, on behalf of Shri Morarji Desai, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of ihe Audit Report (Civil), on Revenue Receipts, 1968 (ia Hindi). [Placed in Library. *See* No. LT—297/69].

THE CINEMATOGRAPH (CENSORSHIP) SECOND AMENDMENT RULES, 1968

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI : Sir, on behalf of Shri Satya Narayan Sinha also, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 8 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952, a copy of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting Notification G.S.R. No. 2191, dated the 5th December 1968 (in English), publishing the Cinematograph (Censorship) Second Amendment Rules, 1968. | Placed in Library. *See* No. LT—297/69]

STATEMENT SHOWING THE ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON THE VARIOUS ASSURANCES PROMISES AND UNDERTAKINGS

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI : Sir, 1 also beg to lay on the Table, on behalf of Shri Raghuramaiah, the following statements showing the action taken by Government on the various assurances, promises and undertakings given during the sessions shown against each :— (i) Statement No. XI—Fifty-eighth Session, 1966.

(ii) Statement No. XII—-Sixtieth Session, 1967.

(iii) Statement No. VIII—Sixty-second Session, 1967.

(iv) Statement No. VII—Sixty-third Session, 1968.

(v) Statement No. V—Sixty-fourth Session, 1968.

(vi) Statement No. IV—Sixty-fifth Session, 1968.

(vii) Statement No. II— Sixty-sixth Session. 1968.

{*See* Appendix LXVII, Annexure Nos. 14 to 20.)

TWENTYFOUR™ REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS (1968-69)

SHRI NAND KISHORE BHATT (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I beg to lay