

Castes and Scheduled Tribes for the posts of Assistant Executive Engineers are as under:—

	Reserved for Candidates	
	Scheduled Castes	Scheduled Tribes
A. E. E. (Civil)	6	3
A. E. E. (Mechanical)	3	1

(b) On 6th December 1967, the Commission had called for interview 16 candidates belonging to Scheduled Castes and one belonging to Scheduled Tribes for posts of Assistant Executive Engineers (Civil). Of these, 10 Scheduled Castes and one Scheduled Tribes candidates actually appeared at the interview.

(c) One candidate belonging to Scheduled Castes was selected out of those interviewed on the 6th December 1967. An offer of appointment has been issued to this candidate.

†KHAN ABDUL GHAFFAR KHAN'S WILLINGNESS TO SETTLE IN INDIA

111. SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan has shown his willingness to settle down in India if the Government of India invites him; and

(b) if so, the reaction of the Government of India thereto?

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI-MATI INDIRA GANDHI): (a) and (b) Government have seen only press reports quoting the views of some people in this regard. The question of reaction does not arise.

†HOSTILE ACTIVITIES BY MIZOS

114. SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that hostile Mizos are operating from Maimi and Kachalong situated inside East Pakistan and forcibly collecting money from Mizo villages within India; and

(b) if so, what is the number of protests made by the Government of India to the Government of Pakistan regarding facilities provided by Pakistan for training and equipping Mizos, Nagas, Khasi and other hill people of our Eastern frontier region and providing them with a military base for their hostile operations against India?

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI-MATI INDIRA GANDHI): (a) It is a fact that a number of camps have been set up in the Chittagong Hill Tracts District of Pakistan, where Myani and Kasalong areas are located for imparting military training to Mizo hostiles. Recently, an armed gang of hostile Mizos operating from this area also looted at gun-point some cash and clothes etc. from the shopkeepers of a small bazar in Tripura.

(b) Between March 1966 and August 1967, ten protest notes have been sent to the Pakistan High Commission at New Delhi.

12 Noon

MR. CHARMAN: Calling attention to a matter of urgent public importance. Shri Dahyabhai Patel.

SHRI DHAYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujrat): Sir, with your permission . . .

PERSONAL EXPLANATION BY  
SARDAR SWARAN SINGH RE.  
KUTCH

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): Mr. Chairman, I only wanted to point

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

out that a question has gone on record but that you were good enough to pass on to the next question. No opportunity was given to this side to explain our viewpoint. He made certain allegations. We are accustomed to hearing all types of allegations from him, but when he makes a specific one I wish that we are also given an opportunity to put forward our viewpoint.

SHRI DHAYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): In view of what the hon. Minister has said, may I clarify the position?

HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI DHAYABHAI V. PATEL: I was referring to what has appeared in the Statesman of this morning where specifically it is stated:—

“At the height of the crisis in April/May 1965, the late Mr. Shastri was kept in the dark about the existence of the Swaran Singh Sheikh agreement of 1960 for the arbitration over Kutch.”

My question related to this positive statement that appeared in the Statesman of today. Will the hon. Minister let us know whether this is a fact? It is because of this agreement we have been let down and our case has become so weak as regards the Rann of Kutch.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Now that he has asked it, you will, Sir, permit me to explain it very briefly. Sir, for anybody to say that Shastriji was kept in the dark or Shastriji did not know things that were happening in the country is extremely unfair, to say the least, both to the intelligence and capacity of Shastriji, as also the functioning of the Government.

SHRI DHAYABHAI V. PATEL: Shastriji admitted this later.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I know that you can feel excited, but

after all the excitement, you should have some patience to listen to us also. I am accustomed to this type of pinpricks, but you should have some courage to hear when things are said which go home.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: We hear you every day.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: About the earlier agreement he has said that Shastriji was kept in the dark and his only quotation was from what appeared in a newspaper. I think that the leader of a responsible parliamentary group should base his information on something more solid than just what appears in a newspaper report. I say it with all the earnestness at my command that Shastriji was, in fact all of us were, and I was a party to it. I am not running away from it. I am not pleading any alibi. I stand by every word. I am a party to it and I am not one of those who try to shirk responsibility. That is not the attitude in which I approach these problems. These are serious matters involving international considerations and complications. We should view it in the proper perspective and not get excited over it. I say it in all earnestness that nothing was kept secret from Shastriji and no one could keep anything secret from Shastriji. The second thing is that the agreement, about which the hon. Member says that it was kept a secret from him, was actually placed on the Table of the House. It was a public document, not a secret either from my friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, if he does his home work, or any other man. One who depends only on the morning newspaper to put a question and does not go through the Hansard or the record of the proceedings of Parliament is certainly not entitled to bring in anger and to bring forward an absolutely childish allegation which is an amateurish way of dealing with such a complicated issue. Here is a matter with which we have been grappling for a long time and it is wrong to say that either in the matter

of acceptance of the principle of a tribunal to settle any dispute of a border nature or in the matter of accepting the substantive question of Kutch as a dispute, I did anything by way of a departure from a policy which had been pursued for over ten years before this was actually signed as a document. I would like to remind Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, if he has got any sense of reason and responsibility left in him, to go through the parliamentary record. Panditji, after his talks with Prime Minister Noon—when Prime Minister Noon visited India—made a statement on the floor of the House and it is very interesting that people forget these things and memory is very short particularly when one is excited and does not go through these matters clearly. Now, this is what Panditji said, on 12th September, 1958 in Lok Sabha, in response to a calling attention notice on the result of talks held between the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan on September 9/10, 1958. This is about the future consideration. This was very long before the agreement which is bothering Mr. Dahyabhai Patel so much . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It should bother you.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: It says:

"We though and we still think that the best course to decide any remaining matter, which cannot be decided by talks between ourselves is to refer it to some independent party/tribunal to decide, because there is no other way. Either we come to an agreement ourselves or ask somebody else to advice and we will accept whatever decision is arrived at, whether it is in our favour or against us. For the present . . ."

This is important:—

"For the present the Pakistan Prime Minister was not agreeable to this being done in regard to this particular matter, but the matter is open for consideration. In our

statement that has appeared in the press it is said that these matters are reserved for future consideration between us."

So, it is a wrong thing for Mr. Patel to merely rise and put a question and we do not have an opportunity to reply to all such innuendoes, which strongly resent.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश): श्रीमान् सुना जाय। मैं एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। मैं यहां पर सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों को बताना चाहता हूँ कि मैं इस समय स्वर्ण सिंह के डिफेंस में खड़ा हो रहा हूँ, मगर स्वर्ण सिंह जी ने जो हाफ-ट्रुथ कहा है उसने मेरा संबंध नहीं है, स्वर्ण सिंह जी का बयान इस सदन को गुमराह भी करता है यह एग्जामेंट मेरे पास है।

"In January, 1960 it was agreed by the Prime Ministers of the two Governments . . ."

HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

(Interruption)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will not allow it.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, आप एक पक्ष को कहेंगे कि वह पूरी प्रोसीडिंग पढ़ दें और सदन के लोग गुमराह रहे (Interruptions) हल्ला मत कीजिए, देश का रक्षा कीजिए, इमोशन में मत आइए।

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may bring it later, but not now. I only allowed Sardar Swaran Singh to give a clarification.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: When later?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may refer to it some time later, but not now.

श्री राजनारायण : इस पर डिस्कसन होना चाहिए। उसके स्वर्ण सिंह जी की बात नहीं है, यह पूरी गवर्नमेंट की बात है, नेहरू जी की जानकारी में लाल बहादुर जी की जानकारी में यह मालूम आया, 1960 के एग्जामेंट पर दस्तखत हुए।

MR. CHAIRMAN. I will take up the calling attention notice. Mr. Dahyabhai Patel.

**CALLING ATTENTION TO A  
 MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC  
 IMPORTANCE**

**REPORTED EXPULSION OF INDIANS FROM  
 KENYA AND OTHER STATES OF EAST  
 AFRICA**

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Sir, with your permission, I rise to call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the reports appearing in the press that thousands of Indians are being forced to leave Kenya as a result of alleged discriminatory laws passed by the Government of Kenya recently and similar developments in other States of East Africa.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH): Mr. Chairman, there are approximately 370,000 persons of Asian origin in East African countries comprising Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania of which there are about 10,700 Indian nationals. The Government of India is not aware of any mass migration of Indian nationals from any of the East African States although recently some people of Indian origin with British citizenship/passports have been moving out from Kenya to U. K.

2. In consequence of the Kenya Immigration Act of 1967 all residents who are not citizens of Kenya are required to take out work and residence permits. An extension of the Immigration Act is a new law licensing all trades and restricting non-citizens to trade in certain items and in certain areas. No such developments has, however, been reported from other East African States.

3. The majority of persons of Indian origin in Kenya are engaged in

retail trade mostly in textiles, clothing and grocery. The community has been extensively engaged in this trade both in cities and towns and in rural areas. On achieving independence Kenya Government gave two years to persons of Indian origin to take up Kenyan citizenship if they so desired. Most of them have, however, continued to retain U. K. Citizenship and are thus subject to those regulations which seek to legislate against aliens being employed in jobs which are capable of being performed by Kenya citizens. Neither the Immigration Act nor the Trade Licensing Bill affects those persons of Indian origin who have taken up the citizenship of Kenya.

4. The Government of India have in the past given permission to persons of Indian origin who have felt obliged to leave their adopted countries, to settle in India and have in some cases, extended certain customs facilities to them. They will be prepared to consider any future cases on the same basis although they hope that those Indians who have settled abroad will adjust themselves to the changing circumstances in their countries of adoption.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Sir, is the hon. Minister aware that this question has been agitating Members of the House for the last many years? I myself put a question in August 1966 and I followed it up by several other questions. The Government's answer was a complacent one that Indians are not experiencing difficulties. Is the hon. Minister aware that people in Zanzibar had to leave their homes and hearths and everything in two minutes and were told, "This is the compensation you are getting take it or leave it; if you want to go, you go." This is the treatment that is being given to Indians elsewhere also in other parts of East Africa. In the face of this, how can the Minister say that he is not aware of the difficulties? Is it not a fact that in this House and in the other