

workers and the union become another contesting party. Suppose the Managing Director feels that the law and order situation has deteriorated. Earlier, it was the duty of the General Manager to inform the local police, to seek the help of the State Government, to seek the help of the police, and they were to come there and take charge of the law and order point of view. They were not to intervene in the trade union dispute itself. Now, in this case, the entire Force will be deployed at the disposal or under the control of the General Manager or the Managing Director. And there is every likelihood, every possibility. I say with all the emphasis at my command that the General Manager who is a party to the dispute will be entitled to use a huge force which is at his back and call to demoralise, to intimidate, to terrorise and to harass the workers. That being the case, if the Government is really serious about the protection of the property, then what they have got to do with the General Manager? Why should the Force be controlled by the General Manager, the employer of the underfaking itself. The Government is interested in the matter of protecting the property of the undertaking. I think even a General Manager may be charged with corrupt practices—he may be in collusion—or theft. There are so many instances in public sector undertakings that the managerial staff connived at pilferages and thefts. Therefore, in the matter of protecting the property of the industries themselves, why should the Manager or the Managerial staff have the privilege of controlling the entire staff of the Central Government? Why should the Inspector-General of Police, why not other responsible officers control the operation of the Central Security Force?

(Interruption by Shri Bhupesh Gupta)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: By 3 o'clock he must finish. He is speaking on his amendment. I have sought your co-operation. Now that will do.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: There is another point....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should also know the time. You must finish your point.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: One minute..

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Basu has finished with his amendment.

The question was proposed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now I am speaking.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will speak on the amendment later. It is now 3 o'clock. We now move on to the Short Duration discussion. It will go on up to 5 o'clock.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION RE NEW IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION PROPOSED TO BE ENACTED BY THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dahyabhai Patel will speak first. On the list we have got names, Swatantra 2, Congress 6 and others. Mr. Dahyabhai Patel will get ten minutes. The rest will get 5 to 7 minutes each. At 4-45 p.m. I will call on the Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: (West Bengal): On a point of order.....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chairman has allotted 2 hours. I want Mr. Dahyabhai Patel to speak for ten minutes and the rest for 5 to 7 minutes each. At 4-45 the Minister will reply.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not a Calling Attention Notice. We, the Opposition, should get all the two hours.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why should we come to this sort of discussion? You must co-operate with the Government Business also. Now some further information has come. Mr. Bhagat will give that information.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): I have just received information from the U.K. High Commissioner that Mr. James Callaghan, British Home Secretary, declared in the House of Commons last night—I quote:

"If a man was thrown out the country and ejected from his work, we shall have to take him. You cannot do anything else in the circumstances."

This is what he has said in regard to the persons who may be thrown out of Kenya. I raised this question with him.

He is further reported to have said—I quote:

"The figure of 1 500 to be allowed into Britain had been arrived at on the basis of the normal inflow of Kenyan or East African Asians. But it is clear that there is no figure written into the Bill and I think it is right that no figure should be written into. The purpose was not to have a rigid quota."

This is the information.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is your reaction? What did you tell them?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now let him start.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Madam, I am grateful to you for giving me permission for changing this Calling Attention Notice into a Short Duration discussion. This is a matter which certainly merits the attention of this House and I am glad to see that a large number of Members have signed to call the attention of the Government to this issue. I

am sorry it is because of the Nehru policy that such a situation has arisen otherwise why should so many Members of Parliament get together to wake up this Government from its slumber? This is not a new thing. This thing has been going on for years. I have been personally asking questions in this House since I came here about the treatment to Indians in East Africa and the callous indifferent attitude of the Indian Government. Our Ambassadors there, our High Commissioners there have been sent there, to do one thing, to do propaganda that Nehru was a great man. They have been utterly indifferent to the difficulties of Indians always.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): It is very unfair. My friend may not agree with the Policy of Mr. Nehru....

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: You need not interrupt me. Sit down.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: . . . He was the acknowledged leader of this country and he has passed away. To refer to him like this . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I will say that. I repeat it with all the emphasis at my command that this is as a result of the policy that this Government has adopted over these issues. It is not only the High Commissioners in Nairobi alone, it is all over. Go round the world and you will see that nobody speaks for Indians. What is the condition of Indians there?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): Was not he a great man?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Even from England, from the country which is enacting this legislation, there have been bold, great citizens who are conscious of the great injustice that is being done to the Indians in this matter. Today's 'Hindustan Times' says:—

"The Bishop of Woolwich the Reverend John Robinson, one of Britain's most prominent Anglican clergymen today announced his resignation from Prime Minister Harold Wilson's Labour Party in protest against the Commonwealth immigrant law"

This shows the attitude of some bold people in Britain itself. But here for so many months and years we have to go on shaking up this Government to make them alive to their responsibility.

Madam this is something strange. Even in the British Parliament there are certain Members who have got up and said that it was the policy of the British Government that resulted in so many people going away to Kenya; they were responsible for the Indians going to Kenya. They used them as hewers of wood and drawers of water. When they did not get the co-operation of the local people—the local people for their own difficulties for historical reasons, were afraid. They were not qualified enough—they used the Indian population. That is the historical background that is forgotten. And on demand of Indians of course we took the lead for their release from colonial domination all over the world. But after that left the people to their own fate. It was very wrong to say that these people of Kenya are citizens of Kenya and they can do what they like. We should not have forgotten them and our responsibility towards them. (*Interruptions*) Madam, I would not like to be interrupted. I have got only ten minutes.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Allir relevant.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Madam, people from India have been going some officially, some unofficially. Many Congressmen, including the present Prime Minister, have gone. She has accepted rich gifts and costly presents and even money for the elec-

tions. But when the time of crisis comes when these people are in difficulty, they are even afraid to say what we say about all other countries. We are very willing to condemn bombing in Vietnam but we are not prepared to say that it is wrong to leave the people in lurch. What is our High Commissioner in Kenya doing? What is our High Commissioner in London doing? Is the High Commissioner in London there only to look after the orders from here? Is it not a part of his duty to look after the conditions of Indians? Is it only the duty of young Naveen Patel, a youth of 25, to hire planes and transport them to Britain? What is the Government or the Air-India or the High Commissioner in Britain doing? It is complete bankruptcy of statesmanship that Indians are being hounded out not only from East Africa but from everywhere in the world. It is all due to the bankrupt Nehru policy successively followed that we are not respected anywhere.

Madam, the Minister made some statement that there is some change in the British policy. Well, it is a little soft offer to us. He himself told us that there are a hundred thousand Indians in Kenya. What about others in East Africa, Kampala in Tanzania, Zambia and Zanzibar where people were asked to leave their homes at two minutes' notice; they were asked to get out because the Prime Minister was to stay there. They said, "All right. This is your property. All right, take so many bags of clothes." Madam, two years ago I personally intervened and asked some of the Ministers to at least allow them to come with those clothes or whatever they were allowed to bring. But then the State Trading Corporation came forward and said, "We will take all these clothes and sell them." When people are coming in this condition, penniless with just their clothes on these greedy Government officials want to deprive them even of clothes. They have already been plundered there. Now the greedy officers of the Government want to plunder them

(Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.)
here. This I say is the wrong attitude of this Government, the mistaken Nehru policy that has resulted in this. This whole policy must be changed. Indians all over the world are respected because Gandhiji showed us the way of non-violence and showed to the world how to attain freedom through non violence. But after that . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: But Mahatma Gandhi said that he was his successor . . .

(Interruption)

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am not yielding. Sit down. I can also shout. (Interruption) Sit down, sit down

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You cannot ask me to sit down.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Madam, you ask him to sit down. I am not going to be shouted down . . . (Interruption) Sit down.

We are respected all over the world because we showed to the world the way of attaining freedom through non-violence. But where is that respect to-day? Under the Congress, Nehru regime we are bankrupt, we are without clothes, without food. We cannot even protect our people. We have not even the courage to say one word for our own people who are flesh of our flesh and blood of our blood. This is the Government we have got to-day. This act itself is a condemnation of the whole Government of India in the eyes of the world, before the tribunal of the world. And we are not even prepared to raise it in the United Nations. What is this? What have we come to? They are our people. They are not other people's people. If they are other people's people, we have to raise it in the council of the world. Why can't we raise it? It is because nobody cares for us. We have taken such a role. To-day we are here. Tomorrow we are there. Like a rolling stone that gathers no mass, nobody takes care of us. Only recently I

pointed out that some Congress Members went on a joy ride to Kenya. I asked them "Have you got anything to say? Have you given any report to the Government?" This is a matter of recent occurrence and they should tell us; we should know about it.

SHRI SANTOKH SINGH (Delhi):
On a point of order.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: This fact was not unknown. It was known that this Bill to tighten restrictions was coming before the British Parliament. It is not a new thing. It has been going on for some months, if not years. And we have been trying to raise our feeble voice against it. It has culminated in this situation, for which nobody else but our Government, our Government that has let us down, is responsible.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Suresh Desai.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI (Gujarat):
Madam Deputy Chairman, . . .

DR. GOPAL SINGH (Nominated):
What are we discussing? Are we discussing Nehru's policy? . . .

(Interruption)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Desai.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: Madam Deputy Chairman before I offer my remarks on this subject most important matter. I must congratulate Mr. Bhagat for the competence with which he has carried on negotiations with the High Commissioner, the forthright statement which he has made to-day and the most healthy attitude that the Government of India have taken up in this matter. Madam, this measure is an unprecedented one, that persons holding British nationality, British citizenship, should be denied entry into Britain. As the House will remember, when Kenya became independent, persons of Asian origin, mostly persons of Indian origin, were given three options—to take up Kenyan citizen-

ship, to take up Indian citizenship or to take up British citizenship. And quite a number of them, a large number of them, opted out for British citizenship because that would give them certain more advantages than their taking up Indian citizenship. So I want to tell my friend that it was they who opted out . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: On the advice of your Government.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: ...when they were given a clear choice . . . (In *interruption* by Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel) I am not yielding, as you did not yield. Sit down, I am not yielding.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. I don't think this kind of passion should enter into this debate. Therefore, I appeal to both sides. Do not interrupt, listen to each other whatever one has to say. After that let the Minister reply. This excitement will lead us nowhere.

DR. B. N. ANTANI (Gujarat): The new Congress Members are more zealous, more orthodox than the original people.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: I do not want to hear your remark, Mr. Antani. So I was saying that it was they who opted out for British citizenship because it brought them certain advantages. But certainly I do agree that this is an unprecedented measure, that people holding British citizenship should be denied entry into Britain. And we are concerned with it because we are a member of the Commonwealth and because we are freely allowing entry to Commonwealth citizens without a visa. That is why we are concerned with it. Now this position was made clear in the British Parliament when Sir Dingle Foot asked the Home Secretary Mr. Callaghan.

"Do the Government not appreciate that it is a very grave matter to interfere with the legal rights of

Her Majesty's subjects who are citizens of the United Kingdom from colonies and who are holders of United Kingdom passports? Have not the people concerned relied upon these rights ever since 1963?"

Here Sir Dingle Foot was obviously referring to the solemn pledge given by Mr. Duncan Sandys, who was then a Cabinet Minister of Britain and Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, who was then high Commissioner of Britain in Africa. Mr. Callaghan replied:

"Yes, Sir, I think that this is very grave matter. It is for that reason that the Government has not rushed legislation on it. We have been watching the situation which has been building up very steadily for a number of months. This is a matter for very grave and earnest consideration. But the Government believe . . ."—and that is most important—"on balance that, whatever the difficulties of legislating, it would be less in the national interest not to legislate."

So Britain is looking after its own national interest and not that of the Commonwealth. This was one supplementary. Another supplementary was asked in the British House of Commons by Mr. Paul Rose of the Labour Party:

"In accepting the need for planning not merely in immigration, would my Rt Hon friend make it clear that, although there are to be limits on entry, these people will not ultimately be deprived of British nationality? This would be against conventions which this country has entered into."

And Mr. Callaghan replied:

"There is no intention to deprive these persons of British nationality. It will be a question, as it were, of forming a queue under which they may enter this country."

. [Shri Suresh J. Desai]

So the clear position, the unprecedented position, is that while they are holding British citizenship, British nationality, they cannot enter Britain. And the question of "queue" which Mr. Callaghan has mentioned, is not a "queue" actually. It is practically a stoppage, fifteen hundred a year is practically a stoppage. In reply to another supplementary, Mr. Callaghan said that he still believed that the right of these people of Asian origin in Kenya to apply for Kenyan citizenship still continued. We understand that this right expired in December 1965. I would like the hon. Minister to make it clear whether this right still exists or it has expired. If this right has expired, then the clear position is that they cannot enter Britain and at the same time they will be squeezed out of Kenya. Now where will they go? What is their position—Stateless people—*vis-a-vis* our country? That is the question which has to be answered. *(The bell rings)* Just one minute more. So this is a very unprecedented measure. We appreciate that they have got their own difficulties racial disharmony and all those things. But at the same time, as the "London Times" has remarked, it is a most shameless measure of the Labour Government. We are glad that the Government of India have taken up a most healthy attitude in the matter. They are carrying on negotiations and it would be a good thing if somehow or other we can get the number increased so that even if it is a little restrictive, it does not mean stoppage. The number should be sufficiently increased so that all people who are squeezed out of Kenya may be taken by Britain according to its solemn pledges. Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, this has two aspects, what they are doing in England, the British Government, and what we propose to do in this country in view of what is happening there.

[THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair]

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will begin by saying something about ourselves. The Congress leaders started the country's independence by worshipping the Mountbattens. We got Lord Mountbatten to squat on the banks of the Yamuna with crossed legs. We got Lady Mountbatten to wear a saree and we felt that all our problems were solved, between the British and the Indians or the people of Indian origin. But nothing of the kind happened. We are still hanging on to the British Commonwealth whereas much long ago we should have left the Commonwealth. It is not surprising, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that the statement of the Government of India does not show even that measure of indignation which has been shown in the 'London Times' which has called this measure a shameless measure. Nowhere you will find in the statement made by the Prime Minister such expressions are used or such sentiments are expressed, sentiments of indignation. Even in the British Parliament some M.P.'s are raising their voice in strong protest against this palpable racial discrimination but here we find that there is an attempt to speak softly and sweetly in regard to this matter lest our leader of the Commonwealth, the British Government, should be annoyed. I think this is not a correct approach. The Government's policy with regard to Indo-British relations is facing crisis after crisis and every time we are getting bitten. On the question of Kutch recently we got bitten; on the question of Indo-Pakistan war the British Government behaved in a particular manner. I can cite many other instances. Therefore I say that this Government must make up its mind and give up this kind of misplaced affection or loyalty towards the British Commonwealth.

As far as the British Government is concerned, it is quite clear that it is pursuing a policy of racial discrimination. Only last year in August for a few days I was in England and I met our Indian friends there, workers,

residents and students. Everybody told me "Compared to what was prevalent a few years ago, there is now a real drive inspired by the ruling powers in England and we are included in what they call 'black races' and racial discrimination is rampant, Indians are being assaulted, Indians are being ousted out of their jobs in certain places, Indians are discouraged in many ways and they are being harassed at the London Airport." And that is what is happening today. The same complaint is coming from others also and from certain people of Indian origin living in other African or Asian countries. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, we must know how the Indian High Commission is dealing with this matter. We find officials of the Indian High Commission, high-ups, going about in flourishing parties with the British in a shameless manner; they are behaving in a disgraceful manner and some top people in the British High Commission shamelessly go to the parties when the people of Indian origin are being persecuted and insulted. They do not have the guts to launch strong protests by boycotting such parties and so on. That is the position today. Therefore I say that you must take note of the manner in which the London High Commission is functioning. If you want to change this system, send some people who have lived in this country and who share the sentiments and urges of our people rather than running the show with a whole number of people, many of whom have not visited this country for the last 10 years or so. You must know that they do not understand anything. Mr. Vice-Chairman, before the War when I lived in England, what did I see? Some of my contemporary students are now in the High Commission very highly placed, and I have a feeling that they have ceased to be Indians at all. Their way of thinking, their posture in life, their attitudes in life are all British. They are now mentally enslaved people and with them we can never stand up to the bullies of the Whitehall. Therefore this is very, very important. We have to take

a firm attitude. I think after repeated experiences coming from the Whitehall it is time that we leave the Commonwealth. Now you find in the statement it has been stated by the hon. Minister that India is practically the only Commonwealth country that gives the right of free entry to British passport holders, irrespective of the country of their origin. It is a one-way traffic: it is being done unilaterally. The British also must behave with us in the same manner. Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is not a question of merely the people of Indian origin. They are our kith and kin and we must naturally have affection and sympathy. But the British Government there is adopting a policy of this kind against all people, Asian and African people whom they call black people. This Wilson Government is behaving in a most scandalous manner. Even in regard to the South Rhodesian regime, as you know very well, it is not taking steps which it should have taken long back. It has not used the Army which it was under obligation to do so when the Smith regime started this kind of naked racial discrimination. Nothing they are doing. Therefore I should like to know the policy of the Government of India. The people of Indian origin are subjected to this kind of racial insult and racial discrimination. It is an affront and insult to our heritage and to our nation. It does not matter which passport they hold. It is immaterial whether they hold a British passport or any other passport. Britain is pursuing a policy of racial hatred. They do it in a subtle manner. Nobody can beat the British in hypocrisy. What South Rhodesia is doing in a crude and vulgar manner, the British people do it under camouflage and false pretexts and under all kinds of false titles and pretensions. I think we should be very clear about it.

Therefore, we should first of all give an ultimatum to the British that unless they give up their policy of racial discrimination, we shall take retaliatory

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta] steps. Immediately the Government should withdraw all the advantages that are given to the British citizens who are of white skin. We do not believe in racial discrimination but they should know that we can also do something. They are enjoying certain advantages unilaterally. They should be told that unless they change the law, we will withdraw all those advantages. They should not merely give petty assurances. But they should change the law vitally and fundamentally to the satisfaction of the people of Indian origin and other people whom they call 'black races'. Otherwise, we shall also be passing counter measures and we shall do something more.

Finally, Mr. Vice-Chairman, we should give clear instructions to our High Commission as to what they should do or they should not do. We should meet this challenge on a social plane and boycott all the functions of the British. We should meet this challenge on a political plane by taking such steps which are open to us diplomatically. We should take certain economic measures. Here the British has got a lot of investment. They do not have many citizens here but Rs. 500 or Rs. 600 crores worth of private investments they have in this country. Let us also say that this will be nationalised and out of the nationalised funds we shall be compensating those people who are suffering in African and Asian countries as a result of the migration laws and racial discrimination. We should tell the British finally and clearly that their expenses will be met by nationalising the British industries, from out of the profits and the funds they have here. I think some concrete steps should be taken. I know that many Congressmen share the same feeling even if they may not make the same suggestion but I think this weak-kneed Government should show a little courage even after so much insult has been hurled at the people of Indian origin. Let us take it as an issue of fundamental rights, of human rights and agitate in the United

Nations also apart from the diplomatic steps that we may take and show that we stand against racial discrimination, no matter which race is affected by it adversely as a result of the immigration law.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. F. BHARGAVA): May I request hon. Members to cooperate with me? I can see the anxiety of hon. Members to express their views. Many Members will be able to express their views if hon. Members will limit their remarks to the time allotted and not exceed it and thus prevent others from speaking.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY (Madras): The whole thing is one of a human problem. The decision taken by the Government of the United Kingdom has created a condition of political implication, especially with regard to India because if many of the persons have to leave that country and go to the U.K., it is for utilising the passport which they are in possession of. If these people are denying Statehood to their own nationals, it would mean they are denying nationality to their own citizens, they being Commonwealth citizens. Therefore I would like the Minister to see, since it is a human problem and should be approached as a human right problem, that it is referred to the UNO for a decision thereon.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why do you want to be in the Commonwealth?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): I want to give this information that the House of Commons has just passed this Bill and has referred it to the House of Lords. Mr. Dahyabhai Patal had not a word to say against the British Government. All his words were against Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. This is effrontery *par excellence* which Mr. Patel has shown.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. F. BHARGAVA): Mr. Muniswamy is in possession of the House.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY: By allowing other Members to encroach upon my time, my time is being lost.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I will look to your time.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY: The situation that has arisen out of this is a grave one. Since they have made an encroachment upon human rights, it is a fit case to be referred to the UNO for their decision. It seems to be a reflection of the apartheid policy in South Africa. This is racial discrimination that is being practised by sending out lakhs of people from Kenya and the Kenyan people have become stateless in their own country. Many friends here are against getting those persons into India because they have already opted for British citizenship. I would request them to consider in this connection that originally they were all of Indian origin. We cannot forget them. We have to take them in case they do not keep them; otherwise, we will have to move the Kenyan Government to see that they are allowed one or two years to go to their country. Therefore I want the Minister to see that this problem is treated as a human problem and not to deal with it on a political basis.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is a shameless and hypocritical measure that the British Parliament is going to pass to-day. By to-day midnight the House of Lords is going to pass the measure. The Indians in Kenya will lose their privileges to-night. That is why we are all concerned and it is natural that we should be concerned but I may remind friends that Mahatma Gandhi was great not because he led the Indian independence struggle in this country but it is because he fought against racial discrimination and fought for the cause of Indians in South Africa at that time. Moreover I can remind my friends that even the British Government, when they were here, started the Indians Overseas Department only to protect the cause of Indians outside

India and that continued till we got independence but the moment we got independence, we forgot the Indian living in Africa or other countries. In 1927 because of the pressure of the movement led by Mahatma Gandhi in that country, our great Srinivasa Sastri was appointed the Agent of the Governor-General in South Africa only to protect the interests of Indians but I am sorry to say that the moment we attained independence, we have completely forgotten our Indian friends living in Africa or other countries.

In 1963 when Kenya attained her independence, when the Indians and Asians were given option to adopt the nationality either of Kenya or of India or of England, at that time our diplomats pointed out the advantages of British citizenship as pointed by Mr. Antani the other day. Our diplomats there advised the Indian citizens to take advantage of the position and to adopt British nationality and to accept British passports. We should not forget that in spite of the fact that they have adopted that nationality, we are always morally responsible for it and we have also compelled them to the situation. It is again the constitutional right of those Indians and Asians to go out from Kenya and try to go to England but there is one difficulty. Because England is not governed under a written Constitution they may not have the fundamental right in the sense that we have in this country. As a result of this, the British Parliament is more sovereign than our Parliament because they can break the law; they can make the law and they have the right to break the law also. That is why to-day the British Government has the courage to adopt this measure and pass a legislation which is, as I said, absolutely shameless and hypocritical. Also they are trying to provoke India and other countries to cut of the Commonwealth relationship that they are now having. I am glad that at least now when this question has arisen, the Government of India has started thinking about the matter but I will again say that to-day, before the

[Shri Banka Behary Das]

British Parliament passes that legislation, we must inform them: 'If you to-day pass this legislation without caring for the legal and moral obligations that you have for those Indians and Asians, then India will definitely consider to-morrow about cutting of the Commonwealth relation with Britain'. If we do not do that, then I will say that we are not doing our duty to the Indians who are living in East Africa and other countries. Only when we do that, the other countries who are trying to misbehave with Indians there will learn their lessons and try to behave, properly.

I may also say that whatever mistake we may have committed by abolishing the Indians Overseas Department which was concerned with looking after Indians not only in South Africa and East Africa but also in Mauritius, Fiji, Zanzibar and elsewhere, at least now the External Affairs Ministry should open a Department or should have a cell there so that wherever Indians are living overseas, their interests will be looked after so that the Indians either in India or outside will be living as dignified citizens in this world.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, this is a matter of not only political significance but also of legal and constitutional importance. Let us understand the matter very clearly. As a rule it is open to any independent country to make whatever laws it wants. The question comes in on two grounds, one on the basis that we are in the Commonwealth and the other, on human grounds.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: As Mr. Antani said, we wanted at that time that they should accept British passports.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Do you think we are asking for charity from the Britishers? Why should you try to humiliate the whole country?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Suppose we pass a law about the British . . .

(Interruption)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Gupta, will you resume your seat? Now I am on my legs. Will every hon. Member take his seat? I can quite understand the sentiments of this House on this question, but let us debate it gracefully. Let every Member put his views and it is up to any other Member to put forward his views. Let Mr. Akbar Ali Khan continue.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Dahyabhai Patel spoke, and Mr. Akbar Ali Khan now speaks, as if we should be apologetic and self-condemning. That is not the way.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You please listen. I have said that it is a legal question and I am saying that on the basis of the Commonwealth, on the basis of the passports that they have accepted . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is on the basis of British passports.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Yes. British passports. How can two speak at a time?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is also on the basis of the Human Rights Declaration.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Yes, I have said the substance of all that. The whole thing is that Mr. Chandra Shekhar and Mr. Bhupesh Gupta do not want to listen to me. If it is so, it is a different matter.

What I am saying is this. It is a very important matter and we feel very strongly about it. As a matter of fact, I was the person who suggested a two-hour discussion. But let us under-

stand the situation. My submission is that in this matter I am with many friends who say that when they have the Commonwealth passport they have the political as well as legal right and they must be allowed to become British citizens.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: On the basis of the British passports they are British citizens.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Yes, and as British citizens they cannot be refused. I was only developing that point. And the same view has been held by many parliamentarians belonging to Labour and other parties, even in the debates and the discussions that are taking place in the United Kingdom. What I want to emphasise is that now our Government must take this stand that as they hold British passports, on the basis of that commitment, the British Government should see that they are accommodated in Britain. Or they must negotiate with Kenya; until these people are all taken in England, if they want to do it under a phased programme, then the matter should be settled between Britain and Kenya.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What do we do here if nothing avails?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am coming. If at this stage you say that we will take them, neither Britain will take them nor Kenya will accommodate them. Let us understand this problem.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let us say that if they are in difficulty, we shall try to settle those people in this country. But in the meantime you take over the British industries here. Bring about the nationalisation of the British industries here. Let us take over the rehabilitation of those people and let it be a first charge on the nationalised British industries here. Make a constructive suggestion like this. Let us nationalise the British

industries here and let the rehabilitation of those people be the first charge on these nationalised industries.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: If they have got the right to pass such a law denying those displaced persons British citizenship we have got the right to forfeit their assets here and use them for the rehabilitation of those people. What is wrong there? Parliament can do it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Here is a constructive suggestion. Five hundred crores of rupees worth of British assets we have got. Nationalise them. And the whites will know what we mean. We shall meet the expenses of those people of Indian origin who have to come away from Kenya from the nationalised British industries.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, now Mr. Akbar Ali Khan is in possession of the House.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You listen to me. It is a matter of approach I am suggesting. I do not believe in abusing somebody. I am taking a certain stand and I am firm on the legal and constitutional aspect of the question as anybody else. But I want to appeal to the good sense of the British people.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Where is the good sense when the British Government has been pursuing this kind of naked policy of discrimination? You have been tolerating it all these twenty years. You bring on shame to this country by suggesting appealing to the good sense of the British people in this matter. There is no question of appeal to the British Government there. I would request you, Sir, to expunge those words.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): On a point of order,

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni]

Mr. Akbar Ali Khan raised the point of appealing to the good sense of the British Government. They have not only not got good sense; I say they have got no sense at all in this matter.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): There is no point of order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They have got criminal sense, the sense of a devil.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: My point is that the statement made by the External Affairs Minister...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I was also educated in the same University College, London, and I am surprised that Mr. Akbar Ali Khan has not learnt anything.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You continue, Mr. Akbar Ali Khan; you have one minute more.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: With all the interruptions only one minute.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I have taken into all that. One more minute.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I hope that at least for that one minute I shall not face any interruptions.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): May I request hon. Members not to interrupt him for one minute?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: My submission is that on the basis of the political stand and legal right the stand that the Government of India has taken should be followed up and followed up constitutionally, legally, politically and morally. I am one of those who feel that, if it comes to that, then we will reconsider the question...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am afraid he will not be accepted even as a copyholder in the London Times.

Even the *London Times* will not accept what he says. It will put the issue in a stronger language, more strong than the language in which it is put by an Indian citizen here, by a Member of this House.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am finishing. I want to tell you that I am second to none in condemning this legislation, but the way to get it through may be tactical, and I appeal...

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mere condemning will not do. Retaliatory measures should be taken if that law is enforced.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Yes, retaliatory measures; we will sever our connection with the Commonwealth, but let us now consider this matter in a realistic way.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): What is the realistic way?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am sure that the sentiments that are being expressed by this House will be conveyed to the British Government and British Parliament. How strong we feel on this question should be conveyed to them.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज कीनिया में रहने वाले भारतीयों का प्रश्न एक जटिल रूप धारण कर गया है। जब अंग्रेजों का शासन कीनिया में था उस समय लाखों हिन्दुस्तान के रहने वाले लोग वहां प्रत्यक्षपूर्वक ले जाये गये, अंग्रेजों के हित में काम करने के लिए। कीनिया के विकास में बड़े अनुभवशील टेक्नोशियन्स और बड़े अच्छे मजदूर लोगों ने पूरी मेहनत करके योगदान किया और आज जो कुछ कीनिया का रूप है आर्थिक विकास में जितनी कुछ भी वहां की स्थिति है उसका बहुत बड़ा श्रेय हम भारतीयों को है जो वहां पर जाकर रहे। अंग्रेजों के भारत

छोड़ने के बाद भी जो बराबर अंग्रेजों के साथ, कामनवेल्थ के साथ सम्बन्ध बनाने के उद्देश्यों के लोनों ने दिये आज उसका भी दुष्परिणाम सामने आया है । जो हम कहते हैं कि उस समय भारतीयों के सामने केवल कुछ आर्थिक हित थे इसलिये उन्होंने ब्रिटिश पासपोर्ट के लिये आग्रह किया—यह मैं समझता हूँ कि उनके प्रति अन्याय करना है । हम ब्रिटिश कामनवेल्थ में रखे जाने के लिये मजबूर किये गये और उसी का नतीजा था कि जब भी आना जाना था, बिना किसी रद्दाव के अंग्रेजों के इंग्लैंड में आने की व्यवस्था थी तब लोगो ने उसका लाभ उठाने की कोशिश की । अगर हमने उस समय ही ब्रिटिश कामनवेल्थ के साथ सम्बन्ध तोड़ दिये होते तो मैं समझता हूँ कि कीनिया के अन्दर रहने वाले भारतीयों को भी फैसला करने में कोई दिक्कत कोई दुविधा नहीं होती और वे अपनी राष्ट्रियता के प्रश्न पर बड़ी आसानी से निर्णय कर सकते थे । 1963 में वहाँ पर कंजरवेटिव गवर्नमेंट थी उसी कंजरवेटिव सरकार के लोगों ने वहाँ के रहने वाले भारतीयों को यह आश्वासन दिया था कि ब्रिटिश पासपोर्ट के आधार पर अंग्रेजों का पासपोर्ट लेने के उनके निश्चय से किसी भी प्रकार की हानि किसी भी समय उनको नहीं होगी । आज कीनिया में कीनिया लोगों ने जो फैसला किया है बाहर के लोगों को वहाँ की नौकरियों में से नकालने का, वह आज विवाद का विषय नहीं है । ब्रिटिश पासपोर्ट रखने वाले सारे लोगों पर जो परिणाम होना चाहिये था अगर इंग्लैंड ने उन सब की समस्या को एक तराजू पर तोला होता तो शायद समस्या यह रूप धारण नहीं करती ।

अंग्रेज जो दुनिया भर में मानवता और ह्यूमन राइट्स का दावा करता है, आज वहाँ अंग्रेज, पहले तो इंग्लैंड के कुछ बरोज और मुहल्लों में ही जातिभेद की नीति की जा रही थी पर अब इस बिना में यह कहा गया :

"substantial connection with Britain, for example, by birth or paternal parentage".

अर्थात् आज इंग्लैंड ने सरकारी तौर पर लोगों को रेजिडेंस का शिकार बनाने का फैसला किया है । इससे यह प्रकट होता है कि अंग्रेजों के मन में जो सब से घृणिता भावना आज तक थी, उसे उन्होंने अब प्रकट रूप से रखने का प्रयत्न किया है । आज यह मौका है कि भारत को अंग्रेजों की इस जातिभेद की नीति को, व्हाइट और नान व्हाइट में जो अद्विष्ट रूप से भेद करने का फैसला किया गया है, उसकी कठोर से कठोर शब्दों में निन्दा करनी चाहिये । आज उनके इस कार्य से, इस बिल के माध्यम से कीनिया के अन्दर भारतीयों की नागरिकता समाप्त होने जा रही है ।

भारत को स्पष्ट रूप से कहना चाहिये कि एक-एक भारतीय जिसकी नागरिकता सट में पड़ेगी तो भारत ने अंग्रेजों के साथ जो सारे सम्बन्ध रखे हैं, जिसको बनाम रखने के लिये हजारों किस्म के तर्क दिये गये थे, जिन सम्बन्धों को कायम रखने के लिये यहाँ पर पुरजोर वकालत की गई थी, ए - भी भारतीय इस कानून के अन्तर्गत वहाँ से निकलना है, तो एक भी भारतीय के सवाग्न अंग्रेजों के साथ कामनवेल्थ से सम्बन्ध होने के प्रश्न पर भी प्रश्नगाम पड़ेगा और यह सब इन सम्बन्धों पर बुरा परिणाम लायेगी । अंग्रेजों के सामने इस विचार को रख दें भारतीयों के इस प्रश्न को हल करना चाहिये ।

भारत सरकार को एक बार फिर से अंग्रेजी सत्ता के प्रमुख व्यक्ति को कहना चाहिये, आग्रह करना चाहिये कि किसी भी फ़ौजी में अगर वहाँ की पार्लियामेंट ने कोई भी कानून पास करने की हिम्मत की तो इनका बुरा परिणाम निकलेगा । अगर इंग्लैंड का हेड आफ स्टेट हिन्दुस्तान और

१ [श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

इंग्लैंड के परम्पर सम्बन्धों को बिगाड़ना नहीं चाहता है, तो इस कानून को पार्लियामेंट के द्वारा मंजूर कर लिये जाने के बाद भी मैं नी मंशरी देते समय उसे दस बार सोच लेना चाहिये क्योंकि अगर इस कानून का यही रूप रहा, तो इन सम्बन्धों पर प्रभाव पड़े बिना नहीं रहेगा और उसके आवरण में भारतीयों के अग्रेजों के साथ अपना नाति को निश्चित रूप से निर्धारित करना पड़ेगा।

SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to protest against the most despicable and dastardly Act of legislation that the House of Commons has passed. This Bill is most unashamedly racist and it shows clearly the mentality of the British Government and of the Labour Party. This House should take a serious note of the implications of this Act of the British Government for this country. There is nothing to choose between the racials in Britain and the upholders of apartheid in South Africa. They are of the same ilk and the sternest action is called for if we are to retrieve not only the honour of this country but also the interests of the citizens of Indian origin who are distributed all over Africa. These are the persons whom the British took from India to Africa. They used these people for their colonial exploitation and they fattened themselves on the labour of those people. And when they left Africa they gave them the solemn promise that they would become British citizens with all that it implied, with all the protection that the citizenship of any country implied. But now through this act of perfidy, these persons are being let loose in the whole world and the situation may well arise when they may be made state-less persons with nobody to look after them. All of us are greatly concerned and it is good that the Government of this country has taken some energetic action in this matter. But I will not hesitate

to say that the protest made by our Government in this respect has been feeble and halting. This is not a recent development. As early as October last, British Ministers were going to Africa and this sort of a legislation was under contemplation. It had even been drafted and kept ready for an occasion like this, and I think we should have made vigorous protests right at that time instead of waiting for this time to come when hardly two or three or four days are left for the legislation to become law.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not even that much.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I tell you that when Members of Parliament go to Britain your High Commissioner there does not even care to see them and brief them about the developments there with regard to these matters.

SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA: It is but right that we learn lessons from what happened and take still more vigorous action. If you see the history of the British Government you will see that for the last few years, indeed for the last few decades, it has been one of letting down Indian interests and working against our national interests, whether it be the question of the War with Pakistan or arbitration on the Kutch question or any other matter, in season and out of season they had been telling us how to behave in international affairs, how to work our foreign policy in consonance with what they considered suitable in the world situation or in the world conditions. These are the very people who have now started a new chapter in international perfidy by the most treacherous action. There cannot be a greater treachery than to say that the citizens of a country should be denied entry into that very country on the basis that they are of a particular race. And we in this country, in this House and outside, have been hearing

in season and off season about the high quality of British law, of British justice, of British fairplay, of British honesty and so on. It had come even to this extent that a clipped British accent was considered the hallmark of civilisation. We had been so much influenced by things British. But this has proved to be detrimental to our national interest and the earlier we realise it the better for the country. Let the Government understand the feeling of this House. Let them understand the temper of the country and try to serve a notice that India has decided to sever all connections with Britain, that it is the mood of this country, its determination and desire that we withdraw from the Commonwealth. That organisation has not served our national interests in any way. It was an organisation so carefully built up by our late Prime Minister Nehru. Various institutions were built around the Commonwealth and we had a vision that it would be a subsidiary United Nations, a multi-racial society in which we would be able to live in amity and peace. But the result has been completely the opposite. It was the same Labour Party which in 1962 when the Immigration Bill came up, said that they would vote against it. They also said that if they were returned to power they would abolish and repeal that Act. But now it is the same Labour Party which has come to power and instead of repealing it they have the whole thing much worse. Sir, this Commonwealth we have seen is nothing but a false facade to perpetuate white racialism and white hegemony and the earlier we understand this the better. It is true that this is a sad development and what had been built up all these years we see crumbling before our eyes. But we are not responsible for that. These small and timid people sitting 4 P.M. in Whitehall ruling over a country which is not only economically devalued but is also morally bankrupt, have rung the death-knell of the Common-

wealth. It is a country from whom we have learnt a lot, we have sought to learn a lot, but now I think the whole concept, the whole edifice is crumbling before us. So there should be no question of sentiments from now onwards. Our own national interests demand that we should take absolutely retaliatory measures. The hon. Minister hinted that they have some actions in view and we would like him to spell out what they are. At least reciprocal arrangements should be introduced right now and the unilateral concessions which we are now giving to holders of British passports irrespective of their place of origin should be removed and immediate steps should be taken to wind up all our connections with the Commonwealth.

And last but not the least, these people will become Stateless people in certain circumstances. The Kenyans would turn them out because they are not Kenyan citizens and they would not be let into Britain. We have a moral responsibility towards them and the statement that the Minister made should be so adapted that we accept responsibility for them, in the sense that we accept responsibility for all the people who are persecuted the world over. They are our kith and kin; they are people who have origins in this country and we should have a broader policy so far as they are concerned and admit them here if they are prepared and willing to come to our country.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): It is time to wind up now.

SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA: I will wind up with just one single observation. In order to rehabilitate these people in our country we should go to any extent, even to the extent of appropriation of British property here or their industries or their investments and debit them against this. And we will not be doing anything illegal. We have our own laws; we have our fundamental Rights and

[Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha]

we shall pursue according to them. The most serious possible action should be taken right now. In our country there are more British people now than at the height of the British Empire. This is neo-colonialism; through trade, aid and all sorts of arrangements they have hoodwinked us into a situation in which they are here today dominating our national life. This situation should wake us up and we should take appropriate steps. Whatever steps the Government intends to take, they should come out in the clearest possible terms showing the manner in which they would proceed in this matter so that the House and the country could be reassured.

श्री गोडे मुराहरि (उत्तर प्रदेश)

वाइप चेयरमैन साहब, मैं सरकार से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब इम सदन में यह माग की गई कि हमको कॉमनवेल्थ से हट जाना चाहिये तब तब हममें कहा गया कि कॉमनवेल्थ में रहने से हमको बहुत से फायदे हैं, तो उन फायदों में से एक आज हमारे सामने है। मुझे तो साउथ अफ्रीका में, रोडेशिया में और ब्रिटेन में फर्क आज नहीं दिखाई देता है। ओपेनलैंड मोसले जो फीनिस्ट कहा जाता था और हेराल्ड विल्सन में मुझे कोई फर्क नहीं दिखाई देता है। आज वह अपने आपको लेकर कहे, कुछ भी कहे, लेकिन ऐसे अवकवरे समाज-वादीयों को हमने बहुत पहले ठुकरा दिया। जहाँ तक हमारी पार्टी का सवाल है हमने बहुत पहले से कहा कि इनमें और औरों में कोई फर्क नहीं है। ये भी इम्पैरियलिज्म हैं जैसे और हैं। इसलिए आज मैं सरकार से यह पूछना चाहूँगा कि जब उन्होंने यह स्टेटमेंट किया तो क्या यह उचित नहीं था कि वे यह साफ कहते कि अगर यह बिल पास हुआ तो हम कॉमनवेल्थ से उसी वकन हट जायेंगे। अभी भी मैं मंत्री साहब से बूझूँगा कि जहाँ वे वकन वे यह साफ कर दें कि हम कॉमनवेल्थ से हट जायेंगे। कॉमनवेल्थ से

हट जाने से ही काम नहीं चलेगा, ब्रिटिश इन्फ्लूजिन भी हिन्दुस्तान में हैं, कई बार यहाँ पर माग की गई है कि उनको नेशनलाइज किया जाये, तो मैं बूझूँगा कि आज शाम तक उनको नेशनलाइज किया जाना चाहिये। कोई बजह नहीं है कि अंग्रेज यहाँ पर हमारे देश की सम्पत्ति को लूटते रहें और वहाँ पर कीनिया में जो हिन्दुस्तानी हैं उनके साथ इस तरह का अन्याय हो। अन्याय हो या नहीं, फिर भी यहाँ पर अंग्रेजों का कोई इन्फ्लूजिन नहीं रहना चाहिये। आज की परिस्थिति में भी अगर उनके इन्फ्लूजिन को यहाँ कायम रखा जायेगा तो इसमें बेशर्मा और बेवज्जा की कोई बात ही नहीं सकती। इसलिये मैं सरकार से चाहूँगा कि अगर थोड़ी भी शर्म बची हुई है इस सरकार में तो आज शाम तक कोई न कोई रिट्रैक्टरी मेजम लेना चाहिये।

आज कीनिया में क्या हो रहा है। हजारों लोग रैरोबी एयरपोर्ट पर इकट्ठा हो गये हैं, वहाँ पर लाठी चार्ज होता है, वहाँ पर भीड़मत्तव मच रही है, हिन्दुस्तानियों का सिर ताँडा जा रहा है और उनका खून वहाँ पर बह रहा है। हिन्दुस्तानियों का खून हेराल्ड विल्सन के हाथों में आज लगा हुआ है फिर भी हम कॉमनवेल्थ के मेम्बर बने रहना चाहते हैं।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They have joined the Commonwealth Secretariat, shameless people.

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : आज यहाँ पर एक प्रश्न था क्वीन्स रेग्युलेशंस फार द आर्मी। मुझे ताज्जुब होता है कि यह कौन सी क्वीन है, उसकी कीमत आज दुनिया के बाजार में दो कौड़ी की भी नहीं है। यह ऐसी क्वीन है जिसके पासपोर्ट का कोई मतलब नहीं हो तो गो कि जहाँ पासपोर्ट में क्वीन लिखते हैं वहाँ के पासपोर्ट होल्डर को जाने जाने में कोई तकावट नहीं होती। ऐसी क्वीन के रेग्युलेशंस अभी

हमारी आर्मी में चले हैं। ऐसी वीरों की दा पेनी की कीमत नहीं है दुनिया के बाज़ार में। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि आज यह सरकार तय करे कि कामनवेल्थ में हम नहीं रहेंगे।

मैं यह भी पूछना चाहूंगा कि जब आप लोगों को मालूम था कि इन तरह का एक बिल आने वाला है तो सरकार का क्या यह फर्क नहीं था कि इस ब्रिटिश सरकार को यह बता दें कि अगर वे इस बिल को बिल पास करते हैं तो हम कामनवेल्थ में नहीं रहेंगे। इसको चार पांच महीने पहले कह देना चाहिये था कि इस तरह का बिल लाने पर हमारा कामनवेल्थ में रहना नामुमकिन हो जायेगा। लेकिन सरकार आज भी एक स्टैटमेंट ले आती है तो मुझे तज्जुब होता है कि सरकार चाहती क्या है। हिन्दुस्तानियों की इज्जत दुनिया में है या नहीं। आज सीनोन में क्या होता है। सीनोन में हजारों लोग स्ट्रेट्स परफॉर्म करते हैं, श्रीलंका में स्ट्रेट्स परफॉर्म करते हैं। जो हिन्दुस्तान आज हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर है उनकी आज क्या स्थिति है। सरकार जगू सोचें, उन पर कोई जिम्मेदारी है या नहीं। अगर जिम्मेदारी है तो अपनी जिम्मेदारी से ऊपर उठिये।

चीन के साथ क्या हुआ। इंडोनेशिया में जूझ चीनियों के साथ बुरा बरताव हुआ तो चीन ने क्या किया। कम्युनिस्ट चीन में जाकर के वहाँ के चीनियों की प्रापर्टी को बर्बाद। लेकिन हमारी सरकार में यह हिम्मत नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तानियों के ऊपर इस तरह का झण्डा ही और फिर हम उनके सामने जाकर के रिक्वेस्ट करे कोई नोट दे, उनके एम्बेडर को बुलाये, बातचीत करें और कहे कि सहब, इस में कुछ न कुछ कर दो तो अच्छा होगा। इससे कोई चीज बनती नहीं है। ताकत से ही कोई चीज होती है। हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार में अगर कोई लज्जा और शर्म बच गई है तो वह ताकत के साथ काम ले और हिन्दुस्तान का जो कामवेल्थ के साथ सम्बन्ध है उसको खत्म करे और हिन्दुस्तान में जितने भी ब्रिटिश

इंस्ट्रुमेंट हैं, चाहे वह आयल कम्पनी ही, चाहे चाय बागान हो या और कोई कम्पनी हो, उन सब को नेशनलाइज़ करे। जब सरकार ऐसा करेगी तब हम समझे कि इस सरकार में कोई शर्म बची हुई है।

SHRI T. CHENGALVAROYAN (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I certainly share the agony of my esteemed friend Mr. Dahyabhai Patel but unfortunately not his anger. I should have expected, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that his anger should have been directed towards 10 Downing Street but unfortunately his memories of the past and the disappointments and distress obsessed him so much that the policies that we have been pursuing with regard to our Indian nationals abroad had been rather unfortunately misunderstood by him, I must be permitted, Mr. Vice-Chairman, to say that this question of the British Immigration law which restricts and in a way prohibits the immigration of people who hold British citizenship from Kenya is a piece of legislation—whatever might be our anger and agony against it—I am sure which every British citizen worthy of the great British traditions and character must be ashamed of and must shed tears about. At the time when Kenya was given independence by the British Government itself there was a solemn pledge and a very sincere declaration made along with the grant of independence that the people of Kenya and particularly of Indian origin would have the option of opting out either for the citizenship of Kenya or for the citizenship of Britain. You know, Mr. Vice-Chairman, at that time our very pious and sincere offer went throughout the whispering galleries of the world that persons of Indian origin wherever they were had at that crucial transitional stage the option to opt out for Indian citizenship. Rightly or wrongly, perhaps rightly, some of the persons of Indian origin in Kenya opted for Kenyan

[Shri T. Chengalvaroyan]

citizenship and most of them opted for the British citizenship. Therefore, the question now before the British Parliament is to respect the British citizenship, which international law gives a complete concept behind it. May I respectfully remind Mr. Harold Wilson, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, that it is a very solemn pledge that they had given to Kenyans and Indians in Kenya at the time of the independence of Kenya. I will only quote the very statement of Mr. Callaghan, when he was questioned by Mr. James Griffiths, the answer that he was given, and his Christian conscience was rather true at that time. He said:—

"...These persons are still free to apply for citizenship of Kenya."

At an earlier stage he said:—

"I very much regret that it is not possible for this country to absorb these persons, to whom we have given the most solemn pledges."

My grievance—may I say my admonition, may I say my repudiation—is that the British Parliament's consideration of this Bill at the present time is a violation of the solemn pledge that had been given at the time of the inauguration of Indian independence. It is a well-known principle of international law that when one country ceases to be Sovereign and transfers its sovereignty to a succeeding nation or a succeeding Government, then the option is given to those people to opt out for the citizenship of either the preceding sovereignty or the succeeding sovereignty. May I with your permission, refer to a very classic authority on international law? Oppenheim says:—

"The duty is that of receiving on its territory such of its citizens as are not allowed to remain on the territory of other States."

They are not allowed to remain in the territory of Kenya. They have been given British citizenship. Over and above that they have been given a passport. Any law relating to passport will clearly convince Members of the British Parliament and particularly Mr. Callaghan that a passport becomes inoperative and ineffective only under three stated circumstances. One is when there is expiry of the period of the passport. The second is when the conditions of the passport have been violated. The third is during times of war or emergency. May I respectfully remind Mr. Callaghan that none of these three conditions or circumstances are present. The British passport is a British passport, whether the photograph in it is black or white or black and white.

Therefore, we, of this House, must certainly get ourselves completely exasperated and voice forth our stout, strong and staunch protest against the way in which this matter is being dealt with. May I be permitted to say this that so far as Kenyans and Indian nationals there are concerned when once they have opted out for British citizenship, it means that they are British citizens and if British citizenship is not valid in Britain itself, God save Great Britain once and for all.

Today the question, therefore, is what is our attitude in the context of this particular legislative attempt. There has been a very serious and in my respectful submission a very sincere suggestion coming down from Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, in order to wreak his ancient vengeance against the British Government and also on some of us on this side. We feel terribly shaken in our faith in the continued association with the British Commonwealth. I have been a very close student and when my great leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, explained the utility, the benefit, the world advantage in the evangelic

endeavour of establishing peace throughout the world through our association with the Commonwealth, I was inspired, I was intoxicated and I was very much devoted to that cause. But today I feel that in the British Commonwealth there is nothing common and also there is no wealth in it. Why should we continue to be in association in the British Commonwealth? The British Commonwealth has become anaemic. The British Commonwealth has become atrophied and by this....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And besides it is stinking.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Let him go on.

SHRI T. CHENGALVAROYAN: By this legislation I am afraid the British Commonwealth will become abortive. We shall give sufficient notice, most respectfully, that if this is the way in which Great Britain is behaving towards other nationals, the time has come and I am sure the hour is going to strike when we have to give notice of our dissociation from the Commonwealth. I only conclude with this note that if this Commonwealth is to be at all continued, this legislation is the last nail in the coffin of the British Commonwealth and when it dies it will die unwept, unhonoured and unsung.

SHRI KHANDUBHAI K. DESAI (Gujarat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, the problem that has been posed by the legislation in the British Parliament—and it has been passed—is not only serious, but also a grave problem for our country. Certain retaliatory measures, which the hon. Minister placed before this House, I think, are a preliminary to further action in the matter. Mere protests and verbal condemnation will not serve our purpose. The time has come now when we have got to think and re-think about our close relations with the U.K. and be a member of the Commonwealth. Asians and par-

ticularly persons of Indian origin, in Kenya, when Kenya's independence was declared, were given the option to opt for Kenyan citizenship or British citizenship or Indian citizenship. Quite a large number have opted for British citizenship. They are as much Britishers as any Britisher can be, whatever be their skin. They have a right in international law to reside in the U.K., if they so desire. It must be understood that these Indians, people of Indian origin had gone to Africa, to Kenya and other parts of Africa, after being lured by the Britishers for their colonial exploitation. It is they who have developed that part of the country, which was practically a jungle into what it is today. It is one of the most viable parts of Africa. It is not only a betrayal, but, if I may say so, it is a perfidy, which has been perpetrated by the British Government, by the British Parliament on the whole world. Who is now going to accept the British word at its face value? And now the so-called progressive and socialist Government in the UK is doing it. Of all persons labour is supposed to be progressive. This is nothing short of a sort of disguised apartheid to allow only 1500 persons per year to immigrate into England. It means closing the door once and for all on Asians. What are they going to do for the next fifteen or twenty years when they will have to live in Kenya? Their jobs are being taken away. Their business is being taken away. Their factories are being taken away. That is, they are neither Kenya citizens nor *de facto* British citizens. So, they have become stateless. If they come to India willy nilly whether they like it or not or we like it or not, we have got to get them here. We cannot ignore them. We cannot leave them alone. But to bring them here means uprooting them from their whole moorings in Kenya which they had created. They would have to be a problem for this country and it will mean as we have seen, how people from Pakistan came here and

[Shri Khandubhai K. Desai]
what sort of rehabilitation problem beset us.

Therefore, those British people must understand that they have also some interest in our country. They have got here considerable capital, considerable assets, it would not be, I think, unstatesmanlike or unwise to freeze the British assets, return of which can justifiably be utilized for rehabilitating those people who are Britishers of Indian origin coming to this country. As I say, it is not a serious question but a very very very grave question that those who have been given a solemn pledge by the Britishers of the day—they have broken their pledge shamelessly without any sense of international morality, and to say the least I may say that they have practically got themselves outside the orbit of civilised people. These Britishers who exploited the whole world for the last 150 years or more willy nilly have got to get themselves out of what is called the Empire. Now they have become most narrow-minded, most parochial, most racial. This country, a big country, as it is, with all its potential of growth, development and strength, can respond and answer them, if not in the same coin, at least in some effective coin so that they will understand what it means to deal with Indians in such a disgraceful way. That is all I have got to say.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I share the agony and the emotional stress which hon. Members have felt on this question of the Immigration Bill which is now being discussed in the House of Commons. Whenever the Labour Party has been in office, it has devalued the pound. It did so in 1950. It has devalued the pound again. When it has been left to this Labour Government, it has devalued Britain's reputation, Britain's moral values and disgraced the Magna Carta which has inspired the Parliaments of many countries of the world.

There is a phrase in the English language which is often used as a term of disapproval. When somebody does something which is not proper, the British used to say, "it is not playing cricket". Now I would request the publishers of the Oxford Dictionary to withdraw this phrase from the English language because it has no meaning in the English language after the present Immigration Bill which is now being discussed in the House of Commons.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is that phrase?

SHRI A. D. MANI: They will say, "it is not playing cricket", as if they alone know. At least we know the British are not playing cricket. The British Government today stands as a hypocritical racial regime as bad as the regime in South Africa. Sir Dingle Foot in the latest issue of the London Times points out a most abnoxious feature of this Bill. Under this Bill it has not been made very clear by the Home Secretary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Bhagat, you have got some officers who do not understand. You say you read what the British are saying. Your statement does not even say that.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I have said that.

SHRI A. D. MANI: According to Sir Dingle Foot, a passport holder who had a European grandfather in Great Britain could come in, but an Indian who had a grandfather in Great Britain cannot come in under this Bill. That is why he calls it a racist legislation. There is a proposal in Great Britain that this matter should be fought before the International Court of Justice. Before I come to this, I endorse the plea that has been made by many Members here that this is the time for us to leave the Commonwealth altogether. At least we will feel happy that we

are not in the company of a nation which practises racialism of a most obnoxious kind. There is no point in our Indian Olympic Association withdrawing from the Mexico Games because South Africa is taking part in these games. If Britain is going to practise this kind of racialism, we can have nothing to do with the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth, as my hon. friend, Mr. Chengalvaroyan put it, is dying. Let us bury it properly now by withdrawing from the Commonwealth, and if we withdraw from the Commonwealth, there are many other nations which will follow our lead.

One of the points I would like to make is this. In condemning Great Britain let us also say a word about the Kenyatta Government which has passed this legislation. The racialism of some of the African countries is as bad as the racialism of South Africa. *(Interruption)* I only want to say that the racialism . . .

(Interruption)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do not spoil it. Not today. I would prefer you not to say that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Please resume your seat, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: You should not create confusion by saying that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would appeal to my friend, the British press will highlight this and create tension between us.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: You should not create confusion. You should withdraw that point.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I would like to say this. Since our members and the Asian community are subjected to so much pressure, it is the duty of the Government to send a Minister or a person of Minister's rank to Nairobi to assist those persons and tell them that if they want to come back to India, the Indian Government will not take the stand that they

263 RS—6.

are British passport holders but that they will give Indian passports unconditionally. This should be done. As this matter is going to be taken up before the International Court of Justice, the Government of India.

(Interruption)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: A Member like Mr. Mani should talk better.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: You say you welcome them to India.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Das, you must talk through me.

SHRI A. D. MANI: If they want to fight it out, we must give our moral encouragement to them.

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN) (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is really a sad thing that we are discussing about a very grave problem, the problem of Indians who are in Kenya. And I do not understand why the Government of India was keeping this matter in abeyance for such a long time and was waiting for a Calling Attention Motion to be moved on this subject.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Because, in the Government of India, we have such.. *(Interruptions)* There are ...

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Will you please sit down, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You know, Mr. Chandra Shekhar.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I shall request Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that at least today he has done some good work. Why should he undo it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am helping her.

SHRIMATI LALITHA RAJAGOPALAN: I want to know whether the Government of India thought or the External Affairs Minister thought that this problem concerned only the Kenya Indians because they held British passports and that it was not the concern of the Government of India? This is really a sad attitude and I am really sorry for it. But that is the matter.

This morning I was hearing the statement of the hon. Minister of External Affairs. And he was treating the problem as if it concerned between the United Kingdom and India and he has not touched anything about Kenya at all.

In this connection, I would like to say that President Jomo Kenyatta said, according to Reuter reports, that "his Government is to promote rapid Kenyanisation of jobs in commerce traditionally dominated by Asians by the end of this year." The Vice-President and Home Affairs Minister, Mr. Daniel Arap Moi, according to an AP reports, is reported to have said that Britain would not legislate away its responsibility for Kenya Asians holding British passports. Asked about what would happen to Asians forced to leave Kenya, who had no vouchers to enter Britain, he replied, "Why should they come back here? They can go back to India".

I would like to ask the Minister of External Affairs whether India is willing to accept them or India is going to evade this issue. And the way it has been handled in this House this matter has not been taken at all in a serious way. I think the entire Government is responsible for this grave mistake. It is also really shocking that these Indians who have settled down in Kenya for ages, who have been referred to by the late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, as 'brother Africans', should have been treated in this manner. And we are looking on.

In this connection, I would like to know, why was this sudden attitude taken by the Kenya Government and whether our High Commissioner, Mr. Prem Bhatia, was in constant touch with the Kenya Government as well as the Government of India and whether anything transpired between the two and whether the High Commissioner was in contact with the Government of India. And if so, why did they not approach the Kenya Government to have a sympathetic attitude towards these Indians and prevent their exodus from Kenya?

Just now, I learn from an hon. Member that the British Parliament has also passed the Bill in the House of Commons and it is before the House of Lords, and it will become a law by tomorrow. At this stage I would like to know whether the British attitude is as before in the past of 'divide and rule'. The Minister has already stated that he is going to take a very stern attitude. But that is not enough and that is not going to pacify the people of India, the Government has to be responsible to, not only to Parliament but also to the people.

I would also like to know—this sudden situation has arisen and it has become very serious—whether the Government of India will snap its ties with the Commonwealth and quit the Commonwealth for ever. In my view, this Commonwealth is nothing but racial discrimination and racial domination.

There is one point which I would like to make before I conclude. I would like to know from the Minister whether it is a fact that Kojia Muslims belonging to the Aga Khan community are being provided with jobs in Kenya whereas the Porbandars and Patels are not provided with jobs. If that is so, I would like the Minister to throw some light on this matter.

Of course, the matter has come to a very serious stage now. It is going to be law by tomorrow morning. We are not going to do anything about it. But at the same time this grave concern of the entire nation should be conveyed by the Government of India to the British Government. And if the British Government is not going to be a little lenient in its attitude, I think as my hon. friend said, the British glory, the British tradition and the British culture will go unwept unhonoured, and unsung.

DR. B. N. ANTANI: This morning, as a man who has been in East Africa from the year 1909 to 1938—my newspaper is still functioning there—I felt that in comparison with the seriousness of the problem of Indians in Kenya, the statement—I am sorry to say—is too timid, too frigid and too insipid on the part of the Government of India whose nationals, Mr. Vice-Chairman, are responsible in bringing the Union Jack for the first time on the soil of East Africa, and this is the reward that this British House of Commons is giving to India today.

Sir, Winston Churchill in his . . . (Interruptions) Every second that I will be interrupted, I think you should credit to my side and give me a longer time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: With interest, one second more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I wish to say that you get seven minutes all right.

DR. B. N. ANTANI: Thank you very much.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I have left some time for him. You should not be unfair to my party. Why are you so hard on our party always?

AN HON. MEMBER: You are very strong.

DR. B. N. ANTANI: The previous speakers have also been emotional. The other day when I said, "My heart bleeds, Prime Minister", the Prime Minister was kind enough to tell me that her heart also bleeds equally. And what is the alternative that she has found in protesting against this measure. Retaliation—according to the hon. Minister the other day—this Government does not believe in; it has come to the climate of reciprocity . . . (Interruptions) Now, I have no quarrel over the word, even if they adopt reciprocity. I know this Government has got no guts to do it. . . (Interruptions). This Government has never shown any guts except to plead for international friendship and friends when we have none. Whatever it is, I do not want to waste my time in going further with this thing. But I want to say about the historic evolution of this problem. This is not the last straw, it is still coming. What I want to know is, it was left to an hon. Member of this House, Mr. Mani. . .

SHRI A. D. MANI: I raised the point.

DR. B. N. ANTANI: . . . who drew the attention of the Government in this House to a judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench in Great Britain which said that the passports issued in the name of the Queen were not valid for administrative purposes.

I am here, Sir, to inquire on behalf of the Indian nation from this External Affairs Ministry what they were doing all the time after this judgment. Well, that happened. The whole Bill came before the House of Commons. What has been done? The High Commissioner, the hon. Minister said, in his first interview with the British Government raised this matter. Thank you, Mr. High Commissioner. What are our High Commissions doing? Nothing. As my friend drew our attention, hundreds

[Dr. B. N. ANTANI.]

of children with British passports going to Nairobi aerodrome are being lathi-charged, are being bled, and the High Commission in Kenya has not even extended the courtesy to go to the aerodrome (*Interruptions*) Not only that. What is the British High Commission doing? I want to enquire of the Minister. Has the British High Commission staff been looking after the needs of these people who have been frankly going there? Only last night, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I was responsible to help a boy of 18 years to go to Great Britain; to obtain the income-tax clearance of a boy of 18 years, being maintained by us all, it took about six hours. This is the way that we are being helped. I have no time to dilate upon this. I will take some other time about it. But what I want now to say is this.

The hon'ble Minister described to-day the policy of the Government of India in respect of Indians abroad—"Indians of Indian origin", "Indians of Kenya nationality" and "Indians of British nationality". Who advised these people to adopt the British nationality? To lose nationality, Mahatma Gandhi said that I will lose my head. That is what we did. I challenge. At the instance of the British High Commission of that time we fell into this trap and we are reaping the fruits of that today.

Once the Commerce Minister of the Government of India, before devaluation, visited East Africa and told my friends in Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania to remit all their earnings and savings to Great Britain. It was at the instance of the then Commerce Minister of the Government of India, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that millions of pounds of the savings were remitted there. Indians questioned the Commerce Minister. He said, "If devaluation comes, do not be afraid. I am there." He is not even in Parliament. Thank God. But what happened? Three months later this

devaluation came and we lost overnight about 40 per cent. of our capital. When I went to East Africa this time, they said, "Do not mention the name of the Government of India. We have had enough. It is that Government which is responsible for all that has been done".

I will now summarise and wind up because I know you are frowning and I cannot stand your frowns. I have got several suggestions to make.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Do not look at me again.

DR. B. N. ANTANI: The time has come for modification of the policy of the Government of India in respect of the Indian nationals abroad. The policy has been drawn very academically on academic grounds without any historic perspective. We went there, as several speakers said, not as indentured labourers. We emancipated the slaves. We made the Bill on abolition of slavery practical. It is Jairam Shivji, it is Ladaramji, it is Tharia Topan who emancipated lakhs of slaves overnight giving them maintenance for years. It is Sherji Haji who could find out the whereabouts of Livingstone and Stanley manning the caravan. It is we who built the Uganda Railway. It is we who established the first British Consulate. You have to see Winston Churchill . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Dr. Antani, it is we who have to keep time also.

DR. B. N. ANTANI: All right. I shall finish. I am not very fond of speaking. He in his book, "Indians in East Africa" has said, "But for India the Union Jack would not have been in East Africa." Sir, Winston Churchill's bones must be shaking in his grave in Westminster when his followers have been giving this reward.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): Not his followers.

DR. B. N. ANTANI: Well, his countrymen have been giving this reward today. I, therefore, appeal to the Government of India to be practical. For God's sake, do not sermonise too much on international ideals. We are fed up with your ideals and we are fed up with the way that you are governing. What we need is realism. Call a conference immediately of the representatives of various provinces of East Africa. The time, Mr. Vice-Chairman, has come to revise our policy to reconsider our policy with a cool mind and get some experience instead of sending missions of goodwill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The time has come for you to resume the seat.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Two minutes. Let him finish his sentence.

DR. B. N. ANTANI: The time has come when instead of sending our good missions our people come to us and let them feel that there is some country, that there is some office in the South Block with all their ornamental protocol, decorations, which has something to give them as a matter of encouragement. Then and then only the External Affairs Ministry will be wiser and well-informed, not through this colossal amount of money on High Commissions being wasted. I thank you.

श्री त्रिलोकी सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मान्यवर इस मामले पर ऐसी बहस हुई है कि कुछ ज्यादा कहने की गुंजायश नहीं रही। मामला बड़ा गम्भीर है। माननीय सदस्यों की नाराजगी समझ में आती है और साथ ही साथ इस मामले पर उन को जो रंज हुआ है वह भी समझ में आता है। मान्यवर मैं आपके द्वारा इस सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। क्यों यह नौबत आई? कोई बजह है। यह कोई दैवी

आपत्ति नहीं है। यह कोई खुदावाद आफत या कहर इलाही नहीं है जो हिन्दुस्तानियों के ऊपर आकर फटी हो। यह उस पालिसी और नीति का नतीजा है जो आजाद होने के बाद हमने पिछले 20 वर्षों में बरती है। उसी का यह लाजमी नतीजा था कि हिन्दुस्तानी कहीं भी हो दुनिया के किसी परदे में हो उसकी इज्जत दिन ब दिन कम होती गई उसके रहन सहन में फर्क आ गया और हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर उसके लिए कोई स्थान बाकी नहीं रह गया।

मेरे एक दोस्त ने इस सदन का ध्यान दिलाया कि गुलामी के जमाने में इन्डियन ओवरसीज का मोहकमा था भारत सरकार का तीन पुस्त, चार पुस्त, पांच पुस्त के गये हुए अदमियों के भी पुराने अंग्रेजों के गुलाम गवर्नर जनरल भी उन हिन्दुस्तानियों के लिये फिक्रमंद थे और यह ख्याल रखते थे कि हिन्दुस्तानियों के साथ बुरा बर्ताव न हो। मगर फिर हमने क्या देखा है। शान्ति का संदेश अमन की बातें ऊटपटांग किस्से और लम्बी डायें। इन सब का नतीजा हुआ कि हमारे पैरों के नीचे से जमीन निकल गई और हम कहां पहुंचे। हमें लंका से भी निकाला गया बर्मा से भी निकाला गया, फीजी से भी निकाला गया, सिंगापुर में भी वही नौबत आई और अफ्रीका में भी वही नौबत आई। क्या किसी को मालूम नहीं है कि महात्मा गांधी जी का पदार्पण सार्वजनिक जीवन में हिन्दुस्तान ओवरसीज के जरिये हुआ था। उनमें बड़ा कोई हिन्दुस्तानी नहीं था और दुनिया में उन जैसा इन्सान 100, 150 माल के अन्दर पैदा नहीं हुआ है। क्या किसी को यह मालूम नहीं था कि अंग्रेजों ने पहले हिन्दुस्तान को गुलाम बनाया और हिन्दुस्तान को अड्डा बनाकर अंग्रेजों ने आधी दुनिया को गुलाम बनाया। उसके साथ हम नीकर के तौर पर गये रसद लेने गये और सिपाही भी बने। क्या यह मालूम नहीं था कि जब अंग्रेज चले जायेंगे तब मुकाम्मा भावादी

[श्री त्रिलोकी सिंह]

को लाजमी तौर पर गुस्ता आयेगा और इस का नतीजा यह होगा कि जो अंग्रेजों के छिन्नगू बनकर आये थे जिन्होंने ब्रिटिश एम्पायर के साथ उसको कान्सालिडेट करने के लिए अंग्रेजों को मजबूत किया था अब उनकी बारी होगी । इस बात को मोटी अक्ल के इन्सान को भी समझना चाहिये था कि अंग्रेजों के जाने के बाद दस पांच साल में हमारी बारी भी आयेगी । मगर हम तो दुनिया को अमन का सन्देश सुना रहे थे और नतीजा क्या हुआ कि उसके एक बाद दीगरे एक एक करके यह नौबत आई ।

इसलिए मैं यह अर्ज कहना चाहता हूँ कि अंग्रेज अपनी सत्ता ही नहीं खो बैठा है बल्कि अपनी इज्जत भी खो बैठा और साथ ही अपने उतूनों को भी खो बैठा है । उसका जो 300, 400 साल पुराना इतिहास था वह आज उसके खिलाफ जा रहा है ।

यह दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि जब जब लेबर गवर्नमेंट वहाँ आई तब तब उसने हिन्दुस्तानियों के साथ बुरे मकूर किये, जितना बुरा सलूक लेबर गवर्नमेंट ने हिन्दुस्तानियों के साथ किया उतना कंजरवेटिव गवर्नमेंट ने नहीं किया । कौन नहीं जानता है कि 1923 में जब लेबर गवर्नमेंट आई थी तो उस ने बंगाल प्राडिनेंस बनाया और उस समय लार्ड ओनीवर सेक्रेटरी आफ स्टेट फार इंडिया थे । उन्होंने 1100 प्रादमियों को नजरबन्द किया था । कौन नहीं जानता है कि जब लेबर गवर्नमेंट आई थी तो मैकडानल्ड साहब ने कम्यूनल एवार्ड दिया । कौन नहीं जानता है कि लेबर गवर्नमेंट ने हिन्दुस्तान के दो हिस्से कराये । उसने आजादी भी दी और दो हिस्से भी करवाये । कौन नहीं जानता है कि आज लेबर गवर्नमेंट में जो अंग्रेजी नागरिक हैं, जो अंग्रेज इंगलिस्तान के रहने वाले हैं उनको कहती है कि तुम वापस न आओ क्योंकि उनका सब्स्टेनशियल कनेक्शन नहीं है उनके रगों में अंग्रेजों का खून नहीं है । हमारे यहां

ऐंश्लो इंडियन को मान्यवर आज भी कानून के अन्दर कुछ खास हक हासिल है । मुंबई असेम्बलियों में भी ऐंश्लो इंडियन नामिनेट किया जाता है यहां पार्लियामेंट में भी नामिनेट किया जाता है । हमारा यह हाल और उनका वह हाल । तो मैं बहुत अदब के साथ और रंज के साथ यह गंजारिश करना चाहता हूँ कि यह टन फुप से काम नहीं लेगा, माई लेडी प्रोटेस्ट्स टू मछ" से भी काम चलने वाला नहीं है । आईये कमर कसिये, बढ़िये और कहिये कि हम ऐसे लोगों के साथ नहीं बैठेंगे कामनवैलथ में । मुझे मालूम है कि कामनवैलथ से अलग होने में हमको नुस्सान होगा और करोड़ों रुपये साल का नुस्सान होगा । मगर इंसान की इज्जत होती है और अगर एक इंसान की इज्जत होती है तो मान्यवर, कौन की इज्जत उससे कहीं ज्यादा ऊंची होती है । हमारी इज्जत अगर घट जाय, हमारी बात की अगर कोई कीमत न रहे, हमारी आनशान न रहे, हमें इंसान न समझा जाये इसलिये कि हिन्दोस्तान छोड़ कर नैरोबी या मदरास में हम आबाद हो गये हैं, अपने बाप दाश के वक्न में, तो फिर हिन्दोस्तान का बज्रूद खत्म हो जायेगा । इसलिये मैं दस्तबस्ता गुजारिश करूंगा कि कामनवैलथ को छोड़ने का फैसला कीजिये, अंग्रेजों से साफ साफ कह दीजिये कि तुम इनको न लो, हम इनको लेंगे और इन लोगों से कहिये कि वे भारतीय नागरिक बनें । लेकिन खुश के वास्ते इन बला को मत बनाए रखिये कामनवैलथ और अपने याराने को, इसमें मुझे उम्मीद है कि हिन्दोस्तान ऊंचा उठेगा । धन्यवाद ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Now I would like to have the opinion of the House. The original list which I had is now exhausted. Still I have got the names of four hon. Members before me. If the House is prepared to sit for half-an-hour longer, then I shall call those

hon. Members. Otherwise I will call the hon. Minister. Does the House want to sit a little longer?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, you will understand the gravity of the problem and the importance of the subject. Therefore, I am making a suggestion. I think all the Members who have given their names to-day should be allowed to speak. The fact that we have arranged this debate to-day shows that we want to give a chance for the Members to speak. Nobody should be barred. There are others also, I understand, who have given their names. If necessary the debate should continue tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): No.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why are you saying "No"? Let me finish my thing. You can do anything, quit the Commonwealth or extend the debate by two hours. The second point is—this is very important—the House has expressed itself, I think the speeches more or less fall in the same line, that it would like to hear the views of the Government given by the Prime Minister herself, the considered opinion of the Government in the light of what has happened in the British Parliament and also in the light of the views expressed here. It would not be fair, Mr. Vice-Chairman, to the House if you call suddenly the Minister. I am not at all meaning any disrespect to him. Mr. Chandra Shekhar will also agree that to reply just now—extempore on this subject will not be proper. First of all, the Prime Minister was not here. I do not know whether she was consulted or not. This is a matter for the Cabinet to meet in an emergency session, in the light of the developments and in deference to the opinions expressed in the House, and they should come and give their considered opinion outlining Government's steps, as far as possible, taking into

account all that we have said. We would not like a routine reply or intervention by the Government here..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Please take your seat. What is the opinion of the House? Would it like to hear some more Members?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The hon. Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise on a point of order. My point of order is this. This statement was read out by Mr. Bhagat, but it was made really by the Prime Minister of the country, dealing with such a subject as warranted the adjournment of the House virtually to discuss this matter, setting aside all other business, even a Bill under consideration. Now Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Prime Minister was not in the first instance present in the House. It is a very, very serious lapse. I am not going into the reasons. She will explain. Secondly, in the course of the discussion...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you have stated all these points and the House does not want to sit any longer.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why can't you hear my suggestion? You will have noted Mr. Vice-Chairman, that party barriers for once disappeared. We spoke the voice of the nation all together. Rarely such a thing has happened in this House or in Parliament. It is a good thing that has happened. I think this itself

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

merits a reply by the Prime Minister. Secondly, many suggestions have been made. People have expressed their dissatisfaction with the statement that had been made, and have given their cogent reasons. Those hon. Members belong not only to this side of the House but also to the Government side. Therefore, I think it is not fair to us to be told that all that we can expect now is an extempore reply by the hon. Minister of State here deputising for the Prime Minister. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I may tell you that in comparable situations in the House of Commons emergency Cabinet meeting is called where things are discussed, opinions of Members are taken and a reply is given or an intervention made the next day, after Cabinet deliberation. Do you think the matter is so simple and routine a business that it does not merit such a Cabinet consideration . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : You have stated your point.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I would request the House; we are not dying to have the reply to-day, we can wait; let the Government consider the matter; and let the Prime Minister come any time tomorrow and give a considerable reply. That would be authoritative. Please understand, in Britain nobody takes a reply from a Minister of State. There, Harold Wilson is speaking; there Cabinet Ministers are speaking. Now, do you think the British public is going to take seriously an intervention in Parliament if the Prime Minister or the Minister in charge of External Affairs does not speak on the subject and give a reply, and only a Minister of State replies? There Ministers of State or Under-Secretaries are not getting up. There Harold Wilson or a Cabinet Minister will speak on the subject in order to build up their case before the world, in order to build up world public opinion. I think nation-

al anger should be reflected here by a speech from the Prime Minister and she owes it to us and to the House.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह बडवरी : सभापति, जी, मेरा यह निवेदन है कि कीनिया के अन्दर जो घटनाएं घटी हैं और ब्रिटिश सरकार ने जो रवैया अख्तियार किया है, अगर इस प्रश्न पर अभी से हमने एक कठोर और दृढ़ निश्चय ले कर के नीति निर्धारित नहीं की तो हिन्दोस्तान के लगभग 40 लाख लोग जो आज विदेशों में रहते हैं उ के ऊपर यह चीज बारी बारी से असर डालने वाली है। आज जबकि सारे सदन में एक स्वर से एक राय निकली है तो इस मुझाव का मैं पुरजोर समर्थन करता हूं कि एक दृढ़ नीति निर्धारित करने के लिये मंत्रिमंडल पहले एक सामूहिक निर्णय ले और फिर प्रधान मंत्री इस सदन में अपनी नीति की घोषणा कल करें। आज इस सदन में किसी भी प्रकार का बिना तय किया हुआ प्रस्ताव या कोई मुझाव तय करने के बजाय मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह निवेदन करूंगा कि आज वे कोई उत्तर न दें क्योंकि इसके काफी गंभीर और दूरगामी परिणाम होंगे। वे इस सदन के इस मुझाव को सरकार तक ले जायें और सरकार इस पर एक बार फैसला करे। और तब कल प्रधान मंत्री अपने निर्णय की घोषणा करें।

श्री महाबोर प्रताप शुक्ल (उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदय, मैं श्री भूपेश गुप्त जी के इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूं क्योंकि आज इस सदन ने जो अपना मत व्यक्त किया है वह केवल इस सदन का मत नहीं है बल्कि 50 करोड़ भारतीयवासियों का मत है। यह समस्या इतनी गंभीर है कि यह उचित नहीं होगा कि गवर्नमेंट सीधे सीधे इसका जवाब दे दे। इसका अर्थ यह होगा कि गवर्नमेंट ने इस पर पुनः विचार नहीं किया है और जो उन्ने पहले निर्णय किया है उसी को वह हमारे सामने रख रही है और जनता की भावनाओं का जो यहां व्यक्तीकरण हुआ है उस पर वह कोई ध्यान नहीं दे रही है

5 P.M. बहुत कम मौके ऐसे आते हैं जब यह सदन एक राय का हो। यह ऐसा मौका है क्योंकि सारे राष्ट्र के हित का प्रश्न है, सारे राष्ट्र के सम्मान का प्रश्न है। इसलिए मैं इस प्रस्ताव का हृदय से समर्थन करता हूँ और माननीय मंत्री जी से निवेदन करता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी से इस पर वक्तव्य देने के लिये निवेदन करें।

श्री गोडे मुराहूरि : वाइस चेयरमैन, मैं श्री भूपेश गुप्त का जो सुझाव है उसी के समर्थन में बोलना चाहता हूँ। मैं चाहूंगा कि श्री बलिराम भगत अपने ऊपर कोई ऐसी चीज न लें जिसको वे निभा न सकें। जो जवाब ये अभी देंगे उसमें जो स्टेटमेंट हमारे सामने है उसी को दोहराने वाले हैं। उससे कोई फायदा नहीं होगा।

वैदेशिक कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री बी० आर० भगत) : कैसे कहते हैं ?

श्री गोडे मुराहूरि : आपकी राय कैसे बन सकती है ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You have made the point.

श्री गोडे मुराहूरि : मैं श्री बलिराम भगत से पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या उन्होंने केबिनेट की मीटिंग बुलाई है सदन में जो डिस्कशन हुआ है उसके बाद उसकी राय हमारे सामने रखना चाहते हैं ? अगर आप केबिनेट की राय रखना चाहते हैं तो हम तैयार हैं वरना मैं आपसे यह दरखास्त करूंगा कि आप जाकर केबिनेट की इमरजेन्सी मीटिंग करवाएं, इसके बारे में कोई फैसला करवाएं और उस फैसले को लेकर यहां पर आएँ तो कोई नतीजा निकल सकता है।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : सभापति जी, 5 बज गए हैं। मैं फार्मली मूव करता हूँ कि इस सदन का आज का समय समाप्त किया जाय।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : I am following a certain procedure. Mr. Chandra Shekhar.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am fully in agreement with the sentiments expressed but here the question is of procedure. It was a short-duration debate. This House cannot force the Cabinet to take a decision here and now and declare it tomorrow. (Interruptions). We will be weakening the hands of the Government. The Government may take some time, a day or two. So, the Minister of State can say what he wants to say. On the contrary it will be creating wrong precedents. In this short-duration debate the Minister of State should be asked to say whatever he has to say and I am confident that the Government will take into consideration the sentiments expressed in this House and the Cabinet will surely discuss this matter. It is for the Cabinet and the Prime Minister to see when the Cabinet should sit. They are also conscious of these things as we are. Why should we dictate to the Prime Minister or the Cabinet to take a decision immediately? (Interruptions). So on this point I cannot agree with my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta. (Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I am following a certain procedure. The names have been noted down by me. I shall call them and thereafter I shall decide what is to be done. Please resume your seats. Mr. Mulka Govinda Reddy.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Vice-Chairman, no doubt this is a short-duration discussion but the subject matter is very important, very grave and very serious. Therefore it deserves the utmost consideration by the Government. The Minister of State need not reply to the debate. As Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has suggested, the Cabinet should meet and take a deci-

[Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy]

sion. We will not be doing our duty if we merely send protest notes to the Government of Great Britain. What is needed is retaliatory measures and retaliatory measures cannot be taken like this. Retaliatory measures can be taken only by the Government. You have sensed the views of the Members of this House. All sections have suggested that retaliatory measures must be taken and therefore it is necessary . . .

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN): Mr. Vice-Chairman, on a point of order. Under rule 176 when a short duration discussion takes place, after the discussion is over, the Minister replies. So the Minister has to reply. Whatever points have been made by the hon. Members can be conveyed by the Minister separately but the Minister is entitled to reply to the discussion.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: The Minister of State for External Affairs is not competent to make an important announcement, particularly concerning this very serious matter. Only the Cabinet or the Prime Minister can do it. Therefore I entirely agree with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's suggestion that the Prime Minister should come and make a statement tomorrow after having taken into consideration the strong views expressed by this House.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: What I want to say is that it is time that we should take some retaliatory measures. One of the measures we ought to take is that the immigration of British nationals into India should be limited. Why can't we adopt a method like that? The second thing that we ought to do is what has already been stated, namely, nationalisation of all British interests. I do not think that at the moment the Minister of State for External Affairs is competent, without a decision of the Cabinet . . .

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA (Bihar): That means every time a suggestion is made the Cabinet will meet.

(Interruption)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Sinha, will you resume your seat?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Mr. Sinha is getting a little excited unnecessarily. I am not certain that my hon. friend is right in regard to this particular matter. Every time a suggestion is made, it is made with due emphasis and in good faith. The suggestion that has been made about retaliatory measures is a suggestion that has got to be considered by the Cabinet. It cannot be considered by the hon. Minister of State. I have some knowledge of East Africa.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Do not go into the merits of the question.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I am merely requesting you to allow the debate to be adjourned.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think we are needlessly involving ourselves in the procedural wrangle. This House today has witnessed a very rare but welcome unanimity of approach on this very important point. Now to expect the Government to announce some decision now or even tomorrow would, I think, be too much, because it is not one decision that is necessary. So many ideas have been thrown out. Naturally it will require not one but a series of decisions spread over the whole future time. So, I do not think Members should insist that categorically 'yes' or 'no' should be said. I will suggest that this debate be wound up with the reply of the hon. Minister

(Interruptions) I will appeal to my

friends not to get unnecessarily agitated over this matter. The Prime Minister of course would come to know about the feelings of this House and I hope she will take the earliest opportunity to come with a firm decision and announce it herself. But to prolong this debate or to postpone it till tomorrow or day after is not procedurally correct nor is it feasible. I therefore suggest that it should be wound up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): It is not a debate now, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, my point has been challenged. First of all we are not at all suggesting . . .

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: He has taken twenty minutes after five and he has spoken once . . .

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I am conducting the proceedings of the House, not Mr. Sinha. I am sorry to say that.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: Let me say this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I know what is to be done.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, first of all, the reply does not come from the Minister. The Minister intervenes in such a debate once a motion has been moved not by the Government but by a Private Member. That is point No. 1, Secondly, here when you have a short duration discussion the rule says:

"The Minister shall reply shortly. Any member who has previously intimated to the Chairman may be permitted to take part in the discussion."

Here you can close this thing.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: May I say . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: For heaven's sake listen. I know what to talk. You do not even consult the Rules. Mr. Sinha, listen kindly for heaven's sake. I know the Congress Party must have

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Be short please.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I can move that the House may not sit because 5 o'clock is over.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You cannot, I will tell you why.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You seem to have made up your mind. Firstly the Minister can get up and say. In view of this, I would not like to say anything more. The Prime Minister will make a statement. He need not even say that the Prime Minister will reply to the debate. If he says this much, it is enough. We know that he is not obliged to make a long speech at all and when we are requesting him, we who have moved the Motion, not to make any statement to-day, naturally he would be all the more entitled to fulfil his role by saying 'Let this debate be closed. Do not ask the Government to make any commitment to-day. We shall consider it. The Government policy will be announced irrespective of the procedural part of the debate'. Therefore I hope you will at least kindly consider the opinion of the Members of this side and I am glad to say, supported by some Members on

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

the other side. It is not at all our intention to hustle the Government to take a decision thoughtlessly. We, on the other hand, want to give a chance to the Government to reflect over this matter and come with a statement at a suitable time in a manner best suited to the occasion and purpose. Only thing I would say is I hope my friend Mr. Sinha will agree, whatever reply he will give is certainly not the reply of the Prime Minister of India nor of the Ministry of External Affairs. He will be at best fulfilling a ritual part. Hon. Members, I ask you, are you wanting a ritual to be observed or do you want the matter to be treated seriously? It is in your hands, I know, but I would again appeal to you, Sir, and through you to the Government and to both of you: "Let our sentiments be not rubbed in the wrong way. It was bad enough that the Prime Minister was not present even for a single moment in the House. It would be worse if we are given a reply in this way when such grave issues have been raised." Therefore, I once again would appeal to you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I have heard the Members and I respect their feelings but all the same the procedure prescribed in the Rules of Procedure has to be followed. I may draw the attention of Mr. Gupta that it is not a motion that is under discussion. It is a short duration discussion under Rules 176, 177 and 178. We are governed by those three Rules. Rule 177 specifically provides that the Chairman may allow a short duration discussion not exceeding two and a half hours and that he has allowed and he was pleased to limit it to two hours. I have, in my discretion, exceeded the time but the rules have to be followed. I cannot adjourn the debate to any other day under the Rules and therefore, I would ask the Minister to make his statement now. However, I may add that this is not a question which can be tackled in any one day. It is a problem which has to

be tackled by the Cabinet from time to time as the situation demands. I am sure the Cabinet will meet in due course at the convenience of the Ministers and others. They will consider this problem and whenever they take any further decision, they will certainly come before the House and announce what decision they have taken. To-day the House expressed its sentiments and the Minister will now reply.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What are you saying?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): It will come up again.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have not been advised correctly.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I am making one thing clear that I have not been advised by anybody and I am not prepared to take anybody's advice and I will go exactly according to the rules and nothing else.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Nowhere it says that it must be on the same day. It says two and a half hours only.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You give me any precedent.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am giving you.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I want your guidance on this. The rule says that the discussion will not go beyond two and a half hours. The hon. Member wants to adopt dilatory tactics and exhaust the time so that the Minister will not be able to reply.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): That is always my discretion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not my intention. You said that you had exercised your discretion. In fact despite the rule, you can always exercise the discretion just as the Chair to-day.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr Gupta, if the problem was being finally decided to-day I may have exercised my discretion in some other manner but I am convinced that this problem is not going to be decided in one day.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Your conviction is another thing Mr. Chandra Shekhar need not think that I want to delay. You have given me the idea.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: You say that you must always oppose. Mr. Gupta we also know how to deal with you people I know you are a very good tactician but we are not going to be put in an embarrassing position and we know how to defend the honour of our country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If you come to that, you do not even make your Prime Minister to be present here. You do not have the courage to go and ask your Prime Minister to be present. What courage you have got? Did you ask your Prime Minister? . . . (*Interruptions*) Do not try to tell me that kind of thing and you do not have the courage to tell the Prime Minister.

(*Shri Chandra Shekhar got up to speak*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Chandra Shekhar, I am on my legs. Will hon. Members take their seats? Let us not be excited over anything.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Who started it?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): As I said earlier, it is not a problem in which a decision can be taken today. Whatever facts are

available with the Government, the Minister will place before the House. The Prime Minister, whenever it is necessary, will certainly come here and make a statement. Does any Member believe that it is a problem over which a decision can be taken in minutes or in one day? What is the use of wasting our time any further. Let us hear what the Minister has to say and wait for any further news.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is very wrong.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I have allowed you all indulgence.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not a question of indulgence. You say that the Prime Minister may make a statement. It was the duty of the Prime Minister to be present in the House. We maintain it. We have every right to demand that the Prime Minister should be present in the House. You may exonerate her, not we. Do not impute motives. I am not at all trying to delay. Mr. Chandra Shekhar did it. All I say—and I say it again by reading the rules—is that he can just, to fulfil the ritual as it were, say that the things would be conveyed to the Prime Minister. If he has any information he can give it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Certainly.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have said very good things. All I say is, the only thing is that the things should be conveyed. I formally demand it, and we expect a statement by the Prime Minister on behalf of the Government.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): That will certainly be conveyed, and I ask the Minister to bring it to the notice of the Prime Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Prime Minister's statement should be made.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): No, that I cannot promise.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How can you say? We demand it of the Prime Minister.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: It is for the Prime Minister when she can conveniently make a statement. A Member like Mr. Bhupesh Gupta cannot force the Government to make a statement. I am also a Member like him but I do not make a demand in the terms he does it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are not forcing the Government but we demand a statement of the Government, a statement from the Prime Minister

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Will the hon. Members take their seats? Will you take your seat, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta? What is happening in the House is not befitting the reputation of this House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have a right as a Member of Parliament and I can demand the presence of the Prime Minister or a statement by her.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Every Member has a right to demand any statement.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And that is what I have done. But people who do not have the courage to talk to her should not try to preach homilies here about parliamentary procedure.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Now may I request the Members to be a little patient and hear the hon. Minister? It is open to us at any stage to raise the question again. Where is the difficulty? I do not understand. Mr. Bali Ram Bhagat.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, for the last thirty-five minutes what has been happening in this House only convinces me that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will go down in the history of parliament as the greatest waster of parliamentary time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I strongly object to it. I have a right to say what I have to say and I cannot be expected to be apologetic in a matter like this.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: You have that right, and I have also the right to say this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am sure, if the Prime Minister had been there, she would not have made such a silly statement over such a matter.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: All this again only proves what I am saying.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is this not wasting time? It is not for him to come here and say that I am wasting time. Mr. Vice-Chairman, now you see why I asked for the Prime Minister's presence or a statement by her. It is because these people do not know how to talk in a responsible manner. He is accusing me that I have wasted time.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I am not yielding, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: These people, for four months, did not do anything, did not inform Parliament, did not tell us what was happening, and they came out with this silly, cowardly, timid statement here in order to cover up their shortcomings in this very important matter. I say he should not accuse me in this manner.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Will you take your seat, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why has he said it?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I shall appeal to all the hon. Members to exercise a little restraint on what they say, and it should be befitting the dignity of this House.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I have greater record in Parliament than Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I am senior to him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: A tiny Minister.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: He should have some sense of responsibility. He has no sense of proportion. He has deteriorated.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know you. You said I wasted time. Mr. Chandra Shekhar also wasted time that way. I may be junior to you in parliamentary career, but I know what you are.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: You may say anything letting loose your tongue. Have some respect for your seniors.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know you. You have been changing so many Ministries. What do you know about affairs of State? You know nothing but to hold on to office.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: It is because I have the confidence of the people.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You know nothing except to flatter your leader to achieve your purpose and then double-cross others if it comes to that—if I may say so, and you say I have wasted time.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Yes, it is more than that. And I will say it a hundred times.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is nothing but information in the statement that you brought and laid before us. Is it any action against that Commonwealth Immigrants Bill? Yet he is angry with me and he has not the courage to show the same anger against Mr. Harold Wilson, and these gentlemen come here and show their red eyes against me—you can understand

it. These are the people that are going to deal with the British. Do you believe, Mr. Chandra Shekhar, that they are the people who can deliver the goods, people who have been corrupted being in office for long years?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I am distressed at the happenings in this House and may I request once again that we proceed in a sympathetic and dignified manner? Every hon. Member who wanted to have his say has had the opportunity of expressing his sentiments and his opinions. Now let us calmly hear the Minister.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Instead of going on talking about other Members and wasting time, let the Minister proceed straight to give the reply.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Yes, Mr. Bhagat.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is very heartening that the House today has exhibited an unparalleled sense of unity in deploring and condemning what is being done in Britain. I have very carefully listened to the speeches, and as I have stated in the statement myself, I am in complete agreement with the sentiments and the attitudes regarding the problems of people of Indian origin in Kenya and East Africa, which have been expressed here. I have said myself that this raises very grave issues. The problem is very grave and serious. Not only it affects the lives of over a hundred thousand people of Indian origin in Kenya, it raises also certain vital moral issues with which we as a nation are concerned. And more than we it is the United Kingdom, where this legislation is being enacted, that should be more concerned according to their commitment to those people. But, surprisingly, the legislation that is being enacted there is discriminatory on grounds of the colour of the skin; racial discrimination is there. In whatever manner it may be explained, the fact is that it

[Shri B. R. Bhagat.]

amounts to the most grossest form of racial discrimination. The United Kingdom, the whole philosophy of their Statehood on which the Commonwealth is based, proclaims that it is against racial discrimination. But it violently violates that principle in this case. We as a nation had to fight for our nationhood, for our Statehood, and we have fought for the freedom of our country. People of my generation and people of the generations before us, we all have fought against British imperialism with our blood, with our sacrifices, and we cannot compromise on this principle. This is a principle which we cannot compromise on. It is the very ethos of our nationhood that we cannot compromise on this principle. This is one principle. But here, it denies the right to the citizens to which they are entitled in law. Whether it is the right under the Human Rights Declaration or is the normal right of any citizen, here, if they hold a British passport, they are British citizens and they have a right to go there. And the second principle is the one embodied in the Commonwealth of which we are also a part, and for our part we have not discriminated against peoples of the Commonwealth and we are allowing people free entry.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA (Uttar Pradesh): For the last twenty years they have been a dead weight on us and we should throw it now at once.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Well, the second principle which is not observed is that the British Government, for the first time, are denying rights to their own citizens. Dr. Antani has cited an instance and said: Why do we not take it up? I tried to go through it hurriedly but there I find that that matter related to the colonial passports, to the colony of Mauritius, when those people were colonial people and where the judgment came in. Now here this is not colonial passport; this is U.K. passport.

DR. B. N. ANTANI: It is true that

—••••

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: How this question arose, I do not know. I am meeting his point of view; I am coming. I am only saying that people of Indian origin in Kenya were having British passports and therefore that judgment did not apply in their case. Therefore that judgment did not apply. That judgment is irrelevant here. Here the question is that these people have the right to enter Britain, to go there as British citizens. It has not been questioned in any court of law and it is beyond any questioning. Therefore to deny them this right is another repugnant thing. And from the moral point of view also it is most repugnant. It is most unfortunate that of all Governments in the world the British Government should have enacted this law. They may say that the induction of these people will lead to pressure on their economy, that there will be social and other problems, housing problems and so on. But these will not deceive anybody. We in this country even at great distress to ourselves, have taken in such a large number of people from different parts who have come here, a very large number of them. And the British who have a developed economy, who are a very developed nation, they should not put forth such excuses. And moreover, these people now seeking to enter Britain, they are well-to-do people, persons who would be an asset to any society. They are either businessmen, technicians or other such people. They can be an asset to any society and to say that they will cause pressure on the economy, that it would be difficult to absorb them and so on, will not deceive anybody. There is no doubt in my mind that there is no case for any such action. That is why we took it up very strongly right from the moment we came to know that they were going to legislate like this. We took it up in the strongest possible manner and we have made our views known to that Government and we have protested and said that this is going to adversely affect our relations. Whatever senti-

ments we wanted to express we have expressed. But in the Government we function in a different way. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta asked, why I did not make any reference to it in the Statement. But paragraph 11 of the Statement says that and even in Britain where the newspapers, leading persons, **Members of Parliament** . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I did not say about that. You have not even used the language of criticism which the British people have used either in their Press or in the House of Commons.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I have said it. I think Mr. Gupta knows that if he comes to the Government he will not use certain expressions he is now using. It does not mean that we cannot express our feelings and our opinions at all and that too very strongly. We have certainly done it even though we might not have used a particular language. We have conveyed our strong feelings.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But the world will see what is contained in the Statement. It will not know your feelings.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: We do welcome the various statements made and the support given in the newspapers and in . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But what have you said?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: We have said what is necessary to say. It is not necessary to use the same words that my hon. friend may have in mind.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, the issue is not that. The Statement will be read by the wide world. I know your feelings. But the people of the wide world will go by this Statement that will be circulated and they will feel that the Government of India has criticised this measure on a much lower key than the criticism which has been voiced either by the

British Press or in the British Parliament. That is what I say. I am not saying that you should start using vulgar or abusive language. But certainly it could be put in proper language.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: We have used the strongest possible words.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You give it to me and I shall draft it for you. Your ICS-ridden priesthood will never know how to do it. They will never know how to attack the British. Give it to me. Ask the Prime Minister to make a request to me and I shall draft it.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Then there is another element. Before Kenya became independent the then Commonwealth Secretary Mr. Duncan Sandys, advised the people of Indian origin to opt for U.K. citizenship and he made all sorts of promises. And the successor government in Britain is not keeping those promises. They say that they did not advise these people to opt for United Kingdom citizenship. Some people have said that they were only stating the policy on this matter that the people of Indian origin should adopt the nationality of the country, that they should make common cause with the people of the country and integrate with the people, but actually, as a matter of fact the Government of U.K. their representatives, particularly Mr. Duncan Sandys advised them to opt for U.K. citizenship and he made many promises. It is really targic to see that the Government is not keeping its promises. Now we have seen the views expressed in this House. There cannot be a stronger expression of the nation's feelings. And the fact that it is unanimous means that it represents the views of the whole nation. Now the question is, what action is to be taken. What should we do? That is the point. Here I would very humbly plead with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that if he expected that I was going to

[Shri B. R. Bhagat.]

announce the policy of the Government without consulting the Cabinet or the Prime Minister . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I did not say that.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: . . . then I do not think he was doing justice to himself or to me. Otherwise why should he try to prevent me from speaking now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, this misunderstanding should be cleared. It is precisely for this reason that I did not want you to venture on this.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I know, but see the sequence of things. The Prime Minister could not be here. Only this forenoon it was decided to have this debate at three o'clock. The Prime Minister whispered that today is the Budget day. Actually the other House is having the Budget presented to it today. Before that there is a Cabinet meeting and there are various other prior engagements. There is absolutely no disrespect meant. There is no disrespect to this House and it is too much to expect that the Prime Minister would show any disrespect to this House. You know she will never do it. If the debate had been for tomorrow, she would have been here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is why I said you can take it up tomorrow. You need not have taken it up on yourself now.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) in the Chair].

श्री सखारसिंह भंडारी : मेरा निवेदन है कि मोशन के तहत जो जवाब दिया जाना चाहिये था वह आपने दे दिया है। प्रधान मंत्री उपस्थित नहीं हो सकी, उसका जवाब भी मिल गया है। अब आप आगे जवाब देने की कोशिश न करें।

श्री बी० आर० भगत : दो चार मिनट सुनिये तो आपको संतोष हो जायेगा।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why are you venturing on this? The Prime Minister is not present here. That is bad enough. For whatever reasons it may be, she is not present here. And if you start replying in this manner then it would be even worse. So I did not expect that you would venture on the task of replying on a policy question. That is precisely the reason why I said let it be taken up on a separate day.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: He said about this Statement. This Statement was made by . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Who drafted it? I say it has been drafted by ICS men.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): This is a Government Statement.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I do not want to take any credit for it, but this Statement has been gone through by me line by line and it has been changed and amended.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am sure you must have gone through it.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Yes, and it has been changed and amended.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, the point is that such statements should be drafted by political leaders.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Let me complete.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The English corrections we can do.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Please do not interrupt.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I say the correction of English we will do it for him.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: But the Statement has been seen and approved by the Prime Minister. This Statement has been made in response to a Calling Attention Notice to the Prime Minister and therefore to say that I have made the Statement and so it has not the necessary value or it does not have the necessary dignity, is I think to take a peculiar view. That is all I will say. I will not say more than that.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): You need not correct him at every stage.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Mr. Vice-Chairman, coming now to the action to be taken, we have advised the British Government that they should increase the quota to 15,000 heads of people so that the whole of the . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is it bargaining?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: There is no bargaining. It is just trying to solve the problem in a reasonable manner and to the satisfaction of the very people whom we all want to help. It is for this that this is being done. It is no bargaining. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta may say that it is bargaining, but I say there is no bargaining at all. As I have said there is no compromise on the basic principle, absolutely no compromise. But then we have to grapple with this practical problem and it is in pursuit of a peaceful solution that we have done it. We have said that the whole problem can be solved in two or three years' time and till then the . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But has he told them that . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): He knows what he should do. You please sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Has he told them that he would take these people and rehabilitate them in this country and for that whatever expenditure may be needed for their rehabilitation we shall meet by taking over the assets of the British here?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Please do not interrupt.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Therefore we have said it is their responsibility; it is primarily, solely, principally the responsibility of the U.K. Government that they should settle these people there if they want to go there. Those who say that we should take them over I think are not helping the cause of the people of Indian origin in Kenya. If we announce that we will take them over I think the British Government will say, all right, you take them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Nobody has suggested that. Mr. Vice-Chairman, all that was . . .

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Is there any wire pulling from behind that this puppet gets up every time?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not a puppet. You may be Indira Gandhi's puppet.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, nobody has suggested that should Britain refuse entry to these passport-holders of Indian Origin we should get them here. What was said was . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Order, order Hon. Member should please take his seat.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: that in such a case they should be rehabilitated here by taking over the British assets here.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, save us from remote-controlled puppets, otherwise we are being put to a lot of hardship.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know what you are saying.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: We have said we reserve our right of action and we have said this because we have to see in what form the legislation emerges, whether the problem is equitably, basically solved, whether the problem is satisfactorily solved or not, whether our basic objection has been met and so on. We have to watch all these things.

Then hon. Members have thrown up certain suggestions, very good suggestions, which have to be very seriously looked into—like if the problem is not solved, if the basic objection of racial discrimination is not met, if denial of the inalienable right of citizenship is there based on the colour of the skin or race, whether we should remain in the Commonwealth or not.

Then hon. Members from all sides have said that we should give up our link with the Commonwealth. This is another suggestion that has been made. Yet another suggestion is that we should bring them all and settle them here and as compensation we should freeze all the British assets here. All these suggestions will require very careful consideration. I agree with the hon. Member, not the Prime Minister alone, but the whole Cabinet will have to go into them and consider them and therefore it is not that the Prime Minister can make a statement tomorrow. It will take some time because when these grave issues are there they require very careful consideration, very serious consideration, before we take a decision. I can only assure the House that so far as this Government is concerned it sticks to

these basic principles and as I have said in the beginning there will not be any compromise on these basic principles. As for the actions we have to proceed in a responsible manner, consider them carefully, consider the feelings expressed in this House unanimously. Also the hon. Members should know there is the other House. They will also discuss this and we will consider the feelings that may be expressed in the other House. We have said that we reserve the right of action and we will, after considering all the aspects of the case, take whatever action is suitable to meet the situation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): The House stands adjourned till 6-15 P.M.

The House then adjourned at forty-four minutes past five of the clock.

The House reassembled at twenty-five minutes past six of the clock, **THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** in the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, on a point of order, before you start. When we adjourned we were told to meet here at 6-15 P.M. The House adjourned till 6-15. We do not know what happened (*Interruptions*). Let me finish. We are now meeting at 6-25, after ten minutes. I do not know what happened.

HON. MEMBERS: There was no quorum.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know what happened. Was our Deputy Chairman gheraoed somewhere? I should like to know it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Have you finished? Mr. Pant.