

[Shri Sitaram Jaipuria]

has been done as follow-up action. Whatever follow-up actions have been taken, so far, are half-hearted and do not come up to meet the situation that has arisen. At the time of devaluation in early June, the impression was given that devaluation would restore the free market forces to a certain extent, and governmental interference would be reduced to the extent possible, but the steps taken subsequently reveal something different. The cash subsidy scheme introduced only a few days back, although welcomed by the traders from the short-term angle I am afraid—and I must say so emphatically—is nothing short of a second *de facto* devaluation. Why did the Government not think earlier that such measures, which were themselves responsible for devaluation, would not be introduced again? A network of cash subsidies and export incentive schemes have been and are being introduced and can the Government assure us that this will not be followed by a second *de jure* devaluation in the near future?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN You may continue on the next day.

5 P.M.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

RECENT EXPULSIONS OF SOME PERSONS OF INDIAN ORIGIN FROM KENYA

DR B N ANTANI (Gujarat). Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the recent expulsions of some persons of Indian origin from Kenya.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI DINESH SINGH). On 30th July 1966, Shri D. H. D. Shah and Shri O. N. S. Nathwani living in Kisumu, Western Province were suddenly arrested and removed to Nairobi. They were served with notice of deportation to leave for India within 24 hours. As they were British subjects, our High Commissioner in Kenya objected to their being sent to India. Shri Shah and Shri Nathwani represented to the High Commissioner that they were very old and had no relatives in United Kingdom. They wanted to come to India as they had some

relatives in this country. The High Commissioner allowed them to come to India on compassionate grounds on the understanding that they would not be deported to India but would come to India on the strength of their valid British passports.

2 Again, on 13th August, 1966, our High Commissioner came to know that another person of Indian origin, Shri B. W. L. Shah had been arrested and served with notice of expulsion indicating that he would be sent to India by the Air-India flight leaving the next day. On further enquiries it was revealed that Kenya immigration authorities had reserved four more seats on the same flight. Our High Commissioner informed the Permanent Secretary of Kenya Foreign Office that expulsion or deportation of British subjects to India was improper. He mentioned that he had come to know that five persons were booked for India on 14th August, 1966 and that they would not be allowed to enter India. He also informed the Minister of State in the President's Office in charge of Foreign Affairs. The High Commissioner's verbal communication to the Foreign Office was followed up by a formal note on the morning of 14th August.

3 Later, it appeared that out of the five persons booked on 14th August, two persons, Shri P. P. Sheth and Shri J. N. Meghji Bhadaressa who had acquired Kenya nationality had been deprived of their citizenship by Kenya Government allegedly for 'having shown themselves by acts and speech to be disloyal and disaffected towards Kenya' and were rendered stateless. On their pleadings and compassionate grounds, the High Commissioner agreed to their being sent to India. The remaining three holding British passports viz., Shri B. W. L. Shah, Dr K. Nagrath and Shri V. P. C. Dodia were withheld and are believed to have been sent to U.K. It is understood that one other person, Shri V. M. S. Chandania has also been declared a prohibited immigrant.

4 The High Commissioner has made it quite clear to Kenya Government that no person, other than Indian citizen, can be deported to India. Persons of Indian origin holding British passports who could normally come to India without any visa or other formalities should also not be sent to India against their wishes.

5 On 15th August, 1966, the Voice of Kenya broadcasting on these expulsions had

objectionable references. This was reported the next day in the newspapers. Our High Commissioner has lodged a protest with the Kenya Government.

6 It is most unfortunate that the official agency of the Government of Kenya, with which we have had close and friendly relations, should make careless and deplorable references. We hope that the Government of Kenya will not permit some over-enthusiastic persons to mar traditionally friendly relations that have always existed between our two countries.

DR. B. N. ANTANI : Madam, a distinction is being sought to be made between persons of Indian origin and Indian citizens. Is it not a fact that these families of Indian origin have not taken British passports of their own volition and free will but they had to? Another point I would like to ask the hon. Minister. Is the hon. Minister aware of the fact that the specific reasons for the deportations are not even disclosed to them? In view of the fact that the hon. Foreign Minister made a statement in this House a few days ago that the treatment of Indians in Kenya has been satisfactory, in view of the development of the present situation and the pronouncement made by the President of Kenya very recently, does he see any reason to modify his opinion? The last question, Madam, that I would like to address the Minister is this. Is it not true that our Agents in these provinces have failed to maintain continuous and friendly contact with the Indian settled in these provinces in order to be able to assess the correct position with regard to their grievances?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Vajpayee.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) : Madam, I would like to submit this procedure. What happens is, if the Minister takes note of all questions and ultimately he is made to answer, he ignores many questions and evades the important points in the questions. Therefore, Madam, it should go Member by Member.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : In what form would the Minister like it?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : It is not a question of his liking.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Provided the questions are very specific and short

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : That is right.

DR. B. N. ANTANI : I hope I come in that category

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yes.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : It seems that the first part and the last part of the question of the hon. Member arise out of a misunderstanding when he refers to people of Indian origin as Indians. They are not Indians. There is a clear distinction between Indian citizens for whom we have responsibility and obligation and people of Indian origin who are settled in different parts of the world and have become citizens of the countries where they have settled or British subjects, and as such this difference will always be there. We shall not be answerable and we have no obligation to take them back into India if they have chosen other citizenship as such. Regarding the position of the people of Indian origin in those areas, it is quite clear that if they wish to live in those countries, they will have to live in friendship with the other local inhabitants. The more we try to make a distinction between them and the local citizens the more problems we shall create for them. It is true that some of them, some five or six, have been sent out of the country, and so have other people been put in prison or have been sent out. I do not think there is any question of an anti-Indian move because of these six deportations.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I will first ask those whose names are here. Mr. Vajpayee.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदया, मुझे अफसोस है कि मैं अपना प्रश्न छोटा नहीं रख सकूँगा क्योंकि यह मामला बहुत गम्भीर है ।

उपसभापति : आपको स्टेटमेंट नहीं करना चाहिये, केवल प्रश्न ही पूछना चाहिये ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : महोदया सवाल यह है कि भारत सरकार अपने दरवाजे भारतीयों के लिए कैसे बंद कर सकती है ? यह केवल कानून का सवाल नहीं है हमारी

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

एक नैतिक जिम्मेदारी भी है। श्री अप्पा पंत ने केनिया के भारतीयों को यह सलाह दी थी कि वे ब्रिटिश पासपोर्ट ले और उसके अनुसार वहाँ के भारतीयों ने ब्रिटिश पासपोर्ट लिया। हम उन्हें आज सलाह दे रहे हैं कि उन्हें केनिया की सिटिजनशिप ले लेनी चाहिये बहुत लोगों ने ले ली है, लेकिन जब तक उन्हें विश्वास न हो जाय कि केनिया में उनके साथ बराबरी का वर्ताव किया जायेगा तब तक उन्हें इस बात के लिये तैयार करना मुश्किल है कि वे केनिया के पूरी तरह से नागरिक बन जायें। लेकिन मैं सवाल उठाना चाहता हूँ कि क्या भारत अपने नागरिकों के लिए—क्या भारत माता के दरवाजे अपने पुत्रों के लिए बंद कर दिये जायेंगे? यह सवाल केवल सकीर्ण कानूनी सवाल नहीं है। बरमा के भारतीय यहाँ आ रहे हैं, पाकिस्तान के भारतीय यहाँ आ रहे हैं और अपने यहाँ बसाये जा रहे हैं, लेकिन केनिया से आनेवाले भारतीयों के लिए हम अपने दरवाजे कैसे बन्द कर सकते हैं? महोदया, मुझे इस पर बड़ी आपत्ति है और इस सरकार के रवैये की हमें निन्दा करनी होगी। मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे हाई कमिश्नर ने केवल यह कानूनी सवाल उठाने के अलावा कि उन्हें भारत न भेजा जाय, ब्रिटेन भेज दिया जाय, क्या केनिया सरकार से इस बात की मांग की कि जिनके विरुद्ध कार्यवाही की जा रही है, देश निकाला दिया जा रहा है, उन पर खुली अदालत में मुकदमा चलाया जाय? उन पर आरोप लगाया गया है राष्ट्र विरोध कार्रवाई का। हम जानना चाहते हैं कि यह राष्ट्र-विरोधी कार्रवाही क्या है। केनिया से आने वाली खबरों से पता लगता है कि प्रेसिडेंट केन्याता और पुराने वाइस प्रेसिडेंट श्री ओडिंगा में जो झगड़ा चल रहा है, उसमें इन भारतीयों को शतरंज का मोहरा बनाया गया है और इन भारतीयों के ऊपर आरोप लगाया गया है कि ये श्री ओडिंगा का साथ देते थे। यह बात अगर है तो बड़ी गंभीर बात है।

मगर हमारे हाई कमिश्नर को मांग करनी चाहिये थी कि इन भारतीयों पर मुकदमा चलाया जाय, उन्हें अपनी सफाई का मौका दिया जाय और अगर उन पर जुर्म साबित होता हो तो उनको सजा दी जाय। उनको केनिया से निकालने का कोई सवाल ही पैदा नहीं होता। मगर यह मांग करने के बजाय हमारे हाई कमिश्नर अपना सारा ध्यान इस बात की ओर लगाते रहे कि उन्हें भारत न भेजा जाय बल्कि उन्हें ब्रिटेन भेजा जाय। यह रवैया बड़ा आपत्तिजनक है और मंत्री महोदय स्पष्ट करे कि क्या भारत सरकार की नीति यही है कि अपने पुत्रों के लिये उसके दरवाजे बन्द रहेगे?

श्री भूपेश गुप्त (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : उठिये, पुत्र उठिये।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : सत्पुत्र उठिये।

श्री दिनेश सिंह . उपसभापति महोदया, अभी मैंने बहुत विनम्र निवेदन किया सदन में और माननीय सदस्य से भी कि चाहे वे जिस तरह के भाव प्रगट करे, लेकिन भारत माता के पुत्र और भूतृ वह कहा है। इसके साथ-साथ वं खुद कह गये भारत के नागरिक। तो भारत के नागरिक के लिये भारत के दरवाजे कभी बन्द नहीं हो सकते और न सरकार की कभी यह कोशिश होगी कि भारत के दरवाजे उनके लिये बन्द रहे। भारत उनका घर है और घर में दरवाजे बन्द नहीं हो सकते। जो भारतमूलक व्यक्ति है, जो दूसरे देशों के नागरिक बन गये हैं, वे जरूर कायदे कानून में आ जाते हैं उस देश के भी और हमारे देश के भी। वे तो सैकड़ों साल से बाहर रहे और वहाँ उन्होंने अपना घर बना लिया। हम यहाँ से जा करके कहीं दूसरी जगह बस जायें और वहाँ के नागरिक हो जायें, तो वहाँ के कानून के बीच में हम आ ही जायेंगे। इसी तरह कोई दूसरे देश से आ करके भारत का नागरिक बन जाय तो वह हमारे कानून के बीच में आ जाता है। अगर कोई विदेश से

आ करके भारत का नागरिक बने और उसके बारे में वहां की सरकार कुछ पूछे तो आप खुद समझ सकते हैं कि हमको कितना बुरा लगेगा। हमारे देश में हमारे कानून चलते हैं। इसी तरह से कीनिया में कीनिया के कानून चलते हैं और अपने कानून के हिसाब से अगर वे किसी को निकालते हैं तो यह उस व्यक्ति के लिये है कि वह मांग करे और वह कह सकता है कि हमारी जांच की जाय। मगर जो वहां पर भारत का हाई कमिश्नर है उसको यह अधिकार नहीं है कि कीनिया के राष्ट्रकों के बारे में वह कुछ कहे। भारत के नागरिकों के बारे में अगर कुछ होता तो जरूर उसका कुछ अधिकार हो जाता। लेकिन जैसा कि मैंने अभी अपने बयान में निवेदन किया कि इसके बावजूद भी जो भारत आना चाहते थे उनको हमने भारत आने दिया और वे चार यहां पर आये।

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore) : Madam, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether it is not a fact that, of late, Kenya, through what is called the Voice of Kenya, and some of the individuals had been taking an attitude which is very unfortunate in respect of India. They have also been referring to the situation in India, saying that it is a country of over-population, a country of poverty, a country of hunger, etc., disparaging to India in general. I would like to know whether any action has been taken with regard to telling Kenya that they must not undertake measures which look hostile on the very face of it, and also I would like to know, Madam, whether all the people of Indian origin have settled in Kenya—most of them must have become by now Kenya Indians, I mean Kenya citizens. I would like to know what is the condition of those people now. Whether they have been subjected to any hostile treatment, I would like to know.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I mentioned in the body of the statement, Madam, that we had lodged a protest with the Government of Kenya over the broadcasts through the Voice of Kenya. But so far as the second question of the hon. Member is concerned, whether the people of Indian origin have settled in Kenya, whether there is hostility

towards them, I do not know what exactly is the implication. I do not think that there is any hostility as such. It will take a little time for them to be truly integrated, as it will take time for those new emerging countries themselves to settle down.

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA (Uttar Pradesh) : Madam, this is not the first time; it has happened times without number that people of Indian origin there have been maltreated and badly handled. May I know from the hon. Minister as to whether he has analysed as to what is wrong with our foreign policy that only persons of Indian origin should be so badly treated and that they should be made the shuttle-cock in many different countries? Can he throw more light on that?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : It is not a question of our foreign policy. There are so many of them who have been allowed to stay on, and where they did not follow the correct policy, there the people were thrown out.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : May I ask the Minister whether his attention has been drawn to a statement made by President Kenyatta himself at Nairobi wherein, after defending the deportation of six persons, he said that those who found 'our' way of life unsuitable must pack up, or 'we' will help them to do so? Has any protest note been handed over by our High Commissioner protesting against this remark of President Kenyatta? I understand that the High Commissioner has been issuing statements in Kenya giving them publicity in the Voice of Kenya and in the Kenyan press.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I do not know what portion of this statement the hon. Member is objecting to. I think it is a perfectly legitimate statement to say in any country—and we say it in India—that those who do not identify themselves with the country should pack up and go. Besides, the statement, according to my information, was made in Mombasa and not in Nairobi.

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM (Nominated) : Madam Deputy Chairman, I want to put a question to the hon. Minister. At the same time I make a request to him not to give an answer to that question immediately today, and that question is whether the time has not come for India to

[Shri Jairamdas Daulatram]

reconsider its policy with regard to Indians, whether citizens of India, or citizens of certain countries, that is, where the countries involved are the countries which have gained freedom recently, countries whose people want to develop their countries themselves, whether the time has not come for us to reconsider our entire policy with regard to Indians in those countries, and the citizens of India who are there, or the people of Indian origin who are there, should be there only for the purpose of the service of those people. Individual Indians, who are there for individual interests, need no longer be there, and we, by a phased programme spread over a period of, say, ten, fifteen or twenty years, withdraw all those Indians and rehabilitate them appropriately according to a proper plan in India's economic structure here, and our relations with these newly free countries of Asia and Africa, which were developing themselves, should only be on the basis of purely disinterested service to their people. This is my question, Madam. I want no reply today. I would request the Government to consider it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It involves a foreign policy question.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Although the hon. Member has been kind enough to say that he does not want an answer here and now, my difficulty arises. If he did not want an answer today, then he could have sent me a letter and I would have sent him a reply. But he has said it in the House, and unless I say something, only one side of the story will go out. I quite appreciate the spirit in which the hon. Member has kindly expressed his sentiments, because he is deeply concerned about our relations with the newly independent countries, and he feels that the presence of people of Indian origin there is a source of friction, and I appreciate that very much. But the point is that we have got to accept the realities as they exist. A large number of people of Indian origin have become citizens of this country, and rightly so, and the more we talk about them, the more we talk about bringing them back, the more we talk about dealing with them, the more we talk about our responsibility in the matter and the other things that have been said here very bravely, it will make their stay in that country much more difficult; it will become

more difficult with every day passing. There is no question of their staying on there for ten years or fifteen years or twenty years. They will be thrown out today if we take this responsibility on ourselves. They have got to settle down in those countries as their citizens. Whatever we can do, we shall naturally do to talk to the Governments, to request them, to have a policy whereby they are not discriminated against, so that there is no pressure on them and they do not have to come back to India, because obviously, if they are pressurised, India will be the first country they will look to to come back, and on this ground we can certainly talk and we can do that. But we should not assume any legal responsibility or moral responsibility in that connection.

AN HON. MEMBER : Why not ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Because it will make their integration very difficult. There was nothing to prevent anybody from coming to India if, at the time of independence of those countries, all of them wanted to come to India; they could have come. They wanted to stay. Only if they let them stay, they will stay.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL (Delhi) : May I ask the hon. Minister if he is aware of the fact that an overwhelming section of the Asian society as it is called there has opted out for the United Kingdom passport and if it is a fact that two—or three—of the persons who have been deported had the United Kingdom passports, has the United Kingdom Government lodged any protest with the Kenyan Government against the deportation ? Thirdly, has the Government assessed this aspect that because African freedom to a great extent was linked up with Indian freedom, the British diplomacy is subtly working on this fact by these small tinkering, by creating small irksomenesses, to create differences between India and Africa, and is the Government taking adequate steps to see that this subtle British policy both from the United Kingdom and from the British personnel working in the Kenyan Government does not succeed and they do not play the British game in this context ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I entirely agree with the hon. Member that there has been a lot of interference from outside in complicating the issue. It is difficult for me to give any further details. And it is also true that a sizeable number have retained

the British passport. Hon. Members may not agree; they may feel that they should all hold Indian passports. But if they hold Indian passports, it would have been a different issue altogether. They were holding British passports because it was convenient for them to go out; they are not subject to our 'P' Form and other restrictions, and the fact that they have not taken up local citizenship is an important factor against them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The point that was raised should be answered properly. We are not going into the question of the technicalities of passports and so on. We do not know the passport laws in Kenya. But we have been told that they held British passports. These are not the matters under consideration. Now, why should not the Government treat this case on merits, because the Government of India is not prevented from allowing them to come to this country, and the Government of India can issue permits for coming? Therefore the question of passport is absolutely irrelevant if other things are satisfactory. Now, here it is not a question of influx of very many people; a few individuals are involved. Why should not the Government of India in such a case accommodate them and allow them to come to this country if they want—I mean the people of Indian origin—irrespective of the kind of passport they may or may not hold? Besides, before independence many of them had British passports . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You must come to the question.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : This is the question. I am asking a question. What am I asking all the time?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please ask.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am asking a question. I am asking why the Government

is not treating this matter on merit since it does not involve the influx of a large number of persons. Why don't you allow these individuals to come when they are of Indian origin? Why are you standing on the basis of technicalities of passports, especially when they do not know what these laws are? The fact that many of these people who were holding British passports before independence and are holding them afterwards—why should that come in the way of their coming to the country of their origin?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I regret to say, with all due respect to the hon. Member, that he seems to have missed the whole point of the statement and the subsequent questions that have followed. We have not prevented anybody from coming here. We have said that anyone who wants to come to this country of his free will is most welcome. We do not want people to be forced out and sent here. Why should they be sent out here? If they want to come of their own free will, the British passport does not require any permit or any visa; all they have to do is to buy a ticket and come here.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I think we have had enough on this.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : I want a discussion on the statement made by the hon. Minister of State. It is a serious matter and the House must be given an opportunity to discuss the whole thing.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at twenty-five minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 24th August, 1966.