

15.01 hrs.

**RESOLUTION RE : CONFERMENT OF
 SAME RIGHTS AS ENJOYED BY
 INDIAN CITIZENS ON PERSONS
 OF INDIANS ORIGIN LIVING
 ABROAD—Contd.**

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : The House will now resume further discussion on the Resolution moved by Shri Balwant Singh Ramoowalia.

Shri Harish Rawat to continue his speech.

[Translation]

SHRI HARISH RAWAT (Almora) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I was saying last time that the Resolution of Shri Ramoowalia was not that ordinary or innocent as it looked outwardly. I do not think there is any other example of this type in the world. In his speech he gave examples of Bangladesh and Pakistan. I do not think there is any country in the world where for one person two types of citizenship are allowed. He has asked to grant Indian citizenship also to a person who has already got the citizenship of another country. If he is provided Indian citizenship, then necessarily he will have to be provided with all the Fundamental Rights also. It is also a little ambiguous as to how one person can enjoy or expect to enjoy the fundamental rights of two countries simultaneously. He has given a limited view point in his speech, which means that with this, our cultural affinity will enhance with the other countries. We would like that our cultural relations with those who have been born in India or whose parents or members of whose family are living in India should continue. We would like that amity amongst us should continue. They may continue to love India's culture, faiths, and traditions. But we also want that the people who have acquired citizenship of any other country should become one with them so that they do not have any difficulty. They have certain

responsibilities towards the people and the country whose citizenship they have acquired. We want that they should have affection for us, but at the same time they should have love and affection for the culture and people of that country also. Citizenship in no way hampers this. If any British national or any other national is living in our country, no one is going to stop him to have affection for his own country. There cannot be any check on him. In our own State of Punjab there are families in which one member follows the Hindu religion and his brother believes in Sikh religion. This does not in any way affect their family relations. I fail to understand the grounds on which the mover of the Resolution has commended it. Keeping in view the present day situation it has no meaning at all. If we think that the people who have gone out of India should be allowed to retain Indian citizenship, then I may submit that in India and particularly in North India people have been coming since long. We consider North India as Aryans' country and the Aryans' too had come here from some other country. Tomorrow they can claim that they believe in the Aryans' culture and they should be given the citizenship of that country from where they had migrated. I think then we will be in serious difficulty. Moreover, in the circumstances through which we are passing at present, such a thing cannot be even thought of. Otherwise, there is possibility of our being in great trouble. Shri Ramoowalia and his Party's Government in Punjab are themselves victims of problem created by such people and he is more aware of this than me. Certain people who have gone out of India and have acquired the citizenship there, are being used by some people in that country against India. If we give them Indian citizenship once again, we will be in great trouble. If on technical grounds we say that certain persons should be given rights of double citizenship, then that is not possible, because we will have to amend the Constitution and those provisions will be applicable uniformly to all. The amended provision would be uniformly applicable to all the persons of Indian origin living abroad. Therefore, it cannot be a practical step. So far as my knowledge

[Shri Harish Rawat]

goes, there is no such precedent in any of the country in the world. Shri Ramoowalia might be aware of any such example, but in his speech he has not mentioned any example or any clause of this type. Therefore, on the basis of incomplete information or under the impact of emotions or with a view to appease certain persons, to remove their difficulties, the mover has brought forward this Resolution in this House. I, therefore, oppose it vehemently. I oppose it not because Shri Ramoowalia has moved this Resolution, but because on technical grounds it is not possible to pass it. It is not favourable to the circumstances prevailing in India and also we do not find any precedent of this type in the entire world. I, therefore, request Shri Ramoowalia to withdraw his Resolution.

[English]

DR. SUDHIR ROY (Burdwan) : Madam, I rise to support the Resolution tabled by my hon. friend Shri Ramoowalia. It is a fact that tens of millions of Indians live outside our country. They are looked upon as very responsible citizens in the countries where they live. They have become prosperous by dint of their hard labour and sincere efforts. But it is a fact that they were compelled to renounce their Indian Citizenship often because of harsh racial discrimination, colour discrimination. There is racial hatred. Therefore, many Indians living in West European countries, Canada or USA, were compelled to renounce their Indian citizenship; otherwise they would have been subjected to various kinds of discrimination. They could not purchase property. They could not move abroad. Therefore, they renounce their Indian Citizenship. This does not mean that they have no soft-corner towards India. This does not mean that they have no feelings for India. Rather, they are second to none in their patriotism and love for India. Therefore, I would request the Government to follow the example of Pakistan which confers double citizenship. That is, people who live abroad are also recognised as citizens of Pakistan. These non-resident Indians have done much to contribute to India's economic growth. They have done much to contribute to our prosperity. But for their help, we could not have overcome

the great foreign exchange crisis in the years gone by. But it is found that, when these people come to India, when they come to visit their old parents or when they come to visit their kith and kin, often they are harassed in many ways. The bank officials try to harass them, the police harass them. They cannot invest in family property, they cannot purchase anything. Therefore, they return very much embittered. Hence, I would support this Resolution that the Indians living outside our country should be granted citizenship right. This will strengthen our emotional integration with them. They must not feel that they are alone, they must not feel that they are maltreated by the Indian Government.

With these words, I support the Resolution.

[Translation]

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA (Pali) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, when I went through Shri Ramoowalia's Resolution, I came to know as to what he wants. Does he want that the people living out of India—say in Montreal or Toronto, in Canada, in Pakistan, any other country or in London—may be given right to come here and with their money power fight elections? The law does not allow this.

He has written in it that for the people who have taken the citizenship of some other country, the Representation of People Act should be amended to allow them to come here and fight elections of the State Assemblies and the Lok Sabha. I want to know as to why they want to come here? Do they consider politics as a means of service to the public? If they think so, then let them come here and reside here and acquire Indian citizenship. This thing has not been said in the Resolution. If the activities of the people who reside outside India have been anti-India, then who will look into them?

There are a large number of Indians who have become the citizens of other countries and reside there. They are able to raise 'Khalistan' slogan in that country. Do we want that they should be allowed to be elected to the Lok Sabha? There are people who have hatched conspiracy to commit a

murderous assault on our Hon. Prime Minister. The Government there had come to know of this conspiracy. Do you want that such people should be allowed to come here? What is the intention of Shri Ramoowalia behind this Resolution?

He has moved this Resolution here and he himself is not present. Has he gone to call them? We have not yet passed the Resolution. Has he gone to extend an invitation to them?

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE (Jadavpur) : Madam Chairman, he should have been present here. Where has he gone?

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA : He has written in the Resolution :

[English]

"With a view to strengthen the emotional bonds....."

[Translation]

Is this the way to show one's love and affection towards the country? He has said :

[English]

"...same rights as are enjoyed by the Indian citizens including the right to vote and to contest elections to Parliament and the State Legislatures....."

[Translation]

Can there be only this way of showing love towards the country? Is there any way to enquire into their past activities? Unless they reside in India, should the ballot papers be despatched to them under the Representation of People Act for making the candidates of their choice? Is it possible? I think that hundreds of people working abroad or working in Army cannot send their ballot papers in this way.

[English]

"Right to franchise to Indian citizens abroad—A number of representations were received from individuals and associations of Indian expatriates

demanding the right to vote in Indian elections. References have also been received in the Commission from the Ministries of External Affairs, Home and Law on the above subject. Under the existing law, only persons whose names are registered in the electoral rolls are entitled to vote at elections to the Lok Sabha and the State Legislative Assemblies."

[Translation]

Shri Ramoowalia has brought forward this Resolution without any concrete ground. As demands of the Punjab are increasing every day, he thought that one more demand may be added. I submit that they have been provided such right neither in the Representation of People Act nor anywhere else. They should first become citizens of the country and should live here for some time ... (Interruptions) and, moreover, they should renounce the citizenship of that country. Only then these types of rights we can think of giving to them. But they thought that they will fight elections with the help of money power. I would suggest that the people who fight elections on the basis of money power should be disqualified. If the people who are not affiliated to any party, who have not worked among the people, whose work is not known to the people, come directly for fighting elections of the Lok Sabha and if they are allowed to contest with their money bags against those who fought during the freedom struggle, served the country, toured different places in the country and established contacts with the people, that is not going to benefit the country and Shri Ramoowalia's Resolution to this effect cannot benefit the country in any way. Some literature is also available on this, somebody had moved it earlier also. That material is not available with me at present. Ultimately, that was withdrawn. I do not want that these people should be given right to contest elections under the provisions of the Representation of People Act or the Indian Constitution. Such a Resolution cannot be of any benefit to us. They too will not be benefited and there is no need of it. Therefore, I feel that all the hon. Members, sitting on this side or that side, should oppose this Resolution with one voice and ask Shri Ramoowalia to withdraw it boldly.

[English]

SHRI NITYANANDA MISRA (Bolangir) : Mr. Chairman, the Resolution before the House is to confer citizenship on persons of Indian origin who have settled in the foreign countries. I do not know if this Resolution will be acceptable even to those persons for whom it is meant. A large number of Indian people have migrated to foreign countries, have settled there; some of them have got citizenship rights and some of them have not. They are doctors, engineers, scientists etc. who have done exceedingly well in different walks of life; in business, trade and industry they have played a very vital role in that country and have comprehensively contributed to the economic development and prosperity and have formed a very good reputation not only for themselves individually but also for our country. These people have also maintained their emotional attachment and affinity with their relations and friends here in our country. Very frequently, they come here, meet their relations and friends. Therefore, the emotional attachment is still there.

We know that during the freedom struggle, Indians who were abroad, made a substantial contribution in giving us moral courage and material support in full measure because they were in full agreement with the hopes and aspirations of the people of this country.

Conferring Indian citizenship on them will not build emotional affinity; it already exists in full measure.

Secondly, whenever our leaders have gone abroad, they have advised the Indian community in foreign countries to remain loyal to that country, to owe allegiance to that country and the people in full measure so that they will be taken into complete confidence and trust by the people of that country and can make a substantial contribution in different spheres of life and earn a place of honour and respectability in that country. The Indian community in all the countries have followed the advice of our leaders and have, in fact, earned that reputation. We are happy to note that. Therefore, even if we confer Indian citizenship rights on them, probably they will not accept it, because their emotional affinity with the people of that country, Government

of that country will be seriously vitiated. If they accept our citizenship, they would become suspects in the eyes of the countries in which they have settled. As I said, they have done exceedingly well there and have earned a lot of reputation and respectability. They would not like to accept the citizenship of this country, because that would result in removing them to a distance from the people of that country. I do not think, there is any provision for a dual citizenship to be given to one individual I do not think that any country confers citizenship on a person who has already become the citizen of another country. If it is so, it does not help, either our country which confers a citizenship or the person who accepts it. I think there is absolutely no need for it and it will not be helpful to any party. Therefore, this resolution in its objective, in its purpose does not fulfil the aspirations of the people who have settled in foreign countries. Therefore, I think this resolution will not help them and I am against this resolution. Ultimately, it is necessary that the citizen of one country must owe allegiance to a particular country of which he becomes a citizen. If a person becomes a citizen of the two countries, to whom will the loyalty go? This is the basic fact. I think it has got an inner contradiction which cannot be removed and it is not completely for all practical purposes acceptable either to the country which confer the citizenship or the persons who have settled in the foreign countries.

[Translation]

DR. G.S. RAJHANS (Jhanjharpur) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is my good luck that when I have risen to speak Shri Ramoowalia has come back in the House. I was thinking as to what made him to move this Resolution. I think that he has moved it after giving full thought to the matter and in his full senses. He must have understood its implications. He is a very good friend of mine. He knows it and I act upon his advice. In this connection I would like to submit two or three points.

He has said that the people of Indian origin living abroad should be allowed to vote, contest Legislative Assembly and Parliament elections. This provision should be made by amending the Constitution. I would like to ask a small question to him.

I have resided abroad for quite a long time—Let him define the term 'the people of Indian origin'. Do you consider those people also of Indian origin who have gone to Africa, Canada or to other countries hundred years back? Do you consider them as such or not? The people who have gone abroad two to four years back are also of the Indian origin. Kindly define it. I also want to know whether Pakistan will grant its citizenship or all the rights to the people who have come from Pakistan and have been living in our country since 1947? There the democracy is either for name's sake or does not exist at all. Similarly, will the people of Bangladesh who have migrated to this country be given rights of citizens by that country? Still more interesting is the case of Sri Lanka. The people fighting there—both Tamils and Non-Tamils—are of the Indian origin. Sinhalese as well as Tamils both are of the Indian origin. Therefore, if this Resolution is passed and they come to India and get elected, what will happen then? Does it look plausible?

Since the time of Lord Buddha, the Indians had spread in the South East Asia.

15.30 hrs.

[SHRI SHARAD DIGHE *in the Chair*]

They still think themselves to be of the Indian origin. Their names are Indian. Will all those people get this right then? And if they get it and his theory is accepted, then we will be reduced to minority and they will overpower us. Kindly visualise that situation as to who will be called 'of the Indian origin.' In fifties when there was revolution in Tibet, a large number of people fled to India. Will China give them its citizenship once again, and make them a part of Government there? Kindly think calmly and do not be charged with emotions. You will find that this theory looks—I will not use the word 'absurd'—very strange that the people of the Indian origin living abroad should be allowed to vote here and fight elections of Parliament. This will, of course, serve one purpose. When Shri Ramoowalia goes abroad, he

will get good respect there and he will say there that he fought for them in the Indian Parliament. This purpose, of course, will be served.

Another point. Will it be proper to give right to vote or fight elections to those who have gone recently out of India? I would like to give one example of a family. I know that family and that belongs to Bihar. Six members of that family settled in Canada and have amassed huge wealth. Four members of that family settled in the USA and earned lot of money. But they too are unhappy. This is so because the people living around them have more money than what they could amass. Therefore, the money has got no value there. Now, if they somehow get a chance to contest elections to Parliament or the State Assembly here, they will immediately come here and spend even Rs. 5 crores in one election. The situation in the country is such that money plays a vital role in the elections and there are areas in the country where people turn the tide with their money bags. The result will be that at present Shri Ramoowalia says that they might be allowed to vote and fight elections and let them be elected as M.Ps., but later on when they will be elected in his place, he will say that it is not good. Therefore, my submission is that this problem should be thought of seriously. It is not that easy as it looks. Someone is sent to America, Canada or England for studies. The parents expect many things from him and sell their property and assets and borrow money for his studies, but that person forgets his parents and marries some girl of foreign nationality there. Even if he does not marry a foreign girl, he prefers to live there. He says that he cannot bear flies and mosquitoes here and cannot live here. He becomes accustomed to a certain climate and likes to reside there. For a month or two he comes here and then flees back, because the facilities which he has enjoyed there are not available to him in this country. As against this there is someone else who has been educated abroad and is living here in spite of difficulties. Since he does not get all the facilities here, he too will be influenced by them. Then why

[Dr. G.S. Rajhans]

should they be given such rights? Therefore, I ask Shri Ramoowalia not to bring such ideas in his mind and if he has brought such ideas, he should wipe them out from this mind.

Secondly, if they are given the right of getting elected here and are given the citizenship the culture of this country will be changed. Every where we will hear pop music and see peep show. God knows what else will be seen here. We will be finished and they will dominate. We will not be able to stop that situation.

I will give you a small example. This I am telling you on the basis of my own knowledge. When an Indian living abroad is asked to send some money to his parents in India, he states where from he can send, he is not saving anything. The same Indian while coming to India, say from Canada, will bring a letter from someone stating that "they have got ten thousand 'rusgullahs'." This means that he has received ten thousand dollars and not 'rusgullahs' and he should be given equal amount of exchange in Indian currency. Had he sent that money through proper channel, country would have got foreign exchange, but he brings ten thousand dollars through an improper channel and gets money for that in black. This method is adopted in smuggling also. Now tell me as to what love for the country such people have? They want only facilities. They have left us and they do not have any affection for us. If these people are allowed to enter the Parliament or any Legislative Assembly, what hope can we have from them for the welfare of the country?

I would like to make one more point. We face a lot of troubles in our own country. We make sacrifices. Once we allow them to settle here, our children will go against us. They will be impressed by their pomp and show and blame us that we are not providing them the same level of living as their children enjoy. If we were to provide the same level to our children, we will have to resort to dishonest means. Will this be in the interest of the country?

Therefore, I shall request Shri Ramoowalia to consider this matter dispassionately

and not to allow such things to enter his mind. We have love for those who have parted company with us. They come here and we also go there. We can never become Member of Parliament of their country. Therefore, we also cannot allow them to become Member of our Parliament.

With these words, I strongly oppose this Resolution.

[*English*]

SHRI V.S. KRISHNA IYER (Bangalore South): Today I speak with anguish because I have to oppose a resolution moved by an hon. Member for whom I have great admiration and regard.

It is the fundamental duty of any person to live in his motherland. Nobody can have two mothers. One can have only one mother and other mother can be only step-mother.

Many of our Indian brothers and sisters go abroad for various reasons. Some of them go there to acquire greater knowledge. Some go to earn their livelihood as they cannot earn their livelihood here. Those who go outside to acquire knowledge, as mentioned by one of the hon. Members, many of them have brought fame and name to our country. There are thousands and thousands of scientists, doctors and engineers who have become very popular there and those countries do not release them to go back to our country. They have really brought fame and name to our country. We also feel proud of them. But they should not forget one thing that their loyalty is first to the country in which they are born. That is why, I am opposing this resolution because it is the duty of every Indian to serve his motherland first. His life is first for his motherland. Let him acquire any knowledge, let him be there for any number of years, but he should come back. There is a demand for him here. We want doctors, engineers, scientists because our country is a developing country. 50 per cent of our population is below the poverty line. Those scientists, doctors and engineers who are serving outside, have no business to become citizens of those countries. They may say that they do not have the minimum facilities

here. I know that many of our Indian scientists and doctors have said that. Of course, I agree with them on this point. But at the same time, I also appeal to the Government of India to realise its responsibility. I am glad that the Prime Minister, more than once, has said in this House that conditions would be created by which they would attract back our Indian scientist, doctors and engineers who are abroad. Such conditions should be created and they should be provided at least some minimum facilities. Those people who are enjoying there, cannot expect the same standard of living here. They should live along with other Indians. They cannot live in palatial buildings. They should adjust themselves in their motherland. What I feel is that we should also see that for those of the Indians who go abroad to acquire knowledge or in search of jobs we should create conditions in this country so that they can come back.

On principle I oppose the resolution. I do not know on what basis Mr. Ramoowalia has moved this resolution. Unfortunately I was not here when he moved his resolution and made the speech.

As one hon. Member has said, this is not the proper forum where we can discuss this matter of giving citizenship. This can only be discussed in the international forum because this will not confine to India alone; it is an international matter. There cannot be dual citizenship.

Whatever it is, I hope, hon. Member Shri Ramoowalia, will agree with me that our Indian brothers and sisters who have gone abroad, they must try to come back and serve our country. At the same time, we are very sorry—the hon. mover is also aware—that we have to bend our head in shame that some of our Indian brothers are engaged in anti-national activities. That should be curbed. We should never welcome such people but for other Indians the door must always be open and we should really welcome them with warmth and affection. So, in principle I oppose this Resolution and thank you for giving me time.

[Translation]

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE

condemn the Resolution moved by Shri Ramoowalia. I fail to understand as to why this type of Resolution has been admitted in Parliament and how we are having a discussion on it. I am much surprised to see this Resolution on the agenda, more so because C.P.M. Members have supported it whole-heartedly. (Interruptions)

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOOWALIA : you are talking of C.P.M. but I say that not even a single Member has supported it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY (Midnapore) : She takes the cord to a snake. She regards everyone as C.P.M. Member. Nobody has supported it... (Interruptions)

[English]

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Yes, CPI(M) supported this, Narayan Da... (Interruptions) Dr. Sudhir Roy has supported this.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : I do not know what happened outside.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Not outside, it was here. Narayan Da, I am just reminding you. He has supported this Bill just now.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

Ramoowaliaji and we know that there are talented persons living abroad. But no one can enjoy dual citizenship. If Ramoowaliaji is an M.P., could he become an M.L.A. If anyone wants to come back, we will welcome him. For him there is the right enshrined in the Indian Constitution. I would like to tell you :—

Khud ko kar buland itna keh har taqdir se pahle,

Khooda bande se khud poochhe, bata teri raza kya hai.

[English]

The Constitution says:

[Kumari Kamala Banerjee]

- (i) Indian citizenship acquired by the birth right.
- (ii) Indian Constitution and the Citizenship Act provide power to consider applications of people who are not Indian citizens and, in suitable cases, to grant citizenship.
- (iii) Persons of Indian origin living abroad can apply and there is no question of any amendment.

[*Translation*]

There is such a right already enshrined in the Indian Constitution, but we are really surprised that Shri Ramoowalia has brought forward such a Resolution. Hon. Speaker has announced officially this morning that ten persons have been killed in Punjab. This has pained us very much. The people of the country have made great sacrifices during the freedom struggle. I had an opportunity to visit Bangkok. There, an Indian is employed in some organisation. When we were going on a vehicle, I had a talk with him. He was speaking against the country. I recall a song, "*Sare jahan se achha, hindustan hamara*". This song has been composed so that we may feel proud of being Indians. Therefore, even if we go abroad, we should not say anything against our country. We have been born in this land. Therefore, we should do some constructive work for the country.

[*English*]

Unity in diversity is our origin. We feel proud of our diversity. Our diversity is tremendous. This is obvious. Everybody can see it.

[*Translation*]

We are proud of our diversity. But we fail to understand as to why Shri Ramoowaliaji has brought forward this Resolution. I would like to bring few points to his notice. What was in his mind when he moved this Resolution.

We understand that Shri Ramoowaliaji has brought forward this Resolution only

for those few people in the U.S.A., U.K. and Canada who have left India and settled there. These countries have big money power and arms power and they say a lot of things about India. Do you want to help the creation of Khalistan here by granting dual citizenship to the people of such countries. Tomorrow these very people will say that the people of China may be granted citizenship of India. Similarly, they can say that those people of other marxist countries may be given rights of Indian citizenship who say that China is their country and Leninism is their religion and they say that India is not their motherland. Have you brought this Resolution to support such people? We strongly condemn such a feeling, because India cannot be the motherland of such people. How can such people be granted citizenship of India? The people who work against the interest of India want that the persons of other countries should be granted citizenship of India so that people of other countries may be brought here and in this way strength could be gained with the money power and the unity and integrity of the country is jeopardized. It seems that Shri Ramoowaliaji has brought forward this Resolution with this purpose in mind. We strongly condemn it.

We would like to tell Shri Ramoowaliaji that we belong to Bengal where Shri Rabindranath Tagore was born and who composed the National Anthem of India. He did not make a mention only of Bengal in his composition. He wrote: 'Punjab, Sindh, Gujarat, Maratha, Dravid, Utkal Banga'. His intention was that whether we are Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs or Christians, we are all citizens of this country and we are all bound by human relationship. Therefore, you should speak on such subject which manifests national unity. All the people should have the feeling of fraternity. I would like to say that:

*Jin ko bhavosa nahin Khud apne fanon par
Voh Khuda ke sahare ki bat Karte hain.*

This Resolution does not deserve our support. We will have to move shoulder to shoulder and keep pace with the progress of the country. Other people are also with us. This Resolution does not

inspire us to work together. We would, therefore, like to request Shri Ramoowaliaji that keeping the interest of the country in mind and to strengthen the hands of our Hon. Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi and to crush the terrorist movement completely and to liquidate the extremists, he should withdraw his Resolution. We are all human beings. It is not possible under any circumstances to grant the citizenship of India to a person of any other country. It is not possible that a person should retain his position as M.L.A. and M.P. simultaneously. He will have to accept his either of the two positions. Therefore, you should withdraw this Resolution. That will be in the interest of all the people. Jai Hind.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH RATH (Aska) : This Resolution advocates joint citizenship and if passed we will have a far reaching consequence. Both of us have been to foreign countries—Srilanka, Fiji, Africa, London, America. We know what are the conditions of the people of Indian origin there. In Fiji, as you know, 51% population is of the Indian origin. At one time a person of Indian origin would have been the Prime Minister but somehow it was sabotaged. We have seen in all the municipalities there the people of Indian origin are Chairmen. Not only that, we have gone to Mauritius. We have gone to other countries. The development of those countries, the economic growth of those countries, was made by the people of Indian origin. We went to Srilanka also. We know that there are lakhs of people, specially the workers in tea gardens who have no citizenship right in that country. They have been agitating for years together to have citizenship right, right to vote. We have gone to Nairobi. We have seen that in Nairobi all the business people are of the Indian origin. This is the case in Mauritius and also in Singapore. In all these countries, it is the people of Indian origin who have gone there and developed those countries and are responsible for the growth of those countries. In some countries they have formed the Government. They are ruling the country and they are Ministers there. Under these circumstances, can you say that they should come to

India and acquire our citizenship? On the other hand, we have gone to different countries like Canada and America and we have seen that some of the Indian-origin people who have gone there and have acquired the citizenship of those countries, have fallen a prey to the conspiracy to de-stabilise our Government. What will happen to those persons if they get citizenship in India? Colonial powers and certain foreign powers are very much against the growth of India and they are financing and fomenting through their agents and doing everything to de-stabilise the national and popular Government in India. So, that must be taken into consideration. Not only that, Sir. Even there is a conspiracy to blow up this Parliament House. In a situation like this when they are trying to de-stabilise India and to cut India into pieces, if this Resolution is adopted, it will only help those people all the more in their nefarious intentions.

I would urge upon the Mover of the Resolution to withdraw the same because it will neither help the growth of this country nor the growth of those persons of Indian origin who have settled in those countries. They have settled there and even formed Government in those countries. Under these circumstances, this Resolution will only help such persons who are interested only to block the progress of India and the growth of this country under the leadership of our esteemed Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, and help the Extremists and others who want to de-stabilise the country. Let us not fall a prey to this and I request the Mover of the Resolution to withdraw it. I oppose it.

[Translation]

SHRI K.D. SULTANPURI (Simla) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to oppose the Resolution moved by Shri Ramoowalia. Considering the views expressed by the hon. Members, it seems that there is no scope for the Indian people, who have settled abroad and acquired citizenship of the concerned country, to contest elections in India and become Members of Parliament. There are such type of elements among them who create disorder in other countries.

[Shri K.D. Sultanpuri]

We visited Yugoslavia. What we have seen there is that the Indian people who have acquired the citizenship of that country, have married at least twice. In whichever country they settled, they married there. Among such people, the number of Sikhs is more and they have married several times. I met a person in Germany who was employed as a driver. That driver told me that when he was in Germany, he married there, when he was in America, he married there and when he was in Canada, he married there also. If such type of people are granted citizenship of this country, if their names are included in the electoral rolls of this country and if they get right to contest elections, will all their wives become citizens of India?

I think the Resolution moved by the hon. Member Shri Ramoowalia is not proper. Moving of such a Resolution amounts to deceiving the country. He should not have brought forward such type of Resolution. He himself moved such a Resolution and now he is not even present here. He should have been here. We thought that there would be a good administration in Punjab. Of course, there is a Government in Punjab, but innocent people are being killed there. Which forces are at work behind this carnage? It seems that foreign elements are behind it. It will be very unfortunate if we give them opportunity to bring such type of Resolutions in the House and the hon. Members extend support to such a move.

We have to keep this country united and we have to maintain its integrity and dignity. This can happen only if all the Members of the Parliament and Members of State Legislatures or the intellectuals think for the interest of the country. It seems that this resolution has been brought forward by some divisive factions or with some ulterior motives. I hope this House will not agree to this resolution.

The main thing is that a person who had been a Minister in Punjab, I do not want to mention his name, talks of Khalistan in Canada in the name of Sardar Jagjit Singh. He belongs to Hoshiarpur district to which Shri Kamal Chaudhary belongs. If such type of people are given citizenship of the country, these very people who are traitors

and who oppose us, try to tighten their hold over India. It was revealed that they had conspired to kill the Prime Minister when he went there for a visit. If such persons are given citizenship of India, the fate of the country will be uncertain. Therefore, care should be taken before bringing forward such a resolution. He has gone out, but I will request him that he should come back in the House and withdraw his resolution.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY (Midnapore): Sir, I rise to oppose the resolution of Shri Ramoowalia with a very heavy heart. The reason of my opposing it is that it is not a proper Resolution and has not been brought at the appropriate time. But it is unfortunate that our sister Mamataji hold CPM responsible for everything. (*Interruptions*) There is a song in our Bengal:

*Mori hai Kolcutta Kewal bhoole bhora,
Buddhimane Kotechori bokaye pore Dhore*

I would not like to dwell on it in detail. What I would like to say is that this should be kept in mind that two types of persons have gone out of the country. The first type of people are those who were sent as coolies by the Britishers out of India to those places where there were tribals and who did not know any work. The workers sent to those countries had the knowledge of working in the fields and factories. They helped those countries in making progress in every field and taught them the methods to grow crops like sugarcane, tea, etc. The second type of persons are those on whom the Government have spent lakhs of rupees in making them doctors, engineers, scientists, but as soon as they got an opportunity, they left the country and settled abroad. Before going abroad they say that they would return, but this has never happened. The first type of people are those who left the country 150 to 200 years ago. They will not come back. We have a lot of problems of our own. We have a population of 70 to 75 crores. There is poverty here. Why will they come here? They have become Chairmen, Ministers, and Members of Parliament there. Why will they come back? This Resolution is not for them.

[*English*]

The Resolution is for such persons who are sitting in U.K., who are sitting in

Canada, who are sitting in U.S.A. and having good fun.

[*Translation*]

We oppose it strongly. This should not happen. These people feel ashamed in calling themselves Indians. They speak ill of their motherland while travelling in planes, trains, etc. But after all, this is our country. We have our own weaknesses and qualities. We have to live and die in this country. This country has provided us milk, food, water and air. They have acquired property in other countries and settled down there and now they want to come here to cast only votes. We have not been able to provide opportunity to our voters to cast their votes. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM PYARE PANIKA (Robertganj) : It has happened due to Charan Singh.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : It has happened due to Charan Singh as well as you. The tribals cannot cast their votes in the country at present. There was a photograph of voters of Bihar published in the "Telegraph" showing the old people trembling. We cannot help them cast their votes. Our Harijan brothers cannot cast their votes. On the other hand we are talking of granting voting right to those who are living abroad and enjoying there. I totally oppose it. This is a very bad thing.

If any Indian who is settled abroad wants to become citizen of this country, he should first apply for it. His application can be considered. But this is not good that they are settled abroad and want to come to India only for casting their votes. It is not proper to say that this is a poor country. Of course our country is poor, but there is a reason behind it. The reason is that the Britishers had plundered this country for 200 years. Our great beloved leader Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das had said in his speech in the convention of Bengal Congress that with the downfall of Murshidabad, the upliftment of Britain had begun to take place. The Britishers plundered Bengal and this country. That is why our country is so poor.

Shri Hansrajji has rightly said that we have to face the problem of muscle power

and money power. (*Interruptions*) In Bihar and U.P. people draw out spear at the slightest provocation. I, therefore, oppose this on this count.

In the end, I shall make one more point. Those people who have settled abroad comprise Sikhs, Muslims and Hindus also. A section of them is engaged in anti-India activities and terrorist activities. Who is this Jagjit Singh Chauhan raising the flag of 'Khalishtan'? We should consider all these things. Because—

*Janani Janam bhoomi sncha,
Swargdapi gariyasi'*

We have to live and die here. I, therefore, strongly oppose this Bill. This Bill should not be passed. I hope that Shri Ramoowaliaji will withdraw his resolution.

SHRI NARENDRA BUDANIA (Churu) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I find myself unable to support the Resolution of hon. Ramoowaliaji. I am surprised that in this present time Shri Ramoowaliaji has brought forward this Resolution. He wants that the Indians who have gone abroad from here and settled there should be brought in the politics of this country. I would like to tell him that before taking part in politics, one has to serve the people and win their hearts. One has to work in accordance with the wishes of the people. In our country, 80 per cent of the people live in the villages. Poor people and workers live in the villages. If the people, who are settled abroad come to India and contest election and become the representatives of the people, will they be able to work in accordance with the wishes of the people? I think they cannot work according to the wishes of the people. If Shri Ramoowaliaji thinks that the Indians living abroad have money and they are multi-millionaires and they can contest elections in India with money power, his view is wrong.

In the last session, a discussion had taken place in the House about electoral reforms. Everyone was of the opinion that the election should be made less expensive. The expenses to be incurred on the elections should be bare minimum. On the one hand we say that the expenditure on the election should be minimised and on the other, such

[Shri Narendra Budania]

type of resolution has been brought here to bring such people in the politics of the country who live abroad and who have money. Will the people tolerate it. In my opinion, if the resolution is passed, it will be a great injustice to the people of India. From press reports we have come to know that there is a foreign hand behind the terrorist activities and communal riots that are taking place at different places. On the one hand we say that there is a foreign hand behind all these incidents and on the other resolution has been brought forward here to allow foreign nationals to contest elections and become the Members of Lok Sabha and State Assemblies. I whole heartedly oppose this resolution. Shri Ramoowaliaji wants to bring an amendment in the constitution. There is no need to amend the constitution. If they are interested in the politics of India or if they want to serve the people of India, they should give up citizenship of their respective countries and apply for the citizenship of India. If they return to this country and serve the people, they will earn their respect. In this way the people may elect them to the Lok Sabha or the State Assembly.

I, therefore, again strongly oppose the Resolution brought forward by Shri Ramoowalia.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : There are some more members who want to speak. So let us extend the time by half an hour.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT) : No, Sir. We have already spent two hours. That was the time allotted for it. Now we should conclude. So I beg to move :

"That the question be now put."

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That the question be now put."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN : So I call upon the Minister to reply to the debate.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF STATES : (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD) I have gone through the sentiments of the hon. Members for the resolution which is moved. The mover has mentioned about the sentiments and the bonds of the people of Indian origin who are now scattered in different parts of the world. There is no doubt about it that all those people who are of Indian origin and are now citizens of different countries have still, in spite of being foreign nationals for very long, the sentimental attachment with the people of the country, with the leadership of the country and with the government of the country. But there is no doubt about it that there are some people of Indian origin about whom mention has already been made in this House from both sides that everything is not well here. Of course, I disagree with some friends in this House that everybody whosoever is there of Indian origin is not anti-India, is not against the policies and programmes of India and is not against the unity and integrity and sovereignty of India. But their number is very very limited. But we do not have to go by the sentiments of the people, those who are residing or those who are now foreign nationals. They have done so on their own, on their own sweet good will. They were not compelled to do so. But Ramoowaliaji has mentioned it and mostly his stress has been that we should not deprive them of their having the social, cultural and sentimental bonds with us. As I have already mentioned, we cannot go by the sentiments. The laws and the sentiments are altogether different things. The law has to take its own role. Therefore, we cannot encourage dual citizenship. I think our lady member from this side put a nice example to Ramoowaliaji that he cannot both be a Member of Parliament and Member of Legislative Assembly at the same time, he has to hold one position at one time. That is true with the Members. That is true with the citizenship also. You cannot have dual citizenship. It will create a lot of problems, not for the countries involved but also for the individuals who will be having dual citizenship. As for other things are concerned, I have gone through the speech. I could not hear Mr. Ramoowalia. This Resolution was taken up in the last Budget Session. But I went through his speech. He has mentioned about the

business. We have provided the laws in India that they can have business in our country under NRI regulations. They have been given a lot of latitude. They have been given a lot of concessions to have this in our country. They can buy property. They can have any type of industry if they want to have. They can import rather from that side, from that country, and also they can export so many things. But as far as the agricultural land is concerned, we are not agreeing to that, which, I think, Mr. Ramoowalia has mentioned in his speech. Because, whenever they would like to buy a land, I do not think that they will be able to cultivate that land. Since he belongs to Punjab, he has mentioned about agriculture. You know that we have a system of "land to the tiller". Any foreign citizen, who is a citizen of the United States or Britain, of Indian origin, if he buys land in Punjab and stays in the United States or Britain, he cannot cultivate crops himself. He cannot practically till the land. When we talk of "land to the tiller", that formula does not apply to him. So, it is not possible. When we talk of selling land by foreigners who are of Indian origin, again FERA comes into the picture. The Finance Ministry comes into the picture. Supposing such a person sells his land, then we will have to pay money and we will have to allow him to take money out of the country. Obviously, when he would like to sell his land, that means that he would like to sell his land and settle abroad permanently. That means, you are not supposed to pay him in Indian currency. You will have to give him in foreign currency. So, it will again be a burden on our nation. FERA is involved. Therefore, it is not possible to go ahead with that.

I would like to read Article 9 of the Constitution which deals with the bar against acquisition of Indian citizenship by reason of a person having voluntarily acquired citizenship of a foreign State prior to the commencement of the Constitution (26-1-1950). Cases of loss of Indian citizenship by reason of acquisition of the citizenship of a foreign State since 26-1-1950 are governed by Section 9 of the Citizenship Act, 1955. Section 9 (1) of the Citizenship Act, 1955 provides that any citizen of India who by naturalisation, registration or otherwise voluntarily acquires, or has at any time

between 26-1-1950 and the commencement of this said Act voluntarily acquired, the Citizenship of another country shall, upon acquisition or as the case may be, such commencement, cease to be a citizen of India.

A man's nationality is a continuing legal relationship between the sovereign State on the one hand and the citizen on the other. This legal relationship involves rights and corresponding duties upon both, on the part of the citizen, no less than on the part of the State. Double nationality puts the person in an awkward situation, as I have already mentioned. He will be subject to claims from both nations, claims which at times may be competing or conflicting. A person having double nationality may be subject to military service in both the States. Double nationality has not been favoured even by the international law. Also in the current international situation of terrorism, as I have already mentioned, which I think most of the Members of the House will share with me—they have also expressed their views, this type of Resolution is going to be against our interests, against the interest of the unity and integrity of the country. We have been seeing for the last few years that the people, even of Indian origin, have been trying to wage war against our own country, they have been coming and trying to kill the people, even the Prime Minister of India. So, such undesirable people will, I think, take more advantage than the genuine people residing outside India. So, we will have no check and balance on such types of people if we accept this Resolution.

Mr. Ramoowalia has mentioned about harassment to those who are receiving money from their kith and kin in foreign countries. I think, he wants that there should not be any inquiry. But we have found certain things on a number of occasions. As I have already said, everybody who is of Indian origin and residing in different parts of the world is not bad. I think, 95 per cent—or I might go to the extent of saying, even 96 per cent—of those people are nice people. But what about the four or five per cent, those who are creating problems, those who get money from different sources, from foreign agencies, to destabilise our country, to destabilise India?

[Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad]

There has to be check and balance on that. If we do not make any inquiry, then anybody, tomorrow, can get money from any part of the world, from any agency to destabilise our nation. It has come to our notice on a number of occasions before. This is something which cannot be tolerated. Therefore, this is not a harassment. We do not want to harass anybody. It is just an assessment. We really want that the money which is being received by our people here from foreign sources should be genuine; it should not be to destabilise our country.

Sir, Mr. Ramoowalia has also mentioned about right to vote. These are all contradictory things. There is no question of accepting it. One cannot even think of right to contest and right to vote. *(Interruptions)* The moment any person of Indian origin is conferred or acquires foreign citizenship, I do not think, that he has any right to contest or vote. He must lose that right otherwise we will have some representatives in Canada and some representatives in USA and they will declare their own country on behalf of our Parliament and Assemblies. There will be no end to it. I do not think that this is a genuine demand to have a right to vote and right to contest the elections. The right to contest elections is not just to contest elections for the sake of contesting elections. After all whoever contests a particular election from a particular party they have some views behind that. They have some conviction behind that. They have some programmes and policies behind their political parties. By getting themselves elected in Parliament or Assemblies they would like to do something for their people and for their nation. If somebody who is a citizen of a foreign country just comes on the occasion of elections and after getting himself elected without any conviction and commitment to the people and the country next day flies back to a foreign country and remains there and again comes for the next elections will it serve any purpose? It is not going to help him and also our people.

I agree with most of the hon. Members who have participated from both sides of the House that this Resolution should be

withdrawn by the hon. Member in the interest of unity and integrity of the nation. This is not a stage. Rather there is not any stage for such Bills to be passed in this House which cannot keep the unity of our people. As for the sentiments I would like to re-assure that we have great regard for people of Indian origin living in different parts of the world. They have also regard for us. I have my personal experience. Whenever you go to any part of the world you meet them and they are also equally anxious to meet you. Sometimes they are even more reciprocal and become very happy to see their kith and kin no matter to whatever religion, caste or community one may belong to. But that does not mean that we give them citizenship here which will be misused by a few persons living outside our country.

With these words I request Mr. Ramoowalia to withdraw the Resolution.

[Translation]

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOOWALIA (Sangrur) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have heard attentively the views expressed by all of my colleagues. The sanctity of this House, the unity and integrity of the country is more firmly implanted than the North Star and I have unflinching faith in and devotion to the greatness of the country. I had no bad intentions behind this Resolution. I saw a friendly match. One of my younger sisters went to the extent of saying that this Resolution would divide the country to pieces. I do not want to say anything in her words, but this much I must say that even if my skin can be used as a thread in preventing the country from being dismembered, I offer myself for that. How did you say such thing? My objective was very limited. We all get chance to go abroad and we have to face certain difficulties there. I just wanted to make from Gram Panchayat to the supreme body of the country, the Lok Sabha aware of these difficulties. I wanted to tell my colleagues and the hon. Minister that the people of the Indian origin who have settled abroad are proud of Indian culture and civilisation... They feel proud of belonging to the Indian

culture. But today the times have changed and we have started generalising with every name. We have all started thinking on the same lines. If 10 traitors of any religion indulge in unwarranted activities—and such people you will find in all religions—we start dancing to their tune and call everyone bad. We are incapable of isolating them. We should isolate them keeping in view their intentions. If some people are of that nature, then they are different from us. I feel that thing and can say with authority that the spouses do not declare daily that they are husband and wife, but trouble with us is that we say daily that the Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and Christians are all brothers. If they are brothers, then where is the need to declare it daily? They are undoubtedly brothers and no divisive force can break this sacred relationship of brotherhood. If some foreigners wearing turbans and in the garb of Sikhs indulge in unwanted activities—which are condemned by 99.9 per cent Sikhs—it is a matter of regret that we generalise them. I was just telling you about the differentiation; I had no other purpose. Now I come to my point.

Even now I feel that 90 per cent of the Indians who have been living in foreign countries for more than 15 years have not got foreign citizenship, they are only immigrants. They have Indian passports. Among Sikhs, 95 per cent hold Indian passports. I wanted to tell about them that they have to face many difficulties at the airport. When they come back here, they are maltreated. Many of them have agricultural land. In case of industry, you have not fixed any ceiling regarding investment by the non-resident Indians, but in the matter of agricultural land, if one brother in a family is in England and in Canada and two brothers are living here, he can neither purchase nor sell it. My purpose of bringing this Resolution was very limited. There were very small things which I wanted to bring to the knowledge of the Government. People living abroad, have visa problem. I had gone to Canada and England some time ago. For the entire country except Punjab it takes 24 hours to get a visa, but if some one is to get to Punjab, he has to inform 10 weeks in advance. We asked our Missions in New York and London about this arrangement.

They replied that we should ask the Home Ministry about it. The Home Minister is present here and I will request him to look into this also. If some mischievous person has to come, he can go upto Ambala by taking visa within 24 hours, but it takes only 25 minutes to go from Ambala to Rajpura.

SHRI AJAY MUSHRAN : Wherefrom does visa come into this Resolution?

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOO-WALIA : I am winding up. Please smile and do not get angry.

SHRI AJAY MUSHRAN : I remain smiling.

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOO-WALIA : We will smilingly wind up.

We have intimated to the Hon. Prime Minister also about the difficulties faced in the matter of visa. Sometimes, non-issues become issues. People who have to speak against the country on one point or the other, they speak many things.

Now, since the entire House is of the view that I should withdraw this Resolution, I am not out of the House; I am the friend of the House. After expressing my view-point and intimating its importance so that our brethren living abroad may get our love and affection, I withdraw this Resolution.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Is it the pleasure of the House the Resolution moved by Shri Balwant Singh Ramoowalia be withdrawn?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Before going to next item, there is one announcement. Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad will make a statement regarding Punjab situation at 5.15 P.M. Now next resolution. Shri D.N. Reddy.