

मंत्रियों के नाम भी लिये गये हैं। आज उन मंत्रियों की सुरत हम यहाँ नहीं देख पा रहे हैं।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : May I request Mr. Sharma to resume his speech tomorrow? Before we proceed to the next item, I call upon the Minister, Shri Bhagat.

statement, but he cannot take precedence over us, in whose names the motion stands.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have not yet called Mr. Gupta. Before that I have made my observation that I have permitted Mr. Bhagat to make a statement so that it may be helpful to the debate.

15.59 HRS.

MOTION RE. STATEMENT ON
COMMONWEALTH IMMIGRANTS
BILL OF U.K.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA (Jalore) : At what time would the half-an-hour discussion be taken up, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It is doubtful. I cannot off-hand say anything on that now.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, a statement was laid on the Table of the House on the 29th February in connection with the new Immigration Law which was passed by the British Parliament on the 1st March. I have also made a similar statement in the other House. Various suggestions have been made as to how this situation can be met.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) :
मन्त्री महोदय कौन सा स्टेटमेंट दे रहे हैं ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Before you move your motion, I have permitted him to make a statement. That is all. He is entitled to make a statement if he so desires, and I have permitted him. You may move your motion later on.

16 HRS.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) : The man in possession of the floor is the man in whose name the motion stands. But since it has been your pleasure to allow the minister to make a statement, we would not quarrel about it. But the rules are clear. It is a set debate. At a later stage, the minister can make a

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा कहना है कि यह एक प्रीसीज्योर की बात है और प्रीसीडेंट की बात है। एजेंडे के हिसाब से मेरा मोशन 4 बजे आना है और चूंकि चार बजे गये हैं इसलिए मुझे पहले अपना मोशन पेश करने और उस पर कहने का मौका उपाध्यक्ष महोदय को देना चाहिए। लेकिन बैसा न करवा कर मंत्री महोदय जो पहले अपना बयान देने जा रहे हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह एक गलत परम्परा होगी। इसलिए मेरी प्रार्थना है कि पहले मुझे अपना मोशन मूव कर लेने दीजिये। अगर मंत्री महोदय कुछ कहना चाहते हैं तो वह बीच में इंटरवीन कर सकते हैं या बाद में अपना जवाब दे सकते हैं। लेकिन मूवर के मोशन मूव करने से पहले मंत्री महोदय का उम पर बोलने देना एक गलत परम्परा को यहाँ पर कायम करना होगा।

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I only wanted to be of help to the House. This is not a new precedent. Many times in the past not only in this Parliament but in the earlier Parliaments also Statements were made in the beginning. It is not a new precedent. But I am not insisting on making the statement, if they do not want it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It should be helpful to the debate and therefore I permitted. But since he himself has withdrawn, Mr. Gupta may begin now. But I will have to be firm about the time—20 minutes.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : Is it a punishment of objecting to the minister making the statement?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He himself on his own has withdrawn. I have not asked him to withdraw.

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO (Kakinada) : The subject is before the House. It is the property of the House. The House wants to know the background. It has been the practice for a long time that when such an important question is raised on the floor of the House, Government will first come with a statement giving the background and full details. Nobody can prevent you from ruling that the statement must first come before the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have already ruled that he can make a statement. He said the statement would have provided some useful information and the debate would have been more fruitful. Therefore, I permitted him. But when objection was raised from the other side, he himself on his own will has withdrawn.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA (Barmer) : He said, if the members do not want, he will not make the statement. But members want it.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) : He wants to speak. He has not withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I cannot compel him to make the statement. I have given him permission to make it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : You have already given your ruling, Sir. They are destroying the image of the Speaker like this.

SHRI A. S. SAIGAL (Bilaspur) : He cannot withdraw unless he takes the permission of the House. The House has not permitted him to withdraw. The House is more important than your ruling; please excuse me for saying this.

SHRI PILOO MODY : All this rift within the Congress party should be resolved outside.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : This is a matter for you to decide. The minister has not withdrawn. We thought it would help the discussion if the Government's point of view was put

forward first. It is for you to decide. You need not regard the statement as having been withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : So far as this question is concerned, my impression was that he was withdrawing. Therefore, I said that I would call Shri K. L. Gupta. If he wants to make a statement, I have already given a ruling that he can give the background of the issue and help the discussion. He is entitled to make that statement.

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam) : Sir, I rise to a point of order. In the Order Paper it is stated that at 4.00 P.M. this motion is to be moved by Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta. Therefore, at 4.00 you called him correctly to make the motion. Supposing the Government wants to give some information to the House to help the discussion, it can be done after Shri Gupta has moved his motion. If you create this precedent today of allowing the Minister to make a statement before the actual motion is moved by the Member in whose name it stands, we will also be entitled to claim the same privilege of seeking your permission to make a statement giving background material which the Minister concerned may not have before he moves a motion on behalf of the Government. This motion has been put down to be taken up at 4.00, it is already 4.05 and I would request you to allow Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta to move the motion.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, I rise to a point of order. This particular motion tabled by us, headed by Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta, has been admitted under rule 184 or rule 193—these are the two rules under which such motions are admitted. I take it that this has been admitted under rule 184. This rule says :

“Save in so far as is otherwise provided in the Constitution or in these rules, no discussion of a matter of general public interest shall take place except on a motion made with the consent of the Speaker.”

Here is a motion which has been duly consented to by the Speaker and this

motion has been admitted after hearing the hon. Minister on 29th February, 1968. Had we been satisfied that day we are not insane enough to move such a motion.

AN HON. MEMBER : Are you sure?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, insanity is a disqualification, but I dare to say that in the case of some this has been waived. You have already given your ruling. I know that certain extraordinary rulings have been given in the past by the Chair, but we have obeyed them. Here is the Prime Minister who comes to the rescue of some of the Members. By interrupting you, Sir, they want to destroy the image of the Speaker in the House (*Interruption*). Sir, I am very sorry they are interrupting me. I am not interrupting them, I have left it long back. I only say, Sir, that if you change your ruling like a pendulum this way or that way it will be difficult for this House to run. You have given a ruling and you must stick to it. You should ask Shri Gupta to proceed with his motion.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Sir, there is no need for any argument on this issue.

AN. HON. MEMBER : He should withdraw the word "pendulum".

SHRI SONAVANE (Pandharpur) : Sir, we cannot stand this. He said that you change your ruling like a pendulum.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, I withdraw the word "pendulum".

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : As you will realise, when the Minister stated that he would like to make a statement, giving the background, I permitted him. But, later on, my impression was that he had withdrawn his request. Therefore, I called Shri Gupta. If I had called the Minister, it was not for prejudicing the debate or forestalling the debate which is going to take place. But, if hon. Members are insisting that the Minister need not give background information, I will call Shri Gupta.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I hope it will not be treated as a precedent.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपकी आज्ञा से सदन के सामने यह प्रस्ताव रखता हूँ कि :

"That this House takes note of the statement laid on the Table by the Deputy Minister of External Affairs on the 29th February, 1968 regarding the Commonwealth Immigrants Bill of the United Kingdom and calls upon the Government of India to take appropriate counter measures."

यू०के० सरकार ने यह इमिग्रेंट्स बिल पास करके लगभग एक लाख ऐसे लोगों के ऊपर, जो एशिया के रहने वाले हैं ओरिजिनली और जिनके पास ब्रिटिश पासपोर्ट है, यह पाबन्दी लगा दी है कि वह यू०के० के अन्दर नहीं आ सकते। दुनिया के इतिहास में यह पहला मौका है जब किसी एक सरकार ने अपने ही नागरिकों के, अपने ही सिटिजेन्स के, ऊपर यह पाबन्दी लगाई है कि वह सिटिजेन्शिप राइट रखते हुए भी उस देश के अन्दर नहीं आ सकते। जहाँ तक मैं जानता हूँ इस तरह का कोई पैरलेल दुनिया के इतिहास में नहीं है। (ब्यवधान)। आपकी सरकार रहेगी तो यहाँ भी वही होगा।

1962 में इसी प्रकार का बिल, इमिग्रेशन, बिल, सरकार ने बनाया था, और जहाँ तक मुझे याद पड़ता है, उस समय सेन्ट्री आफ स्टेट मि० बटलर थे। जब उन्होंने यह बिल रक्खा सदन के सामने, तो उसके अन्दर यह प्राविजन था कि कोई भी कामनवेल्थ के लोग एक दम से यू०के० के अन्दर नहीं आ सकते, चाहे उनके पास, हिन्दुस्तान का पासपोर्ट हो, चाहे पाकिस्तान का पासपोर्ट हो। कहीं का भी हो, वह यू०के० के अन्दर नहीं आ सकते। मैं याद दिलाऊंगा विलसन साहब को कि उस समय उनकी पार्टी अपोजीशन में थी और उन्होंने उस समय यह कहा था कि यह रेशल डिस्क्रिमिनेशन है और लेबर पार्टी इसका विरोध करती है। आज इतना

ही नहीं हुआ है, इससे और ज्यादा हो गया है। केन्या के अन्दर लगभग एक लाख लोग हैं, उनके ऊपर वह ऐसी पाबन्दी लगाना चाहते हैं। उनका कमिटमेंट है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब 1963 में केन्या स्वतन्त्र हुआ तब क्या ब्रिटिश सरकार ने उनसे यह कमिटमेंट नहीं किया था कि वह ब्रिटिश पासपोर्ट वाले हैं, वह ब्रिटिश नागरिक हैं और उनकी सारी जिम्मेदारी यू० के० सरकार की होगी? यह ब्रीच आफ ट्रस्ट है और मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे विलसन सरकार की इज्जत में बहुत बड़ा घक्का लगा है। जो सरकार अपने आप को सोशलिस्ट कहती है, जब वह कंजर्वेटिव पार्टी को क्रिटिसाइज करती है तब रेशल डिस्ट्रिक्मिनेशन कहती है, लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या उसने केन्या के एक लाख आदमियों पर जो कि वहाँ रहते हैं, इस तरह की पाबन्दी नहीं लगाई है? जो एशिया के रहने वाले हैं उनके ऊपर यह पाबन्दी लगाई है। यह रेशल डिस्ट्रिक्मिनेशन है। ब्रिटिश पासपोर्ट ब्रिटिश पासपोर्ट है। पासपोर्ट के ऊपर काला चेहरा है या गोरा चेहरा है, इससे अन्तर नहीं होना चाहिये। आज यू० के० की सरकार ने यह बिल पास करके एम।बी.वी. बोया है कि अगर यह बीज बढ़ता गया तो दुनिया के अन्दर एक बहुत बड़ी क्राइसिस पैदा हो जायेगी। साउथ अफ्रीका के रोडेशिया के मामले में यू० के० गवर्नमेंट आज तक पुर्तगाल को कंडेम करती जा रही थी, लेकिन आज यह सरकार भी उसी रास्ते पर जा रही है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो एक एलिमेंट्री राइट है सिटिजेनशिप का, उसको भी इस प्रकार से आघात पहुँचा है इस बिल के द्वारा।

1963 में पासपोर्ट देने के बाद यू० के० गवर्नमेंट का मारल, लॉगल, कांस्टिट्यूशनल, पूरी तरह से कमिटमेंट है कि वह वहाँ के लोगों के सम्बन्ध में, जोकि उनकी नागरिकता के अधिकारी हैं, इस कमिटमेंट का पालन करेगी। इतना ही नहीं है कि यह कानून

बनाया गया है, वहाँ पर जो लोग हिन्दुस्तान की ओरिजिन के हैं और जिन्होंने यू० के० की नागरिकता स्वीकार की है और यू० के० में रहते हैं, उनके साथ भी भेद-भाव है। उनकी जो हाउसिंग स्कीम है, उसके अन्दर जो हिन्दुस्तानी हैं, वह नहीं आते। लोकल बाडोज में जो बहुत सी स्कीमों हैं, उनमें वह नहीं आते और जो प्राइवेट लोग हैं वह भी उनको मकान जमीन आदि नहीं देते। नौकरियों के बारे में, लाइसेंस के बारे में, प्रमोशन के बारे में एक प्राइवेट एजेन्सी ने 1967 में सर्वे किया था और उसकी रिपोर्ट यह है कि अगर दस नौकरियाँ हैं तो 9 नौकरियाँ ह्वाइट आदमियों को जायेंगी और एक काले आदमी को जायेंगी। इसी प्रकार से तीन मकानों में से दो मकान ह्वाइट आदमियों को मिलेंगे और एक मकान काले को मिलेगा। इतना ही नहीं, यू० के० सरकार की तरफ से यह कहा जाता है कि हमारे लिये यह बहुत बड़ा प्राब्लेम है।

मैं आपके जरिये से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह सही नहीं है कि यू० के० के अन्दर लेबर शाटेंज है और हर साल लगभग 6,000 आदमी यू० के० के अन्दर दूसरी योरोपियन कंट्रीज से आते हैं, तथा वह एलिग्स हैं? उनके पास यू० के० के मिटिजेनशिप के राइट्स नहीं हैं। इस प्रकार से आप एक लाख लोगों के ऊपर, जोकि आप के सिटिजेन हैं और आप के पासपोर्ट वाले हैं, दूसरे देश के लोगों को, जोकि एलिग्स हैं, प्रिफरेंस देते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह किसी भी तरह से जस्टिफायबल नहीं है। एक तरफ तो विलसन साहब ने अपनी करेंसी पाउंड का डिवैल्यूएशन किया, दूसरी तरफ यह बिल पास करके उन्होंने अपने पासपोर्ट का डिवैल्यूएशन किया और अब अपनी ब्रिटिश नेशन को आनर का डिवैल्यूएशन कर रहे हैं। मैं आपके जरिये से सदन को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि आज इसके बारे में केवल हम लोगों को ही चिन्ता नहीं है, यू० के० के अन्दर भी विभाजन है। काफी लोग

[श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त]

वहाँ हैं, काफी समाचार पत्र हैं, बड़े-बड़े लोग हैं, जिन्होंने इसका विरोध किया है।

फिर एक और भी अजीब बात है। अगर कानूनी दृष्टि से देखा जाये तो एक तरफ तो यह हो रहा है कि उनके पास ब्रिटिश पासपोर्ट है और ब्रिटिश पासपोर्ट होने की वजह से उनके कुछ आब्लिगेशन्स हैं, अगर वह क्राउन को एलीजिएंस नहीं देते तो वह ब्रिटिश कोर्ट में पेश हो सकते हैं और ट्रेजन के लिये उनको फांसी की सजा दी जा सकती है, दूसरी तरफ उनके राइट्स क्या हैं? मैं आपके जरिये से बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि यह लोग ऐसे सिटिजेन हैं जिनके आब्लिगेशन्स तो हैं, लेकिन राइट्स कोई भी नहीं क्योंकि वहाँ की सरकार उनके कोई राइट्स नहीं मानती। इतने लार्ज स्केल पर यानी एक लाख लोगों के सिटिजेनशिप राइट्स छीन कर उनको स्टेटलेस बनाना इस दुनिया के इतिहास में पहली बार हुआ है और यह यू० के० सरकार ने किया है। इतना ही नहीं है, योरोपियन कंवेशन आफ ह्यूमन राइट्स, 1963 को, जिस के ऊपर यू० के० सरकार ने भी हस्ताक्षर किया है, मैं कोट करना चाहता हूँ। उसमें कहा गया है कि :

"No one shall be deprived of the right to enter of which he is a national,"

जब उन्होंने उस पर हस्ताक्षर किये हुए हैं तब आज वह इन लोगों को यह अधिकार क्यों नहीं देती? लाखों लोगों को स्टेटलेस बना देंगे तो वह कहाँ जायेंगे? कहाँ रहेंगे, कैसे खाना खायेंगे, उनकी रोजी का क्या हिसाब होगा? जो उन आदमियों की नागरिकता है, जो कि बेसिक कांसेप्ट है ह्यूमनिटेरियनिज्म का, उसको छीनने से कैसे काम चलेगा? आज यू० के० सरकार ने इस तरह का बिल पास किया है।

16.19 Hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

जहाँ तक कामनवैल्य का सम्बन्ध है उसका कंसेप्ट मल्टी रेशल है और इस चीज को यू० के० की गवर्नमेंट ने भी माना है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जो कामनवैल्य आर्गनाइजेशन है यह अपने ढंग की एक अजीब आर्गनाइजेशन है। इस प्रकार की और कोई आर्गनाइजेशन नहीं है। इसमें तरह-तरह की रेसिस के लोगों की सरकारें हैं। अगर इस प्रकार का बिल बनाया जाता है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि कामनवैल्य का जो कंसेप्ट है उसकी जड़ों पर ही कुठाराघात किया जाता है, उसको ही चोट पहुँचाई जाती है और कामनवैल्य का जो कंसेप्शन है वह पूरा नहीं होगा, उसका जो आइडिया है वह खत्म हो जाएगा और अगर ऐसा होता है तो इसका दोष यू० के० की सरकार पर होगा, अपने ही हाथों से वह इसको तारपीड़ा कर रही है। हमारी सरकार को यहाँ के लोगों की भावनाओं से आँगु दुनिया के लोगों की भावनाओं से यू० के० की सरकार को अवगत करा देना चाहिये। जिनके अन्दर कांशंस हैं, उसको बता देना चाहिये कि उनकी कांशंस रिवाल्ट कर रही है।

जहाँ तक केनिया की सरकार का सम्बन्ध है मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं होगी अगर वह यह फंसला करे कि हम अफ्रीकनाइजेशन करना चाहते हैं। यह उनका इंटरनल मटर है। मैं इसमें दखल नहीं देना चाहता। लेकिन मैं मंत्री महोदय से एक बात पूछना चाहता हूँ। वहाँ पर साठ हजार हिन्दुस्तानी ओरिजिन के ऐसे लोग हैं जिन्होंने केनिया की सिटिजनशिप के लिए कई साल हुए दरखास्तें दे रखी हैं लेकिन क्या कारण है कि आज तक उनकी दरखास्तों पर कोई निर्णय नहीं लिया गया है? उन्होंने कोई कारण नहीं बताया है कि क्यों फंसला नहीं हुआ है। यही कहते हैं कि स्टाफ नहीं है। चार पांच साल पहले ये दरखास्तें दी गई थीं। मैं समझता हूँ कि केनिया सरकार की यह एक कैलकुलेटिड एफर्ट है कि वह यहाँ उन लोगों को सिटिजनशिप राइट देना नहीं चाहती है।

अभी मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है केनियाज के जो सिटिजन हैं और इंडियन ओरिजन के जो हैं उनके ऊपर कोई पाबन्दी नहीं है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ जाकर इसकी इनक्वायरी कराई जाए। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जो सिद्धान्त है यह केवल कागज़ों पर ही है। प्रमोशन के मामले में, रिक्तमेंट के मामले में, लाइसेंस के मामले में, इंडस्ट्री और ट्रेड के मामले में वहाँ आपस में भेदभाव किया जाता है। ग़ोरे और काले के भेद की बात तो हमने सुनी है लेकिन काले-काले के भेद की बात नहीं सुनी है और इसको देख कर एक विचित्र बात सामने आ जाती है। मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो केनिया के सिटिजन हैं लेकिन जो हिन्दु-स्तानी मौलिक रूप से हैं क्या उनको भी निकाला जा रहा है? क्या यह सही नहीं है कि रेडियो पर उनके खिलाफ प्रापेगंडा किया जाता है तरह-तरह का? मैं आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि 21-8-66 को इंडियन हाई कमिश्नर श्री प्रेम भाटिया ने इसके बारे में प्रोटेस्ट भी किया था केनिया सरकार से कि इस प्रकार का प्रापेगंडा करना गलत है।

यह जो समस्या है यह कोई नई समस्या नहीं है। 1963 से अफ्रीका में क्या हो रहा है यह हमें मालूम है। ब्रिटिश सरकार इस चीज़ के बारे में चिन्तित रही है यह हमें मालूम है। लेकिन मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि उनकी सरकार ने अभी तक क्या किया है। आप कामनवैल्थ प्राइम मिनिस्टर्ज कान्फ़ेस में जाती हैं। क्या वहाँ ज़रूर चाय पी कर और सैर करके वापिस आने के अलावा और भी कुछ इस बारे में किया गया है? आपकी सरकार ने जब यह सवाल वहाँ उठाया, अगर उठाया है तो, इसका क्या हल निकाला, क्या जवाब इसका मिला? अफ्रीकन कंट्रीज़ की सरकारों ने क्या जवाब दिया और यू० के० की सरकार ने क्या दिया। अगर इस सवाल को वहाँ नहीं उठाया आज तक तो क्यों नहीं उठाया।

यह केवल एक लाख लोगों का सवाल नहीं है। करीब चालीस लाख हिन्दुस्तानी बाहर

रहते हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार का उनके प्रति बहुत ही कैलस एटीट्यूड है, उनकी कोई चिन्ता सरकार द्वारा नहीं की जाती है फिर चाहे लंका के भारतीय हों, बर्मा के हों, अफ्रीका के हों या केनिया के हों। जिस सरकार की जब मर्जी होती है उनको खदेड़ देती है और हमारी सरकार देखती रहती है। हमें अपनी कोई पालिसी बनानी चाहिये, अपना कोई एटीट्यूड बनाना चाहिये और कुछ उसके बारे में सोचना चाहिये।

मैं कह चुका हूँ कि इसकी जिम्मेवारी मूलतः यू० के० सरकार के ऊपर है। लेकिन वे हमारे देश के बच्चे हैं। उनका हमें फ़िक्र होना स्वाभाविक है। अगर यू० के० की सरकार फ़िक्र नहीं करती है तो इंसानियत के नाते हमारा जो फ़र्ज है उसको हमें निभाना चाहिये। हमें उनके लिए पूरी तरह से फ़ेसिलिटीज़ प्रोवाइड करनी चाहियें, वे अपनी प्रापर्टी लाते हैं तो उसके लिए सुविधायें देनी चाहियें, रिहैबिलिटेशन की उनको सुविधायें देनी चाहियें और भी जिस प्रकार की सहूलियतें हो सकती हैं, वे पहुंचानी चाहियें?

श्री क० ना० तिबारी (बेतिया) : गुप्त जी आप यह चाहते हैं कि वे यहां चले आयें?

MR. SPEAKER : I think it is an improper procedure. It is not parliamentary to address the Member directly and then talk to him direct, as though the Chair is not there.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : मैंने तो कहा है कि मूलतः इसकी जिम्मेवारी यू० के० सरकार की है, सोलह आने उसकी है। लेकिन इंसानियत के नाते हमें भी सोचना चाहिये।

मैंने कहा है कि हम सबके साथ दोस्ती चाहते हैं। लेकिन दोस्ती के नाम पर हर कोई आपको दबाता चला जाए तो किसी भी देश से आपकी दोस्ती नहीं होगी। आपको

[श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त]

कड़ा और मजबूत रवैया अपनाना होगा। दोस्ती का मतलब सरेंडर नहीं होता है। हर चीज में आप सरेंडर करते जायेंगे तो दोस्ती चाहते हुए भी दोस्ती आपके पास नहीं आएगी। जहां हमारी इज्जत का सवाल हो वहां हमें रिटैलिएट भी करना चाहिये।

मैं कुछ सुझाव अन्त में देना चाहता हूं। पहला यह है कि तीनों देशों के प्रधान मंत्री मिलें, आपस में बातचीत करें और बातचीत से इस समस्या को सुलझाने की कोशिश करें। अगर इस तरह से यह समस्या न सुलझे तो हमें कामनवैलथ प्राइम मिनिस्टर्स की मीटिंग बुलानी चाहिये और वहां पर इस समस्या को रखना चाहिये। यह केवल अफ्रीका की बात नहीं है। यह सारे कामनवैलथ कंट्रीज की समस्या है। अगर वहां भी यह समस्या नहीं सुलझती है तो फिर सरकार को यहां भी वीसा लागू कर देना चाहिये यू० के० के लोगों के ऊपर ताकि बगैर वीसा के कोई लोग न आयें। अगर तब भी यह समस्या हल नहीं होती है तो आपको यह भी सोचना होगा कि कामनवैलथ का जो कंसेप्ट है अगर इसकी कन्न खुद यू० के० की सरकार खोद रही है तो हमें इस कामनवैलथ को भी छोड़ने पर विचार करना होगा और इसमें हमें कोई एतराज भी नहीं होना चाहिये। इसको छोड़ने के लिए हमें तैयार रहना चाहिये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपने प्रस्ताव को सदन के सामने रखता हूं।

MR. SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That this House takes note of the statement laid on the Table by the Deputy Minister of External Affairs on the 29th February, 1968 regarding the Commonwealth Immigrants Bill of the United Kingdom and calls upon the Government of India to take appropriate counter measures."

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I be to move :

That in the motion, for 'calls upon the Government of India to take appropriate counter-measures' substitute 'recommends to the Government to quit Commonwealth to high-light the worst type of racial discrimination practised by U.K.'

MR. SPEAKER : This amendment is also before the House.

श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव (आजमगढ़) : यह प्रश्न एक बहुत गम्भीर प्रश्न है। इंग्लैण्ड की सरकार ने अभी कामनवैलथ इमिग्रेशन कंट्रोल बिल पास किया है। इस कानून को दुनिया के इतिहास में काले कानून के रूप में देखा जाएगा। इस कानून को पास करके ब्रिटेन की सरकार ने अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मानव अधिकारों पर, मौलिक अधिकारों पर गहरी चोट की है। यह एक ऐसा शर्मनाक कानून है जिसके ऊपर दुनिया के तमाम देशों के लोगों का चिंतित होना स्वाभाविक है। हमारे देश में इस पर इसलिए चिन्ता है कि जो इससे प्रभावित होते हैं उनसे हमारा खुद का सम्बन्ध है; काफी लोग हमारे देश के दुनिया के अन्य देशों में रहते हैं। जहां तक मेरी जानकारी है पचास लाख ऐसे लोग हैं जिनका सम्बन्ध भारत से है और जो दुनिया के मुस्लिम देशों में रहते हैं। केनिया से हमारा इस वक्त सीधा सम्बन्ध है। अगर ब्रिटिश द्वारा पास किये गये कानून को हमने स्वीकार कर लिया तो यह समस्या न केवल केनिया में पैदा होगी बल्कि आगे चल कर अफ्रीका के मुस्लिम देशों में, एशिया के मुस्लिम देशों में भी पैदा होगी। यह प्रश्न केवल एक या दो व्यक्तियों का नहीं है, बल्कि पचास लाख ऐसे व्यक्तियों का है, जिनका हमारे देश से सम्बन्ध रहा है और जो आज दुनिया के दूसरे देशों में फेले हुए हैं। ब्रिटेन के इस कदम के विरुद्ध केवल हमारे देश में ही प्रतिक्रिया नहीं हुई है, बल्कि खुद ब्रिटेन में इसकी गहरी प्रतिक्रिया हुई है। जिस किसी ने ब्रिटिश

पालियामेंट की पिछले पांच सात दिनों की प्रोसीडिंग्स को देखा होगा, उसने यह महसूस किया होगा कि वहाँ पर इस कानून को बड़ी गम्भीर चुनौती दी गई। वहाँ के सदस्यों ने कहा है कि बड़ा शर्मनाक कानून है और यह ब्रिटिश नागरिकों के साथ विश्वासघात है।

हम जानते हैं कि 1963 में केनिया की आजादी के बाद ब्रिटेन के गृह मंत्री खुद वहाँ पर तशरीफ़ ले गये थे और उन्होंने यह सिफ़ारिश की थी कि केनिया के ये लोग ब्रिटिश नागरिकता को स्वीकार कर लें। उनकी प्रार्थना पर, उनके वचन देने पर, जिन लोगों ने ब्रिटिश नागरिकता स्वीकार कर ली थी, आज इस कानून के द्वारा उन पर यह प्रहार किया गया है। ब्रिटेन की सरकार की ओर से कहा जाता है कि उनके आने से ब्रिटेन में ऐसी समस्याएँ पैदा हो जायेंगी कि हम उनको सुविधायें नहीं दे पायेंगे; उनके आने से कई सामाजिक कठिनाइयाँ पैदा हो जायेंगी, इसलिए हम यह कानून बना रहे हैं और उन लोगों के इम्मीग्रेशन को नियंत्रित करना चाहते हैं, इसके पीछे कोई जाति-भेद या रंग-भेद की भावना नहीं है।

प्रश्न यह है कि यह कानून बनाने की आवश्यकता क्यों पड़ी? मैं स्पष्ट रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक दूसरे देशों से सफ़ेद चमड़ी के ब्रिटिश नागरिक इंग्लैण्ड में जाने रहे, तब तक ऐसा कोई कानून नहीं बनाया गया, लेकिन जब उन 1,30 हजार एशिया के लोगों के इंग्लैण्ड जाने का प्रश्न पैदा हुआ, जिन पर केनिया के एक कानून का प्रभाव पड़ रहा है और जिन्होंने ब्रिटिश नागरिकता को विधिवत् स्वीकार किया है, तो ब्रिटेन की लेबर सरकार ने ब्रिटिश पालियामेंट में यह काला कानून पेश किया। मुझे ज्यादा अफ़सोस इस बात का है कि जो सरकार अपने आपको एक प्रगतिशील और समाजवादी सरकार कहती है, उसने रंग-भेद और जाति-भेद पर आधारित यह कानून

बनाया है। मैं ब्रिटिश सरकार को चाज करता हूँ कि चाहे वह जो भी सफ़ाई दे, लेकिन इस कानून के पीछे उसकी रंग और जाति-भेद की भावना है।

इसलिए ब्रिटेन का यह कानून मानवता के लिए एक चुनौती है। भारत सरकार को इस प्रश्न पर केवल इसलिए कोई उचित कदम नहीं उठाना है कि इस कानून से भारतीय प्रभावित होते हैं, बल्कि इसलिए कि हमारी यह परम्परा रही है कि हम हमेशा से दुनिया में रंग-भेद के विरुद्ध लड़ते रहे हैं, हम हमेशा से रंग-भेद और जाति-भेद के आधार पर अप्रीकियों पर किये जा रहे अत्याचार और उत्पीड़न के खिलाफ़ आवाज उठाते रहे हैं। ब्रिटिश पालियामेंट की बहुत ऊँची परम्परायें रही हैं, लेकिन इस कानून को पास करने के लिए उसने बहुत असंवैधानिक और आपत्तिजनक तरीके अपनाए। मैं ब्रिटेन के अखबार टाइम्स को क्वोट करके बनाना चाहता हूँ कि इस कानून को पास करने के लिए 1 मार्च की गणना 29 फरवरी में की गई; हाउस की कार्यवाही रात तक चलती रही; फिर घड़ी को रोक दिया गया स्पीकर ने कहा कि हम हाउस को एडजर्न नहीं, बल्कि सस्पेंड करते हैं और हाउस की कार्यवाही 1 मार्च को 9 बजे शुरू हुई। हाउस आफ़ कामन्स के सदस्यों की प्रतिक्रिया के बारे में इस पत्र में कहा गया है:

"Protests came from both sides of the House. Some Labour backbenchers were as hot as Liberals and Tories in saying that it would be undignified, indecent and irregular for the executive to take shortcuts through procedure with a Bill that so closely touches human rights. It is against the Declaration of Human Rights."

इस स्थिति में सरकार का यह नैतिक कर्तव्य है कि वह इस प्रश्न पर बहुत सख्ती के साथ कदम उठाए। इस बारे में मैं सरकार को कुछ सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ।

[श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव]

सबसे पहले प्रधान मंत्री को ब्रिटेन के प्रधान मंत्री के साथ फोरन सम्पर्क स्थापित करके कहना चाहिए कि हम ब्रिटेन के इस कदम और कानून को बड़ी गम्भीरता से देखते हैं; हमारे देश में कामनवैलथ से निकल जाने की मांग होने के बावजूद हमने कुछ कारणों से जनता की भावनाओं की अवहेलना करके भी कामनवैलथ में रहना पसन्द किया है, लेकिन ब्रिटिश सरकार ने इस कानून के द्वारा कामनवैलथ भावना को, भाई-चारे की उस भावना को, आघात पहुंचाया है। आपको यह जान कर आश्चर्य होगा कि जब कि 23 फरवरी को बिल पेश किया जाना था, उसके बारे में विधिवत सूचना हमें केवल 19 फरवरी को दी गई। हमको चौबीस घंटे का नोटिस दिया गया और कहा गया कि 21 फरवरी तक हम अपनी राय भेज दें, ताकि 22 फरवरी को ब्रिटिश कैबिनेट उस पर विचार कर सके। कामनवैलथ के प्रमुख देश के साथ किया गया यह व्यवहार और उसके प्रति अपनाया गया यह रवैया बहुत अनुचित और विश्वासघाती है। सरकार की तरफ से ब्रिटिश सरकार को कह दिया जाना चाहिए कि उसने हमारी परवाह नहीं की है; हमने उस को राय दी कि इस कानून के बारे में जल्दी न की जाये, हमने कहा कि अगर ब्रिटेन को कठिनाई है, तो वह 1500 के बजाये 15,000 आदमी प्रति-वर्ष अपने यहां आने दे, लेकिन ब्रिटिश सरकार ने हमारी राय की परवाह नहीं की है; अब या तो वह इस कानून में उचित परिवर्तन करे, वरना हम कामनवैलथ से नाता तोड़ेंगे।

हमने अपने देश में ब्रिटिश नागरिकों को बहुत सी सुविधायें दे रखी हैं। अब हमें इस प्रकार की घोषणा करनी चाहिए कि कोई भी ब्रिटिश नागरिक हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं आ सकता है, जब तक कि वह विधिवत् वीसा प्राप्त नहीं कर लेता है। जो सुविधायें हम आज तक उनको देते रहे हैं, उनको वापस ले लेना चाहिए।

यदि ब्रिटिश सरकार ने अपनी नीति में परिवर्तन नहीं किया, तो ये 1,30 हजार आदमी बिना घर-बार के हो जायेंगे, सड़कों पर फँक दिये जायेंगे, उनकी हालत वैसी ही हो जायेगी, जैसी कि पिछले जूज की थी, न उनका कोई देश होगा, न घर होगा, न उनके पास कोई नौकरी या कारोबार होगा और न उनके बच्चों का भविष्य होगा। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि उन लोगों का हमारे देश से सम्बन्ध रहा है, हमारे खून से सम्बन्ध रहा है। अगर कल वे बेघर-बार हो जायें, तो हमारा यह नैतिक कर्तव्य है कि हम उनको सड़कों पर न रहने दें, उनको दुनिया के देशों में भिखमंगे बन कर न फिरने दें। हमको उनके लिए कोई न कोई व्यवस्था करनी ही पड़ेगी। हो सकता है कि कल हमें उनको अपने देश में बसाना पड़े। इसलिए हमें मीधे-सीधे इस देश में स्थित ब्रिटिश प्रापर्टी का राष्ट्रीयकरण कर देना चाहिए, ताकि जिस देश की सरकार ने यह कानून बना कर इन लोगों पर प्रहार किया है, हम उस सम्पत्ति को हाथ में लेकर उन लोगों के भविष्य का कोई प्रबन्ध कर सकें।

प्रधान मंत्री कामनवैलथ के दूसरे देशों की सरकारों से सम्पर्क स्थापित करें और उनको कहें जो देश कामनवैलथ का अगुआ बना हुआ है, वह इस प्रकार का काला कानून बना रहा है, इसलिए वे उस पर इस कानून में संशोधन करने के लिए दबाव डालें।

समाचारपत्रों में यह समाचार आया है कि जिन नागरिकों पर ब्रिटेन के इस कानून का प्रभाव पड़ा है, उन्होंने संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के ह्यूमन राइट्स कमीशन में अपनी आवाज उठाने का फैसला किया है। भारत सरकार को घोषणा करनी चाहिये कि वह स्वयं विधिवत् इस सवाल को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में उठायेगी।

मैं आशा करता हूँ कि भारत सरकार इस प्रश्न के बारे में, जो एक मानवीय प्रश्न है,

जो हमारे देश का एक राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न है, जो कि दुनिया के और देशों में भी पैदा होने वाला है, मजबूती के साथ ऐसा कदम उठायेगी, जो हमारे देश की राष्ट्रीय भावनाओं के अनुकूल हो।

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali) : A very serious, very disturbing and very disgusting—disgusting because we seem to have forgotten all humanitarian values,—situation has been created. After hearing the previous speaker, I started wondering whether it was all the fault of Britain, whether Britain alone is responsible for what is happening in Kenya or whether there are some other parties also. It appears to me that there are four parties to the situation. Of course the Immigrants Bill which had been passed by the British Parliament is the most shameless act. U.K. had suggested to the Indians in Kenya that they could retain their loyalties to Britain. Possibly on the suggestion of Britain the Indians in Kenya declined to accept the Kenyan citizenship which was offered to them after Kenya became independent.

But what the Kenya Government has done is much worse; possibly they had gone too fast in their process of Africanisation. In spite of India always trying to offer its friendship to them, they did not reciprocate. It has been reported that one of the Kenyan Ministers recently stated that he hated Indians and that his Government would do everything it could to find loopholes in its laws so that they could drive out Indians.

The third party to the dispute is the Kenya Indians themselves. No one can deny that an injustice had been done to them, but it is also true that some of the blame for this unfortunate situation lies with the Kenya Indians themselves.

The first point that comes to my mind in this regard is that as reports go, as history goes, they offered very little or no support to the cause of African Independence. Secondly, why did the Kenyan Indians reject the offer of

Kenyan citizenship when it was offered to them? From this, the question would also arise as to why they looked towards Britain and not towards India, and why do they choose to have Britain citizenship and why do they not choose Indian citizenship.

In this connection, it is also learnt that within the two years allowed to them to apply for Kenyan citizenship, only 20,000 out of about 1,80,000 applied for Kenyan citizenship, and only about 4,000 opted for India.

Finally, we come to the fourth party, and that is, the Government of India itself which has blundered all along in its foreign policy. We have heard the slogans—Hindi—Chini-Bhai-Bhai, Hindi-Ceylon Bhai-Bhai and Hindi-Kenya Bhai-Bhai, and God knows what. These slogans for the first time were musical, melodious chimes when they rang in our ears, but when those slogans rang back again after sometime, they were just in the form of loud, harsh unfriendly voices, and ultimately, those whom we used to call Bhai-Bhai let us down. We are seeing what has happened in Kenya, and recently, we saw how that tiny, little Island of Ceylon has been impertinent. And we can do nothing. Everywhere, we seem to be failing miserably in our foreign policy. We cannot visualise, we cannot see what might possibly happen in future, and ultimately we find that our own people are let down in all respects.

Now, the question comes as to what we can do in this situation. Condemning the United Kingdom only would not help. Shri Gupta talked about retaliation. I do not think that a few *zulus* or hartals or a few public meetings here and there would help the cause. Let us see what can be done to meet the situation that has arisen. Let us see it only on humanitarian grounds. Those people have been kicked out or will be kicked out from Kenya. Britain has refused to accept them. Government of India is not willing to accept them. Only this morning's newspapers gave us an indication that possibly our Government, at its party meeting yesterday, had pro-

[Shri S. K. Tapuriah]

posed that we might allow them to enter, with entry permits or something. I feel that we must, in the circumstances, allow them to come to India. Of course they have been bad boys, but our Government have not been very wise in its foreign policy also. Let us absorb them and after all, when we are 52 crores, some 52,000 or a lakh more would not be much. We have been through troubles, and we have faced worse situations in the past and possibly we will have to face such situations and we can solve them also.

In this connection, it has been estimated that the Indians in Kenya have about Rs. 400 to Rs. 500 crores in foreign exchange in the London and Switzerland banks. I was also told that the former Finance Minister, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, was possibly working on a scheme as to how that money could be repatriated into India. These people should be asked to come to this country and we can utilise their entrepreneurship, their endeavour, their enterprise and their capabilities.

The actual position is not known to me, but it is worth exploring whether we can absorb these people and their funds. Maybe our Government will have to be a little more practical about their money being brought back. Let no questions be asked about their past sources of income. Let us not harass them, and possibly we could utilise that foreign exchange much to our own benefit.

A little more condemnation possibly is necessary, of the Kenyan Government. Only condemning Great Britain or the United Kingdom would not help. Let us try to meet the situation; let us also try to review our relations with all other countries right now again, lest we should be let down by another country whom we call friends now, in the future.

SHRI G. S. DHILLON (Taran Taran) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, this situation which has arisen because of the general exodus of Indians from Kenya is quite a serious matter. I have been to Kenya. I am one of those who sincerely believe that the attitude of

the Kenyan Government is very friendly, but at the same time, when they say "nationalisation" they do not mean it in the typical economic sense of the term, but they mean Africanisation.

I happened to be in Kenya just at the time when Mr. Jomo Kenyatta was released. I spent some time with him and I also happened to know other leaders like Tom Mboya, Ngala and others. The former Vice-President of Kenya, Mr. Oginga-Odinga, was with me in London and, I also met him in Kenya and know his views. I can say from my personal observations that all these leaders are quite friendly towards India as a nation and as a people. But when we talk of Indians who had settled there and the Government of Kenya's attitude towards them, we have to look at it from a different perspective. A number of times after independence, I met those leaders and they had a grievance that the Indians do not like to adopt Kenya as their own country. The Indians, on the other hand, had their own fears and preferences also. The Government of India always kept advising them to adapt themselves according to the new situation. In spite of that and in spite of the views expressed by various leaders so many times, the situation remained quite fluid and the result is we are facing the problem which we are discussing today.

In this matter, the attitude of the Indian citizens who hold British passports was perhaps based less on fears than on the fact that most of them preferred British citizenship to Kenyan citizenship or even to reversion to Indian citizenship. But it is very unfortunate that the British Government should have taken this step in spite of the fact that we have very cordial relations with that country and we are a member of the Commonwealth. The haste with which this legislation was pushed through there has attracted everybody's attention and criticism from all quarters in this country and elsewhere.

I have been perusing the proceedings of the House of Commons. It was really very perplexing and exasperating sometimes—the way the British Home Secretary, Mr. Callaghan put this pro-

blem before the members of the British Parliament. At one stage he said, "We do accept the rights of the Indians and ultimately we will have to accept them." At that time, another member Mr. John Hurst retorted : "Then what does this non-sense of the Bill mean?" There is an all-round confusion, but in a way there is this assurance given by the British Home Secretary. Of course, it is an assurance and not a commitment. It should be the immediate duty of the Government of India to proceed with the negotiations. After all, 1,500 immigrants a year is a very small number, compared to the huge population that is waiting to go there.

It was very commendable on the part of Shri Bhagat that he should have mentioned that not 1,500 but 15,000 immigrants should be allowed annually to settle in U.K. I think even at that rate many people will have to wait for so many years. I read yesterday, and also in the newspapers this morning, that whatever be the position—let it develop any way it takes place—the Indians are also welcome to this country and this country will serve as a clearing house. Well, they are welcome. This is their country. But by their choice they preferred British passports. Their stay in this country should be taken as a matter of courtesy or a visit to their brothers. But, ultimately, this reference or hint towards 'clearing house' or other expressions as expressed by him should also be strictly defined and brought to the notice of the British Government. After all, once they come here and the whole matter is allowed to be prolonged a day may come when the British Government may refuse to take back these citizens also. They must be taken in India with some assurance from U.K. Government. After all, this is our own view, that we are good temporary hosts to them and we welcome them. They can come anytime, but that is a matter about which we should be very cautious.

I must say, also, that during all these years—it is a different matter that the situation about our people in Kenya has arisen—we have been in the Commonwealth. We must not ignore to

review the relationship so far as our position in the Commonwealth is concerned. Since the 1965 conflict with Pakistan, we being a Commonwealth country, I have been noting that there has been shown a lot of discrimination from the side of the British Government so far as our interests are concerned. I happen to belong to a district in which all the three fronts of the war are situated, and every time the BBC came out with entirely concocted and distorted news. We brought it to the notice of the authorities then. Even when a few British correspondents visited we told them that the news we received through BBC were entirely baseless. The British Government, knowing that so much propaganda was going on, so much distortion was going on the other side, did not care even later on to amend the matters. The situation in the present context is in no way dissimilar.

Kenya is a Commonwealth country. We are all members of the Commonwealth. They should have devised a certain machinery so that such awkward and ugly situation could have been avoided. But we see that on the assumption of these relations, ourselves being placed in the Commonwealth circle, we are neither shown that courtesy nor that consideration specially when it directly hits our interest.

So I would request the hon. Minister to keep all these matters in view and also the views of the hon. Members of this House. If such a situation is allowed to develop, if in their own words they say that the whole matter will be approached in very human terms, as a Member of the British Parliament said, then what was the nonsense in bringing all these measures before the British Parliament. Even members of the British public may not like them. I strongly appreciate the views expressed by my hon. friend, Shri Yadav, and I associate with those views so far as the demand to review our relations with Commonwealth countries are concerned.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur) :
Mr. Speaker, Sir, as the previous

[Shri S. Kandappan]

speakers have pointed out, we are discussing a very distressing item which involves some of the Commonwealth countries. We have reached a stage when we have to take some decision on humanitarian grounds. People try to absolve this government of its responsibility in this matter. I for one think that the real culprit in this sorry chapter is the attitude taken by the Government of India all along with regard to Indians residing abroad. After independence this Government had no clear cut policy on this question and it did not give any directions to our people who are living abroad, whether it is in Africa, Ceylon, Burma or some other country.

When the Indians left this sacred soil and settled elsewhere, they did not go there just to suck the blood of the people there. They did not go there as trader or businessman. Most of them went there as honest labourers, toiled there very hard and by their blood and sweat raised the economy of those countries. Countries like Ceylon and Burma have frankly admitted the fact that but for the Indians their economy would have been nowhere.

When that is the position, it was the duty of our Government to have taken a clear and categorical stand from the very beginning. It is the moral obligation of this Government to protect the rights of the people who once belonged to this country. It is the lack of firmness on the part of our government from the very beginning that has led to this kind of chaotic situation in which we find thousands of our brethren today. They are facing a crisis and they do not know where to reside, where to resettle, and where to go.

The latest news that we have received from Kenya is this:

"The Kenya Government said today that Kenya Asians who emigrated to Britain were not and never had been Kenya's responsibility since they opted to become British subjects. Kenya has no obligations to these people.

Kenya's duty is to her own citizens."

I think we cannot blame the Kenya Government for this. That is my personal view. When they achieved independence in 1963, they gave a grace period of two years during which they called for applications for citizenship. Opinions may differ on that but, knowing as I do the attitude of Ceylon, Burma and other Governments, I say that the attitude of Kenya was somewhat better and more commendable. Even though four years have elapsed since that offer, there are more than 1,30,000 people who have not opted for Kenyan citizenship.

One hon. Member asked why is it that these people are very keen to go to Britain. I can appreciate the feelings of those people. Because, even after the agreement for repatriation from Ceylon, I know that many Indians in Ceylon are not personally very much keen to come to India, because they know very well the economic position here, I am giving factual information. Actually, our Embassy in Ceylon is trying through various magazines and papers to attract people to opt for India. It is raising false hopes in the minds of the Indians in Ceylon and trying to lure them for repatriation. That is how our Embassy is trying to manoeuvre a strength of 5 lakhs and odd, which has been agreed upon. We know the economic situation in this country. So, it is no wonder that the Indians in Kenya, who have got British passport and who have got every right to demand entry into the United Kingdom do not opt to reside either in Kenya or in India.

17 HRS.

Now, they, of their own sweet will, want to go to Britain. What exercised my mind and pained me very much is that in the reasons given for this kind of a Bill, I do not find any mention of an economic reason for it. The reasons given by them are—I rely on their own Information Services—what they have circulated here. Introducing new legislation to slow down the flow of migrants, the Home Secretary, Mr. Callaghan, said:—

"It is not possible for this country to absorb these persons..... at a

pace which I fear would cause racial disharmony."

That was the ground on which they have introduced this Bill in the House. At another place it says:—

"phasing the entry of these immigrants in the light of social conditions.....in Britain".

These are the two reasons that they have given to justify the introduction of this Bill and the passing of this Bill. I am afraid to use strong words, but it looks like a different version of apartheid. If in this age a developed country like the UK feels so in this racial matter. I am afraid, where it will lead to.

It is everybody's knowledge that there are many English people elsewhere in the world and they are enjoying a very well secure life. I do not want to take an extreme view at this stage, just as some of my friends demand and say, "Snap our ties with the Commonwealth" and all that. I do not want to go to that extreme attitude at this stage, because I do not think that at this stage the British Government have completely disclaimed that they do not owe a moral responsibility to these people. I think so because we find that when the Home Secretary was asked, "What about those who will be thrown out of Kenya?", his reply was:—

"I was asked what we would do about a man who was thrown out of work and ejected from the country; we shall have to take him. We cannot do anything else in those circumstances."

I think, this is still the attitude of the British Government and the Government of India should pursue this matter with the UK. I think, they have already taken up the question of enhancement of the quota that is being envisaged; they want 15,000 families to be taken in instead of 1,500. That, I think, was the suggestion made by the Government of India.

This phased programme of absorbing these people at the rate of 1,500 per annum is something very ridiculous. It

will take decades; at that rate it is impossible for the Asians in Kenya to be absorbed in the UK. I think, the UK Government knows it very well. So, when they give this kind of a reason, we fear that probably they want to shirk their responsibility.

So, it is for the Government of India to take up this matter at all possible levels and see that our countrymen, who went abroad ages ago and who helped to raise those countries economically to come up, are given a decent living in the UK where they would like to go and settle.

श्री शशि भूषण बाजपेयी (खारगोन) :

अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक बहुत अहम मसला है केनिया से ब्रिटिश नागरिकों को बाहर भेजने का। केनिया की जनता ऐसा कभी नहीं चाहती। केनिया की सरकार, खाम तौर से केनियाटा जो है वह अफ्रीका की आजादी के लिए लड़े, बड़ी शक्ति वहां उन्होंने स्थापित की। लेकिन ब्रिटेन हर जगह कुछ न कुछ इस ढंग की चीज करता रहा है ताकि चीजें बटें। यह कोई नयी बात नहीं है। जब केनिया की सरकार ने वहां एशियन्स से कहा कि आप हमारे देश की नागरिकता ले लीजिए उस वक्त ब्रिटेन के वहां, मैकडानल्ड रैमजे के साहबजादे जो कि बहुत तेज आदमी हैं, एम्बेसेडर थे। उन्होंने भारतीयों को सलाह दी कि इंग्लैंड का पासपोर्ट लो। और वह इसलिए ताकि जो उनका रुपया है वह इंग्लैंड की बैंक में जमा हो जाए। उनकी निगाह में सीधे सीधे यह था कि इन भारतीयों का रुपया इंग्लैंड में पहुंचे और उसके बाद जो आज हो रहा है, यह नक्शा वह पहले से ही बनाकर बैठे थे। अध्यक्ष महोदय, इंग्लैंड में चाहे टीपू सुलतान की कुर्सी हो, क्लियोपेट्रा की नीडिल हो या ब्रिटेन की महारानी के ताज का कोहेनूर हो जो कुछ भी वहां पर है वह एशिया के रक्त से बना है, वहां का कुछ नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, ब्रिटेन में जब मैं था तो मैं देखता था कि एशियन्स पर जो धृणा

[श्री शशि मूषण वाजपेयी]

पैदा की गई, कु क्लक्स क्लान वहां पहले बन चुका था—जिस प्रकार अमरीका में लोग सोचते हैं कि नीग्रोज से पीछा छुड़ाया जाये— उसी प्रकार एशियन्स के प्रति वहां यह भावना पैदा हुई, आप ट्राम में या ट्रेन में बैठने के लिये जायें तो दीवालों पर कहीं आपको “निग” लिखा हुआ मिलेगा और कहीं कुछ मिलेगा। ब्रिटेन की यह पालिसी है; उन्होंने हमें चक्कर में फंसा दिया। लेकिन पाकिस्तानियों के प्रति वे आज भी सद्भावना रखते हैं। आज जहां जहां न्यूक्लियर बेसिज हैं, चाहे वह वेस्ट-जर्मनी में हों, चाहे इंग्लैंड में हों, जिस देश में भी हों, वहां उनके प्रति वही पालिसी अख्तियार की जाती है। पाकिस्तान में भी न्यूक्लियर बेस है। पाकिस्तानी खुले आम वेस्ट जर्मनी में जा सकता है, बेल्जियम में जा सकता है, इंग्लैंड और फ्रांस में जा सकता है। 40 लाख अल्जीरियन्ज जो कि फ्रांस में रहते हैं, उनको निकालने की बात क्यों नहीं करते? कॅनेडा में जो यूक्रेनियन्ज हैं, जो कि रूस से गये थे, वहां का रेडियो यूक्रेनियन भाषा में कई प्रोग्राम भी देता है, अगर आज इनको निकालने की बात शुरू हो जाये तो वे कहां जायेंगे। मैं समझता हूं यह प्रश्न यू० एन० ओ० को एक बड़े स्तर पर सोचना चाहिये। भारतीयों को तो यह चीज इस तरह देखनी चाहिये, जिस प्रकार से अन्य छोटे छोटे देशों जैसे बर्मा, इजिप्ट, ने ब्रिटेन की सारी सम्पत्ति नेशनलाइज करली, उसी प्रकार से हमें भी उसका राष्ट्रीयकरण करना चाहिये। यह एक लाख नहीं दस लाख या पचास लाख भी आयेंगे तो हिन्दुस्तान में आज ब्रिटेन की इतनी सम्पत्ति है कि हम अपने उन भाइयों को अपने देश में आसानी से ले सकते हैं। एक जुमाने में भारतीयों को गुलाम बना कर अफ्रीका में ले जाया गया और उन से वहां मेहनत कराई गई। आज अफ्रीका में जो कुछ बना है, वह भारतीयों से बना है। लेकिन उसके बाद आज नफरत का बीज पैदा किया गया। जो दशा आज हम

देख रहे हैं, यह ब्रिटेन की पुरानी आदत है। लेकिन ब्रिटेन भी यह समझ ले कि हम कामनवेल्थ से भी हटेंगे, अगर उसकी आवश्यकता हुई, क्योंकि वही एक कदम है, जिससे एशिया में जाग्रति आयेगी। हमारे स्वराज्य का यह दूसरा चैप्टर होगा, जबकि हम कामनवेल्थ से बाहर आयेंगे। हमें समझना होगा कि ब्रिटेन पाकिस्तान को किस प्रकार से सपोर्ट करता है— यू० एन० ओ० और सिक्योरिटी कौन्सिल में।

कच्छ का जो आज सवाल है, उसके सम्बन्ध में भी जो कुछ उन्होंने किया है, वह हमारे सामने है। ब्रिटेन को और उसकी राजनीति को हमें समझना होगा। वह हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी को आज तक बरदाश्त नहीं कर सके हैं। जब भी कहीं किसी प्रकार मजबूत होने की कोशिश हम करते हैं तो एक न एक विपत्ति वह हम पर डालने की कोशिश करते हैं। यह जो पाकिस्तान का हमला था वह भी उन्हीं के इशारे पर हुआ। इसके अतिरिक्त भी कितनी ही चीजें हमारे देश में कर रहे हैं! अफ्रीका में रंग भेद की नीति अपनाते हैं और हमारे देश में भी किस प्रकार के भेद वह फैला रहे हैं, कहीं भाषा के नाम पर, कहीं प्रान्तों के नाम पर। इसलिए अंग्रेजों को हमें समझना होगा। अंग्रेज तो चले गये, लेकिन उनकी नीतियां आज भी एशिया में प्रगतिशील ताकतों को तबाह करने की कोशिश कर रही हैं। इंग्लैंड के अन्दर आज यह हालत है कि वहां पर एशियन अपने को सुरक्षित नहीं समझते। सारे यूरोप में यह भावना पैदा कराई जा रही है। हमें उनको समझना चाहिये। अमरीका में यह सफेद और काले की भावना—कू० क्लक्स० क्लान० से शुरू हुई। यह इंग्लैंड में भी बन गया है। इसका मुकाबला सारे एशिया को एकत्र होकर करना होगा। मेरा यह मुझाव है कि ब्रिटेन की सम्पत्ति का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाय। झा साहब जो हमारे मिनिस्टर हैं, उन्होंने 1965 में यह प्रस्ताव रखा था कि कामनवेल्थ से हमें वापस आ जाना चाहिये।

MR. SPEAKER : We are going ahead with this debate well in regard to time. We have still got 80 minutes left. Shri H. N. Mukerjee, Shri Rabi Ray, Shri Anirudhan and Shri Nath Pai have yet to speak from the Opposition and naturally an equal number of Members from the Congress Party also have got to speak. I have got the list with me
.....

AN HON. MEMBER : They are saying the same thing. So, the time may be given to the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: If they are saying the same thing, why should they not allow them to speak? In this debate at least I do not see any difference. Let me now give a chance to an Independent Member.

SHRI SHEO NARAIN (Basti) : We want to know who sends this list to you. We are sitting here from 11 a.m. onwards..

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member may ask his party leader or party whip. I am not interested in it. Whatever names the parties give me, I call from the list.

SHRI SHEO NARAIN: You must change the system. You are the guardian of our rights and you must come to our rescue.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall pay special consideration to Shri Sheo Narain apart from the question of party.

श्री ओ० प्र० त्यागी (मुरादाबाद) :
मैंने भी बोलने के लिए चिट लिख कर भेजी थी लेकिन मुझे अभी तक बुलाया नहीं जा रहा है.....

MR. SPEAKER : Every party has sent so many names.

श्री ओ० प्र० त्यागी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे आप बोलने का अवश्य मौका दीजिये क्योंकि मुझे उन विषयों का ख़ास ज्ञान प्राप्त है और.....

MR. SPEAKER : Will he kindly sit down now?

SHRI SHEO NARAIN : I am the only Member in this House, who was born in the British West Indies and yet you are not permitting me to say anything on this.

MR. SPEAKER: I entirely agree with him. But I think his party does not appreciate that good point. Anyway, let me see. Now, Shri Swell.

SHRI SWELL (Autonomous Districts): During the last few days this country has been subjected to a number of agonising tribulations in our relations with other foreign countries. There was the question of our relationship with Pakistan over the issue of the Rann of Kutch. There is at the moment our relationship with the friendly country Ceylon over the ownership of the small island Kachchathivu in the Indian Ocean. On top of it there is this question of our relationship with a friendly Commonwealth country, namely the United Kingdom, over this question of the Immigration Act which the British Parliament has just passed.

Personally, I would have welcomed the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs making a statement before we are called upon to participate in this discussion, because in that case, I would be in a better position to participate more purposefully. I am happy to note that despite all the rumblings in the press which we have read during the last few days, there is a distinct note of sobriety and pragmatism in the approach to this problem. Despite the fact that my hon. friends like Shri Chandra Jeet Yadav and others from the Congress side have put forward very indignant claims and have suggested retaliatory measures such as the withdrawal from the Commonwealth and the nationalisation of British assets in this country, I think by and large this House has taken a very pragmatic approach to this problem. I beg to submit that this is not a legal question. Legally, we have reiterated our position that these unfortunate people of Kenya are British citizens and, therefore, are none of our responsibility. It is for them to take up the matter legally, and I think they are considering the

[Shri Swell]

question of approaching the United Nations and some of them are also contemplating to make an appeal to the International Court at the Hague. I would also submit that this is not even a political question. Politically these people, as we have said, are none of our responsibility. Politically, it is a question for the British citizens, whether in England or in the Commonwealth, to take up with their Government.

I would also submit that this is not an occasion to utilise this forum as a platform for political mudslinging. I would submit that this is a human question, it is a moral question; it is on the basis of a moral consideration, of our revulsion against racial discrimination that we feel that we are involved in this question. It is also because the majority of these people who have settled down in Kenya and subsequently taken British citizenship originated from this country and had played a very great role in the building up of Kenya, whether it was as indentured labourers in building up the Kenya-Uganda Railway track or as businessmen who built up trade and commerce of Kenya at the time when the Africans were not in a position to discharge their responsibilities in these respects.

If we are to look at it from that moral angle and human angle, then the question we should put before us is not who is right, but what is right, what will be right by these people, what should we do at this moment to see that the sufferings of these people are alleviated, that the undesirable aspects of this Act are eliminated, and how best we can overcome this problem. If we look at it this way, I think we should be clear in our minds as to what is the problem we have on hand, the problem with which we are immediately concerned. The problem refers to about 100,000 or even 120,000 Kenyans of Indian origin who are holders of British passports.

Newspapers in the last few days report that during the period when there was a rush from Kenya to beat the date-line of the Act, roughly about

15,000 heads of families had been able to reach England and are now there. The present calculation is that there are about three dependents to a head of family. If you go by that calculation, today out of 120,000 people, about 60,000 have been able to reach England.

AN HON. MEMBER: They have not yet reached.

SHRI SWELL: The heads of families have reached and the dependants will follow. Anyway, it is for the Minister to deny or confirm these figures.

Therefore, the problem in our hands today relates to about 60,000 people. What is the way to help them out of their difficulty?

Now I will point out what the British Home Secretary has said on the floor of the House of Commons to which one of my hon. friends also has drawn attention. The first thing he said was that there was nothing in the Act which specified the number of people who would be admitted into UK. I would submit here that this is not a question of denying these people the right of entry into England. That is not what the British Government or the Act has said. It is a question of regulating entry.

An HON. MEMBER: How?

SHRI SWELL: There is no hard and fast number fixed by this Act. We are told that about 1500 persons will be taken into England every year. But the Act itself does not say that it will be confined to that number of 1500. There is room here for negotiation. I think this Government has taken the right step in trying to bring moral pressure on the British Government, in trying to arouse the conscience of the fellow Commonwealth countries and in trying to arouse the conscience of the world and have this number suitably increased.

There is another news item today or yesterday which says that as a result of the flight of these Indians from Kenya

—these are persons trained in trade and commerce and various other crafts, persons who are the backbone of the Kenyan economy—there is today a sort of economic chaos in Kenya and even the Kenyan Government is realising that this kind of flight would have a very adverse effect on the Kenyan economy. We have at the top of the Kenyan Government today a person of the stature, age and experience of Jomo Kenyatta, a man who had been tempered in the struggle for the freedom of the people. I refuse to believe that a man with that kind of background would not realise what is good for his people. Is not this an opportunity for the Minister of External Affairs to take up this matter of these 60,000 persons with Jomo Kenyatta so that they could be given work permits to remain in Kenya as long as they are not absorbed into the U.K.? Simultaneously the question should be pursued with the British Government to increase the annual quota of the people who should be admitted. If a pragmatic approach is made in this way, the solution to the problem of these 60,000 persons should not be an impossible task.

I do not subscribe to the idea of retaliatory measures such as freezing or nationalisation of British assets in India. We have to remember that for a few hundreds of Britishers who are in India today we have a million citizens of India or people of Indian origin living in Britain. Before taking any hasty or precipitate step in this matter, we should consider what would befall those people who are in Britain today. I do not subscribe also to the proposal that we should ban the entry of the Commonwealth citizens holding British passports to India. Who would suffer if we do so? Firstly, it is these 60,000 persons who would be thrown out from Kenya and whom we are trying to help. We have also to remember that if we insist on permits for the Commonwealth citizens living in India, I think the other countries including the United Kingdom will have the same right to insist on permits for our nationals in those countries. These are the things that

this Government and Parliament must take into consideration.

I would submit to the Government that we give time and make approaches to the United Kingdom Government and the Kenyan Government on the lines that I have suggested.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North East): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think it is generally realised that what the United Kingdom Government has recently done is an instance of the abdication of human decency and a blatant repudiation of the pledges which had been given repeatedly at different times to the Asians in East Africa.

I am worried also because this appears to be part of the combined offensive of racism. There does appear a joint effort to promote this racist idea which is going perhaps to play a most blackguardly role in the coming phase of history. This morning I read about the refusal of the United Kingdom and the United States' representatives in the United Nations even to censure—let alone expel—South Africa on account of South Africa's refusal to call off the so-called terrorist trials of 30 South-west African patriots fighting for freedom, who have been jailed for life.

We know how the Rhodesian court has refused the British Queen's prerogative of mercy and Britain looks on. I read in the papers this morning of a report of the United States National Advisory Commission on civil disorders, how all-pervasive racism is a feature of American life today.

British citizenship was at one time looked upon as something very worthwhile and in the middle of the 19th century, men like Lord Palmerston would make a lot of arrogant noise about it, but the British lion today is a toothless animal. But the lion is a noble animal and the lion, even when it is old and toothless, should know how to behave. Obviously Britain does not know how to behave.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

17.27 Hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

In Britain today there is, we see from the papers, a lobby whose slogan is "Keep Britain White", and the Prime Minister of Britain happens to be Mr. Harold Wilson, who when his crony, Mr. Gardon Walker was defeated by a racist, said he was a parliamentary leper. Now, leprosy is a visitation for which the victim should be pitied rather than be condemned. But I am afraid Mr. Wilson and his tribe have got themselves into a position where they should be called lepers and they should not be pitied but they should be condemned because they are moving jointly with the racials among the Tories and they have done this dirty work. And they have even dropped a pretence that there is nothing racial about it in the Bill which is now an Act. In that Bill there is a reference to the "citizens of the United Kingdom holding United Kingdom passports who have no substantial connection with this country by birth or by parentage." If you are linked by birth or parentage with the United Kingdom you can get away from any of the provisions in this most deleterious Bill.

I know the Kenya-Indians cannot be exonerated from responsibility. But I am very glad that my friend over there, a Congress colleague, pointed out how it was Mr. Malcolm MacDonald who had gone particularly to persuade the Kenyan-Indians to stick to British citizenship when free Kenya had given them the offer that either they should become nationals of that free country or they should choose to belong where they wish to belong—Britain or India—wherever it might be. They chose Britain. They took very little advantage of the Kenyan Government's offer which has been there for more than two years. And yet, they did not take advantage of the offer. Only 10,000 Indians or so have opted for Kenyan nationality and the rest trusted Britain. They trusted Mr. Malcolm MacDonald's blandishments. They forgot that at one point of time Britain had been given the appellation of "per-

fidious Albion." I hate to have to talk like this about a country where I had lived five years of my life and I have nothing against that country and its people.

But I do say that this ruling class, the ruling circle of labour lieutenants of the capitalist class who are bossing over Britain at the present moment, continue to be a tribe for whom we can have nothing but hatred and disgust.

I would like to know from this Government—the Prime Minister has more important preoccupations, but the Minister of State is here—have we tried genuinely to make a move in regard to contacting President Kenyatta? I was very glad when Mr. Swell said that Jomo Kenyatta has gone through fire and he is a kind of person who will not do a wrong thing just like that. How far have we gone in our talks with him? I have been reading Government's statements and there is no mention about our conversation with Kenyatta or with the Kenyan Government or any report from our High Commissioner in Nairobi. I find reports about the contacts which our High Commissioner in London had with the British Government and our contact here with the UK High Commissioner, but there is not a word, not a syllable in so far as Kenyatta himself is concerned.

I would also like to know this. Pakistan is in the picture. Pakistan is, of course, treated in a preferential way by Britain for its own pseudo-imperialist reasons. Pakistan in this case is also a sufferer. Are we making any move along with Pakistan in regard to this matter? I do not know. There is nothing at all to suggest from the papers already laid before the House by Government that we are making any moves along with Pakistan in regard to this matter. Every opportunity to work with Pakistan on a friendly basis has its repercussions, which have an importance which should not be ignored.

If the Kenyan Indians come home, I have a feeling that they do not

deserve to be welcomed here, because of their having disregarded the advice of our own Government that they should have adapted themselves to their country of adoption and should have looked upon that country as their own. They have not done so. But if they come to us, bold India has strength and resilience enough to absorb some of her erring children. But we cannot send them a blanket invitation. They are Britain's headache for the time being. We should tell Britain straight what we think in regard to this matter.

I am glad the suggestion of India leaving the Commonwealth a very old idea which many of us have been pressing here without success—has been mentioned not only in an amendment before the House, but also in two speeches made by Congress members of the House. When India joined the Commonwealth, it was on the basis of common citizenship, conditioned by reciprocity. But the British are behaving in a kind of way which shows that breach of faith comes easy to them. So far as this country goes, they are practising a variety of *apartheid* and we should do something about it. There is no doubt about our having to do something about it. It is about time, more than time, that we made a gesture, so badly needed for sometime, of leaving the Commonwealth. What good is there about it? What is the advantage we get? If belonging to a large community embracing a very considerable part of the world gives you some moral satisfaction, I can understand it. But how can we have moral satisfaction from an association with the Commonwealth whose head is the head of the Government which behaves in this most egregious fashion?

I would suggest, as this amendment has also promulgated, that we quit the Commonwealth, that we stop the repatriation of dividends on British capital and we freeze the British assets that we have got here. There are many other reasons for it. Look at the behaviour of British big money interests, like the Calcutta Tramway Company who ran away and who are now

coming squealing back to get their assets with compensation and God knows with what other benefits. Look at the BOAC which has been recently behaving, not for the first time, in a manner which is against the kind of objective we have got. On the UK citizens in India, a certain amount of curb has surely to be put as a kind of retaliation. We do not like the word "retaliation", but if this kind of thing is done, India should certainly sit up. The more liberal British papers like the *New Statesman* have expressed fears that an agitation might start in Britain—it has already started in some kind of way—for coloured citizens to be expelled. Surely these chaps who shout "Keep Britain White" would be in the picture and they would clamour for a scheme of repatriation of emigrants and all those things.

Britain is taking recourse to *apartheid* on an instalment plan. In Wolverhampton Sikh bus drivers and conductors are demonstrating as because of their beard and turban they are to be pushed out of their office. Two of the British sovereigns till recently wore a beard, and wear a turban I would not get a job in Britain. This is the kind of thing going on, this is the kind of *apartheid* being practised not only by Pretoria but also Rhodesia and Rhodesia's unspoken patron the United Kingdom. India should do something about it in order that her image, which is already so dark in so far as ex-colonial countries of the world is concerned, might be refurbished to a certain extent.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you for this opportunity. I was in London when this Bill was being passed by British Parliament and some of the delegations from Kenya Asians met me. Sir, this is not merely a question to be solved for the people of Indian origin who have been in Kenya but, as the previous speakers have pointed out, this is a very serious problem of denial of British citizenship to those people who have already been given British citizenship.

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

The British Government has passed a law which it has no moral or legal authority to pass. The fact is that the British Parliament is supreme. They have no Supreme Court there. If there would have been a Supreme Court, as we have in India, to interpret the legality of the laws passed by Parliament, I am sure this law would have been declared completely illegal. How can a country deny citizenship to its own people. Once they were given British passports those Asians did not remain Asians or Kenyans; they became *de jure* and *de facto* Britishers except with difference in the colour of their skin. A country which has been preaching democracy, a country which has been preaching rule of law has become the country to provide for the burial of the rule of law. This is the biggest irony of this legislation which has been passed by British Parliament. I know that there is some conscience even in the Britishers and it has revolted. The Arch Bishop of Canterbury revolted against immigration laws. Many members in British Parliament have revolted against this law. A very eminent personality of the Labour Party, Mrs. Gaitskel, who is now a Member of the House of Lords, revolted against this law. I could say that the Members of the British Parliament who even brought this Bill, who made this as law, were completely in defence. They were completely demoralised, fully realising that they were doing something very inhuman. When Mr. Callaghan made the statement that the implementation and success of this law will depend upon the situations, he did realise that the world is not going to sit quiet. It is good this Parliament has taken this opportunity to debate this. People from Asian countries, who had Asian origin, are spread over a large part of this world. There are people of Indian origin, Pakistani origin, in West Indies South-East-Asian in the Middle East in Africa and so on. This problem is haunting all those Indians or Asians like Pakistanis and others, like a ghost. They are living from day to day and month to month. There is a feeling of complete insecurity among them. I would not blame those Asians who were in Kenya at that time, who

were tempted to accept British passports, because they had a lot of faith in the sense of morality and legality of the British Government and British Parliament. They could not imagine that any decent civilised government would behave in the manner in which Britain has behaved.

How any citizen of Britain would be feeling when that country, which they have made as their home, is going to deny them the right of existence. We are the citizens of this country. It is by chance that we are born in this country. There are Indians who are born in some other country. But anybody is an Indian, if he is given Indian citizenship, he feels that he is an Indian in every respect. He will certainly feel disappointed if he is denied the rights of citizenship and that is why we feel it. It is really, as Shri Mukerjee put it, not a question of India accepting them. We have all sympathies for them, but it is a matter which is much bigger than India. It is a matter of dividing the world into colour.

I also do not blame Mr. Jomo Kenyatta for this. But I certainly blame our own Government in this respect, our own High Commissioner in this respect. When the process of Africanisation started in Kenya in a very big way, when every day newspapers were reporting it, our High Commissioner kept us in the dark. Was it not in the knowledge of our High Commissioner that the British Government has been able to establish this kind of arrangement with the Kenyan Government? Does our High Commissioner deny this fact, saying this was not within his knowledge that this is going to happen? Why did he not warn the Government of India? Why did he not inform the Government of India for the last two years that this is going to happen, so that we must take recourse to some action?

AN HON. MEMBER : He has done it.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : I do not think so. Only a few months back, our own Members of Parliament, visited Kenya—Shri Mahida was the leader of our delegation—and he came back and said that he met the

British High Commissioner and others and that he was assured that everything is all right there, everything is rosy. He said that he was assured that the Asians can live there as loyal citizens. So, it gives us lot of pain, now to know that 10,000 applications of the people who have not been given citizenship, are pending. What was happening to the Indian High Commissioner in Kenya and what was he doing all this time? Why did he not bring this fact to the notice of the Indian Government so that the Indian Government could have taken this matter with the British Government before this law came into existence? Now it would be crying for spilt milk because that law has become law with the approval of the British Parliament. It is too late now for doing those things which we could have done before this law became a law. We could have prevailed upon them, we could have insisted upon them, upon Britain, that reciprocal retaliation will be very very dangerous for Britain. However, I am not one of those hard-headed persons who would say that by sheer words we take decisions of serious consequence. I am not one of those people who would advise that the first reaction of India should be to quit the Commonwealth because, the Commonwealth, after all, is the Commonwealth. The people in the world today are coming together. We have formed in the United Nations the Afro-Asian group. Though there may not be anything common between Afro-Asian countries, we have to cooperate because the world moves in such a way. Because we cannot live in isolation, we form into a groups and work there as long as our interests are there. Sometimes we may not agree, sometimes we do not come to arrangements and sometimes we agree to disagree and take recourse to our own methods, but we form into groups because we realise that even for some kind of consideration some joint effort is needed.

After all, we have been making the mistake of assuming Britain as authority over the Commonwealth. Who has made Britain the authority for the Commonwealth? The Commonwealth is symbolically presided over by the

Queen. But it is only by our pleasure that the Queen is presiding over the Commonwealth. If we want to have relationship with Canada, if we want to have relationship with Australia, if we want relationship even with African countries of the Commonwealth like Nigeria and others, this is the forum where we can exchange our points of view and pressurise even Britain that this is our stand and this is the right stand.

By leaving the Commonwealth on whom are we going to take our revenge? On ourselves, because we will be quitting our association with other countries of the Commonwealth and not with Britain only. Our association with other countries of the Commonwealth is very important. By quitting the Commonwealth we are going to create a situation where we will be in isolation and not others.

But there is method. We can take up this subject in the Human Rights Commission. In April the international conference on human rights is going to take place in Teheran. Let this Government have serious thinking about this matter and present a very, very convincing case to the Human Rights Commission. We can arouse the conscience of the world. You remember those days when we were not independent. Then we went to every country, created public opinion and we did succeed. We went to the United States of America; we went to many countries of Latin America; we went to many countries of Europe and created large and wide public opinion in our favour. I wish that kind of public opinion to be created. India will stand as one, in this. This Parliament by discussing this has strengthened the hands of Government of India and I hope they will take this support with great seriousness. I think, we will succeed. I am sure about it.

श्री रवि राय (पुणे) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो प्रस्ताव माननीय सदस्य श्री कंबलाल गुप्त ने पेश किया है, मैं उस का समर्थन करता हूँ। यह मवाल आज ही हमारे सामने आया है या यह कोई नया मवाल है, ऐसी बात नहीं है। आज मुझे याद पड़ता है कि जब "भारत

[श्री रवि राय]

छोड़ो" आन्दोलन की शुरुआत होने के बाद चर्चिल साहब ने हिन्दुस्तान के राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन के नेताओं के वक्तव्यों पर टीका की थी, तो सरदार वल्लभ भाई पटेल ने उनको जवाब देते हुए कहा था कि अभी तो हमने "भारत छोड़ो" का नारा लगाया है, लेकिन अब हमें यह कहना पड़ेगा कि अंग्रेज लोग एशिया छोड़ दें।

ब्रिटेन द्वारा बनाए गए कामनवेल्थ इन्मीग्रेशन एक्ट की हम लोग आज भारत की पार्लियामेंट, लोक सभा, में आलोचना कर रहे हैं, लेकिन यह बहुत खुशी की बात है कि इंग्लैंड के कुछ प्रगतिवादी लोगों ने भी इसका कड़ा विरोध किया है। सबसे ज्यादा विरोध एक ऐसे आदमी ने किया है, जो मानवता का प्रतीक बन गया है। वह आदमी है आर्चबिशप आफ केंटरबरी, डा० रैम्से। ब्रिटेन ने रंगभेद के आधार पर जो विधेयक पारित किया है, उसका विरोध जिस भाषा में डा० रैम्से ने किया है, जो आर्चबिशप आफ केंटरबरी हैं और इंग्लैंड के एक सम्मानित व्यक्ति हैं, मैं उसको आपके सामने पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ :

17.49 HRS.

[SHRI G. S. DHILLON in the Chair]

"The Bill appears to the committee to involve this country in breaking its pledged word, in as much as persons granted United Kingdom citizenship have through the Bill had this citizenship made nugatory. This causes distress and distrust of the Government's word in the immigrant communities and among those who have devoted themselves to the promotion of integration, trust and goodwill. The committee and its staff are perplexed to see how they may continue their work under these circumstances.

If it is even now possible for the Bill to be amended attention is drawn to those features of it which are thoroughly wrong :—

1. In clause 1 of the Bill racial classification is, it is believed

for the first time, formally embodied into the law of the United Kingdom.

2. The Bill fails to include now the recommendations of the Wilson committee about appeals and about the provision of a comprehensive welfare service.
3. The numbers for which entry is permitted are unreasonably timid and are unjust for people classed as United Kingdom citizens.
4. The Bill creates a class of persons who are virtually stateless as they are made to have effective citizenship in no state.

The committee has assumed the existence of immigration controls and has cooperated with their operation in this country. But the Bill introduces into the controls a measure of injustices and indeed bad faith, which unless it is considerably modified can do the gravest harm to the progress of community relations."

चेयरमैन साहब, यह आर्चबिशप आफ केंटरबरी का कहना है। अब मैं आपके सामने जो इंग्लिस्तान के सबसे बड़े कानून विशारद हैं मिस्टर डिग्ले फुट उनका जो बयान है वह भी पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ :

"Sir Dingle Foot takes his stand on the legislation that gave Kenya independence in 1963 and enabled the European and Asian citizens there either to apply for citizenship of Kenya or to retain their citizenship of the United Kingdom. Those who retained United Kingdom citizenship received British passports as a matter of course and were entitled to come to the United Kingdom.

Now, Sir Dingle Foot says. the British Government is making a distinction between the European and the Asian community in the new Bill, saying that those who had a father or grand-father in Britain could come back. This applied to nearly all the Europeans, thus giving them free entry, but the Government intended to refuse the same right to the Asians. That was why he condemned the Bill as 'racialist legislation'."

यह मैंने आपके सामने एक इंग्लैंड के सबसे बड़े कानून विशारद श्री डिग्ले फुट का और आर्किबिशप आफ कंटनबरी का बयान पढ़ कर सुनाया। इससे यह जाहिर है कि इंग्लिस्तान के अन्दर उनकी आलोचना हो रही है। सवाल यह है कि आज दुनिया के अन्दर यह काला गोरा भेद, रंगभेद चल रहा है। आपको तो चेयरमैन साहब मालूम है कि अभी दुनिया में जिसको कि कहते हैं अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जमींदारी प्रथा वह चल रही है। जैसे हमारे हिन्दुस्तान में और एशिया के अन्दर इन्डोनेशिया में प्रति वर्ग मील 200-300 आदमी बसर करते हैं और आस्ट्रेलिया में, साइबेरिया में प्रति वर्ग मील 6, 7 या 10 आदमी बसर करते हैं। तो यह एक जमाना आ रहा है कि जिस वक्त दुनिया के सब जो काले लोग हैं, जो अफ्रीका के लोग हैं और जो एशिया के लोग हैं वह आस्ट्रेलिया और साइबेरिया में जाकर के अहिंसात्मक हो या हिंसात्मक ढंग से कहें कि हमको जमीन दो, हम यहां आकर के बसेंगे। यह एक बुनियादी सवाल है। जैसे कार्ल मार्क्स सोचा करते थे समाजवाद के बारे में कि दुनिया में लड़ाई गरीब और अमीर के अन्दर होगी उसी तरह से चेयरमैन साहब, आज यह लड़ाई होने वाली है। यह सिर्फ इंग्लिस्तान में जो बिल पास कर दिया गया उसका विरोध करने से काम नहीं चलेगा। हमको दुनिया के स्तर पर इस बारे में बुनियादी तौर से सोचना पड़ेगा। इसलिए मैं आपके ध्यान में एक चीज लाना चाहता हूँ कि जैसे मार्टिन लूथर किंग साहब हैं, यह वहां नोबो और गोरे लोगों के रिश्ते को लेकर के नोबो लोगों को ज्यादा सुविधाएं देने के लिए लड़ाई कर रहे हैं। आपको चेयरमैन साहब, मालूम होगा कि जब दो साल पहले डाक्टर लोहिया अमरीका गए थे आइजोना विश्वविद्यालय में भाषण करने के लिए तो आइजोना में जहां कि कानून है कि गोरे लोग जिस होटल में खाना खाते हैं वहां काले लोग नहीं जा सकते हैं डा० लोहिया साहब

गए थे, वह जानबूझ कर गए थे और उनको वहां पर गिरफ्तार किया गया था। डा० लोहिया को मालूम था कि दुनिया में इस तरह की बड़ी लड़ाई काले और गोरे लोगों में होने वाली है। इसलिए मैं भारत सरकार का इस सिलसिले में एक चीज की ओर ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। आज सुबह जब अफ्रीका के बारे में कुछ सवाल प्रधान मंत्री से पूछे गए तो प्रधान मंत्री ने बताया कि अफ्रीका के बारे में बहुत अच्छा बर्ताव हम कर रहे हैं लेकिन मैं आपके जरिए उनका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ जब अल्जीरिया का स्वराज्य आन्दोलन चल रहा था तो बेन्वेला सरकार को पहले भारत सरकार ने मान्यता नहीं दी। चाइना सरकार ने उसको पहले मान्यता दी। कृष्ण-मेनन साहब ने फरमाया कि देशाल साहब क्या सोचेंगे? इस तरह वहां जब सरकार गठित की गई थी तो उस सरकार को पहले चाइना ने मान्यता दी। भारत सरकार ने नहीं दी क्योंकि चीन सरकार जानती थी कि काले लोगों को हमारे साथ लड़ना पड़ेगा। इसी तरह मैं सोवियत सरकार को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि लुमुम्बा जो कि अमेरिकी पूंजी के राष्ट्रीयकरण के लिए कांगों में जो उसकी स्वाधीनता की लड़ाई चल रही थी, उसमें उनको अपना जीवन देना पड़ा, उनके प्रति हिन्दुस्तान का जो भाईचारा और सद्भाव रहना चाहिए वह नहीं रहा और सोवियत यूनियन ने उनकी स्मृति के लिए लुमुम्बा विश्वविद्यालय बना दिया। लेकिन भारत सरकार कोई ऐसा दोस्ताना या भाईचारा काले लोगों के लिए और अफ्रीका की जनता के लिए प्रदर्शित न कर सकी। यह भारत सरकार की परराष्ट्र नीति की कमजोरी है।

इसलिए पहला मेरा सुझाव यह है कि एक सम्मेलन बुलाया जाय लेकिन वह प्रधान मंत्री या सरकार के हेड्स का नहीं बल्कि जैसे मार्टिन लूथर किंग साहब हैं, जोमो केन्याटा हैं या और अफ्रीकन देशों के जननेता और सरकारी नेता जो हैं, उनका सम्मेलन बुलाया

[श्री रवि राय]

जाय और भारत सरकार उसकी अगुवाई करे कि जो काला गोरा भेद दुनिया में चल रहा है, अमरीका और दूसरे देशों में उसको खत्म किया जाय। दूसरा मेरा सुझाव है कि इस सद्भाव को बढ़ाने के लिए प्रयत्न किया जाय। आप जानते हैं चेरमैन साहब कि भारत सरकार की कुछ नीति रोडेशिया के बारे में है जहाँ कि आयन स्मिथ की इल्लीगल सरकार चल रही है, वहाँ हम सिर्फ विरोध करके बैठ जाते हैं। कोई कार्यवाही नहीं करते हैं। विल्सन सरकार ने उनके खिलाफ कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की। और इस विल्सन सरकार के ही चलते हमको कच्छ का समझौता करना पड़ा। लाल बहादुर साहब लंदन पधारे थे और वहाँ उनके कहने से कच्छ समझौता मान लिया जिसके चलते 350 वर्गमील आज हमारी जमीन चली जा रही है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस भारत सरकार की परराष्ट्र नीति इंग्लिस्तान के कुछ इने गिने लोगों के जरिए चल रही है। मैं एक नजीर रखना चाहता हूँ। किंग्सले मार्टिन साहब एक वहाँ के बहुत बड़े राजनीतिज्ञ कहे जाते हैं। उनकी सिफारिश थी कि तिब्बत पर हिन्दुस्तान की सार्वभौमिकता नहीं थी। उसको मान करके नेहरू साहब ने तिब्बत के ऊपर चीन की सार्वभौमिकता है इसको मान लिया। तो इस सरकार की अंग्रेजीपरस्त नीति इसके लिए जिम्मेदार है। जब हमारा राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन चल रहा था तो उसका लक्ष्य था सम्पूर्ण स्वतन्त्रता। सम्पूर्ण स्वतन्त्रता के लिए हम लड़ रहे थे। सम्पूर्ण स्वाधीनता का मतलब था कि ब्रिटिश कामनवेल्थ से हिन्दुस्तान हट जावे। बर्मा को 1948 में स्वराज्य मिला। उसके बाद वह ब्रिटिश कामनवेल्थ से हट गया। लेकिन इस सरकार ने ब्रिटिश कामनवेल्थ में हिन्दुस्तान को रखा। इसलिए यह चीज सामने आती है।

अन्त में मेरे तीन सुझाव इसके लिए हैं। एक तो हम फौरन कामनवेल्थ को छोड़ दें। दूसरा यह कि मैं स्वेल् साहब के साथ सहमत

नहीं हूँ। अंग्रेज लोगों की जितनी पूंजी है खास करके आसाम में और उनके चलते वहाँ बंगे फिसाद हो रहे हैं, इसलिए आज जरूरी हो गया है कि इंग्लिस्तान की पूंजी और जितने वहाँ कारखाने हैं उसको भारत सरकार राष्ट्रीयकरण कर ले। और तीसरा मेरा सुझाव यह है कि जब इंग्लिस्तान की सरकार इस चीज को नहीं मानती, हमारे सुझाव को नहीं मानती तो फिर उनके जो नागरिक हैं उनके हिन्दुस्तान आने के लिए भी विज्ञा की व्यवस्था की जाय। यह सुझाव जो हैं इन पर हम अमल करेंगे तब फिर काले लोगों के मन में हमारे प्रति सहानुभूति, स्नेह, ममता और प्रेम जगेगा और इसके चलते जैसा मैंने पहले आप के सामने रखा था, दुनिया में एक बड़ी लड़ाई काले और गोरे लोगों की होने वाली है, इस चीज को सरकार अच्छी तरह से समझ जाये। इस चीज को जब समझ जायेंगे तो फिर दुनिया में हिन्दुस्तान काले गोरे के भेद को खत्म करने में नेतृत्व लेने की स्थिति में रहेगा। इन चन्द शब्दों के साथ मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI D. C. SHARMA (Gurdaspur): I do not think that I should reiterate what has already been said, but I want to urge upon the Government of India that this is not merely an Indian problem or a Pakistan problem but it is a problem that concerns all the countries that are inhabited by Asians and also some of the countries that are inhabited by Africans. Therefore, we should look at this problem from a wider perspective and from an angle which is more or less the angle of the whole world.

Somebody asked 'What have the Indians done for Kenya?'. Anybody may ask 'What have the Indians done for India?'. It was the Indians who had built the railways in Kenya. I think you must have read *The Man-eaters of Tsavon* by Col. Patterson, in which he has given the story of the Kenyan railways which were built by the Indians. It was the Indians who had built up the railways of Kenya. It was the Indians who had built up the cities and multi-storeyed buildings in Kenya.

Indians were the back-bone, economic and political and I should say, the international back-bone of Kenya. They were a part and parcel of Kenya. Now it looks very odd that these very Indians who have given all their support and help, moral, economic and political, for the liberation of Kenya from the clutches of the British Empire should be thrown out.

18 HRS.

Somebody says that they were not into a trap by Mr. Malcom Macdonald. I do not know this. I do not think there was any trap. But one thing is certain, that they opted for UK citizenship, as some of them opted for Kenya citizenship and some others opted for Indian citizenship. Whether they opted for this citizenship or that, we cannot wash our hands off those persons who are Indians, who are of Indian descent. If anyone wants to do that, I think the prestige of India would go down into the deepest ocean.

Therefore, whether a man lives in UK or in Kenya or any other part of Africa or Asia or Europe, if he is a person of Indian origin, we have to own him. We cannot disown him; if we do so, we shall be disowning these persons here after some 10 or 15 years. Disowning Indians, whether they have opted for this citizenship or that, is, I think, a moral crime, a political suicide and a constitutional absurdity. We must own these Indians.

I do not want to read from papers. But even a paper like the *New Statesman*, which the present UK High Commissioner for India, Mr. John Freeman, was editing till recently, has said something on this echoing our sentiments. I shall read only one sentence of what the paper has written, though I can read many sentences from it. It says that 'this enactment is not feasible on any grounds'—morally, politically or constitutionally. But that does not make those Indians who are not allowed entry into UK happy. Mr. Harold Wilson has become Mr. Hitler Wilson. As Hitler tried to raise the bogey of the Jews, so Mr.

Hitler Wilson is raising the bogey of Indians and Asians. If I read the *New Statesman* a right, I can tell you that the Labour Government is on the way out. This legislation which they have enacted has blackened the statute book of UK; it has brought the UK a very bad name. This Act is going to be the last nail in the coffin of the Labour Government. This is what the *New Statesman* also thinks.

What is the way out? There are two ways. One is that these people who are denied their right of entry and are asked to come in driblets should stage a satyagraha outside 10, Downing Street. They are a brave people, they are the children of Mahatma Gandhi; they have learnt their lessons at the feet of Mahatma Gandhi. They should, therefore, stage a peaceful, non-violent satyagraha.

Secondly...

SHRI K. ANIRUDHAN (Chirayinkil) : Send a delegation !

SHRI D. C. SHARMA : No.

SHRI K. ANIRUDHAN : He himself can go and offer satyagraha at 10, Downing Street.

SHRI D. C. SHARMA : I will go with him.

Our Government should call a meeting immediately of representatives of India, Pakistan, Ceylon and some other South East Asian countries. It should devise ways and means so that some moral pressure could be brought to bear upon them. The hon. lady Member was talking about human rights. I think human rights are to be found only on pieces of paper and as charters and in the archives of the United Nations. Who practices human rights? Nobody. There is no use preaching the gospel of human rights. The UK Government has done this to its most friendly country in this world. All the time we have been friendly to the UK and our Prime Minister the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru would have quit Commonwealth. In order to keep us there, the name was changed from the British Commonwealth to the Commonwealth of nations. We have been very friendly

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

with them and they have done this to a friendly nation. Gratitude is not a political virtue and it may not be even a moral virtue in the 20th century. But what India has done to Britain should be remembered with gratitude and I think that these persons should be taken not in 15 years, or ten years but in one instalment. We should make this demand unitedly and firmly and if we did so I am sure the Government of Harold Wilson which is already crumbling and tottering and feeling insecure will come to terms with us sooner than is imagined.

18.07 HRS.

STATEMENT RE EXECUTION OF AFRICANS BY SOUTH RHODESIAN GOVERNMENT

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : Sir, I wanted to draw the attention of the House to an event elsewhere in Africa, in that part of the Continent which is still disfigured by racism. We have learnt with inexpressible horror that the South Rhodesian regime has perpetrated a heinous crime by executing three Africans. The world has followed their fate with great anxiety in the last few days. This monstrous deed of the white racist regime evokes our wrath and our condemnation. I am sure everyone in the House and the country will condemn this barbarous act and honour the name of the three African martyrs : James Dhlamini, Victor Mhlambo and Duly Shadreck.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) : I join the Prime Minister in paying our homage to these three brave men who, whatever the court in Southern Rhodesia may say, will be described as martyrs who died on the altar of the liberation of Africa.

This sad announcement has lent a new poignancy and perhaps helps us to focus our attention on the main issue of the motion before the House today.

It is vitally important that we should not allow legal niceties and economic considerations to cloud the main issue and it is necessary that we focus our attention on the major issue which this debate has raised.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that by this single piece of legislation—I am at a handicap because I cannot find adequate adjectives to convey both my anger and my sadness at what Wilson has tried to do, and because we are at a handicap since you could not have found a stronger epithet and adjective to convey the resentment that we feel, than have been employed in his own country by the remaining section of decency in Britain. The *London Times* called this in its editorial, “a shameless piece of legislation”. Bishop Malien, an ex-Attorney-General, said that “we hang down our head in shame.” I do not think stronger words can be used by us.

Mr. Chairman, I want to concentrate on the effect this piece of legislation rather than on its other aspects. Mr. Harold Wilson, by this single—

SHRI SWELL (Autonomous Districts) : Just one minute, Mr. Nath Pai. After what the Prime Minister has announced, we feel so overwhelmed that any debate on this question becomes unreal. May I request that you adjourn the House as a mark of sorrow and sympathy for those martyrs and we take up and discuss this subject afterwards?

AN HON. MEMBER : I suggest that we stand for one minute, in silence.

श्री शशिनूषण बाजपेयी (खारगोन) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक मिनट हम लोग खामोश
खड़े हो सकते हैं।

SHRI NATH PAI : May I submit one thing. While we are all sympathy for those who have been executed, while paying our homage, we are bound by certain other decorums too. Normally, the House never adjourns except on the death of a head of State. While we deeply lament and mourn the death of these three martyrs, I would like to say this. It is not as if I am more concerned with the indictment against Mr.