

Wilson, and not with the execution of these martyrs. But I thought we had a tradition which we follow for adjourning the House. But if the Prime Minister, the leader of the House, wants to indicate our sympathy by adjourning the House, we would not challenge it, nor do I think any of my colleagues would challenge it. But perhaps the *via media* would be, the appropriate thing would be, in the light of this strong feeling, the House may observe one minute's silence, if the leader of the House would agree, and then we can continue the debate.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I think the sense of the House is that the House should stand in silence for one minute.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Yes.

*The Members then stood in silence for a short while*

18.12 Hrs.

MOTION RE STATEMENT ON COMMONWEALTH IMMIGRANTS BILL OF U.K.—*contd.*

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) : Mr. Chairman, Dr. Swell was right. I was submitting that when he said that we all feel so overwhelmed, one began to grope for words, whatever one might have thought, because we thought that conventions were discarded in this flippant manner by the authorities in South Africa.

Mr. Wilson, by this single piece of legislation, has disowned what has been enshrined in the best traditions of Britain. By my anger at him is that the dream of generations of British socialists and of other countries—that of brotherhood, that of fraternity and of equality of men—has come to nought by a man who ascended to the Chief Minister's office in Britain in the name of socialism. I am constrained to say this, because I have had the honour of knowing him as a friend and when he was expelled from his party for, I think, a stand which he

had taken on behalf of the working classes of Britain, I had the honour of playing host to him. He then showed a tremendous knowledge about Indian problems. The last speech we then delivered together was in the Congress Hall in Berlin where the theme of the meeting was against exploitation, man by man, against the denial of justice by man to man, and against every vestige of colonialism. I have a feeling—what an irony it is—that a man who was inspiring generations of young socialists around the world to fight against the approach based on birth, race or colour—it was his basic mission to treat this with contempt—should be disgracing the statute-book of the United Kingdom by bringing a piece of legislation whose main inspiration is discrimination on the ground of colour. I am constrained and pained to say that Mr. Wilson has joined the dubious company of the Prime Minister of South Africa and Ian Smith of Rhodesia. Rhodesia's Prime Minister, Ian Smith, would have laughed—perhaps the heartiest laughter of his life—when he received Mr. Wilson's message that the three unfortunate freedom fighters should not have been executed. He must have said, "Mr. Wilson to advise me when Britain is beginning to be another replica where colour will be the discriminating factor?" It will be upto the British people to decide what form of Britain they want to create; we will not have that right. But there is something more vital. This is what Mr. Callaghan told the British House of Commons. This is an example of how a man can speak with the tongue in his cheek. He said :

"... a society which will be diverse in culture and will be equal before the law..."

Indeed equal, but as George Orwell said, whites will be more equal and the brownies and blackies will be second and third! In spite of this denial of basic justice and discrimination on the ground of colour, he has the cheek to tell the British Parliament that this is the law to perpetuate the law of equality in the U.K. He further tells something which

[Shri Nath Pai]

I want everybody including the Prime Minister to ponder over very seriously :

"We have to consider our own citizens, and our own citizens in this country are not least in this matter."

What is the history of the United Nations? I am sorry this ponderous book was brought. I had asked for the smaller volume. It looks pretentious to refer to this. It is said here :

"That we have learnt that the danger of war arises whenever a nation sacrifices to its own ambition the fundamental human rights".

So, whenever fundamental human rights are denied, it is not only the victims of this denial who suffer, but there are dangers implicit, in this kind of denial. Obviously neither Mr. Harold Wilson nor Rt. Hon. James Callaghan seems to be aware of this. Then, he tells the British Parliament :

"We must trust the instinctive sense of fair-play of the British people."

What a mockery! I would not like to use a word like "hypocrisy", but on the top of this legislation, he says "trust our sense of fair-play". It was promised to those people that Britain shall honour their passports. As somebody pointed out, they were persuaded to acquire British passports.

18.18 HRS.

[SHRI S. M. JOSHI in the Chair]

There is also the failure of this country and I hang down my head in shame when I know that tens of thousands of Indians do not want to come to this country. All of us, including the Prime Minister, will have to reflect upon this very seriously. There are more than 5 million Indians in many countries. This is a warning. When pressed to take up the citizenship of the country where they have been living so long, they do not take that citizenship and they do not want to come to India also. Such is the India we have built in 20 years that these people who claim Indian heritage are very reluctant to come back to this country. So far as Indians in Kenya are concerned, they were persuaded to accept the British citizenship.

It is ironical that about the 1962 Act against which Mr. Wilson had raised his strong voice, Mr. James Callaghan has said, while defending a particular clause before the House of Commons, that the liability which arises from the 1962 Act, the imprisonment, is inadequate. That Act was voted against by the Labour Party which is in power today. Mr. Callaghan now wants to close the loopholes which were left in the Act which was introduced by the Tory Government. Sir, Mr. Wilson entered into No. 10, Downing Street, which is the official residence of the Prime Minister of Britain, as a socialist. I have no doubt that he will leave it in due course as the worst Tory Prime Minister of the 20th Century. Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker, who was Mr. Wilson's colleague and life-time comrade, was defeated by a Tory member on the single slogan "Britain must remain white". When that Tory member took his seat, Mr. Wilson had taunted him by saying, "Here is a political leper". What shall we find to describe Mr. Wilson's perfidy? I am short of words.

Mr. Attlee has gone down in Britain's history as the man who presided over the liquidation of the British empire. Mr. Wilson will go down as the man who presided over the liquidation of the Commonwealth.

There has been some talk about our quitting the Commonwealth. I want the Prime Minister to think about this aspect. Let us not make much fuss about it. The Commonwealth, such as it was, we were told by the then Prime Minister, the distinguished father of the present Prime Minister, symponises a community of ideas and a commitment to ideals. After what we have been told, the very basis, the foundation and the lingering good thing about the Commonwealth has been knocked out, not by its critics but by its guardians. We should not make much fuss, we should not appear to be offended and in anger say anything. But I think when the Prime Minister gets the next opportunity to meet Mr. Harold Wilson, after taking about other important things, she should just casually say : "Well, Mr. Wilson, incidentally, I forget to tell you, I heard that the

Commonwealth is dead, although we are sorry about it". This is how we should finish with it. This big talk about threatening crusade and war is not worthy of us. This has been destroyed by the men who are supposed to be the basis for the Commonwealth. When they will make it an offence contrary to their pledges, contrary to the best in British liberality and contrary to the hopes, I am sorry to say, which were held not only by the socialists, liberals and humanists in Britain but of all countries, by Wilberforce, John Bright, by Keir Hardy, by Bertrand Russel and others, they have destroyed it. He has repudiated this rich tradition of the equality of man, of the brotherhood of man and the fraternity of man.

I want to suggest one thing. This is only part of the question with which we will be confronted. This is going to come in a big way. It will be in Fiji tomorrow perhaps and perhaps in other parts of Africa. The Government of India should not take the usual attitude, that whenever the house is on fire it tries to dig a well. When the question of Indians in Kenya comes it tries to have one solution and when tomorrow it comes up in Tanzania or in Uganda it tries to have another solution. What is the long-term policy? We cannot go on evolving a hand-to-mouth solution, an *ad hoc* posture. We need a long-term policy. We need to persuade these brethren of ours in all earnestness to think of the countries to which they belong and try to assimilate themselves with those countries, make common cause with those countries wherever they are living. It is no use knocking at the door of Britain.

Britain is playing a dangerous game. I hope the Prime Minister will be shrewd and alert enough to see that by bringing this Bill their game, I suspect, their hope, I think, is to make India get these people here. Normally, I know how the patriotic sentiments in this country will be. It will be said, they are Indians, their only misfortune was that they believed the promises made to them by the representatives of Britain, temporarily in a lapse they forget the

country which gave them shelter and the country from which they hailed—they forgot Kenya, they forgot India—and therefore let us take them back. I think Britain expects to exploit this tenderness in our mind. We must not fall into this trap. Whereas we shall do everything to help them, let us not fall into this trap. I am not being legal, the wider human aspect we must bear in mind, but this kind of resurrection cannot be allowed.

I want to conclude by referring to the United Nations Charter. It was not a Tory Prime Minister—what an irony of fate—but it was a Labour Prime Minister who signed it on behalf of Britain. Like Shri H. N. Mukerjee I hate to call names to Britain, it will be hypocritical, but we are shocked, we are staggered, we are bewildered. We do not understand this kind of duplicity on the part of a man like Mr. Wilson. He never seems to be missing an occasion or an opportunity to hurt India, be it the aggression by Pakistan or be it the Kutch question. When Pakistan committed aggression he kept silent, but when India went to defend her legitimate right Mr. Wilson on the 6th September pontificated by telling us "I am distressed at India's reaction". When Kutch came the same thing was there. When American arms were used he kept mum. There was something, I do not know what had muzzled him. Now we find he was conveniently away at Huddersfield when his colleague Callaghan was piloting this Bill. Mr. Callaghan devalued the pound first. Now I think he has discredited something in British tradition and in the tradition of socialism. Everywhere socialists will look upon this piece of legislation with distrust.

Having said that, I want to ask one question. Did they not sign the Charter of the United Nations in which it is guaranteed under article 15 that there shall never be discrimination against man by man on the ground of his colour or his birth or his religion or his race? I am told that Mr. Harold Wilson, Mr. Callaghan, many of them, at least one young man who was my fellow student told me—he was a pilot during the

[Shri Nath Pai]

war—when they saw the bombing in Germany they wept. His name was John Stewart. He said they wept when they saw the bombing of Berlin because they wanted to build a new Europe and a new India. What a sad fulfilment of those hopes which they entertained together! But India will have to rise against this hypocrisy and rouse world opinion against this. We are not as helpless as we think. Every decent citizen will be raising his voice against this. There are decent men left in Britain and, I think, in every other country. If we do this thing, I think those saner elements in Britain will derive strength, that lonely voice of the Archbishop or the Attorney-General, who had the courage and decency to decry this kind of thing, which is not only a denial of justice but a shame on the nobler traditions of liberalism.

Let the Prime Minister take the initiative, not in the limited sense of our legal responsibility, but in the wider sense. When Spain was invaded, it was India which took the initiative; when Abyssinia was invaded, it was again India which took the initiative. When injustice is done now in the name of colour of man, it is on the wider aspect that India should strive to work for and rouse world opinion against it.

**SHRI VIKRAM CHAND MAHAJAN** (Chamba): Mr. Chairman, the Immigration Bill is a disgrace to the British nation; it is a disgrace to the so-called sense of justice of the Britishers. What is being done by passing this Bill is a shame to all those great thoughts of equality which they had pronounced in the 19th and 20th centuries when their philosophers said that Britain believes in equality and justice. After the passage of this Bill, as Shri Nath Pai has correctly put it, Mr. Wilson can be placed in the category of Ian Smith and the Prime Minister of South Africa.

But, at the same time, we always come back to the same attack, the routine attack, that the Government of India has done nothing, the Government of India never plans anything and it always fails at the crucial movement. For a change you can give constructive

suggestions; though it is the normal duty of the opposition to make an attack whenever possible on the government, it is not always necessary to do so, especially when a question of common interest or common suffering is involved. So, I would submit that the issue of the immigrants from Kenya should not be utilized to attack the Government and it should not be said that the Government has failed to face this issue. The Government of India has taken every possible steps to see that they do not suffer. The Government of India has used its good offices with other nations and has kept in contact with the United Kingdom Government to see that the lot of the emigrants is not worsened. So, while it is a disgrace to the British Government, it is not a failing on the part of the Government of India.

One of the hon. Members has put the blame on the Indians who are settled in Kenya, saying that they failed the people of that country, they did nothing for that country and, therefore, they are being meted out this treatment and so we should not help them to that extent. It is a strange theory that he has expounded.

**AN HON. MEMBER**: No one has said that.

**SHRI VIKRAM CHAND MAHAJAN**: Shri Mukerjee said that people of Indian origin in Kenya did nothing for that country and that they do not deserve our sympathy. Probably, there may be a change of word here and there, but that was the sense or tenor of his speech.

I submit that even on humanitarian grounds these words should not have been uttered, because they are Indians, they have been belied by a nation and it is our bounden duty to see that they do not suffer more. We should help them instead of making out a case against anybody as they are trying to make out a case against the foreign policy of the Government of India.

Then there are certain suggestions which have been made. One of them is: Nationalise the entire British property. I would have been all for it if

there were no Indians who had settled in Great Britain. About half a million Indians have settled there and if you nationalise the British property here, you can well imagine the result which will flow from your action. What will happen to the half a million Indians who are settled there? You are not able to absorb the present inflow from Pakistan and if you take this retaliatory step, what are you going to do about those half a million Indians there? Before taking any retaliatory step you must first see the consequences which are going to flow out of that step.

Another suggestion which has been made is: Leave the Commonwealth. If the leaving of the Commonwealth would solve the problem of those immigrants, you must leave the Commonwealth; but, if it does not improve matters, then why take a step merely in haste and anger through which we are passing. We should leave the Commonwealth provided it does not harm any of our interests. As one of the speakers put it, it is in a group where you move with certain ideas; it helps in coming in contact with other countries like Canada and Australia; it also helps you in your tariffs and in your economy. Therefore, before you take any retaliatory step, you must also keep in view the consequences which are likely to flow out of it. If a particular step will improve the lot of the people who are coming in, then please take it; but if in the long run it is going to injure your interests, then please do not take any step in a hurry.

Then, there are a few suggestions which I would like to make. One of them is that we should try to persuade the British Government itself, though in the present mood we are going to abuse them. Possibly, it may be a good thing if you ask them to increase the flow of the number of immigrants that will go to the United Kingdom; instead of 50 you can ask them to make it 2,000, 3,000 or 4,000. Possibly, the United Nations Commission on humanitarianism may help us. We may persuade other countries to raise this issue and this may help us. We can persuade the Kenya Government to reconsider their

steps. If we take steps in this direction, possibly we may be able to do something.

Lastly, I suggest that to those who are coming to our country we should give a befitting welcome. We should appoint a committee of this House which should look after their interests.

SHRI K. ANIRUDHAN (Chirayinkil): Mr. Chairman, by passing this Bill the UK Government have acted un-conventionally. By the implementation of it nearly 120,000 to 130,000 Asians, a large number of them Indians, who are now in Kenya would be thrown out of Kenya. It is the British people who gave the citizenship and who gave them free entry into British territories: They did it for the service these Kenya Asians did for the British people to have a bigger empire and also for their well-being.

Now, these Britishers, by passing his Bill, are going away from the promises they gave to the Kenya Asians. By implementing this Bill, they have made a clean distinction between the black and the white. I want to emphasize that point. About Australians who are now in Kenya, about Canadians who are now in Kenya and also about New Zealanders who are now in Kenya, they were not prohibited from entering into the British territory without any restriction. This restriction is only applicable to the Asians now in Kenya. We should take this matter seriously. Some of our friends are even now talking very high of Commonwealth relationship.

I should like to quote from the Lok Sabha proceedings as to what Mr. Bhagwat Jha Azad who is a Minister now said about the Commonwealth relationship and also about the patronisation of the British people. He said:

"...in the last 18 years, the British imperialists—whether it is the blue-eyed Conservatives, whether it is Labour or whether it is Liberal—have all alike been hostile to this country."

We are seeing all this. When there was a fight between India and Pakistan, we saw how they played. Even in this Kutch affair, they have played a very

[Shri K. Anirudhan]

dirty game and also in the Kutch Award. Again, he said :

"Who is Mr. Wilson, is he our boss to say this to India which has given prestige to the Commonwealth? But for India what was the Commonwealth? The late "Jawaharlal Nehru gave birth to this Commonwealth, the late Jawaharlal Nehru made this Commonwealth, what it is, and this British nation of shop-keepers got all the prestige from us and used this prestige against us everytime to beat us at the time of aggression. Therefore, I ask Mr. Wilson, this question : Would he kindly reply to this partner in the Commonwealth?"

Sir, we had been so long a very loyal partner of the Commonwealth. As some of my friends from that side said, it is high time to quit the Commonwealth. I can understand some Swatantra Members saying that it is very difficult and that we should think about it twice or thrice and I cannot understand some of the other Members who spoke from the opposite side that we should think twice against breaking the Commonwealth relations. Just now, our Prime Minister made a statement about the tragic incident that happened in Rhodesia. There, some of their patriots have been butchered and even after that some people are clinging and trying to tag on to this Commonwealth relationship. This relationship, I think, is only to better the conditions of the British people.

Now, I think, it is high time to take a bold step to sever relationship with the Commonwealth. They have looked at it not with a view to distinguish between the Kenya origin or the Asian origin. They are now looking at it as black and white. We should also take a radical step. It is not the time to think twice or thrice. It is the time to act. So, we should sever our relations with the Commonwealth and bid good-bye to the Commonwealth. Also, I think that it is high time our Government talked to the Kenyan Government. After all, Kenya is an African country, and I feel that our Government should negotiate the matter with Kenya and try to settle the problem as far as possible. If we

cannot settle this problem up to our expectations, then we should try to provide for those people wherever it is possible in our country itself. You may ask how we can settle this problem and you may doubt how we shall be in a position to provide them and where we provide them. I would submit that even now we have several plantations in India where we can provide few of these people. In Assam, we are having huge British-owned plantations. In Kerala also, there are Malayalam plantations ranging over thousands of acres; some years ago, some maharajah had gifted these to the white people and now it has become the biggest dollar-earning area of this country. Besides, there are also the Kannan levant plantations. Government should take steps to take away those plantations from the owners. Since Britain has done this in a very unconventional manner, the Government of India also should act accordingly. Why the Government of India should hesitate to take over these plantations? I would request the Government of India to seek the people's co-operation also, because I am sure the people will rally behind the Government of India for this act.

Besides these plantations, there are also the British-owned banks, and also the British-owned engineering industries. Government should take over these industries and also banks and provide there for the people in Kenya who have now been denied of entry into Britain even though they have British passports. I would also submit that we should stop repaying the debts that we are owing to Britain. That is what I would request Government to do.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : It was with a very peculiar feeling that I was sitting in this House and listening.....

SOME HON. MEMBERS : The Prime Minister is not replying ?

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : It is not such a serious problem for the Prime Minister.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I think the hon. Member should have patience and listen.

SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore) : I expect that the Prime Minister also will reply ?

SHRI NATH PAI : Is Shri B. R. Bhagat intervening or replying ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I am replying. I think the hon. Member will grant me the right to reply.

It was with a peculiar feeling that I was listening to the debate, and this is one of those rare occasions on which Members from all sides had given expression to common feelings; they have expressed their sense of horror and anger at what has been done by the Immigration Act in UK. It has a big tragedy about it, because the Immigration Act has cut at the roots of all of us; this one single Act has cut at the ethos of our nationhood, what our leaders had built this country for and this generation for. The leaders of Indian nationhood like Tilak, Gandhi and Nehru have built this nation; in fact, not only this nation but the present-day world, on ideas which have certain great human values, ideas of racial equality, ideas of brotherhood of mankind, ideas of prosperity and common sharing by everybody, be he a white or a brown or a black.

This was the ethos of our nation. When we saw member after member on all sides giving expression to this, I was reminded of the pre-independence days when the whole of our nation spoke with one voice. Today this Parliament has expressed the national conscience, the national will in condemnation of this Act.

This is one side of the picture. The other side is the deep tragedy which I notice with regret which has overtaken the leaders of UK. What has happened to the leaders of UK ? Hon. Members have used certain very strong expressions. I do not want to indulge in that. Mine is more an expression of sorrow and pain and it is in that vein that I am trying to analyse what has happened.

Why have the UK Government done this ? Their own leaders have said that they have done to avoid the stress and strain, social and economic imbalance, which would be created because of the rush of people of Indian origin from Kenya into UK, to avoid the repercussion which such a rush would have in their society. I think this will not carry conviction anywhere. Their own leaders, their own papers, MPs, intellectuals and others have characterised this Bill in the strongest possible terms. Some hon. Members have quoted them. It is common knowledge that this is agitating and disturbing the conscience of Britain also.

Therefore, I do not want to add to the burden of their conscience. I only want them to weigh the losses the rule of law has suffered, the British rule of law on which the Commonwealth concept is based, the basis of racial equality, of a group of nations coming together irrespective of colour and race—that very concept of the Commonwealth which has suffered. If they had weighed all these considerations, I think they would have been wiser in not resorting to this step. I am unable to understand the compelling reasons which led the leaders of Britain to enact this law.

Some hon. Members have suggested strongly that we should take retaliatory action. Many things have been suggested. I would like to go into that a little later. But I want to point out that although it has become a problem in that it challenges the basic postulates, the very concept on which the British nation stands, it has created far greater problems for us, because, as I said, it goes against the grain of our nationhood to accept this Act as it is.

It has been contended that it is not racial. In form, it may not be. Some hon. Members quoted very rightly that it discriminates against people who have no substantial connection with Britain by birth or parentage. That means, *de facto* it will discriminate against people of Asian origin from Kenya and other places. Therefore, as a nation we cannot compromise with the racial aspect of this legislation.

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

Secondly, these people of Asian origin are British passport holders. The leaders of Britain, at the time of the independence of Kenya, advised them to take British passports. I think one hon. Member used this opportunity, which I regret very much, to say something in condemnation of this Government. It would have been better if he had also joined the stream of unity expressed in this House, and not indulged in condemning this Government which was completely unwarranted. It was said that we are also to blame for this, that we did not advise them correctly.

Our policy with respect to these people has been very clear right from the beginning. We gave them a three-fold advice. Firstly, we advised them to accept the nationality of the country they were staying, in this case, Kenya nationality. Then we said that those who wanted to take Indian nationality, were welcome to do so. We told them that they must make common cause with the country of their adoption and remain there. We never advised them to take UK nationality. But some of the present British leaders, who have been in the spearhead of this legislation, had gone and advised them to accept British nationality and take UK passports. The Act discriminates against these people. They are British citizens and are British responsibility. Now, when they go to the United Kingdom they will not be admitted or at least their rights to go there will be severely curtailed and regulated. Some hon. Members have said that this is an attack on the fundamental rights of a citizen. It is the fundamental right of any citizen to live in his country. It is in fact a matter of fundamental human rights. A suggestion was made—we are having consultations about it—that this matter could be taken up in the Human Rights Commission. The problem that we are faced with is a very big problem.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : That is why we wanted the Prime Minister to reply.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : The hon. Member should not be comical in this serious situation; he may reserve it for

other occasions. Some hon. Members said that it was a question of over five million people of Indian origin in Kenya, West Indies, Carribean Islands, East Africa and other places. Therefore, it is a question of what we should do immediately and what we should have as a long term policy. We have to consider this problem in all its ramifications, short term and long term aspects and whatever policy we evolve we should be able to deal with this problem effectively and adequately. We have every sympathy for these people. We share the difficulties in which they are in. But they are the responsibility of the British Government and the objective of our policy is that we must make them realise that it is their responsibility.

श्री रवि राय : अगर ब्रिटेन उनको नहीं लेता है, तो फिर क्या करेंगे ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : We are coming step by step. Some hon. Members said that they should be allowed to come in. After all there are 500 million people in India and a hundred thousand people from Kenya can be absorbed. They can be; there is no problem about that. But they must also consider that the United Kingdom is a far more developed economy and these people are not deadweights; there are traders, businessmen, technicians, stenographers, doctors and others and they can be usefully absorbed more easily in England than here. Apart from that, there is the moral responsibility which the UK Government has. It is not the number of the people but the strength of the economy on which depends the absorption of these people. So, what they suggest is not the proper course to adopt.

After careful consideration of the problem, we have today issued a notification making it incumbent on the holders of UK and colonies passports, normally resident in Kenya, to obtain endorsements on their passports from Indian posts and missions abroad for entry into India. We hope that this step will make it clear to all concerned, particularly the UK Government, that the Government of India is not prepared to acquiesce even indirectly in



denying these people the right to enter freely and without restrictions the country whose nationality they have chosen and obtained. We have taken this decision not by way of retaliation but to emphasise the urgent necessity of allowing these persons rights of citizenship irrespective of their country of origin. We have for the present limited the application of our notification only to the United Kingdom and colonies passport holders, normally resident in Kenya. We do not wish to unnecessarily inconvenience the holders of such passports living in other countries entering India but when similar problems arise in other countries we shall not hesitate to extend the notification to these countries also. It is not our intention to bar re-entry into India even of such passport-holders living in Kenya. We have instructed our Missions abroad to give endorsements on their passports in exceptional cases on compassionate humanitarian grounds. Our intention is only to regulate the flow of such people into India in order to help their re-entry into India, a right which the British Government say they do not wish to deny to them.

Now, I do not know what value can be put to it. Some hon. Members have said that they have no value, but the Home Secretary, Mr. Callaghan, has said that if these people are expelled from Kenya they have no option but to accept them, I asked the British High Commissioner here, what is the value of this. He said it is a promise made to Parliament and the British Government will keep this promise. I do not know. It has no legal basis, but I hope even now, late in the day the British Government will realise their responsibility and take back these people if they go there in distress or under duress.

Secondly, we had suggested to the United Kingdom Government; they have suggested at one time that they would take 1,500 heads of families. That will mean about 6,000 to 7,000 people including the parents if they have their parents living. At that rate, this problem can be solved only in 15 to 20 years. Therefore, I said this is not phasing; this is absolutely to stop them

from coming. What will happen to these people who are thrown out of Kenya. Therefore, I suggested that instead of 1,500, they should take 15,000 people so that instead of being phased over a period of 15 to 20 years, this should be phased over a period of two or three years. This is the point we are emphasising, and they have said that they have not kept any limit in the Act, and therefore it is flexible and they may consider increasing it. But I do not know. Until they do it we have no hopes and we shall continue pressing it that they should increase the limit and the phasing should be on a short term basis and not on a long term basis. That is what we are trying to do.

In this connection, some hon. Members suggested that we should try to persuade the Kenyan Government also to realise that these people who have lived there and contributed to their economy and who ultimately will be slowly going out, should be treated sympathetically; that they should also treat this question sympathetically. I do not know what will come out of this, but certainly the Prime Minister has directed me to go there and talk to the Kenyan Government. More than that, I cannot say. But we are trying to make efforts in this direction. If the United Kingdom, whose main responsibility it is, to solve this question and if the Kenyan Government also take a sympathetic view, at least if the Africanisation policy is slowed down a bit, I think this problem can be solved with ease and facility, but I cannot say anything more than that.

Then there was the question of the Commonwealth which was raised. Many hon. Members have said on both sides of the House something on this whole concept of the Commonwealth. Now, it is not a United Kingdom Commonwealth. It is a Commonwealth of Nations. (*Interruption*) What is the basic, main idea of the Commonwealth? One hon. Member has said that it has been described by the late Prime Minister as the community of ideas. It is a very good description. But the basic thing is, it is based on racial equality.

SHRI NATH PAI : Even if they commit a particular crime ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I do not know what has happened to my hon. friend Shri Nath Pai. He is becoming more and more impatient.

SHRI NATH PAI : Because you provoke us.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I request him to listen to what I am saying.

SHRI NATH PAI : We are listening to you very patiently.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I said that the basic concept of the Commonwealth is racial equality. There are 26 members, at the moment, in the Commonwealth, belonging to different races, colour and creed.

There is one member of the Commonwealth which has no diplomatic relations with Britain—Tanzania. As I said, the commonwealth spirit, as it is called, is based on racial equality. Basically if that is attacked, I think nobody can prevent its dissolution.

19.00 Hrs.

श्री रवि राय : हमला तो हो गया ।

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : UK does not say that this is a racial measure. Let us give them a chance. They should prove that this is not a racial measure by taking back all those people who are UK citizens. If they do that, that will prove that they still have faith in the rule of law. But looking to the sentiments of the House, to our own national ethos and our confirmed faith in racial equality, we will certainly consider in all seriousness what we should do, if this thing does not happen. In a matter like this, we should be careful. We did not join the Commonwealth in haste. We weighed all considerations. Certainly we should not leave it in a huff. On the question of racial equality, South Africa was expelled from the Commonwealth. In this matter, we cannot take unilateral action. We have to discuss it with other members of the Commonwealth. If we carry conviction to the other members of the Commonwealth, then Britain can be expelled. (Interruptions).

Some smaller points have been raised that 10,000 applications are pending and we have not done anything about those Kenyan Indians seeking Kenyan citizenship. We have taken up the matter with the Kenyan Government. Only the other day, the Vice-President of the Kenyan Government has announced that he is looking into those cases and they will decide them expeditiously.

Mr. Swell said that there are only 60,000 people left. He is wrong. The 15,000 people who have gone in that rush preceding the enactment include dependants also; that is not the number of the heads of families. Still there are about 80,000 to 100,000 people left over.

He referred to the long-term policy. It is a very moot point. We are looking into that problem and we are also examining what our policy should be in regard to all those countries.

AN HON. MEMBER : After 20 years !

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I have explained in great detail our policy with regard to people of Indian origin. Now a new and a very serious situation has arisen and in the light of this, we will examine it. Certainly in a dynamic world, we cannot have fixed ideas and fixed policies. We are looking into this long-term aspect of it, the ramifications of people of Indian origin in other places, etc., and we will try to evolve a policy which meets the situation very effectively.

SHRI SWELL : There are 600 Kenyan Indians in the high seas now approaching the shores of India, who have not obtained any endorsement on their passports from the High Commission in Kenya.

What are you going to do about them ? Are you going to allow them to enter India ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I think a ship has already reached Bombay. They will be allowed.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : सभापति जी, मुझे प्रसन्नता है कि सदन के सभी माननीय सदस्यों

ने मेरे प्रस्ताव का स्वागत किया है और जो मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि वह स्वयं जाकर के केन्या सरकार से बात करेंगे मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूँ। मैं यह आशा करता हूँ कि जो सरकार ने लांग टर्म पालिसी का मतलब लगाया है, वह एक लम्बी, लॉग स्लीप नहीं होनी चाहिए। अभी अफ्रीका के बारे में है, सम्भाषित जी, मैं आपको कहना चाहता हूँ कल को यह मांग और सवाल भी आने वाला है, सीलोन के बारे में भी यह प्राबलम होने वाली है। इसलिए सरकार को जागरूक रहना चाहिए और यह मैं फिर दोबारा कहना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर में चार साल से यह दरख्वास्तें पड़ी हैं। अभी तक आप के हाई कमिशन ने या केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कुछ नहीं किया। तो इस प्रकार से वहाँ पर एक क्रूसेड चल रहा है हिन्दुस्तानियों के खिलाफ उसमें आपका हाई कमिशन इस प्रकार सुन्न नहीं होना चाहिए। उसको काम करना चाहिए और मैं केन्द्रीय सरकार से यह कहूँगा कि आप इस मामले में थोड़ा ज्यादा दिलचस्पी लें, उसको देखें कि उनकी कठिनाइयाँ क्या हैं। इस प्रकार से अगर सरकार जागरूक रहेगी तो यह समस्याएं पैदा नहीं होंगी। यू० के० सरकार ने भी आपको कई बार पहले लिखा है। मैं और अधिक नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। प्राइम मिनिस्टर महोदय को भी शायद कहीं जाना है, ऐसा मालूम पड़ रहा है। तो मैं फिर इसका स्वागत करता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि मेरा यह प्रस्ताव सर्वसम्मति से पारित हो जायेगा।

MR. CHAIRMAN : I shall put the amendment first. The question is :

"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 highlight the worst type of racial discrimination practised by U.K.'"

*The motion was negatived.*

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Let them have the racial discrimination.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"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."

*The motion was adopted.*

\*AGREEMENT WITH 'NOVOSTI'  
 19.10 Hrs.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA (Jalore) : Mr. Chairman, the interference of the Soviet Government into the social and political life of India has assumed very large proportions and has reached the climax now. The three forces of the Soviet Government, the intelligence, the press and the radio have combined to launch an attack into the social and political activities of the country. The intelligence in the form of KGB, Radio Peace and Progress and then Novosti the press, these three forces have combined together.

About one year before the last general elections this campaign started and it had been systematically and methodically conducted by the various forces of the Soviet Union—intelligence, press and radio. But, in spite of that, the Government of India had been meekly submitting to the hegemony of the Soviet Union in the form of these three forces—intelligence in the form of KGB, radio in the form of Radio Peace and Progress and Novosti in the field of the press.

KGB, as you are aware, is an organisation about which certain inquiries were made by the Home Ministry. Although the reports have not been published, it is well known that KGB has been interfering in the affairs of India on a mass scale. In the last elections, as many as 129 candidates were supported and finance to an extent of over Rs. 1 crore came into the election campaign of