

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** If you have given notice, it will be considered. I am told, it is under consideration. But please do not raise it like this.

12.02 HRS

**CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE**

**DISCUSSIONS re. DEPORTATION OF KENYA ASIANS**

**SHRI R. BARUA (Jorhat):** Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

Outcome of the discussion held by Shri Bali Ram Bhagat, Minister of State for External Affairs, in Nairobi with the Government of Kenya on the question of deportation of Kenya Asians.

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT):** On March 6, 1968, this House discussed some of the consequences flowing from the Commonwealth Immigration Act which affected those holders of British passports who were of Asian origin. During those discussions Hon'ble Members generally shared the feeling that it might be desirable to have an exchange of views with the Government of Kenya and its leaders. Since I was leading our delegation to participate in the Independence celebrations of Mauritius on March 12, I proceeded to Nairobi on March 14.

During my stay in Nairobi, I called on the Vice-President of Kenya on March 15. The Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Kenya was also present at the meeting. This was followed by my meetings with other Ministers in the Kenya Government and with some of the Representatives of the People of Indian origin from different parts of Kenya. These were useful in promoting understanding by all concerned of the complexities, the magnitude and the implications of the problem. An arrangement had been

made for me to call on His Excellency the President of Kenya in his country house on March 18 at 10 A.M. However, this was later cancelled.

This House will be glad to hear that the Government of Kenya has now decided to extend for a period varying from one to two years, work permits issued to non-citizens which will include person of Indian origin, holders of British and colonies passports. This will be subject to renewal.

**SHRI R. BARUA:** The people of Kenya suffered under British Imperialism and India always extended a helping hand to them during the Mau Mau movement. Keeping that background in view, is it a fact, as has appeared in some section of the press, that the British Government had some hand in scuttling this meeting of our Minister with the President of Kenya? I would also like to know how it is that our Foreign Ministry spokesman came out with a statement completely absolving the British Government before the Minister could make a statement here.

**SHRI B. R. BHAGAT:** We do not know and it would not be proper to surmise on this matter particularly when Kenya is an independent country. It is not for us to say that they are guided by any other power. I think, it is a very sensitive matter and we should not go into this question. As for the spokesman, he merely said that the British Minister in the High Commission here had represented to him and said that it was not true that they had anything to do in this matter. That was what he said.

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar):** More than this.

श्री हरदयाल देवगुण (पूर्व दिल्ली) :  
हमारे विदेश मंत्री जी की केनिया में जाने की जो पृष्ठभूमि है वह सदन को मालूम है। वहां की सरकार से मिलकर माननीय मंत्री जी जो प्रयास करना चाहते थे समाचारपत्रों के

अनुसार वहां की ब्रिटिश हाई कमिशन ने उसे सफल नहीं होने दिया। उनके जाने से पहले ही ऐसा वातावरण बनाया गया और इस प्रकार की चेष्टायें की गई कि इनका मिशन सफल न हो और ऐसा हुआ भी। जिस प्रकार से ब्रिटिश सरकार ने इमिग्रेशन बिल पास किया कामनवेल्थ देशों से पूछे बिना और वहां सारी समस्या पर अच्छी तरह से विचार किये बिना उसको देखते हुए ब्रिटिश सरकार के साथ और केनिया की सरकार के साथ हमारे इस अपमान के लिए सरकार ने क्या कार्रवाई की है। ब्रिटिश सरकार ने जो दबाव डाला है उसके प्रति आपकी क्या नीति है? क्या इस स्थिति के बाद बिल पास करने के बाद और इस प्रकार के अपमान के बाद हमारी सरकार ब्रिटिश कामनवेल्थ से निकलने के लिए तैयार है या नहीं है।

श्री ब० रा० भगत : मैं आग्रह करूंगा कि इसको अपमान के रूप में न लिया जाए। जैसा मैंने बताया है—

श्री हुकम चन्द कछबाय (उज्जैन) : वहां से बुरी तरह से लोगों को निकाला जा रहा है और आप कहते हैं कि अपमान के रूप में न लिया जाए।

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अगर सरकार में आत्म-सम्मान की भावना नहीं है तो इसको बिल्कुल अपमान नहीं मानना चाहिये। मैं बिल्कुल सहमत हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Hon. Members should realise, as the hon. Minister has said, that it is a sensitive question and it is still under consideration.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : He had gone there as the External Affairs Minister. Therefore it is an insult, not to Shri Bali Ram Bhagat, but to the Government of India and to the whole country. He should not say that it is not an insult at all.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : यह परसनल मसैअर थे प्रधान मंत्री के। उनकी बिट्टी ले कर गए थे। उसके बावजूद भी वे इनको नहीं मिले। यह नेशनल ह्यूमिलिटी नहीं थी तो और क्या थी।

श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर (सहरसा) : यह भारत का अपमान हुआ है और इसलिए उन्हें ये शब्द वापिस लेने चाहिये। यह स्वाभिमान की बात है। अगर उन में स्वाभिमान की भावना नहीं है तो इनको क्षमा कर देना चाहिये।

श्री ब० रा० भगत : जैसा मैंने कहा, मेरी मुलाकात वाइस-प्रेसीडेंट से और सभी मंत्रियों से हुई। बातचीत हुई और मिलने का उद्देश्य यह था कि वहां जो ...

श्री मधु लिमये : पूर्णतया सफल हुआ है !

श्री ब० रा० भगत : मिलने का उद्देश्य एक तो यह था कि वहां की सरकार से बातचीत की जाए कि यह जो परिस्थिति उत्पन्न हो गई है उस में जो एशियाई लोग हैं वहां उनका हैरासमेन्ट न हो, उनको तकलीफ न हो और दूसरे जो लोग हैं उनके दिल में कांफिडेंस हो और हिम्मत हो कि इस मुसीबत को वे ठीक झेल सकें और सही तरीके निकाल सकें। जैसा मैंने कहा बातचीत के आधार पर यह बात हो गई कि उन में कांफिडेंस भी आया और केनिया सरकार में यह बात हुई कि इस तरह से एकाएक लोगों के चले जाने से उनको भी नुकसान पहुंचता है और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय वातावरण में भी दुराव होता है। अब उन्होंने यह लागू कर दिया है कि बर्क परमिट्स वगैरह एक दो साल के लिए बढ़ा दिये जायेंगे और एक्सोडस बन्द हो गया है और यह जो यहां मांग की गई थी यह पूरी हुई। जैसा कि मैंने बताया है, केनिया और हिन्दुस्तान में कोई दुश्मनी नहीं है। उन का यह इरादा नहीं था कि वे हमारा कोई अपमान करें। इस मामले में इस दृष्टि से नहीं देखना चाहिए। (व्यवधान)

[श्री ब० रा० भगत]

जोश या उत्साह में अगर हम कोई ऐसी बात कहें, तो इससे वहां पर रहने वाले हमारे एशियाई लोगों को नुकसान होगा। केनिया और भारत में जो मैत्री है पीछे का जो हमारा इतिहास है इस से उस में दुराव पड़ेगा। हम जानते हैं कि यह सदन यह नहीं चाहता है और इस लिए भी इस बात को ज्यादा बढ़ाना नहीं चाहिए।

श्री हरबयाल देवगुण : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने यह भी पूछा है कि मंत्री महोदय केनिया राष्ट्रपति से मिलना चाहते थे और उनको प्रधानमंत्री का पत्र देना चाहते थे, राष्ट्रपति इन से नहीं मिले और वह पत्र नहीं लिया, क्या यह सच है या नहीं।

श्री ब० रा० भगत : मैंने अपने जवाब में कहा है कि केनिया के राष्ट्रपति से मेरी मुलाकात का समय तब हो गया था, लेकिन वह मुलाकात नहीं हो सकी, यह बात सही है। (व्यवधान)

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : क्यों नहीं हो सकी।

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : क्या मंत्री महोदय प्रधान मंत्री की कोई चिट्ठी ले गये थे या नहीं ?

श्री ब० रा० भगत : जहां तक पत्र का सवाल है, उस में ऐसी कोई बात नहीं कही गई थी; मुझे इंटरडिक्शन दिया गया था कि मैं मिलने के लिए जा रहा हूं। वहां के सभी नेताओं से मेरी बात हो गई। राष्ट्रपति से भी मिलने की बात थी, लेकिन अगर उन से बात नहीं हुई और वह पत्र नहीं दिया गया, तो वह ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है, जिस से— (व्यवधान)

श्री हरबयाल देवगुण : मैंने कामनवेल्थ से निकलने के बारे में जो प्रश्न पूछा है, उस का भी उत्तर दिया जाये।

श्री ब० रा० भगत : पिछली बार यहां पर यह सवाल उठाया गया था और इस बारे में माननीय सदस्यों के विचार हमें मालूम

हैं। कामनवेल्थ में एशिया और अफ्रीका के ज्यादा सदस्य हैं। कोई भी निर्णय लेने से पहले उन से भी बात करनी होगी। इन सब बातों पर सोच कर इस बारे में फैसला किया जायेगा। मैं भरोसा दिलाता हूं कि इस प्रश्न पर इस सदन की ओर जो राय और विचार है, उसका जरूर खयाल किया जायेगा।

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam) : We do not want our relations with Kenya to be spoiled in any way. But are we to understand that it is in keeping with the dignity of this House that the representative of the Prime Minister was entrusted with a letter to be handed in personally to the President of Kenya and when he was not able to do that, he should be allowed by this House to say that questions of national prestige and self-respect do not arise at all. Are we to allow this thing to be said in this House by the Minister of State for External Affairs ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Shivappa...

SHRI RANGA : I have put it to you. Is it in keeping with the dignity of this House that the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs should be carrying a letter from the Prime Minister of this country to the President of Kenya, he should go there but he was not able to deliver it or he was prevented or whatever it is; yet, he should be allowed....

SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore) : On a point of order, Sir.

SHRI RANGA : ...to state in this House that the question of self-respect or dignity of this country and of this House does not arise at all as a result of his failure to discharge the functions with which he was charged by the Prime Minister of this country ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Even assuming that you have put a question, it is not keeping with the dignity.... (Interruptions). That is true. But on occasions when you are

angry, you have to be very patient and you have to control your anger. As the Minister has said just now, and as you yourself know, it is a delicate matter and we should not....

SHRI RANGA: Why did he say that the question of self respect and dignity does not arise at all?

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK: We want to know from the hon. Minister as to what amounts to an insult in international parlance.

SHRI RANGA: They do not deserve to be in their places.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Minister....

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I would....

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai): What is happening? Here are the names of people who have given notices; you have not called those members, but you entered into a dialogue with Mr. Ranga and now you are asking the Minister to reply. It is for you to reply. You do not deserve to be here at all. (*Interruptions*). The Prime Minister should take note of this that he does not deserve to be the Deputy-Speaker of this House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have not followed what he said.

SHRI HEM DARUA: My name is here; you did not call me, but you entered into a dialogue with Mr. Ranga when he rose on a point of order, and now you ask the Minister of State to reply to the point of order. You do not reply. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara): We are following a certain procedure: only the names of those members who have given notice should be called. If there was a point of order, certainly you could listen to that, but it is for you to reply to the point of order and it is not for the Minister of State to reply to that. This is what is being objected to.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I made an observation. There is no question of ruling. I made a general observation, but again he added something to which he had to reply....

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: How can he reply? Once you depart from a certain procedure.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am following the procedure. I allowed him to raise the point of order....

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: Once you depart from the procedure, you have to allow others also to start a dialogue with you. That is the complaint.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I do not want to continue this dialogue or angry exchanges on this issue particularly. I made an observation. I want to be cautious in my language and would ask the members also to be cautious. He raised a point of order; I made an observation and again he put some sort of a question and he was about to reply to which you are objecting. What is Mr. Kundu's point of order?

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak): Mr. Hem Barua should withdraw his remarks.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Was it proper on the part of Mr. Hem Barua....

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: In an agitated mood, he had said that, but now I have explained the position.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Making such remarks does not add to the dignity of the House. Those remarks should be withdrawn. It would be in keeping with the dignity; he should withdraw, whatever he has said in anger.

SHRI HEM BARUA: I have learnt in my boyhood that we should never hide our feelings. That was my feeling. You violated the procedure and, therefore, I had a right to point that out. I did not quarrel when you asked Mr. Ranga to raise his point of

([Shri Hem Barua])

order. You were justified in that and Mr. Ranga was also justified in raising the point of order.... (*Interruption*). It was for you to give the reply to Mr. Ranga....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He said something in anger. The best thing would be for him to withdraw that. This is not adding to our dignity. I would advise him to withdraw.

SHRI HEM BARUA: If my words have pained you, I withdraw them.

SHRI S. KUNDU: My point of order was very simple. The hon. Minister while replying said that there had been no insult. Whether there had been insult or not is a thing which the nation will decide and which the House will decide. It is not a matter for opinion by the hon. Minister. It would be by his conduct.

SHRI A. K. SEN (Calcutta North West): Is that a point of order?

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI: What is this? One Member is speaking, and we find that another Member is asking whether it is a point of order. I think the hon. Member who is raising the point of order has got the right to raise it provided you accept it. If Shri A. K. Sen wants to say anything, he can seek permission from you and then speak. If he is going to interrupt in this manner, then there will be trouble in this House....

SHRI A. K. SEN: I can object.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI: If he wants to interrupt, he can do so only after seeking the permission of the Chair and he should not interrupt like this. It is the Chair which has to say first whether it is a point of order or not. Before the Chair decides it, no hon. Member can get up and interrupt like this.

SHRI A. K. SEN: I can object on the ground that it is not a point of order.

SHRI HEM BARUA: He is trying to usurp your authority by saying all sorts of nonsensical things.

SHRI A. K. SEN: I have not.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: By saying that it was no point of order, he was not making any aspersion on the Chair. It was just a side remark which he made.

SHRI A. K. SEN: Everybody knows it.

SHRI S. KUNDU: My point of order was this....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Some hon. Members were taking exception and asking whether it constituted insult or loss of prestige for India. That was the main question. The question that was raised was whether this House had the right to say something on that or whether the Chair should rule on it.

SHRI S. KUNDU: My point of order was this. When Shri Hardayal Devgun put his question, the hon. Minister said that there was no insult. My point of order is this. Whether there was insult or not will be decided by the House and the entire country. It will arise from the behaviour and from the code of conduct. The question which was not answered was this whether when the Minister came back to India, no Government officials had met him at the airport, which was a breach of the protocol. Secondly....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member has only got a right to raise a point of order. What he is saying now has nothing to do with the point of order. He cannot extend the area of his point of order and start asking a question.

SHRI S. KUNDU: But the answers to the questions must be specific.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is whether this House should take notice of the statement made by the Minister that there was no insult; it has been stated that a meeting could not be arranged with President Kenyatta, though he went there and

it was published that he was going to meet him; whether he went there to meet him or not is something which I do not know because I have no first-hand information, but it was presumed that he was going to meet him.

SHRI S. KUNDU : The other question was that when he came back....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have followed his point of order. His point of order, if I have understood it aright, is whether this is a matter for his personal opinion or the opinion of the Government or whether this House should take cognizance of it and pass some remarks about it or some judgment about it.

As I said earlier, Shri Ranga had raised this issue that everybody felt a little sorry about the whole episode. There is no doubt about it. Everybody felt it. But is this the moment to express our feelings in a loud and explosive manner? For, as the hon. Minister has said, so many other complications are there. There are quite a number of Asians there and their problems are there, and their fate hangs in the balance. Is this the moment when we should take it in that light and immediately explode ourselves in this House? My view is that hon. Members should consider this aspect because it is a delicate and sensitive matter.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA (Jalore) : On a point of order. My point of order is this that questions are asked to elicit information, and it is obligatory on the part of the hon. Minister to give the information wherever it is possible. Shri Hardayal Devgun's question was whether the appointment was cancelled by the Minister or the President and what the circumstances of that cancellation were. That point has not been clarified.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : So far as I know, he has fully answered it.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : He has not yet replied to that question. He has not explained the circumstances.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : On a point of order, if an hon. Member puts a question, then it is for me to dispose of the point of order and rule it out. If the hon. Member was not satisfied with the answer, he should have put another question immediately. There is no point of order.

SHRI HARDAYAL DEVGUN : I am not satisfied.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, Shri Hem Barua.

SHRI HEM BARUA : We have the best of relations with Kenya, and we do not want them to be disrupted on any ground whatsoever. But the fact remains that the conduct of Kenya towards our Minister was not praiseworthy; it was disgusting conduct, because President Kenyatta refused to meet....

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North East) : On a point of order. I have been waiting with patience. There is a very imperative rule in this regard. Rule 41(2)(xix) says :

"it shall not refer discourteously to a friendly foreign country;"

Here is a very experienced Member who has said in regard to the conduct of President Kenyatta....

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह नियम बिल्कुल लागू नहीं होता। आप मुझे इस पर सुनिए।

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : ...that it is something which is very—I am not going to repeat it—... It should not be done. If Government says that some discourtesy has been practised, this House can certainly take note of it. But if Government appears to deny any discourtesy, for Members to go on saying that discourtesy has been practised is extremely wrong; it should not be allowed in relation to a friendly foreign country. Kenyatta is Kenyatta and Kenyatta today is very much a factor to be reckoned with in Africa. After all, we should function in a responsible way and we should try at least from time to time to do that.

**SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY:** On this point of order I want to say something.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** I have already cautioned Members who are putting questions not to use language which might exacerbate.

**SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE:** They are using it over and over again.

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA:** We would like to repeat it.

**SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY:** I do not think that what Shri H. N. Mukerjee has said has any validity whatsoever. For, Shri Hem Barua while putting his question has repeatedly said that we should maintain good relations with Kenya, no matter whatever thing might have happened. So, there is no discourtesy shown to the Head of Kenya. But Shri Hem Barua had not finished his question. It is only after he completes his question that the hon. Member can say what he wants to say.

**SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE:** He has already used that word.

**SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY:** He only said that not meeting a State Minister, a representative of India was not a matter which we could say was praiseworthy. That is what he has said. He has not made disparaging remarks against the Head of Kenya.

**SHRI HEM BARUA:** We have the best of relations with Kenya and I do not want those relations to be disrupted on any ground whatsoever. But the fact remains that the President of Kenya refused to meet our Minister who was an emissary of the Prime Minister, and the fact also remains that our Minister met the Vice-President of Kenya who explained his case and did not wait for a second to listen to our Minister's explanations. And when he saw some of those leaders in Kenya, one of them turned round and said 'Well, when you imposed visa restrictions on persons of Indian ancestry whether

they hold British passports or Indian passports matters little to the persons of Indian ancestry,—you do not have the moral right to criticise us over our measures. This was what happened. President Kenyatta wanted to meet our Minister. That was on a particular Monday. On Sunday he informed him that he was not going to meet him, whatever that might be due to; I think this is an insulting thing, and we must not overlook that fact, although we want the best of relations to be maintained with Kenya.

In the context of that, may I know from the Prime Minister whether she herself proposes to visit Kenya or whether she proposes to send some of her senior colleague to Kenya so that the senior colleagues might not be treated as Shri B. R. Bhagat was treated? President Kenyatta refused to touch Shri B. R. Bhagat even with a pair of tongs. That was the trouble. Therefore, I would like to know whether the Prime Minister proposes to send any senior colleague of hers there.

Britain has adopted the Immigration Act which is based on racial considerations, because there can be no other consideration. May I know whether the Prime Minister is going to take this matter up particularly with Britain so as to see that Indians who hold British passports are not treated on racial grounds as they have been treated at present.

**SHRI B. R. BHAGAT:** Although the hon. Member has said that we must maintain the best of relations with Kenya, some of his remarks were not purported to that effect.

**SHRI HEM BARUA:** I was stating facts only.

**SHRI B. R. BHAGAT:** It is wrong to say that nobody heard me. We had good discussions, and I have said that the result has also flowed; nobody has made any remark....

**SHRI HEM BARUA:** They have extended the period permit. They had done so before our Minister

visited. He waited for three days to meet President Kenyatta, but he could not meet him. But he is not saying it. I can expose him to the marrow of his bone.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Nobody has made any remark that we are imposing restrictions on people of Asian origin and yet we were going to talk to them. All these things were not true, and, therefore, the assumptions drawn by the hon. Member on these things which were not true are wrong. I would again like to stress that the people there were very cordial and their Ministers and Vice-President were very cordial. The talks were very cordial and at no stage there was a feeling that because a very senior man had not come, therefore, they will not meet or talk. That is not the point. Even the President—if I am not disclosing a secret—himself fixed up this appointment personally. But subsequently it was cancelled. It must be due to some compelling reasons and we should not go into that (*interruption*).

श्री हुक्म चन्द वल्लवाय : हाउस इस बात को जो जानना चाहेगा कि राष्ट्रपति से मिलने का जो समय तय हुआ वह क्यों रद्द हुआ ?

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : If I may reply to the last part of the hon. Member Shri Hem Barua's question, we have had discussion on this Immigration Bill and our view also is that it has racial aspects, there is racism behind the proposal. But as far as the other question is concerned, about whether somebody proposes to go to Kenya, there is no such proposal.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh) : From the answers of the hon. Minister, he has made us understand that we should not say anything to strain the relationship between Kenya and India. But why did this situation at all arise ? Does not the

hon. Minister at all realise that the relationship between Kenya and India has been jeopardised, because of the fact that the British Government had been making a propaganda to this effect, that the Indian Government representative proposes to come to Kenya with the intention to interfere in their internal affairs ? I would like to have a categorical answer from the hon. Minister, whether it was not a fact, and whether this kind of propaganda had been carried on by the British to divide Asians and Africans, to divide Indians and Africans, to divide India and Kenya, and whether any notice was taken by our High Commissioner about the situation that was developing there, because, in spite of the fact that we have had very good relationship with Kenya, this kind of situation has developed. Therefore our High Commissioner should have been in the know of the developments taking place. I want to know whether he informed the Government of India about those developments. The High Commissioner deserves to be recalled, and I have no doubt about it. The hon. Minister has mentioned about a letter that he carried from the hon. Prime Minister. Here is an official spokesman of the External Affairs Ministry who says in reply to a question that he was not aware if Mr. Bhagat had carried a letter from the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, to President Kenyatta. The spokesman of the External Affairs Ministry has the cheek enough to say that he does not know about this letter. This is the state of affairs which has been allowed to go on in this country. Now, the hon. Minister has categorically stated that there was a letter which he carried. The hon. Minister's position has been jeopardised by the talk of the spokesman of the External Affairs Ministry. I would expect that the hon. Minister will take proper action in regard to this matter.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : It is true that even before I went there, a feeling, and some rumour was expressed that I was going there to inter-

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

fere in the internal affairs of Kenya, particularly because I was going there to ask them to slow down their policy and thus interfering in their own internal affairs.

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai) : By whom, please? British or whom?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Please do not interrupt me. The High Commissioner, at one stage was hesitant whether in this situation a visit will be fruitful and he discouraged it. It is true. But we asked him to counteract this rumour, talk to the people concerned and prepare the ground so that a fruitful discussion may take place. He informed us that he had done so and this feeling had been dispelled. I was here when this point came out that certain quarters were interested, in Nairobi also and here also, that a certain country was interested in seeing that my mission is frustrated. (An hon. Member : which is that country?) But the British High Commission's representative has come and denied it. It is not for me to go over the whole matter once again. Those who are in the know of world affairs know that there are forces working which are creating divisions between the developing nations and the nations which have emerged out of their struggle against imperialism and colonialism. Those forces are in operation and our eyes are wide awake. These forces are operating within the country also. Therefore we should know all these things. What action we should take to counteract such things is more important than to apportion blame against any other country. It is not for me to say which country was there. As far as the other questions were concerned, I will say this.

श्री मधु लिमये : वह जवाब नहीं देंगे तो कौन जवाब देगा। ऐसा उतर हम बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकते हैं। उन्होंने सीधा सवाल पूछा कि क्या अंग्रेजों ने यह किया, आप हां कहें या ना कहें।

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : About the letter, the Spokesman of the External

Affairs Ministry was not correct when he said that I did not carry a letter. But I asked him. He explained. He said suddenly this question was sprung on him and he said he did not know whether I carried a letter or not.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : This is how an officer of the External Affairs Ministry duped the Minister. The same treatment was accorded to Shri Morarjibhai. Are they working independently of the External Affairs Ministry, or are they part of the Ministry?

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह डेलीकेट मामला है। इसके कई तथ्य सामने आये हैं, कई तथ्य सामने नहीं आये हैं और मिनिस्टर साहब ने कई तथ्यों को टुइस्ट करके बताया है। चूँकि सारा सदन इसमें इंटेरेस्टेड है इसलिए मेरी प्रार्थना है कि एक घंटे का डिस्कशन इस पर रखा जाए। उन्होंने कहा कि हमारी इंसल्ट नहीं हुई। वे प्राइम मिनिस्टर के स्पेशल मैसेन्जर थे। इन सारी चीजों का सवाल है। हमारे हाई कमिश्नर ने चिट्ठी लिखी थी कि आप मत आइये तो उसके बाद क्या हालात बदले। ये सारी चीजें हम डिस्कश करना चाहते हैं। इसलिये आपसे प्रार्थना है कि आप एक घंटे का डिस्कशन इस पर रख दीजिए।

श्री रवि राय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, ...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We will consider it. I cannot just now, off-hand, say all that. I have seen certain expressions in the House. Your suggestion will be considered.

श्री हुकम चन्द कच्छबाय : किन कारणों से कंसिलेशन हुआ, यह मालूम होना चाहिये।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : What I would suggest is this. That Bill will come before the House and we will take it up along with the Bill.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह प्रिविलेज का सवाल है, आप सुन लीजिए।