

hakims for their own patients. It used to be on a small scale. Now, since it has become a major industry, millions of patients are using these drugs and so naturally it is necessary that Government should exercise the greatest care and take precautions so as to safeguard and protect the health of the people.

Sir, it has been brought to our notice several times, on several occasions, that most of these modern drugs, such as asperin, sulpha drugs and acromycine and other drugs are mixed with Ayurvedic drugs and sold as Ayurvedic medicines or distributed as Ayurvedic medicines so much so they are not protected or covered by the Drugs and Cosmetics Act. In this way, they escape. That is a very dangerous thing. Also, according to the Udupa Committee, most of the Ayurvedic drugs which should contain some very valuable ingredients such as gold, arsenic, copper, saffron and musk etc. actually do not contain them. It has even been reported that gold which goes into some preparations like *makaradwaja* and other things is taken out of it, and so, what goes out is only *makaradwaja* minus gold. These are the things which have been brought to our notice. So, it became imperative that we should bring forward this amending Bill before this House.

16 hrs.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Are we getting pure gold in *makaradwaja* at least?

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Nominated—Jammu and Kashmir): 14 carat.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. Minister likely to take some more time?

At 4 p.m., we have to take up another discussion.

Dr. D. S. Raju: If you could give me five or ten minutes more, I can introduce the Bill for consideration.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Let him continue tomorrow. If the hon. Minister

wants to take ten minutes more, that should not be deducted from the half-an-hour allotted for the half-an-hour discussion to be raised by me. If the hon. Minister takes ten minutes, then Shri Harish Chandra Mathur would get one hour for the discussion that he wants to raise, which would mean that my half-an-hour discussion would start at 5.10 p.m. So, either the House may sit up to 5.40 p.m. today, or the hon. Minister may continue tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister may continue his speech tomorrow.

16.02 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE: INDIAN REPATRIATES FROM NEWLY INDEPENDENT COUNTRIES OF AFRICA

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): I beg to raise the discussion standing in my name, on the question of the Indian repatriates from the newly independent countries of Africa. I hope the House has got a full conception of the magnitude of the problem.

We have more than 3 lakhs of Indians and persons of Indian origin in these newly independent East African countries. Even in Zanzibar, we have got about 18,000 persons of Indian origin; 350 of them are Indian nationals. In Tanganyika we have got about 87,000 Indians, that is, persons of Indian origin; 5,000 are Indian nationals. In Kenya, we have got more than 1,80,000; about 7,650 of them are Indian nationals.

When we speak of the Indian repatriates, we speak with a certain background. To a person like me it is almost inconceivable why there should be conditions in which Indians should feel compelled to leave a country which they have adopted, to leave a country where they have gone and settled and contributed a considerable lot. India's association with the African countries in their free-

*Repatriates from newly
Independent Countries
of Africa*

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

dom fight and in securing social justice has deep roots and is of a unique nature. The Father of the Nation, the man of the century, got stirred and inspired by conditions in Africa and gave inspiration and leadership to that country first and only secondly to this country. Our interest in African people, their welfare, prosperity and progress is of an abiding nature, and we feel so much at one with them in their sentiments, feelings and aspirations. India blazed the trail of the fight for freedom against colonialism. Even today, in Africa, if there is anything which stirs the people, it is that feeling of the fight against colonialism. Naturally, there was a tremendous goodwill and respect for India and her leaders in that continent. But it appears that there has been a great corrosion in that goodwill and fraternal feeling. Government owe an explanation to this country and to this House as to why that is so, and what the factors which are responsible for this corrosion in the goodwill which had been generated through the joint effort of this entire country and her leadership and by the assistance and sympathy and support which was unhesitatingly and unqualifiedly given to that great country and to the people of that great country, are. Will the hon. Minister deny the fact that there has been a corrosion? Is it not due to a lack of understanding on the part of Government to keep the fire on and to maintain public relations in such a manner as they ought to be maintained? Government owe a satisfactory answer and explanation to this House on this subject.

Have Government not taken Africa for granted? We are fully aware that other countries which had hardly any goodwill and which were hardly known in African countries, such as China and Pakistan are very active with their propaganda and cultivating the people there at all different levels, but we who had that tremendous goodwill have not been

able to maintain that, leave alone the question of further cultivating and trying to understand their problems and trying to understand the problems of the Indians who have settled there.

It is in this context that I am speaking. A large number of people had to leave those countries. What has happened in Zanzibar? There, it was the High Commissioner for the United Kingdom, who helped all the nationals who were whites, whether they were the British or the Germans or the French, but the Indians were given a cold shoulder, and there was no arrangement from our side to take good care of the people there and to give them solace and security. Our representative in that country, namely, the Indian High Commissioner there, had stated on February 24th, that there were about 400 Indians destitute in Zanzibar. They approached him for a free passage from that country. Why is it that those conditions were there? They wanted certain relaxations, but there was nobody to look after them.

It is in this context that I wish to refer to the speech made by the hon. Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs here almost at the same time. Shrimati Lakshmi Menon, Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, put the blame for the difficulties of overseas Indians on those Indians themselves. She has said that the ordinary Indian in pursuit of wealth is not progressive and is completely devoid of any feeling that free India had generated those Indians abroad still think in terms of the antiquated customs and practices that prevailed in India years ago causing a great concern to the Government; and she went castigating the people there and saying that they were responsible for their own difficulties.

I cannot recall any instance in the history of the world where a Minister or a high official in great authority had talked about his own people.

or about the citizens of his own country or about the people of his own country in such terms; instead of trying to help them, instead of trying to give them proper advice and instead of trying to have some diplomatic activity in those countries where those Indians are and instead of trying to see that their difficulties are resolved, our Minister makes this self-righteous speech in a bravado spirit which the Prime Minister condemns so much when somebody else speaks with that; anyway, this is the attitude which the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs has taken, and I take strong exception to the manner in which she has treated this problem and made some generalisations and remarks. She has not tried to help those Indians who are there. She has only tried to complicate the problem, and she has only created more difficulties.

We are entitled to know what steps the Government of India have taken in those countries, what steps they have taken to cultivate the relationship and to understand the difficulties of those people. There are hundreds of people who are in service, and there are thousands of people who are in the trade. Whether they are feeling secure or not, whether they are having the same and equal rights of citizenship there or not, whether they are being discriminated against or not are the vital questions which are exercising our minds and about which we are feeling concerned. The law and order situation in certain parts of those countries is such that even people who are devoted to those countries do not feel secure. It was for the Government of India to tell those people, and to tell us and also to take up with the Heads of those States or with the people in authority there, the difficulties which the Indians who have settled there and who are now the nationals of those countries are facing, what the law and order situation is, whether they feel safe or not, whether they are being given a

treatment of equality or whether they are being discriminated against.

I am not one who would like that everybody from there should come over here. But we must definitely see that the climate and the conditions are created in those countries for them to continue peacefully there. This should not at all be difficult in view of the very friendly relationship which we have with those countries.

She also said that these Indians who have settled there have not identified themselves with those countries. It is really unfortunate that such a statement should have been made. It is common knowledge with most of us that those people who have settled there, who had money, have helped most of the political leaders who are now at the helm of affairs; they helped them not only with money but in more than one way. Instead of bringing those things out, such sort of statements may create difficulties for the more than 3 lakh people who are settled there.

It should also be understood that there were no organised political parties there which the Indians could have joined. There were certain parties which were underground. A party like the Mau Mau—they could not have joined it. Still, in more than one way, the Indians had in every respect identified themselves with the aspirations of those people, as this country and the people of this great country have identified themselves with the great aspirations of the African countries. Even today, it is almost a passion, that whenever we talk of Africa, we feel as if we are members of one family. This is particularly so in the case of Africa. But unfortunately the position today is deteriorating. It is a failure of the External Affairs Ministry at the diplomatic level. Those people who are at the high level live in ivory towers there. They do not mix with the people. They do not mix

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

with the people at the cutting level, at the ground level. We have not got good public relations at the lower level. Even the delegation of MPs which had gone there very recently and toured those East African countries have conveyed to me such sort of feelings.

Unfortunately, my hon. friend who has to reply to this debate happens to be junior to the person whom I am criticising and so he will be left with no alternative but just to support what she had said. I wish it would have been better if the senior Minister had been here and if he had been able to take a broader view of the entire situation and try to understand the difficulties instead of trying to justify the mistake that they have made and what they have done in this matter.

17.14 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Let us understand the situation. When the Indians had gone there, it was all one commonwealth there. The genesis, the background and the history should also be taken into consideration. I agree that the people who had gone there had not gone as missionaries. That is quite true. But they had a great spirit of adventurousness, a greater spirit of adventurousness than the Minister who criticised them at least. They have contributed to the welfare and well-being of the people of those countries. I hope this will be realised and proper treatment will be meted out to them.

In the end, my request is two-fold. First, we should take it up at the diplomatic level. We must strengthen our relations there and we must strengthen our public relations at the lowest level. We must try to create conditions there to see that our people in those countries feel safe. There is no reason why any man who has settled there would like to get uprooted and come over here. So I do

wish that they will take it up at the diplomatic level and see that there is equality of treatment, that they feel secure, that there is no law and order problem for them.

I am glad that the hon. Minister has come at the right time, though he is a little late, because my whole submission was that it is no use justifying the bravado spirit in which she has made these castigating remarks, most uncalled for remarks, most unfortunate remarks against our people, something unknown in the history of any country—such a statement made by any person in authority and responsibility. I do hope now they will strengthen their Missions there, they will take it up at the diplomatic level with the heads of departments to see that the life and property of the people who are settled there are safe, and they continue there. I wish they will also try to understand the difficulties of those people who want to come away from there, and create certain facilities which they demand, so that they may feel that they have a place to come to.

About repatriation, I do not know what has been done. I was told that certain steps had been taken, but we would like to be enlightened, and those people should be assured that it is our desire, it is our policy, that they should settle down there; they should give prosperity to that country and prosperity to themselves, and they must give the fullest support to the aspirations of these emerging countries. But those people who, under certain circumstances, under compulsion, have to come here should be afforded all the facilities for repatriation.

Shri Iqbal Singh (Ferozepur): I fully agree with what Shri Mathur has said. The plight of the Indians in Africa, particularly the East African countries, should not be made more complicated by statements like

Independent countries of Africa

that made by the Minister of State for External Affairs. It is regrettable that these feelings have been generated there. Whether freedom has been achieved or there is upheaval in those countries, we should also try to adjust ourselves to that, and not give a hasty opinion which will not solve any problem, which does not help anybody.

Apart from that, even more Indians are coming from Burma. If people of Indian origin in the East African countries have played a large part in their fight for independence, Indians in Burma have played no less a part in the fight for the freedom of Burma and India, but now 80,000 persons are coming from there. And what is the reply of the Ministry? It is that it is the creation of the Indians themselves. I submit that the whole context should be reviewed. There should be some re-thinking in the External Affairs Ministry, particularly because these people can be helpful, they are helpful. At the time of Chinese aggression, they rose to the occasion. In East Africa and elsewhere they played their part, and played it well. So, we should not make such statements about the people living in these countries and doing useful work not only for the betterment and independence of those countries but for this country also. Every businessman living in East Africa is not the type depicted in the statement. So, this type of statement, especially from the Ministry of External Affairs, and that is a sensitive Ministry, should not come, that is my submission.

Secondly, whatever the difficulty, we should try to solve it through the External Affairs Ministry, but most people in the Ministry do not take a liberal view of things, or a sympathetic view. That is the main problem and difficulty. This is the last subject which our diplomats abroad generally touch; they think this is the most unimportant subject. That should not be so. Whatever their difficulties we should try to solve them.

In that statement, the Minister has said that they should not be allowed to bring the money. If they are not

allowed to bring the money, if they are not shown any sympathy, where should they go? The Government of India should take a more liberal view of the situation in which Indians in East Africa and Burma find themselves. Steps should be taken so that they feel that those in the mother country take a sympathetic interest in their welfare.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta South West): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am very glad that Mr. Mathur has introduced this motion which relates to a very important subject now and which is likely to assume even more importance in the coming days. I am one with Mr. Mathur when he says that it is the duty of the Government to render all possible assistance and facilities to those Indian settlers in these African countries who either wish to come away now to India for whatever reasons it may be or who are compelled by certain circumstances to come away. I agree that the Government has done very little and certainly the attitude of the Government deserves to be criticised for not being sympathetic enough in that direction. I also hold no brief whatsoever for the statement of the hon. Minister of State which had been referred to here. I feel inclined to agree that being a Minister that sort of a public statement should have been avoided and it was not very helpful in the circumstances.

But having said that, I am afraid that I cannot agree entirely with the approach which my hon. friends Mr. Mathur and Mr. Iqbal Singh have taken. Some amount of sentiment and emotionalism may tend to obscure our vision of this problem correctly. It is one thing to talk about the attitude that those countries have towards India but that should not necessarily be equated with the attitude towards Indian settlers in those countries. This matter has to be viewed in its correct and historical perspective and for this reason it is of utmost importance that the relations of this country with those developing

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

nascent nations of Africa are not impaired or harmed in any way; that is of much bigger interest for our country than any other thing . . . (*Interruptions*).

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): When they are driven out. . . .

Shri Indrajit Gupta: If they are driven out on grounds of racial discrimination or as a result of the development of any unhealthy, chauvinistic, anti-Indian practices there, I would certainly be the first to condemn those countries.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: But what else is it?

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I know that all these sentiments of emotionalism can be worked up from below. . . . (*Interruptions*.) Facts are bitter sometimes. I am not yielding.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I would like to know. You are an hon. Member of this House. We would like to know from you what is the difference between the emotional feelings that we express and the emotional feelings which they express? Do they not drive them out?

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Have you finished?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Go ahead.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Sometimes it is good not to indulge so much in self-righteousness but to adopt a self-critical attitude; it will do us good. There are three reasons, they are facts. I am not blaming anybody but they are facts. I do say that there is nothing wrong in Indian settlers having gone there to do business. But the fact remains that on the eve of independence of these East African countries the way in which the African population has seen these settlers was, what may be called as if they were the 'haves' while they were themselves the 'have-nots'; they have amassed

quite a lot of wealth. I am not blaming them for this wealth but that is how facts existed . . . (*Interruptions*.)

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: What about order there and security for them?

Shri Indrajit Gupta: That is a different question and I am coming to that. Therefore, economically those countries were very backward, undeveloped, poverty-stricken, and much less mature than India was on the eve of her independence. Even we prided ourselves; in the early years and the first flush of independence we were very much exercised over the question of Indianisation of services; we wanted to Indianise everything that we can. It is a healthy national sentiment. Sometimes we could not proceed. . . . (*Interruptions*.) In Africa almost the entire business had gone into the hands of not only Indians but other Asians also, and that did produce a certain reaction. I do not say that justifies driving people out. There were also a large number of Asians and Indians in the civil services; they were in Government jobs. Who does not know that when Uganda was on the eve of her independence, a large number of these Asians and Indians submitted their resignations *en masse*, and what were the issues at dispute? The issues were whether they will be able to preserve those service facilities and privileges which they had shared with the British at the time of the British raj in those countries; the overseas leave facilities, special housing conditions and special allowances which they had enjoyed at that time they were certainly in danger of being withdrawn. Because the new Governments in Africa had said that though they were not going to practise any racial discrimination, between Africans and non-Africans, nevertheless, they wanted these people to accept the similar type of conditions which the Africans were going to have, whereas they were standing for the continuance of the privileges which

they had earlier got during the British regime. And rightly or wrongly, whoever has followed these things knows that this action in Uganda which was followed by mass resignations by about 1,400 other officials, belonging to the African Common Services Association, was interpreted in Africa as a sort of an act of pressure, of political blackmail. It is very unfortunate, but it is a fact. I agree with Shri Mathur that our Government, by other means,—representation at the proper quarters and by keeping themselves more alert and more informed and acquainted with the developments that were happening there—could have taken up many things. Perhaps even informally, they could have represented many matters, which they failed to do. But these things did take place.

Though Shri Mathur says that Indians in all these countries have played a part in the freedom movement of these countries—I agree—one cannot lump all the Indians together and all the Asian settlers there together. The poorer sections, I think, have certainly played a creditable role and they have always identified themselves with the poorer Africans but there is a section there, economically better off, who have become a sort of local leaders. When I criticise the Government, I equally criticise the local Indian leadership there,—leaders, mind you, and I am not condemning Indians. Shri Mathur mentioned the Mau Maus. It is a fact that when the British suppression movement against the Mau Mau was going on, a small, handful of the upper class Indians there who locally called themselves the leaders of the Indian community, had gone round to the British authorities begging them to allow Indians to be recruited into the security forces which was suppressing the Mau Mau. It is a fact that the mass of the Indian settlers there probably disassociated themselves from this thing.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: We are talking about the masses. (*Inter-ruption*).

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Secondly, in Uganda, when the Kabaka of Buganda was restored to his throne, it was a day of great rejoicing throughout Africa, but we know that when the Kabaka of Buganda went back from exile and was restored to the throne and when he was driving through the city, which was decorated with flags and banners—all the population was out rejoicing and celebrating—I have only newspapers reports to go by—it seems the Indian community was conspicuous by its absence at these celebrations.

Such things have happened. Therefore, I would say in the first flush of independence, we should be patient about it and we should not condemn outright all these African countries as though they are following a deliberate, anti-Indian racial policy. I do not believe that that is so.

An Hon. Member: Condemn the Government.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Yes; I am also condemning the Government. I think the Government should have been much more alert. But I could not follow, and I am confused at one thing. How are they to intervene in matters affecting the people who are not Indian citizens? How will they deal with people who have either become citizens of those countries or who, by the thousands, have applied for British citizenship? On the eve of independence, all these have queued up, applying for British citizenship papers, not for Indian citizenship or the citizenship of those countries. How is our Government to intervene directly? They can do something indirectly—I agree—which they do not do.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: It may also be a diplomatic failure.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: It may be. I do not hold any brief for the Government. For example, I think these things can be dealt with in a much broader perspective. There are Afri-

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

can students who stay in our country. If all of us together make an effort to have closer relationship with them and remove their complaints also, that would help also the relationship in Africa towards Indians and so on.

There are so many things which need to be done. But I think that those Indians who are wanting to come back to this country, for whatever reason it may be, or who have been compelled by some economic circumstances to leave, should be provided with all possible facilities of repatriation and given all facilities to bring away whatever money they have earned. I am told in many cases, they cannot. The Government should do everything for providing transit facilities, for allowing them some relaxation of the normal customs regulations and all those things. These things should certainly be done.

In conclusion, I agree that Mrs. Menon, being a Minister, need not go round the country making public statements like this. Especially at that juncture, I think it was inadvisable.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How long would the Minister take to reply?

Some Hon. Members rose—

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): About 15 minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Under the rule, those who have given previous notice only can speak. I have not received any previous intimation except from Mr. D. C. Sharma.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, while the debate is on, certain questions are raised and they should be clarified. Mr. Gupta has raised certain points, which must be clarified.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri D. C. Sharma.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, one of the mistakes that our Ministry of External Affairs makes is that it creates artificial walls of isolation between Indian nationals and persons of Indian origin. I think for legalistic and other purposes, this may be useful and necessary and may be taken to be valid. But I must say that from the broad angle of Indian nationhood, from the broad perspective of our country, this kind of distinction is working the greatest harm to our country here and is doing the greatest damage to our countrymen abroad, whether they are our nationals or whether they are settled somewhere else. Therefore, the Ministry of External Affairs should take upon itself the principle that any person of Indian birth who was born in India, is one of their charges. The degree may be different in the case of those who are Indian national and those who are nationals of some other country. But they should first of all realise that it is their duty to be the guardians of all persons who are born Indians, whether they are our nationals or not. That is the first mistake that our Government is making.

When I go to other countries, say, America, I find persons of German origin, Irish origin, French origin and other origins in America and they make friends, fraternise and become popular with the persons who are there. They do not make a distinction as we do in our country.

Shri Shinkre (Marmagao): They are Americans first.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Secondly, diplomacy consists in making a bad situation tolerable, in making a good situation better and in making a desperate situation acceptable. I think judged by these standards, our Indian diplomacy so far as our missions ab-

road are concerned, has utterly failed. I ask one question from the people who are in our missions abroad: How many times do they visit Indian visitors? They follow the old British tradition of aloofness from the people there and the result is, if you go to any country where Indians are settled, they will tell you that they keep aloof. I do not want to mention the name of the country. I had been to some countries and this is the complaint I have heard from the Indians who are there. Mind you, most of them are Indian nationals. They keep themselves aloof and apart; they think they are the elite of the world and they do not want to mix with others.

The third point I want to make is this, that taking for granted that we have been making money, as my hon. friend said—who does not make money—and that we have not been identifying ourself with the freedom struggle of those countries, I only want to say that by and large the Indians in Africa, to whom my hon. friend, Shri Mathur, referred, have been a force for good in that country. I say this with due sense of responsibility. They have built up the business in that country. They have built schools in that country. They have done everything that any human being can do. They have had very good relations with the people of that country. There was only one country which was the eye-sore of Indians—South Africa. That country had been like that for a pretty long time. They had good relations before India became free. What has happened to that now, I ask respectfully of the Ministry of External Affairs. The Indians there were happy before India became free. The Indians in Kanya in Uganda, in Tanganyika, in Zanzibar and other places were doing well. If they are exploiters now they were exploiters at that time also. But they were doing very well then. Their relations with the people of those countries were happy. They were considered to be very good fellows. What has happened now to those very persons who were in the good books of the nationals of those countries? How is it

that they have turned out to be persons who are not desirable?

Sir, the answer is this. Our country, our External Affairs Ministry and our Missions have not taken good care of them. If our country had taken proper care of them, I think they would have been as happy as they were before India became independent. The fact of the matter is, they are neglected now. The High Commissioners at that time from the United Kingdom used to look after them in a much better way than what our High Commissioners, Ambassadors, Envoys and our Consuls do now. Therefore, the whole trouble has arisen from the fact that we are not so solicitous of their welfare as we should have been.

Then I come to my last point. The fact of the matter is that we have to project an image of India whether through our missions or through our External Affairs Ministry. What image has been presented by the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs. I heard the other day the Deputy Minister saying that they are sitting on the fence, they neither become Indian nationals nor do they become something else. What image of Indians are we presenting here on the floor of this House; not through Shri Mathur or somebody else, but through the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs and through the Deputy Minister? We are presenting them an image of India as if those persons are not wanted by us, they are a drag on us, they have been driven out by us and they are not a part and parcel of us. But the image that we should present to every country in the world is that every Indian, even if he has accepted some other nationality, is rooted in the culture, in the soil and in the traditions of India, and that he is our brother. Somebody spoke about China. In China there are two Chinas—thank God there is only one India—the Kuomintang China and the other Mao China. But when they go abroad they say that they are Chinese and

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

they look after each other. But here India is one and it will continue to be one. Even then our External Affairs Ministry does not look upon them as the true sons of the soil, as the true sons of India, as those persons to defend whom, to safeguard whose interests is our duty. I think this has got to be done, as otherwise our name will be in the mud all over the world and we would not be able to hold our head high when we go outside India.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: I thank Shri Mathur for bringing this very vital question before the House for discussion, for it gives us an opportunity of considering the conditions of our brethren living in different parts of the world. How have they gone to those countries? During the last quarter of the last century thousands of our men and women have left for Africa, South East Asia and other countries. So far as Canada and America are concerned, they are well-settled and we have nothing to worry about them. As far as other countries are concerned, they have gone there firstly as labourers to build and construct things for them. Then they have gone there as farmers and a number of wonderful farms have sprung up in those countries. They have also gone there as skilled and semi-skilled labourers and they have built many good factories. Then, many people have gone there as traders and built good trade relationship with those countries. So, my submission is that these people went to those countries to help them progress industrially or otherwise and they have contributed their share.

Here we must remember one important thing. Irrespective of the part of the world in which they are living, as long as they are Indians, it is the duty and responsibility of our government to help and protect them. Here I will quote one instance. In 1947 when Kashmir was raided by Pakistan, there were a few hundred Britishers living in Kashmir. The moment the trouble started, aeroplanes came right from England to

evacuate every man, woman and child and their property. Everybody was evacuated in no time and every property which was movable was saved. Naturally, all those people felt very much elated and happy.

Therefore, my submission is, this is not a matter which can be taken in a light-hearted fashion. It is a responsibility which Government cannot shirk. All Indians, irrespective of where they are staying, are our brothers and their protection should be our responsibility. I would feel insulted if my brother or sister is insulted anywhere in any part of the world. But have we taken up that question in that spirit? No, we have not done it.

Sometime back, I think it was last month, I asked a question about the Indians in Zanzibar. They have not been evacuated by anybody in spite of the fact that they were in the same British Commonwealth. The Indians who have settled there have undergone a number of insults and what not; they have suffered a lot of losses as well. Since they were holding British passports, the Britishers should have seen that they are evacuated. When I asked a question to the Ministry of External Affairs whether this has been brought to their notice and what action they have taken the reply was that since those Indians have gone there on British passports, they are not our responsibility. I will humbly submit that I do not at all agree with that approach. I would ask every Indian who is true to his soil, true to his motherland, to see that Indians, who are our brothers and sisters, wherever they are, are not humiliated or insulted by the countries concerned. We should not stand on technicalities.

What is the position today? I will not repeat the sentiments expressed by my hon. friend, though I certainly agree with them. In Burma business and commerce has been nationalised. Hundreds of thousands of Indians have been thrown out of employment. People who owned big business houses,

big factories and what not have been thrown out of employment or livelihood. Now they are destitutes. What is the duty that we have to perform?

I would say that our government must take up the responsibility of looking after them. Those who would like to come back to India must be evacuated. Of course, those who would like to continue there can do so. Others, should be evacuated without any loss of time. Then, funds should be made available to them, long term loans repayable in easy instalments so that they are again able to settle in life. Otherwise, they should not be left there in the lurch. That will discredit us internationally and I do not know what it might bring to our nation as a whole.

Therefore my submission is that this is a very right occasion when this matter has been brought before the House, the Government must satisfy not only us but they have to satisfy the whole country. They must satisfy everybody with regard to the care that our Government take for our fellow brethren who are living in far-off corners, specially when they have come to be placed in the present circumstances. I hope, we will get a very satisfactory reply from the Government.

Shri Dinesh Singh: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, to be able to look at this question of the people of Indian origin abroad we have to go back a little into history. My hon. friend, Shri Mathur, and some other hon. Members have already referred to some aspects of this history.

It was about 100 years ago that people first went to East Africa and South Africa to work there. We have had contacts with this part of the world as with South-East Asia and West Asia. It is much older and it goes back actually into the folklore and mythology, but these people about whom we are discussing today went out of this country roughly 100 years ago. They went to Uganda about 80

or 90 years ago when they built the railroad there. They performed a very difficult task. They built the railroad; they opened out the country and with them went some people who helped to build the trade in that country.

With your permission, Sir, I might read out a small paragraph from the East African Royal Commission of 1953-55. It says:—

“Indeed, the remarkable tenacity and courage of Indian traders had been mainly responsible for stimulating the wants of the indigenous people even in the remotest areas by opening to them a shop-window on the modern world and for collecting for sale elsewhere whatever small surpluses are available for disposal.”

This is their activity.

It is not restricted only to the economic field. In political life they took a very active part. The House knows that the Father of our Nation himself started his political movement in Africa and later on many people took very active part in the political movement in that part of the world. After the end of the First World War the Indian community was the first to press for the common voting roll which became the main demand of the African people till they became independent.

Therefore we see that the people of Indian origin who went to Africa have played a very important role in the development of the country and in its political life. But we have also to bear in mind that while some of them were playing very important roles, there were many who were not interested very much in what was happening in the country. That was partly because they were occupied in their own business and partly because they still maintained close connections with India. This led to a certain amount of separation and isolation

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

between the people of Indian origin and the Africans living there.

At the time that they went from here India was beginning to be ruled by the British and they went there conditioned that the same ruler was ruling India as was ruling East Africa and they accepted this position as also the position that was, to some extent, deliberately created by the ruling power of keeping the people of Indian origin separate from the Africans. It is not that the Indians themselves remained separate, but there was an incentive for them to remain separate because the property qualifications and others were such that Indians received certain favoured treatment as compared to the Africans. In any city one would see a European area, with it an Indian area and that the Africans were not allowed to live in the city at all. They had their locations outside the city. So, having gone with a certain amount of background here of accepting a foreign ruler, they accepted the position there readily and tended to fall in the trap and remained separate to some extent with the local people. This is the genesis, the basis, from where we move forward.

Afterwards, Sir, when India became independent, the question came as to what was to happen to the people of Indian origin settled in different parts of the world which was still being ruled by the United Kingdom because till then they had the common citizenship, the British citizenship. And the question arose as to what was to happen to them. I would recall to you the clear statement that the Prime Minister made in this regard. He had said:

"Our policy in regard to Indians in Africa or indeed in any part of the world has been repeatedly and clearly stated. We have left it to the Indians abroad whether they are to continue to remain Indian nationals or to adopt the nationality of whichever country

they live in. It is entirely for them to decide. If they remain Indian nationals, then all that they can claim abroad is favourable alien treatment. If they adopt the nationality of the country they live in, they should associate themselves as closely as possible with the interest of the people of the country they have adopted and never make it appear to function in any way that they become an exploiting agency there."

This was the clear statement made by the Prime Minister, if you like, an advice given to the people of Indian origin who live abroad.

Shri Hanumanthalya (Bangalore City): May we know what was the exploitation which Indians were doing? Please explain that point. Let us know what was the exploitation that the Indians were carrying on.

Shri Dinesh Singh: I do not think it will be very desirable for me to go into the details.

Shri Hanumanthalya: You are taking umbrage under that phrase. We want to know what was the exploitation taking place there.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Ask the Africans.

Shri Dinesh Singh: Any trading community in that respect is an exploiting agency.

Shri Hanumanthalya: Have we driven out the British firms and the German firms from here? Have we driven out all the foreign trading firms in India because they are trading in this country? We must be able to get there what we practise here.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore): We should.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: You are protecting them. That is why they are here.

Shri Dinesh Singh: To my mind, they are equally an exploiting agency.

As I was saying, the position that they had at that time was to choose whether they wanted to retain the British citizenship that they had or wanted to adopt the Indian citizenship or the citizenship of the country that would in due course come to them after independence. A number of them adopted Indian citizenship and became Indian nationals for whom we were fully responsible. The bulk of them decided to retain the British nationality and they were to be governed by the laws that were then to be framed by the British Government and subsequently by the Governments of the countries that became independent. In this process, as and when these countries became independent, they offered them the nationality of these countries with certain time limitations for them to decide whether they want to become the nationals of those countries or not. Quite a number of them accepted the nationality and became the nationals of those countries and are now enjoying full and equal citizenship rights along with the people of African origin there. Quite a large number of them are still hesitating because they still have the period to choose, at least in Kenya and Uganda. This has created a certain amount of difficulty.

Just now my hon. friend Prof. D. C. Sharma—I do not know if he is here or not; I think, he is not here—mentioned. . . .

An Hon. Member: He is coming.

Shri Dinesh Singh: I am glad he has come. He mentioned that it was our responsibility to look after the people of Indian origin whatever their nationality may be. This is a kind of a talk that, I would submit, creates all the difficulty. The people who have accepted the citizenship of a country have to behave as the nationals of the country in which they live; they may be people of Indian origin; they may be emotionally and socially very much in tune with us,

but they have to function in the interests of the countries which they have now adopted. No country would like to have amongst its citizens people who owe their allegiance to another country.

My hon. friend Shri D. C. Sharma gave an example from the USA where he mentioned that people of different origin had settled down and had become nationals and were yet retaining contacts with their countries. Perhaps, they were cultural contacts; I do not know. But he must also appreciate that within his own lifetime there have been two World Wars in which people who had gone from a certain country in Europe had taken active part in fighting that country on behalf of the USA. It is a position that no country will accept that their own nationals look to another country for allegiance. This is a position in which there can be no compromise.

The people have got to make up their minds themselves and make up finally, because if they do not do it, then they jeopardise the position of those who have taken up that nationality and are willing to live in equality with the people there.

There is also a charge that our diplomatic missions have not functioned fully, and that they have not helped in the integration of these people. I do not know; there may be some specific complaints here and there. I cannot speak for all of them. But by and large, I would submit that the people in our Missions in Africa, especially in East Africa, have had to perform a very difficult task, because they had to give a certain amount of advice to the people of Indian origin, when they came to them; they also had to bear in mind the interests of the people of Indian origin there and to try to explain to them that their interests lay in making a clear choice and to take a position where none could start accusations against them. I think that by and large, they have acquitted themselves very well. It is a matter of great credit for us

from
Independent Countries
of Africa

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

that the people of our Missions living in those countries, sometimes, during difficulties, have never been accused by the Governments or by any other interested party, of doing anything which has not been in the interests of India, in the interests of the people of Indian origin, and also in the interests of the countries to which they have been accredited.

But I do agree that it is to some extent our duty to help in the integration of people of Indian origin in those countries. As regards people who have become our citizens, as I have mentioned earlier, we are making every effort for their security, for them to come away here, and we are also providing the facilities. But as regards those people who are still hesitating, I would repeat the same advice that the Prime Minister had given, namely that they must make up their minds finally. If they want to become Indian citizens, our citizenship laws are open, and according to the citizenship laws, they are welcome to become Indian citizens, and we shall do our best to help them. Those who wish to stay on there and continue the trade and live there must make up their minds finally, adopt the nationality of those countries and face the future boldly. No community can afford to live in this hesitation. We have minorities; other countries have also minorities; but minorities must face the future bravely. They must take up a position, and they must ask for their equality and the guarantees that they have. If, as suggested by some hon. Members, they look to India to provide them with all those opportunities, they will never integrate with that country, and they will never be able to settle down there and they will never be able to win the confidence of the people there.

Regarding the facilities, may I mention very briefly what we are giving? Two matters were referred to in this connection. One was about providing transport for those people to come

back to India and arranging for the goods that they were to bring. We already have from East Africa at the moment three services per month, which carry roughly 800 to 1200 passengers. Till the end of this month, they have a waiting list of roughly 800 passengers.

17 hrs.

We are arranging for another ship to ply six more sailings till about the end of August with a capacity for about 600 passengers in each sailing. This will be able to take care of any backlog that there may be.

Regarding the facilities for their coming here, clear instructions have been issued to the Customs by the Ministry of Finance to allow them facilities. Under the Transfer of Residence Rules, they can bring all their money in. There is no difficulty. They can bring in all their personal effects. They can also bring in under certain restrictions, that is, about payment of customs duties etc. stocks in trade, machinery, industrial apparatus, merchandise, motor cars, motor cycles and all other possessions that they have. Every possible facility has been given and, by and large, we have heard only praise from those people who are coming.

The State Governments are also willing to give them facilities that they give to Indian nationals regarding establishment of small scale and village industries, taking loan for any large industrial enterprise and so on, if they so wish.

Therefore, I would submit that there has been no failure on the part of Government in either helping the people of Indian origin in these countries, people who have become Indian nationals in those countries, or in helping those who wish to come away, both in respect transport and all facilities to come back here.

I would like to conclude only with this brief remark, that these people

are passing through great difficulties. It is a period of transition in these countries as it was in our own country. There is the question of Africanisation. As my hon. friend, Shri Gupta, had said, we were also anxious to have Indianisation at the time of our independence. But all these things can be settled if we tackle the problem carefully, discuss it with them and not bring emotion in it, because it is the most dangerous thing that can happen—to link it up emotionally, in which we treat all of them as Indians and more or less make it impossible for them to stay.

17.02 hrs.

REVISION OF DEARNESS ALLOWANCE*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Before we begin the half-an-hour discussion, I would ask the hon. Finance Minister to make a statement for two or three minutes to help the discussion.

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): In order to facilitate the discussion, I may state that the question of revising the rates of dearness allowance admissible to Central Government employees as a result of the average for 12 months of the working class consumer price index reaching the figure of 135 in the month of January 1964, is already under the consideration of the Government in accordance with the recommendation of the Second Pay Commission on the point which is accepted by Government. I hope to be able to announce Government's decision in the matter in about a week's time. The revised rates will have effect from the 1st February 1964. The price index for the month of January being available only in the third week of March, we were not able to deal with it earlier.

I might also add that the figure of average price index registered a sudden rise as a result of the change in the indices for the cities of Bombay and Ahmedabad on the reports of the

Committees set up by the Governments of Maharashtra and Gujarat. This has raised the index figure by two points. Otherwise, perhaps the effect would not have come in the month of January, as it has in the present case.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I am really surprised to hear this announcement. I thought that the announcement would contain a declaration about the enhanced dearness allowance. Probably the Finance Minister thought that an impression might go round the country that he would be making some announcement because of this discussion. I shall not try to score a victory or point over this matter.

A question was put by me on the 30th April, to which the hon. Deputy Minister replied:

"At the moment, it is being finalised and the hon. Member will know very soon the decision taken in the matter".

I am happy that the hon. Finance Minister, realising the growing discontent among the Central Government employees has come out in this House with a statement that an announcement will be made within a week.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore): After Parliament adjourns.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I would have liked him to make a statement tomorrow or the day after on the floor of the House. Anyhow, even after the figure of 135 was reached in February, 1964, his approach to the problem was just like that of moody Hamlet, to revise or not to revise, but today he has been able to make up his mind, and some revision is likely to take place just after a week.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): Just after a week, or just after two days?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: To help the Finance Minister to take a decision, I will try to impress upon him what should be the quantum or the correct basis in arriving at a correct decision.