

[The Deputy Chairman.]

(i) that Friday, December 10, 1965 at present allotted for Private Members' Bills may be allotted for the transaction of Government Business, (ii) that the Rajya Sabha should also sit on Saturday, December 11, 1965 and (iii) that the House might curtail or dispense with the lunch recess and sit beyond 5 P.M. as and when necessary.

We go on to the Resolution.

RESOLUTION RE WITHDRAWAL OF
INDIA FROM THE MEMBERSHIP OF
THE COMMONWEALTH—*continued*

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : Madam Deputy Chairman, I support the resolution moved by Mr. Dharia that this House is of opinion that India should withdraw from the membership of the Commonwealth. I do not hesitate to lend my full support to this very important resolution. At a time when we are facing enemy No. 1 China on the one hand and Pakistan on the other, we have to discuss our relations with Britain. We have been associated with Britain for a long time and in the Commonwealth for the last eighteen years after we attained independence. It is argued that Britain is not the only member of the Commonwealth, that there are others, both white and coloured nations, who are members of the Commonwealth. It is argued, instead of our quitting the Commonwealth why not we make Britain quit the Commonwealth?

Madam Deputy Chairman, it is all understood that even though the white nations are in a minority in this Commonwealth, it is Britain that declares and dictates policies. It may be true that we have little voice in the affairs of the Commonwealth, but judging from the results it has been found that it is in the interests of Britain that the Commonwealth link is being continued. We must examine the part played by Britain in our dispute with Pakistan.

As we all know, by an Act of Parliament independence was granted to India

and Pakistan. We all know that in that Act of Parliament it was stated that the Indian Princes were free to accede either to India or to Pakistan or to remain independent. When Pakistan committed unprovoked aggression against Jammu and Kashmir, the Ruler of that State who had legally and constitutionally every power to enter into any agreement, decided to accede to India. For this the British Parliament is a party. When such is the position, Britain is going on encouraging Pakistan with regard to this dispute over Kashmir. Madam Deputy Chairman, we are aware that in the recent conflict it was Pakistan which committed aggression against India. It was Pakistan which sent infiltrators into Kashmir territory. It was Pakistan which first violated the international border by sending massive troops into Chhamb sector of Jammu and Kashmir. It was Pakistan which tried to bomb or bombed Amritsar. It was again Pakistan which committed first aggression against our naval base in Gujarat. From any account it is evident and quite clear that it was Pakistan which committed aggression on all fronts. In spite of that the British Government and particularly the Prime Minister, Mr. Harold Wilson, declared that India committed aggression against Pakistan when India crossed the international frontier in order to defend her own territory, her own honour, her own integrity. From any account it seems that Britain is following a partisan attitude, an attitude which should be condemned, an attitude by which she has gone on encouraging Pakistan. It was because of Britain that Pakistan was established. Otherwise India would have remained as one entity. For all the sins that Britain has committed against India, it is unwise, unfair, improper on the part of India to continue its relations with Britain in this Commonwealth.

We have seen, Madam Deputy Chairman, whenever an occasion arises, whenever there is an independence movement for the colonial people, Britain has not gone to the rescue of the working class, has not gone to the rescue of the oppressed peoples of those countries. We have seen what dirty game it is now playing in Rhodesia. When in Aden the Government of the people was suppressed and dismissed which was an elected Government under the constitution, and in the same way when the white regime

of Ian Smith declared unilateral independence, Britain did not act. If only Britain had acted in time, if only Britain had threatened to use force, Ian Smith would not have dared to declare unilateral independence thus depriving 4 million Africans of self-rule. Britain has double standards. She supports Pakistan over Kashmir saying that self-determination is necessary, but at the same time she says that Ian Smith should not declare unilateral Independence but no force is used to suppress the illegal seizure of power by the white regime. Madam Deputy Chairman, you are aware that there are still some dependencies, some countries, which are under the tutelage of Great Britain. It is time that we lent our support to them to see that they are liberated. Today we see the same game, the same divide and rule policy, being played by Britain in the small island of Fiji. There they are trying to encourage racial differences between the Fijians and the local Indians and they are trying to deprive that small country of independence. The same dirty game Britain is playing in British Guiana; the same game she is playing in Mauritius. In all these countries we are having a substantial Indian population; they have been struggling for independence. But, unfortunately, being under the tutelage of Britain, they have not been able to secure independence or self-rule for themselves. We must lend our whole-hearted support to see that these countries are liberated at the earliest possible time.

Last week or so, one of the organs the United Nations—one of its Political Committees, I believe—passed a Resolution that immediate steps be taken to see that Fiji and Mauritius are given independence. The Government of India should see that independence is given to these countries and that they are free from the clutches of British rule.

While we are discussing our relations with Britain in the Commonwealth, we should see what part Britain is playing in world politics. Britain has ceased to be a first-rate power; Britain is now a third or fourth-rate power. Britain takes its dictates from, or is guided by, America. So, whatever policy Britain is now following, it is the policy that has been dictated or guided by the United States imperialism.

So, with our connection with the Commonwealth, we are indirectly encouraging Britain to play this sort of colonial role in world affairs. Britain has entered into military alliances in Asia and in Europe. Britain is a party to the CENTO, the SEATO and the NATO alliances. How can we who claim to follow an independent policy, how can we who claim that we follow a non-alignment policy, associate ourselves with Britain when Britain is following the colonial policy in order to preserve its imperialist rule? We might say that the Government which is ruling that country now is a Socialist Government. It is true. But for home policies they may adopt socialist measures but for outside policies they are not prepared to take socialist measures. They are still continuing the old legacy and they will continue to be the exploiters, they will still continue to be imperialists.

From all accounts, we can see that our continuance in the Commonwealth is not beneficial to India but that it is beneficial to the colonial interests of Britain. Our association with the Commonwealth is a prestige and an honour and a prized possession to the Commonwealth. If we cease to be a member of the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth will crack. Some have been advocating that we should try to expell Britain from the Commonwealth and the other Afro-Asian countries which are now members of the Commonwealth can try to see that a better policy is formulated. If we quit the Commonwealth, the prestige that the Commonwealth today has will be reduced but the prestige of India will go up in the eyes of the Afro-Asian world. We can still continue to have very friendly relations with the Afro-Asian world and if finally we decide to quit the Commonwealth, our position in the Afro-Asian world would be much different from what it is today.

3 P.M.

Therefore, I plead that the continuance of our membership in the Commonwealth is not in the best interests of the country but it is in the best interests of Britain. Some people might say that we should not take a decision of this nature, that it is a decision of far-reaching consequences.

[Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy.]

I agree that it is a very important and vital decision. We have got to take it in a very cool and calculated manner. But during the last 18 years we have been seeing the part played by Britain in world politics and the part played by Britain in our disputes with the other countries. Britain and America declare that they are prepared to go to the rescue of India or any other power if that power or that country is attacked by Communist China. But this very country of Britain is helping Communist China in more than one way. Britain is continuing its trade relations with China, it is expanding its trade relations with it and Hong Kong, which is an international port, is the place through which China is continuing trade not only with Britain but also with America and other countries. That is exactly the reason why, while China claims some territory here or some territory there, it does not want to take over Hong Kong; it is for this very reason that it is helpful to them to have Hong Kong as a free port so that China can import any quantity of any valuable material which she may require.

The British Government, whether it is the Labour Government or the Conservative Government, has always followed a policy of divide and rule: it has always followed a racial policy; it has always helped the white racist minorities in other countries. We have seen it. When the United Nations have declared that in order to fight South Africa, sanctions should be applied, that trade relations with South Africa should be cut off, Britain still carries on trade with South Africa. So, from any point of view—either from the national point of view or from the international point of view or from the socialist point of view—if you analyse the present situation in the world, you will realise that Britain is playing a secondary role, that it is playing a role which is more convenient for the furtherance of its imperial game. And when that is the position, we should be very careful about continuing our association with the Commonwealth and we should take a decision that India does not want to continue her membership in the Commonwealth, and we should quit the Commonwealth. By quitting the Commonwealth, our prestige

will go up and we will have better friends, reliable friends, in the Afro-Asian world and we will be in a better position to shape the destinies of the world. Thank you.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh) : Madam Deputy Chairman, I congratulate my friend, Shri Mohan Dharia, for bringing this Resolution before this House. I feel honoured to lend my whole-hearted support to this Resolution. For certain people of the older generation, it may look sentimental. But I feel proud in asserting that as young students of the Allahabad University during 1949-50, we opposed the idea of India entering the Commonwealth and even at that time we did not think it proper to create this new community of certain nations without any common objectives. And even at that time this discussion was raised. But what was the point in entering the Commonwealth? The Minister of External Affairs will bear me out—at that time Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of the Nation, pleaded with the country and with the leaders of the Government that partition was an unfortunate thing, that there should not have been a partition of the Indian sub-continent and that if we wanted to have closer relations between India and Pakistan, there should be a link, Mahatma Gandhi, a saint as he was, thought that the generosity of the British people would come to our help and that we would be able to keep better relations with Pakistan through British diplomacy. Not only that, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru also agreed with this proposal. When on the 14th November I was attending a meeting of the Congress Parliamentary Party, I heard the speech of our Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. He said that Panditji never believed that anyone would tell a lie to him; he was so generous, he was so great-hearted, that he always thought that whatever was assured to him, would be adhered to. Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, a great statesman, a generous personality which history seldom produces, believed in the words of imperialists. But I may submit, Madam, that very often certain political leaders fail to understand the real implication of imperialism. While Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi, out of generosity, had faith in the British motives, even today in 1965, with all the experience of 18 years, there are certain people in this country

who come and plead that there should be restraint, they plead that the British people are not so bad as we think, that there are good people in Britain. Now, Madam, what has been the attitude of the British nation as such?

If you want to understand the attitude of British imperialism you have to visit a village in Scotland and any Scottish person will give you the interpretation of the British history in its true perspective. For two hundred years Scotland has been a part of Britain, of the U.K., but these English people have not forgiven Scotland. Madam, when last June I was in Scotland and I visited a war memorial of a battle-field, I was surprised when the Scottish Information Officer asked me to spit at it. I asked him, "Why should I do it?" He said that it was a token of the condemnation of the British imperialists' attitude that they invaded and subjugated their country. This is the attitude of the Scottish people towards Britain.

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE
(West Bengal): Even today.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Why? Because they are nearer home. They understand what the British people are. They understand what British imperialism is.

My friend, Mr. Mulka Govinda Reddy, talked of the Labour Party's socialism. I have been always a great admirer of the British Labour Party. But during my one-month stay in the U.K. I did not come across even a single British man who was pro-Indian. I discussed with many Members of Parliament. I discussed with the B.B.C. people. Some people say that the B.B.C. is not controlled by the Government there. They say that they are objective. You will be surprised to know, Madam, that during that one month they quoted from only two speeches made in the Indian Parliament in every meeting there, wherever I went, whether it was an official function or a function organised by the Press people, or a function organised by others. What were those two speeches? One speech was by Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia where he had described the 'lucky dog' of Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru and it was given the

front-page coverage, and the other was the sentence by Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit, "We are prisoners of indecision". The British statesmen knew only these two speeches. The reply to Dr. Lohia given by Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru was never quoted. The reply given to Mrs. Pandit by Lal Bahadur Shastriji was never published in the British Press.

Not only on that occasion, what happened on the Rann of Kutch incident? At that time the Prime Ministers' Conference was going on in London. While leaving India for the U.K., our Prime Minister had made a statement that he wanted peaceful co-existence and friendliness with Pakistan. Not a single British paper published his speech. On the other hand every little Pakistani version that the Indian soldiers were fleeing like flies was given the front-page coverage. When I drew the attention of the Director of the B.B.C. to this, he said that this might be a mistake of judgment. Can you believe that this is just out of ignorance on the part of the Britishers?

Madam, the British Members of Parliament were pleading that there were no Muslims in India. When I told them that there are 5 million Muslims in India, they said, "Is it so?" Do you think that an intelligent nation like Britain does not know the simple fact of history. But they want to twist history. What is the reason?

Madam, the British imperialists have not reconciled to the fact that this sub-continent has become free. They feel that Pakistan is their creation and, therefore, it should be supported at any cost.

This morning some friends here were saying that the British Prime Minister, Mr. Wilson, did not make any speech describing India as an aggressor. Unfortunately, Madam, I could not get a copy of the British Information Service bulletin. In that bulletin in inverted commas, Mr. Wilson has been quoted as saying, "This is aggression". After our march into the Lahore sector. I do not remember the exact words but that is what it meant.

Not only that, when China gave an ultimatum to India in 1962, both the U.K. and

[Shri Chandra Shekhar.]

the U.S.A. unequivocally said that they would come to the aid of India. This time the U.S.A. said that the matter was serious and they would support the Indian Government. But what was the reaction of the British Prime Minister, Mr. Wilson? Mr. Wilson said, "We are observing the situation and we will make our comments when such a situation develops". Madam, even in the face of aggression from China when they were not unequivocal, when they were not categorical in giving support to this country, what for should we be in the British Commonwealth? Madam, I ask any man who talks of sincerity, sobriety and gentlemanliness, what for do we go to London every year? Is it not a fact that we glorify the British Crown and the Prime Minister of that Crown runs down this country. It is against the self-respect of this country.

When the Prime Ministers' Conference was going on in London, the whole British Press was full of anti-Indian propaganda. Not even a single man came out to say that something good was going on in India. I challenge any man in this House to let me have one cutting from the British Press where Indian efforts at reconstruction, Indian efforts at revitalising our economy, have been publicised anywhere. It is because they have not forgiven us for attaining our freedom.

This sentimental reason apart, I shall like to draw your attention, Madam, to another factor. It is said that U.K. is not alone; there are 22 other nations. But what is the position of these 22 nations? Four white nations with 86 million population are the nation with all sophisticated scientific development, with all the modern technology, with all the amenities of life, while 640 million people living in the Afro-Asian countries, that is, coloured people, are still groaning under the pressure of squalor, poverty and disease. What has the Commonwealth done for these 640 million people? I shall not go into statistics, Madam. I have got full statistics with me.

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA (Bihar): How many years have elapsed?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Eighteen years. They say that economic questions are involved. What are the economic questions? The economic questions are that the British people have got their assets here. Do you know what is the average earning of the British assets in foreign countries? The average earning is 7 per cent. but in India they earn 9.4 per cent.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two minutes more.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: In India they earn 9.4 per cent. while in Pakistan they earn on their total assets only 3.2 per cent. This is the economic side of the situation.

If you think in terms of external aid . . .

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL (Delhi): Which has also been stopped.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Yes. . . in external aid also, more than 50 per cent. comes from the U.S.A. If you take the World Bank and the U.N. Fund, hardly 11 per cent. is from the U.K. Every time you take the aid every time you get the slander. Are you ready to tolerate this? Are you going to take this insult every time? I have no grudge against the British people. But I put it, through you, Madam, to this House for what are we in the Commonwealth? Only to be disgraced and dishonoured at every moment whenever a crisis comes before this country? I would like to make one more point. If you take the trade relations with the U.K., hardly 31 per cent. of our total exports are to the U.K. and what do we import? Only 18 per cent. is imported from the U.K. We are having 18 per cent. of our imports from the U.K. and if we go into details, we will find there also that we are not in an advantageous position. If you take into consideration individual trade agreements, it will be an eye-opener. I do not know whether some Members

have taken the trouble to study the agreement with one company of the U.K. about a cable factory. The Government of India, in 1949, entered into an agreement with a private company in the U.K. that the company would help us in establishing a cable manufacturing factory somewhere in Bengal and at that time the agreement was that in the coming twenty years if we are not able to produce to the fullest extent of our requirements, twenty-five per cent. of the remainder will be imported from the British company. Today the situation is that we are paying double the price. What we can get from Switzerland, or from Germany at half the price, we are getting from England because of an agreement in 1949 and that agreement is not only a private agreement but the British Post Office people are involved in it and on their certificate, on their assurance we take it at double the price. This has been brought out by the auditors in the last year's report. In this situation, if certain people want to plead that we should continue in the Commonwealth only because some twenty more countries are there, may I ask them through you as to what happened in Rhodesia, what has happened in Aden and what has happened in the other countries of the Commonwealth? Is it not a fact that the other day my distinguished colleague, Mr. Gujral, raised the question of the bases . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is over.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: . . . and at that time the hon. Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs said that the U.K. is not obliged to consult the Commonwealth countries. Where our vital interests are involved, even there the U.K. Government does not care to consult us and here are the people who say that the British Crown or the Queen of the U.K. is the head of the Commonwealth. For what? Is it for disgracing us, for dishonouring us, for taking advantage of our association with the Commonwealth and going to the help of Pakistan? In all humility I shall say to this House and specially the Foreign Minister that once, in the U.N.O. he said to the World Assembly: 'If you are not going to behave in an honourable way, we are not going to be here' and he walked

out of it. When he could walk out of the U.N., what is the difficulty in walking out of this dead organisation, known as the Commonwealth? With this plea, I request through you, the Foreign Minister, to give serious thought to this proposition and I hope he will agree to the Resolution moved by my friend.

SHRI D. THENGARI (Uttar Pradesh): I am led to believe that the future historians would have to record that our link with the Commonwealth had been a very uncommon phenomenon because every country looks after its own national self-interest first and is not carried away by high-sounding phrases and in this particular matter it seems that we are influenced more by phraseology than by reality. Our late Prime Minister, who sincerely believed that this Commonwealth was a partnership of people with different ideologies, political systems and policies and a challenge to the world and that the Commonwealth was a lesson in agreement and harmony through arguments and debate, even he, had come to doubt the real utility of any such organisation and in March 1962, on the floor of the Lok Sabha, he even dropped a hint that it may be possible for India to go out of the Commonwealth, though he was careful enough to point out that the particular issue that was being discussed—that was the U.K. Immigration Bill—was not sufficient enough to quit the Commonwealth. That remark of Pandit Nehru had removed the impression that might have been created in certain quarters that the Commonwealth link was a sacrosanct one and that it was not open to revision. By implication, Pandit Nehru had made it clear that India could quit the Commonwealth if and when the need for it arose. The arguments in favour of continuing in the Commonwealth are too simple, namely, that it gives India a sense of belonging, that it helps many practical projects that we have undertaken on socio-economic plane, etc. but we cannot be oblivious to the fact that the Commonwealth has already ceased to be as homogeneous as it was intended to be. For example, on colonial matters junior members of the Commonwealth were not seeing eye to eye with the senior members. The courtesy of mutual consultation also was not shown on a number of crucial occasions. For a number of years Britain's

[Shri D. Thengari.]

policy towards South Africa was based upon its indifference to the attitude of the other Commonwealth countries. The Common Market brought up further incompatibilities. Great Britain clearly put its own national self-interest above that of the other Commonwealth countries. The division on the basis of colour was not also negligible. So far as India is concerned, we know that we have been discriminated against by Great Britain rather consistently. It has been siding practically Pakistan as against India and the episode is so recent that it need not be recapitulated. It was Great Britain's policy of divide and rule that was responsible for the partition of our sacred motherland and also on the issue of Kashmir Britain has been persistently siding Pakistan as against India. Great Britain is also soft to China whose attitude towards India has been hostile. British strategy is mainly responsible for the antagonism of the various native communities in Burma, Ceylon, Fiji, Mauritius, East Africa and British Guiana towards Indians. We should not be enamoured of mere dreams or visions. We must be aware of our needs or realities and like every other nation in the world we must also consider our national self-interest supreme and therefore on the criterion of national self-interest I think that this entire question requires reconsideration. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri R. P. N. Sinha.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): What time would the Minister intervene? We would like to listen to the Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are many Members to speak. Mr. Sinha.

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA: Madam, in the first spurt of anger, in the wake of the Pakistani aggression against India there was a widescale demand in this country for withdrawing from the Commonwealth but as the time passed and sober thinking dawned upon us, the demand lessened and to-day we find that the opinion here is very much divided on this question. One of the examples of it we found was in the Lok Sabha when a person like Mr. Frank

Anthony, who was very vociferous in condemning Great Britain and hinted at withdrawal from the Commonwealth during the last session, went to the extent of saying that India should never withdraw from the Commonwealth. In international affairs, passion has no place and as the Foreign Minister will tell us Bhuttoism does not pay in the long run. In the United Nations his antics made many a country, that were sympathetic towards Pakistan, withdraw that sympathy. Similarly, Don Quixotes have no place in international affairs.

When I was listening to the arguments of the mover of the Resolution, I was reminded of the argument which my small daughter gave for quitting the Commonwealth. She said that we should leave the Commonwealth because in her school, the British Information Centre, was showing a documentary and charging eight annas per head for seeing it. So what I mean, Madam, is that in matters like this we must think soberly and dispassionately. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was one of the very staunch anti-British leaders in this country when the struggle for independence was going on out, subsequently, as the Prime Minister of free India he decided to join the Commonwealth, and it was not for nothing that he made that decision. He knew that in the international world a country cannot remain without certain associations or forums for the expression of opinions, and the Commonwealth is one of those forums where we can express our opinions along with other countries of the Commonwealth and act in close unison with them. That was one of the primary reasons why he decided to join the Commonwealth. Even take the instance of China, People's China as she is called. She has received all kinds of insults at the United Nations, but even today she has not left her endeavours to get admission into the United Nations. Why? It is because China today has no forum in the world, and a country which has no forum is like an outcaste country in the international world and in international affairs.

Now I have heard very carefully the arguments in favour of quitting the Commonwealth. One of the arguments is that the Prime Minister of the U.K. made certain unfriendly statements. It is true

that the statement that he made during the recent Indo-Pakistani conflict was very unfortunate, that it was not only unfortunate but it was also definitely mischievous. It was a statement by Prime Minister Harold Wilson; it is true, but Harold Wilson may be succeeded tomorrow by some other Wilson. Men may come and go; Prime Ministers may come and go, but the country remains. We cannot therefore think that for all time to come the U.K. is a country that will remain hostile towards us.

Now one of the reasons why I say that we should not go out of the Commonwealth, why I oppose this Resolution is that we have still a lot of commercial interests involved between the two countries and it is not so easy to get away from them. For instance, take the case of our tea trade. Our biggest market for tea is the United Kingdom. Now there are many countries in the world, which have started recently tea cultivation, and they would be only too glad to catch that market if we lose it. Similarly there are so many other interests, but I would not like to go into details. So many interests are involved between the United Kingdom and India, and therefore it is not possible to get out of the Commonwealth all of a sudden. Then there are the African countries. Their policies are very much different from the policy that the United Kingdom has been following in world affairs. Still they want to be in the Commonwealth. Why? It is because they think that here is an association, a forum where they can function effectively.

Again I do not agree with Mr. Chandra Shekhar that our commercial connections with Great Britain have been of no benefit to us. Some hon. Member talked of the aid. But only the other day we read in the papers that Great Britain was going to give India development aid without interest, whereas many of our friendly countries have been giving aid to us with interest.

I hold no brief for the U.K. I hold no brief for Mr. Harold Wilson either but what I mean to say is that we must not come to a decision in a huff, or when

the heat of passion is raging in the country. It is a problem that has to be considered very coolly, and we must leave the matter to the Government, to our Prime Minister and to our Foreign Minister to decide whether it will be in the interests of India to get out of the Commonwealth, but we cannot come out with a Resolution, pass the Resolution and then try to force the Government to take a certain decision. That will be a wrong procedure. It may be that the attitude of the United Kingdom has been hostile towards us, but let the Government, taking every factor into consideration, come to a decision that would be in our interest to remain in the Commonwealth or not to remain. Well, they certainly love the country, if not more at least as much as we do, and they will take a decision that will be in the best interest of the country. But we should not try to force their hands

With these words, Madam, I oppose the Resolution.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY Madam Deputy Chairman, this is a political question and must be viewed from the purely political standpoint. No doubt the origin of this discontent with the Commonwealth is very recent. References have been made more than once to Mr. Wilson's attitude in regard to Pakistan's aggression. Now I do not think Mr. Wilson, the Prime Minister of England, in so many words, marked out India as an aggressor. All that he said was, when India took the offensive, he advised India not to take the offensive, because that will escalate the war, that will broaden the range of the war. That is all that he said. Now Madam Deputy Chairman, we seem to think that the Prime Ministers of England are very learned about Indian affairs. Now one has to be in England for some time in order to know how comparatively ignorant even leading English statesmen are about Indian affairs. It was so even when India was directly under them. I do not know if Mr. Dharia was born then but on one occasion, Lord Salisbury, the then Prime Minister of England, from his seat in the House of Lords described Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji as the black man from India.

AN HON. MEMBER: While he was blacker.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Now Dadabhai Naoroji, by all accounts, was as fair as, if not fairer than, Lord Salisbury. Now that gives you an indication as to the ignorance of leading statesmen in England about Indian affairs.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN (Nominated): How do you explain that kind of ignorance as between England and India even at that time?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: It is this. In regard to any other matter except England, English people are so insular that their ignorance about other countries is no doubt vincible, but it is colossal.

How was poor Mr. Wilson to know that the Chhamb sector was right within Kashmir and that the Indian forces took the offensive in order to prevent the Pakistani forces from making headway?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Wilson made that statement on the 6th and by the 3rd everything was known to him, including the report of the Secretary General and the London Times of the 29th published the whole account of it. But Mr. Wilson deliberately ignored all that.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Mr. Gupta seems to be in the confidence of the Prime Minister of England and to know more about what he said than what he actually said.

Mr. Dharia also was very violent about the BBC and of the English press. The BBC is a public corporation and it is independent of the government, unlike our All India Radio. Therefore, we cannot blame the British Government for the sins of omission and of commission of the BBC. So also the press there. I get three English weeklies, *i.e.* The Observer, The Sunday Times and The Economist. I observed that the Sunday Times in its reports of the Indo-Pakistan war placed side by side the accounts they received from the Pakistan correspondent and the accounts that they received from the Indian correspondent. And as for The Economist, one of its earliest articles condemned Pakistan for the

aggression on the ground that Pakistan was too weak to win the war. "Pakistan cannot win the war", was the editorial of that leading economic paper *The Economist*.

Great Britain has been condemned and the Prime Minister of Great Britain has been condemned for not taking sides. We should remember that both Pakistan and India are members of the Commonwealth and Pakistan is also a military ally of England. So one can understand the hesitation with which the Prime Minister of England would support any move to condemn Pakistan.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But no one can understand how Mr. Ruthnaswamy supports Mr. Wilson.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: And why should condemnation, especially political condemnation take place in public? Diplomacy and politics are not generally played in public. One hon. Member, I think it was Shri Chandra Shekhar, referred to Scotland, that Scotland was dissatisfied with England. That has been a perennial attitude of Scotland to England. But they make it up by getting all the commercial jobs in London and by obtaining all the chief political posts in the English Cabinet. It has been said that the British Empire had been conquered by Irishmen for the Scotchmen to rule the empire and for the Englishmen to look on with a grin.

And this Commonwealth, Madam, is like most Englishmen and like most English institutions, very illogical. But it works, and that is the test to which all political institutions must be subjected. First of all, it is both republican and monarchical. A number of republican States which have attained independence recently are members of the Commonwealth, and are important members of the Commonwealth, including India. The Commonwealth started as The British Commonwealth, but it is becoming non-British and almost a non-European institution. And the members of the Commonwealth have the right of criticism, of mutual criticism and free criticism. No one objected to Pandit Nehru condemning

the Suez move of the British Government. Nobody resented it, not even in England, because that was the right of members of the Commonwealth to criticise each other, one of the marks of independence. And in the Commonwealth, the most illogical thing I believe is that it is the only political organisation, the only States' organisation that allows the right of secession to its members. It is there actually in the Statute of Westminster, this right of secession given to every member of the Commonwealth. Although it is such an illogical institution, it works. It provides for the security of its members. It consolidates their security. It renders a number of political, international and economic benefits. As for political benefits, against China, Great Britain with Russia and the United States of America, offered its help before India asked for it, and that is always available against that nation. In international affairs we get support in international gatherings, in international conferences with regard to disarmament, with regard to nuclear warfare and so on. We can expect support from the members of the Commonwealth in these matters.

When we speak of the Commonwealth we must not speak only of Great Britain. Great Britain is only the centre. Mr. Dharia found fault with Great Britain for holding the Prime Ministers' Conferences and the Commonwealth Conferences in London. Well, Great Britain would be the first to welcome any other country offering to bear the expenses of the meetings of the Prime Ministers' Conferences or for the meetings of any other Commonwealth conferences.

Economically also we derive great benefit from our membership of the Commonwealth. We get certain preferences which we would not get if we were not a member of the Commonwealth, and our trade both with regard to our exports and with regard to our imports, with the Commonwealth cannot be despised.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Then why have the Queen of England as the head of the Commonwealth?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Well, India agreed to it, India has not objected

to it. All the members of the Commonwealth agreed to it. It is only a convenient thing. And the King of England has been the head of the Commonwealth for centuries.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Had they courage to ask that question of the late Prime Minister?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I am glad the hon. Member agrees with the late Prime Minister at least on one thing.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Madam Deputy Chairman, when this question was first considered it was not considered from a sentimental or emotional standpoint at all.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, we are tired of listening to so much praise of the British Prime Minister. Will he do it a little less?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Southern Rhodesia has not even been touched upon yet.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, you will get your chance to speak.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: He cannot object to what I say.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Even in England there is a section which is against Mr. Wilson.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Yes, that is what you get in a democratic country. When this question was first considered, Madam Deputy Chairman, at the time of our independence, it was purely political and material consideration that prevailed with our leaders in agreeing to continue in the Commonwealth. The Prime Minister whose birthday was commemorated a week ago was a most anti-British statesman, and yet he felt that it would be in the interest of India to remain in the Commonwealth. And then Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, also a great hater of British imperialism, advised the Prime Minister and the

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.]

Constituent Assembly that it would be in the interest of India to continue as a member of the Commonwealth. It does not mean that for all time to come India should be a member of the Commonwealth. A time may come when India is so independent, when India is so self-reliant and so self-sufficient that she can rely upon herself for advancing her political and economic and her defence interests and then she can decide to leave it. But for the time being, at the present time, I think it would be suicidal for us to quit the Commonwealth.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : Madam Deputy Chairman, as I sat here listening with a great deal of attention and respect to the learned speakers, Mr. Ruthnaswamy and Mr. Sinha, I was wondering about which Commonwealth they were talking. Were they talking of the Commonwealth that used to be? Were they talking of the Commonwealth that they would wish it to be? Or, were they talking of the Commonwealth that exists? If it is that, perhaps they have misread history. It is tragic that I should have to get up here and remind these learned people that they are not keeping themselves abreast of the times. It is tragic that I should have to get up today to tell them that the time has changed, the leopard has changed its spots, the British have come out in new colours. What the British have done in the matter of Kashmir and in the matter of the Pakistani aggression against India has neither been in the spirit of the Commonwealth nor in the spirit of friendship nor even in the spirit of those who perhaps would be the benefactors of India. I shall not take your time, Madam, in repeating all that, the long tale of treacheries, the long tale of lies and the long tale of misrepresentations that the British have resorted to. It will be useless for me to talk to you today of how the British press, the radio, the politicians chose to misrepresent the situation. Having done that, having kept quiet when Pakistan aggressed in Kashmir, having damned us because we came to defend our liberty and save our own prestige, having done all that, now the British have shown us another face. When our Foreign Minister and our Prime Minister have unequivocally

declared that Kashmir is not to be discussed they now say that it shall be discussed and whether it shall or shall not be discussed ultimately will depend upon how strong we are, how firm we are but I would like to draw the attention of Mr. Ruthnaswamy to a speech by one of the Members of the British Labour Party. I would like to quote from the speech of Mr. Jaugar, who headed a six-Member delegation on a study tour of Pakistan. After that, that team went to Afghanistan and there he said : "Peace between India and Pakistan cannot be maintained without a political solution of the Kashmir issue." This is the British attitude and this completely annuls all the professions that the communications had failed, all the professions that the poor fellow, Mr. Wilson, did not know at a particular time what he should have known. They are now trying to browbeat us politically, trying to tighten the strings and they are telling us that economic aid would not be available to us. They are also telling America and using their influence with America which now is saying that dollars will be needed before wheat can be given. I know all these techniques. These tactics of pressurization are nothing new to the British. The British pressurization is known to this country and I would like here to quote a few words, Madam, for your consideration.

"We have been patient for too long with such unseemly, prejudiced and mischievous attacks by high placed Britishers on our administration, our leaders and our people . . . we are fully aware of the machinations of the vested interests, both in India and the United Kingdom, to hand over as difficult a legacy to India as possible. Balkanisation of India was being actively promoted. Large-scale disturbances were manufactured."

You would be surprised, Madam, to know that I am not quoting from Jawaharlal Nehru. I am quoting Sardar Patel and this is what the Sardar said in 1948. All that is past, the British have changed and when the character of the Commonwealth changed we thought that the British also would change. Jawaharlal Nehru joined the Commonwealth. Yes, and we are proud of the day because he had done so. He exhibited a great width of vision and also

greatness of mind and heart. He showed that he was willing to forget the past. We are willing to forget the past but we have to deal with the present and we have to deal with the future and dealing with the present we find that the attitude of the British today is not what it should be, especially in the spirit of the Commonwealth. When the Algiers Conference broke down, we were sorry because we thought that the Chinese machinations were responsible and this was a set back for Asian and African unity. We were sorry for that. I thought that all those who believed that Asia and Africa should come together and emerge as a continent of progress would be sorry but what was the British attitude? What did the British press say about this? It said that the predominant feeling in Algiers was not to be pushed around by anyone any more. "All leading countries and nations involved except India can derive some comfort from the way things have turned out". I am quoting from "The Sunday Times", a leading newspaper of England. If it comes to anybody's interests, even China is good for them. They do not stop at that. When China is intruding into our borders, when we thought that all these people will unite to see that India got stronger, resume all the aid and delivery of goods that were stopped, what do we find? No such thing has happened. The danger to this country is very great, from China, as the Prime Minister has said. What has been their reaction? They sit back in self-satisfaction and smile at us. They think they can twist us around but whether we can or cannot be twisted or whether we shall be or shall not be twisted around is for us to decide. If it were only a case of India, perhaps I could have understood the case because we were an old colony and even the successors of Mr. Churchill have not yet reconciled themselves to a free and great India but what has been done to Rhodesia? There, double talk has taken place and even the British press says that Mr. Wilson never meant what he said. He did not wish that Rhodesia should go down. He wanted it to be strong and also wanted it to give birth to a society in Africa which should very much resemble South Africa and I would like to quote one paragraph from this week's "New Statesman" which says, in a letter to the Editor from a person who has left after the UDI:

"Perhaps I will be accused of racist fever if I compared Rhodesia today to a vast concentration camp where life, property, self-respect of every African is in danger."

This is the type of society which is being delivered within the Commonwealth which is proud of its values. This is the type of society against which Mr. Wilson refuses to move excepting talking of sanctions but sanctions can never decide issues nor have they decided any issue so far. If sanctions could decide issues, South Africa would have gone down long ago. If sanctions could decide issues, Rhodesia would never have dared to do what it has done and they know in their own heart of hearts that Mr. Wilson would never do anything because he had given an assurance that no arms would be used against Rhodesia. A new camp is taking birth in Africa consisting of South Africa, with whom Pakistan still continues to trade, Mozambique and Angola under the Portuguese, which are members of NATO, and Rhodesia. Thus the African continent is divided, the British wants it divided and this camp is standing against Kenya, against Uganda, against Zambia, against Malawi—all members of the British Commonwealth, partners in the greatness, partners in the Commonwealth, partners in the common prosperity, partners in dreaming of the great future. This is the future which the British is offering to the junior members of the Commonwealth. This is the position which British policy has taken. Madam, I would particularly draw the attention of Mr. Ruthnaswamy and Mr. Sinha to this change of British policy and that change is that Africa must remain divided and must remain weak. They would never like that the entire continent should get up as a monster of freedom and should be such a force against which the imperialists and the neo-colonists cannot stand. This change also shows that they want Asia and India should remain weak. Therefore, all aims, all pulls, all efforts are concentrated on us to keep us weak. Above all, bases in Indian Ocean are being established, expanded and strengthened so that if ever we dare to talk of freedom, if ever we dare to stand up on our own, if we dare to say anything which does not suit the masters, they can show us that they are stronger

[Shri I. K. Gujral.]

It is this Commonwealth, Madam, that I talk to you about. Whether we should leave it or should not leave it perhaps might need certain discussion because that will depend upon how mechanically we should function but this thing is definitely certain that continuation of this pattern of Commonwealth is neither in the interests of India nor in the interests of Asia, nor in the interests of Africa. If this Commonwealth is to continue then it must change shape. Its shape can be changed, yes, by expelling the British from it; its shape can be changed, yes, by the Asian and African majority asserting itself; its shape can be changed, yes, by its becoming a force of progress, by its becoming a voice of revolution, voice of independence. Therefore India has . . .

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA: We can change that only by remaining in the Commonwealth.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Yes, to attend that last meeting where the British is expelled. Therefore if this House is willing to call a meeting tomorrow and if Mr. Sinha is willing to support it I have no objection. I do not say the Foreign Minister should send his letter of resignation tonight to the British Commonwealth; I do not wish that he should tell them tonight that we are walking out but I do wish that the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister should take immediate steps to see that a conference is convened of all African and Asian nations and those members of the Commonwealth including the British who choose to attend to discuss—what?—whether we shall or shall not liberate Rhodesia, to discuss whether Aden shall be given freedom or not, to discuss whether India will be allowed its own rightful place or not. Let on these three issues votes be taken in the Commonwealth and if all those African and Asian nations who stand for revolution, for greatness and for independence vote for these causes then those who do not vote shall not find a place in the Commonwealth. No institution, no organisation, not even a club, has any reason to exist which does not have a purpose and anything trying to exist—even individuals—which loses faith in existence, which loses the purpose has no reason to exist and it shall die.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I thought you would say, not even the Congress.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Mr. Misra, if the Swatantra Party which does not have a cause to exist, nor a reason to exist, continues to exist without any national or international policies, without having any policy, if it chooses to exist, taking bits and pieces from here and there and forming a foreign policy, then certainly it has no cause to exist. Therefore I appeal to Mr. Misra not so much as a Swatantraite but as an Indian—I believe he is an Indian first and a Swatantraite later—that as an Indian, and more than an Indian, as a progressive man believing that this world must progress, we must take up that attitude towards the Commonwealth. In my last speech I had said that the Commonwealth has already come to be dead. It is no more in existence. But I do not want it to die also; I do not want it to die because of the British. The British have no business, to kill any organisation. If their attitude is so much against international co-operation, if their attitude is still a legacy of the past, if their attitude today is such that it does not recognise how democracy, how freedom, how progress can march forward, then the British must cease to exist and not the Commonwealth and therefore I plead with the Foreign Minister and the Government of India through him that we must take steps to call in the first instance a meeting of all the Afro-Asian members of the Commonwealth to take a joint stand and out of this joint stand must emerge a united policy which would bring all the emerging nations of the world together against those who try to suppress us and against those who try to thwart our march forward. Thank you

4 P.M.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. You have only 15 minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, I am glad that we should have had an opportunity to discuss this very important Resolution. Even when I was abroad I was carefully following what the hon. Foreign Minister spoke about the Commonwealth. It appears to me from the Indian papers that he had defended the case just because

he had to defend it. Today he has to make out a case for our continuing in the Commonwealth in the light of the developments in all these 18 years and specially in the recent months. That is what we expect of him. We do not want general sermons on the Commonwealth; that stage is over. When even people in White Dominions are seriously questioning the British conduct from the standpoint of Commonwealth relations it does not behove a Minister of the Government in this country to try to make out as if the relations are all right and that we stand to gain by continuing that system. Madam, Commonwealth relations, as far as Britain is concerned, is a tale of unmitigated double talk and treachery and this is something which can be proved by facts and figures, whatever one may say. You may order a gun salute in honour of the Queen as you did in 1961; the British Queen reciprocated this gesture by making a personal visit to Lisbon in support of Portugal's resistance, Salazar's resistance, against the granting of independence to Goa. It is well known how they behaved over the Goa matter but I do not wish to go into all that. Much has been said about the Kashmir issue and rightly so but that is nothing new. In March 1956 there was a meeting of the SEATO Council in Karachi. After that meeting, Mr. Hamid-ul-Haq Choudhury, Foreign Minister of Pakistan, made a statement in public in which he said and this is very interesting—that "the most notable achievement of the SEATO—at that time SEATO was called SEADO—was the joint affirmation of the members of our stand on Kashmir." I am quoting his words. About the same time Mr. Eden the then Prime Minister of the U.K., declared in public that he was contemplating to make Dacca the Headquarters of SEADO. These are recorded statements. Then immediately after that the Pakistani Ambassador, Mr. Lal Shah Bokhari, who was at that time in Damascus, declared that Pakistan would like to take Kashmir by force if they had the force. Therefore all these things are going on. If you go back to 1951 when the decision to convene Constituent Assembly was announced immediately the British Government called a meeting of the Security Council in order to prevent this and the speech of the British representative in the Security Council was always cited by the Pakistani authorities to

obstruct the convening of the Constituent Assembly. Now that speech is well known. He made that speech I think in March 1951 and that famous Resolution was passed calling upon India not to proceed with it and do nothing to disturb what has been settled in 1948. That is how they behaved even at that time. Then when the Constituent Assembly took this decision—and the Constitution must have come into force in the beginning of 1962; part of it had already been in force—then again the British authorities had a special meeting of the Security Council called in order to obstruct it. That is what they have been doing ever since the so-called Kashmir issue came up or was brought to the forefront and it was in consonance with their policy. Therefore nothing need surprise us today because the Kashmir question is kept alive by them deliberately with a view to carrying on British and American plans on our sub-continent against the people of India and the people of Pakistan but specially against the Indian Republic because the Indian Republic is a non-aligned country and has certain other pursuits in world affairs, pursuits of peace and anti-colonialism which naturally the British do not like.

They want to keep us always involved in trouble so that they can carry on their neo-colonialist designs against the sub-continent, against the peoples of both these countries. Therefore, it should be understood in that context.

Now, we recall the speech of Prime Minister Nehru made on the 27th of April 1949 seeking ratification of the decision of the Prime Ministers' Conference in London about the Commonwealth and if you go through his speech you will find that he had certain expectations. What were those expectations? He felt that by remaining in the Commonwealth India's interests would be served better. He felt that by doing so he would also be in a position to promote the cause of world peace. He felt that the country's defence would also be strengthened having regard to the fact that India had certain relations coming from the British days in regard to defence matters. Now, let us see whether these objectives have been fulfilled. That should be an objective test here. As far as the pursuit of world

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

peace is concerned, we know that in the British Commonwealth, so far as Britain and the White Dominions are concerned, they run counter to the objectives of world peace. Today we have before us the demonstration by the British Government, even by the Labour Government. In Southern Rhodesia, a Government which is accused of having committed treason, which has no legal title whatsoever, the Ian Smith Government, is not being dealt with properly and when the Commonwealth countries are demanding that troops be sent there, in order to put down the treasonable action, ensure that this unilateral declaration of independence is not allowed to pass and prevent the racist regime being established there, they are prevaricating about it. The Labour Party at its conference and otherwise has made it absolutely clear that but for the conduct of the British Government, Mr. Ian Smith and his gang would not have behaved in the atrocious, criminal manner, as they are doing today. Now, this is what is happening in England. I was getting some papers from England recently when I was abroad. Every day page after page carried criticism of the British Government, coming from the supporters of their own Party.

AN HON. MEMBER : Very healthy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That is one thing.

In Aden, what are they doing? In Aden they are putting down with violence and terror, in the typical British way, the freedom struggle. The UN Resolution for terminating colonialism and granting independence is being openly defied by Britain. We cannot do anything about it. Therefore, apart from what they are doing in Pakistan, that should be noted. Now, I can give very many examples, but some examples I should give here. What is this Commonwealth? Oh, so many African members are there. So, we are there. One Minister said : Why should we get out of the Commonwealth. We should drive Britain out of the Commonwealth. It almost sounds like saying : We shall drive Queen Elizabeth out of Buckingham Palace, but the Minister did not say that. Now, these are absurd demagogues. Well, they are there.

Many of these countries would not have come into the Commonwealth but for the fact that India is in the Commonwealth. India provides respectability to the Commonwealth to be abused by the treacherous British ruling class against our country and against the interests of the freedom loving people all over the world. And we should not give an *alibi* to the British in this manner to continue the prestige that we give by our association with the Commonwealth. If we had not remained in the Commonwealth in the way Burma did not remain in the Commonwealth, well, I think many other Afro-Asian nations would not have gone in for the Commonwealth. Even if they did so, what would they have found there? Anyhow, we are a mature nation, with a fairly developed economy, compared to other Afro-Asian countries. We have a long history, a mature political movement, a mature and broad national leadership. We should really show the way, instead of saying that our association is there because others are there. I think we let them in also by our conduct by remaining within the Commonwealth.

I should like to invite the attention of the House to what they did in the Security Council only two months ago. The British Government wanted to invoke article 39 of the Charter in order to declare India an aggressor and seek sanctions against our country. Let Mr. Swaran Singh deny this thing. Why is he holding that story from the country? We have also our means of knowing it and I put it to the House that Mr. Chagla was angry precisely because the British Government wanted to invoke article 39 against our country. They did not succeed, of course. Invocation of article 39 would mean that the Security Council would have declared India an aggressor and that would have given rise to the question of consequential action to deal with such an aggression. Let him say it. Let him say it, because let the world and other nations which are in the Security Council hear a straight denial by them that the British Government did not try to do so. What is our answer to that? What else could be a better treachery? An hon Member here still says that when Mr. Wilson said such a thing, he did not understand what it meant. Mr. Rukhnaswami may be misinterpreted into the Swatantra

Party, but Mr. Wilson is a seasoned politician and he knows what he says. He says what he means.

Now, about other things. Let us first take our sterling balances. In 1945 the AICC passed a resolution about the sterling balances, which Mr. Winston Churchill publicly wanted to expropriate and deny. That resolution criticised the British Government's policy and said the sterling balances should be used for national development in a free India. At that time "we had Rs. 1547 crores as sterling balances. After independence, how did the British behave? In the first instance they sold us rotten defence equipment, which were no good for anybody, for Rs. 134 crores. This is gone. Then, they forced us to pay them tapering annuity of the order of Rs. 296 crores, to pay pension till the lifetime of Her Majesty's servants in India who had retired. In other words, this sum of Rs. 296 crores was provided for paying pension to the butchers of Jallianwalabagh, for people who assaulted the mother of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in the streets of Allahabad, to the men who hanged our patriots and martyrs, who killed Bhagat Singh, who let loose terror and violence unheard of in the annals of British history on our soil. Even today the murderers of Jallianwalabagh are being provided from our sterling balances. Let them deny it. I am quoting from official figures. This is how the sterling balances were eaten up. And then what did they do? Instead of allowing us to draw on the sterling balances—we were entitled to draw Rs. 46 crores every year—they put all kinds of restrictions on us. We could not do so. And then they imposed upon us an unequal balance of trade and started sending all kinds of materials—horses, whiskey, wine and what not—in order to make payments out of the sterling balances. Artificial deficits were created in order to make trade deficits on our account from the sterling balances. That was done. This is the story of the sterling balances, a story of shame and dishonour. It is a story of plunder and downright plunder. Therefore, I say this thing.

Then, what happened? Then came the question of Hyderabad. The British Government openly supported, Mr. Winston

Churchill supported the Nizam of Hyderabad against India and Mr. Winston Churchill made a statement so provocative that even Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel had to call Mr. Winston Churchill to account in a public statement in the Constituent Assembly and asked him to stand before the bar of history and he used very strong words. And then, as you know, Mr. Monckton was sent, in order to give constitutional cover for the Nizam's attempts to declare independence and it was with the help of the British that arms were sent to the Razakars. Crores of rupees were transferred. Out of it Rs. 20 crores were given to Pakistan from a particular account on the Nizam's famous note. The British Government carried out that deal.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, your fifteen minutes are over. You must wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want a few minutes more. I have not even started. I can give many more examples of such things. Therefore, from whatever angle you judge—the example of the Congo, the example of Goa, the example of Hyderabad, the example of Suez; even now they are trying to set up joint naval bases against our country in the Indian Ocean—from whatever angle you judge, from the economic angle and from the defence angle, you cannot remain in it. I have got plenty of facts and figures to show how Britain deliberately sabotaged our defence. If you look at the handbook published in Britain, you will find that it was a planned attempt on the part of the British Government to keep India weak on the defence front. That is why we could not develop our defence. No wonder that when we go to the Soviet Union to buy submarines from that country, objection is at once raised in Britain. Madam, therefore, I say that there are very many things and I think many facts can be given. Therefore, I say today let us not quarrel about the past. I think Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was sentimental in that matter. His speech will be remembered as a piece of good literature and fine wishful thinking. Life has proved that it was an unhappy choice, that it was an incorrect decision, and today we are nationally demanding that India should quit

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
the Commonwealth, and this is the national demand. If the Government believes in the sincerity of the people and is sincere in its tribute to the patriotism of the people, let this patriotic demand be translated into action.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That will do, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, Mr. Awadheshwar Prasad Sinha.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Madam, . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have called on Mr. Awadheshwar Prasad Sinha. You have finished your sentence.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am just finishing. If we withdraw, our prestige will go up. We shall not lose on our economic front. That is what I say, and politically we will be in a better position to mobilise the people in defence of our interests and in promoting the cause of world peace and anti-colonialism.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA (Bihar) : Madam Deputy Chairman, before I speak on the resolution, I express my great satisfaction at the safe and healthy return of my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta from Russia after treatment. Though I differ from him, I treat him as my good friend and my younger brother. I have listened to him with great interest and I would like to tell him that on the issue of our leaving the Commonwealth or staying in the Commonwealth, he has been totally irrelevant. But I have listened to him and I would beg of him to listen to me also patiently.

My friend, Mr. Dharia, moved this resolution and said things very feelingly about the attitude of the British towards us during the Indo-Pakistan conflict. Shri Chandra Shekhar also spoke about it. My friend, Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy, also spoke about it, and just now a great catalogue of things has been described by my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta. But I dare say, Madam, that all this, whether true or partially true, is totally irrelevant to the issue.

Even the Britishers in one of their statements, recently the Prime Minister of Great Britain, called it the Modern Commonwealth. It is an obsession with us, this word "British", even when the Britishers themselves called it the British Commonwealth. I would like to remind the House that we entered this Commonwealth when we became a Republic. Before that we were drafting our Constitution and we had the Governor-General, Lord Mountbatten; he was there; then our great leader, Shri Rajagopalachari was there. When we entered the Commonwealth, we entered as a Republic. Madam, the Britishers have no written Constitution of their own. We have a written Constitution. In our Constitution the word "Commonwealth" does not occur anywhere. Mr. Swaran Singh can rise up just now and say we are out of it. So, this is quite a unique organisation in the world. This is not like the Warsaw Pact; this is not like SEATO or CENTO or NATO. This is a voluntary sort of Prime Ministers meeting and discussing things and then going back and doing what their country demands them to do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : May I ask one question ?

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA : I have not put you any question. I have listened to you. I felt like putting to you many questions. But when I was appealing to you, you were talking to somebody else. So please do not disturb me. I have limited time at my disposal. So, Pandit Nehru knew that Pakistan was there. Pandit Nehru knew the attitude of the Britishers that in the U.N.O. they were pro-Pakistan so far as Kashmir was concerned. He did not do it for sentimental reasons. People say that his love for Kashmir was sentimental. It has been proved today that when Shri Lal Bahadur went to Kashmir along with Panditji in 1954—he saw Kashmir for the first time in 1954—Shri Lal Bahadur saw under his leadership what reply India had given to Pakistan on Kashmir. Pandit Nehru is no more, and it was, Madam, a very rude shock to me when Mr. Attlee, an old man for whom we have great respect, remarked when the Indo-Pakistan war was going on : "When Nehru was there, I thought Kashmir was an obsession with him. But

now when Nehru is no more, things would depend on reason." But let Mr. Attlee come to India, we will give him, in spite of this statement, a great welcome. I will take him to the remote corners of India, Cape Comorin or Assam or Maharashtra or Bihar or anywhere. Let him ask the peasants what they feel about Kashmir. They feel that if Kashmir goes, India goes. India has given its word of honour to the people of Kashmir that we are with them, and so we must be with them through thick and thin. So when we entered this Commonwealth, we knew that the Britishers were not with us so far as Kashmir was concerned.

Madam, we have a certain weakness in our mind. We think that only the help of Britain can help us to retain Kashmir. No, no. Not even thousand Britains can prevent India from retaining Kashmir in the Indian Union. We will have it in spite of Great Britain. What Mr. Swaran Singh did there at the U.N.O.? What great difficulty he had, and he knew the Britishers, the way they behaved. He knew much more than all the catalogue of things my friends have said. He knows where the shoe pinches. He knows what is relevant and what is irrelevant. All praise to him, all congratulations to the Foreign Minister, that in spite of all that he saw to it that the resolution that came, the second resolution was just a shadow of the first resolution. Mr. Bhutto came back more or less weeping. Such a great success Mr. Swaran Singh achieved. But after having that experience, that bitter experience, Mr. Swaran Singh comes and tells us in both the Houses that we should not come out of the Commonwealth in a huff. We should think over it, and it is not a bilateral thing between Great Britain and India. Here, I have to say I have great respect for Mr. Ruthnaswamy; we have a lot of differences in socio-economic matters; we are poles apart; but whenever he speaks, I listen to him with respect because he has his arguments. He knows how to put things, and I am told that some of our Ministers were his students. He has been a teacher all his life, and I put myself in the position, though I am a colleague of his in Parliament, of a student to hear what new points he is going to cover, whether I agree or differ from him. Today when he is trying to say

about Kashmir what Mr. Wilson said or did not say, I would tell him most respectfully that it is not relevant to the issue at all. But that is relevant to the issue of the relationship between Great Britain and India. If that is discussed, we can say a lot. I myself felt a great deal about it. Even now I am feeling about it—that the supply of armaments by private firms about which commitments had been made has been stopped till now. This stoppage of those armaments would harm India. But so far as the relationship between Britain and India is concerned, I am second to none, for its progressive improvement in spite of this feeling. After all, I have served the Congress and served this country during the last 44 years ever since I was 14 years old and I had been put in jail for years and years. But that suffering and resultant bitterness were turned into harmony and goodwill by Mahatmaji, by his magic touch. And we do not now talk of Jallianwala Bagh; we talk of the present and the future. That is the difference between ourselves and others. So, when Sardar Swaran Singh says, after his experience at the UNO where he had laboured day and night with all sorts of intrigues to be overcome, that we should not do anything in haste, that we should think over it, why does he say so? Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was a great man of vision and idealism. He knew that the Britishers were not soft towards us so far as Kashmir was concerned. Knowing that, he joined the Commonwealth and by joining that, he changed the very structure, the very foundation, of the Commonwealth. Recently, Mr. Wilson paid a tribute to Mr. Nehru on the 14th November. I forgot to bring that piece here. He said that Mr. Nehru was one of the builders of modern Commonwealth, one from whom the Commonwealth had got sustenance. The African countries are there. I tell you, I have knowledge about the African countries. My friend, Shri Gujral, was waxing eloquent about the countries. But none of them wants to leave the Commonwealth. Ceylon, Malaya and Singapore do not want to leave it. I am not talking about Pakistan. So, why should we leave the Commonwealth? Have we no faith in Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri that he will make his presence felt there? How did he function when he went there last time? We should try to know it.

[Shri Awadheshwar Prasad Sinha.]

He dominated the scene there. We were not led there, we tried to lead the Commonwealth. Then, why should we leave that forum?

My Communist friends have always opposed it. I heard their arguments about Britain's attitude in the Indo-Pakistan conflict. Ever since we entered Parliament, ever since 1952, they have been talking against this Commonwealth, that we should go out of it. But in that there is not much point to be covered. But I ask : So long as the Government of India feels, so long as Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri feels, so long as Sardar Swaran Singh feels, that we will be effective there, that we will be useful there, why tear off this sort of relationship? In these days of division, dissension, animosity and malice in the world, why should we not cling to it and try to make good use of this thing? My Communist friends are there. Let Soviet Russia have some sort of organisation, a loose organisation, like this, with no constitution, but just like this, with some progressive countries in the world, and I would request and advise my Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs to join that sort of organisation also, provided it is as free and as independent as this organisation which we can leave at will. It is nowhere written, nowhere signed that "hereby we choose to be a member of the Commonwealth." We have not to send in any resignation; we have just to say that we want to go and we go. The Commonwealth is a useful association; we have to be there. We should not consider the bilateral relationship of Britain and India only and make the mistake of leaving the Commonwealth. That is a foolish thing; it is very bad. And the Britishers must take note of what our young men are saying about their behaviour during these days. They must make a note of it if they care to have good relationship with us. I entirely agree with Shri Gujral, Shri Dharia, Shri Chandra Shekhar and others. But our being in the Commonwealth is quite a different issue. We are there quite effective and we must be there. If we leave that place, we will harm ourselves and not the Britishers. So, we should not make this mistake in anger and take Great Britain as if it is the Commonwealth itself. It is a great mistake.

Therefore, though I have great regard

and love for Shri Dharia—he is a young man and he has put forward his points in a very sober manner—I am very sorry that I have to oppose the Resolution.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJ-PYE (Nominated) : I rise to oppose the Resolution . . .

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN (Andhra Pradesh) : Why?

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJ-PYE : My hon. friends will soon know why. If they are afraid that I am holding a brief for the United Kingdom, I can assure them that I am doing no such thing.

I heard most of the speeches that were delivered in the House this afternoon and I found that this anger and wrath against Great Britain was caused because of her attitude towards us during the recent hostilities of ours with Pakistan—or rather hostilities of Pakistan with us, I should say. They were shocked but I may assure them that I did not feel that much shocked, may be because I am older and they are young.

Looking back even to 1911 and 1912 when the Morley-Minto Reforms came into being, we would realise that it was during those times, over fifty years ago, that Britain had very laboriously injected this poison of communalism into our body politics. It worked itself up and we find that in 1947 it led to the partition of this great sub-continent. That is history; everybody knows it. And realising that the facts were such and also that it was a Labour Government, a Socialist Government, which was in power when partition came into existence, when India was partitioned, it was no surprise to me that the United Kingdom took that attitude which she did. When the Kutch Agreement was signed, we put too much of faith in Great Britain. I remember our External Affairs Minister and even our Prime Minister hopefully looking at Britain to solve this problem of the Kutch frontier. I am afraid, though it was to our dissatisfaction, we had to accept it. And again, when the hostilities with Pakistan came about, we thought

that the United Kingdom would take a just and impartial attitude looking at things as they were, but she did not. I was not surprised because, as everybody knows, Pakistan is her baby; divide and rule has been her policy for years not only in regard to India but in regard to Ireland and in regard to every other colony where she had her rule. And it is nothing to be surprised at. It is something to be watchful about, something to remember and something on which to formulate our policy as we go along.

The reason why I oppose this Resolution is that it would be really unwise, imprudent, for us to equate the Commonwealth with the United Kingdom. The Commonwealth is a totally different thing. It is an economic relationship between the different States. I know; even there, from the economic point of view, we have to suffer because sometimes spokes are put in the way of our trade and so on and we do not get the benefits that we should. But we have got to fight for it. India is a young nation, I know. It has not come of age; it is only 18 years old. But we have got to realise that we have to be practical, we have got to know our own interests and we must give up this sentimental belief in having permanent friends. My friend Shri Dharia, quoted the popular—well-known, English saying that the English have no permanent friends, the English have only permanent interests. It is about time that we took notice of that adage. And I can say no country has permanent friends. Every country should think of its own interests and should act accordingly.

Permanent friends are impossible. Even in a family nobody is willing to give up power. A mother does not like to give up power in favour of her daughter and does things according to her wishes. What a mother-in-law does is well-known all over the world. Even a father does not like his son to look into the affairs of the family. The father resents when the son asks the father to retire or take rest. Nobody likes to give up power. And U.K. is not going to give up power without being made to give it up. We must realise that. There is another thing. I am afraid I do not know how much more time I have.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You get in all 15 minutes. You have taken five minutes.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJ-PYE: Then, Madam, there is another point that we must consider. This point can be a point which we can work up in our favour and that is this. A number of African States are members of this Commonwealth. It is up to us to build up friendly and sympathetic relations with them. Fortunately or unfortunately, quite a number of our own people are residents in these different African States. The relations of these people—I have not been there, but from what I hear and from what I read I can say—with the African communities of these States are not always amicable. Now it is up to us, Madam, to see that these relations turn out to be amicable. It is for us to throw in our lot with the African inhabitants of those States, and if we could win their sympathy, win their friendship, I am sure, we will have a very strong position in the Commonwealth, and we need not be led by the nose by the U.K. We have got to see that such a thing comes up.

We have to desist from being exploiters in these African States as the White people have been so far. I know it is going to be difficult. As I just said nobody wants to give up power or the economic or financial position that he has established. But if we have to march along, if we have to keep our place in this world, we have got to realise practical issues, we have to realise what we should do for our own development and for our own place in this world.

About this Commonwealth and the different conferences and meetings of the Prime Ministers of the Commonwealth, they take place usually in the U.K. I think it is about time that the different States demanded that these meetings take place in rotation in every State.

The Finance Ministers met in Pakistan recently and we did not attend that meeting. But, that apart, the Prime Ministers' meets should be in different States of the Commonwealth and not only in the U.K. It is absolutely obvious that if the States

[Shrimati Shakuntala Paranjpye.]

of the Commonwealth work together and work for their own development and realise how they are being gripped into a servile position, they will improve. I know at present the case of Rhodesia is very much in the limelight. I know that U.K. is not playing her part as she should. I know she is prevaricating, as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said. I know she is not wanting to give help, not wanting to send her forces into Southern Rhodesia to see that the rebel government is put down. And even in sending her forces to Zambia she has been very halting and very miserly. But still things cannot last that way. Things will have to change. If we look how Britain has lost her power, has lost her place of a first-rate nation gradually, we need have no fear and we need not support this Resolution, and we need not quit the Commonwealth. We can use the Commonwealth for our own benefit, for the benefit of the whole human race.

Thank you.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : Madam, we have realised that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is back in his seat in the House and that it is no longer the old, sedate, colourless House that we face now. It is again a House full of thundering noise and continuous interruptions and so on though at the moment he is not in his seat. I wish he had been here to interrupt me too!

There have been two specific views expressed today. They may be largely divided into two specific categories. One is represented by Mr. Ruthnaswamy and the other by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I have an idea, Madam, that there never will be a reconciliation between the views of Mr. Ruthnaswamy and Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. Luckily, as an Independent, as I have sometimes mentioned before, I sit in the middle and I can look to the left and I can look to the right and take a somewhat detached view of what is going on.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : It is from this point of view we look to you.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : Naturally I welcome it. I expect full reciprocity from you.

I wish to go back a moment, Madam, to the background of this question. It has a very vital and illuminating background. It was in 1923, as far back as that, that for the first time an Englishman, and no less a person than the late Mr. C. F. Andrews, published a booklet entitled, "The Immediate Need for Independence". His theory, which he expounded in that booklet, was that India can never be a dominion, and that if India became a dominion and joined the British Commonwealth, it would cease to be a British Commonwealth. With her vast number of people and the biggest pulling power and strength, India would be the centre of the Commonwealth. Mr. Andrews thought that then the British might well drop out.

After a few months, in 1923, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru was speaking as the President of the U.P. Provincial Conference at Gorakhpur, and for the first time he said that the aim of the Congress movement for freedom, could never be Dominion Status, but only Independence. Then Gandhiji was very much in the picture. For many years he held the view, "Inside the Commonwealth if possible, outside if necessary". But it was only at the Lahore Congress that ultimately India voted that we shall be independent, and have no truck with Dominion Status. Gandhi and Nehru had a long and fruitful quarrel over this till Nehru converted Gandhi and Gandhi accepted Independence as the goal. But most curiously when India did become independent and we established the Republic of India, we voted to be in the Commonwealth. This is one of the most astonishing things that have ever happened in this country.

My friend, Mr. Chandra Shekhar, analysed events and said that Pt. Nehru was a gullible man who believed in the vague promises of British imperialists. What can be a greater insult to the memory of that great hero of India, the man of dauntless courage and of a will of steel than to say that he was ignorant enough to be carried away by the promises of imperialists? It was not that at all. Again, somebody said that it was Shri V. K. Krishna Menon who, on this matter, influenced Pt. Nehru. I do not think so far one moment. Pt. Nehru was influenced by nobody except

that he was influenced by right thinking, a correct diagnosis and proper study of the situation. But he had a genius of making people think that he had accepted somebody's advice when it was really his own advice to himself.

So if somebody believes that Mr. Krishna Menon influenced him, or if Mr. Krishna Menon himself is under that illusion, we should leave all of them to their illusions. Pandit Nehru was the one internationalist of this country who understood world affairs better than any man in this country. Mahatma Gandhi himself was a child before Nehru in international affairs. Mahatma Gandhi always accepted Pandit Nehru as his conscience keeper in international affairs. Now when Nehru said: "Let the Indian Republic remain inside the Commonwealth", he was not transforming the Republic of India. He was completely transforming the Commonwealth which became no longer a British Commonwealth. For the first time a Republic became a member of the Commonwealth. It was an astonishing thing and the resilience of the British mind is such that when it suits Britain it will accept any compromise. Britain accepted this compromise and to-day we have this Commonwealth. We are the biggest pulling power in this Commonwealth. Somebody said, and correctly that it is because India is in the Commonwealth that there is a Commonwealth and no one knows this better than the British people and the Prime Minister of England. He knows it very well that if India walks out of the Commonwealth, there will be no more a Commonwealth. If India walks out, the African nations will take no time in walking out. All the trump cards are in our hands. Why are we then so panicky? All the power is in our hands and we can take a decision in the Commonwealth which nobody can challenge. In such a setting, why should we run away turning tail upon the Commonwealth?

(Interruptions.)

Let me go on. I was very pleased that some Congress members were opposing this Resolution. It shows the interplay of democracy in Congress ranks. But I come back to this that it is not necessary for

us to take a decision in panic, in anger, in haste or in any kind of huff whatsoever. We can deliberately do a thing when we want it. Nobody has compelled us to be in the Commonwealth. It is an act of free choice and it is because of this act of free choice that the biggest Republic of the world is inside the Commonwealth. We can choose our time and we can choose our method to leave. My own thesis is that this Commonwealth is so full of contradictions inside that it will explode one day. It has not yet fully exploded. Rhodesia seems to be one point of explosion. It is not necessary for us to take upon ourselves the onus of walking out. Why should we walk out of a place where we hold all the trump cards? Now, supposing there is a mistake which the British Government commits, as they did in attacking Egypt, and Pandit Nehru, as the Prime Minister of this Republic told the British Government: "What you are doing is unmitigated wrong" he could do as freely. I do not think they have ever forgiven India for that. It is still rankling in their minds. If today again something happens which is not right, which is not good for the Commonwealth, Mr. Shastri can stand up and say: 'What you do is wrong and we will not accept it' and the cue will be taken by every nation in Africa and several other nations in Asia. So it is not necessary that we should now, in a huff, walk out. We must stand up against wrong decisions inside the Commonwealth.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL
AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH):
We have said so in regard to Rhodesia

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: Absolutely. Now supposing there is another Commonwealth Prime Ministers' meeting, the biggest issue will be Rhodesia. I think the British Government will not call a Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference too quickly but if there is a conference of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers, Rhodesia will be on the table and the British Government will have to tremble before the attack that will be delivered at the table against what is happening in Rhodesia, and we can make it an issue. There is nothing to prevent us from making this an issue. If we make it an issue and

[Shri G. Ramachandran.]

then Britain herself quakes and if Britain herself says: 'We cannot meet this challenge' then it will be a startling situation. So what I would say in conclusion is that there is a vital historical background to this place which the Republic of India occupies to-day in the Commonwealth. It is not for us to act in the spirit of a high school boy in a huff. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta luckily to-day used the word that India is a very mature nation. I hope he means it. If we are mature, we must act like mature people. We cannot act in the spirit of a high school boy to whom some gift has been refused. It is not a matter of rupees, annas and pies between India and Britain. It is not a matter whether the trade balance between India and England would be favourable to one side or the other. It is not even a matter whether they would give us some guns and planes. The matter is one in which we have a great conglomeration of free people in a free association in which we are also there by a free choice of ours. We can walk out tomorrow but it is for us to see, like good statesmen, like a nation committed to certain big issues in this world, whether this Commonwealth can continue to be utilised for the benefit of mankind and the moment we realise that it cannot, it is for us to leave it and when we leave it, it collapses. So let us take that kind of a look at this problem and there is nothing lost by not acting in a hurry. Thank you.

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE: Madam, I was wondering in the recess of my own mind if the Resolution, as framed, does not betray a sense of frustration. The Resolution suggests at any rate that we are suffering from what may be called inferiority complex. Why should we leave the Commonwealth? Should we leave it because a British Prime Minister happened to have failed to sympathise with us on a particular occasion? Why cannot we overpower the British sentiments and obtuseness such as they are to-day and make Britain realise our stand in international affairs? Many arguments have been employed in support of the proposition that we should leave the Commonwealth but they appear to me to relate to facts of ancient history pressed into modern service. What the Britishers did at the time of the Suez Canal incident or what

they did at the time they left India or what they did in Congo have been relied upon for the purpose of supporting the Resolution that India should at once quit the Commonwealth. We must take the realities of the situation into account, take up a strong attitude consistent with our own self-respect in the present context of events and tell the Britishers to leave the Commonwealth rather than leave ourselves. I think that this Resolution conceals a spirit of defeatism and surrender. It is nowhere laid down that unless we toe the British line we can never continue in the Commonwealth. If it is a fact, which I think it is that we are a powerful factor to be reckoned within the Commonwealth, then of course we can influence the decision of that body as a whole. If we cannot do that, then only it can be said that we have failed to achieve our purpose. Therefore, I submit with due respect to the sponsors of this Resolution that it would be all wrong to leave the Commonwealth in a spirit of disgust or of anger.

In politics there is hardly any scope for the play of passions. Now one speaker characterised our late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru as a sentimental person who yoked India to the Commonwealth for reasons which can only be called sentimental. I fear, Madam, the speaker himself grew sentimental and he tried to force upon the attention of the House certain arguments which have little relevancy at the present moment. The question of Britain's African policy in the past has also been raised with a view to showing that the Britishers are not playing the game. It has also been said that they have not played fair with Aden, Kenya and Zambia. I submit, Madam, these are considerations which are irrelevant to the present issue. With regard to the present-day problem involving Southern Rhodesia, I think India has made her position perfectly clear. She has made it plain to all concerned that she is not prepared to support any move which will give encouragement to the rebel Government which is now functioning in Rhodesia. If these are the only facts, then I think there is no reason for our leaving the Commonwealth. Now the question that may arise is whether we are in a position to influence the collective decision of the Commonwealth and compel

those who are against our progressive ideas and do not see eye to eye with us, to leave the Commonwealth. Madam, one speaker emphasised the fact that even today in Scotland there is ill feeling towards the Britishers. I am not sure if that is a correct statement. Whatever that may be, I think that in the Commonwealth, as it functions today, and as it is constituted at the moment, India can very well influence the collective decisions of that body, and can at any rate play a significant part in its decision making. If that is the position, there is no reason why India should leave the Commonwealth in a huff. The British Queen being the titular head of the Commonwealth is cited as a point in support of the Resolution. I submit, Madam, that again is a very sentimental point. The real consideration is whether we stand to gain or stand to lose by remaining in the Commonwealth. That is the question which we have to decide. As one of my friends very rightly pointed out, it is not always a question of pounds, shillings and pence. It is the question of the nation's integrity, of the nation's stand being vindicated, and that is the all important consideration in deciding whether we shall continue in the Commonwealth. If anger prevails, if passion is allowed to rule the consideration of the matter, then I fear, Madam, we shall be making a mistake. If in some future time we find that it is not worthwhile for us to continue in the Commonwealth, surely it will then become our duty to leave it. But simply because . . .

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : If Mr. Mookerjee is prepared to move an amendment to the Resolution that India should try to expel Britain out of the Commonwealth, then I am prepared to amend my Resolution accordingly.

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE : I am just now opposing the Resolution. As I said, if it appears at any future time that we cannot usefully continue as a member of that Commonwealth organisation, there will be no hesitation to leave it. Well, India is not like a Hindu wife who, until recently, had been in the position of being once a wife, always a wife; but India having once

been a member of the Commonwealth need not always, in all circumstances, continue to be tied to it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am afraid, Mr. Mookerjee, it is 5 P.M.

SHRI DEBABRATA MOOKERJEE : I oppose the Resolution with these words.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : With your permission, Madam, I want to move a motion, and I am prepared to amend it if you so suggest. Now I will invite your attention to rule 20, Madam, you will agree that the matter has not been adequately discussed, a matter of great importance. Therefore, I would like that we discuss it further in the next session, keeping it alive, and I am moving :

"That the debate on this Resolution be adjourned to the next day allotted for Private Members' Business."

Now I would also like this to be added in continuation "in the next session as the first item on that day." Now I have read out separately this part. Normally, unless a Resolution is passed or is otherwise disposed of, say, defeated, during a session, the Resolution will lapse, and in this case this Resolution will lapse and for a whole year this House may not be in a position even to bring up a Resolution of this kind and table it. Therefore we should not preclude ourselves. I think the House will agree. Let this matter be discussed and let us come to some conclusion. There will be time also. I would request that the House agrees to the suggestion that I have made. There is nothing in the rules that prevents you from keeping it alive for the next session.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The normal practice is that Resolutions are not carried over to the next session. However I shall put it to the House and take the sense of the House. So I am putting it to the House for carrying over this debate to the next session. Your motion is what you

[The Deputy Chairman.]
said. Now will you please move your motion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : My motion is, I beg to move :—

“that the debate on this Resolution be adjourned to the next day allotted for Private Members’ Business in the next session.”

The question was put and the motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday.

The House then adjourned at four minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 6th December, 1965.