

12-00½ hrs.

BOMBAY REORGANISATION BILL*

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. B. Pant): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the State of Bombay and for matters connected therewith.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the State of Bombay and for matters connected therewith."

The motion was adopted.

Shri G. B. Pant: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): I want a clarification about a point of law. The States have all been enumerated in the Constitution. It is not that I am objecting to the introduction of the Bill; the House has agreed to it. I only want to see how we should proceed in the matter. Shall we first amend the Constitution and provide for another additional State as and when it is enacted or shall we first enact legislation and then bring it in the list of the Constitution?

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to give any advice. When the matter arises once again at the consideration stage, if the hon. Member wants to make any reference to this, then it will be time for me to consider and then the hon. Home Minister will consider all these matters.

Shri Tyagi: My fears are that the Bill cannot be permitted according to the Constitution . . .

Mr. Speaker: I cannot help him.

Shri Tyagi: Because, unless we provide for the additional State in the Constitution, we cannot create a State

because the States have been limited; their number is limited in the Constitution and we cannot have a fresh State unless we amend the Constitution providing for another State.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid the hon. Member is a little too late. When I put the question whether leave should be granted or not, he must have immediately opposed or supported or asked for an opportunity to speak on this matter. He has lost the bus. When it comes to the consideration stage, he can make the suggestions to the hon. Home Minister and he will consider everything. If he is not satisfied he can oppose it or do anything he like at the consideration stage.

12-12 hrs.

RELIGIOUS TRUSTS BILL*

The Deputy Minister of Law (Shri Hajarnavis): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the better supervision and administration of certain religious trusts.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the better supervision and administration of certain religious trusts."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Hajarnavis: Sir, I beg to introduce the Bill.

12-12½ hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: POLICE FIRING IN SOUTH AFRICA

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I gave notice of a Resolution which I intended moving today. With your permission and the permission of the House,

*Published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II—Section 2, dated 28-3-60.

†Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru].

I should like to make a very minor alteration, a verbal one, in it—inclusion of the name of a place—to make it a more factually correct Resolution. May I read it in the amended form?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I beg to move:

"That this House deplures and records its deep sorrow at the tragic incidents which occurred at Sharpeville and in Langa township near Capetown in South Africa on March 21, 1960, resulting in the death of a large number of Africans from police firing. It sends its deep sympathy to the Africans who have suffered from this firing and from the policy of racial discrimination and the suppression of the African people in their own homeland."

Sir, the other day, when mention was made about this tragic incident in this House, I ventured to say something and to express a sense of shock which, not only this House, but the whole country had experienced on receipt of this news from South Africa. Now, the Resolution I am moving is, as the House will see, if I may use the word, a moderately-worded resolution. It has been deliberately worded in that way, not because any of us feel very moderately about this matter because it is a matter in which strong feelings are aroused and have been aroused in this House and in this country and over a great part of the world. Nevertheless, I thought that it would be in keeping with the dignity of this House and of Parliament if we should express ourselves in this restrained and moderate and rather limited way rather than use strong language. The matter is too serious merely to be disposed of by strong language or any language. It is not the custom of this House normally to consider such

matters which are supposed to be in the internal jurisdiction of another country nor indeed would we like the other countries to consider matters in the internal jurisdiction of this country. That is the normal practice; it is the right practice. Nevertheless, sometimes, things happen and occurrences take place which are not normal at all but which, they are exceedingly abnormal and they become difficult and undesirable for some normal convention to come in the way of the expression of the feeling which is deep-seated and powerful. After all, this House is and ought to be, to some extent a mirror of our people's feelings and therefore, although this is not a normal procedure, we felt that this House should be given an opportunity of expressing the strong feelings which it has, in regard to these tragic incidents.

It is bad enough for a large number of people to be killed or for there being a mass killing as there has been in this place in South Africa a week ago. It is worse to have this killing in the manner it was done, so far as accounts have appeared. You must remember that behind all these lies a certain deliberate policy which the South African Union Government is pursuing. This is perhaps not the time to discuss in any detail that policy, the policy of segregation, apartheid or, however it is called. But it is well to remember all the same what this policy means, both in theory and in principle and in practice. In principle and in theory it is the negation of everything that the U.N. stands for and we stand for, of course. I am putting it from the larger ground of what the U.N. and the U.N. Charter stand for. It is the negation of what presumably every civilised Government today stands for or should stand for. That is a serious matter.

Not too long ago, when voices were raised in a great part of the world denouncing the racial policies of the

Nazi regime in Germany and a great war took place bringing enormous slaughter in its train, it was said that partly at least—there were many reasons—it was because of those racial policies which the old Nazi Government pursued on the basis of master race, with the right not only to suppress but to exterminate people belonging to some other race, which they thought was almost a sub-human race. Now, that policy, in principle, is adopted and openly proclaimed in the South African Union and as has been often stated in this House, that can only lead to disaster because it is impossible to conceive that other countries of South Africa or indeed of any other part of the world would accept that or submit to that policy. That is the question of principle—*apartheid*. But in regard to the actual practice of it, I wonder how far hon. Members are really aware of the details of how the Africans have to live, what they have to submit to, to what conditions of living, where families are torn as under, husband from the wife, father from the son. Without special permission, they cannot leave; they cannot move or do anything without special permits and passes. They may have lived in a place for a whole generation but if they have got a little work outside that place they have to leave that immediately, within a question of hours. But I am not going into that. What I am only pointing out is that it is not merely a question of theory—important as it is, the question of principle; and theory—but a question of the practice, the enormous burden that is cast upon them, the African people, by the Government there. They are, as I said, the people whose homeland is that country. They are not aliens; they do not come from elsewhere. The people of Indian descent in South Africa, as we all know, and remember, have had to put up with a great deal of discrimination and suffering and we have resented that. But we must remember also the African people have to put up with

something infinitely more than that and our sympathies must go out to them, therefore, even more than to our kith and kin there.

I am moving this resolution today just a week after these occurrences. It so happened today has been declared by some African organisations as a day of mourning, and perhaps, therefore, it is to some extent appropriate that this resolution should be considered by this House on this day of mourning.

The other day the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom visited Africa and I think in South Africa itself he referred to what he called a wind of change coming or blowing across the African continent. That was a moderate reference to the ferments and tempests that are taking place in Africa. But whatever that may be, it is clear that the policy of the South African Union Government has not taken into consideration these changes, or knowing them, realising them, nevertheless is not going to be affected by them. And they introduce this system, namely, every person has to carry a pass wherever he goes, and he must not go in this area or that area. The House will try to think of it: if every person has to carry a pass all the time, going from one part of the area to another and to be harassed by the police, it is the life not of even a normally semi-free person, but almost the life of a prisoner on ticket or leave. That is what the African population of the South African Union has been reduced to, and it is not surprising that they have resented it and protested against it.

I cannot say without much further knowledge the sequence of events that happened there, but broadly speaking, it was a peaceful protest, as far as we know. There might have been some violence but I cannot say definitely. But the fact remains that these people who were protesting in the main peacefully were mowed down by machine-guns: while at the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

same time, to terrify them, I suppose, jet aircraft were flying overhead and all kinds of military machines surrounded them.

Something terrible has happened there; something terrible not only on that particular occasion but in the context of the modern world; and it is not surprising that there has been this great reaction all over the world, and I believe the matter is going to be brought before the United Nations.

Now, the United Nations Organisation also, normally, does not interfere in the internal affairs of another country although there have been cases when it has interfered and rightly interfered in giving consideration to those matters. It may be said that this is not a matter for the United Nations—a matter that is likely to lead to violation of international peace and security, that is, the charter of the United Nations. Well, in that sense, in the strict sense of the world, perhaps it is not. But in any real sense of that word, of that phrase, it is very much a matter in which the United Nations, as representing the international community, should consider this, because it involves something of the most intimate concern to humanity itself.

This problem is dividing today, and will divide even more, humanity into large differing and conflicting sections. It means something even worse than a normal war between nations, something of racial conflict spread all over the globe. I do not say all these things will come but they may come and they will undoubtedly come if this kind of policy is persisted in.

So, this matter is not one merely affecting the South African Union. It affects the whole of Africa and indeed it affects all of us, whatever we may be. It is an odd position that a member of the United Nations is using its State power for suppression, for the assertion of its racial superiority

within its territory; that is the question; using the State power in doing something which is objected to and denied by the United Nations in its charter.

This is the background. These are the problems that are likely to arise in the future. Because of this, I have ventured to put forward this resolution for the consideration of this House. Sir, I move.

Mr. Speaker: Resolution moved:

"That this House deploras and records its deep sorrow at the tragic incidents which occurred at Sharpeville and in Langa township near Capetown in South Africa on March, 21, 1960, resulting in the death of a large number of Africans from police firing. It sends its deep sympathy to the Africans who have suffered from this firing and from the policy of racial discrimination and the suppression of the African people in their own homeland."

Shri Braj Raj Singh: (Ferozabad): Sir, I may be permitted to move my substitute resolution. I would like to add Sharepeville and Langa at the appropriate place in the resolution which was given notice of.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I beg to move:

That for the original resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"That this House views with great concern the rising tide of racialism in South Africa resulting in the ruthless suppression with violence of a great majority of the population in Sharepeville and Langa townships and trusts that these brutal methods will rouse the conscience of humanity all over the world against the policy of the South

African Government which runs counter to all canons of civilised Government and deserves not only the condemnation of mankind but the assertion of such a forceful worldwide opinion as would make it impossible for the South African Government to pursue its present policy of racialism and ruthlessness." (1)

Shri Khadlikar (Ahmedabad): I may be permitted to move my resolution with a slight verbal change.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri Khadlikar: I beg to move:

That for the original resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"That this House expresses its deep sense of shock and of sorrow at the outrageous firing that took place in Langa township near Capetown in South Africa and in Sharpville near Johannesburg on March 21, 1960, in which the police killed, wounded and maimed for life, a large number of unarmed and peaceful African men, women and children. It sends its heartfelt sympathy to the Africans who have suffered in the massacre and condemns the policy of apartheid being ruthlessly enforced by the white settlers against Africans in their own homeland. While assuring the Africans of its full support, it appeals to the people of the world to stand by the Africans, in a spirit of brotherhood, in their struggle for political freedom, social equality and human dignity.

And it appeals to the United Nations Organisation to outlaw the South African Government for its unabashed disregard and violation of the Charter of the Fundamental Human Rights." (2)

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): I beg to move:

That in the resolutions—add at the end—

"and condemns the South African Government for meticulously executing this policy of racial segregation leading to mass-massacre of men, women and children."

Shri Khushwaqt Rai (Kheri): Since the name "Sharpville" has been included in the Prime Minister's resolution, I need not move my amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, it has already been incorporated in the Prime Minister's resolution.

Shri Radha Raman (Chandni Chowk): What is the time allotted for this resolution?

Mr. Speaker: I hope the discussion will proceed in the spirit in which the resolution has been moved. We do not ordinarily, as the Prime Minister has referred, take notice of events that occur in any particular country. But this is not an event which is of a political nature. It is a human one, a moral issue. It is a negation of the human rights that have been declared and it affects the conscience of the world. In that spirit, discussion may go on and we may express our deep sense of sorrow. One Member from each group may take part and try to be as brief as possible.

An Hon. Member: What about the time?

Mr. Speaker: We shall have half an hour.

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City—Central): Mr. Speaker Sir, I rise to support the resolution moved by the hon. Prime Minister and I agree with the sentiments that he expressed while moving the resolution. What is happening in Africa is a sort of a war of liberation that began with the end of the second World War, out of which

[Shri S. A. Dange]

many countries in Asia realised their freedom. That wave is now passing over Africa. But as usual, the imperialist rulers do not realise the strength of that wave nor do they realise the necessity of bowing down to that. Therefore, they are resisting. —but resisting in a peculiar way, in the most inhuman way, but which may not be very surprising.

I am sure in the end the African people are bound to be victorious. But in this fight for their victory, what is the role that we should play and the role that the other powers concerned should play? For example, the minority of white racists and imperialists who rule in South Africa are certainly not doing it on their own. They were planted there by big powers in search of gold, diamonds, mineral wealth and the cheap labour of Africans. First they exported the Africans as slaves to build their plantations. Now they have planted their own racists inside Africa and converted the whole continent into a pit of slavery.

Under these circumstances, a serious duty devolves upon those powers particularly who hold the colonies in the continent of Africa and who directly or indirectly support racial discrimination, whether in Africa or in their own lands. Therefore, it would be very appropriate for us to make a move in the United Nations that this sort of rule that is going on should be condemned and the United Nations, in terms of its Charter, should express its opinion on that.

Secondly we should see that when our Prime Minister meets the others in the Commonwealth Conference—I am sure he will do it—he should bring the whole thing to the attention of the people in such a way that their conscience is moved and make them feel that they can affect events in South Africa far more than what we can do from here. For example, if England, America and France do decide to stop this racial discrimination in South Africa, I am quite sure the

South African racists will bow down to their decisions. For example, the South Africans are not carrying on their trade and their activities in isolation from the big capitalist world of England, America and France.

Already France knows that Algeria is fighting. Ghana has got liberated; Uganda is liberated. They will see that ultimately the whole of Africa is bound to be liberated. If the peaceful actions of these unarmed Africans are to be suppressed by violence on the scale that is being done, I am quite sure the liberated kingdoms and countries of the North African continent are bound to rush to the help of the South Africans. In what way they will help, it is for them to decide. France knows how Algeria is receiving help in its liberation struggle. So, let the South African Government also know that the Africans whom they are suppressing will also receive help from the outside world and also from independent States of Africa.

Therefore, Sir, the fight for liberation of Africa is a fight for everyone. Though we pass a resolution particularly with reference to racial discrimination, yet in general, it involves the problem of the independence of the African people. A very small minority is oppressing a majority people, who are living in their own homeland, as the resolution says.

With these words, I support the resolution. If the amendments are to be accommodated, they should be; but I would also make a request that the resolution should be a unanimous one from this House.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of my party and myself, I support the resolution and I fully endorse what has been said by our Prime Minister. It is true that whatever action takes place in a nation is under the jurisdiction of that nation and may not ordinarily be the concern of another nation. But fortunately today beyond the nation, there is an international world, there is a world of humanity and certain things

that are done within the nations come to be of intimated concern to the whole of humanity. This mass killing in Africa is one such incident.

It certainly makes us angry, but I think it should make us more thoughtful than angry. But in spite of our boasted progress, in spite of the advance of civilisation and culture, often we behave specially in group-like manner, as if we were barbarians. Often it happens that when there are mass killings, the attention of the world is directed towards them. But in South Africa and also in many other places, people are being killed, tortured and put into prison from day to day and that attracts no attention. If human life is sacred, it is not sacred only in the mass; it is also sacred in the individual. As a matter of fact, the individual makes the mass. Let us, therefore, be a little introspective on such occasions and see that we are not caught in the cruelty that we condemn today.

Sir, I support the resolution.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have the privilege to associate myself, on behalf of the Independent Group in Parliament, with this resolution. I am glad that the Prime Minister has given us an opportunity to express our sense of horror at what has happened in South Africa.

I think the Prime Minister was right in drawing attention to the fact that we are not attempting to intervene in domestic problems. He also pointed out that what has happened in South Africa is something perhaps of critical importance for mankind. When I look at it, I feel that it is a challenge to the conscience of the whole civilised world and more particularly, I feel that it is a challenge to the conscience of the democratic world and in a very special sense, it should be a challenge to the commonwealth.

What these killings have sought to do is to focus attention on racialism and I agree entirely with the Prime

Minister when he says that this racialism has in it all the potential of world disaster. What we have seen in South Africa and are seeing is the expression of this racialism in its most brutal and even in its most degraded form. I attempt to look at this problem in a world context and more especially in the context of world democracy. My friend, Shri Dange, I think has indicated what is likely to happen in Africa and perhaps in Asia. If democracy, and more especially the Western democracies, do not condemn this outrage, then my own view is that inevitably the Africans in their torture and in their desperate search for assistance, and particularly some kind of moral comfort, will turn to the Communists because, as we know, the Communists at least pay lip sympathy to the doctrine of race equality and they turn their faces against discrimination based on colour. I think it is time that the Western democracies realise what is the issue, because this belief spreads that democracy is the political creed of the white man and democracy spells just this, that is, merely equality for the white man but disability and torture for those who are of a different pigmentation, then my own feeling is that democracy will not only be rejected in Africa but it will be rejected in Asia.

I have, in my own way, been a humble student of anthropology, and what amuses me is that the responsible leaders in South Africa should talk as if they have never studied the history, and they have certainly talked as if they had never heard of anthropology or anthropological truths. Only this morning I read in the press a statement which has an almost vulgar reference to white civilisation, the supremacy of the white civilisation. Obviously, with all due respect to white civilisation, I would remind people who glory in it that it is only a very recent phenomenon in world history. And if the white nations do not show any sense of history, perhaps they show no commonsense it may be but a very transient phenomenon in world history. Perhaps we do not know very

[Shri Frank Anthony]

much about it, but with my little reading I found that the Negro race, in their own way, have made very proud contribution to the cultural achievements of the world. And what the South African whites do not seem to realise is that the oldest civilisations have not been the white civilisations. There have been the Mediterranean civilisation, the Asian civilisation if you like—and in it I include the civilisation of India—the Mongaloid civilisation and the civilisations from Malaya and if the Western democracies under-rate these and insist on the pernicious doctrine of white supremacy and the supremacy of the white civilisation, then it will bring its own nemesis. And may I say this with great respect to those who indulge in this doctrine of white supremacy that before the whites themselves—I think the British realised in India—that it is not only a short-sighted policy but a suicidally short-sighted policy. Two or three millions of whites in South Africa are not going to stem the inevitable tides of history.

Today, as the Prime Minister has pointed out, South Africa is in a ferment and nothing is going to prevent the Africans ultimately from coming into their own.

May I end with the note that I hope that the Commonwealth countries will take a very strong line in this matter? Because, I think it was the Prime Minister who referred to this fact some time ago that literally the complexion of the Commonwealth has changed. The complexion of the Commonwealth today is predominantly brown and, with the accession of more and more independent African States it may well become predominantly sable hued. Before the Commonwealth is this stark issue. Racialism, I have always felt, is not only an evilism but it is perhaps the most dangerous ism which the world has to face today and either for or against the democracies, particularly the Western democracies, will have to take sides and on the answer will depend, in

my humble view, not only the future of democracy but perhaps the future of mankind.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): Mr. Speaker, I fully associate myself and the Ganathanra Parishad with the sentiments and the feelings of the Prime Minister on the brutal and inhuman massacre of the South Africans by the South African Government. I not only express my sympathy and condolence to all those who have suffered but, at the same time, I salute the martyrs who have paid their lives for their liberties, and I condemn the South African Government for this ghastly killing. It is unthinkable that even in 1960 some Government, who claim themselves to be civilised and who subscribe to the United Nations Charter of Human Rights, and who are the members of the United Nations, should resort to this sort of policy of racial discrimination and differentiation in their dealings with human beings, because of their racial affiliations. It is a clear case of genocide and the United Nations should intervene.

When the resolution on genocide was moved in the United Nations, India had the proud privilege of being the initiator of this resolution and so I think the Government and the Prime Minister should rise to the occasion and should use their good offices to move the United Nations so that they could deal with this matter properly. Our Prime Minister has championed this cause on a previous occasion. I request him that instructions be given to our representatives at Lake Success so that they could move in this matter in the right direction.

In the beginning I thought that my Communist friends would raise a point of order, because it relates to the internal administration of another country, as they did at the time of discussing the genocide in Tibet. They have not done it, and it is a good thing they have not done it, and this House has given its full support to the Prime Minister's resolution.

I urge upon the Prime Minister, at the same time, to reconsider the question of severing India's connection with the Commonwealth; because South Africa is a member of the Commonwealth and India is a member of the Commonwealth and when our approach to this human problem is so different, there cannot be any common meeting ground. I sincerely hope that when India and South Africa differ on this fundamental issue, there is no common cause to sit across a table and discuss. I hope the Prime Minister will reconsider this matter in the ensuing Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference.

With these words, I whole-heartedly support the Resolution so ably moved by the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker: The Resolution should be treated as a condolence Resolution. We need not go far away from that.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: While associating myself, on behalf of the Socialist Party, with the sentiments expressed by the hon. Prime Minister, I would have liked that this House should have gone further in expressing in concrete terms the feelings which I have seen in the country against the murders which have taken place in South Africa. I feel that the Resolution which has been moved by the Prime Minister does not go long to express those feelings. As the Prime Minister himself stated, it is a moderate Resolution. I feel it is not only moderate, it is also timid, because we have seen it stated that the British House of Commons was to discuss a motion "to protest in the strongest possible terms to the Government of the Union of South Africa" about the shooting and to convey "the abhorrence of the British people that such an outrage should take place within the British Commonwealth". Elsewhere also, stronger feelings have been expressed. Lest it should be taken that perhaps some sort of violence was used on people who were guilty, I may quote here one of the authorities. The Anglican Bishop of Johannesburg, the

Right Reverent Ambros Reeves, gave the following account of the Sharpeville riot, as compiled from the sworn affidavits from about one hundred wounded Africans in Beragwanath hospital in Johannesburg.

"The Africans began gathering in the township early in the morning as instructed by Pan-Africanist leaders. They understood they had to protest against carrying passes. They also had the idea that a White man would speak to them at the police station, as they had been informed of this by White Policemen.

The Africans began to gather, but they had not the slightest intention of fighting. They had no sticks. Their leaders had impressed on them beforehand that there was to be no violence.

The Africans were unanimous in pointing out that they would not have allowed women and children to go to the police station if there was to be violence."

So, it is clear that there was no violence on the part of the Africans themselves but it is only the South African Government which indulged in violence.

While associating myself with the sentiments expressed here by the previous speakers, I would like the Government of India to take certain concrete steps. I would like that a strong world public opinion be created and India should do its bit in creating the same against these mass killings in South Africa. Our Prime Minister should refuse to sit in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference to be held in London if the South African Prime Minister participates in it. Our representative in the Security Council must be instructed to take the initiative to condemn the mass killings in South Africa when the discussion in the Council takes place tomorrow. The Government should show its heart-felt sympathy towards the Pan-Africanist movement and help

[Shri Braj Raj Singh]

it in its own way to achieve its objective. When President Nasser visits this country our Prime Minister should, in consultation with him, evolve a programme under which a second Bandung Conference might be held somewhere in Africa in the near future comprising of the nations of Africa and Asia. India should quit the Commonwealth of Nations and should in earnest try to bring the Asian-African nations closer. The United Nations should be strengthened so as to effectively check such racial outbursts in future. The matter should be taken up in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference if our Prime Minister attends it and some suitable action should be taken by the Conference itself.

Shri Khadilkar: Mr. Speaker, Sir, while sharing the sentiments expressed by the hon. Prime Minister when he moved the Resolution, I would like to add a few observations on this occasion.

I was surprised to hear at the outset the hon. Prime Minister when he said that it is more or less a matter of internal jurisdiction. The world is fast advancing and a time has come when certain issues which are more or less moral issues, issues which have a direct bearing on the world community, should not be considered as domestic issues or issues on which any Government when it expresses itself should be constrained in expressing itself by diplomatic moderation.

So far as the South African people are concerned, I feel that we are united with them by a special bond because the method of struggle which we adopted for achieving independence—I mean passive resistance or Satyagrah the same was conceived in South Africa. In that peculiar background Mahatma Gandhi conceived it. We, in our country after Gandhiji's arrival in this country, practised it and we claim that through that method we have achieved our independence. Therefore when we are connected with the Africans through this bond—a

peculiar bond of struggle and of brotherhood—is it not our duty to give full-throated expression to the feelings of the people in this country and in this House? This is my first submission.

When I make this submission I look at the scene at the present moment in Africa. What is this pass system meant for? There are several types of passes. Everybody has got to carry them. It is meant for pinning down the African labourer to a particular locality so that he cannot exercise his bargaining power and is socially immobilised. As the British Labour Party Leader has observed this morning, the African is entirely made to surrender his bargaining strength and remain ever in subjection of the White settler's domination. This is the position.

Therefore this struggle assumes a peculiar significance in South Africa. It is not simply racial discrimination as it is supposed to be. There is racial discrimination practised in several countries. For the first time it has fortunately not taken a white against black turn because the conscience of the Western world has been aroused. All over the West you find that feeling of sympathy being expressed sincerely. For instance, I was surprised to read this morning that in Norway flags are to be flown at half mast. This is something which would stir the hearts of the people. We are much nearer Africa. Are we not going to take some positive steps about that? Or, are we inhibited in our expression? My hon. friend used the word 'timid'. I would not call it timid, but it is tame and insipid because of some diplomatic propriety. I think that would be wrong and that would not go a long way in giving them support. A time has come when India will have to assure the Africans that we will stand by them in their struggle for political freedom, social equality and human dignity. Unless we say this, giving expression to our feelings, I do not think we are discharging our duty towards our African brethren.

So far as this problem is concerned, it is also on the international level. It will be taken up in the United Nations very soon. When it is taken up there, as I said, there have got to be some limits for the exercise of national sovereignty, as we call it, and certain issues will have to be taken out of national jurisdiction and dealt with on the world plane by the world community. If that is not done at the United Nations and if some sort of definite action is not taken like keeping out nations which are not prepared to abide by certain Charters of the United Nations, just like the Human Rights Charter, because of the diplomatic bargaining that goes on in the international organisation, is India going to be a party to such a bargain? I would like to ask that. Therefore this matter is to be looked upon with all seriousness at this juncture.

The other day I read that our Vice-President has said that at the highest diplomatic level, that is, the summit level, the problem of atom bomb and its dangers to humanity is being considered. But he thought and rightly thought, I feel—that the problem of racial discrimination and racial segregation is equally or even more important and some method must be found out to eliminate this type of perpetuation of apartheid that is being practised and practised in a ruthless manner in South Africa.

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj (Wardha): What do you suggest for that?

Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh): He is making a speech.

Shri Khadijkar: I am not the Government. The hon. Member asks me: What do you suggest for that? I have some suggestions. It is for the Government to act. Suppose the hon. Prime Minister was not occupying the Prime Ministership and was sitting on this side. The other day when he described this tragedy as a ghastly tragedy and compared it with the Amritsar or Jallianwalla Bagh tragedy, you never asked him

"What do you propose to do about it?"

Therefore I say that it is a question of expressing your feeling and giving them support in their struggle. Another aspect is there. We can extend them help. We can extend there monetary help and help them in every way possible. We can rouse world conscience—that is already aroused—to see that this practice of segregation is stopped once for all and that they are allowed to live in their own homeland with equal dignity. That is the only way.

I would like to utter one word of warning before I conclude. As I said I do believe that we owe certain moral obligation to Africa because Gandhiji got that inspiration for that peculiar method of struggle in a peculiar surrounding where a mass of black humanity was helpless and a white minority was sitting tight over its head. This was the position. He perfected it here. But if no action is taken by the civilised community of the world, as Marx has predicted, in South Africa, it will not be simply a class war, but the class war will take a racial form, and at that a worst type of form.

13 hrs.

Therefore, I would appeal to the Prime Minister not to be restrained or constrained by diplomatic moderation, but give full-throated support and in every way possible help the struggle of Africans for full freedom, full social equality and human justice.

With these words, I move my amendment.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): May I say something?

I have some important points to say.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Siva Raj.

Shri Siva Raj (Chingleput—Reservé—Sch. Castes): On behalf of the Parliamentary Group of the Republican Party of India, I accord my full support to this Resolution.

This Resolution being, as it is, an expression of sympathy with the Africans in their hour of suffering, does not call for an elaborate exposition of principles of international justice or national sovereignty or racial discrimination or the like. The Republican Party, as you may know, Sir, has pinned its faith in the annihilation of all kinds of discrimination, whether it be racial or caste or anti-semitic and the like. Consequently, this Resolution commands our full sympathy and support.

I will also appeal to the Prime Minister to utilise the opportunity when he goes to attend the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference to move this matter at the right time and in the right quarters, and I dare say we can entrust that responsibility to him with confidence.

But may I draw the attention of this House that this House should not, only on occasions like this, start expressing its opinion on this question of racial discrimination? But it must be the constant endeavour of this House and the people of India to preach against racial discrimination or discrimination of any kind all over the world including our own country. I do hope that this Resolution will afford an opportunity for not merely the Members of this House but also the people outside to constantly think about the question as to how discrimination between man and man can be removed.

With these words, I support the Resolution.

Shri Mohammed Imam (Chitaldrug): I fully associate myself with the Prime Minister and other hon. Members in condemning the atrocities that are being committed by the

South African Government on a peace-loving, patriotic people who, as a result of racial segregation and class prejudice, are being subjected to ruthless suppression and various other indignities.

We are all aware and we are conscious of the prolonged trial, both physical and moral, to which our South African friends, and also our Indian friends, are being subjected by a series of detestable outrages. It looks as if the South African Government is adopting the mass extermination methods of the Nazis who one day drove away from Germany the entire population of Jews.

I do not want to go to the extent of suggesting that India should dissociate itself from or sever its connection with, the Commonwealth, but I must point out that these atrocities and inhuman acts of a member of the Commonwealth is doing great damage to the reputation of the Commonwealth, and it is left to the Prime Minister, when he attends the next meeting of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers, to restore that reputation and to see that no further damage is done to the Commonwealth.

South Africa is a member of the Commonwealth. It has been a member from a very long time, and it must respect the wishes of the other members; otherwise, it has no place in the Commonwealth, and it must be asked to quit.

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): They are not attending the Commonwealth conferences.

Shri Mohammed Imam: Also, it is a matter that should be taken up at the UNO, and India must take the lead and initiative, and see that the South Africans get their legitimate rights and aspirations fulfilled.

The exploratory spirit and the mutual jealousies of the various European nations led to the appropri-

tion of the entire continent of Africa, so much so now I think the entire continent is under the domination of about six European nations. They have either colonised, or had themselves gone and settled down in various parts of Africa, and the local people were being exploited. Now a spirit of nationalism is manifesting itself throughout the continent, and we have been hearing of the struggles and the privations of the people in other parts of Africa also.

So far as South Africa is concerned, the white settlers came and made South Africa their home. They came there as the guests of the original settlers. After establishing themselves firmly and fully there, they expropriated the rightful settlers, and now the real inhabitants, the permanent inhabitants, have become the foreigners, and the foreigners have become the rulers and permanent inhabitants. That is the irony of the situation.

Not only that. These original inhabitants, and also the Indians who went there, are subjected to various indignities, various discriminations, so much so their life there is attended by various perils.

Of late we have been hearing of so many atrocities being committed, and the recent one, the massacre of about 70 people in one day, is the greatest atrocity which crowns their atrocious methods. This is a blot on civilisation, this is a blot on humanity, and the Prime Minister must see that right is done to these peace-loving people.

After all, what do they want? They want equal citizenship, they want equal rights, they want equal treatment, and it is but right that as human beings we sympathise with them and we treat them with all consideration.

So, with this I fully support this Resolution.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: Now I may say a few words, some very important points I have.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: I beg to say that I highly admire our Prime Minister for bringing this Resolution, but he and all the members here are not viewing the point from the world stand point. They are all thinking from the party standpoint or State standpoint or country's standpoint, but I consider the question from the world standpoint.

I am very sorry to say that in certain parts of our world there is turmoil today. We must go into the very depth of the question and find out what the cause of it is.

According to certain natural laws, human currents do flow. The Aryans flowed into India, the Mongols flowed into Europe, the Arabs flowed into India, and now the Europeans are flowing out, or have flowed out into America, and they flowed out also into South Africa, and when they arrived there, they gave light, they brought a higher civilisation to South Africa. We must recognise that. And I think to this Resolution we must add that the people of South Africa should study our Brahman culture, how the Brahmans could hypnotise millions of people here and keep them together with themselves. It is a great fact. If these Europeans follow our Brahman culture they will be able to harmonise the peoples of South Africa and there will not be any more trouble there. We can also suggest saying, "Look to Englishmen who took lesson from the Brahmans of India, how wonderfully they could settle the questions of India and Ghana and other States, and how our brethren the French are falling; for instance, they could not settle the question of Algeria even today."

The trouble in South Africa is this that the Boers are fighting with the Englishmen there and they hope that

[Raja Mahendra Pratap]

the Englishmen will come together when they direct all their attention against the blacks. That is at the bottom of this whole trouble. Now, what we can do is to try to utilise Christianity and higher sense of the whites and our Brahman culture.... (Interruptions).

There is nothing to laugh at it. It is a mere fact. In this way this matter will be settled and in that part of the world peace will reign. I support the Resolution of our hon. Prime Minister with this addition that he may also suggest some remedy. Only condemnation always is not good. There must be some remedy proposed and I propose the remedy.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Sir, we must not forget that the year 1960 is the year of Africa, Africa shaking off the manacles of slavery and emerging into freedom. But I cannot understand the desire on the part of the South African Government to continue to live as a solitary landmark of medievalism in a world that is crusading with meticulous zeal towards the realisation of progressive ideals and the translation of the ethics of humanity into practice. The South African statute-book is overloaded with too many legislations that cut at the very root of the fundamentals of human rights. The so-called Roman-Dutch law of treason that operates there in an angry manner provides that a man can be expelled, imprisoned, flogged deprived of employment or excluded from public life even on the flimsiest grounds. These are the conditions that exist there.

Now, Dr. Verwoerd, the Prime Minister, introduced a Bill in Parliament seeking an all-White referendum on the question of South African Republic and within a week of the introduction of this Bill in Parliament the South African police demonstrated what is in store for the South Africans

as second-class citizens in that country. South Africa belongs to these people and not to the handful of white people,—the shameless relic of imperialism that ought to have been dead as Dodo by now. If the South African turns at Dr. Verwoerd and says: "Get out all of you," possibly he would be both morally and legally justified to do so. But he in this largeness of heart and generosity of spirit does not say like that. He simply says "Give us the rights to live as free men." That is what he is saying.

We must condemn this holocaust of bloodshed and at the same time show our sense of outrage at this event. What is a pity is that machine guns are used against an unarmed people and it is more distressing to know that saracen armoured cars and troop carriers are supplied to the South African Government by a member of the Commonwealth, that is, Britain. Now, this question is lying in the Security Council on a complaint lodged by an Afro-Asian Group. But, I am afraid, except expressing their important rage on this particular issue they will be sleeping over it as they have slept over so many issues all these years. But I feel that the Commonwealth Conference can do a lot and, therefore, I suggest to our hon. Prime Minister to consult the Prime Ministers of other countries in the Commonwealth so as to evolve ways and means to collectively condemn this racial discrimination policy of the South African Government and at the same time this massacre of women, children and aged people. I would suggest to the Prime Minister to see whether it could be possible in consultation with the other Prime Ministers to prevail upon Dr. Verwoerd to change his policy of apartheid, of racial segregation and all that.

Lastly, I would suggest to the Prime Minister if it could be possible on humanitarian grounds to organise a relief fund in this country for the dependants of those victims who fell at the shooting and also those people

who were injured, or else the Prime Minister could organise some contribution to the fund that has already been started in South Africa by men like Rev. Ambrose Reeves of the Anglican Church.

With these words I associate myself with the sentiments expressed in this House and the Resolution that the Prime Minister has moved in this House.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Sir, I rise to support the Resolution moved by our hon. Prime Minister. Through this Resolution the anguished heart of India and the outraged conscience of India speaks. It is not only India which speaks through the Resolution but all the people of this world who have the good of democracy in their hearts, who stand for equality in all spheres of life and who want that nobody should be denied any kind of civic rights. All such persons speak through this Resolution. This Resolution is the test case not only for the peoples of the world but also for the governments of the world. It is by this Resolution that people will judge whether the homage that we pay to freedom of movement, freedom of livelihood, freedom of voting; whether the homage that we pay to the equality of opportunity, to the sanctity of civic rights are real and, whether these things are really operative so far as the governments of the world are concerned, so far as the people of the world are concerned. I think that so far as my country is concerned, we are to a man behind our hon. Prime Minister in his noble endeavour in order to right these wrongs, in order to give the nationals of South Africa their proper status, in order to give them their true dignity—true human dignity. We are all behind them and I believe that all the right-thinking peoples of the world are also behind them.

I would at the same time say one thing that the struggle which the South Africans have been carrying on has been described even by

a paper, like, *Manchester Guardian* as a legitimate struggle. It has also been a peaceful struggle, as our hon. Prime Minister put it. So, we are all behind these South Africans who are fighting for their rights. But in the struggle there is also a warning; the spirit of defiance has got hold of the people of South Africa. There have been manifestations of this spirit before also. But this manifestation is in a class by itself, and when the spirit of defiance of a people is once aroused, I know that nothing can put it down. All the Sabre jets all the armoured cars of the massive police forces of South Africa will not be able to put down this legitimate and right struggle of the South African people. I can assure the South African people that every Indian is behind them, because they are fighting the fight in a spirit which was vouchsafed to them by Mahatma Gandhi, the spirit which says that one should not put up with any kind of injustice, one should not endure any kind of oppression, one should not try to lie before any kind of power, however great, but one should resist such things peacefully. I am sure as the leaders of the Pan-African Congress have said, though they are at this time under detention under the suppression of Communism Act, they have been waging a peaceful struggle. I know that the South Africans will wage a peaceful struggle, and I have no doubt that in the near future, tomorrow or the day after, they will win, and the day they win, the cause of democracy will triumph, and the cause of human rights will triumph, and the cause of human dignity will triumph.

I wish all success to the people of South Africa.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat): May I say a word before you put this resolution? You have said that we should treat this only as a condolence resolution. But I think that you and the entire House would like, besides treating it as a condolence

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

resolution, also to underline the general feelings of the people of India against this racial discrimination, and give our support to the people of Africa who are fighting for their freedom.

Therefore, I should like you not to treat it only as a condolence resolution. I would submit this for your consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Very well. The resolution stands as it is.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not strictly and merely a condolence resolution; of course, not. But what I understood Mr. Speaker to mean was that in our discussions, we might treat it briefly as that, not that the resolution is limited only to a condolence resolution; it goes beyond that.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: That clarifies the position.

Shri S. A. Dange: May I suggest that in view of the character of the resolution, we may adopt it standing instead of sitting?

Mr. Speaker: Very well. May I request that in view of the consideration urged by the Leader of the Opposition, Shri S. A. Dange, that the amendments may be withdrawn and not pressed, so that we may carry the spirit of the resolution by passing it unanimously? I hope hon. Members would not insist upon my putting those amendments to vote. They may all be treated as withdrawn.

Shri Khadilkar: In view of the explanation given by the Prime Minister that it is not a limited sort of condolence resolution, but it includes everything I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: May I say a word before withdrawing my amend-

ment. I hope that the sad thoughts which have been expressed in this House would be borne in mind by the Prime Minister in our future dealings with this problem. Since wishes have been expressed here that there should be unanimity, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

Shri Hem Barua: I also beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Have these Hon. Members leave of the House to withdraw their amendments?

Hon. Members: Yes.

The amendments were by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: I only wanted to avoid controversial issues, and that was why I said that this might be treated briefly as a condolence resolution, but the resolution reads as it is with all its implications.

The question is:

"That this House deplores and records its deep sorrow at the tragic incidents which occurred at Sharpeville and Langa township near Capetown in South Africa on March 21, 1960, resulting in the death of a large number of Africans from police firing. It sends its deep sympathy to the Africans who have suffered from this firing and from the policy of racial discrimination and the suppression of the African people in their own homeland."

The Resolution was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: May I now request hon. Members to kindly rise in their seats to express our deep sense of sorrow at these happenings?

(The Members then stood in silence for a minute)