

श्री जे० आर० कपूर : क्या मैं समझूँ कि सरकार न अभी तक इस बात पर कोई विचार नहीं किया है कि पंचवर्षीय योजना में जो निर्णय किये गये हैं उसको कार्यरूप में कैसे परिणत किया जायेगा ?

t[SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: May I presume that the Government has not given any thought up to this time to the question of how to implement the decisions made in the Five Year Plan?]

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR:- As my hon. friend¹ will appreciate each item in the Five Year Plan is connected with the working of some Ministry. In this respect also, the Commerce and Industry Ministry will come to the aid as mentioned in the Five Year Plan and, as a matter of general policy, my hon. friend knows that Government are in favour of aiding the small scale industries as also the cottage industry products and in this also Government are devoting the best attention.

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: That is exactly my point, Sir.

SHRI T. V. KAMALASWAMY: As the hon. Minister is aware, Sir, the majority of the other small scale industries are cottage industries in South India; therefore, will Government consider the question of giving a subsidy or greater encouragement to such cottage industries?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Sir, the cause of small scale production units in the match industry is always kept in mind and sometime back there was a report that they were suffering from many handicaps and Government have given some help and my hon. friend will appreciate the facts that as against a production in 1948, of 148,697 cases, the production in 1952 is 176,902, which is largely due to the encouragement given by Government.

[†]English translation.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: May I ask my hon. friend, in view of the monopolistic character of this particular firm whether Government have considered the possibility, at some time or other, of nationalising this concern?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I think I will reply "sometime or other".

It is really a big question and I think we are mixing up two questions into one: the first question is ;>o **far** as we are concerned, to increase the production. There is this concern, Wimcos, which have to their credit a large majority, about 3/4ths of the production of the country. The next question is whether and when and if so how to liquidate the monopolistic character of that concern. The second is a different question altogether and that must await some time; we cannot prejudice production by mixing up the question of production with other extraneous questions.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: May I know whether Government is considering the possibility, in view of two objectives, namely, further revenue for the Government of India and **the** abolition of a monopolistic character?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is a suggestion for action.

ELECTION OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE U. N. O.

*615. SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether Shrimati Vijayalakshmi Pandit was nominated for election as the Secretary General of the United Nations Organisation; -

(b) if so, whether Government approved of the nomination; and

(c) whether other Governments were consulted before agreeing to the nomination?

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON): (a) and (b). Shrimati Vijayalakshmi Pandit's name was proposed by the delegate of the U.S.S.R. on his own initiative.

(c) Does not arise.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Am I to understand, Sir, that there is no question of accepting nominations even if proposed on their own initiative by foreign countries?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: You will permit me to explain what happened, Sir.

Before this name was proposed, there was a good deal of talk as to who will be elected and there was a great deal of difficulty in finding a suitable name, as the House knows. Among the names suggested by various Delegations was Mrs. Pandit's. Thereupon, a reference was made to us whether in case the name was proposed the Government of India would be agreeable or not. An answer was given that no effort should be made on our part but, if ultimately it was found to be the general desire of the Assembly there, then we might consider it as a proposition to solve the deadlock but, no effort on our part should be made. This was made clear to the various Delegations there. That is how the matter stood.

Then in the Security Council, it appears, Mrs. Pandit's name was suggested; as far as I know, it was not formally proposed but was suggested as a name to be considered by the U.S.S.R. representative. Thereupon, it was pressed by some other Delegates that immediate votes should be taken. The U.S.S.R. Delegate said: 'I have suggested this name; let us wait. There are other nominations also'. Nevertheless, on the insistence of others, a **vote** was immediately taken. There

was no time for reference to either our Delegate or to the Government of India and the voting was rushed through at that stage. That is how the matter stood.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Apart from the factual error—because there was a twenty-four hour lapse between the time of nomination and the actual election—may I ask if, when the Government said that they could agree to this nomination, if it was made to solve a deadlock, they indirectly but actively accepted some of the principles of the U.N., such as veto and also the permanency of the five nations on the Security Council?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: We have always accepted those principles not indirectly but directly. We have accepted them and I am surprised at the hon. Member's question. These are the fundamental bases of the U.N. which we had accepted already.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I asked a specific question of the principle of this veto. Am I to understand that the Government of India accepts the principle of veto and¹ also accepts the permanency of Five Members in the Security Council which more or less means five Nations ruling the world?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The hon. Member is going rather too deep but may I say that it is not largely a question of our accepting every little thing that happens there or even every procedural detail of the United Nations? But, it is functioning in that way and I think there was reason for the original decision for the veto. Keeping in mind the circumstances and the realities of the situation not logically correct—it so happens that the five nations may come to fight. One of them does not count really but some of the nations do actually, in fact, dominate world politics. It is no good saying that half a dozen nations which have no importance in world affairs should out-veto a few nations

which definitely will not be realistic enough although it may be logically correct in some other way. So, this decision was made in San Francisco many years ago that there should be this veto because without that veto it would have meant that every activity of the U.N. would provoke a world war. It was because one of the major nations was against the others that this was suggested. It was a lesser evil. It is not a happy system. All the same there are the Big Five Powers on the Security Council each having the power of veto, and when some of them obviously do not like to agree with the others they apply the veto. Possibly they do play a very important part in world affairs.

**BRITISH SHIPPING TRADE RESTRICTIONS
WITH CHINESE PORTS**

*616. SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government of the United Kingdom have consulted the Government of India about the tightening of the restrictions by the Government of the United Kingdom on the shipping trade with Chinese ports; and

(b) if so, the opinion tendered by India?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU) : (a) A reference was made by the U. K. Government to the Government of India, but this was not subsequently pressed.

(b) There was no occasion for any answer to be sent to the U. K. Government on this subject, but India's policy in this matter is quite clear and has been stated previously. India was not a party to the U. N. Resolution of 18th May 1951 banning the supply of strategic material to China. The Government of India continue to adhere to the same policy and have not accepted

any commitment restricting trade with any foreign country.

May I add that, after the answer was drafted, a formal reply on behalf of the Government of India has been sent to the U. K. Government.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Do I understand that trade between India and China is going on as usual without being influenced by the U.N. Resolution?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: There has not been in the last many years much trade between India and China, and such trade as has been between India and China has been in regard to specific items being purchased by us or sold by us. We want to continue that and to add to that but anyhow not much could be done. We have not been influenced by any other considerations.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: May I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to a newspaper report which appeared this morning about the conclusions of the Macarthy Enquiry Committee where they have also taken note of our ships under our flag carrying on trade with China? If so, may I know if the Government think that this is desirable?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I do not know to which report the hon. Member is referring. I have not seen it. I understand there is something about ships under our fleet. Whose report is it?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: It is the Report of the Senate Foreign Relations Enquiry Committee presided over by that famous Senator, Macarthy. He has listed two or three ships under the Indian flag, as carrying on trade with China. I want if such investigation even indirectly into our affairs is considered desirable by the Government?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I need hardly assure the House that we attach no importance to Macarthy or his Committee in what we might or might not do.