

[Shri C. G. K. Reddy.] interests, the different factors that go not only into the production but also the consumption of that particular product and it should be a good principle that you should recognise that these interests know more than the hon. Minister himself. It is, I think, a principle which he must himself agree to because he cannot be expected to know everything about it, and the interests directly connected with that particular industry would know more about it. Therefore, Sir, when you give that power to them, they know how to develop that industry, they know what is good for that industry and they lay down certain policies. But if he finds that they have laid down a policy which is against the national interests, he will always be in a position to use such extraordinary powers and he will have the full support of Parliament. Therefore, there is no case for this particular thing. I should therefore suggest—and again it is too late in the day to move an amendment and for the hon. Minister to accept it—that in spite of the fact that nominations have been put down, the hon. Minister should see that his nominations approximate as much as possible to elections. That is, whenever he makes nominations, he must do it in full consultation with, and if possible, with the full concurrence of the various interests concerned.

One more point about this and that is this: So far as the Board is concerned, we have eight interests. My conception or any Development Board or Industrial Board is that it should be composed of three factors which determine not only the production but also the consumption and development of that particular industry, i.e. the management, the consumer and the labour. Here you have got seven or eight interests and we do not know which particular interest is going to be given weightage. That is why I asked the hon. Minister whether he had in his mind what would be the composition of this Board and the number of members which each

interest will have on the Board, but he was not able to tell me. He wanted a certain amount of flexibility. Whenever you constitute a Board, you must have these factors in mind, which determine not only the production but the consumption and development of the industry; i.e. the management, the consumer and the labour should be equally represented on the Board so that the industry may be properly looked after.

If you will permit one or two more minutes, I should like to emphasise one or two points made by hon. friend, Mr. Sinha. He said that the Assam plantations are working at a disadvantage as compared with those in West Bengal. He talked about price parity of coal and other raw materials which go into the manufacture and in the processing of tea, and he also pleaded for a price stabilisation policy so that it will be possible for us to maintain the price at a reasonable level, which will not go so far below as will ruin the industry and not go so far above as will ruin the interests of the consumer. These are suggestions which need the serious consideration of the hon. Minister. I hope that with the extraordinary powers that he wishes to have in so far as the Board is concerned, he will be able to direct the Board to look into these matters and take such action as is necessary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The discussion on the Tea Bill will be interrupted now to allow the Prime Minister to make a statement on foreign affairs.

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU) : Mr. Chairman, since the last occasion when this House discussed foreign affairs, much has happened in the international sphere and many important developments have taken place. No major problem has been solved, but it may be said that for the first time in several years large numbers of people have hoped

that solutions might be found. The "cold war" has somewhat toned down.

Many evidences of this new approach have come from the Soviet Union and, however some people might view them, they must be welcomed as helping in lessening the tension of the world. In China also there has been evident a desire for the peaceful settlement of the Korean question.

This House will remember that some months ago a Resolution regarding Korea was sponsored by India in the United Nations and was passed by the General Assembly by an overwhelming majority. That Resolution, as I stated in this House, was no mandate tout an earnest approach to find a basis for a settlement. The President of the General Assembly of the U.N. communicated it in this spirit to the Chinese and the North Korean Governments. Unfortunately, both the Soviet and the Chinese Governments rejected that Resolution and our hopes of a settlement suffered a serious setback. Recently, however, new proposals were made by the Chinese Government in regard to Korea which opened the door again for a fresh approach to this problem which was, to some extent, in line with the Resolution passed by the U.N. Shortly afterwards, the Chinese Government put forward fresh proposals, referred to as the 8-point proposals, which were a very close approximation to the Indian Resolution passed by the General Assembly of the U.N. We welcomed those proposals because they seemed to afford us a promising and solid basis for a solution of the immediate problem, which was in line with the accepted policy of the U.N. Many other powers also welcomed these proposals.

Two or three days ago, the United Nations Command in Korea put forward certain counter proposals. Any constructive approach to this problem is always to be welcomed. We were glad therefore that these attempts were being made to solve a problem which had given so much trouble in the past. On a close examination of

these counter proposals, it appears that they diverge considerably from the General Assembly's Resolution to which the U.N. stands committed. It appears that the Chinese and North Korean Governments have expressed their disapproval of some of these proposals and stated that they cannot accept them as they are.

So far as India is concerned, we would welcome any solution which is accepted by the parties concerned. We feel, however, that such a solution is much more likely to be found on the basis of the U.N. Resolution, and the Chinese 8-point proposals approximate so nearly to this Resolution that they should form the basis for discussion and we hope a solution. It should be possible to amplify them or to vary them by agreement where necessary. We earnestly hope, therefore, that this avenue of approach will not be given up but will be pursued. In any event, we trust that the negotiation at Pan-munjon will be carried on, even though there might be occasional setbacks.

The House is aware that India has often been mentioned in some of these proposals and it has been suggested that this country should undertake various responsibilities. We are reluctant to assume any distant responsibilities.

But if an agreement is arrived at between the parties concerned and the task suggested for us is within our competence and not opposed to any policy that we pursue, we do not wish to escape that responsibility. That responsibility is all the greater because it is India's good fortune to have friendly relations with the great powers who on either side are parties to the dispute. If India can serve the cause of peace in any way, we shall gladly offer our services. But such services can only be offered if there is an agreement as regards the solution.

I have referred to the new hopes that have been raised in the minds of innumerable people, hopes that the fear of war, which oppresses humanity, will diminish and the cold war, the horror and burden of which was described recently in eloquent and forceful

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] language by the President of the United States, might end. There is undoubtedly a new atmosphere in the world and the outlook is brighter than it has been for a long time. It is for the statesmen of the world, and more especially those shouldering heavy responsibility in the great nations, to seize this opportunity with courage and wisdom, and lead humanity towards peace. I am very glad that the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom has recently suggested a conference on the highest level between the leading powers of the world to meet informally in privacy and without a rigid agenda to tackle the problems that afflict mankind and to make every effort to rid humanity of the fear of war. I would earnestly commend this suggestion. The stakes are the highest that the world offers and a war-weary and fear-laden humanity will bless those who will rid it of these terrible burdens and lead it to peace and happiness. President Eisenhower is not opposed to the idea of such a conference but has said that the time for it is not ripe.

In the Middle East, I regret to say that the situation has gravely deteriorated. India is deeply interested in these countries of the Middle East and has the friendliest ties with them dating back to long ages past. It will be a misfortune, not only for the countries concerned but for the world, if these problems of the Middle East are not solved peacefully and co-operatively.

The great continent of Africa, from its northern Mediterranean coast to the far south, is in process of dynamic change and eruption. In the extreme south, as is well known, a racial policy of gross intolerance and arrogance has shocked the world. In other parts of Africa also, in various shades and degrees, this racial policy is in evidence. It comes into conflict with the rising nationalism and consciousness of African nations. Unfortunately there has been a great deal of violence on all sides and repression, which has brought misery to vast numbers of people. No solution of the African problem

can be based on racial discrimination or on the suppression of the African people, who have suffered so terribly for centuries past and who must command our sympathy. I earnestly hope that methods of violence will cease there, for this can only bring misery to all concerned.

It has been our misfortune, during the past five or six years, to have strained relations with our neighbour country Pakistan. Any calm and dispassionate consideration of India and Pakistan will lead to the inevitable conclusion that there must be friendly and co-operative relations between them. Geography, past history, common cultural background and innumerable individual contacts lead to this conclusion. Any other conclusion is fraught with unhappiness and disaster for both. I am happy to inform the House that, during recent weeks, there has been a marked improvement in these relations and many friendly gestures have been made to us from Pakistan which we welcome and reciprocate. We shall make every endeavour to dispel the clouds that have darkened our respective horizons and caused unhappiness to so many people.

The Governor-General of Pakistan recently stated that the independence and sovereignty of Pakistan must be fully recognised and no attempt should be made to interfere with them. I am surprised that this obvious proposition should have been put forward. There is or can be no desire on the part of any reasonable persons to interfere in any way with the freedom and independence of Pakistan. Certainly India does not wish to do so and desires friendly relations with its neighbour and sister country; each recognising the other's freedom and integrity. I am sure that there are some misguided persons in India as well as in Pakistan who have continually sown the seeds of hatred and ill-will against the other country and who talk wildly about conflict and interference. But this Parliament and the country have denounced and repudiated this mischievous outlook and false ideology.

In recent months, a domestic agitation which influences our foreign relations, has demonstrated how utterly irresponsible and mischievous this outlook is. I refer to what is known as the 'Jammu agitation' which has demonstrated to what lengths irresponsible behaviour, harmful to the nation, can go. This agitation has not only injured our cause internationally but has made the very solution, which it seeks, much more difficult of attainment. It has been a challenge to the authority of Parliament and an attempt to upset by unlawful and often violent means the decisions of our Parliament. It has been a matter of peculiar regret that those whose primary duty it must be to uphold the Constitution, and have respect for the laws made under the Constitution, should be guilty of inciting people to violate those laws. I am not merely concerned with the moral aspects of this matter but also with the evil consequences, both national and international, that flow from it.

The world is full of problems and a tortured humanity seeks anxiously for some relief from its fears and burdens. In this tragic drama, a measure of responsibility comes to us in this great country. We have enough of our problems here and they consume our thoughts and energy, but we cannot isolate ourselves from the great brotherhood of the nations and from the common problems that affect humanity. Whether we wish it or not, fate and circumstances have cast this responsibility upon us and we must discharge it. In the matter that we, in common with other countries, discharge it will depend whether our generation and the next will live in peace and bring about the progressive happiness of mankind or suffer irretrievable disaster. That responsibility we can only discharge if we are united and hold together, remembering always our high ideals and objectives and not allowing ourselves to be swept away by the fear or passion of the moment.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Sir, yesterday in anticipation of the statement I requested you if it would be possible

to find some time, probably tomorrow, to have some useful discussion on the statement that was expected today. I am sure the hon. Members here would be quite willing to sit either this afternoon or tomorrow afternoon if the Prime Minister is willing to have a discussion.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Sir, may I signify our general appreciation of the Prime Minister's statement? We hope the Prime Minister will give full and courageous expression to the deepest urges of the Indian people for the establishment of world peace, now that new possibilities have opened.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the House had consultations with the Prime Minister but before tomorrow evening it will not be possible for him to have any time for this.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Why not tomorrow?

- MR. CHAIRMAN: Till tomorrow evening he is busy and after that we adjourn.

Mr. Vaidya on the Tea Bill.

THE TEA BILL, 1952—continued

(MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN *in the Chair*.)-

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAIDYA
(Madhya Bharat):

श्री कन्हैयालाल डी० वैद्य (मध्य भारत): उप सभापति महोदय, इस बिल पर जो वाद-विवाद हुआ है, उसमें विरोधी पक्ष की ओर से जो बहस की गई है वह एक सिद्धान्त का वाद-विवाद बन गया है और कम्युनिज्म (Communism) गान्धीज्म (Gandhism) के आदर्श पर मानों इस हाऊस (House) में कोई चर्चा हो रही है, ऐसा कल से दिखायी दे रहा है। मैं इस समय अपनी ओर से कोई अधिक बात तो इस विषय पर नहीं करना चाहता हूँ, किन्तु इतना स्पष्ट कर