

[Shri V. V. Giri]

the modification of the decision of the Labour Appellate Tribunal on the appeals against the award of the All-India Industrial Tribunal (Bank Disputes) (Sastry Tribunal) [Placed in Library. See No. S-252/54.]; and

(ii) Statement of reasons for modifying the decision of the Labour Appellate Tribunal on the appeals against the Award of the All-India Industrial Tribunal (Bank Disputes), dated the 28th April, 1954 [*Placed in Library. See No. S-253/54.*].

**FURTHER NOTES EXCHANGED BETWEEN
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA AND PORTU-
GUESE GOVERNMENT**

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of certain further notes exchanged between the Government of India and the Portuguese Government regarding Portuguese Possessions in India. [Placed in Library. See No. S-251/54.]

NOTIFICATIONS MAKING AMENDMENTS TO ESTATE DUTY RULES

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri M. C. Shah): I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 85 of the Estate Duty Act, 1953, a copy of the Notifications No. S.R.O. 1706, dated the 22nd May, 1954, and No. 13 dated the 6th July, 1954 making certain amendments to the Estate Duty Rules, 1953. [Placed in Library. See No. S-257/54.]

PETITIONS RECEIVED

Secretary: Sir, I have to report that four petitions have been received on the following subjects:

(1) Duplicate allotment of residential accommodation to displaced persons;

(2) Restrictions with regard to crossword puzzle schemes:

(3) Merger of Seraikella-Kharswan with Orissa and suppression of movements against their integration with Bihar: and

(4) Floating of 'Tax Evaders Loan' to unearth the hidden money of tax evaders.

Statement re: Petitions

Number of Signatories	District or Town	State	Number of petitions
1	Delhi	Delhi	30
1	Coimbatore District	Madras	31
2701	Seraikella	Bihar	32
1	Delhi	Delhi	33

PRIME MINISTER'S STATEMENT ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): The House is aware that since it took into consideration the international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto on the 15th May last, events and developments of much significance have occurred. All these are, in a general way, of concern and interest to us. Some of these events and developments are of more proximate concern to us. In some of them again, our sentiments and our historic circumstances are engaged; in others we are either involved or are concerned to avoid involvement; and in some we have accepted, as part of our international obligations and concern for peace, heavy burdens and onerous responsibilities.

It is not my intention to refer to all these matters or to deal with any of them at great length but to make a comparatively brief statement, setting out the Government's appreciation of and position in respect of some of these problems and developments.

The situation in respect of the Portuguese settlements in India, which has aroused much attention and concern both in the House and the country, is one which has continually engaged the study and active consideration of Government. Internally in the Portuguese settlements, the opposition and resistance to foreign and colonial rule has gathered momentum. This is an entirely Goan movement, popular and indigenous. It has been countered by the authorities by the time-honoured but discredited methods of colonial assertion, repression and authoritarian violence coupled with the denial of inherent rights of the people to their freedom and self-determination.

The position of the Government of India and indeed of the people of this country, is well-known and hardly needs restatement. Goa and the Union of India form one country. As a result of foreign conquest, various parts of India came under colonial domination. Historical developments brought almost the entire country under British rule. But some small pockets of territory remained under the colonial rule of other foreign powers, chiefly because they were tolerated as such by the then British power. The movement for freedom in India was not confined to any part of the country, its objective was the freedom of the entire country from every kind of foreign domination. Inevitably the movement took shape in what was called British India and, ultimately, resulted in the withdrawal of the colonial power and the establishment of the Republic of India. That process of liberation cannot be completed till the remaining small pockets of foreign territory are also not freed from colonial control. The Government and the people of this country, therefore, fully sympathise with the aspirations of the Goan people to free themselves from alien rule and to be reunited with the motherland.

The policy that we have pursued has been, even as in India under British rule, one of non-violence and

we have fashioned our approach and conduct accordingly. This adherence to non-violence means

(i) that we may not abandon or permit any derogation of our identification with the cause of our compatriots under Portuguese rule; and

(ii) equally we may not adopt, advocate or deliberately bring about situations of violence.

We regard and base our position on the fact that the liberation movement is Goan and spontaneous, and that its real strength lies in this fact.

The Government of India, and I am confident the great majority of our people, have no intention of adopting any policy or methods which depart from these principles, which are the foundations on which our very nationhood rests and which are the historic and unique legacy of Gandhiji and the pioneers of our freedom.

Further, we may never forget that, in our approach and endeavours for our own freedom we were enjoined to eliminate fear. I want to say in all sincerity that the Government do not and will not function in this matter on a foundation of apprehensiveness and fear of probable consequences, of threats, from whatever quarter they may come, or condone, much less approve or support, methods of conduct based on fear. Such methods are opposed to our policy and deny the basic ideas of non-violence.

The Portuguese Government have indulged in reckless allegations and unrestrained abuse of us. Moved by the fear characteristic of those whose strength is based on force, they have sought to amass their military strength on their possessions in India to terrorise the people. They are well aware that they constitute no terror for us.

It is not, however, the intention of the Government of India to be provoked into thinking and acting in

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

military terms. The Portuguese concentrations and ship movements may well be a violation of our national and international rights. We shall examine and consider these and take such legitimate measures as may be necessary. But we have no intention of following the Portuguese Government's example in this respect.

The Portuguese Government have, in their representations to us and to other countries, as well as in their crude propaganda, indulged in totally untrue and reckless allegations. The purpose of all this is to arouse opinion against us by painting us as aggressive militarists, anti-Christian, particularly anti-Catholic, and hypocritical expansionists. They want others to believe that we want to make Goa an Indian colony.

These allegations are repudiated by the Goan people in the Portuguese possessions themselves, despite the authoritarian regime there and the repression, the censorship and State-controlled propaganda. The Goan liberation movement, however, continues to grow and may well be measured by the increase in violence and recklessness of Portuguese allegations and propaganda. Goans, outside Goa, mainly in India and East Africa, have expressed themselves in favour of this movement. They demand the end of alien rule and the reunion of Goa with the motherland.

The Portuguese allegations about Indian hostility to Roman Catholics and the danger to Catholics if Goa joined the Indian Union have been repudiated most emphatically by the Roman Catholics of India and, more particularly, by their eminent leaders. The Catholics in India regard these Portuguese allegations not only as false but as a slur on themselves and their country. They point to the five billion Catholics in India, who have absolute religious freedom and enjoy the consideration and respect of the rest of their compatriots. They know that the

guarantees of our Constitution are a reality. Recently, at a widely attended meeting of Goans in Bombay, composed of people of all shades of opinion, mostly non-sectarian and non-party, this feeling found emphatic expression and the falsity of Portuguese allegations was exposed.

I deeply regret that the Portuguese Government should have decided to arouse religious passions to serve their colonial ends. They have failed in this endeavour.

I would like to take this opportunity of stating once again some aspects of our basic approach in respect of Goa, when it becomes a part of the Indian Union:—

(a) The freedom and rights guaranteed by the Constitution of India and which specifically refer to freedom of conscience, worship and practice of religion, will extend in full measure and in all their implications to these areas.

(b) The special circumstances of cultural, social and lingual relations and the sense of a territorial group which history has created will be respected.

(c) Laws and customs which are part of the social pattern of these areas and which are consistent with fundamental human rights and freedoms, will be respected and modifications will be sought only by negotiation and consent.

(d) As we have done in the rest of India, full use will be made of the administrative, judicial and other services, confident that the return of freedom to and the unity of these areas with the motherland will enable adjustments to be made in harmony with progress and with the desires of the people.

The House knows that recently some Notes have been exchanged between the Portuguese Government and the Government of India. They have been placed on the table of the House. It will be evident from these Notes that the Government of India have stated their position with firmness, clarity and restraint and unprovoked by either the language or the content of the Portuguese Notes. The Government believe and are confident that the House will agree that this is and should be the way of behaviour of Governments. I shall refrain from detailed comments on the Notes exchanged except to say that, consistent with their policy of settling differences and resolving problems by conciliation and negotiation, the Government of India promptly accepted the very first offer of the Portuguese Government to cooperate with them on the issue of impartial observation. The Government of India have no objection to this and they have nothing to conceal. They have proposed that representatives of the two Governments should meet together at once and implement the principle on which they have agreed. The last Note of the Portuguese Government appears to raise some further doubts and difficulties, but the Government of India have intimated their firm desire to pursue conciliation and negotiation and urged the Portuguese Government to enable the conference to begin.

I would like to say on behalf of our country and Government that we have no animosity towards Portugal or her people. We believe the freedom of the Goans, now subject to Portugal, would be a gain for Portugal as well. We will continue to pursue, with patience and firmness, the path of conciliation and negotiation. Equally, we must declare that we would be false to our history and betray the cause of freedom itself if we did not state, without reserve, that our country and Government firmly and fully believe in the right of our compatriots in Goa to free themselves from alien rule and

to be reunited with the rest of the motherland. This will serve the cause of friendship and understanding, even as freedom to India has led to friendly relations between the United Kingdom and India. We would therefore invite the Portuguese Government to cooperate in the peaceful consummation of these endeavours.

The position in respect of the French settlements happily affords at present a different and more hopeful picture. I believe we may reasonably feel that we are nearing the consummation of our hopes of a peaceful and lasting settlement, arrived at by conciliation and consent, honourable and satisfactory to all concerned. Exchanges of views and ideas between ourselves and the Government of France have been in progress for some time and they are being pursued with goodwill on both sides. The Prime Minister of France has demonstrated to the world his patriotism and political boldness as well as his desire for peaceful settlements by negotiation. I have every hope that we shall before long witness the solution of this problem in the context of the full freedom of our people and of firmer friendship between India and France.

The present phase of this problem is, as I have said, hopeful, but it has not always been so. The exercise of patience and our firm desire to reach settlement by negotiation has justified itself. The House will perhaps allow me to say that this policy of action with patience and prudence, in accordance with the principles we hold, does justice to ourselves and also yields results.

From these two issues, geographical and politically proximate to us, I would now ask the House to turn to others, in which we are no less concerned and are perhaps more onerously involved and committed. I refer to the two Conferences held in Geneva in April to July of this year. Both these Conferences were concerned with the countries and peoples of Asia. Yet the principal participants in the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Conference, with the significant exception of China, were non-Asian States. This corresponds in some measure to the reality of the modern world, a reality that represents territorial, racial and political imbalance. It also enables us to appreciate that we cannot consider, much less resolve, the important problems of the world today by regarding them as Asian or European, Eastern or Western, problems exclusively. Their solution, however, requires the recognition of the place of Asia in the modern world.

This was evident at Geneva in several ways. Firstly, there was the presence of China at both the Conferences, proclaiming by her presence there not only the inevitability of the recognition of facts, but of the purposefulness of such recognition.

Secondly, there was the fact that at the Conference on Indo-China, the deliberations of the South East Asia Prime Ministers at Colombo had an essential and inescapable role in the Geneva deliberations, although none of these countries participated, at Geneva. The Colombo proposals on Indo-China were themselves, in large part, based on similar proposals submitted to this House on an earlier occasion and which, with certain modifications in formulation, found favour with my fellow Prime Ministers.

The Conference on Korea adjourned inconclusively, but it should be noted and affirmed that the Conference has not broken up. The problem of Korea has to be resolved in the interests of Asian and world stability and peace. It is not without significance that no party at Geneva was willing or ready to force the Conference to a catastrophic or even formal end. The great majority of the States represented wished and sought at least partial solutions. The proposals made there contain the elements of advance and a concern to find a settlement. They can be a kind of bridgehead from which a hopeful landing to the shores

of a Korean settlement may, and indeed, should be planned or envisaged. The Geneva Conference should not be permitted to lapse. Endeavours to make progress towards peace in Korea should be continued.

At Geneva, the Indo-China Conference assumed the greater importance. The historic role of this Conference was that it was the alternative, or the deterrent, to what threatened to lead to World War III. This is the feature of the Geneva Conference on Indo-China that gives it a memorable place in history.

The mediatory role of the two Presidents of the Conference, Mr. Eden and M. Molotov, and the dominant desire that pervaded Geneva despite all conflicts and deadlocks, was that there should be a settlement and the grim alternative must be averted.

Apart from the two Conference Presidents, the Chinese Prime Minister, whom we had the pleasure of welcoming in this country, distinguished himself as a constructive statesman. He also brought to the Conference the first-hand sense of the reality of the new Asia. His visit to India appears to have assisted him to understand the Asia outside of China and also to appreciate the evolving South East Asia pattern of collective peace.

Great as the role of others was, the main task and therefore the determining role rested with the principal belligerents—France and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. Direct negotiations between them first proposed in this House and later affirmed at Colombo, became an important feature in regard to some aspects. To the Prime Minister of France, M. Mendes-France, and the representatives of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam our gratitude is due for the courage and vision with which they tackled this difficult problem. The three other Governments in Indo-China, represented at the Conference, namely, Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam, all intimately in-

volved in the horrors of war, also made their contribution to the settlement. Indo-China has been a truly negotiated settlement where not any one of the belligerents but peace has been the victor.

The Armistice settlement rests on the agreement between the combatants, represented by the two High Commands. On them rests the responsibility of maintaining it. But, from the beginning of the Conference, the role, functions, composition and the procedure of the neutral or impartial Supervisory Commissions bedevilled the deliberations, and stood deadlocked for a long time. The agreement reached on the functions as now set out and the composition of the Commissions with Canada, Poland and India proved the turning point. To India, a place on the Commissions was proposed by every participant and on every occasion. Finally, the Chairmanship of India became one of the necessities for a settlement.

India had not been a participant at the Conference. She had not sought a place on the Commissions. Indeed, we did not even disclose whether we would or would not accept responsibility. When this responsibility was offered to us, we could not refuse for our refusal would have meant imperilling the whole agreement. We have thus to shoulder this heavy and onerous responsibility.

We have been fortunate in our colleagues and in our relations with the parties in Indo-China. Hitherto all decisions in the Commissions have been unanimous. This itself represents goodwill and an earnest desire to work as a team. On the 1st August I inaugurated a Conference of the three Governments to establish the Commissions on the date fixed by the agreements. This Conference came to unanimous decisions and sent out in record time an advance party under Sri S. Dutt, Commonwealth Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs. Sri Dutt returned two days ago after all the three Commissions had been established. I feel sure that the House

would wish to assure them of its goodwill and its earnest hope of their success.

It is a notable feature of the Indo-China settlement that it provides for the establishment of the independence of the three States—Viet-Nam, Laos and Cambodia—and seeks to safeguard their sovereignty on the pledges of mutual respect of each other's integrity, freedom from interference in each other's internal affairs, and the undertaking not to enter into military alliances with other States. Thus, the Indo-China States bid fair to find a place in collective peace rather than in war blocs.

To the people of Indo-China, irrespective of their former antagonisms to one another and in all their grim travail, we send our sincere and warm wishes and hopes for peace, unity and prosperity. Asia has greater hopes of peace and stability as a result of the Indo-China settlement.

I have already mentioned the visit of Mr. Chou-En-Lai to Delhi. The welcome he received was spontaneous and proclaimed the urges of our people for understanding and peaceful relations. It was also an expression of a sense of Asianhood among our two peoples. This visit has brought greater understanding of each country to the other.

The joint communique issued by Mr. Chou-En-Lai and myself, as Prime Ministers of our respective countries, has attracted world attention. The five principles set out there flow from the collective peace approach. Our nearest neighbour Burma has also adhered to these five principles and other countries in South East Asia favour them. The understanding we have established is not aimed against any country or group of countries. We hope that it contains the nucleus of the pattern of collective peace, the only alternative to war-preparedness and the only substantial approach to real security.

Early next month a meeting is going to be held at Baguio in the Philippines to consider proposals to form a South

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

East Asia Collective Organisation. We have expressed our inability to participate in this meeting because it seems to us that it is likely to reverse the trend of conciliation released by the Indo-China settlement. Collective security, according to our belief, can only come by resolving world tensions and developing a pattern of collective peace. Anything that adds to those tensions takes us away from peace. We are apprehensive, therefore, that the proposed South East Asia Collective Organisation will in the present do more harm than any good that it may hope to do in the future.

It is the view and the hope of the Government of India that the present lowering of world tensions, following the Indo-China settlement and the expressed desire of nations for peace, should be followed up and utilised to further the means and prospects of world peace and of resolving present world tensions. The United Nations General Assembly, which meets next month, has before it this historic task. We trust that it will endeavour to resolve some of the stubborn conflicts of our world by the collective peace approach and not by relying on false hopes of peace and security based on fear and war.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Education Minister.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): May I make one request, that this important statement should be circulated to all the Members?

Mr. Speaker: It would be circulated.

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION ON STARRED QUESTION No. 632.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): On behalf of the hon. Minister of Education, I beg to make the following statement.

On the 4th December 1953, in reply to a supplementary question to star-

red question No. 632, enquiring whether Government would consider removing the big disparity which was alleged to exist in the pay scales sanctioned for Manipurians and for non-Manipurians employed as teachers in Government High Schools in the State, it was stated that that question was also being considered. In this connection, I wish to correct a possible misapprehension in the minds of Members and to say that what the Deputy Minister intended to convey was that the question would also be considered of bringing the scales of pay of certain posts in Government High Schools in the Manipur State into line with those for the corresponding categories of posts in the neighbouring State of Assam. There is no disparity in the pay scales of Manipurians and non-Manipurians in the State.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

FOOD ADULTERATION BILL— contd.

Clause 10.—(Powers of food inspectors)—contd.

Mr. Chairman: We proceed to the next legislative business in the House. Yesterday we finished Amendment No. 137. We proceed further.

Order, order, there is so much noise in the House. Amendment No. 26. List No. 2. Mr. S. V. Ramaswamy.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): Not moving.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Gurupadaswamy. Amendment No. 1, List No. 1.

The Minister of Health (Rajkumari Amrit Kaur): May I request that there may be less noise in the House? We cannot hear one word.

Mr. Chairman: May I request hon. Members now not to speak with each other and kindly resume the business of the House. Yes, Mr. Gurupadaswamy.