

(c) if not, whether the said Factory has been exempted from the provisions of the Factories Act in this regard?

The Deputy Minister of Railways (Shri Shah Nawaz Khan): (a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) Neither the provisions of the Factories Act nor the rules framed by the Madras Government under Section 40 of the Factories Act visualise that the staff employed in Railway canteens should be railway servants, and therefore the question of exemption from the provisions of the Factories Act does not arise.

12.10 hrs.

#### MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

STATEMENT BY FINANCE MINISTER IN WASHINGTON RE: QUEMOY AND MATSU ISLANDS

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of some adjournment motions. One is by Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I told him that I was not satisfied that there was anything here for being brought up before the House by way of an adjournment motion. I shall read out the adjournment motion:

"The statement made by the Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, in a radio interview in Washington in defiance of the Bandung principles and the declared policy of the Government of India in regard to the Chinese People's Republic's inalienable right to the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu."

I have got a cutting from the newspaper of the entire report of his statement there and the interview. He only says that there ought to be no violent warfare lest it should engulf the whole world. I do not find any statement there that Quemoy or Matsu does not belong to the People's Republic of China. He is not arguing. He is emphatic about this matter. Shri

Morarji Desai is not here now. Under these circumstances, I thought it was not necessary that every statement that was made by any Minister anywhere in the world should become a matter for adjournment motion here. I do not know if he has informed the Prime Minister that he is going to make a statement and sent an advance copy. The hon. Prime Minister will be in the same position as any others also in this matter.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I got this only half an hour ago.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister says that he got this only half an hour ago.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not complaining of the time. I am prepared to deal with it without any notice.

Mr. Speaker: All that I can say with respect to this matter is that this is not the first of its kind. Hon. Ministers go on various businesses, and somehow, even beyond their own legitimate province, they are asked questions by journalists, and sometimes, it is rather difficult to avoid the temptation of talking to them. Under these circumstances, it is rather difficult that every time I shall go on adjourning the normal business of this House. Let us await until the hon. Minister of Finance comes in.

Some Hon. Members: Yes, Sir.

Shri Nagi Reddy (Anantapur): Events do not wait. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Anyhow, he will be here. Others need not participate. Now, what about Shri H. N. Mukerjee?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—Central): You will permit me to say in the beginning that I waited a while before I sent in this adjournment motion, because I wanted to find out

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

if there was any disclaimer or anything by way of an explanation. But it was a radio interview which the Finance Minister gave, and I dare say there is a recording of it which should be available to our representation abroad. I feel that this is very important, and it is a pity that successive Finance Ministers abroad open their mouth and put their foot into it. This statement as reported in the newspapers,—and I am quoting from *The Times of India* dated the 12th September, 1958—is objectionable in itself, and it is utterly inconsistent with the Prime Minister's oft-repeated stand on the issue of the foreshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. You will permit me to quote a few sentences from this report.

"He was asked if India favoured one side more than it did the other in the Formosa crisis. The Finance Minister replied 'Whoever used military force is wrong, to my mind. If one side uses military means and the other side defends itself, I cannot say that the person who defends himself is wrong'."

Now, in regard to this Formosa crisis, as the journalist concerned put it, the Government of India, through our Prime Minister, has made our position, our national position, absolutely clear, and that is, we know who is in the right and who is in the wrong. Therefore, this is, I feel, a piece of prevarication which is utterly unworthy of a man holding such an exalted position.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am afraid the hon. Member should not use such language. There is no meaning in using such language as this against any hon. Member, and that too, a Minister. There can be honest difference of opinion. I myself held the view or thought that there may be persons in the world, and particularly, in this country, who do not want a war, whatever might be the intention. Hon. Members have urged and urged that

we should go to war. But, no, the hon. Prime Minister is anxious that there ought to be no war in the world, and that everything must be settled peacefully. That is one view. (*Interruptions.*) I am not favouring the one view or the other. Are we to discuss here that this gentleman should have said that even a violent war must be carried on against Formosa, and then say that a Minister prevaricates this and that?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** May I explain my position?

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** You will let me explain myself a bit. You will permit me to say a few words.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member will not cast aspersions, but will merely refer to those points to allow me to come to a conclusion one way or the other.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** I am not going into the merits of the question. But I say that *prima facie* an issue arises where the statement of the Finance Minister lends itself unfortunately to an interpretation which gravely jeopardizes our position in regard to a very friendly neighbour. And I do wish . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** That is one point. What is the next point?

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Over and over again, at a time when there are military activities going on, especially, on the part of the American troops in Formosa and the Navy and so on and so forth . . .

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat):** There is the Seventh Fleet in China.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** . . . questions are asked, leading questions, to which he gives answers which are at best equivocal and at worst a complete repudiation of our foreign policy in regard to China. For example, when

he was asked whether our sympathies lay anywhere, he said it was not his business to say which Government should hold China. "The Communist Government does hold China, as a matter of fact", he added, "it is not for me to say that the Government should be changed". I cannot imagine a more blatant piece of deviation from the kind of policy which with national support the Prime Minister has propounded. I therefore, appeal, and I wish the Prime Minister at least to explain the position.

I am not going to hurry anybody. Let us wait, if you feel in your wisdom that it is better that we should find out exactly what was said. The recording of the interview possibly would be available by that time, and that ought to be made available to this country, but I feel that for the time being, a statement has been made by a very exalted representative of the Government of India, who is boosted in a certain section of the dubious press in a rather vulgar fashion, as a successor of the Prime Minister, as a person who can change the policy of the present Government. Now, statements are being made which go against the grains of India's foreign policy. That is why I wish that something is done in order to pour oil, so to speak, on unnecessarily and gratuitously troubled waters and the waters were troubled not by any act of the Opposition or anybody else but by certain very thoughtless and irresponsible pronouncements of the Finance Minister.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I can understand that the hon. Member attaches importance to certain world problems. But, attaching importance to them does not mean that we should lose our sense of language or perspective. I have read this report in the same newspapers as the hon. Member has done, and the whole stress as a matter of fact, is as follows. May I say that in another statement on another occasion, the Finance Minister said clearly,—which was stating our case—"We consider the islands...."

—and this was about Formosa, not about Quemoy and Matsu; Formosa stands further away; if he says, Formosa, it applies much more to Quemoy and Matsu. He said this:

"We consider the island to be Chinese but had stated our view that the matter should be settled peacefully."

He has not at any time swerved from that view, but he has been laying stress on the fact that it should be settled peacefully. Now, whether it can be settled peacefully or not, or whose fault it is that we are having a state of war or near-war or whatever it is, is another matter.

I really do not think that the hon. Member is at all justified in the interpretation he has put or the other remarks that he had made in regard to this, because the whole burden of his remarks is the necessity of avoiding war. And it should be remembered that he was answering questions. He was asked, for instance, something about the Government of China, It is the American view-point, or at any rate, the view-point of many Americans or some Americans, that the Government of China should be changed. Now, he says 'That is none of my business' or gives some answer to that effect. Now, the hon. Member takes exception to that. My point is that, first of all, having made his position clear as to what our position is, that is, that Formosa belongs to the Chinese Government, and if Formosa belongs....

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Which Chinese? Nationalist Chinese?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Not at all. There is no difficulty about it. Obviously, we consider that it is the People's Government of China that he was referring to in the context. The other is not referred to by us anywhere. There is no doubt about that. After all, he is examined and he talks

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

about the avoidance of war and our not getting entangled and all that. It may be that the problem lost its certain clearness in the discussion about non-violence and peaceful methods. But there is no question of the Finance Minister saying anything—I have gone through it very carefully—which is against our policy which has been there frequently proclaimed or against the Bandung principles. I just read through the whole Bandung thing. I do not know fully if the hon. Member wants to know again and afresh what our policy is in regard to Formosa or Taiwan or Quemoy or Matsu. It is as clear as anything can be. We only recognise one Government of China, and that is the People's Government of China. For us, constitutionally or legally no other Government exists there. We know of course, that there is a certain government controlled by the Kuomintang in Formosa or Taiwan. In fact, we know that it also controls the Quemoy and Matsu islands. But because we only recognise one Government, that is the People's Government, we think that Formosa and those islands must necessarily be part of the Chinese State, that is, the present Chinese State on the mainland.

Quite apart from this, the Quemoy and Matsu islands are about six or ten miles from the mainland. It is, as I have said previously, something like the island of Elephanta being occupied by an enemy sitting in front of Bombay City. It is an intolerable position—somebody sitting at Elephanta and bombarding Bombay City. Therefore, quite apart from the larger question, it is extraordinarily difficult for this position to be stabilised or to be accepted.

Then there is another thing. In his speech, the Finance Minister referred repeatedly—and this itself can give the key to what he was thinking of—to Goa and said "We hold that Goa is part of India. It is part of India.

It should come to us. We think we have a strong case and all that. Yet we do not take violent measures". He gave that as a parallel.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** If the 7th Fleet had come in, what would have been our attitude?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** That is not the point. I am not discussing that now. I am discussing what the Finance Minister said. He gave an example and said 'Goa is ours, it should be ours; yet we do not indulge in military or violent activities'. He was stressing the fact that the problems should be solved peacefully. Now, whether they can be solved peacefully or not is another question. Some think that it is insolvable by peaceful methods. That is a different matter. But I am discussing what he said, and I do submit that there is no question of any confusion about it, if one realises it.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** May I ask a question of the Prime Minister? The report says, as I had quoted earlier, that the Finance Minister personally believed that it was not his business to say which Government should hold China. We recognise China not only *de facto* but also *de jure*, and it was only a statement which was requisitioned from him by the Correspondent, and he chose not to say. The Prime Minister may be content with it; he has made his bed and he has to lie on it. But I do ask whether he can reconcile this position of our foreign policy with this kind of statement made by the Finance Minister.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I have stated that it was in answer to a question and it depends on the type of question that was put. It is obvious. A question is put 'Do you want a change?' He said—'It is none of my business. It is for the Chinese people to determine'. It is a straight answer. I do not see any difficulty about it. Our position and our policy are quite clear on the subject.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, must certainly be satisfied with this. When the hon. Prime Minister, who is in charge of external affairs, has repeatedly said what Shri H. N. Mukerjee wants him to say, why should he worry about what another Minister says elsewhere? I am really surprised. There is no fear about it. It is certain that both the Opposition and Government are on the side of the hon. Prime Minister so far as the external affairs policy is concerned. Nowhere has it been criticised. There has been no change of policy. Therefore, again and again to bring up every other statement made by another Minister and make it the subject-matter of discussion here and to try to create disturbance in the minds of those people in China—in the Government of the People's Republic of China—as to what that really means, is not proper. I would only request hon. Members to let sleeping dogs lie and not to make much of such things. If the hon. Prime Minister, who is in charge of external affairs, had said something even though indirectly against our policy, I would allow him to raise it.

**Shri Tangamani (Madurai):** There is collective responsibility.

**Mr. Speaker:** Collective responsibility is there. But let us not make a flutter and give a wrong impression to the outside world. The hon. Member himself must have said; "This does not matter. This is what he means". (*Interruptions.*) God has created individuals, not one single tortoise running over the whole world. There are a number of bulbs, each reflecting its lustre. Each man is entitled to the language that he uses. It may be different from others. Circumstances are different, the manner of putting questions may all be different.

Therefore, from a distance let us not misunderstand what any Minister has said. If he had said apparently something different from the avowed policy of Parliament, then we can take cognisance of it. I am appealing to

all sides of the House. If anybody puts a question, let him say, 'that is not the interpretation; this is the interpretation'.

**Shri Asoka Mehta (Muzaffarpur):** You have not understood his difficulty. Professor Mukerjee is unhappy because deviationism and revisionism are considered to be in order in this country.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member is trying to take advantage of this situation and say something which he has in his mind.

Under the circumstances, I am very happy that whatever might be the impression that has been created in any part of the world by the hon. Finance Minister's statement, there has been a reiteration of our policy in unequivocal terms by the hon. Prime Minister, which ought to be the declaration and interpretation of the policy.

Therefore, I would appeal to hon. Members that hereafter—not that I am putting a ban—they may make light of such matters. Wherever there is a definite policy which we have accepted, not only a single Minister but the whole Cabinet also cannot change it without the consent of this House. Under the circumstances, let us not get into a flutter over what this Minister says or that Minister says, so long as the policy is not changed by this House.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** May I point out that on various occasions the Prime Minister himself has said that he does not like our going abroad and making statements against our country? If these are made such an issue, and if the Finance Minister of such a big country goes abroad and says it, do you ask us make light of it?

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not trying to make light of it. Not only the Finance Minister but everybody who goes from this country ought not to be free with respect to all matters pertaining

[Mr. Speaker]

to us. I would give this advice; any Minister who goes out may confine himself only to the point for which he goes. If the Minister for Steel goes, let him not talk about anything other than steel. This will avoid all difficulties.

Under the circumstances, I do not think there is any necessity for me to give my consent to this. Consent is withheld to this motion.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Would you keep it pending till the Finance Minister comes back?

**Mr. Speaker:** No, no.

12.29 hrs.

POINT RE: ADJOURNMENT  
MOTION

**Mr. Speaker:** I have to inform the House.....

**Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indian):** Mr. Speaker, I have given.....

**Mr. Speaker:** I have disallowed it.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I wanted to raise one or two matters....

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. The hon. Member will hear me and then he may or may not raise it. I repeated the other day and I do so again. Besides being an ordinary Member, he is also one of the Panel of Chairmen; therefore, he must also know what exactly I have proposed to do.

All adjournment motions are brought to me. He knows and every other hon. Member knows that without my consent, it cannot be brought up before this House. As soon as I see an adjournment motion, I examine it and say either that it is a matter of law and order or some other thing,

this is not specific or definite or an urgent matter of public importance. It must be specific and definite; it must also relate to something which has been done in contravention of the prevailing rule or law etc. There must be neglect on the part of Government or improper action on the part of Government. There must be default. I consider all these and come to some conclusion. After all, I have to come to some conclusion and I do so. Then, when I tell him that I am not going to allow, the hon. Member may keep his soul in patience. If he wants to persuade me to allow the discussion, he will kindly write to me or talk to me. I am prepared to bring it up if I am satisfied. There is no such urgency with respect to this matter that unless it is decided today the Heavens are going to fall. Therefore, the hon. Member may satisfy me whether the statement of a particular Minister which he refers to is such that a discussion should take place on it, adjourning all the other work of the House. I have got to decide that matter. I have done that and if any hon. Member wants to get up against it it is disobeying my orders.

I am giving the hon. Member an opportunity—I am not shutting him out permanently—to come and talk to me in my Chamber. If he convinces me, I can bring it before the House tomorrow, if not today. If I am not convinced, there is no other remedy except that he must get rid of me.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** Sir.....

**Mr. Speaker:** Order please. He cannot get rid of me so soon.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I want to raise a point of order, unless you say I cannot raise it.

**Mr. Speaker:** On a prior occasion—it was some five years ago, soon after my becoming Deputy-Speaker—this very hon. Member wanted to raise a