

**Forged Currency Notes**

185. **Shri Daljit Singh:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) the number of cases of printing of forged currency notes detected during 1959 and 1960 so far; and

(b) the action taken against the offenders?

**The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai):** (a) and (b). The information is being collected and will be placed on the Table of the House as soon as it is ready.

**Production of Coal**

186. **Shri Daljit Singh:** Will the Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel be pleased to state the quantity of coal produced in Public and Private Sectors during the year 1959?

**The Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel (Sardar Swaran Singh):** The quantity of coal produced in the Public and Private Sectors during the year 1959 was:—

Public Sector—6.75 million tons.

Private Sector—40.33 million tons.

**S.C. and S.T. Welfare in Punjab**

187. **Shri Daljit Singh:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the total amount sanctioned by the Central Government for the welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in Punjab during 1959-60 and 1960-61 so far; and

(b) how much amount out of it has been actually spent?

**The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shrimati Alva):** (a) and (b). A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix I, annexure No. 55.]

12.02 hrs.

**MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT**

**ALLEGED REVERSAL OF POLICY TOWARDS CHINA**

**Mr. Speaker:** I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Shri Asoka Mehta, Shri M. R. Masani, Shri Vajpayee and others on the following subject:

“The situation arising out of the sudden and unwarranted reversal of Government’s declared China policy approved and endorsed by Parliament as evidenced in the Prime Minister’s latest communication to the Chinese Premier, accepting the Chinese proposal for an unconditional meeting between the two Prime Ministers.”

Do we discuss in an adjournment motion matters of policy? Also, do not we have opportunities now on the Address of the President, the debate on the Budget and so on?

**Shri Asoka Mehta (Muzaffarpur):** Sir, in the letter of the Prime Minister that was placed on the Table yesterday it is said:

“Although any negotiations on the basis you have suggested are not possible, still I think it might be helpful for us to meet.”

A distinction is here made between “negotiation” and “meeting”. On this point, the House has discussed the matter over and over again, and the policy that the Prime Minister himself had put forward and that was endorsed by the House has been different. In his letter of 7th November, the Prime Minister has said:

“It is our common desire that such a meeting should bear fruit and it is necessary, therefore, that some preliminary steps are taken

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

and the foundations for discussion laid."

Likewise, in the same letter he has said that there must be an interim understanding. Earlier still, in the earlier letter, the position was clearer still, where it was said:

"No discussions can be fruitful unless the posts on the Indian side of the traditional frontier now held by the Chinese forces are first vacated by them and further threats and intimidations immediately cease."

In the last Session, on the last day, you will recollect, we had a discussion, and on the 21st December the Prime Minister made it clear, while he gave us a gist of his reply sent to the Prime Minister of China, when he said:

"I would prefer to wait for his promised reply to my letter of 26th September and our note of 4th November before we discuss what should be the next step."

Throughout, therefore, Sir, the meeting if it was to take place was on the basis of certain conditions being satisfied, and the Chinese have been demanding all the time that the meeting should be unconditional.

The House, Sir,—on various occasions it had discussed this matter—has approved the stand that was taken by the Government in the past that any discussion, any meeting has to be on the basis of certain conditions, and now we find, Sir, that suddenly the Prime Minister has decided to have a meeting without any of these pre-conditions being fulfilled.

Far from any satisfactory reply having been received from the Prime Minister of China to the letter that has been sent by the Prime Minister and the note that we had sent in November, the reply received throws the whole frontier of India into the

melting pot. As the note that has been given makes our position very clear, it is difficult to understand why the policy which we have consistently followed, that a meeting must be held only when there are possibilities of a fruitful discussion, should be changed. Fruitful discussions take place only when certain pre-conditions are fulfilled. A meeting without any kind of pre-conditions is fraught with grave danger.

This sudden change in policy, this acceptance of the demand made by China that the two Prime Ministers should meet,—I am sure they are going to meet where they are going to discuss something very serious, and discussion on anything serious without the necessary pre-conditions being met is something completely contrary to the policy that has been accepted by the Parliament—this sudden reversal of policy, demands a very serious consideration.

Some Hon. Members rose—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. I have heard enough from the hon. Member. At this stage I am not going to allow any argument. I only want to know whether there is really a change of policy; if so, whether this House ought to have been consulted before such a change of policy has been undertaken. These are the two points. If I am satisfied *prima facie* I will allow a discussion. If I am not satisfied, of course, other opportunities may be availed of and not by way of an adjournment motion. These two points are simple. I am going to hear the hon. Prime Minister, whether there is really a change of policy.

**Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur):** Sir, I would like to draw your attention to the President's Address. The President was pleased to state:

"My Government, therefore, pursues a policy both of a peaceful approach, by negotiation under appropriate conditions."

The Prime Minister has now invited the Chinese Prime Minister unconditionally. There is no relevance now to discuss the President's Address. A new situation has arisen, and the House should be given an opportunity to discuss it.

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** I am sorry, Sir, that hon. Members have a feeling of any kind of reversal of policy. So far as I am concerned and my Government is concerned, there has been no reversal, and the identical line of approach which we have followed and which has been expressed in the President's Address is expressed in the note to the Chinese Government.

The hon. Member, Shri Asoka Mehta, quoted from something I had said, that a meeting will not be in these conditions fruitful. I have not here in front of me whatever I have said, either in this House or in the other House or in a Press Conference or anywhere. I have always taken up the position that it is our policy to meet anybody and everybody in order to find a way. That is the general proposition in which I have been trained for the last 40 years, and I do not think, certainly, it will be right for me, and I do not think it will be right for this House to accept any kind of policy which refuses to meet and discuss. That is the broad approach to every problem in which most of us have been trained in the past and we followed it with those whom we struggled against and we fought against.

Apart from that, Sir, the question is what our position in a particular matter is. Now, in this particular matter, when the Chinese Prime Minister invited me to meet him within, I think, seven or eight days at Rangoon, I pointed out that in that way the meeting will serve no purpose and, anyhow, I could not go there. I agreed, and I have been repeating it several times in this House, that I am always

prepared to meet when it is proved, as the hon. Member has pointed out, that it will lead to some fruitful results. Now, when we consider all these developments, recent developments—we had received a reply which was published yesterday—it took us a long time, naturally, to find out the various facts, historical and others, and there was some delay—I was very anxious that that reply of mine, of the Government, to the Chinese Government should be in the possession of the House as soon as it met. But, unfortunately, there was some delay. The reply itself was prepared about the end of last month. We decided that it would be better for the Ambassador himself to take it rather than for us to telegraph it; and therefore, there was some delay. I could not place it right at the beginning of the session or even earlier. There was about a week's delay.

Another fact, if you permit me to mention, is this, a curious misunderstanding. The letter that I have addressed to the Chinese Premier is, I think, dated 5th February, while the note is dated, I think, 12th February. Obviously, hon. Members will realise that the letter was dated the day I signed it. The note which had been prepared before the letter—obviously it is part of the letter—had to be dated when it was being delivered in Peking. So, it was dated a few days later, but the note came earlier. I had to wait—I could not help it—till it was delivered before I could place it before the House. As soon as I got the news that it was delivered, immediately I placed it on the Table of the House. This was done yesterday.

Now, the only question for this House to consider is whether there has been any reversal of the policy. I submit that there has been no reversal so far as my mind is concerned and so far as we are concerned. We have been considering this matter and we came to the conclusion: we sent this letter and that letter, which it should be remembered, is a part or a necessary complement of the long note we

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

have sent, here we have firmly and clearly stated what our policy in these matters is. We find that having regard to all the circumstances we should not rule out the possibility of meeting—not, if I may submit, of negotiating on that basis and I have said in that note which is part of the documents—and we cannot rule out this meeting from both the points of view, of our past policy and present policy and other large considerations.

So, I submit there is no such reversal. Anyhow, these matters, I admit are important and vital and this House should have every chance of discussing them. They are, in fact, possibly being discussed even in connection with the President's Address. Possibly they might be discussed later also. I would be glad to have the assistance of this House in all these matters. They are too vital to be passed through in this way. It does not, I submit, give rise to an adjournment motion.

**Shri Goray (Poona):** You said you should be convinced whether *prima facie* there has been a reversal of policy or not.

**Some Hon. Members rose—**

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. I know what I said. Hon. Members will kindly hear me. There must be an end to this. I have asked the hon. Member, one of the sponsors of this motion, in the representative character, to speak. Then, I called upon the hon. Prime Minister. In the meanwhile, if an hon. Member gets up, shall I ask him to go on? How long will this kind of thing go on? Is there no end to this? It is rather strange. (*Interruptions*)

**Shri Goray:** Therefore, it should be admitted.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Hon. Members know fully well. One side is heard and then the other side is heard and then the judge comes to a

conclusion. Otherwise, we will have to go on endlessly. (*Interruptions*) I am sorry, I cannot allow this. If hon. Members want to put their case before the House, they should make up their minds and they will have to anticipate not only their points of view but the objections and explanations from the other side and then answer them in advance. I will have to hear both the sides and then I will have to make up my mind. Let it not be understood that I am trying to shut out anybody. But this is not the procedure that shall be followed.

So far as the motion for adjournment is concerned, it is clear. If there is really a change of policy, I would be the first person, in a matter of this consequence, to allow the adjournment motion immediately. What has led to this has been made clear. The hon. Prime Minister has now explained the position. He was not willing to go to Burma unless there was some useful purpose to be served. From that, it is understood that unless some conditions or some useful purpose had been satisfied, there is no further meeting.

Now, evidently, hon. Members who have tabled this adjournment motion wanted to know whether there has been any change or any possibility of any useful meeting and they thought that a change of policy has arisen. This is too big a matter to be disposed of through an adjournment motion. This matter was referred to in the President's Address and I am sure in his reply the hon. Prime Minister will certainly place before the House what are the circumstances that have occurred recently for him to consent to a meeting with the Chinese Premier. I do not think it is necessary to have an adjournment motion and adjourn the House to discuss it. We will immediately proceed with the debate on the President's Address.

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** Sir, the point that I made has not been answered by the Prime Minister nor have you tried to give a ruling. For the first time, a distinction is sought to be made between negotiations and meeting. In the past, meeting was considered to be a part of the process of negotiation. Now, the two are put in watertight compartments. You, Sir, are a very distinguished lawyer and our very respected Speaker. I would like to know, and my colleagues would like to know, where you draw a line between meeting and negotiation. If in the past we were not to negotiate unless theoretically a meeting was conceived, in practice there was to be no meeting because a meeting was to be a part of the whole complex of negotiations. Therefore, a major change has been made in the policy. On that point, neither the Prime Minister has said anything nor in your ruling have you tried to explain.

**Mr. Speaker:** There may be negotiations without meeting. There may be negotiations with meeting. Without meeting there can be negotiation; with meeting there can be negotiation. And then even with meeting, there may be no negotiation.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara):** What is this meeting for? To discuss weather?

**Mr. Speaker:** My only point is whether the House should adjourn and give preference to this matter and discuss as to why he has now made up his mind to meet. What is the difference between the one and the other? This is too big a matter to be disposed of in an adjournment motion. I will allow a free discussion on this matter if points are raised, by whichever side which has got some doubts and differences, as to what will be disposed of at this meeting, whether it is not negotiation, etc. Then those points will be answered by the hon. Prime Minister to the satisfaction of the House and to the satisfaction of the country at large. I feel that the ad-

journalment motion is not the proper remedy for this purpose, and I do not give my consent to it.

**Shri Vajpayee:** Will you allow us to move a new amendment to the motion on the President's Address in view of the Prime Minister's letter?

**Mr. Speaker:** When such an amendment is moved, I may consider that matter. It is all hypothetical now.

12.18 hrs.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

##### AMENDMENTS TO INDIAN ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE (PAY) RULES

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar):** I beg to re-lay on the Table, under sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the All-India Services Act, 1951, a copy of Notification No. G.S.R. 1291 dated the 28th November, 1959 making certain amendments to Schedule III to the Indian Administrative Service (Pay) Rules, 1954. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-1787/59.*]

##### NOTIFICATIONS ISSUED UNDER MEDICINAL AND TOILET PREPARATIONS (EXCISE DUTIES) ACT AND CENTRAL EXCISES AND SALT ACT

**The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat):** I beg to lay a copy of each of the following papers:—

- (i) Notification No. G.S.R. 112 dated the 30th January, 1960 under sub-section (4) of Section 19 of the Medicinal and Toilet Preparations (Excise Duties) Act, 1955 making certain further amendments to the Medicinal and Toilet Preparations (Excise Duties) Rules, 1956. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-1894/60.*]
- (ii) A copy of each of the following "Notifications under