

[श्री निरंजन सिंह]  
ernment or local authority, as the  
case may be, to manage the affairs  
of the mine . . ."

प्रभी जितने सिविल भूट होते हैं या  
इंमेजेज होते हैं, उसके लिए प्रेसिडेंट  
रेसपांसिबिल होता है, वहां का डाइरेक्टर  
रेसपांसिबिल नहीं होता है। डाइरेक्टर को  
स्पू नहीं कर सकते, प्रेसिडेंट को स्पू करना  
होता है। इस प्रकार इस क्लॉज के अनुसार  
आपने अपने लिए बचत कर ली और  
एक दूसरे आदमी को बजत नहीं की।  
वैसी चीज आपको नहीं रखनी चाहिये।

इस बिल के बारे में मैं काफी बातें कह  
सकता हूँ, लेकिन मेरा समय हो गया है,  
इसलिए इजाजत चाहता हूँ।

STATEMENT *RE* PREMIER CHOU  
EN-LAI'S LATEST LETTER AND  
PRIME MINISTER'S REPLY THE PRIME  
MINISTER AND MINISTER OF  
EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI  
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): I am grateful to  
you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity of  
making a statement.

Three days ago, on the 18th December, I  
received through our Ambassador in Peking,  
Premier Chou En-lai's reply to my letter of  
the 16th November. This letter has already  
appeared in the Press and so I need not give  
any details about its contents.

I read this letter with regret. It does not  
accept the reasonable and practical proposals  
which I had made to Premier Chou En-lai in  
order to secure an immediate lessening of ten-  
sion along the Sino-Indian border and to create  
the necessary atmosphere for a peaceful  
settlement of the border problem. It is merely a  
reiteration of claims to extensive areas in our  
territory which by history, by custom or by  
agreement have long been integral parts of  
India. It does not contain any reply to the  
detailed letter which I had sent to him on  
September 26 and the note of

November 4 in which some salient facts  
bearing on the situation had been mentioned.  
Premier Chou En-lai has stated in his letter  
that he would send a reply to this previous  
letter and note of mine in the near future.

I have today sent a reply to Premier Chou  
En-lai referring to the above facts and stating  
that I am sorry to find that he had based his  
claim on recent intrusions by Chinese  
personnel into parts of Indian territory. It is,  
in fact, these intrusion which had brought  
about the present situation and created appre-  
hensions. I have further stated that I cannot  
accept the allegation that Indian forces had  
occupied any part of Chinese territory, or  
committed aggression at Kongka Pass or at  
Longju, where our established check-post was  
attacked by Chinese troops.

Premier Chou En-lai in his letter has  
spoken of the "friendly manner" in which  
Indian personnel who were captured in the  
Chenmo Valley were treated. I have referred  
him again to the statement of Shri Karam  
Singh about the treatment that he and his  
colleagues received while they were prisoners  
in the custody of the Chinese border forces.  
This statement clearly indicates the  
deplorable treatment to which the Indian pri-  
soners were subjected.

Premier Chou En-lai had suggested that he  
and I should meet on December 26 so as to  
reach an agreement on the principles which  
are presumably to guide the officials on both  
sides in the discussion of details. I have  
repeated, what I have said previously, that I  
am always ready to meet and discuss with  
him the outstanding differences between our  
countries and explore the avenues of  
settlement. I have, however, pointed out that I  
do not see how we can reach an agreement on  
principles when there is such complete dis-  
agreement about the facts. I would prefer to  
wait for his promised reply to my letter of  
September 26 and our note of November 4  
before we

discuss what should be the next step. I have added that it is quite impossible for me to proceed to Rangoon or any other place within the next few days.

In my reply I have expressed n\ entire agreement with him to the sentiments which he had expressed in the last paragraph of his letter, to the effect that the principal concern of our two countries should ba "with the programme of long-term peaceful construction to lift ourselves from our present state of backwardness, and that we should not be parties to the increasing of tension between our two countries or in the world." India has welcomed the fact that there is some lowering of world tensions and that "the world situation is developing in a direction favourable to peace". It is for this reason, even apart from the imperative need to improve the relations between oib\ two countries, that in spite of recent events, I have continually stressed the need for a peaceful settlement of our problems.

I might add that some days ago we asked our Ambassador in Peking to coma h consultations and that we expect him to be here in three or four days' time. Thank you.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: (Bombay):  
With your permission, Sir, may I say that the situation now seems to be rather very serious? Would the Prime Minister consider the feasibility of having a discussion on this situation now before we disperse? As I said previously, it is possible for us even to sit late at night. Let us have a discussion on this matter so that we may be able to assess the situation properly and know the mind of the Government.

SHRI D. P. SINGH (Bihar): I think a new situation has arisen, in riew of the reply which we have received from Mr. Chou En-lai. So. T •would also associate myself with his suggestion that there should be a discus-ton of the situation which has arisen.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: In this matter I am in your hands, in the hands of the House. This question was raised in the other House and I told them that it wa, for the House to decide or for the Speaker. I personally did not see the necessity for a discussion at this stage, although mally I welcome discussions, because this is a stage where no new development has taken place, except of course the reiteration of certain positions, points of view. But I have no objection to a discussion. All that I would say is that so far as I am concerned, I am leaving Delhi day after tomorrow morning. We have only today and tomorrow, tomorrow afternoon in the other House they have decided to have a discussion for two hours. That is the position, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the same subject?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Yes, Sir.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: We can take up the discussion either before that or ter that. I have no objection. I do not think that on our side anyone will have objection to sit even late. I think a discussion on this matter should be held in the House.

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA (Bihar;: Is it a fact that this letter from the Chinese Premier was released by the Chinese Embassy to the Press?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: When I received Mr. Chou En-lai'i letter—he had had it delivered to our Ambassador in Peking, who telegraphed to us—in that letter there was a mention by Mr. Chou En-lai that after I had received this letter he would release it to the Press and it was, therefore, released by him nt Peking.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND (Madhya Pradesh): Would it be possible to have a joint sitting tomorrow after six?

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-Was it released before he received it or after?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Alter. I have made that clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He said so: After he received it. What is it, Shrimati Seeta Parmanand?

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Mr. Chairman, we may have a joint sitting of both Houses so that time could be saved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Joint sessions are provided only in case of conflict between the two Houses. I do not think there is any conflict.

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA: Is it the normal procedure that when the Prime Minister or a Government writes a letter to the other Government, that is released by the Embassy of that Government or the other Prime Minister who receives the letter? What is the normal procedure?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That has been done by us too. We did that in the case of our letter.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Is the consent of the other party generally not taken in this matter, and may I know whether one party can release it without the consent of the other party? Just I want to know the general procedure, the diplomatic procedure.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Normally such letters are not published at all. Diplomatic correspondence cannot be carried on if letters are constantly being published. But recently chiefly because of the debates in this House and the other House and the desire of the Houses to know all that has happened we published all this correspondence in the White Papers and that is a continuation of that. Naturally we had to follow it up. We could not have debates here, proper debates, without information being given as to the latest development. Therefore, we have been publishing and they have been publishing and we cannot complain of their action in this matter. But all that we try to do is not to

publish them before they are received by the other party.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Prime Minister, may I ask whether it would be possible for you to have a discussion here between eleven and one o'clock, suppose we started at ten tomorrow for the Question Hour?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Yes, Sir, if that is your will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, we meet tomorrow at ten. Then Question Hour will be over at eleven. Between eleven and one o'clock we will have discussion on this question.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Thank you.

### THE MINES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1959—continued.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, only two minutes left, shall I start?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Start. We are sitting through lunch.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: Mr. Chairman, the amending Bill that has been brought before this House needs to be considered quite seriously.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

I propose to oppose this Bill. Although there are a number of provisions in this Bill which are really good and a certain amount of advance in the direction of protecting the interests of the workers has been registered, I would state very clearly and emphatically that it is a very halting Bill and a very unsatisfactory Bill. The amending Bill that has been brought now has been brought after the experience for eight long years of the working of the original Act. I regret to state that the actual experience of those eight long years does not get properly reflected in the provisions of this amending Bill. The fact of the matter is that the condition of the workers in the mines is worse than the condition of any other section of industrial workers. They