

[श्री निरंजन सिंह]

ernment or local authority, as the case may be, to manage the affairs of the mine . . ."

अभी जितने सिविल सूट होते हैं या डेमेण्ड होते हैं, उसके लिए प्रेसिडेंट रेसपांसिबिल होता है, वहाँ का डाइरेक्टर रेसपांसिबिल नहीं होता है। डाइरेक्टर को स्यू नहीं कर सकते, प्रेसिडेंट को सूच करना होता है। इस प्रकार इस क्लाइम के अनुसार आपने अपने लिए बचत कर ली और एक दूसरे आदमी को बचत नहीं की। ऐसी चीज आपको नहीं रखनी चाहिये।

इस बिल के बारे में मैं काफी बातें कह सकता हूँ, लेकिन मेरा समय ही 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 tension 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 intrusions which had brought about the present situation and created apprehensions. 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 prisoners 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 disagreement 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 my 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 be "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 our 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 come here for 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 view of the reply which we have received from Mr. Chou En-lai. So, I would also associate myself with his suggestion that there should be a discussion 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 was for the House to decide or for the Speaker. I personally did not see the necessity for a discussion at this stage, although normally 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 even after 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's 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 at Peking.

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

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Was it released before he received it or after?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: After. 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