

this particular question. It is a very dreaded dangerous disease. Another thing is that the hon. Minister has said that proper insecticides have been given for spraying and all these things.....

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Now you finish it. You have already taken five minutes on this only.

DR. KRUPASINDHU BHOI : It is very important questions, Sir. Let there be half-an-hour discussion on this. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he is aware of the fact or not that the present insecticides which are supplied to different States are resistant to plasmodium ffoliperum which is also a carrier for the viral fever ?

KUMARI KUMUDBEN M. JOSHI : Sir, so far as the hon. Member has said that viral fever is on increase and the Government is not concerned, I disagree with that statement. We are very much concerned and the viral fever is not on increase. You can not generalise the things ..

(Interruptions)

DR. KRUPASINDHU BHOI : You can not avoid the question.

KUMARI KUMUDBEN M. JOSHI : I have listened to you very patiently. I said that we are very much concerned and so far as the viral diseases are concerned, he said the increase is 150 percent. I disagree with that.....*(Interruptions)*

DR. KRUPASINDHU BHOI : You tell us the figures or you supply to the House.

KUMARI KUMUDBEN M. JOSHI : Sir, so far as this problem is concerned, the reasons vary from place to place. Sometimes malaria causes the virus and sometimes so many other things cause the virus. We have asked the State Government and they have reported to us about the disease and the casualties.

So far as Delhi is concerned, we have not received any report. If the hon. Member is interested in it, we will asked the Delhi Administration about this and whatever information we get, we will pass on to the Member.

Sino-India Talks

*43. SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA† :

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state :

(a) whether a Delegation from China visited India during the month of October, 1983;

(b) if so, nature of talks held with the Indian Leaders; and

(c) the outcome thereof ?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO) : (a) Yes Sir. Official level talks were held in New Delhi from October 24 to 30, 1983.

(b) Besides the boundary question, the talks covered other aspects of India-China bilateral relations as well including trade, cultural contracts and exchanges in the field of science and technology. An exchange of views on the current international situation also took place.

(c) On the boundary question, detailed discussions were held and an attempt made to evolve a mutually acceptable set of principles to serve as guidelines for future discussions. While some common ground was covered, differences on certain vital aspects remained and they will be taken up at the next round of talks. On cooperation and exchanges in other areas of bilateral relations, the ground was prepared for these contacts during 1984. The exchange of views on the current world situation was a useful exercise resulting in a better understanding of each other's perception of the international situation today.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, a reasonable progress has now been recorded as a result of these talks. But on the eve of talks, we have such attitude of China as describing Sikkim as an independent State and rejecting the protest note of India and also indulging into selective intrusions in Ladakh and Arunachal Pradesh and so on. In view of this, no doubt, India has conducted itself with patience and skill. But, then, this was the fourth round of talks and during the progress of these talks we have such attitude coming from China. I would like to know whether these matters were taken up with the delegation, whether it was impressed upon the delegation that such things hamper the progress of the talks and, if so, with what results.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : These matters are not taken up with the visiting delegations; they are taken up with the Government through the diplomatic channels. So far as delegations are concerned, they come with authority to talk only on the matters on which they are supposed to talk. So, the instances referred to by the hon. Member have been dealt with through the diplomatic channels, as is the practice.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : I do not know how many people would be satisfied with this reply; perhaps nobody. The main reply to the question is rather vague. We are told that "common ground was covered and differences on certain vital respects remain..." and so on and so forth. I would ask the hon. Minister to spell out the main achievements. Let this House know what were those main achievements and the common ground covered and what exactly are those differences that are lingering, because they are of very great importance. We are also told that the international situation was discussed. We sit down to settle our boundary issues. When even that is not settled, we enter into a discussion on India's relations and conduct of international relations. I do not know how far that is relevant, but I would like to ask the hon. Minister as to what exactly were the main issues, with respect to the international situation, which were discussed in this context.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : The answer to part (c) has not been couched in

this language in a light-hearted manner. It has been deliberately done, because we were discussing how to evolve common principles. Earlier on the Chinese side gave us a draft of certain principles, which they considered adequate. We, in turn, gave them our own draft, which included the important points raised in their draft, plus what we considered equally important for inclusion. Now the exercise was to marry these two drafts and find out if we can come to an agreed common draft. In that exercise, naturally, on certain issues which we consider important, the inclusion of which or the reflection of which we consider important...

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : What are they ?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : That is what I am saying. It is very difficult for me to place all the individual aspects before the House, because the whole thing is in a state of evolution. So, it would not be proper, it would not be fair, on my part to really open up the discussions here and say who said what. At the moment they are at a delicate stage. So, I would appeal to the members not to ask for any more details about the progress that has been made. On the first three visits I have made a report to the House on what had happened during these visits.

Now it will be appreciated that at the time of the fourth visit there has been a forward movement; there has not been a leap but a slight forward movement; it is a slow movement in the sense that, in so far as the previous visits were concerned, we were only taking our own stand and repeating our own stand. Now we have come to grips with the differences, with the problem as such and we are trying for the first time to evolve common principles, on the basis of which discussions could take place. So, this in itself is a forward movement. But, while doing that, we have encountered certain difficulties. So, this exercise will continue. Unless we are able to evolve these common principles, I do not see how we can take the next step. Therefore, on both sides there has been willingness to discuss. Naturally, the delegation did not, perhaps, have full powers to accept the other side's point of view. So, we took a

little more time and this will be continued at the time of the next visit.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : My other question is : What exactly were the main issues with respect to the international situation which were discussed in this context ?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : It is of a general nature. When the delegations met, it was at the instance of the Chinese side that we agreed to have a general TOUR DHORIZON as they call it, of the international situation. It was vrey brief, it did not impinge on our bilateral talks, but they devoted some time to that discussion also.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Sir, while appreciating the progress already made during the course of discussions, as the hon. Minister has practically mentioned about it in the course of his earlier reply that attempts have been made to evolve a mutually acceptable set of principles to serve as guidelines for future discussion, may I know whether in this connection the Government of India placed its 6-point working proposition while China placed 5-point working proposition ? If he is in a position to spell out this 6-point working proposition, I will be very glad. And at the same time if he is in a position to spell out the 5-point working proposition which was submitted by the Chinese side in the draft, naturally it will be easier for us to determine as to where we stand. In this context, may I know what the major difference between Indian approach and Chinese approach is ? I would like to know if the sector-to-sector solution of the border dispute as suggested by India and the comprehensive solution as suggested by the Chinese side, constitute the major area of differences between the two approaches.

In this context it is necessary to understand whether the Government at a particular stage of negotiation offered the Colombo proposal as the starting point for discussion as against a package proposal offered by the Chinese side. May I know whether the Government has taken this position that both the package proposal and the Colombo proposal have been finally buried ?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : Sir, regarding the first part of the question in regard to the marrying of the two sets of principles I have already submitted to the House that they are in a state of continuous discussion and we are at a delicate stage in that discussion. So, I would not like to give details right now.

About the other one, in regard to the sector-by-sector approach and the comprehensive approach, these two broad categorisations need to be understood in the right perspective because there is really no complete dichotomy between them. We have both, a comprehensive solution and sector-by-sector approach. Our approach was: Let us take sector-by-sector and see if we can agree on one sector, the next sector, and go on to the areas in which we find it more difficult to agree. Now, this time, this approach has not been opposed, it has not been rejected and to some extent their position has come in line with this, yet the fact remains that until we are able to evolve the common principles on the basis of which discussions have to take place, we cannot adopt either this approach or the other approach in practical terms. Therefore, while to some extent there has been progress on that aspect also, we cannot really build on that much more until the principles are evolved. This is the position.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : What about my question whether the Colombo proposal and package deal have been buried ?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : That is an old story that happened during the previous visits. (*Interruptions*). I would like to say that the word 'buried' is not applicable here. It is a continuous situation; we are talking about all aspects.

PROF. RUP CHAND PAL : While fully appreciating the steps that have been taken to improve our relations with most important neighbour, I would like to ask one thing. Very recently, at the time of talks and even after following the talks, a very important Chinese leader is reported to have said that there is an ample scope for exchange of scientific and technological knowledge between India and China for

mutual benefit of these two countries of Asia. If that is so, I want to know what is the reaction of the Government in this regard and whether the Government is considering any concrete proposals in this respect.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : The discussions did take place during this round of talks on science and technology. Both sides reviewed the on-going programme of bilateral exchanges in the field of science and technology and expressed satisfaction on its implementation. Both sides also put forward a number of new proposals indicative of their expanding interest in learning from each other's experiences. The new proposals between Indian and Chinese delegation concerned a wide range of subjects in varied fields, namely agriculture and irrigation, electronics and communication systems, health population control and drug research, mining, biotechnology, natural medicines, sericulture, etc. etc. There are many things that have been discussed.

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA : After the talks, there were widespread press reports that the Chinese side had accepted India's proposal for border negotiations on the basis of a sector-wise approach. This was categorically stated in the press whereas the hon. Minister tends to indicate that there was no categorical acceptance and the reply, if I may say so, has been rather in general terms. I would like to know categorically from the hon. Minister whether the sector-wise approach has been accepted by the Chinese or whether it has not been accepted.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : I have told the House that what they have accepted is in line with what we have been saying in regard to sector by sector approach. But that is not the end of the story. It is bound up with other things. At one stage, it was even said that unless we have evolved principles, a sector by sector discussion will only result in sector by sector dispute. We do not agree with that because we do not consider that there are any disputes in certain sectors. Therefore, instead of going back to square one, I have only generally stated that there has been a change this

time in the sense that while on the previous occasions, the sector by sector approach was matched by their package proposal and we could not really resolve this approach with that proposal, this time, there has been a change in what they said. But that goes only a part of the way. This is what I tried to explain.

Report about the Railway Accident between Ludhiana and Ambala

***44 SHRI MOHANLAL PATEL† :**

SHRIMATI KISHORI SINHA :
Will the Minister of RAILWAYS be pleased to state :

(a) Whether the enquiry Committee constituted to inquire into the causes of the railway accident between Ludhiana and Ambala has submitted its report;

(b) If so, what are the findings; and

(c) What other measures have been adopted for the smooth running of trains in the disturbed State of Punjab to avoid further untoward incidents?

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI A.B.A. GHANI KHAN CHAUDHURY) : (a) to (c) A statement is laid on the Table of Sabha.

Statement

(a) and (b) The accident has been inquired into by the Commissioner of Railway Safety, Northern Circle, who functions independently of the Railways under the Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation. His report is awaited.

(c) The following special measures have been taken to ensure safe running of trains in the State of Punjab.

(i) Intense patrolling by the permanent gangmen, alongwith Police, of vulnerable Sections.