

given me notice and written to me asking indulgence to allow him to say a few lines to prepare the background for asking a question. He also sent me a book. Of course, he is a learned scholar and he has written books. But during the Question Hour on a supplementary he cannot trace the background and all that (*Interruption*). Even then I wanted to give him time at the end. I thought his supplementary must be the last. From the way he had written I thought he would take a long time preparing background and all that. Therefore, I thought of allowing him to put the last supplementary so that there was no trouble. In the meanwhile this trouble started. I did not anticipate this trouble. What can I do? Instead of my sympathising with the hon. Member he should sympathise with me.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh): Sir, I rise to a point of order. I would like to crave your indulgence in pointing out that the hon. Member here while putting a supplementary question....

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur): Sir, under what rule is the hon. Member raising this point of order... (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. I would request the hon. Lady Member not to rake up that issue now. There is no point of order. Her point of order will itself create further trouble.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Please hear me. I would beg of you....

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Sir, under what rule is she raising this point of order? She has no right to speak now.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Sir, kindly hear me and then rule it out if you consider it to be out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I would request the hon. Member to hear me before I hear her. She wants to raise a point of order. She has every right to raise a point of order. But the Question Hour is over. On the Question Hour she has no right to raise a point of order. I have already passed on to the next item and called Shri Yashpal Singh to call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs. On that issue if the hon. Member has any point of order I am prepared to hear her. I do not want to go back and allow a point of order now about what happened during the Question Hour. If she is going to point out something about the questions put or answers given, I am not allowing her to do that. A point of order is to be raised about the business that is before the House. The business before the House now is "Calling Attention to matter of urgent public importance". If the hon. Member has anything to say about that, I can allow her.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Sir, you may rule it out, but I want to raise it because it concerns the record.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not allowing that now. By referring to the record the hon. Member wants to go back to the Question Hour. I am not allowing that. As I said, a point of order must be on the subject that is before the House and the subject now before the House is "Calling Attention Notice". Whatever she has to say about that I am prepared to hear.

12.10 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

TALKS HELD WITH US OFFICIALS IN DELHI.

श्री यशपाल सिंह (देहरादून) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अखिल भारतीय लोक महत्त्व के निम्नलिखित विषय की ओर वैदेशिक-कार्य

[श्री भगवान् सिंह]

मंत्री का ध्यान दिलाता हूँ और प्रार्थना करना हूँ कि वह इस बारे में एक बक्तव्य दें :—

“अमरीकी अधिकारियों के साथ दिल्ली में हाल ही में हुई बातें”।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT):

The Government of India have been holding annual consultations with several friendly Governments, e.g., Japan, France, Australia and Malaysia. Government have also agreed to hold such consultations with the U.S.A., U.S.S.R., U.K., Ceylon and Indonesia. Such consultations with friendly Governments on problems of mutual interest both in the bilateral field and in the wider international field are useful and help a better appreciation of each other's point of view. In accordance with a similar agreement reached with the U.S. Government, a delegation led by Under Secretary, N. Katzenbach, of the U.S. Government visited India and held the first of such consultative meetings with us from the 26th to the 28th of July.

The discussions covered a wide range of topics in the international sphere as well as in the bilateral field. It was not intended to enter into or negotiate any concrete agreements. We reviewed the broad problems of Indo—U.S. economic relations and expressed the hope that these relations would remain close in the future. The U.S. Delegation affirmed their interest in our programmes of economic development.

The discussions were carried out in a frank, informal and friendly spirit. The two Governments necessarily have their own independent judgments on various problems, born out of their different situations and interests. However, we have reason to feel satisfied that the discussions helped a better understanding and appreciation of the different points of view. Hon'ble

Members will appreciate that as such consultations are, in their very nature, confidential, it would not be desirable for me to go into the details of the discussions.

With your permission, Sir, I place on the Table of the House a copy of the joint statement issued at the end of the talks.

STATEMENT

A joint statement issued in New Delhi on July 28, 1968, at the conclusion of the talks between representatives of the Governments of India and the U. S. A.

Representatives of the Governments of India and the United States met July 26—28 in New Delhi to discuss matters of common interest. The Indian delegation was headed by Minister of State B. R. Bhagat; the US delegation was led by Under Secretary of State Nicholas Katzenbach.

During the three days of frank, friendly and informal discussions the members of the two delegations exchanged information about developments in their respective countries, examined in detail a number of foreign policy issues of common interest and concern, and exchanged views and analyses on various specific issues of world tension.

There was no intention to negotiate or reach agreement on specific questions. Each side looked upon the talks as an opportunity to learn more about the attitudes of the other and the factors on which these were based. The delegations also examined opportunities for improving the prospects for world peace and for the further development of the already close relations between India and the United States.

At the conclusion of the talks both sides felt that this new venture in an old friendship was beneficial in every

respect. They agreed that this should be the first in a series of similar bilateral discussions, and that the next meeting would be held in Washington next year.

श्री यशपाल सिंह: मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब कि आज चारों तरफ़ एक बार का एटमस्फियर है और हमें खुद ब्लैक-माउट करना पड़ता है, तो इस हालत में क्या उन अधिकारियों के साथ कोई ऐसी बातचीत हुई है कि यदि हिन्दुस्तान पर आक्रमण हो, तो अमरीका हमें हथियारों से या और किसी तरह से इमदाद दे सकेगा।

SHRI SHIVAJI RAO S. DESHMUKH (Parbhani): Sir, I rise on a point of order. The hon. Minister of External Affairs has just now been pleased to make a statement and lay on the Table a public statement which was issued on the conclusion of the talks that we had with the US authorities. Time and again it has been reiterated by the Chair in this House that whenever an important declaration has to be made, it should be made first in this House and then to the public outside.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: It is not a statement that has been made to the press. No press statement was made; no press interview was given. We deliberated here and we did not discuss about this matter with the press. But it is normal feature that at the end of the talks there is a joint statement. That statement, as a part of the statement which I have made, I am for the first time ever giving to anybody outside.

MR. SPEAKER: His complaint is that it was published in the press. What the Secretary of the Congress Parliamentary Party means to say is that on the same day when it was signed it could have been laid on the Table.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam): How can the statement be placed on the Table?

MR. SPEAKER: After the joint statement is signed, the next day it could be placed here. That is what he said.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI (Bhubaneswar): May I know whether, while discussing mutual interests, the US delegation evinced mutual interest in securing information from the Government of India about the Soviet arms supply to India and whether from our side we wanted to know the reaction of the US delegation to the Soviet arms sale to Pakistan, the position that they are now taking in regard to developing relations with China and whether they would further supply US arms to Pakistan or not?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: They never asked for details of the purchases of military hardware from the Soviet Union.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: It is a common fact known to the people and the press that the U.S. Government delegation wanted, specifically, to know what quantity of arms the Government of India is getting from the Soviet Union. I just wanted to know whether the Government the Government sought clarifications from the U.S. Government delegation what was their reaction to the supply of Soviet arms to Pakistan and also about their close relations with China. I want to know whether we sought clarifications from them on these points.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: As far as the question of details of the arms is concerned, I have already replied. Whatever may have been published in the press the fact is that they never asked for it. As far as our reactions are concerned, we generally made known our reactions to them.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (Diamond Harbour): There is no doubt that the visit of the U.S. delegation was meant to retard the growth of

[Shri Jyotirmoy Basu]

normalcy in the Indo-Pakistan relations which their Indian stooges, namely, communal forces who had been successfully engineering communal riots within the knowledge of the Home Minister and big business were also anxious to disrupt. The visit of the American group wanted to disrupt the normalcy that is almost coming about in the Indo-Pakistan relations...

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi): A young student of New Delhi is detained in Pakistan for the last two years... (*Interruptions*). How would the hon. Member or somebody else feel if his son was detained in Pakistan? (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. You may not agree with what he says.

Let him put the question. Pakistan will not hear your voice. Our Parliament is disturbed.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU: There is no doubt that they came to induce, to press on India, to send more material support for Vietnam. Last year, they sent goods worth about Rs. 4.9 crores. They came to induce India to invite the U.S. Navy to stay in the Indian Ocean. In that context, may I know whether the following subjects were discussed with them—I want a categorical answer and I have the right to know that—and they are:

- (1) Unconditional withdrawal of American soldiers for Vietnam;
- (2) Our policy in West Asia;
- (3) U.S. interference in our internal affairs; and
- (4) Moratorium on the repayment of our borrowings, the trade deficit and the proposal to neutralise ill-effects of devaluation.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Although I cannot disclose the details of the discussions, I can assure the hon. Member that on all these questions, whether it is Vietnam or Middle-East or even Indo-Pakistan relations, we have made our views known to them.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Indrajit Gupta.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU: I am asking whether these subjects were discussed.

MR. SPEAKER: I will repeat, on his behalf, a little louder. The Minister said that our point of view has been made clear in our talks with them.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU: On all these four items?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, on all these four items.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): The Minister is determined not to give the House much information and, therefore, I do not know whether there is much use asking any question.

He is trying to say that this kind of talks are very normal and routine talks like this go on every year with so many Governments which he has mentioned. But the fact remains that this is the first occasion when such talks have been held with the United States and that too, at the initiative of the United States, as has been stated in an earlier question. Therefore, I would like to know, broadly speaking, whether it is Mr. Bhagat's assessment—because he has been leading the team for these talks for three days—that the reasons for the sudden desire on the part of the United States with whom we have had so many years of relations—never before they wanted to have this kind of talks; only now suddenly this year they wanted to have—are the impending debacle

in Vietnam on the one hand and secondly the fact that in Pakistan too their bases are being wound up and thirdly because of this: Mr. Katzenbach, the leader of the team, has written an article in the *American Reporter*; it seems that a new wind is blowing over the United States and they are looking forward to becoming friendly with China. This may be a great discomfiture for our Swatantra friends, I am sure. (*Interruptions*) He has even said in this article that the danger of Chinese threat is being exaggerated. All this, he has written in his article. It means that Americans are thinking along new lines. I want to know from Mr. Bhagat whether, after these three days of several hours of talks, he was able to get any impression or form any assessment that the United States wants us not to rely on so much of their aid because they are not so much interested in giving us aid as a bulwark against China because their own policy towards China is changing, and whether they had raised this question: either you get less aid from us because you are getting arms from Soviet Union, or you have to depend now on a sort of regional co-operation or regional pact with the countries of South-East Asia and in that case we, the United States, may consider supporting. What is the shift? We do not want any sudden shift to take place again as happened recently—you come here and say, 'We never foresaw' and all that. Something is brewing; otherwise, the Mission would never have come. Please tell us what is the new strategy that they are thinking of. We do not want to know your views. What have you known from them?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: It is true that this was the first of the series of talks with the United States, and it is also true that these talks were held at their initiative. What induced them to take this initiative, what was the motivation, I cannot predict precisely, but if he wants my assessment, I can certainly tell him that the

United States do attach importance to this country and in a changing world—it is true that the whole Asia is changing, that the world is changing—they are anxious to know our views on some of these important aspects. This is the assessment that I can give to the hon. Member. (*Interruptions*)

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

ANNUAL PLAN, 1968-69

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI-MATI INDIRA GANDHI): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Annual Plan, 1968-69. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-1528/68.*]

R. G. KAR MEDICAL COLLEGE AND HOSPITAL (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1968.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH, FAMILY PLANNING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI B. S. MURTHY): On behalf of Shri Satya Narayan Sinha, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the R. G. Kar Medical College and Hospital (Amendment) Act, 1968 (President's Act No. 16 of 1968) published in Gazette of India dated the 9th May, 1968, under sub-section (3) of section 3 of the West Bengal State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Act, 1968. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-1529/68.*]

श्री यशपाल सिंह (देहरादून) : मैंने श्रीमान् से कल पत्र लिख कर भी पूछा था, आप की तरफ से कोई मुझे लेटर नहीं मिला, कोई जवाब नहीं मिला। श्रीमान्, इतनी बड़ी बेकायदगी हो गई . . .

MR. SPEAKER: He will please sit down. Secretary.