

one question should take 35 minutes.

**Shri Dinesh Singh** wants to give a personal explanation.

**Shri Dinesh Singh:** During my absence, I believe some hon. Member had mentioned in connection with the CIA that I had . . .

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** What is this? Is he replying?

**Mr. Speaker:** Personal explanation, because his name was brought in.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** But why during the Question Hour immediately? It can be done after the Question Hour.

**Mr. Speaker:** In connection with the question, he is answering a point because his name was brought in. If he is giving the House information, that should be good.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** He cannot intervene in between questions

**Shri T. Vishwanathan:** Questions must be answered during the Question Hour. If anybody has got a personal explanation to offer, that can be done after the Question Hour is over.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Members wanted him.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** When the question was put, the Minister was to reply, or the person concerned should reply, but now in between he cannot make a statement. He can write to you that some allegation has been made, and that he should be allowed to make a personal explanation.

**Mr. Speaker:** One Member particularly pointed out that the hon. Minister was not in the House. Question No. 2.

**Shri Pahadia:** We must also get a chance.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thirty-five minutes have been taken. A number of Congressmen have also got a chance.

**Shri Dinesh Singh:** Will I get an opportunity to make a statement?

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes, 35 minutes were taken by this question. There are many other important questions.

**Shri Shashiranjani:** It is not proper. You should not have given him a chance. But having given him a chance, he should not be stopped now.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is agreed that he will give a personal explanation after the Question Hour.

**Shri Jaganath Prasad:** I have been rising to put a supplementary question.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have called the next question. We have taken 35 minutes for this question; it is too much.

#### India's Relations with North Vietnam and Cuba

\*2. **Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there is a growing pressure from the U.S.A. not to have any relations with North-Vietnam and Cuba;

(b) if so, whether this is one of the conditions for giving aid to India; and

(c) the reaction of Government thereto?

**The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla):** (a) to (c). There are provisions in the latest U.S. legislation relating to aid according to which the U.S. Government may not extend aid benefits to countries having trade relations which sell, furnish or permit their ships or aircraft to transport goods to or from North Vietnam or, except within certain defined limits, to Cuba.

This is the law of the United States which can only apply to United States authorities; the legislation of one country obviously cannot be binding on Governments of other countries.

No pressure has been exerted on the Government of India by the U.S.A. not to have any relations with either Cuba or North Vietnam. We remain free to accept or not accept aid as we choose. The aid which the U.S. Government are currently willing to extend is in our national interest and its acceptance is in no way derogatory to our sovereign rights. If at any time any abridgement of our rights were threatened, our reaction would be fully in accordance with our honour and interest.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I wish to know whether it is a fact that sometime during the negotiations, when they were going on with the United States for aid, they put any condition on our having trade relations with North Viet Nam or Cuba, and was this in addition to their own law and if so, what was the reply of the Government of India?

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** I am in a position to give a categorical answer to this question because I was concerned with the negotiations. At no time, at no stage was it ever suggested by those who were negotiating on behalf of the United States that we should not trade with North Viet Nam or with Cuba. Nothing pertaining to this question was ever agitated between the two negotiating parties.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** After the barbarous attack on the people of North Viet Nam by the United States Government, in what way and to what extent have we extended help to the people of North Viet Nam, not in the matter of armaments but in the matter of increased trade with these countries?

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** There is no trade with North Viet Nam and that is so for obvious reasons because we had apprehensions that anything that we may send to North Viet Nam may be passed on to China, and you know how friendly China is to us. With regard to Cuba we had trade in jute and that trade continues. We export

jute to Cuba and there has been no interference with that trade.

**Prof. Samar Guha:** Is it not a fact that the Prime Minister herself admitted in a press statement perhaps in January that the United States had exerted pressure on India not to enter into any firm trade with North Viet Nam or Cuba....

**The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi):** No Sir.....

**Prof. Samar Guha:** And did not the United States say that it would not be in a position to give aid to India if it acted contrary to their stand?

**Mr. Speaker:** She has answered the question: no, Sir.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** The Prime Minister, unfortunately, was not properly reported. I have got the official transcript of what the Prime Minister stated and, if the House wants it, I will read it out. She spoke in Hindi and the reporters could not take it down properly.

**Mr. Speaker:** Question No 3 Shri Supakar.

**Shri Ananda Nambiar:** Let him read that statement, Sir

**Mr. Speaker:** It is not necessary. Let us go to Question No 3.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** We would like to put some supplementaries on Question No 2. It is a very important question.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have called Shri Supakar.

**Shri Hem Barua:** May I submit that there should have been a clarification on what Shri Samar Guha has said? Did the Prime Minister make a statement like that? It is reported widely in the papers. We might have some misunderstandings or apprehensions. So, let us get a clarification.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have gone to Question No. 3.