

**MOTION RE: STATEMENT BY  
FINANCE MINISTER ON HIS  
VISIT ABROAD**

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now resume further discussion of the motion moved by Shri M. R. Masani regarding the Statement of the Finance Minister on his visit abroad. Out of 2½ hours allotted for this, one hour and six minutes have already been availed of. One hour and 24 minutes now remain. Acharya Kripalani may continue his speech.

**Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West-Reserved-Sch. Tribes):** Before we proceed, may I humbly submit that you will reconsider the recommendation in regard to the allotment of time in regard to this particular motion? You had indicated elsewhere that you would use your discretion to extend it by half-an-hour or so

**Some Hon. Members:** More

**Shri Jaipal Singh:** One hour or half-an-hour is left to your discretion. I would submit that this debate has taken rather an important turn. If you could extend the time further to enable hon. Members who have tabled amendments, for example, they will be able to speak.

**Mr. Speaker:** We have got one and a half hours now. That means, half past one. The hon. Member will reply

**Shri M. R. Masani (Ranchi-East):** Yes.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will try to extend the time till two o'clock not more than that at the most

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Mr. Speaker, at the outset, may I say that I welcome this discussion as I welcomed a question that was put in this House yesterday in regard to the report of an interview given by the Finance Minister. So far as the Government is concerned, we do not wish to come in the way of the fullest discussion of this. If it pleases you to

extend the time for discussion, we are quite agreeable to it and we do not wish to come in the way. That depends on the convenience of the House and the work before it.

This question raises certain rather important and vital issues, and certain issues which may be considered to be of a personal character although there is nothing personal about what a Minister does in his official capacity. The first point is, I should like to clear that up because some doubt seems to have arisen in the mind of the Members, if there was any variation or different emphasis even in regard to our foreign policy. We have said that there is none. But, I should like to state that with greater emphasis that I believe, our Government believes, that this policy is not only the right policy, it is the only policy, it is the policy which has succeeded, not failed, it is a policy, I venture to say, to which inevitably other countries will come. I say there is no alternative to this policy except one and that is, disaster to mankind. Let countries choose which policy they want: the policy that leads inevitably to this disaster to all humanity or the policy which in its broad outlines we endeavour, in all humility, to pursue. Of course that does not mean that in its application there may not be slight variations here and there. But, basically, it is the policy, if I may say so, contrary to the policy of cold war.

At any moment we could perhaps criticise this cold war because it goes counter to the broad approach, I hope, which we have in this country and which we have had. But, at this particular moment in the world's history when all kinds of dreadful weapons are being thrown about, when people are feverishly preparing for even more terrible weapons, to think in terms of cold war is to invite that very disaster against which the countries are supposed to prepare. So, I submit that in regard to our basic foreign policy, let there be no doubt. It is as firm and as strong as India can make it.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

But, it is not merely a question of our desire, it is not merely a question of our inheritance from our past thinking, past actions and past conditioning, but it is something which I venture to say is inevitable if one takes a broad view of things in the world. It is a policy which must be adopted by other countries also unless, as I said, they drift, not gradually, but rather rapidly to disaster. But, while keeping to the broad terms of that policy, there are many ways of furthering it here and there. But, in the main, I should like to make it clear that certainly, if there is the slightest variation from that policy, that basic policy, by this Government or any Government, I shall be no member of that Government.

Apart from following a certain policy, that policy itself is one of approach, apart from other things of holding to certain principles, and yet at the same time approaching in a friendly way other Government whether one agrees with them or disagrees. We have ventured to do that and I believe that we have done that with a measure of success.

There are many people here, Members, who have been abroad and who can perhaps look at this problem in a wider perspective. I am sorry that hon. Member Acharya Kripalani is not here because he has recently returned from a long tour of foreign countries, and I should have asked him to reply to some of his arguments himself from the experiences he has gathered during his tour.

We are criticised for going on begging missions and thereby demeaning ourselves and our self-respect and honour or taking up some other attitude which is offensive, or, as Shri Masani said referring to our Defence Minister, being not agreeable enough to others or being offensive to others. We are criticised for all this on both sides, either being too agreeable or not enough agreeable or being disagreeable.

I shall deal with these matters sepa-

ately, but what I would like this House to consider, and any one outside this House, is: how does India stand in the eyes of the world? Do we stand there in the shape of a humble suppliant prepared to give up our basic policies for a mess of pottage, for some money or something? How do we stand? How does the world look at us? Do they look upon us with some respect, do they think we are a self-respecting country, a country with some honour, a country which has a policy which it tries to follow with some integrity? We may make mistakes, of course; we all do.

It is not for me to answer that question. Any person with knowledge can answer it, and I ask and invite Acharya Kripalani to answer it from his own experience of a few months' tour abroad. And I say there is only one answer to it. The answer is that India's head is high, that India is no suppliant to anybody, that so far as we are concerned, we would rather see anything happen, anything to the Second Five Year Plan or to any Plan rather than that the honour of India should be sullied, and the self-respect of India should go. Let us be clear about that.

Acharya Kripalani, I regret to say, used some language unworthy of him and unworthy of this House yesterday with his suggestions that we should strut about like proud cocks in the international arena, challenging everybody and cursing everybody. That is neither good politics, nor good sense, nor indeed does it follow from the basic policy that we pursue.

How is it, if the House will think of it, that this country is not allied in a military sense to any country and yet whenever our citizens or nationals go, they are welcomed? Whether they happen to go to what is called the capitalist camp or Western Europe and America, or the Communist camp or the East, our people are welcomed, and not only welcomed but received with affection almost. Why is it if I

go abroad to any country, whether it is the United States or the Soviet Union or China or Japan or Scandinavia, that I am welcomed with fervour?—not because I have any virtues, not because of any particular personal reason, but because the policy we have pursued of friendliness with firmness in regard to our own basic policy with integrity about certain ideals has impressed people. And this is not a welcome from Governments only, which, of course, one has to put out anyhow, but it is always a welcome from the people of the country where we go to, because we have touched the hearts of the people, because we have set something and we follow a policy which finds an echo in the hearts of the people. Therefore, let us be quite clear on this subject.

We go, Shri Mukerjee said, with a begging bowl to other countries. Well, it is true that we have asked, not in a hush-hush way, but openly for the help of other countries. We have asked for it making it clear as every one knows that we are not bargaining with any policy in regard to it, any basic policy that we pursue. Other countries have also been helped in the past and in the present. I think Shri Masani quoted yesterday Prof. Kaldor when he said that he hoped that India would get one-fifth of the help from the United States that China had got from the Soviet Union. Now, China is welcome to that help, and the Soviet Union is welcome to give it, but I am merely pointing out that this business of loans or long credits or help of this kind being given by countries in a position to do so, industrialised countries or more advanced countries, is a common thing—has been and is. There is no abandonment of self-respect involved. Of course, one can do the same thing in a good way or a bad way, that is a different matter. There is no harm in that provided always that we do not barter anything for that help, that is important; and I invite the House to see that we have not done so. Our Finance Minister has not done so.

There is one aspect which I should like to put to this House. I am not here to defend every word that the Finance Minister may say or has said. We are not a regimented school where we speak only with one voice, one tone, one intonation. We speak sometimes in somewhat different languages, but we are together because we have a common purpose, because we are working for common purposes, because we have, broadly speaking, a common approach even though we differ in many other ways. That is the way of democratic governments.

Now, there is a certain reflex of the cold war in other countries sometimes in our considering a problem even in our country because maybe of our sympathies, maybe of our inclinations, maybe of our apprehensions and suspicions. The result is that if I go to the Soviet Union and I am received there with the greatest friendship and cordiality which touches my heart and I thank them for it in appropriate language, people in America, or maybe some people here who think that way, think that I have sold my conscience to the Soviet Union. See what I have said when I left the Soviet Union, I think I used the words "I have left a bit of my heart here". I did. I felt as moved by what I saw there, the reception I got there. So everybody wonders there must have been some secret pact there, I am lost to what they consider the right side and all that. Somewhat later, I go to the United States, and I receive a cordial welcome there, and I say how much in common we have with the United States in the democratic traditions, how I have admired Lincoln and Washington and Jefferson and others. Well, people say, 'He has sold himself to the United States' immediately.

The fact of the matter is that I have deliberately conditioned myself, and I think, succeeded in doing so, in seeing as far as possible the good in others, because I find, and I am convinced, that the common points between countries are far greater than the uncommon points, than the points of con-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

troversy. Unfortunately, when we get tied up with this cold war business and outlook, every stress is laid on the points of difference, till they are magnified out of all proportion, and everything, even the common humanity of the people, sinks somewhere into the background.

Here you see in the world today these great giants, the United States of America and the Soviet Union facing each other grimly with armed might, and apparently hostile to each other, but I am convinced, and I have said so often enough, that there is far more in common between the Soviet Union and the United States than people imagine, in fact, between the people, I say, between the fundamental outlooks of the two countries. We get lost in these old-world terms which gradually cease to have much meaning.

Of course, there are differences; I do not deny them, but the similarities are striking and amazing and they are basic, and I have no doubt that they will come together—those two countries; I hope they will, in the sense of ensuring the peace of the world, because the time has come when it is obvious that neither of them can think or can dare to think even of crushing and suppressing the other. It cannot be done without common destruction to all mankind.

Therefore, if that is so, the only other way is to think coolly that while retaining their different outlooks, they have to live together. The only way is the way of coexistence, peaceful coexistence.

So, I say, when I go to countries, I go to Scandinavia, Japan etc. I am moved. Maybe, I am rather emotionally inclined in this way. But I am moved. Everybody is moved when others are kind to him, when others are affectionate to him. I have no doubt that it is a law, a fundamental law of nature that you get what you give. If you give affection you will get it. If you give hatred, you are

likely to get it. So, it has been our good fortune to have the goodwill and even the affection of the people of other countries, even though we did not wholly agree with them, even though we were entirely opposed to each other. But when we say this, when we use this friendly language to one, used as they are, used as some of us even are to the language of cold war, immediately suspicions arise that something is afoot. Now, I beg of you to consider this, that this is not a question of doing anything underhand or behindhand. If at any time we want to do something behind the scenes, how long can we keep it behind the scenes? It will come out sooner or later. That is why I said at the very outset that I welcomed this discussion here. It is far better to discuss things in an open House than whisper them in the lobbies and elsewhere. That is so far as our major policies are concerned.

May I just say one word, that while the question of foreign assistance is a natural question, if it does not come India does not vanish into the thin air? India carries on with greater difficulties, greater problems. No doubt, we carry on. I am not frightened. I say quite clearly I am not frightened of the prospect of no help coming. I think India is strong enough to bear that burden too; we will suffer, we will slow down, but we will carry on and we will carry on with our head high and bow down to nobody. Of course, I want that help to come in all friendliness, and I hope it will come, because that somewhat eases our process of development.

Shri M. R. Masani said yesterday something about foreign help being needed and being essential for India, foreign exchange or foreign help, for the next half a century. I am no prophet, but it seemed to me a remark which I would not accept at all. I do not accept it.

Shri M. R. Masani (Ranchi-East): I said, foreign capital; I did not say foreign help.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I stand corrected. He said, foreign capital. I do not even accept that; that is to say, I am not opposed to foreign capital coming, but I am not looking forward to fifty years of—if I may use the word—dependence on foreign capital coming here. There may be foreign capital, but I do not know fifty years later what the state of the world will be. I think the pace of change in the world is so terrific that all our present day ideas will not probably be applicable fifty years later. However, that is something about the future.

Now, may I say quite frankly that when I saw, first of all, a report, a report of the report in *The New York Times* of the interview which the Finance Minister gave, some passage in it disturbed me, caused me considerable concern? He was not here then; he had gone. I communicated with him about this. I said 'I was concerned at this. Does it mean this?'. He sent me a brief telegram saying 'Of course, not. There was complete misunderstanding.' and so on and so forth. Well, I was satisfied, except that I regretted that any such misunderstanding should arise in the minds of people who read that. But so far as I was concerned, I was content at that, and all my concern was that this misunderstanding should go, because in all these matters, when we discuss a matter in various hypothetical situations, all kinds of things are said, which, isolated from their context, may mean something quite different.

Now, questions were asked yesterday or the no time did he envisage any type of conflict between India and Russia and China. Well, the very idea of asking that question or imagining that such a thing was a remote possibility surprises me. Now, people think, some people, that we adopt a certain policy in India, because we are afraid of Russia or China, that we adopted a certain policy in Tibet because we were afraid of China. Well, it is not for me to present to this House my *bona fides* in these matters.

But so far as I know myself, and so far as I know our Government, I can assure this House that there was not the slightest element of fear or apprehension in regard to our policy in regard to China or Tibet or Russia.

I am absolutely convinced that—not for emotional reasons, not for any reasons of my likes and dislikes or wishful thinking, but for severely practical reasons—there is not the remotest possibility of Russia or China or the United States of America attacking or being aggressive to or having war with India. And, therefore, I fashion my policy accordingly. I admit countries change their policies; countries get excited; things happen; you have a liking for a country or you dislike it; all these things happen. You see today countries that were at war with each other—and the most terrible of wars—ten or twelve years ago—are friends today, military allies against others who were their allies. These things happen. So, I am not basing my judgment on likes and dislikes, but on the realities of the situation. I would not go into that. I am prepared to argue this with anybody.

Other people seem to think that war is bound to come and if war comes India will suffer in this way or that way. Well, my reply to them is that if war comes, war of that kind, it is perfectly clear to me that nobody will escape suffering, and it might indeed end in putting an end to human existence in this world.

So let this be quite clear. Whatever ideology Russia follows or China follows or the United States of America follows, there is no question of our being affected, and allowing it to affect our policy, through fear. What is the position today? There are large numbers of countries in Western Europe, America etc. which accept, by and large, what might be called a modern version of capitalism tempered by socialistic advances, in some cases, considerable advances. A very large portion of the world is governed by what might be called the Communist ideology. There it is. These are

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

facts. But people, more especially the people in these rival camps and blocs, seem to forget that there is a very large part of the world which, though wanting to be, and being in fact, friendly to these countries—both—still is not committed to either this ideology or that, either to the western capitalist ideology or to the Communist ideology of Russia. We are not hostile to either. We may accept something from here and something from there. But we are not committed to them, and a good part of the world is not so committed.

Now, whatever it may be, it is also clear that you cannot force and compel your ideologies on the other, and we have seen that; whether it is, if I may respectfully say so, in the case of the western bloc trying to force down its ideology by force of arms or on the side of the Communist nations trying to force down their ideology by force of arms, both have failed. And it has been made quite clear that you may convert people, if you like, by peaceful methods, but you cannot ultimately convert a country or a nation by the sword, though you may destroy it by modern arms.

So coming back to a certain personal aspect, the Finance Minister delivered many speeches there. It is for the House or Members to read them—they are in the Library of the House and anyone who wants can obtain copies of them—and find out exactly where he said something against our policy, basic policy. You may not like, you may say, 'Oh, he is too friendly to the Americans' or 'too friendly to the British' or 'too friendly to the Germans'. May be, you may not accept that in that way. But when we go to America, it is our business to be friendly to the Americans, when we go to Germany, it is our business to be friendly to the Germans. Are we going there to pick up quarrels with them? When we go to Russia, it is our business to be friendly to the Russians or the Chinese or Japanese, as the case may be. That is not from the

point of view of some kind of bargaining diplomacy, trickery and manoeuvre—not that. It is or should be the normal intercourse between nations, because only then can you get the best out of the other and give the best that you can, and then decide for yourself what you like, because, otherwise, your mind is closed if the approach is hostile.

May I mention here a fact which perhaps may not be relevant? We talk about the Commonwealth connection and some hon. Members on the other side of the House and—I should be quite frank—some hon. Members on this side of the House, do not like that connection. There it is. They say: 'Why? Apart from other reasons, see what England does about Kashmir. See what she does about Goa or some other place and so on. And you want to be tied up to them'.

I can quite understand and appreciate this strong reaction, because, after all, I have the same reactions often enough. We are made of the same stuff and we react to the same things more or less. Take this Kashmir matter. It has been a matter of deep pain and grief to me—the attitude of the United Kingdom Government in it. I am not going into that, but trying merely to point it out. But that does not lead me to get so excited as to change my basic policies. If my being in the Commonwealth had even in the slightest affected my policies, affected my policies in regard to foreign or domestic matters and made me go against me in a particular direction, then the case for quitting the Commonwealth was complete, to my mind. If it does not, then I am not going to quit it, because I do not believe in breaking any bond which we have in the world today. There are too many destructive tendencies afoot. I want to keep that bond. It might help; it does help.

In fact, I welcome in a few days' time the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference that is going to be held here, knowing full well that what

happens to us in parts of the Commonwealth, in South Africa, in other places, knowing also that the Commonwealth contains today all kinds of other countries, Malaya, Ghana and others, but, above all, believing that at this time more particularly in the world, what are required are more and more bonds. Let these be of silk, not of iron chains, but let us have this type of bonds so that we may approach and try to understand each other, and even where we differ, we can do so in a friendly way.

Shri M. R. Masani referred to Shri Krishna Menon and the fact—if it is a fact—of, I am using his words, 'his provocative utterances' in the United States, that it did not go down with the people well there, that he was disliked by some Americans or others. May I say straight off that in the recent debate, Shri Krishna Menon made certain remarks which I regretted very much, which, in fact, he withdrew—he apologised for them. It is clear that the strain on him during this time was so very much.....

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): He was sick also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The strain on him was very very great. For the moment, he broke down under the strain and said something which was unfortunate.

But having said that, I would like to say that his performance, his putting forward of our case for Kashmir, has been a magnificent one. Let us realise it. I want to make it quite clear to all that in what he said he represented us, he represented us fully and completely.

Let us, therefore, judge of these problems. I do not want anyone of our colleagues or anyone else to say things which irritate people. I am afraid with all the goodwill in the world sometimes I slip and say such things. I am sorry for it afterwards, but that is a different matter. It may be that is a human failing.

I should like, therefore, this House to approach this question not in a

narrow, censorious way of catching a word here or a word there—we all make mistakes, we may make mistakes—but see the broad trends of our activity. Obviously, we function, that is, in our Government, with joint responsibility. That is not only the theory but, I submit, the practice. I am responsible for what my colleague, the Finance Minister may do—I may not agree with every word he says—just as he is responsible for what I do or for what each one of us does. That is the only way to function, and we have to give each other, naturally, a large measure of freedom to interpret Government's policies. We cannot all the time be sitting together and issuing every letter and every statement to be made. Sometimes the emphasis may be slightly this or slightly that, but basically there is, or can be, no change not only in our foreign policy but, broadly speaking, in our domestic and economic policy.

One thing more. I should like to refer to Acharya Kripalani's remarks yesterday; one remark of his about a friendly country was peculiarly unfortunate. It is a great country, a country which is faced with grave perils and has faced them bravely and it is our pride and privilege to have been closely associated with that country in its period of trial and difficulty. We hope to be associated with them in this close and intimate way in future. So, it was peculiarly unhappy to learn of the word that he used which was completely unjustified.

Shri Hem Barua: Regarding the Prime Minister's speech referring to Acharya Kripalani, I just want to say a few things, one or two words.

Mr. Speaker: Acharya Kripalani is not here. How could he anticipate what the Prime Minister was going to say?

Shri Hem Barua: Just a word by way of explanation, Sir. The Prime Minister in the course of his speech had made a reference to Acharya Kripalani. I am sorry he could not be here. He had another engagement and he could not cancel that. About

[Shri Hem Barua ]

a word he used yesterday, the Prime Minister said that it was unworthy of an hon. Member of this House and this House itself. I agree with the Prime Minister when he says like that. But, at the same time, this word was previously used by a Member in this House.

\* \* \* \* \*

When Kripalaniji said like that, it was the Finance Minister who said that the hon. Member knows this kind of things better. Acharyaji had learnt it from the Finance Minister himself. That is what I have to say.

Mr. Speaker: Whoever might have used it, it is unfortunate that that word should find a place in our proceedings here, whoever might be responsible for it or whoever might have started it. When once the ball is set rolling, we do not know where it goes. It is ultimately coming to personal remarks like this.

\* \* \* \* \*

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Sir, my motion asks this House to record its approval of the statement made by the Finance Minister. Sir, the Prime Minister has risen above this debate which took a rather controversial character. But, I shall seek in my own way to bring the debate back to what was intended to be the subject-matter of discussion; and that is the statement of the Finance Minister.

I feel that the two speakers, Prof Mukerjee and Acharyaji who spoke from this side of the House strayed very much from this subject of discussion. So far as the communist spokesman was concerned, I felt that every one of us in this House knew that, speaking for his group, he would use it as an occasion to mount a tirade against what are known as democracies and also use it as an occasion to sing hallelujhas on behalf of the communist dictatorships. I see my friend, Prof. Mukerjee is here. His personality unlike his talks is extremely

likable and I expected verbal pyrotechnics from him. Sometimes I indulge in them myself. But, as a lawyer I also know this that verbal emotionalism is not always conducive either to clarity of thought or accuracy of statement.

Our friend, Prof. Mukerjee, good communist that he is, not only acclaimed, but I felt he magnified the kind of assistance that we are getting from the communist countries. I do not deprecate them. I think we should welcome aid from whatever country it comes. He told us that we had received—I think it was—Rs. 60 crores from Soviet Russia and that it had been given to us on uniquely generous terms. As I said, I am not deprecating the aid. I feel that Government would welcome aid from any country with which we have diplomatic relations. But what I am deprecating is the distorted picture that Prof. Mukerjee sought to give to this House in the matter of the aid that we are receiving. He said: 'Look at the aid that Russia has given us; look at the generous terms on which we have received the aid; Rs. 60 crores at 2½ per cent'—and I take it—'for a period of 12 years'. He asked the Finance Minister: 'Have you got anything comparable from the so-called Democracies?'

I am not here to strike a comparative balance between the aid we have got from the communist and the democratic countries. But I do feel this that even Prof. Mukerjee, in spite of his communist stigmatism preventing the rays of democratic enlightenment from penetrating his mind should at least be fair enough to this House not to attempt to give a distorted picture.

As the Prime Minister has pointed out, we do not go as suppliants to anybody. We do not go with a begging bowl; we get aid, without compromising either our self-respect or our basic policies. But what will be the effect? People would probably be left with the impression that here we



Minister on his Visit  
Abroad

are a democracy, seeking to vindicate the principles of democracy—seeking as the Finance Minister said, to regenerate this country by democratic process—and yet countries which have certain ideological bonds with us do not assist us.

I am not going to deal with the table of assistance that we have received from all the democracies; but, I will deal only with some of the figures so far as American aid is concerned. What is the nature of this aid we have received from America? In 10 years we have received from America almost one billion dollars, that is, about Rs. 500 crores. Now, my friend says, 'Look at the generous way in which the Russians have treated us'. Probably, they have been generous. I am not against that. But do not by implication say that other people have behaved usuriously towards us, because, of these Rs 500 crores that we have received, Rs. 200 crores has not been given by way of loan. It has been by way of straight aid. If you call it a gift you can. We have to pay no interest on it and we do not have to return it.

I am talking about the aid from U. S. Government, apart from the aid that we may get which is quite substantial from private American agencies. Apart from this Rs. 500 crores, Rs. 200 crores of which are to be the straight aid, we get Rs. 30 crores of straight aid in respect of our Technical Assistance Programme. I feel that here at least you may abuse the democracies—that is part of the stock-in-trade of the communists—but I do not say that our gratitude should take the nature of our becoming some kind of satellite. What is the position with regard to aid in respect of foodgrains? Shri Mukerjee knows as well as I do. But for American aid not only would our position have been difficult but this country would have faced starvation. That is a stark fact and let us recognise that. In 1951, we received 2 million tons by way of a loan. 2½ per cent rate of interest, over a period of—not 12 years

as Russians have given—30-35 years. Recently there was an agreement. I think it was somewhere in August. It provided for the supply of 3·5 million tons of foodgrains (wheat), 200,000 tons of rice, a large quantity of milk and dairy products and cotton. I think it amounts to about Rs. 176 crores. Of these Rs. 176 crores, Rs. 25 crores is straight aid and we do not give back anything of this. I am only saying this in order to correct the distorted picture that Shri Hiren Mukerjee deliberately sought to draw before this House.

In this morning's paper, there is a report of a statement by the Food Minister. He says that because of circumstances beyond our control, we are facing a food gap of 3-4 million tons and the only way in which we will be able to bridge it will be with American help. I do not wish to deal with the assistance that has been given to us by the other democracies. Shri Mukerjee knows but he forgets, as all communists forget, the aid we get from the Commonwealth countries under the Colombo Plan. Canada and Australia and other countries give aid—not loans with interest.

I have the very greatest respect for Acharya Kripalani. I was not only surprised but disappointed with his performance. He dealt with anything but the statement of the Finance Minister. His speech ranged from Swadeshi to personalities and I feel that he allowed his personal anger with the Finance Minister over some incident between them to overcome his usual sense of proportion. Quite frankly I was unable to understand Acharya Kripalani's reference to the Finance Minister as a financial orphan.

**The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):** I am an orphan all right. I have not got either father or mother.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** But he used it in a figurative kind of way. I could only presume that he meant that because the Finance Minister was not a khas Congressman being in the Con-

[Shri Frank Anthony ]

gress, he was not a financial orphan but a political orphan. Quite frankly, I feel that Acharya had a nostalgic ring about his reference to the Finance Minister being a financial orphan. I feel that if the Finance Minister does reply, he can very well say to the Acharya that, if anything, Acharya today is much more a political orphan than the Finance Minister is because the Finance Minister not being a *khas* Congressman is in the Congress fold all right, while Acharyaji in spite of all his nostalgic acquaintance and apparent claim to be a Congressman is outside the Congress fold.

But, what was the main attack of the Acharya. He attacked the Plan and he attacked the basis of the Plan. The Prime Minister was here when the Acharya was making this attack. If anybody is to be held responsible for the Plan and the basis of the Plan, it should be the Prime Minister primarily. The Prime Minister was here and that was perhaps the reason why Acharya did not seek to make a frontal attack. Being a *khas* Congressman, he probably still carries certain fright of the Prime Minister with him. So, instead of him, he turned his vigorous attacks to the unfortunate Finance Minister.

What did Acharya say? I cannot understand. I will ask him but he is not here. I do not like to say anything about anybody. But what did he say? He purported to sound a clarion call to the country. Scrap the Plan. Let us think only in terms of *swadeshi*. Let us do little things in a little way. That was his clarion call to the country. In this Sputnik age, Acharya Kripalani makes a call to the country to resurrect some decomposed economic doctrine, a sort of a cow-dung and bullock cart economy.

Mr. Speaker: No, no. Order, order. In trying to defend or advance arguments, he should not swing the pendulum to the other side.

Shri Frank Anthony: I do not know which side.

Mr. Speaker: Every one of these is *Swadeshi*. He may say *Swadeshi* is not suitable for the time being and so on. But cow-dung and bullock-cart—I do not think it is right. There were great men. We have deemed particular persons as great; there was the Father of the Nation. They all started that particular theory and went on.....(Interruptions.) Order, order. It is not right that anything direct or indirect said here should make insinuations like these. They are unnecessary. This is a circle and it must be cut somewhere.

Shri Frank Anthony: I am sorry; I seem to be misunderstood. I was not calling into question the concept of *Swadeshi*. But what I was calling into question was what I understood Acharya to mean that we should retain our background economy and our backward way of life. That is what I feel he was asking us to do. Let us do little things in a little way. Let us scrap this Plan of ours. He said that.

I know that Acharya said that he had been a backward pupil. My experience of backward pupil is that they grow up into backward adults. I have had something to do with education and I find that backward pupil invariably try to make and impress their backwardness in everything they do. My fear of Acharyaji is this. When attacking the Plan, he is seeking to perpetuate in India a backward way of life and a backward economy.

His next ground of attack was that the Finance Minister had degraded the country by going with a begging bowl. My communist friend, Shri Mukerjee, evaded the crucial question. The question is this. Do we need aid today? Here, I join issue, very respectfully and squarely, with the Prime Minister. I say it is only political bravado to say that we do not need aid. We do need aid, a large quantity of aid and we need it immediately: How are we going to attempt to bridge this huge foreign exchange gap which is widening every

day. I do not understand why we think it is repugnant to our self-respect to admit that we need aid. We do need aid urgently. I am one of those who feel that we will never be able to carry through with the core of the Plan, whatever it may mean, unless we get substantial aid.

Acharyaji objected to my friend, the Finance Minister, going with a begging bowl. Begging bowl implies wanting charity. In asking for aid, as we are doing, we are asking for extended credits. It is not synonymous either with begging or with charity. Other self-respecting countries, with as much self-respect as we have got, have also built their backward economies on the basis of foreign aid. I for one cannot understand why they should seek to stigmatise foreign aid as something repugnant to our self-respect.

I do not know why we should blame the Finance Minister for going to get aid. After all he did not go on a holiday jaunt. He did not go as a result of some private decision on his part. This must have been a Cabinet decision. Acharya also objected to the fact that the Finance Minister should go and get aid.

13 hrs.

Why didn't we get it through the normal diplomatic channels? If Acharyaji was here I would have said: this is a unique occasion and unique occasions require unique measures. Methods of normal diplomatic channels would not do. We want massive aid and we want it on Government to Government level. Who other than the Finance Minister is the best qualified person, as he said in his statement, to make these Governments understand the magnitude and the extent of our needs and what we are trying to do with the aid we are seeking to get?

Sir, Acharya Kripalani asked why we should go to these countries. Are they friends of ours? Look at the Kashmir question; look at the Goa question. Acharya Kripalani, sitting near the Communists, seems to be

acquiring some kind of a Communist taint. I thought it was always a democratic virtue that you may disagree among yourselves. We certainly have very serious points of disagreement with America and Britain. I always thought that it was a supreme democratic virtue, to which I believe the Acharya still subscribes, that friendship does not mean that you agree with everything and on every point. You may disagree, but you can still remain friends.

I would like both my friends Acharya Kripalani and Prof. Hiren Mukerjee to answer this question. We need aid—presumably even Prof. Mukerjee will concede that proposition. From whom are we going to seek aid? It is natural that we should seek aid from the democracies. They have given us substantial help. They are, I believe, the only people who are capable of giving us the kind of substantial help that we need. It is not only natural, it is proper that we should go to them and say: we have certain ideological bonds with you: we need Rs. 400 or Rs. 500 and ask them to give it to us, not by way of charity, not into a begging bowl, but give it to us on terms of extended credit.

My friend objects. If my friend Prof. Mukerjee is able to persuade his cronies either in the Kremlin or in Peking to give us Rs. 500 crores, I am quite certain that the Government of India would welcome. Can Prof. Mukerjee or his group persuade their communist friends to give us Rs. 500 crores as extended credit?

**An Hon. Member:** Send them in a delegation.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** Not the kind of Rs. 60 crores about which my hon. friend was vociferous. We need Rs. 500 crores to Rs. 600 crores and if we get it from the Communist countries, I would feel glad.

**Shri E. Ramanathan Chettiar (Pudukottai):** On a point of order, Sir, is "cronies" a parliamentary term?

**An. Hon. Member:** It is a thoroughly parliamentary term.

**Mr. Speaker:** At any rate it is not unparliamentary. I am also guided by the House.

**Shri B. Ramanathan Chettiar:** He said "cronies in the Kremlin".

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** It is all right.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I regret to say this. But I feel that it has to be said.

What was the motive for all this abuse of the Finance Minister? Who has mounted this abuse against him? What was the reason? I feel that it is not merely the normal communist motive of wanting to abuse the democracies, wanting to glorify the Communist dictatorships. It was a different motive. I say this because it has got to be said. I know that the Communists profess loudly their interest in the Plan, their desire to see the Plan succeed, but the louder their protestation the more I suspect they are wanting the Plan to succeed. I feel that secretly it would serve the communist policy and technique to see that the Plan fails, because if the Plan fails, there will be economic frustration, there will be economic bitterness, there will be consequent political unrest and it is on that frustration, on that bitterness, on that unrest that the communists thrive. It is on the crest of these troubles that the Communists usually ride to power.

I disagree with my hon. friend, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari on many of his fiscal policies. But I felt that any person who could see clearly should have seen through this communist game. They were frightened since they felt that the Finance Minister's visit might succeed. So, they thought, let us do what we can to make his mission a failure. Of course, it was a pretext—some alleged statement of his.

What has the Finance Minister said? He went on a difficult and delicate mission. He does not have to come back to the Prime Minister for every word, or every utterance he makes.

But they wanted to drive a wedge between the two. It was a very good pretext; here is an opportunity for them to bring about a disagreement, to drive a wedge between the Prime Minister on his foreign policy and the alleged statement of the Finance Minister. I am glad that the Government has not fallen into the trap.

If they had driven a wedge between the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister, if the Finance Minister had been repudiated, what would have happened? It would have meant that the mission would have failed, and the communists would have succeeded in the strategy of killing the mission.

Sir, I feel that there has a great deal of controversy been raised, but much of it has been deliberately fabricated. I also feel this that with regard to our Plan, some of us may disagree with certain details of the Plan. But we have accepted this Plan; the House has accepted it. What do we say? We say that basically we will give due priority to the fact that ours is an agricultural country; so we will give first priority to it. After that we must build a minimum industrial base to Indian economy, because unless we build that we can never give to our people, as we hope to give them, in fifteen or twenty years a reasonable standard of living. That is the Plan. I believe that we have accepted the fundamentals of the plan; the House has accepted it.

I feel that in some respects the Plan represents not only a kind of hostage that we are giving to the future prosperity of India; it represents a hostage which we are giving to the future of democracy in India. I believe that through the Plan democracy in India will be on trial and that is the crucial basic issue. I believe that people who formulate policies in the other democracies will see through the present mist of controversy and they will realise that this Plan is a challenge to the future of democracy in India.

If the Plan fails it will not only be a failure of the Plan, it will not only be a failure of democracy in India, it will be more than that. It will be a failure of democracy in the world.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod):** May I make a submission?

You have already said that some more time would be given for this discussion. I suggest that, if possible, the whole of today may be allotted for this discussion. Or else, if there is some time left, the discussion on the food situation may be taken up and may be continued tomorrow. There is, of course, the Delhi Municipal Corporation Bill for which some time will be required. After this discussion is over, discussion on the Delhi Corporation Bill may be resumed and the discussion on food situation commenced tomorrow.

**श्री अजयराव सिन्हा (फ़िरोजाबाद):** अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस में मुझे यह निवेदन करना है कि सदन में विभिन्न प्रकार की विचार-धाराएं हैं। इस विषय पर सब प्रकार के विचार प्रकट हों, इस लिए इस वाद-विवाद का समय कुछ बढ़ा दिया जाए। जैसा श्री गोलवल्लन ने कहा है आज का सारा समय इस को दे दिया जाए जिस से सब लोग अपने विचार रख सकें और विभिन्न विचार-धाराओं का प्रतिनिधित्व हो सके।

**Shri Yajnik (Ahmedabad):** I would support that proposal. In view of the long statement made by the Prime Minister in the matter, I feel that sufficient time should be given to all groups in this House to have their say in the matter.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have already said that normally, according to the time that has been allotted, we would have to conclude this debate at 13.30 hours, but that I would extend it till 14.00 hours. In view of the suggestions now made I will extend it to 14.30 and that will be final. I cannot allow one more

hour. We will have to conclude it by 14.30. I believe the Home Minister and the Finance Minister also would like to take part in the debate.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** Then others will not have any time.

**Mr. Speaker:** They will have time. I will call representatives of the various groups. I have already done so with respect to some of them. I will call the others also. Therefore, this debate will certainly conclude at 14.30 hours.

**Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi-West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes):** Sir, at the time when we met in the Business Advisory Committee we had not in mind the intervention of the Prime Minister. Now you have been pleased to tell us that the hon. Home Minister also would like to be heard. We would be very happy to listen to him, but there will be many more Cabinet Ministers; perhaps, the hon. Shri Morarji Desai might also join it. We the sponsors of this motion are most anxious that adequate time may be available at the disposal of the House. May I again plead that you use your discretionary powers more generously and let us debate this up to about 16.00 hours today?

**Shri Yajnik:** How would you have time for the various groups if the Ministers also intervene?

**Mr. Speaker:** All the various groups will be given time. I shall call on Shri Yajnik and one or two other groups that still remain. I shall try to do my best. A suggestion has been made to me that so far as the time taken by both the Ministers is concerned, the time up to 14.30 should be exclusive of the time taken by the Ministers. There is another suggestion that has been made by Shri Gopalan that, in view of the fact that one full day has been allotted for the debate on the food situation and there is not enough time today to complete the debate, we may pass over the discussion on the food situation till