

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have not heard anything of the speech just now. You have just walked in. Have some patience.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: Even we say sometimes, and many a time even Bhupeshji also says, that it is a socio-economic programme. I am not entering into a controversy on this issue. But no man has made any valid objection to any point in the programme. That is what I wish to submit. Whether you like a person or you like the author or not that is a different question. But the programme as such is a social programme. It is good programme, and the implementation...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: For your information, in this House we together, in 1959, when Jawaharalal Nehru was there, passed the Anti-Dowry Bill. We have passed the anti-dowry measure. Why lecture on that? This is very good, and...

DR. RAJAT KUMAR CHAKRABARTI (West Bengal): What does he know about dowry?

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: Just because certain ills which continue to afflict the society are brought into the focus of public attention and public gaze, what is wrong with it?

In any case, I am on Nagaland and not on the Five-Point Programme. Therefore, I would humbly request the House to accord approval to the Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That this House approves the continuance in force of the Proclamation issued by the President on the 22nd March, 1975 under article 356 of the Constitution, in relation to the State of Nagaland, for a further period of one year with effect from the 26th March, 1977."

The motion was adopted.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION REGARDING CONTINUANCE IN FORCE OF THE PROCLAMATION ISSUED BY THE PRESIDENT IN RELATION TO THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister will now move the other Resolution on Tamil Nadu.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): What happened to the amendment that we gave? I gave two amendments. One has, of course, been dealt with. The other amendment was to the effect that the extension should be till 15th of April. I think it is not necessary to give extension for one year. For reasons of administrative convenience and practical difficulties, you can give extension up to 15th of April, by which time the Lok Sabha will be in a position to deal with it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh, we are on Tamil Nadu now. Let the Minister move the Resolution on Tamil Nadu.

SHRI VIRENDRA KUMAR SAKHALECHA (Madhya Pradesh): I also gave an amendment regarding this Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am told that you were informed that it was inadmissible.

SHRI VIRENDRA KUMAR SAKHALECHA: I was told about it in the House. I was not informed earlier.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can find out if an amendment is inadmissible.

SHRI G. LASHMANAN (Tamil Nadu): I rise on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. K. Brahmananda Reddi.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI): Sir, I beg to move the following Resolution:—

"That this House approves the continuance in force of the Proclamation issued by the President on the 31st January, 1976, under article 356 of the Constitution, in relation

[Shri K. Brahmananda Reddi]

to the State of Tamil Nadu, for a further period of one year with effect from the 10th March, 1977."

Hon'ble Members would recalled that the Proclamation under article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Tamil Nadu was issued by the President on 31st January, 1976. Approval to the extension of President's Rule for a further period of six months from 10th September, 1976, was accorded by the Rajya Sabha on the 17th August, 1976, and by the Lok Sabha on the 23rd August, 1976. The present period now expires on the 9th March, 1977.

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: On a point of order Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think we can have the point of order after the speech has been made. You have it either in the beginning or after the speech.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: The House is fully aware of the circumstances that led to the imposition of President's Rule in Tamil Nadu. It will be recalled that there were grave allegations that the administrative machinery had been misused by the erstwhile Government resulting in mal-administration and extensive corruption.

A report highlighting the measures taken by the Government of Tamil Nadu for toning up the administration and stepping up the pace of development activity of the State after imposition of President's Rule has been circulated to Hon'ble Members in the House. I would only like to highlight some of the important fields where significant improvement has been registered in the wake of President's Rule. The foremost task was to provide clean and efficient administration. Vigorous steps were taken and are being continued to eliminate corruption, avoid delays and ensure proper maintenance of discipline at

all levels of administration. Punitive action has been taken against corrupt and inefficient officers. Special cells were constituted to look into irregularities and mal-practices reported about the functioning of co-operative societies, Central Banks, etc. and religious endowments. Anti-corruption and Vigilance Directorate has been strengthened and the procedure for disciplinary proceedings has been speeded up with the reorganisation of Disciplinary Tribunals. Special stress has been laid on prompt redressal of grievances. Due attention has been given to improvement in police-public relations with special emphasis for providing speedy redress in case of harassment of Harijans and other weaker sections of the community. Public Relations Department has been revitalised. The law and order situation has remained under effective control after the proclamation of the President's Rule. The situation on the student and labour fronts has been peaceful.

The State Government has been able to undertake larger development effort than before. As against the annual plan of Rs. 186.26 crores in 1975-76, the outlay of 1976-77 was stepped up to Rs. 217.20 crores, and that of 1977-78 to Rs. 260.12 crores. Thus there was a 17 per cent increase in the size of the 1976-77. Annual Plan as compared to the Plan of the previous year, and a 20 per cent increase in the 1977-78 Annual Plan as compared to the Plan of 1976-77. In *per capita* terms the plan outlay has gone up from Rs. 35 in 1975-76 to Rs. 63 in 1976-77. It is significant to note that about 56 per cent of Annual Plan outlay is earmarked for the schemes included in the 20-Point Programme.

Due priority has been assigned to the core sector such as agriculture, irrigation, industries and power. In the field of power generation, as against an outlay of Rs. 70.38 crores in 1976-77 the provision for 1977-78 is roughly

Rs. 92 crores. At the end of the year the total capacity would be 2900 MW. This will go up by 110 MW in 1977-78 by the commissioning of Kundah Stage IV and by roughly 500 MW in 1978-79, thanks to the first unit of the Tuticorin Thermal Scheme the Kalpakkam Nuclear Power Scheme and the Suruliar Scheme. But Tamil Nadu will still need more . . .

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: In spite of the Central power.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: . . . and in this context, the proposal regarding completion of investigations of the second mine cut at Neyveli has since been cleared by Government.

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: Why they did not do it earlier?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lakshmanan, do you want to participate in the debate or not? You will have your say them.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: Sir, hon. Members have expressed anxiety over the delay in taking up the Salem steel project in Tamil Nadu. I would like to state that the detailed project report prepared by the Dastur Company has been cleared by the Steel Authority of India Ltd., and the Public Investment Board. The project has been found to be commercially viable. The Government have also agreed to the estimates. Considerable work has already been done at the site so that there will be no difficulty in launching the work connected with stage I of the steel plant. Stage I of the special steel plant with an outlay of Rs. 127 crores is being taken up immediately. Stage I will have a capacity of 32,000 tonnes of finished stainless steel.

Sir, vigorous efforts have been made towards the effective and speedy implementation of the new economic programme. Since February 1976, nearly 1.70 lakh house-sites have been assigned and the beneficiaries include over 40,000 persons belonging

to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. So far, 2870 bonded labourers have been released. Minimum wages for agricultural labour have been enhanced. Book banks have been organised in 37,295 schools and 245 professional and arts colleges benefiting nearly two lakh school and college students.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The issue is why are you not holding the elections?

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: I am coming to that. Kindly have a little patience.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: These are not the matters to be stated here.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: More than 9,000 training places have been actually utilised under the new apprenticeship scheme. Because the State is under the President's Rule it is my duty to place before you the effort that has been made during these months. More than one lakh students have been benefited under the scheme for supply of essential commodities at controlled rates.

In reviewing the need for continuance of the President's rule in Tamil Nadu, we have been guided by what is good for the State and its people. Rapid strides have been witnessed in almost every field since the introduction of the President's rule. It is not something unexpected from the people of Tamil Nadu, known as they are for their hard work. It is important that the fillip that has now been imparted to the 20-point economic programme is kept up. For accelerating the tempo of development, further sustained efforts will be required. Therefore, organizing elections to the State Assembly at this stage would have meant diverting the State's energies. Further, between the date of announcement of elections to Lok

[Shri K. Brahmananda Reddi]

Sabha, i.e., 18th January, 1977 and the date of expiry of the present term, i.e. 9th March, 1977 the period was too short to complete election without having recourse to extension of the present term.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How many pages?

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: After careful consideration, the Government have decided to seek the approval of the House for extending the President's rule for another period from 10-3-1977. By virtue of the amendment to article 356 of the Constitution (42nd Amendment), 1976, the period of extension of President's rule now stands raised to one year. It is, therefore, proposed to extend the period of President's rule in Tamil Nadu for a period of one year from 10-3-1977.

With these words, Sir, I commend the resolution for the approval of this House.

The question was proposed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Lakshmanan, what is your point of order?

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: Sir, this act of summoning of the Rajya Sabha by the Vice-President, acting as the President, has been done on the advice of his Council of Ministers with the *mala fide* object of extending the President's rule in Tamil Nadu which is due to lapse on 10.3.1977. The mandatory articles of the Constitution as well as the provisions in the Representation of the People Act, 1951, state that a new Legislative Assembly duly elected by the people should be constituted to take office immediately after the President's proclamation under article 356 of the Constitution lapses. However, since the ruling party at the Centre does not want to hold elections to the Legislative Assembly of the State of Tamil Nadu and since the said party wants to have Tamil Nadu under its control by continuing the President's

rule at a time when elections to the Lok Sabha are being held, I apprehend that the ruling party through the Cabinet has advised the President to summon the Rajya Sabha for the purpose of extending the President's rule. I submit that the *mala fide* or colourable action on the part of the Vice-President acting as President, in summoning, proroguing or dissolving the Assembly can be questioned by me. As has been submitted, the action of the Vice-President, acting as the President, in summoning the Rajya Sabha is with the calculated and colourable object of extending the President's rule in Tamil Nadu. I, therefore, submit, Sir, that the said summoning of the Rajya Sabha to meet here today should be cancelled.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I gave an amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me first deal with this matter. I think you have already gone to court and the court also has rejected your case.

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: My going to the court is different.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I gave notice of my amendment; I do not know what has happened to it. I gave an amendment to the effect that the period of extension should be limited to 15th of April this year. Now, Sir, I think this amendment is quite in order. Why it should not be admitted I cannot understand. The maximum period you can get is one year. That is now under the new provisions of the Constitution but it does not mean that we cannot give an amendment restricting this period when it is open to the Government to hold elections and restore popular rule even before the expiry of the period for which they are taking sanction. Sir, I would like to know what the position is.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the position is the same as that of Mr. Sakshalecha's amendment. It is not admissible.

Now, I think, we will start discussions after lunch. That is better.

The House stands adjourned till 2 P.M.L.

The House then adjourned for lunch at fiftysix minutes past twelve of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at two minutes past two of the clock, [The Vice-Chairman (Shri Ranbir Singh), in the Chair.]

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रणवीर सिंह) :

सदस्यगण, आज तमाम काम खत्म करना है। इसलिये यदि 5 बजे के बाद भी बैठने की आवश्यकता हुई तो बैठक होगी।

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Gujarat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to oppose the Motion moved by the Home Minister Shri K. Brahmananda Reddi. I hold that the imposition of President's Rule in Tamil Nadu in 1976 itself was a *mala fide* act. It was a colourable exercise of power for ulterior ends. The article was not invoked for any of the purpose referred to in article 356 and warranted by the Constitution. Article 356 was invoked, as it has been invoked repeatedly, over and over again despite misgivings expressed not only by the opposition parties, but also by all political and constitutional societies in the country. Just now I had listened to the Home Minister who said that it is wrong to call this an abuse of article 356 and they have never abused it. He also said that they have only used it when they must. I wish it were so. This is the thirty-eighth time during the last 30 years when this article has been invoked. I may recall that when this particular provision was being debated in the Constituent Assembly, there were strong misgivings that this was likely to destroy the federal character of the country, that State autonomy

would be reduced to nullity and that the executive at the Centre would abuse it arbitrarily.

I recall how a person like Hridaynath Kunzru, who was an active member of the Constituent Assembly, a highly respected politically thinker, described it, I quote: An expression of nothing but the undiluted autocracy of the Centre. And replying to the entire debate that took place on this provision, Dr. Ambedkar, the architect of the Constitution, said: I can understand and appreciate the misgivings expressed but I can assure you that nothing of the kind that has been apprehended is going to happen and I have every hope that this particular provision which empowers the Central Government to impose President's rule in a State to sustain the normal functioning of the Assembly or the Government, will remain a dead letter in the Constitution. From the words that he used that "I hope it will remain a dead letter in the Constitution", it is evident that the expectation of our Constitution makers was that this is a provision which should be there just to keep the State in check, in leash. It should not be used at all. If at all it should be, it should be used on rare occasions only. And I am sure the Home Minister will not deny that 38 times in 30 years is not a rare occasion. Thirty-eight times is often enough and if one were to analyse one by one, every single case of imposition of the President's rule, I am of the view that in an overwhelming majority of cases there has been no constitutional breakdown in that State. No such failure of constitutional machinery in that State—or as the Constitution put it, "When the Government of that State is unable to function in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution"—such thing has occurred. In most cases it has been either to topple a non-Congress Government, a Government that is manned by one of the opposition or more of the opposition parties or in some cases, it has been, surprisingly, to sort out family problems of the ruling party, as

[Shri Lal K. Advani]

it happened in Uttar Pradesh or as it happened in Orissa recently. It had nothing to do whatsoever with any failure of constitutional machinery. And there have been other occasions also, for example in Haryana, where on the plea of defections taking place, President's rule was imposed. President's rule is not a device to check defections. The device that has to be there to check defections is lying in the cold storage, I do not know, for how many years and even now nothing is being done about it.

My humble submission is that in all the preceding cases, in case of Tamil Nadu also when in January 1976 President's rule was imposed, it was not at all imposed because there was a breakdown of constitutional machinery. I was not here in those days when the issue was discussed. I was—thanks to the Government of India—a Government guest in a Bangalore prison but I have had an occasion to go through the report sent by the Governor and while going through it carefully I could not discern or discover an iota of evidence that there was any failure of constitutional machinery. There were charges of corruption. There were charges of secessions. But on both the issues I am of the opinion that corruption charges should not be levelled arbitrarily, when it pleases or suits the ruling party. There should be an automatic machinery to investigate and examine and probe all cases of political corruption, wherever they occur. Whether it is the ruling party or whether it is an opposition party, the device should be foolproof, should be automatic for both.

The Administrative Reforms Commission and before that the Santhanam Committee, both of them had gone into this matter at length, made various suggestions, made various recommendations and sought to see that this issue of political corruption is checked salutarily and for that purpose, it should not be left to the will and fancy of Mr. Brahmananda

Reddi to decide when and against whom should a Commission of Inquiry be instituted. During the last ten years, there have been so many allegations and charges of corruption against so many people. A full Memorandum was submitted by many Members of Parliament and MLAs against Mr. Bansi Lal. Nothing happened about it. It was just shelved, frozen. But we note that Commissions of Inquiry have been appointed during this period against Mr. Badal. They have been appointed against Mr. Karunanidhi. They have been appointed only lately, recently, a couple of days after Mrs. Nandini Satpathy quit the Congress Party, against Mrs. Nandini Satpathy. Now how do you explain this except as an act of political, partisan vendetta. Is it anything else? It is nothing else, there is no justification. The ruling party is not in the least concerned about checking corruption as such. If it were, whether it is my party or whether it is your party, or any one party, I would be the first person to uphold any Commission of Inquiry appointed to go into charges of corruption.

In this particular case, it was really scandalous to find the Governor making a report, making charges and charges and charges—which charges also he wanted to be entrusted to a Commission of Inquiry—and then going on to state that because of these charges, I feel that the Government should be suspended and President's Rule should be imposed and that too he says right from the time this Government came into office. Within a year, all those charges came to notice, so that for four years—from 1972—1976—this Governor acted in collusion with that Government. Just a few weeks before elections are due, before the normal term of the Assembly is about to come to a close, he comes out with this report and makes a report and President's rule is imposed in that State and there is charge of secession against the DMK. I feel that this is wholly unjustified, improper and indiscreet to make a

charge of that kind. I have been a witness to the entire political history of the DMK, how it has been functioning. I myself have been a critic, a severe critic of any secessionist tendency anywhere in the country. I and my party—Janata Party—believe in the integrity of the country and we would not compromise with anything that weakens the integrity of the country. And so when the DMK advocated secession, or suggested that they have a separate State of their own part from the rest of the country, we were opposed to it. But later on, as every one is aware—the ruling party is also aware—and not merely in the days of Mr. Karunanidhi but earlier to that, Mr. Annadurai himself who had also held a position in Tamil Nadu politics and who was one of the main mentors of the DMK Party, made that change. Under his leadership, the DMK left that path publicly, disowned the stand and plank of secessionism, and said so. I remember in 1965, Lal Bahadur Shastri had convened an all-Party conference and in that conference, I would like to quote what Mr. Annadurai said. He said, "There may be some misconceptions about us because at one time we had demanded a separate State of our own. But we have given it up". How unqualified, unreserved is this statement—"We have given it up and I assure you", he told all those present including Mr. Shastri, "and I assure you that we have realised that we can swim with India or sink with India". Now here is a statement, very categorical, unequivocal, made by the DMK leader and always upheld by all the leaders of the DMK and just for our own partisan interests, we take advantage of some statements here and there that may be made by some individuals. And you use this stick of secession to beat the DMK with. I think it is not only partisan but also acting against the interests of the country when we make false accusations of this kind knowing them to be false. It should be our duty to bring everyone into the mainstream, and if there are any aberrations

here and there, to correct them rather than make some accusations against some individuals and make that an excuse for imposing President's rule in that State. I do not think anyone can honestly deny that President's rule in Tamil Nadu was imposed only for one reason—because the Government of Tamil Nadu refused to ditto the dictatorial and totalitarian tendencies that were evident in the Central Government at that time. It is because of that that today the DMK is entirely with us, all those who are opposed to any kind of dictatorship, any kind of totalitarianism in this country. I hold no brief for anyone. If there is any corruption anywhere, I cannot hold any brief. But I would certainly think that so far as the issue of corruption is concerned, article 356 is irrelevant to it. Corruption is irrelevant to article 356. Article 356 cannot be invoked to look after maladministration, to check corruption, to check other evils of this kind which are political evils. For that the right recourse is either to set up an automatic machinery to deal with political corruption or leave it to the people of the State to elect the right type of politicians. In that State elections were due shortly. We postponed those elections. We imposed President's rule and one year after imposing President's rule we are coming to the House for another extension.

I have tried to listen to the whole speech of Mr. Brahmananda Reddi. I found not a word to explain why an extension is necessary. Not a word except saying that it is not possible. What is not possible? There is his speech of 20th August, 1976 in the Lok Sabha. There he said:—

"As a result of the failure of monsoons and scarcity conditions which are prevailing in ten out of the States fifteen districts, the administrative machinery is tied down to the urgent task of providing relief to the affected areas. The holding of an election before the expiry of the current term of President's rule is therefore not possible."

[Shri Lal K. Advani]

This is the explanation that was given by the Government on 20th August, 1976, that because of the scarcity conditions prevailing in the country it is not possible to hold it before the expiry of the term of six months which is 10th September. He could not hold it before 10th September. Now, after six months, we expect him to hold it but he does not hold. He comes to the House again for a further extension, and no justification is offered, no explanation is offered. The most surprising part is that in the country Lok Sabha elections are being held. At the same time when the Lok Sabha elections are going to be held, he is not willing to hold elections in Tamil Nadu. If the argument were that we would like the Lok Sabha elections to be de-linked from the Assembly elections and the issue is relating to the State level and not relating to the national level and therefore the electorate should be given an opportunity to judge independently, I would ask them: Why then are you holding elections for the Kerala Assembly? For the Kerala Assembly you are holding elections and in Tamil Nadu and Nagaland you refuse to do so. Is there any justification excepting partisan, political expediency? Nothing else. That is the only basis on which article 356 is invoked again and again and therefore I oppose it.

Vice-Chairman, Sir, article 356 is one of the emergency provisions. The manner in which every single one of these provisions has been used, abused and mutilated after 1950 calls for a second look at all these provisions. I have been a supporter of the emergency provisions earlier, with certain amendments and restraints; but, after all that I have seen happening during the last 19 months, I am afraid that unless these provisions go, absolutely, *in toto* things will not improve. In the same way in which Hitler abused similar provisions in the Weimar Constitution, we have witnessed abuse of the Constitution in this country. That should not happen because India has become a de-

mocracy after trials and tribulations, after sacrifices and sufferings. Just for the fancy of some individuals or for the convenience of the ruling party, this should not happen.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): Please try to wind up.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Yes, I will wind up. This the country cannot tolerate. Today a powerful wave is sweeping the country, a powerful change wave is sweeping the country, and I am most grateful to the Government for having made it possible. It is a reaction, a sharp and powerful reaction, to all the traumatic experiences that you have inflicted on the country during the last 19 months. I cannot claim credit for what is happening. What is happening is not my doing. I was in jail for 19 months and thousands of my colleagues were also inside. So we could not be held responsible for all that is happening today. If that is happening, it is because of you, because of those in the Treasury Benches, and I would appeal to you that for God's sake, think of the country, do not think about the party, do not think of one individual or two individuals—the stakes in the country are much higher. I would appeal to you that this is not the proper way in which you just casually and cursorily do things as you are holding this session. My colleague referred to this yesterday. And I was shocked that the Government does not have the decency even to come to the House with the Resolution saying that this time there will be no Private Member's Business—strangely, no mention whatsoever has been made, the kind of thing that was done earlier. This time they have taken it for granted—Parliament is taken for granted, the press is taken for granted, the Judiciary is taken for granted, the political parties are taken for granted. And all is done arbitrarily just to suit the fancy of the ruling party.

Sir, I feel that even now the Home Minister should give an assurance to the House that he does not propose to postpone the elections in Tamil Nadu and Nagaland for a long time, and that he proposes to hold them early. God knows whether he would be in that position to be able to order the elections. I must say that if any other Government comes, all the Constitutional amendments that have been effected, all the abuses that have taken place of the emergency provisions, including article 356, will be an old story. I notice that an amendment has been made in article 356 only to exclude judicial review—only for that purpose. An amendment has been made in article 356 to extend the period of the President's Rule from six months to one year. Both the amendments are reactionary and retrograded. Both these amendments are in a direction entirely contrary to the one which the experience of the last 30 years warranted. I would say that so far as we in this House are concerned, the complexion may not perhaps change much, but very soon, in the other House, as the whole country looks forward with hope and expectation, an entirely different and new complexion will emerge. I am sure that if that new complexion comes, that will certainly discard and scrap all the reactionary, retrograde and anti-democratic amendments, including the amendments to article 356, and further insulate even the earlier amendments from the arbitrary whims and caprices of the ruling party.

Thank you.

SHRIMATI LEELA DAMODARA MENON (Kerala): Sir, I support the motion contrary to what the honourable Member just said, I do not think is a *mala fide* attempt. It is an inevitable formality. It is very clear that we should not have the elections in Tamil Nadu just

now. The situation in the State does not warrant any election there, especially when it is concentrating on local issues.

Sir, Tamil Nadu was one of the best-governed States in the country. It was in the forefront in industry, in development, everything, but during the regime of the DMK Government, the situation became so bad and things went out of control so much that President's Rule had to be imposed. Then there were no tears shed, excepting by those people who regretted that they could not make hay while the sun shone. Sir, the hon. Member just now said that there were misgivings. But if there were misgivings, then there would not have been that terrific response when soon after the introduction of President's rule, the Prime Minister visited Madras; there was a sea of people on the Marina beach where people had collected to express their relief that President's rule had been introduced in that State.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON (Kerala): You can bring them and show them here.

SHRIMATI LEELA DAMODARA MENON: I cannot transfer Tamil Nadu to Delhi. What happened in that State? People were absolutely disgusted. There was no water, no electricity, no attempt to implement any of the development programmes. There was a great set-back even in the ordinary welfare programmes that had been undertaken in that State. There was drought. Of course, drought is not man-made. But certainly misuse of the drought relief funds is man-made. It is a very open thing that funds allotted from the Centre ...

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I want one clarification. The DMK rule was there for nine years. When did it become

[Shri G. Lakshmanan]

bad? In which year did it become bad?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): Order, please.

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: I am not pressing. But I want to know when it became bad.

SHRIMATI LEELA DAMODARA MENON: I said, droughts are not man-made, droughts are not ordered by man. But when the drought came and the people suffered and the Centre released large amounts of funds for drought relief, these funds were misused; and it has been proved that those funds have been misused. Sir, I do not think that the imposition of President's rule in that situation has been an arbitrary decision, I think it was a very necessary action because of what had transpired in that State. There were not only these problems of maladministration. Of course, maladministration went on also in the form of completely dislocating the administrative machinery. Sir, corrupt officers were encouraged and honest officers were dismissed. Just to quote one instance, an RTO, one of the most honest officers of Tamil Nadu, was just summarily dismissed and the young man, who had a very honest and glorious record of work, died of the sorrow of having been dismissed and insulted like that. Later on, he was posthumously reinstated because he had gone to the court before he died and the court had reinstated him, though posthumously. The whole administrative machinery was completely dislocated. There was corruption. There was misuse of not only funds allotted for drought relief and other things but also of funds offered to God in the temples. The Hindu Religious Endowment funds were misused. They were given to people who not only did not deserve it but who had no faith in the temples or in God and who had no connection with them. Such malpractices and maladminis-

tration had been going on there. Apart from that, far more injurious things had happened there. They had encouraged clandestine activities and anti-national activities. The emergency did not have much effect there because the conditions for which the emergency had to be declared continued unchecked as the Government there did not take action to suppress anti-national activities or to create conditions in which these anti-social activities would be retarded or checked. Sir, apart from that, there had been a Centre-baiting programme. Whenever the Government there was charged with not being able to do anything, they started a Centre-baiting programme. They started a language bogey creating conditions of violence disruption and anti-national activities. There was no other go but to institute President's rule in that State for the safety of the people there and for national safety also. After that what happened? Before that, I would like to refer to another point. There was a national declaration abolishing bonded labour. The DMK Government said there was no bonded labour in the State. We know that there was bonded labour and later on those people were freed. When the Minimum Wages Act had to be introduced and when other States did come forward to have minimum wages fixed for the poor working class, the DMK Government in Tamil Nadu did not do so, even to the detriment of neighbouring States like Kerala. When in Kerala the Government fixed the minimum wages for bidi workers, cashew workers and for plantation labour, the whole set of people in the private trade migrated to Tamil Nadu because there was no minimum wage and therefore they could employ labour and extract work from them. Then the President's rule came and it was nationally accepted that there has been peace established in that State. There has been a phenomenal increase in the developmental programme and the Twenty-Point pro-

gramme was successfully implemented for the benefit for backward sections. The administration has been properly streamlined. I am not going into the details because a beautifully prepared pamphlet has been distributed to all the hon. Members. These details show that in Tamil Nadu there has been a lot of improvement. Therefore, now the hon. Home Minister is asking this House to extend the period of President's rule so that all the gains during the President's rule could be consolidated and improved upon in a concrete and substantial measure.

It has been asked why elections are not conducted in Tamil Nadu whereas they are conducted in Kerala. In Kerala there is an elected Government that has asked for elections there. It is for the administration that has to decide whether there are conditions suitable for holding elections, whether there are anti-national activities or other problems connected with local issues that may come up at the time of elections. I find it is inevitable that there should be an extension and therefore I support this motion with the plea that the progress achieved by the State so far should be made more substantial. An era of progress has started during the President's rule and this progress should be made more substantial, beginning with the steel plant in Salem which will benefit the people of Tamil Nadu. With these words, I support the Resolution.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, the issue before us is not the Presidential proclamation as such. We have discussed it a year ago. And our views are well-known on the proclamation and also about the D.M.K. Government. In fact it was Shri Kalyanasundaram, a Member of the dissolved Lok Sabha, who submitted a charge-sheet against the D.M.K. Government. We stand by it. Today the

issue is whether the President's rule should continue. In short we are discussing whether the election in the State should or should not have been held.

When the Lok Sabha elections are being held in Tamil Nadu, the same process was available for the Government to go through the election to the Assembly, with a little additional cost. The Government should explain as to why the Assembly elections are not being held in Tamil Nadu and why another extension is being sought. There is no justification whatsoever which has been put forward convincingly or otherwise by Shri Brahmananda Reddi in moving this motion

Sir, you will remember that on the 12th of November last year, when the extension of the Lok Sabha was sought through a Bill, I strongly opposed it and immediately after me, Shri D. K. Borooah, the Congress President and our colleague, got up to oppose me and justify as to why extension was needed. He made a long speech and in his speech he said so many things and he was good enough to call me "a simple person, a gullible person" and said that I did not understand things. But, Sir, where is Mr. Borooah now? When the Prime Minister announced the elections, where were these people, who had made long and great speeches before opposing the holding of elections? Where are they now who assailed the holding of elections? The moment Prime Minister announced the elections they started making speeches saying that the elections are good, that the Prime Minister's sense of timing is great, that the Prime Minister knows everything and so on and Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is completely forgotten. This is your logic! Therefore, I say: Do not make great speeches and do not carry your convictions on your sleeves, but try to say things sensible and take

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

chances in life to see whether you are sensible or not.

Sir, there is no justification whatsoever, as I said, for postponing and delaying the elections in Tamil Nadu. But it is not merely that. What is upsetting us today is the mentality, the philosophy and the approach behind such steps. They cannot justify those steps either on grounds of principle or on grounds of expediency or by any accepted standards of democracy or democratic norms. I say this thing because in the ruling party today, there has emerged an extra-constitutional authority, functioning outside the scope of the Constitution, issuing orders to the officials and the Ministers and having the Chief Ministers and other Ministers dancing attendance on them and they have developed a new set of philosophy and a new set of rules and a new set of standards and when the ruling party members, the Ministers and others, betray such tendencies, the nation has to be alerted and the nation is being alerted in the context of the elections. Democracy has to be saved not only from the Opposition which is assailing it, some sections of the Opposition to be precise, but also from the forces of internal subversion from within the ruling party, Sir, functioning from unconstitutional centres of power. I hope our electorate, our voters, our people, will call them to book as they approach the elections and I would be very happy to see some of them at least not returned to those positions where they can misuse power or help others misuse power. I mean, the position of authority.

Sir, behind the postponement of the Tamil Nadu Assembly elections and the attitude of this kind, there is a philosophy and I wish to say one or two words about it. Sir, we are today a little disturbed. I hope Mr. Om Mehta will listen to me very carefully and I wish that my words should be conveyed to all quarters

which may be interested in saving democracy, at least in recognising the blunders and errors they are committing today. There is our friend now, Mr. D. K. Borooah, the President of the ruling party . . .

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Is it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I mean the Congress President, Mr. Borooah . . .

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: *De jure*?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: . . . my good friend, very learned, cultured and affable. I have nothing against him personally. In fact if anything, I have only abundance of affection for him. But can you tell me, friends, whether the AICC has started an Institute of Political Science with Mr. Borooah as the Director and with Mr. Antulay and Mr. Raju as the two Professors? I would like to know this because from these quarters a new kind of philosophy, a new set of theories and new ideas, absurd and fantastic, are coming like the Niagara Falls almost daily. We cannot catch up with the expanse of brains and even more the expanse of their eloquence—theorising on the part of some of these friends. Take, for example, Mr. Borooah, the leader of the ruling party. Hence it is very relevant. It is he who surprised all of us and perhaps embarrassed all of us, and Shrimati Indira Gandhi most, when he said: Indira is India, India is Indira. Have you heard such things being heard by any Indian since the days of Manu? Is there any Indian?

श्री लाल कृष्ण वाणी : (गुजरात) मनु, ने, किसी ने, नहीं कहा। मनु ने नहीं कहा है।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Nobody said. Here, in this great land great figures have come and gone. Never have we used such expressions. For Mahatma Gandhi, we never said: Gandhi is India, India is Gandhi. Did you say this thing? Did we hear Jawaharlal Nehru is India, India is Jawaharlal Nehru? Mr. Borooah said

it. Why? I do not understand. Was it flattery? Was it sycophancy? Was it anything of that sort? I do not know. I should like to know from which philosophy it comes. Sir, we had never heard such things, except once, and that was before the World War. And it was Hess in Germany who said: Hitler is Germany, Germany is Hitler. My friend, Mr. Borooah, who is a staunch anti-fascists . . .

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA (Orissa): Sir, I think he is quoting out of context . . . (Interruptions). He should not quote out of context . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is Mr. Borooah who said: Opposition has become irrelevant, and he said this in his usual party style. . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): Are you discussing Mr. Borooah or Tamil Nadu. . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He said: Leave alone Indian history. Well, Indian history is a big proposition. Indian history is very relevant to the direction of the Sixth Lok Sabha. The Opposition is relevant to India. These things should not be said. Everybody else, according to Mr. Borooah, is marginal and only Mr. Borooah and his party are substantive. Is it so? Are such utterances justified?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): Are you discussing Mr. Borooah or President's rule in Tamil Nadu?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You do not know your leader. I am coming to Haryana, and. . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): Come to Tamil Nadu.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am giving the background. I think these theories are dead, and. . .

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS AND DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI OM MEHTA): Sir, when President's rule was imposed in Tamil Nadu, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta had supported it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Bhupesh supported it. And now I am discussing this. Why are you extending it?

Take another theory given by our great, esteemed friend from your State, Sir, who is ruling Haryana by remote control. You may be denying it. Our friend, Mr. Bansi Lal, in connection with this election business, made a speech at Ambala Cantonment on the 7th January. And he always makes very interesting speeches. Therefore, I shall share my interest with you. He said. . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): Is Ambala in Tamil Nadu?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You do not know where Ambala is!

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): I want to know from you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Defence Minister said:

"For the Congress there was no urgency for holding elections. We are, after all, the elected representatives of the people. If foreign democracies, in the wake of wars or the like, can postpone their elections for ten years, what is the urgency for elections here? We have also waged a war and this war was against poverty."

What a profound utterance! It would invite the Nobel Prize. Such utter nonsense has never been uttered. If Nobel Prize had been given for speaking utter nonsense, he would have been given that prize.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

You see the Defence Minister of the country making such statements. No elections are needed. We have been elected. What is the need for elections! He has shown such callous ignorance of history when he said that elections were postponed for ten years after the war. Mr. Om Mehta should tell his colleague. If he has any chance of reading history, he should read it. After the World War II, Mr. Churchill went to the polls and lost the polls. Mr. Bansilal does not know such things. Mr. Bansilal is busy with the arrangements of the affairs of the extra-constitutional authorities. Where is the time to read other Constitutions? If you read the Constitution, you come to know about these things. Mr. Bansilal wanted the elections to be postponed for ten years or so.

(Interruptions)

SHRI KALI MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): What is that extra-constitutional authority? What are you talking about?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You don't know it! That is the difficulty in this extra-constitutional authority. They are the people whose name should not be taken in the House for the time being. That is what Mr. Bansilal said. He wanted the postponement of the elections. I say that such things are dangerous.

Then we have got another friend. He is Mr. Antulay. He has got his own ideas about the elections. He went to Orissa to topple Nandini Satpathy in Orissa. Then he made speech. You know, it is very difficult for us to adjust to these things. On the 17th of December, he made a speech amongst the Congressmen. Mr. Antulay, whatever he is, said:

"Our history demonstrates that subedars and subedaris have always been responsible for weakening national unity and indeed for the loss of independence. A strong Centre with direct loyalty of the

people to the national leader was the only safeguard for the unity, integrity, progress and future prosperity of the nation."

Samachar adds:

"Mr. Antulay called upon Congressmen to stand solidly behind the Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi, and have their "direct loyalty" to her as "loyalty is not divisible nor can it be through some medium." Mr. Antulay said: "the relationship between the national leader and the followers should be direct and all others who were placed by her to discharge certain duties in their own spheres, such as Chief Minister, can expect only cooperation of their colleagues and not loyalty, which is the whole democratic prerogative of the national leader, Mrs. Gandhi."

Wonderful authority! Here is the Constitution. We have 26 years of practice of this Constitution. We have worked successfully for 26 years. Does any of that come from this? Sir, we thought that the responsibility of a Minister of the State Cabinet is the same in his own context as that of the Central Cabinet Minister. We thought Mr. Brahmananda Reddi is in the same way responsible to the Prime Minister as someone, shall I say, Mr. Narsa Reddy in Andhra Pradesh in relation to Mr. Vengal Rao. Now this is the position. In our Constitution, it is a settled thing. It is a well-settled law. Now, Mr. Antulay thinks: No loyalty there; loyalty must be here. Suppose, Sir, in a State another Party Government remains in power. What happens then? Now these theories are uttered. These theories never augur well in any political system. We are not living in the days of the divine right of the king and the queen. Even then, it will not be said in the most absurd, fantastic manner in which Mr. Antulay put it. He is a learned man. I am told that he is a lawyer. Where did he get these ludicrous and absurd ideas, I cannot understand. He seems to be in a hurry to carry the favour

of the extra-constitutional authority. Is that so? Then do it privately. Why make such public statements? Imagine, Sir, this statement is published abroad, as it must have been. How will the people take it? What will they think about democracy? Sir, this is what I say. This danger is there.

(Time bell rings)

Lastly, Sir, I should like to say two things. I do not wish to say about the Parliamentary Affairs Minister. Here Sir, our friend, Mr. Raju, our very beloved friend. He smiles all the time. Now he developed a thesis. And in his statement about the responsibility, Mr. Raju said: "The Opposition's proposed collective leadership was a contradiction in terms." He asked: 'Is it possible for a great nation like ours to take the risk of one person sitting on a horse, the other holding the reins, the third whipping the horse, the fourth showing the direction, and the fifth watching all this tamasha?'—And I would like to add the sixth that the sixth issuing the theory from the AICC office. But I do not add it because he has not said it. "Will the horse run?" Mr. Raju is running all right. He is running amuck with his theories and other things. Sir, he said: "Collective leadership came only when a particular junta came to power and could not find a suitable person to lead them." Sir, many such things he said. What am I to say? Article 74 of the Constitution is based on the foundation of collective leadership. The President acts on the advice of the Council of Ministers, headed by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister, as Mr. Ivor Jennings and others pointed out, is the pivot of the Cabinet. Cabinet has collective responsibility. Prime Minister is *primus inter pares* first among equals. This is how things have been understood, preached in this House, practised also in many ways. And here comes Mr. Raju,

trotting out a theory in order to put across such ideas. Are you then going in for that kind of thing—one leader, one party, one country plus only one AICC General Secretary? Are you going in for that? I do not think so. Then, why say such things? Why do you go away from the accepted norms and principles of the Constitution, its letter and its spirit, its practice, its custom and its convention if you say that, you believe in following it?

(Time bell rings.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): Please try to wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Please don't ring the bell. I am trying to finish.

Then, Sir, as far as my friend, Mr. Raghu Ramaiah—Mr. Om Mehta, your senior is now being talked about—is concerned, Mr. Raghu Ramaiah nowadays does not take interest in parliamentary affairs. He takes interest in others affairs. Sir, I do not say that he has interesting affairs as such. I say he takes interest in others affairs. Sir, Mr. Raghu Ramaiah was heard to speak at a public meeting at Guntur and addressing a young leader he told to the audience—people were shocked and bewildered—I have been a slave of your grand-father. I have been a slave of your mother and I shall be your slave. Do you expect, Sir, decorum and dignity, principles of parliamentary democracy and ways of parliamentary life and parliamentary system to be preserved and maintained by people who make such public utterances to the disgust not only of the audience but of the whole country? Such is the position how things are being done. This extension in Tamil Nadu will only strengthen these very forces and indeed they are the result of such things. Here we have got the extension of the President's rule in Tamil Nadu. Tamil Nadu is very adjacent to Pondicherry and the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

Lt. Governor of Pondicherry is Mr. Kulkarni. Yesterday I indicated to Mr. Om Mehta this matter and I should raise this point again. You know the position of Lt. Governors and how they are functioning. Mr. Kulkarni is the Lt. Governor of Pondicherry and he addressed a Congress meeting from the Congress platform. He abused the Communist Party and he is breaking up the trade unions and creating rival unions. The matter was brought to the notice of the Prime Minister and it was stated: Kulkarni, Governor of Pondicherry, openly encourages disruption, breaking up of trade unions, etc. Pray stop this undemocratic action. Then Mr. Subbiah, ex-Minister in Pondicherry—Pondicherry has no popular Government now—talked to him and Mr. Kulkarni denied that he had attended any Congress meeting. He said that he had attended the meeting of some State function. But when he was confronted with the material, well, he could not deny. Here is the card, Sir, Well, it is in Tamil. I think it is written in Tamil. The card says that it is a meeting to celebrate the 59th birth anniversary of Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi. The card also says that the Lt. Governor Pondicherry, Mr. Kulkarni, will inaugurate the celebrations and Mrs. Kulkarni has kindly consented to distribute the prizes. That is all right. Let him go. There is nothing wrong. But what happened is that he utilised the opportunity to attack the Communist Party. Is it proper? I produce the card. I produce the document. Mr. Kulkarni denies it. He told them an untruth when he was confronted with the charge that he was using the Congress platform, which is not a Governor's business to attack a political party in this manner. He denied it. Sir, I have got the documentary evidence. I should like to know from Mr. Om Mehta what remedy we have got against such Governors. Well, Sir, it is not open to a constitutional Governor to go and speak against any party anywhere.

That is a task for the political party, or, for the matter, members of the Government if they do not like any person in the opposition. But, here he was speaking against a party on a solemn occasion—well, I take it 3 P.M. a solemn occasion, Shrimati Indira Gandhi's birthday—to oppose the Communist Party and from a Congress platform. Then he did not have the courage to own what he had done. He had to get away by saying that it was a State function. How could it be a State function? Had the State decided that birthdays of Ministers or the Prime Minister or the Chief Ministers should be held? In any case, it was a meeting which was called by the Congress Committee and invitation cards were accordingly sent. I have shown you the card.

Not only that. He is doing so many other things, breaking up the unions, putting up rival unions, creating all kinds of things and all the representations to him have failed. Mr. Om Mehta, have you sent a man of extra-Constitutional authority with the title of Governor to indulge in extra-Constitutional and unconstitutional acts? I would like to know. I demand an enquiry into the whole affair. Sir, here are the papers. I demand an enquiry into the allegation that has been made. I demand that Mr. Kulkarni be removed from the governorship because he has not kept his oath of office by functioning in a manner in which he has functioned there. Now, Sir, this is what has happened when you prolong the Governor's rule.

I do not say very much about Mr. Sukhadia except that when some young friend from here went to visit Tamil Nadu at the time of the flood, or whatever you call it, in November—I will not mention him—that young friend accompanied by Governor Mr. Mohan Lal Sukhadia drove in an open jeep, etc. etc. and I find Mr. Om Mehta's name is also there. Mr. Om Mehta, you are our Minister, Minister of State for Home Affairs, occupying a very responsible position.

Why do you encourage your Governor to accompany a private person? I do not get even a chowkidar....

SHRI OM MEHTA: Sir, on a point of information, I must tell him that there was a cyclone in Madras and I had gone for that cyclone to give relief to those who were the victims of that cyclone and as the Governor was to accompany me to some place, he came there and we both went.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very glad, but was this cyclone blowing such a way that you should be trailing somebody else along with your Governor? We also go to Tamil Nadu when there is cyclone or storm or some flood. We go to the other States but we never get a chowkidar to come with us, not even a chowkidar. Bhupesh Gupta and many other people have been in Parliament for 25 years; we are 62 years of age or something like that. When we go to a State on the occasion of some natural calamity, flood cyclone or whatever it may be, we never see even an orderly from the Governor's House to make an enquiry as to say: "How are you Mr. so and so?" But here, we find the Governors coming and, well, accompanying somebody not being accompanied by somebody. Your order of precedence is your business. But the trouble is that the extra-Constitutional authority today in the order of precedences number two. That your Cabinet Ministers say. What can I do? And then what happens? The Governors behave in this manner. I protest against this kind of thing. Instructions should be issued to the Chief Ministers and Governors as to how they should behave on public occasions. Yes, let the Governor receive public men, great poets of our country. I can understand that. Let the Governors give the same treatment to others; but in this manner I am not blaming that young man or others individually. I am blaming the manner in which the country is being run today, the manner in which we are functioning today and we want

to ensure from this House that such scandalous exhibition of sycophancy, of cowardice, of an attempt to act in this manner is put a stop to once and for all to save our democratic honour, our democratic institution from disrepute and shame. This is what I want I have said enough. Therefore, I say that elections should have been held in Tamil Nadu. I do not know why you are delaying the elections. You will be spending more money later on. When the elections are held later on the same voters would come to vote and they would have to elect an Assembly so that Tamil Nadu would be able to have a popular Government. Sir, if you hold the elections later on, there will be also difficulties for persons to contest the elections. As you know, if Lok Sabha elections are separated from Assembly elections, it complicates the situation and makes the elections needlessly expensive for everyone. But here, there must be some horse trading perhaps. I do not know. This is very wrong. Therefore, I am opposing this kind of thing.

Sir, you are ringing the bell. I have said enough. Before I sit down, I regret that Tamil Nadu elections did not take place. They should have taken place. This would have helped our democratic institutions. You remember, the Prime Minister, in her speech in 1975, on the morrow of the proclamation of the Emergency said that measures have been taken to put democracy back on the rails. What has happened? Every day, by such unauthorised, unconstitutional, illegal, improper and other actions of the Government, democracy is being subverted from within and it is going more and more off the rails. Elections would have helped you in restoring the normal process of democracy in Tamil Nadu and a Government could be formed by whatever party or group of parties who may win the elections. I hope that democratic and anti-separatist forces would win the elections. But I am not on that point. I want the process to be restored and this is what we should have done. At your convenience, you impose President's

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

Rule. At your convenience, you withdraw it. There should be some norms. Can you not discuss this with all of us so that some norms could be evolved and we could go by the rules of the game? We will also be able to understand what will happen then. This is such a scandalous thing.

What happened in Orissa? President's Rule was imposed on the 16th December, 1976. Shrimati Nandini Satpathy told me that she had the majority. They could not remove her from power. She said 'I would not resign; When I have the majority, why should I go?' She was threatened that she would be dismissed and that President's Rule would be imposed. Telephone calls went from here to the Governor that she should be asked to resign within 15 minutes and that otherwise she would be dismissed. This is the way they function.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Mr. Gupta, she did not resign when she was asked to resign.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No. The Assembly could have been called. Before the imposition of the President's Rule, you could have easily removed her from power through a No-Confidence Motion. This was possible. This was not done. President's Rule was imposed. The game was over. The majority was converted into a minority. Shri Binayak Acharya now got the majority. Shri Binayak Acharya himself seems to have said this on the 18th of January. I am reading out from statement.

"The Chief Minister went on record soon after the installation of the Ministry that it was Mr—"

I do not name him—

"...who first considered the change as necessary in view of the political crisis in Orissa and he even showed the way how to achieve that."

You know the person. Everybody knows him. He has no status as a

Minister. But on his advice, this was done. He lives in Delhi I am told. He is not very old either. On his advice, this was done. Of course, after some time, this statement was denied. But is it not a fact that one of your Deputy Defence Ministers used the Defence aircraft to fly between Bhubaneswar and New Delhi again and again to carry out the toppling operations? Immediately after that, he is promoted as a Minister of State. Is that the way to run the democratic institution? I should like to know it. You know very well what his name is, Janaki Ballov Patnaik. Everybody knows that he has promoted after 'operation topple'. We need a Defence Minister for protecting our frontiers, for saving the country from external threat, not for such 'operation topple' as in Orissa and other places. Do you need a Defence Minister for that? Then better have a Minister in charge of 'operation topple'. We can understand that. You can pay him from the Consolidated Fund of India, if you like. I am told that defence planes were used. (Interruptions.) What is it?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): Please wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mig Fighter is required for 'operation topple'. Mig Fighter is required for external aggression. When you commit internal aggression against your own Chief Minister, you need a different type of Minister, a different type of plane and a different type of constitutional authority, different sets of norms for violation of Constitution all along the line. This is what is happening.

श्री लाल श्रद्धाणी : श्रीम मेहता जी,
19 महीने में इनको को भी दुश्मन कर
दिया क्या ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, that is not the question, Mr. Advani, something was brought in West Ben.

gal but it did not succeed. And now, those who were part of the 'operation topple' but failed, are now sabotaging the Congress election and our election. One of the saboteurs' Tarun Kanti Ghosh, is the special assistant to the Police Minister of West Bengal. He is an independent candidate now. A Congressman, who has been suspended, is still the special assistant to the Police Minister. Mr. Shyamal Chatterjee. And then there is Mr. Kamal Nath, Sir, if you have persons like Kamal Nath and others and these kinds of people, these Congress seats are in danger in West Bengal, just as our seats are in danger. This is what is happening today. This is how they are behaving. Surprisingly enough, Mr. Tarun Kanti Ghosh has been saying that they are all very good nationalists and that is why they are behaving like that. What disciplinary action you are taking against him, I do not know.

SHRI OM MEHTA: He has been expelled from the Congress Party.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Om Mehta is clever enough, because you cannot catch him easily. I must say, you cannot catch Mr. Om Mehta easily. He is a good man but I never thought that he had become so clever. During the period of emergency, one man has graduated in cleverness, he has almost got the Ph.D. degree and he is Mr. Om Mehta, there is no doubt about it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): Please wind up now. (*Time Bell rings*).

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: So, Sir, I need not say such things. Save democracy. We must know democratic norms.

I would request you to hold elections in Tamil Nadu at an early date so that popular Government could come and democratic and other forces could take the rightful place in conducting the affairs of the Tamil Nadu State.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA (Gujarat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Resolution moved by the Hon'ble Home Minister.

As has rightly been put by Mrs. Leela Damodra Menon, this is nothing but an inevitable formality for the extension of President's rule. She has advanced reasons why the extension is required. Also it is beautifully described in this booklet; so I need not go into details. But I was much interested in the speeches of the Opposition which are more or less like public speeches on the eve of the elections. My friend, Mr. Lal Advani, has left the House. But he was crying for democracy. He was telling us that there is a choice between dictatorship and democracy. He described the State as a totalitarian State. I would like to remind him about what the Morcha of the so called Janta Party has done in Gujarat during the last five years. I do not want to go into the details of those navnirman days. But in the recent elections also, I want to give only a few examples of what happened in the last week. Only the day before yesterday, our worker was attacked in Sabarkantha district. His name is Dayabhai Solanki. He was so much beaten for canvassing for the Congress Party that he became unconscious and he remained unconscious for 12 hours. I rushed to the place. I went to the hospital. I took him to the different hospitals and lastly I brought him to Ahmedabad where he was still unconscious. Yesterday, I was informed that his life was in danger and his condition was very serious. Therefore, I could not come yesterday and I came only today.

Sir, what is democracy? I don't understand the definition of democracy of Mr. Advani and his friends. Democracy to them is liberty and licence to attack only the minorities and the poor people of this country. What they have done in the past and what they are doing at present is nothing but suppressing the poor and the down-trodden communities of this

[Shri Yogendra Makwana]

country. They want liberty and licence to attack the Harijans and minorities. If I am not mistaken, Sir, I would like to describe certain incidents of Assembly Elections in 1975 in Gujarat. During those days in one village the Maulvi of the village was called and he was threatened that if he would not vote for them, the whole community would be massacred, Sir, is this the democracy? This is the definition of democracy of Mr. Advani and Mr. Morarji Desai. They are now crying in the name of democracy and dreaming for majority in the Lok Sabha. Just now my hon'ble friend, Mr. Lal Advani, said that they will get a majority in the Lok Sabha. I think it is dream. And he got a dream because he is under a great illusion about his friends and his party. They want to win elections not by winning over public opinion, not by educating the public, not by convincing the public but by threatening them, by attacking them and by force. This is their definition of democracy. We do not accept—at least the poor and the down-trodden people don't accept—this definition of democracy.

Only yesterday, there was a procession of congress party in Nadia in my own district. And the procession was attacked. My wife is hurt. She has got a blow on the head. Our candidate for Lok Sabha, Mr. Dharamsay Desai was also hurt. He got an injury on the hand. Several others were also injured by the Janata Party. They are now crying for democracy and in this House they say that this is a totalitarian State, this is a dictatorial State. What right have they got to say like this?

On the contrary, I would like to congratulate Mr. Bhupesh Gupta who has rightly said that even today he sticks to his words that they supported imposition of President's Rule in Tamil Nadu. But again he says that he was opposing the extension because Assembly elections there are not clubbed with the Lok Sabha elections. Sir, I fail to understand why a man like Mr. Bhupesh Gupta says that the Assemb-

ly elections should be clubbed with the Lok Sabha elections. He is aware of the fact that national issues are quite different from the State issues and we do not want that the State and national issues be put together and elections held. That is the only reason for which the Lok Sabha elections are separated from the State Assembly elections. The Congress Party and the Congress Government do not want to club parliamentary elections with the State Assembly elections.

Sir, when the Jana Sangh Member, Mr. Advani, was describing the Government as totalitarian, I was reminded of Mr. Morarji Desai's speech on the 22nd February at Bangalore and also of the speech of Mr. Balraj Madhok. Mr. Madhok said in a statement that he has disassociated himself from the Jana Sangh because there are more Fascist elements in it. On the 22nd of February, Mr. Morarji Desai in his speech at Bangalore said that Jana Sangh is not a communal party and is not connected with the murder of Mahatma Gandhi. Till yesterday he was shouting in my State of Gujarat that the hands of Jana Sangh were stained with the blood of Mahatma Gandhi. Now that very man says that Jana Sangh was born in 1950 whereas Gandhiji's murder took place in 1948 and so how Jana Sangh can be held responsible for it?

Sir, from the behaviour of Mr. Morarji Desai and his Bangalore speech and other previous speeches which I have quoted here, all of us can understand their hypocrisy. They made political speeches here. Mr. Advani—and Mr. Bhupesh Gupta also—made public speeches in Parliament just to ventilate themselves to the people of India throughout the country by the medium of press which they cannot do in a public meeting.

Sir, nobody in this House can agree with them because, as I have given the examples, they are different groups—I do not like to call them par-

ties—and these groups have no ideology. A party has a definite ideology. The Congress has the definite ideology of democratic socialism whereas the Janata Party is only a group, a crowd with different ideologies, each wanting to go in different directions. Mr. Advani gave an idea of his dream, as to what will happen in the country if they get a majority. I hope, and I feel confident, that they are not going to get a majority. They are talking of the Constitutional amendments. But when will they do it? They can do it only if they get a two-thirds majority in the House. Is it possible for them? I think the reason why they described this dream in this august House is just to mislead the people of the country, through the press which is hostile to the Congress Party. Sir, I do not want to say more on this occasion, but at least I can say that these different groups, different parties, which have united in the name of the Janata Party, have no other aim except to establish a fascist regime in this country, with the help of the foreign money.

Sir, I need not repeat the reasons why the President's Rule in Tamil Nadu had to be extended. As I have already put those in the beginning of my speech, and as they have already been described by the Hon. Home Minister and Mrs. Leela Damodara Menon, I need not say anything further.

With these words, I support the Resolution moved by the Hon. Home Minister.

Thank you.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Resolution which my honourable friend, the Home Minister, has brought is another example of double talk. When we charge the Government with dictatorship, it is told to us that if they did not believe in democracy, they would not have ordered the elections. Ac-

cording to them, the very fact that the elections have been ordered and the elections are going to take place in the country, shows the preponderance of the Congress leadership as believing in democratic things. If they believed in democracy, they would have ordered the elections in Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry and Nagaland as well.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (Shri Lokanath Misra) in the Chair]

The whole speech of Mr. Brahmananda Reddi—as also the speeches of Mrs. Leela Damodara Menon and other Congress Members—does not give an iota of justification for the extension of the President's Rule. Rather, the whole speech of Mr. Brahmananda Reddi, and all the papers circulated, go to show that the President's Rule is no more required. The papers regarding the President's Rule in Tamil Nadu were circulated to us this morning. These show that the President's Rule was imposed because of two or three things: firstly, the administration was functioning very badly; secondly, there was corruption; and, thirdly, anti-national activities were taking place in Tamil Nadu. Sir, I do not agree with the last reason because the whole philosophy has changed. With the Constitutional amendments, any anti-Government activity, any anti-Central Government activity, any anti-ruling party activity, becomes an anti-national activity. I think that no anti-national activity was taking place in Tamil Nadu; and I think that even those who were getting protection there, they were all patriots of the first water, who loved India and who wanted to protect this country. As regards the other two charges, this report shows—probably on page 1—under the heading “TONING UP OF ADMINISTRATION”—that “special emphasis has been placed on toning up the State Administration at all levels, improving the economy of the State and eliminating corruption”.

[Shri Krishan Kant]

Sir they say:

"In the field of general administration, the need for discipline among the staff, constant supervision and guidance, measures to avoid delay and courteous and impartial service to the public, has been realised and ensured."

When all those things have been realised and ensured, where is the argument left for extending President's Rule?

SHRI OM MEHTA: I must tell you that certain things have been done and some still remain to be done.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: I will come to that. The second thing is, they say that because of corruption and wasteful expenditure that have taken place in the.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You see, some of Mr. Om Mehta's roles are invisible, but what he says should not be inaudible also.

SHRI OM MEHTA: I was not inaudible, your machine was off.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Then they say that the State Government have effectively reduced non-essential expenditure and other things. And they say that corrupt officials, officers who have outlived their utility for public service and who have been found to be inefficient have been weeded out under the compulsory retirement scheme. All corrupt Ministers have been removed. All corrupt officers have been removed. The administration has been toned up. Non-essential expenditure has been reduced. Then why President's rule? Sir, interestingly when I went to Tamil Nadu, as I got down at the airport and was passing through the Guindy area on my way to the Congress (O) office, I was told that Mr. Sukhadia, the Governor of Tamil Nadu, was the President of the District Congress Committee, Guindy! This is how the Governor is functioning in Tamil

Nadu. The Governor has reduced himself to the position of a District Congress Committee President and functions under the orders of the Congress and not under the provisions of the Constitution as adopted in 1950.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: No, no, that is a very wrong impression. I do not think you should say that.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Sir, this is a fact. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta mentioned a letter as to how a Lt. Governor was behaving. In the same way, all Governors are behaving. And any Governor who does not behave in this way is removed immediately.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: No, please. Revise your opinion.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: All the Governors have become pliable instruments. And any Governor who does not become a pliable instrument is unacceptable and is removed or is not given extension. That is the situation in India. That is why we will have to find out new methods of appointing Governors. While you appoint a Governor, you will have to consult the Opposition and others so that impartial people are appointed and they will not play into the hands of the powers at the Centre.

Another charge was about the corruption of the DMK Ministry. Now, I am for taking action against all corrupt people. But it must be done in an impartial manner. Take action against Mr. Karunanidhi; take action against anybody else; I do not mind. But when one sees the facts of the situation, one begins to doubt the motives of the enquiry commission against the DMK Ministers. Charges against Mr. Karunanidhi were given by certain persons after 1972, and those charges relate to the period when he and the DMK were allies of the ruling party at the Centre. They fought the elections together.

SHRI OM MEHTA: In 1971,

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: The charges relate to that period. And all those persons who have left the DMK have been excluded from the purview of the enquiry commission. This shows how impartially the enquiry has been ordered and implemented. Secondly, Mr. Badal has made so many speeches during the last few days wherein he has said that if he had agreed to join the Congress, no enquiry commission would have been appointed against him. But because he refused, an enquiry commission was appointed against him. What happened to Dwarka Prasad Mishra? No enquiry commission was appointed against him. But when a Chief Minister was sent from here, with the support of Mr. D. P. Mishra—he was a good man—and when ultimately an internal quarrel started, an enquiry was ordered against Mr. D. P. Mishra. So the criterion of ordering an enquiry against corruption is not the corruption of a person or an institution, but what one's equation is with the powers that be in the State or at the Centre. Shrimati Nandini Satpathy was all right and all support was given to her from here. The moment she became *persona non grata*, she was removed and an enquiry commission was ordered against her. Is Government to be run according to the principles embedded in the Constitution or is it to be run for factional purposes and not even for partisan purposes which one can still understand? But this is for factional purposes in the same party. What happened to the Leader of the House? He had the majority with him. Still President's rule was imposed in Uttar Pradesh and he was removed. Then Shri Bahuguna came. He too had the majority with him. Still he was removed and somebody else came. The same thing is happening everywhere. The terms 'majority' and 'democratic principles' have lost all their meaning. I am glad Shri Bhupesh Gupta has made a speech today....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have been making such speeches for over one year.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: If there was no emergency, many of the things would not have taken place. Cut in the bonus of workers, growth of monopoly houses and more unemployment are all the results of the imposition of emergency during which there was no law. There should be a completely correct method or system of inquiry against corrupt persons in authority. Many people have written against Shri Devraj Urs. But no action has been taken.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The trouble was we were faced with the situation when extra ruling party authority and extra Constitutional authority combined to destroy democracy.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: This happened why? Because if the imposition of emergency....

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI LOKANATH MISRA): No interruptions, please. You go on.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: I do not understand when elections could be held in Kerala for the Assembly along with Lok Sabha elections, why cannot there be elections to the Assemblies of Tamil Nadu and Pondicherry? My friend referred to secession. Both the late Shri Annadurai and Shri Karunanidhi said they were not for secession. But there are certain factions in Tamil Nadu which are susceptible to this. Now look at this situation. The President of India is to be elected shortly. If there is no State Assembly in Tamil Nadu, the whole State will not be able to participate in the election of the President. Legally you can hold election even if there is no State Assembly because that happened in Gujarat. But that was a different situation because there was drought then. Tamil Nadu is a sensitive State. If the State cannot participate in the process of election of the national President, what would the people of Tamil Nadu think? What will happen? My friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta has moved an amendment. The President's rule should not be imposed

[Shri Krishan Kant]

first and should not be extended now. It should end by the 10th when election to the State Assembly should be held....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have suggested 15th April.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: But the Government have put themselves in a tight position. I hope the Home Minister will say while replying that the President's rule will be extended only till the election to the State Assembly will be held by the 15th April. It should not be extended beyond that date so that the representatives of Tamil Nadu are able to participate in the election of the President of India. This is very essential.

The Home Minister said that election to the Assembly would be diverting the energy of the people there from developmental activities. We have decided in the Constitution that we want to make development in this country by involving people through elections. Now you are saying that you want development without the people. What is this contradiction? If Lok Sabha elections do not divert the energy of the people, how can Assembly election divert it? That would only help them in involving themselves in a better way. If elections are there, they say.....

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: I said it is a question of involving the people in the developmental effort and not involving the people in the elections....

(Interruptions)

SHRI P. K. KUNJACHEN (Kerala): It goes against you....

(Interruptions)

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: We know your mind. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Congress is now exposed. They feel that elections are a disrupting element and that it should not be included in the Constitution at all. Probably they are suffering now. But for Gandhiji and Nehru, it would not

have been there in the Constitution. If it had been left to you, you would have done away with elections. You have developed a mentality which is not democratic, which is not pro-people and which is dictatorial and authoritarian and anti-people. They indulge in double-talk.

I would like to say one thing now which I could not say in the morning. Their double-talk is so much visible now. They order the elections. We wrote to the Government, when they ordered the elections, that all those detenus under the MISA and DIR should be released so that everybody would be able to participate in the elections in directing the country democratically. Till now, Sir, there are about six thousand to ten thousand people in jail put in jail under one pretext or the other. Sir, if they consider that under the present Constitution the elections are a cleansing process, we would like even those people who do not believe in democracy to be able to involve themselves in this so that they are able to develop democratic principles, democratic values and democratic norms and an ethos for democratic way of life and we want that because we want democratic changes and peaceful changes, but by your own actions you have shown that you do not believe in democracy at all. We have full faith in democracy. You also say that you have faith in democracy. But by your actions you clearly show that you do not believe in democracy. Therefore, you are leading yourself to a very delicate situation. That is why, before the country completely goes down the precipice, elections to the Tamil Nadu Assembly should be held and the prolongation of the President's Rule there should end by the 15th of April and also, elections to the Tamil Nadu Assembly should be held and, similarly, elections should take place in Nagaland also. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI S. W. DHABE (Maharashtra): Sir, this is a Resolution which, I think, does not require a very long debate. In fact, we are on the eve of

the General Elections and many people in the Opposition say that they will come out successfully and the Government is to be formed in this month which will shape the destiny of the people of this country and also of the people of Tamil Nadu. Therefore, Sir, I consider this as an obvious necessity that article 356 has to be invoked to continue the President's Rule there. There is no provision in the Constitution by which the time could be curtailed to a period of less than one or two months as was suggested by my friends here. Under article 356, it is only one year now and previously it was only six months. Therefore, there is no choice and there is no provision for curtailing the period. The mandatory provision is there, the Constitutional provision is there. Previously it was six months and now it has been amended by the recent Constitution (Amendment) Act which has made it now one year. Article 356(2) gives the power to the Government and the Parliament to amend or annul the proclamation at any time. Therefore, Sir, to say that it should be curtailed is wholly irrelevant for the purpose of this Resolution and this is a very necessary step.

Sir, if you consider the history of the Proclamation, you will find that it was issued on 31-1-76 on the basis of the Governor's Report and it was debated at length in the Rajya Sabha on the 8th of March 1976 and I need not go into all those details now. But the Report itself says that there were a number of lapses such as administrative and financial improprieties, highhandedness and favouritism to party interests, misuse of funds allotted for drought relief, Veeram Project, great malpractices in the sale of paddy and so on. One of the administrative and financial improprieties committed at that time, according to the Report, relates to a particular item. A sum of sixteen lakhs of rupees, allotted under the Fourth Plan to be spent on propaganda for the removal of untouchability was diverted to the In-

formation and Publicity Department. I fail to understand the argument of Mr. Advani who said that financial impropriety or corruption could not be a ground for issuing the Proclamation under article 356. But, Sir, when the Budget is approved and the grants are made for specific purposes, they are to be used only for those specific purposes. For the security and welfare of the masses, the Government, which is elected by the people of India, can certainly invoke the provisions of article 356 of the Constitution. In the January 1976 report and in earlier reports, one of the charges, which is very serious, is that they were making propaganda in the State conferences that they had the right to go out of the Indian Union, that they should have the right of secession and if they are not given the right of autonomy they would seize the All India Radio and other Central Government properties. Sir, in this background you see the statement of the Jana Sangh and Janta Party leader, Mr. Advani, that they will oppose the constitutional amendments, that they shall repeal these amendments.

What is the 42nd constitutional amendment? It calls upon all citizens to maintain the unity of India and national integration. A chapter has been added about fundamental duties. Now, they will oppose this amendment of the Constitution which has given a very clear indication that nobody has a right in our country to talk of secession. They support the D.M.K. Government. It is obvious. The Janata Party wants to do it.

Then, they have stated that they would repeal other amendments to the Constitution. What has been done by the constitutional amendment? Very important rights have been given to working class. Workers' participation in management has been given a place of pride. It has been stated that legal aid will be given to the poor.

But the most important thing which I want to say at this stage is the cons-

[Shri S. W. Dhabe]

titutional amendment to the Preamble. In this land, Sir, we shall have secular democracy. The words "Sovereign, Secular, Democratic Republic" have been substituted by "Sovereign, Socialist Democratic Republic". Therefore, when the Jana Sangh people oppose the amendment, when they say that they will repeal the constitutional amendment, it is obvious that they do not accept secularism in this land. Mr. Jagjivan Ram, leader of one group, has stated and made a statement. Let the Jana Sangh leaders come forward and say specifically that they have accepted secularism in this country. They have not done it so far. The main objection by the Jana Sangh leaders against the amendment of the Constitution is the inclusion of the word 'secularism'. Another word which they do not like is the word 'socialism'. They are all opposed to socialism. They do not want social control. They want a free society in which merchants and businessmen will have a right to raise prices at any time and exploit the poor people.

Therefore, Sir, only those who have no faith in socialism and also in secularism can say that they would repeal the constitutional amendments. But certainly it is a great step that amendments to the Constitution have taken place. There will be democratic socialism, and secularism will be the creed.

Sir, in this report which has been circulated along with this, about what the Government has done under President's rule in Tamil Nadu, a number of developmental activities have been stated. I do not want to show each and every thing. But on pages 11, 12 and 13 it is clearly shown that D.M.K. Government was not implementing the 20-point programme. They gave only lip-sympathy to it, it has been stated how many house sites have been given to the poor villagers and landless labourers. The number is 1,69,992. It has also benefited a large number of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes people. There are

other achievements also. Bonded labour has been abolished. Facilities for their rehabilitation have also been created. It clearly shows that if the Government has got the will and the welfare of the people at heart, they can take big steps forward. The report itself shows and justifies the President's rule.

There was a speech here about the other points and the Five-Point programme. The Five-Point programme is really a national programme. It is no use taking about irrelevant things like extra-constitutional authority or extra-legal authority. I know how some people take their inspiration from the extra-territorial ideologies and extra-territorial masters. The programme is removal of illiteracy. Can't it be a national programme? Second programme is anti-dowry. Mr. Advani talks about Hindu philosophy. Is he in favour of dowry? The Five-Point Programmes are abolition of dowry, eradication of illiteracy, family planning and other things. One of their leaders, Mr. Charan Singh, has said: Not only am I a firm believer in family planning; I have written a book on family planning and if power comes in my hands, I will legally enforce it. In fact, these are the national welfare programmes. Such programmes should be above the party level.

Lastly, it has been said that there is Janata wave. If Janata wave is there why are they opposing the Resolution? Janata wave will not be successful in this land for the simple reason that they did not heed the advice of their Messiah, Jayaprakash Narayan during the last five years. He was asking them to form one party. They could not do it. (*Time bell Rings*). When the elections came they formed the party. What is the guarantee that they will continue together? They have said in their manifesto that if they do not come in power, they will challenge and have the right of Satyagraha. They have not said how they will behave if they come in opposition. What is the guarantee that they will not gherao the

legislators and the Members of Parliament? What is the guarantee that they will accept the verdict of the people? There is no answer given by the other side to these things. It is said that a woman can give birth to four good children. But the miracle has yet to happen in this country when four women will give birth to one son. With these words, I support the Resolution.

SHRI P. K. KUNJACHEN: I oppose the Motion moved by the Home Minister because the President's rule in Tamil Nadu has been imposed with *mala fide* intentions. This has been proved by the actions taken so far. From the pamphlet issued to us regarding Tamil Nadu, it has been claimed that much improvement has taken place in Tamil Nadu and that the situation is good in all fields, economic, political, administrative, industrial and what not. They say the situation has improved in all fields. But they are not prepared to hold the elections in Tamil Nadu. One hon. Member from the Congress side said that they have separated the parliamentary elections this time from the Assembly elections. But in Kerala, you have already ordered for the Assembly elections. Then what prevents you from holding the Assembly elections in Tamil Nadu, we cannot understand. And now you want to extend the President's Rule for one year more. You are actually acting with a vengeance against the Tamil Nadu people because extensive transfer of officers and staff have been ordered. You have said: "Extensive transfers of officers and staff have been ordered in most of the Departments with a view to toning up administration and counter the vested interests. In the Police Department as many as 4,000 constables, 600 head constables, 390 sub-inspectors and 90 inspectors were transferred. Transfers of higher level officers involved 90 Deputy Superintendents of Police and 40 Superintendents of Police. These changes have helped in creating a new image of the Police Force." Similarly,

transfers have taken place in all the Departments, and employees and people are being victimised. For what? To suit the convenience of the ruling party. Now, corruption charges are being raised against Ministers. For what? To suit the convenience of the ruling party. The corruption charge has become a weapon in the hands of the Central Government for bringing down the Government in a State. That is the attitude you are adopting now. Have you got any respect for democracy? You have only scant respect for democracy. This can be seen from the statements that have been made even after ordering the elections. The Prime Minister says that she is a democrat and that she believes in democracy. But what statements are being made by her colleagues and lieutenants day after day? You can see some of them. And I quote:

"Opening the Congress election campaign in Pune, the Chief Minister of Maharashtra, Mr S. B. Chavan, said that those who had been detained in jails should thank Mrs. Indira Gandhi. In any other country, bullets would be in store for them."

This is the statement made by Mr. S. B. Chavan, according to the 'Statesman' of 17-2-1977. Sir, I quote another statement made by the Chief Minister of Punjab, Mr. Zail Singh, He said:

"Emergency would be lifted if the Opposition was completely crushed in these elections."

So, Sir, it is clear from this as to why emergency has been imposed.

The Chief Minister of Haryana has stated that the doors of jails are still open. Government and the mentality of the Congress Party and it shows in which way they are taking this democracy and in which way they are going forward. Even though the Lok Sabha

[Shri P. K. Kunjachen]

elections have been ordered, we do not believe that they will be held in a free and fair manner. In that connection also so many allegations have appeared in the Press.

Sir, in the State of West Bengal goondas are attacking the workers of the C.P.I.(M) and the workers of other opposition parties. A complaint has been filed.

SHRI JAHARLAL BANERJEE (West Bengal): It has all proved false.

SHRI P. K. KUNJACHEN: You say it is false but actually it has happened. This is the way you are always doing. Whatever you do, you completely deny.

(Interruptions)

Our leader, Mr. Jyoti Basu, has given a statement of the incidents which have happened in Bengal and I am reading some of them. Under Sitapur police station in Howrah constituency, Congressmen have been creating disturbances in the election campaign of the C.P.I.(M) candidate Mr. Samar Mukherjee, who was the Deputy Leader of the Party in the dissolved Lok Sabha. Similarly, at some places under the Diamond Harbour constituency posters for election meetings are torn and defaced by the Congress youth and some C.P.I.(M) candidates were also beaten up by them. Mr. Jyoti Basu, has complained to the Chief Election Commissioner regarding these matters. This has been given as an election complaint to the Chief Minister of Bengal, Mr. Ray, and also to the Chief Election Commissioner.

SHRI JAHARLAL BANERJEE: Have you seen the reply?

SHRI P. K. KUNJACHEN: Yes, I have seen the reply. If anybody goes through the details of the reply, he will see that inwardly he has admitted that such things have happened.

Then, Sir, what has been happening in Kerala? In the constituency of

Comrade A. K. Gopalan an election office was opened at Mohammah. This office has been ordered by the police to be closed down and the police is standing guard there so that C.P.I. people do not open the office there. in Tellicherry the D.S.P. has issued an order that permission should be obtained for doing propaganda from a police officer and for that purpose an application should be made affixing one rupee stamp thereon.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI LOKANATH MISRA): Mr. Kunjachen, I would remind you that we are discussing the Tamil Nadu Proclamation.

SHRI P. K. KUNJACHEN: Sir, I know that. We are now having elections to the Lok Sabha. My charge is that in Tamil Nadu the President's Rule has been extended with a *mala fide* motive. So in the present election also the Government will act in the same way. That is my charge and I am raising certain points. In Cannanore and Alleppey sanction is given only for this box type election propaganda. That is the position in Kerala. Sir, many States are using their ministerial powers for election propaganda and they are calling their friends and others to the TVs etc., and they are also collecting funds. This is the way they are doing in Kerala. I know it personally. That is why I am raising it here. Therefore, if election is to be conducted this time in a free and fair manner, something should be done about it. There at present about 6,000 prisoners throughout India who are not being treated as political prisoners. The Government claims that they are Naxalites or R.S.S. members or members of banned organisations. That is the claim of the Government. Sir, whatever be the position, they should be released and if they have committed any crime, they should be tried before a court and they should be punished. We have no objection but no person should be kept inside the jail without trial or without being produced before a court. Not only that. Emergency

should be lifted before elections. Only then we can have free campaigning and we can freely approach the people. Not only in Kerala, but throughout India actually, the Government are issuing orders after orders for bribing the voters. They are giving two D.As. or....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI LOKANATH MISRA): Please wind up.

SHRI P. K. KUNJACHEN:one D.A. and they are increasing salaries. Previously the Government said that any increase in salaries will result in inflation. But now, there is no such consideration and in one State, two D.A. instalments have been issued; in another State, one more D.A. has been given and such concessions are being given throughout India.

When we raised the point and expressed our apprehension that rigging will take place in this election, Mr. Boorach has, in a way, accepted....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI LOKANATH MISRA): Anyway, please wind up now. Kindly do not search for points because the time is already over.

SHRI P. K. KUNJACHEN: Mr. Boorach has accepted, in a way, that rigging has taken place previously. I quote here from 'Amrita Bazar Patrika': "Mr. D. K. Boorach said that no rigging in the polls would be possible this time". That means that rigging has taken place earlier and this time it will not be there. This is the promise he has given.

Another thing that I want to point out is that the P.A. of our Minister, Mr. Chavan has been arrested on a charge of espionage and also the Director....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI LOKANATH MISRA): That is not relevant. Do not raise that point now.

SHRI P. K. KUNJACHEN: ...from the Planning Department has been arrested for passing on the information to the American Government. If the Government has any respect towards democracy, on this count alone, Mr. Chavan must have resigned by this time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI LOKANATH MISRA): Please wind up. This point is not relevant in regard to the Proclamation of Presidents rule in Tamil Nadu.

SHRI P. K. KUNJACHEN: Extension of President's rule is also to suit the convenience of the Government. They have no respect for the democratic ways. That is why I am raising this issue as a proof for that.

With these words, Sir, I conclude.

श्री कल्प नाथ राय (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं तमिल-नाडु में राष्ट्रपति शासन की अवधि बढ़ाये जाने के समर्थन में बोलने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। विरोधी पार्टी की तरफ से जनतंत्र, प्रजातंत्र, लोकतंत्र की बातें उठाई गई हैं। लेकिन जब पूरे एशिया और अफ्रीका में साम्राज्यवाद आया, चाहे वह अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवाद हो या पुर्तगाली साम्राज्यवाद हो, ऐसा होता है कि जब भी साम्राज्यवाद का आंदोलन होता है तो दुनिया के सारे देशों में जनतंत्र आता है तो इसी तरह एशिया के मुल्कों में और अफ्रीका के मुल्कों में जनतंत्र आया। आपको मालूम होगा एशिया और अफ्रीका के 90 प्रतिशत देशों से जनतंत्र खत्म हो गया और हिन्दुस्तान में वह जनतंत्र कायम है। इस के लिये कांग्रेस पार्टी बधाई की पात्र है जिसके नेतृत्व में हिन्दुस्तान में जनतंत्र और प्रजातंत्र कायम रहा है।

आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, डी० एम० के० की तरफ से संविधान की बातें उठाई गई हैं। मैं उन लोगों को याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि डी० एम० के० कैसे सत्ता में आई।

[श्री कल्प नाथ राय]

हिन्दुस्तान के संविधान की धारा 344 में लिखा हुआ है कि हिन्दुस्तान की राष्ट्रभाषा हिन्दी होगी। 344 धारा में लिखा हुआ है कि राष्ट्रपति एक आयोग विठाएगा जो 15 वर्ष के अंदर अंग्रेजी को धीरे-धीरे हटवायेगा और उसकी जगह हिन्दी राष्ट्रभाषा होगी। इसी संकशन में लिखा हुआ है कि पहली जनवरी, 1965 से हिन्दुस्तान में राजकाज की भाषा हिन्दी होगी और संविधान की उसी धारा को लागू करने के लिये श्री लालबहादूर शास्त्री ने हिन्दी का प्रचलन मद्रास में कायम किया। संविधान की धारा को लागू करने के खिलाफ तमिलनाडु के अंदर एक जबर्दस्त हिन्दी आंदोलन चला। हिन्दी के खिलाफ इतनी बड़ी नफरत पैदा की गई, तमिलनाडु के अंदर इतना जबर्दस्त आंदोलन किया गया कि उस नफरत के पेट से डी० एम० के० की हुकूमत सन 67 में तमिलनाडु में कायम हुई। हिन्दुस्तान के संविधान को किसने तोड़ा? कांग्रेस पार्टी ने हिन्दुस्तान के संविधान को तोड़ा या डी० एम० के० के लोगों ने तोड़ा? किसने हिन्दुस्तान के संविधान की धाराओं को लागू करने के खिलाफ जबर्दस्त आंदोलन किया? मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या तमिलनाडु के अंदर संविधान नहीं लाया गया, तमिलनाडु के अंदर क्या गीता नहीं जलाई गई, रामायण नहीं जलाई गई, क्या राम की मूर्तियों को जूतों की माला नहीं पहनाई गई? क्या हिन्दुस्तान से अलग होने की बात तमिलनाडु के लोगों ने नहीं उठाई? क्या संविधान की बात करने वाले डी० एम० के० के लोगों ने अपने खुद हिन्दुस्तान के संविधान की धाराओं को लागू करने से रोकने के लिये जबर्दस्त आंदोलन नहीं किया था? क्या डी० एम० के० पार्टी हिन्दी विरोधी आंदोलन के पेट से नहीं पैदा हुई? हिन्दुस्तान का संविधान बनाने वाले लोगों ने हिन्दुस्तान में राष्ट्रभाषा हिन्दी को पहली जनवरी, 65 से लागू करने की बात की है तो संविधान की धारा को किसने तोड़ा? तोड़ा, इस बात का जवाब आप को देना होगा।

मेरा कहना है कि जनघाती, राष्ट्रघाती और देशद्रोही ताकतें तमिलनाडु के अंदर 1967 में कायम हुई। कौन नहीं जानता कि सन 1967 के पहले तमिलनाडु में कामराज साहब की हुकूमत थी। कामराज के शासन-काल में तमिलनाडु की दिन दूनी रात चौगानी तरक्की हुई। सन 62 के अंदर गांव-गांव में बिजली, गांव-गांव में ट्यूबवैल और नहरों का जाल बिछाया गया और स्वच्छ शासन देने वाले कामराज के खिलाफ 67 में हिन्दी विरोधी आंदोलन करके, हिन्दुस्तान के संविधान को बरबाद करके, नफरत के पेट से डी० एम० के० का जन्म हुआ।

तमिलनाडु की द्रविड़ मुनेत्र पार्टी ने संविधान को जलाया, गीता को जलाया। इसी पार्टी ने श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू को काले झण्डे दिखाये। द्रविड़ मुनेत्र पार्टी ने संविधान को पैरों के तले रौंदा। द्रविड़ मुनेत्र पार्टी के श्री नायकर और श्री करुणानिधि के लीडरशिप में तमिलनाडु में नफरत का वातावरण पैदा किया गया और इसके परिणाम-स्वरूप वहां पर सन् 1967 में द्रविड़ मुनेत्र पार्टी हुकूमत में आई। इस पार्टी की इस प्रकार की कार्यवाहियों के बावजूद कांग्रेस पार्टी ने इनको हुकूमत करने का मौका दिया। लेकिन इस देश का बच्चा बच्चा इस बात को जानता है कि अपने पांच वर्ष के शासनकाल में द्रविड़ मुनेत्र कथम पार्टी ने जितना भ्रष्टाचार फैलाया, जितनी कुनावापरस्ती फैलाई, जितना नेपोटिज्म फैलाया, उसका इतिहास में कहीं उदाहरण नहीं है। किसी भी कांग्रेसी मंत्रिमंडल ने इस प्रकार के काम नहीं किये। पिछली बार मुझे जब मद्रास जाने का मौका मिला तो मुझे यह देखकर ताज्जुब हुआ कि श्री करुणानिधि के जीवन काल में ही मद्रास शहर के अंदर उनका एक 10 फुट ऊंचा स्टेड्यू खड़ा कर दिया गया है। इसी प्रकार के स्टेड्यू अन्य शहरों में भी बना दिये गये हैं। इस प्रकार की कार्यवाहियों के कारण ही द्रविड़ मुनेत्र पार्टी की सरकार के खिलाफ

श्री जी० रामचन्द्रन ने, जो इस पार्टी के ट्रेजरर थे और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के नेता श्री भूपेश गुप्ता जी के साथी श्री कल्याणसुन्दरम् ने सन् 1972 में भ्रष्टाचार का एक आरोप-पत्र प्रधान मंत्री जी के सामने प्रस्तुत किया और कहा कि इन भ्रष्टाचार के आरोपों की जांच होनी चाहिए। आप जानते हैं कि 1971 में हमारी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने किन्हीं पोलिटिकल एक्सपीडिएन्सीज और पोलिटिकल कंवनिएन्स की वजह से इस पार्टी से समझौता किया था। लेकिन जब श्री जी० रामचन्द्रन् ने देखा कि भ्रष्टाचार के आरोपों की जांच नहीं की जा रही है तो उन्होंने प्रधान मंत्री के खिलाफ और श्री करुणानिधि के खिलाफ एक वक्तव्य देकर यह कहा कि भ्रष्टाचार के आरोप की जांच नहीं की जा रही है, इसलिए वे अन्ना-डी० एम० के० का निर्माण करते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि अन्ना-डी० एम० के० पार्टी द्रविड़ मुन्नेत्र पार्टी के भ्रष्टाचार के कारनामों के विरोध में पैदा हुई पार्टी है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह बात सत्य नहीं है कि जब सरकारिया कमीशन बैठाया गया तो श्री जी० रामचन्द्रन् ने इसका स्वागत किया। उन्होंने कहा कि इस प्रकार का कमीशन पहले बैठाया जाना चाहिए था।

आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य इस बात को जानते हैं कि एशिया और अफ्रीका से साम्राज्यवाद मिट गया और एशिया और अफ्रीका से साम्राज्यवाद मिटने के बाद जापान से लेकर अफ्रीका तक समस्त देशों में जनतंत्र कायम हुआ, लेकिन बहुत से मुल्क इस प्रकार के भी हैं जिनमें मिलैट्री हुकूमत ने सत्ता अपने हाथों में ले ली। इसके विपरीत हमारे देश में कांग्रेस पार्टी की वजह से और श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू की वजह से हिन्दुस्तान में वोट का राज आज भी कायम है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसके लिए हमें अपने देश के नेतृत्व पर गौरव करना

चाहिए और इसकी सारी जिम्मेदारी कांग्रेस पार्टी पर आती है। कांग्रेस पार्टी ने इस देश में प्रजातंत्र को कायम रखा है।

दूसरी बात श्री भूपेश गुप्ता जी ने श्रीमती नन्दिनी सतपथी की सरकार के बारे में उठाई है। मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या श्रीमती नन्दिनी सतपथी उड़ीसा में एक इलेक्टेड लीडर थीं? उनको कांग्रेस हई कमान ने नामिनेट किया था। मैं समझता हूँ कि जिस हुकूमत को नामिनेट करने का अधिकार है उसको विदड़ा करने का भी अधिकार है। यदि श्रीमती नन्दिनी सतपथी का वहां पर इलेक्शन हुआ होता तो उनको हटाने के विरुद्ध कोई बात कही जा सकती थी। माननीय सदस्य इस बात को भी जानते हैं कि सन् 1971 में सिन्डीकेट के अत्याचारों के खिलाफ हिन्दुस्तान की जनता ने कांग्रेस को बहुत बड़ा बहुमत प्रदान किया। आप इस बात को भी जानते होंगे कि बहुत पहले कांग्रेस हवाई कमान ने यह निर्णय किया था कि अब इलेक्शन से मुख्य मंत्री नहीं होंगे बल्कि हवाई कमान की राय से मुख्य मंत्री होंगे। गुजरात के अन्दर श्री घनश्याम औझा को, आन्ध्र प्रदेश के अन्दर श्री नरसिंह राव को और उड़ीसा के अन्दर श्रीमती नन्दिनी सतपथी को इसी प्रकार से मुख्य मंत्री बनाया गया। ऐसी स्थिति में मैं समझता हूँ कि जिस व्यक्ति को नामिनेट करने का अधिकार है उसको विदड़ा करने का भी अधिकार है। इसलिए भारतीय कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को किसी प्रकार की चिन्ता करने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है। क्योंकि दुनिया में जहां भी तुम्हारी हुकूमत है, वहां जनतंत्र का मूल्य घटा है। इसलिये हिन्दुस्तान में भ्रष्टाचार को कायम रखने वाले प्रजातंत्र को हम नहीं अपनायेंगे।

आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री कृष्णकान्त जी ने कहा है कि हम प्रजातन्त्रिक हैं। उनकी पार्टी के नेता चौधरी चरणसिंह ने अभी एक बयान दिया है कि यदि मेरी

[श्री कल्प नाथ राय]

हुकूमत होगी तो इमेरजेन्सी का समर्थन करने वाले मेम्बर पार्लियामेंट को वोट के राइट्स से हम वंचित कर देंगे। जो व्यक्ति इतना बड़ा तानाशाह है, जो आदमी बिना सत्ता में आए, इस तरह का बयान देता है कि यदि मैं पावर में आऊंगा तो जिन लोगों ने इमेरजेन्सी का समर्थन किया है उनको वोट के अधिकार से वंचित कर दूंगा, तो मैं समझता हूं कि चौधरी चरणसिंह, दल बदलुओं के सम्राट चौधरी चरणसिंह इतने बड़े तानाशाह हैं, जितना हिटलर, मुसोलिनी भी नहीं रहे होंगे। क्या चौधरी चरणसिंह के प्रजातंत्र में लोगों को अपने विचारों की भिन्नता रखने का अधिकार नहीं होगा? क्या श्री कृष्णकान्त जी और चौधरी चरणसिंह जी आप लोगों के राज्य में जो संविधान में इमेरजेन्सी का प्रोविजन है, उसको निकाल दिया जायेगा।

इसलिये यदि किन्हीं कारणों से प्रजातंत्र में कुछ खामियां आई हैं तो उनके लिये आप सुझाव दीजिये, उसके लिये संघर्ष कीजिये। अगर कोई बात आती है तो उसको रेस्टोर कीजिये। प्रजातंत्र की हुकूमत में बहस होती है, एग्जीमेन्ट-डिस-एग्जीमेन्ट होते हैं, लेकिन जो फैसला होता जाता है, उसको अन्त में माना जाता है।

आदरणीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, तमिलनाडु में आज जो चुनाव नहीं हो रहे हैं, उसका कारण यह है कि वहां पर पिछली सरकार के लोगों के ऊपर जो भ्रष्टाचार के आरोप हैं, उनकी जांच हो रही है। जिस दिन भ्रष्टाचार की जांच खत्म हो जायगी, सरकारिया साहब अपनी रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत कर देंगे और उस रिपोर्ट पर आखिरी कार्यवाही हो जायगी, यदि तब भी इस देश की सरकार और प्रधान मंत्री तमिलनाडु में चुनाव नहीं कराती हैं तो निश्चय ही वह प्रजातन्त्र के दुश्मन होंगे। लेकिन जब तक उस कमीशन की रिपोर्ट नहीं आ जाती है तब तक तमिलनाडु में चुनाव कराने का कोई मतलब नहीं है। क्योंकि

सारा मामला सबजूडिस है। वहां पर अन्ना डी०एम०के० के नेता श्री रामचन्द्रन और श्री कल्याण सुन्दरम के कहने पर यह सरकारिया कमीशन बना है। सरकारिया कमीशन की जांच पूरी होने पर तमिलनाडु में चुनाव होगा। कांग्रेस पार्टी चुनाव से बिल्कुल नहीं घबराई है और वहां जब सुविधाजनक होगा चुनाव करायगी और वह तमिलनाडु में जनता को हुकूमत कायम करेगी।

SHRI K. A. KRISHNASWAMY (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice President, the Resolution seeks extension of President's rule in Tamil Nadu for a further period of one year. The extension is being sought for the second time. The State of Tamil Nadu has experienced the Presidential rule for the past 13 months.

Sir, the intention of the following fathers of the Indian Constitution as well as the spirit of the provisions of the Constitution is that it should be the anxiety of the Union Government to restore the popular government as soon as possible. So far as we are concerned, the All-India Anna DMK has welcomed the dismissal of the discredited Karunanidhi Ministry and has appreciated the appointment of the Enquiry Commission. We have been stressing and will continue to stress and demand that the President rule is no substitute for a popular Government. Only through popular Government a feeling of democratic duties and peoples involvement become a reality. The condition in Tamil Nadu after the imposition of the President's rule has completely changed. The State has now a clean and efficient Government, quick to respond to the needs of the people. The damage done by the DMK Government has been rectified. Efficient officials are at the helm of affairs and are chalking out programmes to help the weaker sections.

Sir, my submission would be to know from the Hon'ble Home Minister whether he could give some indication regarding the early State

Assembly elections in Tamil Nadu so that a popular government could be restored immediately.

Sir, the next point that I would bring forth to you kind notice is, it seems that the Government of Tamil Nadu is examining the report of the Sarkaria Commission against Karunanidhi and some of his colleagues to see what follow-up action could be initiated against Government officials and politicians found guilty by the Commission. Therefore there were substantial reasons for the dismissal of DMK Government and the appointment of the Enquiry Commission. The DMK Government had indulged in serious acts of maladministration, corruption and misuse of power for partisan ends.

The DMK Government had disregarded the instruction from the Central Government in relation to the Emergency while misusing the emergency power for its own purposes. Under the guise of demanding greater autonomy, the DMK had been encouraging the separatist activities in the State. Now, Mr. Karunanidhi and his fellow-travellers, taking advantage of the relaxation of the emergency and free press due to the elections, are indulging in the false propaganda that because of their opposition to the emergency and the Prime Minister the DMK Government was dismissed on political grounds, and they want to create an impression that they are not corrupt politicians but political martyrs. To avoid this unhealthy trend in Tamil Nadu politics, I request the Home Minister to expedite the follow-up action regarding the Sarkaria Commission Report. Even in the public interest and political integrity, the Report of the Sarkaria Commission may be published so that the people can know the true colour of these corrupt politicians in Tamil Nadu.

Finally, the parliamentary elections to be held in the later half of March will prove that Tamil Nadu will not

lag behind any State in strengthening the hands of the Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the acknowledged leader of the Indian nation, and we are well aware that the elections would be fair and free and conducted in a peaceful manner. But it is my duty to submit that some unhealthy trend has been encouraged by the reactionary forces in Tamil Nadu. Mr. Karunanidhi and his fellow-travellers have indulged in the bogey of 'police harassment' to mislead the public and thereby create tension. Another disturbing feature of the election campaign in Tamil Nadu is that the press owned by vested interests supporting the Janta Front is indulging in the circulation of stories of oppression by the Progressive Front consisting of the All-India Anna DMK, Indian National Congress and the Communist Party of India. My submission would be that the Home Minister should take note of this trend and do the needful.

With these words, Sir, I support the Resolution.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपमहाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करते हुए निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि विरोध पक्ष को इस बात पर एतराज है कि तमिलनाडु में चुनाव क्यों नहीं हो रहा है ? परन्तु तमिलनाडु की द्वाविड मुनेत्र कड़घम सरकार ने अपने प्रशासन काल में जो कुछ भी किया है उसके लिये उसे तो बहुत पहले ही भारत सरकार को हटा देना चाहिए था । कड़घम सरकार ने उन लोगों के लिये जिन्होंने राष्ट्रभाषा के विरुद्ध आन्दोलन किए या अपने अराष्ट्रीय कार्य के प्रदर्शन किये या रेल की लाइनें उखाड़ी, पोस्ट ऑफिस जलाए, रेल के डिब्बे फूँके, पेट्रोल की व्यवस्था की । तो जिस दिन उस सरकार ने इस तरह

[श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाह:]

की व्यवस्था की उस दिन ही उसने साबित कर दिया कि वह अराष्ट्रीय सरकार है और राष्ट्रीय एकता और राष्ट्रीयता के विरुद्ध चलने वाली सरकार को तो भारत सरकार ने उसी वक्त डिस्मिस कर देना चाहिए था। लेकिन मुझे एतराज है इस बात पर कि भारत सरकार ने इस काम में देर की—उस सरकार को हटाने में। श्रीमन्। आज विरोध पक्ष श्री ओर से यह जोरदार मांग है कि वहां विधान सभा का चुनाव होना चाहिए। लेकिन जो विधान सभा के चुनाव में वे साबित कर सकते हैं उस को साबित करने का मौका लोक-सभा के चुनाव में उन्हें प्राप्त हो गया है। अगर वे अपनी राष्ट्रीयता, लोक प्रियता, लोक सभा के चुनाव में साबित कर देते हैं और अराष्ट्रीय कार्यों के इल्जाम में जनता की अदालत में अपने को निर्दोष साबित करते हैं तो उन्हें हक होगा कहने का कि विधान के चुनाव अभी तुरन्त होने चाहिए। लेकिन जब तक वे यह साबित नहीं कर देते तब तक यह लाजिमी है कि वहां पर राष्ट्रपति शासन कायम रहे क्योंकि कजगम की सरकार ने अपने प्रशासन काल में ऐसा कोर्स बनाया अध्ययन का जिस से विद्यार्थियों के दिमाग में अराष्ट्रीय भावनाएं पैदा की जा सकें, जिस से विद्यार्थियों के दिमाग में राष्ट्रभाषा विरोधी भावना पैदा की जा सके, जिससे बच्चों के दिमाग में राष्ट्र से अलगत्व की भावना पैदा की जा सके। बच्चों की जो पुस्तकें बनायी गयीं उनमें ऐसी बातें रखी गयीं। जब तक ये सारी चीजें ठीक नहीं कर दी जातीं, जब तक पुस्तकों से यह चीज निकाल नहीं दी जाती, जब तक स्कूलों में जो दोष लाये गए हैं, उन्हें दूर नहीं कर दिया जाता, जब तक सरकारी कर्मचारियों में जो राष्ट्रविरोधी भावना भरी गई है, राष्ट्र से अलगत्व की भावना जो भरी गयी है उस को जब तक दूर नहीं किया जाता, तब तक वहां पर राष्ट्रपति

शासन नितान्त आवश्यक है। कजगम की सरकार ने जो इस तरह के कार्य कर रखे हैं, इस तरह के कार्यों की जो नींव डाल रखी है, इस तरह के कार्यों का जो निरोपण कर रखा है, जब तक वह समाप्त नहीं हो जाता तब तक वहां से राष्ट्रपति शासन समाप्त नहीं होना चाहिए। यह भारत सरकार का कर्तव्य है, संवैधानिक कर्तव्य है कि संविधान के अनुसार वहां की सारी चीजें व्यवस्थित हों, वहां की सरकार भी संविधान के अनुसार कार्य करे। क्या यह सत्य नहीं कि कजगम की सरकार के देखते हुए वहां पर उत्तर और दक्षिण के, आपस के विरोध की भावनाएं पनपायी गयीं? मैं उन चीजों को कहना नहीं चाहता। क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि धार्मिक भावनाओं को ठेस पहुंचाने वाले कार्य वहां किये गये और कजगम की सरकार ने उन्हें बर्दाश्त ही नहीं किया, बल्कि उन्हें शह भी दी? क्या ये सारी बातें अराष्ट्रीय नहीं हैं और क्या ऐसे अराष्ट्रीय कार्यों को चलते रहने देना और उन्हें न रोक पाना भारत सरकार की कर्तव्य हीनता नहीं होगी? इसलिए भारत सरकार का यह परम कर्तव्य था कि वहां की सरकार को समाप्त करती और वहां तक राष्ट्रपति शासन चलाती जब तक कि ये सारी चीजें समाप्त न हो जायें। श्रीमन्, मैं उन घटनाओं का जिक्र नहीं करना चाहता, लेकिन चाहे तमिलनाडु की सरकार हो, चाहे कोई और सरकार हो, ऐसे कार्य की इजाजत देना जिनसे राष्ट्र का अहि हो, जिनसे राष्ट्रीयता को ठेस पहुंचे, राष्ट्रीय भावना समाप्त हो ऐसी सरकार को एक दिन भी बने रहने का हक नहीं है।

अब मैं एक बात कह कर अपनी बात खत्म करूंगा। व बात यह है कि तमिलनाडु में जो कुछ हुआ उसको काउन्टर करने के लिये भार

सरकार को और भी सजग होना चाहिए और लाजमी है कि जो लोग भाषा की आड़ में अपनी राजनीति चला रहे हैं, जो लोग भाषा की आड़ में जनता को गुमराह कर रहे हैं, जो लोग भाषा की आड़ में जनता को गुमराह करके अपना राजनीतिक स्वार्थ सिद्ध करते हैं उन को जवाब देने के लिये उत्तर भारत में भी दक्षिण भारत की भाषाओं का अध्ययन और अध्यापन होना चाहिए। यह दुख की बात है कि त्रिभाषा फार्मूला स्वीकार हो जाने के बाद भी उत्तर भारत की राज्य सरकारें अपने ही दक्षिण भारत की भाषाओं के अध्ययन और अध्यापन की व्यवस्था नहीं कर पा रही हैं। दूसरी भाषाओं के अध्ययन की व्यवस्था करने पर लाखों लाख रुपए खर्च हो रहे हैं। जिन भाषाओं को पढ़ने के लिये विद्यार्थी नहीं हैं और जो भाषा की सही परिभाषा के अनुसार भाषायें नहीं कही जा सकतीं उन के अध्यापन के लिये आज लाखों रुपए खर्च हो रहे हैं, लेकिन दक्षिण भारत की भाषाओं के अध्यापन के लिये उत्तर भारत में कोई व्यवस्था नहीं हो रही है। मेरा निवेदन है कि भारत सरकार का कर्तव्य है कि वह उत्तर भारत की राज्य सरकारों को इस बात के लिये विवश करे कि वे अपने यहां दक्षिण भारत की भाषाओं के अध्ययन और अध्यापन की व्यवस्था अवश्य करे। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI LOKANATH MISRA): Mr. Lakshmanan, strictly 15 minutes for you. I am giving you five minutes more than I have given to the other Members.

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: Because I belong to Tamil Nadu. Thank you.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I oppose this Resolution vehemently because

if this Resolution is accepted by this House, then it will be death to democracy. Therefore, I oppose this Resolution. Sir, we are told that Parliament is supreme. We have been under this impression only. But today somebody is more supreme than Parliament, and that is unfortunately the personality of the Prime Minister of this country. Sir, in the month of November we, parliamentarians, extended the life of Parliament by one more year. We were told "Now we cannot hold elections; therefore, elections have to be postponed by one more year." And that was accepted by Parliament. Within two or three months, the Prime Minister announces the dissolution of the Lok Sabha. She recommends to the President of India to dissolve the Lok Sabha and announce elections. Sir, why do I say that the personality of Prime Minister is unfortunately more supreme than Parliament in this country? I would have appreciated if Parliament had convened and the 525 members of the Lok Sabha and the 225 members of the Rajya Sabha who had approved the resolution for the postponement, had been taken into confidence. Of course, we in the Opposition opposed it. But we did not have a majority and, therefore, we were not successful. But still that is the decision of Parliament. The Prime Minister or the President should have convened Parliament and told the Members of Parliament "Now, we can hold elections" and Parliament Members would have simply approved it. But Parliament was not told. Instead there was a talk over the radio and everybody was told that elections were going to be held. We have welcomed the elections. But the method, the means this Government adopts in implementing the democratic principles in this country is completely dictatorial and that is why I say that there is somebody more supreme than Parliament in this country, and that is the personality of the Prime Minister of this country. (Interruption) I am not yielding. Sir, President'

[Shri G. Lakshmanan]

rule was promulgated. In Tamil Nadu when President's rule was promulgated in Kerala and when presenting the Bill, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, the late lamented leader and Prime Minister of India, spoke. This is what he had said. I quote:

'The Congress Party of Parliament met for three long sessions confidentially to consider this matter when people spoke frankly and fully without any inhibitions, as they should. Why? Because the Congress Party, being wedded to democracy and Constitutional procedures and having been conditioned by them, was anxious to understand why something was done which was criticised as being undemocratic. It shows the texture of the Congress Party. Even when its own Government adopted a step of this kind, it did not take it for granted. It wanted to argue. It wanted to criticise and it wanted to get at all the facts and then to decide.'

This is from the speech of the late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru when he presented the Bill on the promulgation of President's rule in Kerala. I would ask all the members belonging to the Congress Party sitting here whether such a meeting was held by their Congress Parliamentary Party and whether they were taken into confidence when President's rule was promulgated in Tamil Nadu. Where was then the democratic principle established by Jawaharlalji for which he worked and died? Till the 30th January, 1975 nobody knew that there was going to be President's rule in Tamil Nadu whereas in 1959 Shri Jawaharlal Nehru placed his proposal for President's rule in Kerala before the Congress Parliamentary Party. This may happen to us today. Tomorrow you may be in the opposition. It should not happen to you. You should not, therefore, approach this

problem from a party angle. You must approach these issues from a democratic angle and take decisions after consultation. The Prime Minister should not consider herself as supreme to the Parliament itself, as she does. Therefore, this act of the Government in establishing President's rule in Tamil Nadu is completely undemocratic and will be very bad for the history of this country. Shri Reddi is my friend and he can have this extension for one year. But after the promulgation of emergency and the President's rule, what has happened in Tamil Nadu? Political leaders were detained. I am sorry to place before this House one example of Shri Chittji Babu. He was killed while in jail. He was beaten and he is no more today. On the day he died, he was released as a dead person. It was said that he was sick, he was having heart attack, he was having blood pressure or something like that. Would not any decent Government have released him? Why was he not released when he had heart attack or blood pressure or so many things as mentioned in the statement issued by the Government? If Shri Reddi wants this extension to take away the lives of my colleagues in my party in the prisons, I am against it. Will he say that they were not beaten up? Of course, he said that the other day, he said that they were not beaten up. But today he knows that they were beaten up. Sir, this thing should not happen to any political party or any political worker in this country. Therefore, I say that by one more extension you may take away the lives of some of my colleagues in the party. Why was the President's rule promulgated? You know, Sir, that the DMK was in power when the emergency was promulgated. We were the only Opposition party in power under the leadership of Dr. Kalaignar Karunanidhi when the emergency was imposed. We convened a meeting of the Working Committee of our party and we raised a slogan that democracy should be saved at any cost in the country and therefore,

we opposed the emergency. A mammoth gathering was therefore at Anna Seerani Arangam and there also about five lakhs of people stood up and raised the slogan: "We shall see that democracy is saved in this country." We opposed the resolution relating to the emergency and till our resolution was passed, we, all of us, kept standing there. So many instructions came from the Central Government. The Central Government wanted us to arrest their political opponents. But we refused to arrest any political party man in the name of emergency. But we arrested the economic offenders and we arrested the bootleggers and we arrested so many such other people, but we did not arrest any political opponents of ours or any other political workers. We were observing all these things. That was why our Prime Minister once said that there were two islands in the country, that is, Gujarat and Tamil Nadu, where the Opposition was in power. But, Sir, we were functioning in the most democratic manner and the Government was functioning in the most democratic manner. But immediately thereafter they promulgated the President's Rule. What has happened during this one year of the President's rule? Some achievements have been mentioned to us in a document by our Home Minister, Shri Brahmananda Reddi. If you have got so many achievements, then why should you not bring about President's Rule throughout the whole of India? You see, in a democratic country, a popular government is dismissed and even when a democratically elected government is there in a State, President's Rule is promulgated. In such a democracy, any democrat including Mr. Reddi will come and say that the elected government was not able to function. Therefore, why not impose President's Rule in all the 22 States of India? Therefore, Sir, I say that this is not a proper thing I am not against the Congress Party or the Central Government. You may like to know

what they have done during this one year there. Why is the CBI there now? Why should the Income-Tax people be there? You know that they were telling that our leader, Dr. Kalaingar Karunanidhi was corrupt and that he had a lot of black money and all that. But, you know, we have deposited the entire funds of our party in the Indian Bank under Account No. so and so. I would like to throw a challenge now to the ruling party. What is your amount? How much you have got? How much of that you have deposited in the bank? What is your financial position? We have told the people of Tamil Nadu that we have got about fifty-six lakhs of rupees. We have got that much and we have deposited it in the Indian Bank. Recently, about ten days back, we received a communication from the Income-Tax Department that we have been charged income-tax to the tune of thirteen lakhs on our party funds.

There is another thing also. Our party cannot function at all. Mr. Reddiar is quoting one year's achievements. But how many police officials interfere in the functioning of our party? (*Time-Bell Rings*).... When the people were in prison, they were asked by the officials, police officials, to make a statement that they did not like the leadership of Mr. Karunanidhi. 'We will let you off. You resign from your party. We will let you off.' The entire police force was used, the entire Government machinery was used, to see that democracy is completely crushed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI LOKANATH MISRA): Now, you have to wind up. You have taken 15 minutes.

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: I will finish in two minutes. All these things we are faced with, because we have got mass support of the people of Tamil Nadu. Now, the Sarkaria Commission is there. I do not know whether it is the Sarkaria Com-

[Shri G. Lakshmanan]

mission or Sarkar Commission. I am also involved in that. It is said that we tried to kill an ex-member of this House. All kinds of things are being said....(*Interruptions*). I tell you, Mr. Reddiar, the Central Government has completely failed and stands exposed before the people of Tamil Nadu today. You have done many misdeeds and have taken away the life of Chitti Babu. You have brought in the police to crush democracy itself....(*Time bell rings*). You are successful in crushing so many parties. You have completely failed. We are going to come in a huge majority not only at the State level but at the all-India level also and the Prime Minister, who considers herself supreme, will have to sit in the Opposition. You have committed many misdeeds. Therefore, you do not deserve to rule....(*Interruptions*). You are telling that the Opposition do not conduct themselves properly. Let us exchange sides. You come to the Opposition and teach people how the Opposition should conduct themselves. We come to the ruling side. You have misruled the country for so long. We will rule the country and we will show you how the ruling party should conduct themselves, in a democratic manner.

I am sure this Resolution would not have been brought in by Mr. Reddiar personally, by himself, because he wants that in a State adjacent to his State there should also be a popular government. But still he has been forced to do it because of difficult circumstances. What to do? Therefore, I oppose this Resolution. This is the death of democracy in this country.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI (LOKANATH MISRA): The hon. Minister,

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: Sir, this Resolution for the extension of President's rule in Tamil

Nadu has evoked some strong criticism from some friends in the Opposition. Shri Advani, on behalf of the Janta Party, has tried to forcibly put his party's partisan point of view before us. It is true, Sir, that article 366 of the Constitution is not meant to be frequently used. It has to be used after considering either the Governor's report or other relevant material pertaining to the State Government and the Government has to take a responsible decision thereon. I have no objection, Sir, to any friend in politics sitting in the Opposition or in the side to make a point of view of his party. But one who gives advice, general advice, not only must display cleaner hands. A man who comes with clean hands has the right not only to advise anybody, any party—even the Opposition party. But, Sir, I want to know whether what happened in Gujarat was democracy. Is forcing legislators and others to resign from their elected membership and not allowing the duly-elected Assembly to function properly justified? Was it a democratic act. If Mr. Advani's previous party had anything to do with the exercise of power, then I beg to submit that he has no right to advise us today.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Since my party has been named, I would like to make it very clear that so far as Gujarat incidents are concerned, when force and coercion were used against any legislator. Neither any party nor any other opposition party was there. It was the Navnirman Samiti of students, section of whom is still with the ruling party (*Interruptions*). On a point of personal explanation.... (*Interruptions*). You have mentioned my name and you have mentioned my party. (*Interruptions*). Mr. Vice-Chairman, I beg leave from you. This is being repeated over and over again. This is a slanderous charge. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I can say that ever since the day Jayaprakash Narayan and we the political parti-

es, took hold of the situation, for example in Bihar, we saw to it that not only your Members but our Members also did not resign. We never used coercion of any type. This slanderous charge which is being repeated again and again against Jayaprakash Narayan and against my party is absolutely baseless. In Gujarat, violence did occur at one stage and when Morarji Desai . . .

(Interruptions)

MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI LOKANATH MISRA): You have made your point.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: When Mr. Morarji Desai undertook a fast it was a fast not merely demanding the dissolution of the Gujarat Assembly, it was a fast against violence also. There is no question of my hands. My hands are very clean. A man like Mr. Brahmananda Reddi talks about my hands being unclean. I am shocked.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: What does it mean by hands being unclean?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I am willing to face any debate on this issue. I wish you had not used the words 'clean'. After all the tyranny you have perpetrated during the last 19 months, you talk about me and my party. I am shocked. (Interruptions). Mr. Vice-chairman, I have tried my utmost to know to the precise and correct issues raised in this debate. I did not go here and there.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: I have not gone astray. I am only sorry that I have touched a weak point of yours. I am not saying anything personal against you. I am saying that a man who wants to give advice to the country and to the people in general should come with cleaner hands. That is all that I am saying. What is wrong with it?

1104 RS—7.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: From clean, it has come down to cleaner.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Ranbir Singh) in the Chair].

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: Now, let me assume that what you have said is correct. Have you ever on the floor of the House condemned the action either in Gujarat or elsewhere?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: That is exactly what I am saying I have pointed out that not merely the violence was condemned but our leader. Mr. Morarji Desai, went even on a fast..

(Interruptions)

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: Sir, I am not yielding...

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): Order please:

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: You see only after the 24th March....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): Order please:

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Even I was attacked. They burnt my scooter. They threatened to kidnap my son. And who was responsible for this?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame.

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: Mr. Reddi, you are talking about decency. You should have resigned..

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): Order please.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: Sir, my intention was not to offend

[Shri K. Brahmananda Reddi]

the feelings of either Mr. Advani or my good friend, Mr. Lakshmanan. I only wanted to say one broad fact, namely, if you want to accuse another person, first think of yourself. That is all. It is a broad proposition which we have in our tradition. That is all.

Sir, my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, who is not here now, made a speech. His long speech was very amusing, and if I may say so, it was said more in joke rather than in seriousness. Sir, when our Party President, Mr. D. K. Borooah saw about a million people at a meeting there at about the end of June or the beginning of July, when he saw a multitude of people he felt in his emotion to say that India is Indira and Indira is India. What does that mean? That only means in my opinion and I have understood it this way that Indira has completely identified herself with the millions and millions of poor people and their problems. It only means that. It does not mean anything else. How can it mean anything else? Suppose, Sir, I say that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is Rajya Sabha and Rajya Sabha is Bhupesh Gupta, it only means that he attends it regularly, he identifies himself with all the speeches that are made here. And he makes long speeches. It only means that. It does not mean anything else. Therefore, do not mislead public opinion. Kindly try to understand the view that has been put forward by Mr. D. K. Borooah. When he saw a million people, a multitude of people listening to the speech of the Prime Minister, he said: "India is Indira; Indira is India." It only means—in my opinion and I think it is correct—that she has for a long time completely identified herself with the millions and millions of poor people in India and with their problems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: Sir, my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has also said about collective

leadership and tried to ridicule the idea which my friend, Mr. Raju, who is not here, has enunciated. And he said that the Cabinet is a collective leadership. I don't think it is a collective leadership. It is a collective responsibility. It is not a collective leadership. What Mr. Raju is referring to is the multi-leadership of the Janta Party. That is all. Therefore, I do not think that he is on the right or correct ground when he says that he criticised the collective leadership. Now, my friend Mr. Lakshmanan just now spoke in an emotional way naturally because he is an affected person belonging to Tamil Nadu, having identified himself, rightly or wrongly, with Mr. Karunanidhi. Therefore, naturally he has a right to feel aggrieved.

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: As you have rightly or wrongly, identified yourself with Mrs. Gandhi.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: I am not going to take any offence to whatever you may say.

(Interruptions)

Many of our friends, including Mr. Krishan Kant, have been saying: It is all right, you take an extension but try to indicate as to when the elections would be held, I would only submit, Sir, that it is not proper for me on the eve of an election to commit a future Government, when especially you are threatening that you will sit here. Is it proper for me? No.

Now, this is a democracy. If Mr. Advani feels as if he is already sitting here and you also feel that you are sitting behind him, what objection can I have? I wish you success. Now, in his emotion he has tried to say: What is this? All of a sudden the Prime Minister has dissolved the Parliament when there was a Resolution by the Houses that it has been extended by a year. I do not know if it is parliamentary practice—Mr. Advani will tell us, he knows better—whether Parliament should be

called and after being called told that it is dissolved. I think it is the prerogative of the Prime Minister in any democracy to advise the Crown or the President to dissolve the House. I think so. Mr. Lakshmanan, you kindly revise your opinion.

Now, you said that the Prime Minister did not consult even the Party for promulgating the President's rule in Tamil Nadu. Did Mr. Karunanidhi at any time call the Assembly for dissolving a municipal council? Did he call? Was it discussed? My friend in his enthusiasm to support somebody tried to get...

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: There is a book by late Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru. You say that procedure should not be followed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): Order, Order. Mr. Lakshmanan, you had your chance to speak.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: Now, Sir, twice before it has been fully debated in this House, the question of imposition of the President's rule in the state, why it was called for, whether it was necessary or not and how it was justified. I do not want to quote the speeches of my friends here on this side but I want just to say a word or two about the speech made by Mr. Yogendra Sharma—Is he here? No, not here—on behalf of the C.P.I. Mr. Yogendra Sharma, supporting the Resolution, said that he and his party, the I. welcome the dismissal of the Karunanidhi Government in Tamil Nadu. The promulgation of the President's rule and also the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry into the Karunanidhi Government. Steps should have been taken earlier, he added. He also said that in Tamil Nadu all sorts of lawlessness were coming to the fore. It created an obvious danger to the peace, integrity and unity of the country and nobody in the country would tolerate that a State should be ruled by a

party which encouraged anti-national and secessionist tendencies in the State. There is further speech also which for want of time, I am quoting.

Now, Sir, I was a little surprised when Mr. Advani made a very forceful plea about the anti-secessionist attitude of the D.M.K. I am sorry I do not know when he got convinced on this matter. There is no use quoting Mr. Annadurai. It is true that Mr. Annadurai said what was quoted by Mr. Advani but things are different. Sir, let me say—and Prime Minister also said at a public meeting in Madras at a huge gathering—that the policies and politics of D.M.K. also changed with the death of Mr. Annadurai. Even the attitude towards the foreign policy of India also changed with the death of Mr. Annadurai. Therefore, Sir, I am not going into the details but I can tell you time and again whenever an opportunity offered itself in the name of autonomy, they brought in this thing surreptitiously and clandestinely...

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: Sir, in the year....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): Why are you interrupting? Order please.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: I am only trying to tell the House certain facts, certain attitudes and certain speeches made and the content of those speeches and the implications of those speeches and the purport and import of those speeches. That is all. And it is for you to judge and I want Mr. Advani also to judge from those statements what they meant, whether there was a threat at any time, a veiled threat in the shape of some resolution that if you do not concede State autonomy as they wanted, not the State autonomy in the sense in which you and I understand, but the State autonomy in the sense in which Mr. Karunanidhi alone understands, according to his wish this thing will be done.

[Shri K. Brahmananda Reddi]

This a dangerous situation which all of us should guard against irrespective of whoever may come into power. You have rightly condemned any secessionist attitude of any party in any part of India. Very good. But I am only trying to tell you that you are on a slippery ground when you want to say that the D.M.K. has that same mentality and the attitude even today. Now, I do not want to say any disparaging remarks about my friend Mr. Karunanidhi. It is only fifteen days before the announcement of elections that the D.M.K. was all praise for the 20-point programme and also for the 5-point programme, more praise for 5-point programme than the 20-point programme and therefore, I want to caution him, not Mr. Lakshmanan; he is wedded to D.M.K. and the party and Mr. Karunanidhi; it is all right and I do not want to seduce him, neither will that benefit me. Now, Sir, one other serious allegation which he made is about Chitti Babu's death. I am very sorry that Chitti Babu should have died after release. However, I am sorry . . .

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: Chitti Babu was only released . . .

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: I will not say a thing which is not true and which is not borne out by facts. You can be sure of that. I have been Chief Minister long enough.

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: Sir, the Minister is making a wrong statement.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): The Minister is not yielding. Whatever you say will not go on record.

(Shri G. Lakshmanan continued to speak)

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: Now, I would quote this about Shri Chitti Babu for the benefit of the House.

"Thiru Chitti Babu was a known case of diabetes mellitus, myocardial infraction, piles, umbilical hernia, anal stricture and stricture urethra. He had a heart attack in 1972 and he was treated in the Government Hospital. Earlier, he had a heart attack in 1969 and was treated at the Willingdon Nursing Home, Delhi. He also had treatment for cirrhosis of liver. He also had difficulty in passing motion and urine because of these complaints. He was admitted in the Central Prison Hospital with the history of fever and chest pain on 23-9-1976 and was discharged on 30-9-1976. After being checked by a number of specialists in October, he was admitted in the Government General Hospital on 30-10-1976. He was under treatment by Dr. N. Rangabashyam, Surgeon, Government General Hospital. Even though he was offered parole, he did not avail himself of parole. The parole was offered to the detenu's lawyer who presented the petition for the detenu's two wives to attend on him. The detenu did not avail of this offer. His application to have his two wives to attend on him in the hospital was readily granted. On 22-11-1976, he was operated upon. Subsequently, his request to have his nephew to attend on him was also granted. During the post-operative period, on and off, he had breathlessness for which he was treated. On 3-1-1977 after discussing with the detenu and his family, the attendant risk, a second operation, was carried out under general anaesthesia by Dr. Rangabashyam. He died on after a third heart attack in the General Hospital in the care ward."

This is the history Mr. Lakshmanan would say? was not treated properly, was uncared for and the was due to neglect, wh say?

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: Sir, you must permit me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): The Minister is not yielding. Your remarks will not go on record.

(Shri G. Lakshmanan continued to speak)

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: I would like to advise you and your party to be very sorry about his death. But you should not make political capital out of it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RANBIR SINGH): The Minister need not take note of his observations.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI: Sir, one more point and I have done. Unfortunately, when emotions rise, when friends want to make certain points, political democracy becomes a casualty. You plead for political democracy for half-an-hour. You plead for political and parliamentary democracy for 29 minutes and in the thirtieth minute, you kill that democracy with your own words. You were talking of political democracy. But why should you bring in high personages? Is it in consonance with parliamentary conduct and business to bring in high personages like

Governors and other people and name them here, who cannot defend themselves here on the floor of this House and whose conduct is not discussable in this House according to me.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

Therefore, Sir, my submission is that the continuation of President's Rule in Tamil Nadu is very greatly justified irrespective of the views of Mr. Lakshmanan. I hope the House will approve of this Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That this House approves the continuance in force of the Proclamation issued by the President on the 31st January, 1976, under article 356 of the Constitution, in relation to the State of Tamil Nadu, for a further period of one year with effect from the 10th March, 1977."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned *sine die*.

The House then adjourned *sine die* at twenty minutes past five of the clock.