

THE BUDGET (KERALA), 1965-66—
Continued

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we go to the Kerala Budget.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Before that, Madam, I have given you a slip, notice . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But what is the subject?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Subject nothing.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, on your own statement, I am sure, you have no subject. You will please take your seat.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Subject nothing, but the Home Minister yesterday in his particular statement, which was read out, mentioned certain Party as the Right Communist Party. I do not know whether any such Party is there in Kerala. Now, the Governor in his statement has said the Right Communist Party. We would like to know which is that Party. The Minister is misleading the House.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Mr. Govindan Nair will continue his speech.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR (Kerala): Madam Deputy Chairman, yesterday my speech was interrupted by the statement of the Home Minister proclaiming President's Rule in Kerala. I was trying to convince the House that there was a possibility of avoiding President's Rule in Kerala and the Governor should take steps to convene the Assembly as early as possible.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): How?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Yesterday I tried to argue how it was possible. It is true that in the Governor's statement, which has been placed before us, he has said that the Muslim League was not prepared to support the Left

Communist Ministry, but the leader of the Marxist Communist Party had openly challenged that statement saying that he was sure of getting the support of the Muslim League, if he was permitted to form the Ministry. Now, is it not the usual practice, when no Party has an absolute majority, that the largest Party is called upon to form the Ministry, as it happened earlier? I pointed out two occasions when such Ministries were formed, one in 1952 by the Congress and the other in 1956 by the PSP. Even outside India there were instances where minority Parties were allowed to form a Ministry and they continued to be in the Ministry for some time. Now, that is what is going to happen in Ceylon also. So, my point is that instead of allowing the Assembly to meet and decide their fate, just based on the report of the Governor, even without summoning the Assembly, what was the hurry for imposing the President's Rule in Kerala? That is what I cannot understand. Now, I am reminded of the situation in 1960. In 1960 the Congress and their friends had a thumping majority. Even then they could not fix upon the Ministers. It took them more than three weeks to decide as to who all should be in the Ministry. The Governor was very patient. He conceded the time they wanted and finally a Ministry was formed. My point is that some of the Parties have claimed that they can form a Ministry. The leader of the Marxist Communist Party has claimed that he can form a Ministry. So, also, the leader of the Kerala Congress has been saying that it is possible for him to form a Ministry and get the confidence of the House. Why do you not give them a trial? Instead of doing that, why should you hurriedly impose the President's Rule? That is what I cannot understand. I think it is a very wrong step which will be very much resented by the people of Kerala and it is an outrage on the constitutional rights of the people there.

Now, yesterday I was trying to point out that the imposition of the DIR even now is a very wrong thing. While I was trying to argue that point, some of the Members here expressed the view that as long as the dispute between China and

[Shri M. N. Govindan Nair.]

India remained unsettled, as long as the occupation of our territory by the Chinese continued, this emergency had to continue and the DIR had to continue. That was the opinion expressed by some Members here. This is something which I cannot understand. Now, I am sure there are at least some Members here who were in the Constituent Assembly. I request them to recall the political situation that existed at that time when our Constitution was framed. Now, at that time a part of our territory was occupied by Pakistan. There was a cease-fire, but Pakistan refused to withdraw their army from that part of Kashmir which was occupied by them. Internally more than 25,000 communists were put in jail in the name of trying to subvert the government, in the name of violent action. It is true that in certain places there were violent actions as in Telangana. At that time, the Constituent Assembly decided that in spite of all these the Fundamental Rights should not be denied to the citizens. Then, why now you feel, because there is a portion of our territory occupied by the Chinese, that this emergency should continue and the Fundamental Rights should be denied? This I cannot understand. Now, the present situation is also very similar to the situation that existed at that time, excepting that the cease-fire on the Chinese border, on the northern border, was unilateral on the part of the Chinese. At the same time, it has to be admitted that we accepted the cease-fire. So, a cease-fire exists as it existed in 1950. Now, as far as the internal situation at that time is concerned, at least you could point out Telangana. What is here now? What are the charges? Can documents be produced on the lines of the Andhra revolution of certain violent ideology? The Government should intervene when concrete steps are taken by certain Parties in a particular direction. Nothing has been placed before the country to prove that apart from statements and speeches or documents any attempt was made by any body for any armed action here. So, there was absolutely no reason for denying fundamental rights to the citizens in the name of emergency. Immediately it has to be revoked and the fundamental rights restored to the citizens of India.

The day before yesterday, on the 23rd March, the Home Ministry has come out with an analysis of the election results in Kerala, and it was given wide publicity. In that statement they have tried to prove that the Communists have lost or are losing their hold among the people in Kerala. I am not going into the whole argument but I would like to point out one thing. Our Home Ministry fails to distinguish or differentiate between a Gallup poll and a general election. General elections are held to know which are the parties that are getting the maximum number of seats. There what was the position? According to the statement the official claim is that the exposure of the anti-national stand of the left Communists by the Government carries significant weight with the electorate. Can there be a more absurd statement than this? They contest the election, they bag the maximum number of seats. The 29 people who are arrested, they win the elections, and now comes the Home Ministry with a statement that their propaganda carried a significant weight with the electorate. But I am glad that they have come out with the statement, because this reveals the thinking of the Home Ministry in the whole affair. And what is that? They intended these arrests with a special purpose. It is not a question of national security. They wanted to reduce the strength of the Communists in Kerala and so they came out with the statement.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How much more time do you need? Two and a half hours are allotted for this Budget debate. You spoke yesterday also.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: A few minutes more. So, this was the purpose. In order to reduce the strength of the Communists in Kerala they thought that immediately before the election they should come out with these arrests, they should come out with this kind of propaganda and see that the Communists are reduced in strength.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I think you think very poorly of the intelligence of the Home Ministry. They knew that the party would suffer but in the interests of the security of the country they had to do it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are not adding to that intelligence.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I have very poor respect for it.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Akbar Ali Khan is putting a leading question.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I agree with you on that because in the elections this claim has been proved false by the results, and why? Is it because the people of Kerala are not patriotic? No. All this analysis is wrong. But people take every election as an opportunity to give their verdict on the politics of every party. Instead of allowing the people to give their free verdict, what did the Home Ministry do? They tried to impose their verdict on the people. It was a challenge to the electorate. Not only that, to add insult to injury the Home Ministry comes and says that even if you elect these people, it is not going to release them.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: For security reasons.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: What security? What is the security except for your party and nothing else?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Of the country.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: So, that challenge thrown up by the Home Ministry was taken up by the people and they voted and saw to it that the maximum number of them got through.

Then about the claim by the Home Ministry that the Congress has won, they have given the percentages of the votes they got. I am not going elaborately into all those, but I want to draw your attention to certain developments in our State. Now Shri Kamraj, the President of the Congress, who was guiding the elections, did he canvass votes in the name of the Congress policies?

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras): On a point of order, Madam. The hon. Member is not justified in making

any allegations against a person who is not here to defend himself.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: All right. I leave out the name of Shri Kamraj. Did the Congress President guide the election?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): He is doing Shri Kamraj an honour.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Why should they bring parties here?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: It is a party election. What was the situation in Kerala? Was the division between the Kerala Congress and the Congress a political division? It was a division on the basis of caste. The Nairs and the Christians combined together and challenged the right of other communities . . .

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): Is it not a fact that the Communist Party also did the same?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Also, not exclusively.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: The point is that the Kerala Congress was backed by the communalists of the Nair community and the Christian community, and they were trying to get the support of the Muslim League also. To counter that, did the Congress take a national stand? No. They tried to work upon the sentiment of certain other communities. They met the communal leaders of other communities, worked with them, encouraged and inflamed their communal feelings and tried to bag some votes, thereby making Kerala a battle ground between two rival communal groups.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Madras): That is the usual game of the Congress.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Divide and rule was the game of the Britishers. Are you going to follow the same in States?

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): They have inherited everything from the British.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Instead of giving a national political life, the Congress during all these years—I agree with my friends when they say that the Congress is used to it. But I thought that they would have learnt some lesson from past experience.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): Even the Communist Party is not immune from this trouble.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Which trouble?

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Dividing yourselves.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Nobody can beat you in this trouble.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I expected that the Congress would learn some lessons from past experience. Everybody agrees that political instability has become chronic in Kerala, but nobody has cared to study why there is this political instability. It is the encouragement given by political parties to these communal forces that has been responsible for the political instability in our State. That is why we are . . .

SHRIMATI DEVAKI GOPIDAS (Kerala): That is why you want the Congress to be undermined all along.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: As far as the Congress is concerned, Shri Mannath Padmanabhan who has been in the main responsible for the split in the Congress Party was their hero yesterday. They encouraged all the communal forces, the Nairs, the Catholic Church, etc., to fight them, and it boomeranged. Instead of learning a lesson from that, what did they do? They thought that they would work up the Ezhava communal leaders.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I just want to know what lessons his party has derived and why they were routed. We would like to know it.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: It is a very reasonable question. When communal frenzy was worked up in the

country by certain political parties when certain leaders of the political parties wanted to exploit that situation, they were able to succeed. The Congress increased its strength in no time; agreed. The Left Communists with their alliance, with the Muslim League succeeded; agreed. Rightly or wrongly, we got completely routed. It does not matter. We tried to keep away from this communal frenzy and we were routed. We were routed because, though we entered the election field this time . . . (Interruptions) That is another matter. When some people give their verdict, they get elected to the Assembly. Suppose the Jan Sangh has a majority in a State. Are you going to refuse them?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: No, no.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: On the other hand, national political parties encouraging communalism are working in this communal frenzy. Unfortunately, we got out of it and we lost, we are not repentant about the stand that we took. We are sure that after this temporary period the people will see that this kind of communal fight between one group and another cannot benefit anybody, nor even those who are engaged in this fight. So, we will patiently wait for that time when the people will give up this communal frenzy and take a more correct rational approach.

(Time bell rings)

I will take one minute.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can take two minutes.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: The main point is about the Kerala Budget. Unfortunately, because of this President's Rule, that was forgotten. You will allow me just some time, I do not want to go into details about it.

Just as I pointed out, the main reason for the political instability in our State was these communal fights inside our State and the encouragement which they were receiving from political parties. Another important reason for the political instability is the economic situation in our State.

Whenever there is a crisis, everybody is alert and all of you say, yes, something has to be done for Kerala. The main reason for the political instability in our State is its economic backwardness; it is industrially backward. But somehow the crisis is tided over and Kerala is forgotten. Now, normally, on the eve of the Fourth Five Year Plan, an elected Assembly should have been there to discuss the economic problems and put forward proper suggestions. That Assembly is not there. So . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): May I just intervene to ask whether the Members who have been elected to the Assembly and who have not taken their oath, will be given their salaries?

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Because of the interruption, I did not hear it.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN (Kerala): That does not matter.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: My point is that priority attention should be paid to this miserable economic condition that exists in our State and immediate steps should be evolved by which this malady will be remedied. And now greater responsibility falls on the shoulders of this House to see that greater attention is paid to this matter.

Before I conclude, I have to point out that the imposition of the President's Rule and the way in which the Home Ministry has behaved during this period have created serious doubts in the minds of the people about their faith in parliamentary democracy itself. Now I ask you to think very seriously. Suppose your fundamental rights are denied, suppose the Members whom they elect cannot even attend the Assembly. Under such circumstances, what is the remedy left to the people if they want to change the Government? In the name of the DIR your fundamental rights are denied, in the name of national security, even the Members who are elected to the Assembly are not allowed to attend. Under such circumstances, a normal citizen

in this country will feel that if he wants to change the Government, he has to take recourse to some other method, and what is that other method? If parliamentary elections are not the way of changing the Government, then what is the other method?

SHRIMATI DEVAKI GOPIDAS: According to you, bloody revolution.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: You are pointing your fingers against the Left Communists that they are trying to work up an armed revolution here. I point my finger against the Home Minister, Mr. Nanda, who by denying the fundamental rights to the people, who by not allowing those people who have been elected to attend the Assembly, is paving the way for an armed revolt.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Provocateurs.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: You have to think very seriously. Once you start in the wrong way, the next step will put you in a worse condition, and in that way things may develop in the State, in this country. So, I want the Government to make a retreat, restore fundamental rights, withdraw the DIR and allow those Members who have been elected to function—not only those who have been elected but since now we have the President's Rule, I want all those DIR prisoners to be released—and give hopes in the minds of the people that they can exercise their fundamental rights, that they can choose whomsoever they want to put in the administration. Remember your experience in 1952. We contested the elections while we were underground, while some of our people were in jail. And you know, the Constituent Assembly was quite correct, even under such circumstances, to grant fundamental rights to the people and allow people to contest the elections. The result—you know—was a change in the political climate itself. Either you follow that procedure or you will be paving the way for an armed revolt in this country. You have to decide, the ruling party has to decide, which is the way you want to travel.

I conclude.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, where is the Minister?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Deputy Minister is there.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There are many Deputy Ministers. It is a serious matter. Kerala is now a Central subject. The Kerala Budget is being discussed here wherein other questions are to come. Naturally, are we to be consoled by our Cinderella Deputy Minister? I have my sympathies with him. I am not suffering . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is taking notes now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have also been taking notes, I have seen it. Therefore, quite apart from taking notes or not taking notes, I should like to know: Is this House so disqualified and under a kind of moral preventive detention that our Home Minister or his . . .

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Some Cabinet Minister should be here.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would request the Deputy Minister to call one of his colleagues. I am conveying it to him. Mr. Karmarkar.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): May I on a point of order rise to support what Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said? It is not right that this House should be treated in this particular manner and I do suggest that you should adjourn the debate until a Cabinet Minister is here.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I would like to support Diwan Chaman Lall . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have in this House in the past observed that proper courtesy should be shown by the Cabinet-rank Ministers and the Ministers of State to this House. But somehow it goes unheeded. And, therefore, I am conveying again that someone of his col-

leagues should be here to listen to this debate. Mr. Karmarkar.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The House should be adjourned, Madam.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR (Mysore): Madam Deputy Chairman, when I was listening to my friend opposite, Mr. Nair, I was wondering whether he had remembered at all that he was speaking on the Budget except at the end when somebody perhaps reminded him that today was the Budget discussion day and not a discussion on the Home Minister's statement. Now in fact I am rather disappointed with that because if he had spoken more about the Budget I would also have spoken a little more about the Budget and perhaps a little to his satisfaction. But since he has covered a ground which he feels technically relates to the Budget but which is largely irrelevant with regard to the mention of the Budget, I should like at the outset to deal with a few of the points which he has raised.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: You need not be provoked.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I am not provoked. I am rather quietly subdued as my friend, Mr. Nair, will find it. He smiles but he is excited within and I am also similar.

Now, Madam, when he began with smiles and something of a reasonable looking argument, I thought he would develop it. But he began with a seemingly rational analysis of the political situation and he ended with a threat. I am quite sure in my mind if any such revolt, armed or unarmed, comes the people of India are absolutely capable of dealing with it and scotching it in the bud if at any time an armed revolt comes against the Constitution, and I am quite sure in my mind when it comes to the defence of the Constitution against any one who breaks the Constitution by arms, they will know what it is.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: You are breaking it.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: That is quite all right. You are breaking it now and charging us with breaking it.

Again my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, may be excited a little later because I have to say later something which might excite him. What I am saying is this. It will, what I might say, enlighten me on another aspect. I should say there seems to be a little shadow of a difference in reasoning so far as our friends—of our own country, be it said to my shame—friends who are behind the bars in Kerala and friends like my friends opposite who spoke just now, who seemingly appear to be different but who are essentially made of the same texture of opinion, are concerned. And then I thought about myself. At least I can honestly tell myself that so far as socialism is concerned, I am out and out a full-fledged socialist, though friends there also, including my friend, Mr. Nair, are socialists. He is something more than a socialist. When I was trying the other day to find out the difference between a socialist and a communist, I found rationally two things. Whereas a socialist like us on this side believes in a democratic form of Government, believes in peaceful methods, the Communist, as the label goes with capital "C", does not necessarily believe in peaceful methods anywhere, and I presume since they call themselves communists. . .

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: My complaint is that you have no faith in democracy.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Yes, you have a complaint and you will have many more complaints at the end of my speech. That is why I have risen to speak. Madam, a Communist with capital "C", in India also, I presume—if he is to be an honest Communist and if he has to distinguish himself from socialism of this government—has to believe that violence is permissible just as some of our freedom revolutionaries thought that violence was permissible. Like that I presume that the Communists believe violence to be permissible. That is item No. 1.

In my country unfortunately in addition to that—there are countries where the

Communists are national but here unfortunately, the present company excepted, to save trouble—normally we find from their utterances that there seems to be such a gulf between a normal communist and a citizen of this country. They speak as if we treat them like a mother-in-law or even worse than a mother-in-law and, therefore, we people do not deserve to be there; they speak in a mode of mind as if the people of this country or the political parties that are there are something that should not exist, as if they belong to some other country. To put it in a scientific language, it strikes me—I wish I am wrong, I hope I am wrong—that they think in terms of extra-territorial loyalty. That is the second thing which distinguishes a normal socialist from a communist.

The third thing is—and that is relevant on the point which my friend made—he says in the name of security you arrest people. Shall we arrest people of peaceful methods? The arrests do follow in the name of security. Then, all his arguments follow from the general level of his argument, though wrong, and he asks the Government, "Whose security?", "Security of the Congress." He makes us appear as if we look upon national security as the security of the Congress. One simple question I put to him—I speak subject to correction—why should the Government of India feel impelled as a matter of national duty, not as a personal vendetta—Congress is too big an organisation today in the popular way and too powerful also . . .

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Not in Kerala.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: . . . to ever think of mean methods? Other weaker people can think about it. I hope my friend, Mr. Vajpayee, who has generous instincts will accept that part of my speech which at least in his opinion is reasonable. I do hope that he is with me when I say that these people were endangering the security of the country and the Government of India would have failed in its duty had it not arrested these people and put them behind the bars. I wish we were wrong, though I do not hope I am wrong because I am quite sure I am right.

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar.]

I wish these good gentlemen, peaceful doves behind the Kerala bars at least declare, send out a communication which my friend, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, will permit that statement to come out, saying, "We do believe in peaceful methods. We do count the Chinese aggression as aggression to be fought tooth and nail by our blood". Let them send out that one line. The very fact that they have not condescended to say anything of the kind proves that they are enemies of the country today and do deserve to be behind the bars. There is no doubt. Let at least one of them say that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, let him speak on the Budget . . .

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I do not yield to my friend and my friend should know as a gentleman and as a good Member of this House that when a man does not yield he must sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You should know how to talk. You are an ex-Minister only.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: That is quite right. Ex-Minister is not a term of abuse. An ex-Minister has the advantage of being both an ex-Minister and outsider.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: May I intervene?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I do not yield. I do not yield to him and I do not yield to you. I am very sorry about that. (*Interruption by Shri P. N. Sapru*) I will apologise to him. I do not yield. I must be protected.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I am asking him a question . . .

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I must be protected. I do not want either help or hindrance in my speech.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sapru, order, order. Will you please take your seat?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Mr. Sapru is an elderly man. And my friend ought to know that when a person is speaking . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can put questions at the end of his speech, Mr. Sapru.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Exactly, Madam. He has other opportunities. Unlike my friend, who has been an able advocate and a Judge, I am not used to links in my speech being broken. I have not that equanimity which he has got.

Now, Madam, I was driving my point. If it were not right for us to lodge them in jail, they could have made us look wrong in the eyes of the world by saying that they want to follow the method of peace, they are not for China, they will fight China and that China is aggressor. But nothing of the kind. I do not want any proofs from the Home Minister, no other proofs, no documents, no oral speeches. This proof is sufficient for me. If I am arrested and I am innocent, the first thing that I would do is to write to the District Magistrate that I am innocent. Nothing of the kind.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Have not you read the statement of Mr. Namboodripad?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I am making that point in order to meet the other points made by my friend. In all innocence he comes and asks us the question. Here is a party of forty, twenty-seven inside and thirteen outside. Anyway it makes a small difference as to the character of the two. It might be that some are cleverer and some are not clever. Some give legal evidence and some do not. I do not make any imputation against those thirteen who are outside. What is it that the Home Ministry did or the Government of India did or the President did? They have followed the normal democratic practice. When a Legislature is elected—I know their definition of democracy, their democracy I know, I have studied a little of that and I do not mean democracy of

that kind—democracy is a people's rule, not the rule imposed upon the people. That is my definition of democracy. According to normal parliamentary practice, which my friends opposite also have agreed to follow—since they are here in the Opposition, they have to abide by the rules of the game—what is it that the Governor has to do? The Governor has to consider whether the man whom he calls upon to form a Government is able to sustain the Government, does not matter whether it is the Congress, Communist, SSP or having any other label or no label at all.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You cannot anticipate it.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: If 71 Members, if a majority of the Members of the Legislature—my friends cannot anticipate anything except trouble—does not matter what colour they belong to—I do not know the exact number, 134 or 141 whatever it is, if one half plus one were to go into a meeting, say that my friend Mr. Govidan Nair is the Leader of the Party and they are a Party, the Governor was duty-bound to call Mr. Nair and no one else.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How did you form a Ministry in Orissa?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Orissa has been a red-rag to my hon. friend and it is not a red-rag to me. In any case I am innocent of much what has happened in Orissa. He is an authority on this subject, unnecessarily, and he can better answer that question. Now the Kerala Governor, who is a seasoned administrator—I will take another ten minutes . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: All right, seven minutes as a compromise. I was saying that he is a seasoned man, he is not a nobody. To a large extent he is an objective person. He may be a Congressman in his views. I do not know but he is principally a Labour man.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is a good man.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: No doubt all these gentlemen are also good men, that is another matter, but then he is a good man. They have no complaint with regard to his functioning. It is the Home Ministry. They have not said one word about the assessment of the Governor which means in normal legal language that my friend Mr. Nair has accepted all that the Governor has said; otherwise he would have said that the Governor's analysis is wrong. He is angry with the Home Ministry which only acted on what the Governor has said. So I presume for argument's sake, judging from the way in which he has put his argument, that he entirely agrees with the analysis of the Governor and the analysis seems to be based on numbers. One is 40, the other is 36, third is 27, fourth is 12, then 3 and odd and one and a half, and all that. That is the analysis and it is obviously clear. To even an intelligent man like Mr. Nair it should be clear. It is of course clear to a dense-minded man but even to an intelligent man it should be clear that none of these parties could form a government. The Congress, I must congratulate—though I belong to it, as a Congressman I do not do it with the idea, my friend can take it, of flattering the Congress organisation but I say that under the circumstances the Congress was the wisest to have done what it did. We do not claim a majority, we do not want to give any quarter to the rebels from the organisation. A rebel or a renegade is much worse than anyone. We do not want to have any truck with them. We stand alone and we shall form an honourable opposition to any Government that can be formed. They did not feel, they were not anxious to form any Government though it might have its own advantages. They said: 'All right, give an open field to the Communists'. When my friends there have said: 'Leave out the prisoners', I was reminded of that small poem I learnt in the fourth standard—"We are Seven"—Where are you? Two have gone to Conway to dwell, two have gone to sea and the only person present was the one who was eating his supper in his Porringer. Now, 27 have gone to sea which means they are behind for proper reasons. Thirteen, perhaps, some of whom also

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar.]
might have been locked in with justification, anyway they are outside. These are the assets. Some others may come. I am surprised my friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta sometimes is tempted to let himself away from logic. He is a very esteemed barrister and a constitutional student. I expect some better thing from him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not a Barrister, I am a political worker.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: A political worker of a very rare intelligence, and a rare acumen. He rises up and tells me: "Wait and see". Are we going to the bazaar to wait and see which vegetable we are going to purchase? We are certainly in a different situation. We have to run a Government, he has to run nothing. Perhaps he has to run chaos. We have to run a Government. We, as responsible people, the Governor as a responsible person, had to constitute a Ministry.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have to run the Rajya Sabha.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: It is now as clear as daylight. I very much regret that it is not only from that side that we encounter the difficulty but I have found that some Members of this House and the other House who had better reasons to be better-informed, one or two of them said: "Why not take a chance?" I do not name but someone sitting is also there, a very distinguished friend and gentleman, my intimate friend among them, said. "Why did you not convene the Legislature?" I said: "What is going to be the agenda? To fish about for the formation of a Ministry? Is that the agenda?" How can an Assembly meet? The Assembly is not a unit like the public meeting of the Congress Party or the Communist Party which can meet even without an agenda. They can discuss the agenda on a moment's notice but we are a Government, we are a State. I know that Mr. Gupta also knows it too. There cannot be any functioning of the Legislature unless there is a Government to guide that Legislature.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Let us hope, we build on hopes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is it allowed?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: There is no question of allowing. Now the Legislature cannot be there. I am only trying to meet the point—why not allow them to meet? In this matter, just as in my humble opinion we cannot afford to be soft to the enemies of the State, enemies of the country, enemies of the people, just to the same extent we cannot be false to the Constitution so long as we want to follow it. That is a clear position and in my humble opinion and not necessarily as a Congressman—I have a capacity which is an independent capacity, I am not bound, I have not sold myself to any organisation—and if there is anything wrong with the Congress I would have had the desire, I would have had, if I might say so, the will to have said that it is wrong. I might keep quiet about it but I advocate it because I am a student of public affairs, and a little older than my friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and therefore a little more experienced in the good sense of the word, if I might put it very humbly, perhaps with a little larger sense of national service to my credit also. I would like to tell him that so far as this question is concerned, of the Constitution, the Government of India, the President, has behaved in the correctest way possible, in the cleanest way possible and properly.

I would like to say, just as my friend Mr. Nair said at the end, one word about what has to be done in Kerala. Kerala is a gifted province, lucky in its people but unlucky in nature, difficult, with 15 cents of land per head, vulnerable industries, quite a good export earning province but with a sense of unemployment. There is large unemployment in Kerala and I am quite sure in my mind that if Kerala had been given a little prior consideration in the matter of employment—how to do it is not my present thesis, it could be done, it is not a large population, just about 10 million or whatever it is—if during these 2 years or 5 years whatever it is, I do not wish it to be long, though on my side of the country, all the reforms and the good that were done in any municipal area where when the municipality was superseded and by the Adminis-

trator—I do not mean to say that this should happen here, that the Government of Kerala should be superseded, but taking full advantage of the present situation, I wish that the Government should give importance to this question of employment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You want to be the Governor?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Well, if it so happens, I do not mind, but perverse, not perverse people, perverse doctrines only prosper when there is poverty and misery. Just as I was wondering whether it is unparliamentary, my good friend opposite who, is now dozing, said that it is not unparliamentary and therefore, I am using that, just as in my own erstwhile field of health, I found that mosquitoes prospered wherever insanitation was found. like that pernicious doctrines prosper only where there is poverty and if some efforts are made to lessen it by employment opportunities, I think we might have a better Kerala. Thank you very much.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I want to ask one question of Mr. Karmarkar. A general election was held in Kerala. Some persons stood for various seats in the Kerala Legislature. They must have been put to expense for doing so. The Assembly is not being called at all. Now they will not be eligible to receive any salary until they have taken the oath. Is that a fair way of dealing with people? I am just posing this question. I do not understand this word 'national security', because I do not find any danger to national security today. So far as this national security is concerned, it is an entirely different issue. But I want to be clear in my mind that they will get their allowances. And how will they get their allowances?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let the debate continue and I think the answers could be given later. Mr. Vajpayee.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश):
महोदया, यह पहला ही अवसर नहीं है, ज
सदन को केरल के बजट पर वादविवाद करने
का अवसर मिला है। पहले भी चार बार केरल

में राष्ट्रपति का शासन लागू किया गया और
संसद् की स्वीकृति से बजट कार्यान्वित हुआ।
जिन परिस्थितियों में इस बार राष्ट्रपति का
शासन लागू किया गया है वे चिंताजनक हैं।
कल गृह मंत्रालय के राज्य-मंत्री महोदय ने
अचानक आ कर सदन में यह घोषणा कर दी कि
राष्ट्रपति जी ने केरल का शासन अपने हाथ
में रखने का निर्णय उद्घोषित कर दिया है।
मेरा निवेदन है कि वामपंथी कम्यूनिस्टों के
खिलाफ गृह मंत्रालय ने जो कार्रवाई की है
उसका समर्थन करते हुए भी मैं जिस ढंग से
केरल में राष्ट्रपति का शासन लागू किया गया,
उसका समर्थन नहीं कर सकता। राज्यपाल
को विभिन्न राजनैतिक दलों को इस बात का
सौका देना चाहिये या कि वे केरल में सरकार
बना सकते हैं या नहीं। जो एसेम्बली बनी
नहीं, जिस एसेम्बली के सदस्यों ने शपथ तक
नहीं ली और एक संवैधानिक गुत्थी है कि जिस
एसेम्बली की बैठक नहीं बुलाई गई, जिस
एसेम्बली का निर्माण नहीं हुआ, जिसके
सदस्यों ने शपथ तक नहीं ली, उस एसेम्बली
को भंग कर दिया गया। अब कहा जाता है कि
यह मामला अदालत में ले जायें और संविधान
की दृष्टि से कोई गलत काम हुआ है या नहीं
यह सर्वोच्च न्यायालय में जा करके तय कराएं।
मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर संविधान की भावना
का खयाल रखा जाए तो यह मानना होगा कि
जो कुछ हुआ वह अनुचित हुआ। केन्द्रीय
गृह मंत्रालय ने एक अनौचित्य का परिचय
दिया है। बजट मंजूर होने के बाद अगर
केरल के गवर्नर चाहते तो तीन महीने तक
शासन चला सकते थे और विभिन्न राजनैतिक
दलों को अवसर दे सकते थे कि वे इस बात का
प्रबन्ध करते कि वे शासन चला सकते हैं या
नहीं। लेकिन जो कुछ किया गया वह संविधान
की भावना के प्रतिकूल है।

केरल एक सुनौती है देश के राजनैतिक
दलों के लिए, लोकतंत्र में विश्वास रखने
वालों के लिये और केरल एक चेतावनी है
सभी देशवासियों को, कि क्या भिन्न-भिन्न

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

राजनैतिक दल यदि लोकतंत्र को जीवित
 ॥ चाहते हैं तो मिल-जुल कर शासन
 संभालने की जिम्मेदारी उठा सकते हैं या
 नहीं। जो कुछ केरल में हुआ वह सन् 1967
 में भारत के अन्य प्रान्तों में भी हो सकता है।
 हो सकता है कि अन्य प्रान्तों में किसी दल का
 स्पष्ट बहुमत न आए, तो क्या दलों का कार्य
 यह होगा कि वहां लोकतंत्र को समाप्त कर
 दें विधान भंग कर दी जाये और राष्ट्रपति
 के शासन के लिये मार्ग प्रशस्त करें? लोकतंत्र
 का तकाजा यह है कि स्पष्ट बहुमत में न होते
 हुए भी राजनैतिक दल इस बात की कोशिश
 करें कि जनता ने जो उनके ऊपर भार सौंपा है
 उसको वे ठीक तरह से निभाएं। मैं नहीं समझता
 कि कांग्रेस पार्टी ने अकेले चलो का नारा क्यों
 लगाया? कभी कांग्रेस दल सब के साथ
 चलना चाहता है—कम्यूनिस्ट शासन को
 गिराने के लिये मुसलिम लीग का समर्थन
 लिया गया, प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के साथ
 गठबन्धन किया गया और एक मोरचा खड़ा
 किया गया और कम्यूनिस्ट शासन को गिराने
 के बाद एक एक दल के साथ कांग्रेस पार्टी
 ने विश्वासघात किया। केरल की कहानी
 है कांग्रेस के विश्वासघात को, कांग्रेस के नेतृत्व
 की विफलता की, कांग्रेस की गुटबन्दी की,
 कांग्रेस में घुसे हुए सम्प्रदायवाद की विजय की।
 यह आवश्यक है कि सब से बड़ा राजनैतिक
 दल होने के नाते कांग्रेस अपने रवैये पर विचार
 करे। कांग्रेस अनन्त काल तक राज्य नहीं
 कर सकती। //

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव (राजस्थान) :
 कोई नहीं कर सकता।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : कांग्रेस को भी
 विरोधी दल और विरोधी पक्ष में बैठने की
 कुछ आदत डालनी चाहिये। मगर वह आदत
 डालने के लिये तैयार नहीं है।

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव : बिल्कुल तैयार
 है।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : वे या तो स्वयं
 राज्य करेंगे या राष्ट्रपति के शासन द्वारा अपना
 राज्य चलाएंगे।

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव : वह विरोधी
 दल बनने को तैयार है।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : एक बार प्रजा
 सोशलिस्ट पार्टी बहुत कम संख्या में थी और
 तब केरल में उसकी सरकार बनी। वह
 सरकार कुछ दिन टिकी भी। अगर इस बार
 भी किसी छोटे दल की सरकार बन जाती
 और वह फिर न चलती तो कांग्रेस पार्टी पर
 और गृह मंत्रालय पर कोई यह आरोप न लगाता
 कि उसने अन्य दलों को शासन के निर्माण
 करने का, चलाने का, मौका नहीं दिया।
 लेकिन आज तो आप पर आरोप लगाया जा
 सकता है कि आपने सारी योजना इसी ढंग
 से बनाई कि केरल में राष्ट्रपति का राज आ
 जाए।

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव : उसने अपने
 हारने की योजना बनाई, क्या आपके कहने
 का यह मतलब है?

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : मेरे कहने
 का यह मतलब तो है आप हारे अपने कर्मों से
 और अगर आपके यही कर्म रहे तो आप
 और भी हारेंगे। अगर आप हार गए,
 इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि केरल में लोक-
 तन्त्र समाप्त कर दिया जाये, विधान सभा
 भंग कर दी जाये। जो भी दल शासन
 चलाता चाहते हैं उन्हें एक मौका जरूर
 देना चाहिये और आपने उनको मौका
 नहीं दिया।

मैं इस संबंध में एक बात और कहूंगा।
 अखबारों में यह खबर छपी है कि श्री अजीत-
 प्रसाद जैन केरल के राज्यपाल नियुक्त
 किये जा रहे हैं। क्या यह सच है कि श्री अजीत-
 प्रसाद जैन ने अपनी नियुक्ति केवल इसी
 शर्त पर स्वीकार की थी कि अगर केरल में

राज्यपाल का शासन होगा, तब वे गवर्नर बन कर जायेंगे और अगर किसी दल का बहुमत हो गया तो वे गवर्नर का पद स्वीकार नहीं करेंगे। हम चाहेंगे कि गृह-मंत्रालय इस बात का खंडन करे। कुछ अखबारों में यह बात भी छपी है कि श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन तब तक केरल में जाने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं जब तक यह साफ न हो जाये कि वहां प्रेसीडेंट रूल लागू हो गया और अगर प्रेसीडेंट रूल लागू नहीं होगा, तो वे केरल में नहीं जायेंगे। वे तानाशाह बन कर वहां जाना चाहते हैं। आश्चर्य है गृह-मंत्रालय ऐसे व्यक्ति को राज्यपाल नियुक्त करता है जो घोषणा करता है कि जब राष्ट्रपति का राज हो जायेगा, तब हम वहां जायेंगे। ये चीजें नई दिल्ली की प्रतिष्ठा को बढ़ाती नहीं हैं।

केरल के निवासियों को राष्ट्रपति के राज का पहला तोहफा मिला, एक भेंट मिली, जब 12 मार्च को तानूर में गोली कांड हुआ। मुस्लिम लीग का उम्मीदवार वहां जीता और उसने अपना जलूस निकाला। जब तक वह जलूस मुख्य सड़कों पर चलता रहा, पुलिस उसके साथ थी। बाद में वह जलूस गलियों में घुस गया और जलूस वालों पर आरोप लगाया जाता है कि उसने वहां लोगों के घरों पर हमला किया। वहां परिस्थिति काबू कर ली गई लेकिन आध घंटे के बाद पुलिस का एक सबइंस्पेक्टर 50, 60 मुस्लिम लीगियों के साथ आया और उसने लोगों को घरों से पकड़ पकड़ कर निकाला, रात हो गई थी, एक पुलिस सबइंस्पेक्टर ने टार्च की रोशनी मारी और जनसंघ के दो कार्यकर्ताओं का नाम लिया, एक जयचन्द्रन् का, एक मुब्रह्मण्म् का, जब उन्होंने कहा कि 'हां', मैं जयचन्द्रन् हूं, तो पुलिस के सबइंस्पेक्टर ने उसको गोली मार दी। दो कार्यकर्ता गोली से घायल हुए। गोली चलाने का आदेश किसी मैजिस्ट्रेट ने नहीं दिया, गोली चलाने की वहां आवश्यकता

भी नहीं थी। इस पुलिस इंस्पेक्टर के साथ जनसंघ के कार्यकर्ताओं का कुछ पहले का झगड़ा था जिसका बदला लेने के लिए पुलिस के सबइंस्पेक्टर ने गोली मार दी। दो कार्यकर्ता घायल हुए, बाद में मुब्रह्मण्म् गोली से मर गया। हम मांग कर रहे हैं कि इस कांड की अदालती जांच होनी चाहिए। मैं नहीं कहता कि किसका दोष है, मैं यह नहीं कहता कि किसकी गलती है। मगर पुलिस का अफसर गोली चलाए प्वाइंट ब्लैक, बिना किसी मैजिस्ट्रेट के आदेश के और उस गोली के परिणामस्वरूप एक कार्यकर्ता घायल हो जाये और एक अस्पताल में जा कर मर जाए, तो यह अदालती जांच का मामला है। अब तो आप किसी राजनैतिक दल पर इसकी जिम्मेदारी डाल कर नहीं टाल सकते। केरल में कम्युनिस्ट सरकार नहीं है, मुस्लिम लीग की सरकार भी नहीं बनी, केरल में आपने राष्ट्रपति राज लागू कर दिया, गृह-मंत्रालय जिम्मेदार है। मैंने कालिग अटेंशन का नोटिस दिया था कि इस गोली कांड के बारे में गृह-मंत्री सदन में आ कर वक्तव्य करें, मगर उस नोटिस को नहीं माना गया। मैं इस मांग को दुहराना चाहता हूं कि तानूर में 12 मार्च को जो गोलीकांड हुआ उसकी अदालती जांच की जाए, तथ्यों का पता लगाया जाए और जो पुलिस के अफसर दोषी हैं उनको दंडित किया जाए। अगर राष्ट्रपति राज के नाम पर जनता के अधिकारों का इसी तरह से हनन किया जाएगा, पुलिस इसी तरह से मनमानी करेगी तो केरल की जनता राष्ट्रपति राज को पसन्द नहीं कर सकती।

आखिर, कांग्रेस की तुलना में कम्युनिस्ट क्यों जीते? आपने उन्हें देशद्रोही कहा और उनकी देशद्रोहिता में मुझे कोई संदेह नहीं है, मगर मैं दोनों प्रश्नों को अलग रखना चाहता हूँ। अगर कांग्रेस के कुशासन से पीड़ित जनता कांग्रेस के शासन को हटा कर कम्युनिस्टों को

[ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

वोट देती है तो कांग्रेस के नेता इस जिम्मेदारी से नहीं बच सकते। जनता को अच्छा शासन चाहिए। केरल में आर्थिक प्रगति की गति को बढ़ाने की आवश्यकता है। वहां सबसे अधिक सुशिक्षित व्यक्ति हैं लेकिन सब से अधिक बेकार लोग भी वहां हैं। और केरल की राजनीति को हम अगर साम्प्रदायिकता से ऊपर उठा कर राष्ट्रीयता और लोकतंत्र के धरातल पर नहीं ला सके तो केरल की बीमारी और भी फैलेगी। केरल कांग्रेस अगर मंत्रिमंडल बनाना चाहती थी तो उसको मौका देना चाहिए था। वह आपसे फूट कर अलग हो गए हैं, इस बात को ध्यान में रख कर भी अगर आप उनका समर्थन करने का निश्चय करते तो शायद केरल की राजनीति में एक नए अध्याय का श्रीगणेश हो जाता। आखिर, अगर कांग्रेस को हटाने वाली पार्टी बनेगी तो कांग्रेस में फूट पड़ने के बाद ही बनेगी। उसके साथ लोकतंत्र के प्रयोग को सफल करने का आपको निश्चय करना होगा अन्यथा फिर मेरा सुझाव स्वीकार कर लीजिए कि यह जो फेडरल स्ट्रक्चर है इसको खत्म कर दीजिए, यूनिटरी फार्म आफ गवर्नमेंट पूरी तरह से लाइए, संविधान में संशोधन करिए, केवल एक केरल की विधान सभा नहीं सारी विधान सभाएं भंग कर दीजिए और नई दिल्ली से शासन चलाइए। लेकिन अपनी सुविधा के लिए राष्ट्रपति राज लागू करना, विरोधी दलों को शासन चलाने के अधिकार से वंचित रखना और फिर नाम लेना संघीय संविधान का, फेडरल स्ट्रक्चर का और लोकतंत्र का—ये दोनों बातें मेल नहीं खातीं।

मैंने कहा, केरल एक चुनौती है, केरल एक चेतावनी है, सभी राजनैतिक दलों के लिए, सभी देशवासियों के लिए। यदि आज हमने उस चेतावनी पर कान नहीं दिया तो आने वाला कल हमारे लिए इससे भी अधिक खतरनाक संकेत ले कर आएगा।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at five minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock, the DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

MOTION RE. STATEMENT ON ANTI-NATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF PRO-PEKING COMMUNISTS

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Madam, I beg to move:

"That the statement on the anti-national activities of Pro-Peking Communists and their preparations for subversion and violence, laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 18th February, 1965, be taken into consideration."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): On a point of order, Madam.

Three Members of this House are detained and two of them, Mr. Basava-punnaiah and Mr. Ramamurti are mentioned in this statement. Now, they are not present in the House and their absence is due to the fact that they are prevented from coming here. They desire to be present in the House so that they could state, as Members of this House, their case to their colleagues. I should like to know from the Home Minister whether he has taken into account this fact and whether he has received a letter from Mr. Niren Ghosh, another Member, stating his case and whether . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): What is the point of order? The point of order is to be decided by the Chair and not by the Home Minister.