

Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development held in Washington in September 1954 [Placed in Library, see No. S-434/54]

(ii) Report on the Meeting of the Consultative Committee on Economic Development in South and South-East Asia held in Ottawa in October, 1954 [Placed in Library, see No S-435/54]

STATEMENT SHOWING ACTION TAKEN ON ASSURANCES, PROMISES, ETC GIVEN BY MINISTERS

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE (SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR). On behalf of Shri Satyanarayan Sinha I beg to lay on the Table the following statements showing the action taken by the Government on the various assurances, promises and undertakings given by Ministers and on suggestions made by Members during the various sessions shown against each:—
Assurances, etc —

(i) Statement No. II, Seventh Session, 1954

(ii) Statement No. VIII, Sixth Session, 1954

(iii) Statement No. XI, Fifth Session, 1953.

(iv) Supplementary Statement No XII, Fourth Session, 1953.

(v) Supplementary Statement No. XVII, Third Session, 1953.

[See Appendix VIII, Annexures Nos. 15 to 19.]

Suggestions.—

Statement No. IV, Fifth Session, 1953

[See Appendix VIII, Annexure No. 20.]

MOTION FOR ELECTION TO THE COURT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DELHI

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (DR K L SHRIMALI). Sir, I beg to move the following motion:

"That in pursuance of section 43 of the Delhi University Act, 1922, read with item (xvi) of clause (1) of

statute 2 of the Statutes of the University of Delhi, this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may direct, one member from among themselves to be a member of the Court of the University of Delhi vice Dr Anup Singh, who retired from the membership of the Council of States on the 2nd April, 1954 and thereby ceased to be a member of the said Court with effect from that date"

MR CHAIRMAN. The question is:

"That in pursuance of section 43 of the Delhi University Act, 1922, read with item (xvi) of clause (1) of statute 2 of the Statutes of the University of Delhi, this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may direct one member from among themselves to be a member of the Court of the University of Delhi, vice Dr. Anup Singh, who retired from the membership of the Council of States on the 2nd April, 1954, and thereby ceased to be a member of the said Court with effect from that date"

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN I have to inform hon Members that the 2nd December, 1954, has been fixed as the last date for receiving nominations and the 6th December, 1954 for holding election, if necessary, to the Court of the University of Delhi

The nominations will be received in the Rajya Sabha Notice Office upto 12 00 Noon on the 2nd. The election, which will be conducted in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote, will, if necessary, be held in Secretary's room (Room No 29) Ground Floor. Parliament House, between the hours of 3 P.M. and 5 P.M. on the 6th December 1954.

RESOLUTION REGARDING PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION ON ANDHRA

THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS AND STATES (DR. K N. KATJU): Mr. Chairman, I beg to move:

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 15th November 1954, under clause (1) of article 356 of the Constitution, assuming to himself all the functions of the Government of Andhra."

Sir, the House is fully familiar with both the background and the actual facts which led to the President taking this action. The background has been that ever since the formation of the Andhra State last year, the party position has been vacillating. There have been no elections and with the division of the State, the Legislature was also divided and 140 Members came away from the Madras Legislature and formed the Andhra Legislature and the division between the different political parties was very uneven and the result was that Government of the day was carrying on with a very slight majority, sometimes 1, sometimes 2, sometimes a little more but it was always a very unbalanced thing. Now, Sir, in the Andhra State, as you know, the one very big question has been the question of prohibition. Under the Constitution, every one knows that prohibition is a matter of directive principle. The Constitution has given a directive that every State Government shall aim its policies towards the enforcement of prohibition. In the old Madras State, the Government of the day had enforced prohibition throughout the entire State and that was inherited by the Andhra Government and in that Government today there is complete prohibition. The Andhra Government, after the separation, appointed a Committee under the chairmanship of Shri Ramamurthy to go into the whole question, make investigation about the actual conditions as to how far the policy had succeeded and make recommendations. The Ramamurthy Committee submitted a big report and made certain recommendations which were, if I may put it that way, somewhat towards relaxing, if not completely abolishing, this policy of prohibition. We are not concerned here with that particular matter. Now this report was

considered in the Andhra Legislature and a certain Resolution was passed in the month of May—on the 27th May 1954. Some Members were dissatisfied as to the action taken by the Government to implement this Resolution of the Legislature and notice was given of a motion of no-confidence in October to this effect. The motion was:

"This Assembly expresses its want of confidence in the Ministry for having failed to respect and implement the recommendations of the Ramamurthy Committee as decided by the Assembly on the 27th May 1954."

The motion was limited to this particular matter. Now, after three days' debate, voting took place on the 6th November and the total strength of the Legislature being 140—out of them almost the full House was present—really it is a very surprising thing that 139 Members were present in the House—only there was one absentee. Now out of 139, one was the hon. Speaker and another Member remained neutral and 137 Members actually voted and if you add the Speaker, actually 138 Members were present and 137 voted and out of 137, the result of the division was 69 in favour of the motion of no-confidence and 68 against the motion. The result was that this motion of no-confidence was carried by one. The Ministry met, they pondered over the situation and they submitted their resignation, but along with the resignation, they also said that having regard to this want of equilibrium and always uncertainties prevailing, it was desirable—and they advised the Governor—that there should be a general dissolution, so that people may be given an opportunity of having a stable Government for themselves, of pronouncing their own opinion upon this big question of prohibition and all other relevant questions. That is what they did. They submitted their resignation and they gave this advice. Now, Sir, the Governor was faced with a very difficult situation. He sent for and saw the leaders of different groups

[Dr. K. N. Katju.]

but these gentlemen, apart from meeting the Governor and telling him in conversations as to what they thought of the matter, also issued statements to the press and these gentlemen have stuck to that statement and tendered their advice to the Governor to the same effect. The House would be interested to know the composition of the majority opinion given in favour of the Resolution. The votes were 69. These 69 consisted of 40 members of the Communist Party—the largest group, 8 were members of the K.L.P.—abbreviation for Krishikar Lok Party. Seven were members of the Praja-Socialist Party, called P.S.P. Then—more important still—2 were dissidents from the Congress people who had been working with the Government right up to the end and I believe within probably two or three hours of the voting, they said they would cross over for this particular motion. And there were two dissidents from the Andhra Praja Party which normally functioned with the Congress, with the governing party. Then there were—again rather interesting—2 members who belonged to what are called the dissidents from the Communist Party. They were formerly members of the Communist Party. They had withdrawn from that Party, dissociated themselves from the activities of that party, but on this occasion they joined their old comrades and voted. There were others, Independents 5, 2 were Rayalseema Independents and 1 was a Scheduled Caste Federation gentleman.

So far as the other people were concerned, the Congress party and others who voted against the motion, they were altogether, as I said, 68. There were 51 members of the Congress Party. Five members of the Andhra Praja Party voted with them. There were 7 Independents. One member of the Praja-Socialist Party voted with the Government, one a K.L.P. dissident, and there were three others.

Now, on the 6th, this motion was carried and as I already told the

House, just within three hours, the Government tendered their resignation and their advice. The same afternoon, the P.S.P. issued a press statement and to that very effect they made their position clear to the Governor. This is the press statement:

“The alternative is either a successor government or re-election. A successor government cannot improve the stability of political life in Andhra.”

I will read that sentence again:

“A successor government cannot improve the stability of political life in Andhra. To bring conditions of peace and harmony in the political life of Andhra heterogeneous political groups and elements should be eliminated, and this has been long over-due. Good administration is ultimately one of the ends of a State and any attempt to form a government with a hotchpotch majority should be discouraged.”

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Was the Government ever a homogeneous one?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will have a chance.

DR. K. N. KATJU: This is the statement that was issued. There were seven members of the P.S.P. and if you deduct.....

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Andhra): May I know, Sir, if that statement was issued before or after these members met the Governor?

DR. K. N. KATJU: It was issued that afternoon, and when this gentleman, Mr. Raju, talked to the Governor, he stuck to that statement.

Very well. If you deduct 7 from the 69, the majority shrinks to 62. Then come 2 dissident Communists. They also issued a press statement. Mr. C. V. K. Rao said,

“The House has given the verdict that the ruling party is incompetent to administer the State. As things stand today, there is no alternative, —united opposition—which can take

the reins of government. All progressive forces in Andhra must be united to give a lead to Andhra for the betterment of the common man. I feel that the verdict of the people must be taken to form a stable government in Andhra State through general elections. No single party in Andhra today will be in a position to administer the State, the united front of all progressive forces must alone give the lead to the country."

And that means that 2 more go and the majority is reduced to 60. Then, Sir, so far as the.....

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal): What an account!

DR. K. N. KATJU: Then come the K.L.P. gentlemen. Of that party, Mr. Lachanna's contention was also that. He added further that he could not say at present if his party would or would not join a Government formed by the Communists and others. He added that assuming that the Opposition were not given a chance to form a Government, he would in no circumstance countenance a caretaker Government. That is a matter of importance.

Under the constitutional practice recognised in England, the outgoing government, when it is defeated on a motion of no-confidence can go to the King—the head of the State—and say, "Well, we advise you to dissolve the Parliament. We want to go over the head of this Parliament to the people, to the electorate, and then the question will be decided whether we have the confidence of the electorate or not." And normally, according to the constitutional practice, usage and accepted doctrine, that advice is accepted. Here, in the case of Andhra, the outgoing Ministry advised that there should be dissolution. They had also made it clear, Sir, in so many words, having regard to the conditions in the Assembly there, they would not remain in Government, that they

would in no circumstances, form a caretaker Government. Now, what was the Governor to do? So far as the other groups were concerned, it is a matter of common knowledge. I make no statement on my own authority, that so far as their members were concerned, there was nothing in common between the Communists and the P.S.P. The Communist Party stands for one set of doctrines—good or bad. I am not going into that at all. And the P.S.P. stands for another set of principles. They call it the Gandhian philosophy, they believe in decentralisation, they believe in the village *raj*, and so on and so forth. There is nothing in common between them and the Communists, except that on this particular occasion, they found themselves in favour of the thing, there is nothing else, I do not know really, for it is not for us to pronounce upon their action, but if they believe in the Gandhian philosophy, the first dictum of that philosophy was complete abstinence from liquor, the enforcement of prohibition. But probably for some political purposes or other purposes, in Andhra, instead of there being prohibition, they felt there should be the reverse of prohibition. Anyway, the P.S.P. is out of the question.

Then there was the Krishikar Lok Party which said that they would like to wait and see. So far as the two dissidents of the Communist Party were concerned, they said that they would have nothing to do with them; then there were two dissidents from the Congress who had just walked over for the day and nothing else. So far as the Communist Party was concerned, it took up this position: It said, "Give us the chance. We are only 40 but we have got the plums of office which is very attractive and we will be able to put in a majority of patriotic people who will become Members, Officers and so on." I do not know whether the books are here but in another place, long passages were read, particularly by Members of the Communist Party, as to what the legal

[Dr K N Katju]

doctrine was I say that all that legal discussion is totally irrelevant here because the Constitution makers in India, through their wisdom and foresight, saw some such need, so far as the States were concerned and put in deliberately, article 356 Under this, if the Government breaks down and the President finds on a report received from the Governor or otherwise—because the responsibility is entirely that of the President and he may act upon information which he may gather from different sources—that it is not possible to carry on the Government in the normal manner, he may assume to himself all the powers What is the situation today? The President is not anxious to assume executive authority I may tell the House that the Delimitation Commission have now completed their work and have submitted their Report. The elections are going to be held some time in February and I do hope that within two or three months, at the outside, the verdict of the electorate will be known and Andhra Desh will have its own Government according to the wishes, of the people, in the month of March Therefore, normal constitutional process will be restored at that time What do we want in between? Do we want that this State should be made the cockpit of politicians' endeavours, going this way and that and that there should be eternal chaos? I submit, Sir, that this was precisely the case for the operation of article 356 of the Constitution Majority opinion was in favour of general elections, as a matter of fact very likely some hon Members would say that they had been pressing for a general election for the last twelve months but that when matters came to a head elections had been ordered This will take place within three months but the whole point is, what is to be done in between? One suggestion was for a caretaker Government of all the parties That presupposes that there should be understanding between the parties to have an all-party caretaker Government The Congress Party says that it will

have nothing to do with a caretaker Government, the other parties say that they also will have nothing to do with a caretaker Government. There it ends but are you going to put up a minority party and ask it to form a caretaker Government? That will introduce chaotic conditions and I say further, that in conditions like these, there ought to be a convention that, in order to ensure fair, free and unfettered elections, in order to avoid any wrangling afterwards by different parties that the elections were not free, that Government's influence was being brought to bear upon the electorate, that the Government agency was being utilised, and so on and so forth, the Governor should be in charge to ensure that elections are completely above-board This way, the people will have a completely free voice and they may go wherever they like, vote in anybody's favour they like instead of allowing these party permutations and combinations and goings-about here and there. The Constitution has provided settled methods

The Proclamation, Mr Chairman, does not indicate a long Government here under these special circumstances The Governor will just carry on for three months under the directions of the President the day to day administration of the State The most urgent step to take for him is to make proper arrangements for holding elections

That is all that I have to say and I submit that this Resolution may be accepted by the House without much debate though I see that my hon. friend, the Leader of the Communist Party is very anxious to get up, probably to seek to demolish my case

MR CHAIRMAN Resolution moved

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 15th November, 1954, under clause (1) of article 356 of the Constitution assuming to himself all

the functions of the Government of Andhra”

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Sir, I beg to move

“That in the first line for the word ‘approves’ the words ‘considers unwarranted’ be substituted.”

“That for the original Resolution the following be substituted, namely.

“That this House having considered the President's Proclamation issued on the 15th November, 1954, under clause (1) of article 356 of the Constitution, assuming to himself all the functions of the Government of Andhra, is of the opinion that sufficient efforts should have been made by the Governor of Andhra to call upon the Leader of Opposition in Andhra Assembly to form a Government before the President assumed to himself all the functions of the Government of Andhra”

MR CHAIRMAN The Resolution and the amendments are before the House for discussion. I will ask Mr. Sundarayya to speak, I hope the discussion will be restrained and relevant

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA Mr Chairman, I rise to oppose the Proclamation of the President taking over the administration of the Andhra State

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V K DHAGE) in the Chair]

Dr Katju has just given us some mathematical calculations, some quotations, and such other things to prove the necessity of the President having to take over the administration of Andhra. Dr Katju pooh-poohed the Leader of the Opposition in the Andhra Assembly—who happens to be leader of the Communist Party whom naturally the Congress and Dr Katju do not like—when he demanded his right to be called upon

to form the Government. Dr. Katju said that he wanted to take the plums of office, Dr Katju was much more vehement in the other House and used words such as ‘tomfoolery’ ‘insult to the Constitution’ and ‘mockery of the Constitution’, to describe the demand of the Leader of the Opposition to be called upon to form an alternative Government. In this connection, I would like the whole world, including Dr Katju, to know who is indulging in tomfoolery and bribery, who is insulting the Constitution and is making a mockery of the Constitution. I do say and I do indict that it is the Congress Party and the Congress Party alone that is responsible for this tomfoolery and bribery, for this mockery of the Constitution and for insulting the Constitution.

SHRI R U AGNIBHOJ (Madhya Pradesh) Question

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA I would like the hon Members to know what exactly the position is. I shall also give certain arithmetical figures as did Dr Katju. The position as it emerged out of the general elections in February 1952 was as follows. The Communists won 42 seats, 41 in the first elections and one in a by-election. Eight seats were captured by Independents with the active support of the Communist Party. They signed the pledge and said that they would abide by our condition to form a Government. They also said that they would never join the Congress in the formation of a Government. So, the eight Independents were elected on that understanding. The KMPP won 20 seats—it was the KMPP at that time—and Shri Prakasam told the public that the Congress was a rotting Party from which worms were coming out. That is the characterisation by a man whom you have taken into the Congress-fold. I want to know the morality of the Congress. Shri Prakasam said, at that time, that the Congress was rotting and he also said that worms were coming out of it. He further told the

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

public that, in those circumstances, he would have nothing to do with the Congress—rather, he would fight the Congress—and that he would, along with other progressive parties—in which naturally the rotting corpse is not a progressive party—form a Government. He said this before the public in many places to defeat the worst Congress leaders who indulged in all kinds of atrocities in Andhra for three years. On an individual basis, fifteen more seats were captured with Communist support. The figures are there and they can be seen. According to this, what is the position. The position is that 65 out of 140 people won either through Communist influence or through its support. Six people were at that time on the Socialist ticket. Out of the 140 seats, the Congress could just scrape through with only 40 seats; the Independents who won, won against the Congress Party, not against the Communist Party. They did not win against the Krishikar Lok Party, did not win against the Praja-Socialist Party. They won against the Congress. That means they appealed to the people that the Congress is a decaying party, that the Congress is a reactionary party, that it has betrayed the trust that the people reposed in it, that the Congress has broken all the pledges that it gave to the people and that therefore the Congress should not be returned. It is on the pledges that the other parties gave them that the people elected them. But what happened afterwards you all know. I do not want to go back to the year 1952, when Andhra was only a part of the Madras State, to show what these Congress people had done there in this regard and in respect of other matters. That will be a long long story. So I confine myself to the formation of the Andhra State itself and to the elections wherein the Congress had got only 40 seats in a House of 140, and ask: How is it that it was called to form the Ministry? How is it that it got the bogus majority by which Dr. Katju again and again swears? Sir, how did it come

to it? First of all, the Governor, who was appointed by the Congress Government here, who was a civilian, who has no political background except the background of a civilian, thought it his duty to call the Congress Leader to form the Ministry. I would like here to point out to the House that in the Madras State, when the composite State was there, when all the opposition groups with 166 members to support them joined and approached the Governor of Madras, Shri Sri Prakasa, the Governor, said: I am not going to recognise the combination of groups. I am going to call that party which in the elections emerged as the largest single party, if not the absolute majority party, the biggest party. The Congress at that time had a strength of 155 in Madras. It was on that principle that Shri Rajaji, who came not by election but by nomination to the Legislative Council, was called to form the Ministry. With the Governor calling him to form the Ministry, Rajaji was able to win over other groups and form the Madras Ministry. Then why was not the same principle followed in Andhra State? When the Andhra State was formed, why did not you call the largest party elected by the electorate, the Communist Party with 42 seats with 8 Independents pledging their support to the Communist Party, which pledge was given openly to the electorate, to form the Ministry there? It was not done because it did not suit the Congress Government here to form the Ministry there on democratic principles by which they swear. Therefore they adopted a new principle according to which today the Communists have got only 42 whereas the Congress has got 51 seats. How did the Congress get 51? Because it gained the Independents who were not with us but who before the people pledged that they will be against the Congress; they have gained those Independents from Rayalaseema from Vizag district, who before the people pledged that they will fight the Congress, but after promising the people like this, after they got elected, they joined the Congress for plums of office. That is why

they got 51 when the Congress Party was called to form the Ministry. Now I would ask Is it justified? Is it moral? You had one principle in Madras State where you said that that party which had the biggest number in the election should be called to form the Ministry. Now as it came to the question of Andhra, now when you find that you were only 40 as against the Communist 50, you induced the Independents to come into your fold though the latter pledged to the electorate that they were out to fight the Congress. Now you gave them the Congress ticket, promised offices to their relatives and took them into the Congress fold and then formed the Ministry. What morality is this? Who indulged in this tomfoolery and bribery? It is the Congress Party that supported this tomfoolery and not the Communist Party. I can very well understand Sir, that when the electorate does not return one party in absolute majority, it is just proper democratic procedure to have a coalition Government of different groups and different parties who are prepared to accept an agreed programme and who will abide by that programme and work it. But Congress does not do that thing. The Congress not only does not do that thing, it wants to keep the whole power into its own hand and for that it refuses to form coalitions and the worst way in which the Congress deals is this thing. That is why Dr Katju has praised the Praja-Socialist Party. Yes, he can praise it because he wants to woo them. Let him do so. We have no objection. But let me inform Dr Katju that the leader of the Praja Socialist Party, Shri Ashok Mehta in the other House called the tactics of the Congress not only undemocratic politics but political piracy. Yes. What did they do? They did not as a minority Congress Party approach the Praja-Socialist Party. They did not approach the Krishikar Lok Party to come and form along with them a coalition Government. They did not have that morality. They did not have the courtesy to do it. They did not have such an alliance on the basis of an

agreed programme. But what did they do? They promised Shri Prakasam who only a few days back said that the Congress was a rotting dunghill from which the worms were coming out, and offered him Chief Ministership and thus enticed him away from the PSP. This is the Congress morality. Then along with him certain other people also from the P.S.P. joined the Congress. Thus the P.S.P. got split. A section came under Shri Viswanatham called the Praja Party, another section continued as the P.S.P. and yet another section joined as Associate Members the Congress. This is how the Congress morality worked at that time. They did not stop with this Party. They went to the Krishikar Lok Party and they said to them. Let us form a coalition. The K.L.P. however believed in the Congress word and they now reaping the result of their belief in the Congress morality. The K.L.P. which before the elections said that they were going to fight the Congress was, on account of its vacillating attitude in the Madras State, the composite Madras State, the factor which enabled Rajaji to form the Ministry there, and the same K.L.P. said here: Yes, we believe in your work. Let us join hands with you. And they joined as Associate Members. But for the Congress even the surrender on the part of the K.L.P. was not enough. They wanted to liquidate the K.L.P. After taking them in as Associate Members and when the question of the formation of the Ministry came the K.L.P. group suggested Shri Lachanna as their nominee as Minister but the Congress Leader did not want Shri Lachanna as a Minister because he thought that Shri Lachanna at least in some cases might not toe their line. Therefore they said that they would take Shri Thumma Reddi as a Minister. On that issue the K.L.P. split and one section went to the Congress. This is Congress morality, this is Congress democracy. They gave Chief Minister's post to Shri Prakasam, made Shri Thumma Reddi a minister and thus broke two parties. They won over

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

Rokkam Narasimha Rao, an Independent of Vizag district, who had a following of 4 or 5, by appointing his brother Shri Rammohan Rao, the Superintending Engineer of Highways by bypassing the senior Engineer, Shri S. Sayaji Rao, whose right it was to be promoted as such. They bypassed him and they promoted the junior engineer because he happened to be the brother of Shri Rokkam Narasimha Rao and thus the Congress got the five votes of Rokkam Narasimha Rao's group. This is how they got on.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan):
Even High Court Judges.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Yes, they can even offer the posts of Governors or they can offer key posts in their factories. That is a different matter. This is how the Congress got its Ministry formed. Even then they were not assured of a majority. So they started the worst of the political games, of disrupting the unity of the Andhra people by rousing regional feelings in them and making one corner of Andhra to fight another. Any sensible man with any political integrity would have thought that the new Andhra State has come and every effort should be made to see that the new State functions properly.

In deciding the question of capital any sensible man who has got any knowledge of Andhra would have selected the most central place for its capital which would be within the reach of every section but the Congress Party did not care for the Andhra nation. The Congress Party did not care for the development of the people of Andhra. The Congress Party did not care for the unity of India either. They want to rouse regional feelings; they want to rouse communal feelings and that is why they selected Kurnool as the capital because they thought by locating the capital at Kurnool they could get the support of the Rayalaseema Congressites. They put the Rayalaseema people

as against Sircar people, as against the rest of Andhra. In Rayalaseema there are 50 lakhs of people and they want to pit these 50 lakhs against the 150 lakhs. They also raise the slogan Reddy vs. Khamma. They say, if you want to change from Kurnool to any centralised place, then Khamma domination will come and Reddy domination will go. These are facts that cannot be controverted by anybody who knows anything about Andhra. They selected Kurnool. Even the Congress Press itself and the whole population was against this. They condemned this as anti-national and as disrupting the unity, but the Congress went on. When the Assembly met to decide the question as to where the Andhra capital is to be located, then the Congress adopted another tactics. Now, they said, that Kurnool is only temporary up to 1955, April 1st or perhaps June or October 1st. And then they will change it to Vizag. And why Vizag? Because they want to get the Independents from Vizag to support them. First they fixed Kurnool to get the Rayalaseema people to support them. And when they were faced with defeat, they wanted to divide the rest of the vote. When they said that after 1955 they will take the capital to Vizag, the poor Vizag M.L.As. voted with them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not all.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Of course, not all. When this question came up and when vote was taken, the Communists and other people said, "This is disrupting unity. It should be in a central place at Vijayawada or Guntur. Why change it from one corner of Andhra to another extreme corner?" This is not the way the capital question should be tackled. When we said that, the Congress Government kept silent. Can you understand a party like this? It was their own proposition that the capital should be shifted. But they kept silent and they did not demand a division. So this is what they did with regard to the capital question but even then the Government was not sure in its seat.

Then there was the question of High Court. Since they had already decided Kurnool to be a temporary capital till Visala Andhra came into being, Guntur which is the central place for Andhra should have been chosen for locating the High Court. They did not want that, because they wanted to satisfy the Vizag and Srikakulam M.L.As. There were 20 or 25 of them. Therefore they said, "We will take the High Court to Vizag."

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): Are we discussing the location of the capital of Andhra or the transfer of Andhra to the care of the President?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Certain Congress people do not like realities to be spoken. I am only tracing who is indulging in tomfoolery and bribery and who is indulging in the mockery of the Constitution, who is offering insult to the Constitution. And that is exactly why I say that this proclamation by the President is unconstitutional and as such should not be accepted by this House. And to marshal my facts, I am saying all these things. To get the Rayalaseema M.L.As. they had the capital at Kurnool and to get the Srikakulam and Vizag M.L.As. they wanted to take the High Court to Vizag. But when the question came up, the majority went against them and the High Court had to be shifted to Guntur and not to Vizag. This is how the Congress went on playing region against region, community against community.

Not only that, Sir. Now, take the question of University. There is already the Andhra University. The whole of the Andhra, even the Congress Press and the whole of the intelligentsia said, let all the education be combined in the Andhra University. If you want more colleges, let them be opened. If you want residential universities to provide education of all sorts we have no objection. But do not divide education; do not divide the intelligentsia of Andhra; do not divide the students

on the basis of region—Rayalaseema vs. Sircars. But again the Congress said, no. Tirupati should have an affiliating university confined to Rayalaseema and Nellore districts. This is how they split. They want to split the intellectual life of Andhra, the student life of Andhra, the social life of Andhra. Even the Congress members revolted against this kind of thing. They promised certain things. They said for two years Tirupati university will be a residential university. After two years we will see. This is the trick by which the Congress Government keeps itself in power.

Then, I will come to the question of prohibition itself. Dr. Katju was very eloquent on this question as if the Government had been defeated on this question of prohibition. He wanted to show that the Communists and other people were those who wanted to encourage drinking habits and who wanted Andhra to be made a nation of drunkards. If his idea is to raise this kind of bogey, then he is entirely mistaken. The way in which the Congress Government is implementing prohibition, it will never succeed in this country. What has actually happened? Ramamurthy is not a Communist. Patti Satyanarayana Rao who is another member of the Ramamurthy Committee—he is a retired judge—is not also a Communist. These people went to all places and enquired from Congressmen, from the intelligentsia and from all others and what was the conclusion they came to? It was that instead of prohibition being a success, there was in every village and in every town more and more distilleries coming into existence. It has become a flourishing industry backed by the landlords, backed even by some of the Congress people themselves, with a share for all the different officials from top to bottom. Better do away with this corruption. Do not think you are making a success of prohibition. If you want really prohibition, the first thing to be done is to increase the standard of life of the people, so

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]
that people won't go to these alcoholic drinks but will take to better and healthy drinks. Without doing that, you not only introduce prohibition which is a total failure but you have created unemployment among the 20 lakhs of toddy tappers. They have been unemployed now for the past seven years. You have been promising employment for them all these seven years—to these 20 to 30 lakhs of toddy tappers.

Now, they appeal to the Gandhian ideology. I think the Congress Party should be ashamed to take the name of Gandhiji. Do not bring in Gandhiji's name whenever you are in the soup. If you really want to venerate Gandhiji—whatever the political difference—if you want to venerate Gandhiji's personal life, at least do not bring in Gandhiji for all your stupid things. Gandhiji was against drinking but not in the way in which you are implementing it. You want to bring in Gandhian ideology to woo the Praja Socialist Party. "You also say Gandhism, you also follow Gandhian ideology. Why did you join with those Communists, those devils, why did you join with those people and destroy the Congress Government, that beautiful Congress Government that was there in Andhra?" This is the funniest way of argument. On the question of 'prohibition' I would like to say this. In January 1954—three months after the Andhra State had been formed—when the Budget was being discussed, a cut motion on 'excise' came up. Then they staved off their defeat on the question. Then and there they said: "We are thinking of appointing a commission" and the few individuals who were about to vote against the Government were kept back and thus they staved off their defeat. In January 1954, those who were promising that "we are appointing an enquiry committee, this enquiry committee whatever it recommends we are going to carry them out"—a solemn pledge given in the Assembly, did not keep

their word. They appointed the enquiry committee and that enquiry committee unanimously recommended the scrapping of prohibition—of course, they said free ration of foreign liquor and free tapping for certain purposes which is nothing but scrapping the whole thing. Now, the Assembly again assembled to discuss these things. The Congress Government promised that in the Assembly they would bring a resolution to discuss that subject. They refused to do it. Then a no-confidence motion is tabled against it. Then they say, "We will discuss it." Then, when they put the discussion—it is an official day, let us put it on record, it is an official day, it is not a non-official day—a resolution is moved, of course, by a non-official person. But Shri Prakasam, on behalf of the Government, said: "Let this resolution be taken on the official day itself, because this is a question in which the Government itself is interested." Now, the debate goes on. The vote is taken. The overwhelming majority is in favour of implementing the Ramamurthy Committee's recommendations. The Government does not challenge a division, it accepts without any division. The whole House accepts that the Ramamurthy Committee's proposals should be implemented. Then, as soon as the Assembly rises, the Deputy Chief Minister, the Leader of the Congress Party, Shri Sanjiva Reddy, says: "No, I am not going to implement the Assembly's decision." Who is insulting the Constitution? Who is making a mockery of the Constitution? Is it Shri Sanjiva Reddy, the leader of the Congress party, or is it the Communists who made a mockery of the Constitution? You promise before the Assembly that you are going to carry out the Ramamurthy Committee's proposals—you move it on an official day making it an official agenda—the Assembly overwhelmingly votes to implement it, members including Congressmen—and you don't even dare to challenge a division on that. And immediately after that, as soon as the Assembly disperses, you go about and say that

you are not going to implement the Assembly's decision. This has been said before the people of Andhra, before the M.L.As. of Andhra. Mr. Sanjiva Reddy later on said: "If you have got the majority; bring a no-confidence motion; otherwise, we are not going to implement." This is Congress morality; this is the way Congress interprets the Constitution. On five occasions, on five issues the Government gets defeated and the only answer Shri Sanjiva Reddy gave was: "If you want us to get out of the Government, bring a no-confidence motion; otherwise, whatever you say, whatever you decide, we are not bound to implement." Who is insulting the Constitution? Who is making a mockery of the Constitution? I would like Dr. Katju, the great constitutionalist that he is, to answer this question—who insulted the Constitution, who made a mockery of the Constitution? That is why before the people of Andhra, before the Andhra Assembly, there was no other go except to take up the challenge, to take up the challenge with this Government which had been floored again and again in the Assembly, which was unfit to carry on even a single moment, and that was why the no-confidence motion was brought forward. Sir, when this no-confidence motion was moved, it was passed by one vote. In fact, the Congress Government would not have lasted even the thirteen months, had it not always threatened: "If you vote against us, there will be Governor's rule. We will dissolve the Assembly." It was the fear of dissolution of the Assembly that kept the unity of the Congress. It was this that kept the few independents, who for thirty pieces of silver sold their souls, sold their own promises to the people and joined the Congress because they were afraid that when they went back to the electorate the people would give them a fitting reply for betraying the election pledges. That was why they wanted to stick to the Congress and, therefore, whenever Shri Sanjiva Reddy was in difficulties, he always said: "Either you

stand by us or I am going to dissolve the Assembly." In spite of this fear—you must understand the significance of this defeat of the Congress—in spite of the threat hanging "If you defeat us, there will be Governor's rule and the Assembly will be dissolved"—in spite of these if the no-confidence motion was carried, it shows what tremendous popular pressure, popular opinion was there against this open mockery, open insult, open negation of the Constitution practised by the Congress.

Sir, now the same question with regard to waste land also came up. First the Government opposed it. In two sessions they defeated us. In the third session, once again, we brought the motion and the Government found that an overwhelming majority was against them. Therefore, they accepted it, but in implementing it they exempted half of it from the land. The remaining half they said, in the name of distributing to the poor people, distribute to poor political sufferers. We have no objection to distributing land even to political sufferers, but in the name of the poor political sufferers, Congress landlords are being given land. It is this way that the Congress runs the administration.

Now, Sir, if the Ministry has been defeated, what is wrong if the Opposition Leader, a leader of the largest party elected to the Assembly, a leader who has 42 persons behind him and 8 independents behind him, what is wrong for such a party to demand, as the Leader of Opposition, that he be called and be given a chance to form a Ministry? What is wrong about it? How is it tomfoolery or bribe? How is it distributing offices and other things? How is it an insult and a mockery of the Constitution? What is the practice in the British Parliament?

Of course, there are long quotations and other things in the other House which are very, very inconvenient for Dr. Katju to answer. Now, he says "I am not going to quote it"—because

[Shri P. Sundarayya]

it is useless to quote all these precedents. Because for you it is not convenient, let us argue on the basis of article 356 of the Constitution itself. Has the Constitution broken down according to article 356? I say 'No', in spite of Dr. Katju saying 'Yes', because his arithmetic is very funny. I do not know where he learnt because most probably he must have forgotten his principles of arithmetic. It must have been a long time since he learnt this thing. Sir, he started taking it from 69, and then minus two and so on.

1 P.M.

Now, I will make him know to calculate arithmetic in a different way. Sir, true, we were 40 Communist Party members at that time

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): Mr. Sundarayya, will you take some more time?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I will certainly take more time

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): Then you can continue after lunch. The House stands adjourned till 2-30 in the afternoon.

The House adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House re-assembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, the Vice-Chairman (SHRI V. K. DHAGE) in the Chair

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE RE ISSUE OF A NOTICE BY LOK SABHA FOR INTRODUCING THE ANDHRA BILL.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Before we proceed, I would like a question of the privilege of this House being taken up, as also the contempt that is being shown to our Constitution itself, because here is a Notice issued by the Secretariat of the Lok Sabha dated the 26th November giving a list of business for that House, Item No. 2 "Dr. K. N. Katju to move for leave to

introduce a Bill to confer on the President the powers of the Andhra State Legislature to make laws and also to introduce the Bill." This I got just now. I want to draw your attention as well as that of the House to the gross contempt that is being shown by the secretariat of the other House to this House as well as to our Constitution. The Constitution clearly lays down that the President's proclamation must be approved by both the Houses of Parliament, and till the proclamation is approved by both the Houses, the question of investing the President with those powers does not arise. When we are still discussing this matter and in fact long before this question was moved in our House, this notice had been issued. I want you to take note of this and give your ruling.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): Is it from the Lok Sabha or from this House?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Lok Sabha.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): I will look into this matter and in the meanwhile, Mr. Sundarayya will proceed with his speech.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Tomorrow we will take up this question of the privilege of this House and the contempt that has been shown to this House as also to our Constitution.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): Is the hon. Member fixing tomorrow for this, or is the Chair doing it?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: We will deal with this tomorrow. Contempt has been shown to this House and it is our responsibility to whichever party we belong, to safeguard and uphold the privilege of this House and our Constitution. I would have liked Dr. Katju to be present and to have heard him on the way he himself and his Ministry are treating the Constitution.