

**RESOLUTION RE: PRESIDENT'S
PROCLAMATION ON ANDHRA—
continued**

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I would like to debunk the arithmetic of Dr. Katju. I have got a long list of cases of corruption just to maintain the Congress Government in Andhra, but I do not want to go into details, because then I would be taking not another half an hour but perhaps another half a day. Only one glaring instance I would give. Against another Reddy—because Sanjiva Reddy is a Reddy—because of his corruption, a tribunal was appointed to go into his conduct. He said he would like to go into the records of the Tribunal, and in so doing he destroyed certain documents. He was caught red-handed.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Hyderabad): On a point of order, Sir, are we investigating this matter? How is this within the purview of this resolution?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: It is relevant because the Opposition has been charged with corruption, tomfoolery and bribery, and my point is that it is not the Opposition which is so, but the Congress whose champion Dr. Katju is. He has had the audacity to fling that charge against the Opposition Party. Sir, I would have liked the person who indulged in it to be present now.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): I would like no references to persons who are not members of this House, because they will have no opportunity to defend themselves, but the hon. Member can certainly have his case put up in an indirect manner.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: That is exactly what I am doing. I am putting it indirectly. I am not mentioning the names, but if Dr. Katju challenges me on this, I am prepared to give the names. They are all in

my record here. It is the Congress Ministry that indulged in this tomfoolery, bribery, communalism and regionalism disrupting the whole life of the Andhra people.

Let me now go into the arithmetic of Dr. Katju and show how a majority that overthrew the Government was ultimately reduced to a minority by Dr. Katju's mathematics of subtractions. I will proceed in another way. The number of Communist members was 42. Then there were five people who were elected on the Communist Party ticket and had pledged that they would support the Communist Party and who later formed themselves into the United People's Movement. Dr. Katju quoted the statement of one person, Mr. C. V. K. Rao, that since the Government had been overthrown, an alternative Government should be formed and for that the best way was to dissolve the Assembly. Another colleague of his in that five-man group, Mr. Rokkam Narasimha Rao, said that the Opposition should be called in and given an opportunity to form the Government and he would support any coalition. Dr. Katju has quoted the statement which is most convenient to him. The Leader of the Opposition in Andhra said, "You call me to form the Government. You have already dispersed the Assembly. You re-assemble it. In three days I will face the Assembly with my list of Ministers." Why could not the Governor see whether the Opposition had a majority or not? Why should he arrogate to himself the ability of judging whether the Opposition had a majority or not. That would have showed whether this group of five would vote with the Opposition. Our submission was that these five people would have solidly voted with us, whatever differences we might have with them in certain minor matters. The leader of the five independents who voted with the Government against the no-confidence

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]
 motion, Mr. Rokkam Narasimha Rao, issued a statement after the Ministry had fallen, "I am prepared to support any coalition Ministry." Why did not Mr. Trivedi, the Governor of Andhra, take note of it? Why did not Dr. Katju take note of it? I take it that he knows only the arithmetic of subtraction and not of addition. That would have made our number 52. The Scheduled Caste Federation Member, elected with our support, will always be with us, had been strongly with us during the last three years, in spite of the many money bags offered to him to win him over. That brings the number to 53. Then there are the two Rayalaseema independents who voted against the Government and who had been elected with our support. They are still with us, and with them our number comes up to 55. Then there is the P.S.P. Two of them—Mr. Subba Tata Raju and Mr. P. Suryachandra Rao—who were elected with our support, would not have voted against us. Similarly Mr. M. V. Subba Reddy and Mr. Siddanne Goud both P.S.P. members, who voted against the Government, would not have voted against us. Then there are the Praja Party Members who voted against the Government and who were solidly with us.

This makes about 61 to 65. I don't stop even there. If 65 is not enough to form a Ministry out of 140, then I would like to bring to the notice of this house the statement of Shri P. V. G. Raju, the Leader of the P.S.P. whom Dr. Katju was at such great pains to woo—and he is wooing him even now—he may or may not succeed—but what is the statement which he made on the floor of the Assembly? He said, "We will tolerate a Communist Government as we have tolerated the Congress Government and as long as the Communist Government carries on a socialistic programme, we will not vote against them". I am not actually quoting his words but the sense is that. Not only that. The Ministry

was defeated on the 6th and the voting took place at 5 P.M. On the 7th morning just before he went to the Governor he told us that he was going to abide by his stand which he had taken. He was not going to join the Ministry but he was not going to vote against the Ministry till he judged by its action whether it required the support or was to be overthrown. It can be understood logically because, the P.S.P. has got a theory of equidistance or a theory of irrelevance—whatever you may call it and so they stand by it. He said that they would judge the Ministry and then only they would vote. Why did you take those 7 or 8 votes of the P.S.P. as going against us and as going to the Congress? You should have kept it as at least neutral. Then take the leader of the K.L.P., Shri Lachanna. Shri Trivedi says: "He is not prepared to join the Ministry but that he is still considering." All that he said, even according to the quotation is that he had not yet made up his mind whether to join the Ministry or not. He did not demand dissolution of the Assembly. In fact the statement made by him was, when he read in the papers that President had taken over, that 'it is nothing but murdering the democracy'. That is the statement he issued. So 65 plus 8, it comes to 73. With 8 Socialists as neutrals, 1 Assembly President already elected, when you have got 73 votes in a House of 139, is that not enough majority? This was the reality there and I would like to remind the House that Shri Raju had taken an entirely different stand on the floor of the House till he saw the Governor. It was only after he saw the Governor on the 7th November afternoon that he issued the statement that the Assembly must be dissolved and new elections should be called for. That is why we do charge that the Governor was not only not impartial but was totally partial to the Congress Party and he tried his best to see that the Opposition did not have an opportunity to form the Ministry.

I would like to say that not only we had got absolute majority from the election results in 1952 by the old process but even as per this statement on the 6th and 7th November by the various party leaders, by various individuals, if we had been called, we would have formed a more stable Government in Andhra. I would like to go into this question of stable Government. A stable Government can be formed by a coalition of different groups provided there is a common programme. I do say that we have no common ideology between the P.S.P., K.L.P. and the Communist Party. Somebody said "How could a common ideology have been forged?" as if the Congress has a common ideology with K.L.P., the P.S.P. and other groups. The only common ideology that has been forged during the last 3 years between the Congress and these various groups is the common ideology of offices and plums.

AN HON. MEMBER: Welfare of the people.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: That is a very big word which the Congress cannot use. Apart from this, I would like to know what is wrong with coalition Governments? What is wrong if various small groups join together on an agreed, on a common programme for the welfare of the people and carry it out? Is it distributing plums of office? Is all coalition Government taboo as per Dr. Katju's constitution and his theory of politics? It is very amazing. If that is so, I would like to put a pertinent question. How is it that they called the P.S.P. a group of 19 in a House of 118 in Travancore-Cochin and entrusted them with the formation of a Ministry? Of course it is a concealed coalition. Before the people in the office the P.S.P. of 19 is there and behind them the Congress might be there. We don't want this kind of coalition. We openly say 'Here are the various programmes on which we will agree and we are

prepared to face the Assembly.' Why did not the Governor take the constitutional position of calling the single majority party in the Andhra Assembly and entrust them with the formation of an alternative Ministry? Here I would like to go into details. British Constitution was quoted. There were long quotations and counter-quotations in the other House and all of us are aware of them. Dr. Katju was right in saying "Why do you go to the British practice? Let us go by our own practice." It is because they swear again and again by the British practice and in fact in our own Constitution it is laid down that the privileges and rights of both Houses would be the same as in the House of Commons. You had quoted that. All right, if you don't want to quote it, let us see the French practice. It is another Western democracy and it is not an Eastern democracy or People's democracy. It is a bourgeois democracy of the great French people. They have had coalition Governments again and again. A coalition Government may not last long, he says. Let it not last long. What is wrong. If a certain kind of coalition cannot carry on a programme which is satisfactory to the people, then certain groups secede. They will form another kind of group and carry on. In the French Constitution it is laid down that an elected assembly shall not be dissolved for 18 months or two years and later on the Government must be defeated twice and for the third time the Government cannot be formed, in which case only the President is allowed to dissolve the Assembly. Otherwise what happens is, whenever the executive thinks that this Assembly is not carrying out their wishes, they always use this sword of Damocles and say "We will dissolve the Assembly, go and face the electorate." They have got the money bags to back them and they think it is easy every time to throw us to the elections. We are not afraid, in spite of money bags, to face the elections. The Andhra

[Shri P. Sundarayya.] elections will show them where we are and where the Congress is. There is no need to pose now. But this power of dissolution of an elected assembly in one individual is most undemocratic. If the criterion is that unless an absolute majority comes in the elections, no party will be allowed to form a Ministry, then is it a new principle that they are laying down? That is not the principle by which they stood in the Madras Assembly. That is not the principle by which they stood in Travancore-Cochin either in 1952 or in 1954. It is not the principle on which they stood in Andhra also in 1954. Why is it that a new principle is being enunciated when they are forced to call the Leader of the Opposition? If you say that unless the people vote by majority, that party will have no right to form Ministry even in coalition with other groups, then I say that the Central Government itself, the Central Congress Government itself has no business to exist. It is unconstitutional according to their own principles. It is unfortunate in our country that only the Congress Party was there in the Constituent Assembly who made this Constitution and it is sanctified only by the Congress.....

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: This is an incorrect statement to make. Every group of political opinion was represented when the Constitution was being framed.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: No. And they formed a Constitution and the then existing temporary or provisional Parliament as it was called, passed an electoral law in which proportional representation was given the go by and by this a minority could capture office by an overwhelming number of seats, in the House of the People and in the local Legislative Assemblies. That is why in the Central Legislature, in this Parliament, though the Congress party got only 44 per cent.

of the votes, they could get 75 per cent. of the seats and now they have the audacity to say that unless a party has an absolute majority, it has no right to form a ministry. Similarly in the Travancore-Cochin State, and in the Andhra State, the Congress with an absolute minority—not even 30 per cent., even less than that—they could form ministries. But when the Communist Party in co-operation with other parties is prepared to form a ministry, then they fling the Constitution and say, you are not in a position to form a government. But this kind of argument will deceive no one. Sir, the crisis in Andhra is not a constitutional crisis. The crisis in Andhra is the crisis for the Congress Party and that crisis is affecting not only the Congress Party in Andhra, but it is corroding the whole of the All India Congress. That is why they wanted to dissolve the Assembly. But let me assure you, Sir, that in the elections, the Congress will not get an absolute majority, either in the number of seats or in the votes.

AN HON. MEMBER: You will see that.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR (Travancore-Cochin): Yes, we have seen in Travancore-Cochin, and we have seen in the Malabar elections also.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: And you will see it in Andhra.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): Yes, please proceed.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, the corruption, and tomfoolery and bribery and the insult and mockery of the Constitution, on the part of the Congress does not stop there. The Ministry resigned, but the Governor asked them to continue for some time. Dr. Katju has said that it is a very good precedent, for they did not form any caretaker Government, as in Travancore-Cochin because people might interpret it in other ways, that

it might influence the elections. They say in Andhra there is no caretaker Government and that it is a good constitutional precedent. But I ask, what is the difference between a Congress Ministry, a caretaker Government, and a Congress Governor and the Congress Central Government? It is all the same thing, whether a Congress Government is there or a local Congress Governor is there. The Central Congress Government is here and to say there will be more impartial elections there is not likely to deceive anyone. What is the difference between the two? There is only as much difference between them as between Tweedledum and Tweedledee. Please tell us what is the difference. I do not see any difference. On the top of it, you say there will be a very fair election. The results will show.

During the last one week, when the Ministry was allowed to stay on by the Governor there, do you know what are the Resolutions that they passed, all in preparation for the elections. Is not that huge army of Road Transport Officers and Development Officers who were appointed, disregarding all rules of the Government departments, disregarding every principle of appointment; is that not sufficient for them? I have got a whole list of such posts which they have created and filled against all rules of service and.....

AN HON. MEMBER: Could you give us the list of their names?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Yes, I am prepared to give it. The permit for one route is sold for Rs. 40,000 and so the value of one Road Transport Officer in Andhra, hon. Members can easily calculate for themselves. As if this is not enough, as if these Road Transport Officers were not enough, as if these Development Officers were not enough in Andhra, they have appointed 27 Deputy Panchayat Officers, saying that they want to build up new panchayats. The Ministry itself had

resigned and they had no business to pass any such order.

And then, these great apostles of prohibition, these great advocates of prohibition, these men who swear by the name of Mahatmaji, these Congress leaders, after they had resigned, they passed a Resolution—because they have to face the electorate—laying down the rules regarding prohibition, loosening the implementing of prohibition. Yes, these rules which they have passed actually loosen prohibition. They said that for getting foreign liquor, there is no necessity to get any medical certificate, you have only to apply and you will be given the permit to get the foreign liquor. I would like to know when did Gandhiji say that foreign liquor could be consumed freely, that there need be no medical certificate for getting it; that only Indian liquor should be prohibited? I would like to know in which writings of his has Gandhiji said that.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Which do you prefer, foreign or Indian?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I prefer neither.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Your Ministers prefer foreign liquor.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I am prepared to offer either to whoever wants it. But as I was saying, I want to know in which writing has Gandhiji said that if you want a licence for Indian liquor you should produce a medical certificate and for foreign liquor no such certificate is necessary? Sir, let us not be deceived by this kind of talk about prohibition, about helping the poor and all that. What they want is that the rich people should be able to purchase things just as they like, drink and dance and do anything, and for that no medical certificate is necessary. But it is necessary if the poor man who in his distress wants:

[SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA:] to go in for a cup of toddy. Then the Government comes in and says it is a sin, it is against Gandhiji's teaching, against the Congress ideology, that it goes against everything that is human and all that. Please do not preach this Congress morality for heaven's sake. The people are not going to be taken in by that. But the elections are coming and so they want to deceive the Andhra people. For the last two years they are pitting the Tungabhadra High Level Channel scheme against the Nandikonda project, though the latter would irrigate as much as 40 lakh acres, though it is the basis on which we wanted the Andhra State to be formed. These Congressmen to keep up their parochialism, to keep up their regionalism, they pit Tungabhadra High Level Channel against the Nandikonda project though the former cultivates only some 5 lakh acres, and though it could be constructed between the Mysore and Andhra Governments and the famine relief funds of the Central Government. This is a small scheme and could be taken up with the money coming from the Central Government for famine relief or from the money coming from the Mysore Government. But they have pitted this Tungabhadra High Level Channel project against the Nandikonda project. But what do they actually say? They say, "We have recommended the Nandikonda project to the Central Government." But the Central Government comes forward and says, "No".....

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Sir, there is no Minister present in the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are afraid of the Opposition.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Unless the Minister is there, we refuse to proceed.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ: But the Parliamentary Secretary is there.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Why even that? The Congress Members are there. Sir, we must register our very strong protest against this. It is an important debate for the whole of democracy in one State has been smashed and the Minister is not prepared to come here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Order, order

ANOTHER HON. MEMBER: Who are you to call "Order order"?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): The Minister took my permission just now to go out. He will be coming in a minute. In the meantime, the Parliamentary Secretary is taking down notes. Since I have permitted him and since the Parliamentary Secretary is here taking down notes, I think you can proceed.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Then, can I digress to some other point? After all what is the use of my continuing on this point when the Minister is not here?

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): The whole of the hon. Member's speech is a digression.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): The Chair cannot direct as to the manner in which you should take up your speech.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I would like to point out that the Congress Government said up to the last that they had recommended the Nandikonda Scheme to the Central Government.

Here, Shri Jai Sukh Lal Hathi, the Deputy Minister for Irrigation and Power, says that no such report has ever come. There is another Minister who comes and says that they had sent it but that the Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission was doing the mischief as he was against the Nandikonda project. On top of all this, the

Congress Governor says that the Andhra Ministry did not send any such report, that it is all wrong and that the whole matter was under consideration. This is the way in which they want to approach the people. I would like to ask Dr. Katju as to who is playing tomfoolery, who is bribing and who is insulting the Constitution? Since Dr. Katju was not here when I raised the point about the notice, I would like to repeat, for his benefit. In view of the notice that has been given there, who is making a mockery of the Constitution? Who is offering insults? Is it the other parties or is it the Home Ministry itself when it has thought it proper to circulate to the other House as its business, on 26-11-1954,—before this House has passed the Resolution approving of the Proclamation—a Bill investing the legislative powers of the Andhra State in the President? Is it constitutionally correct or, is it because he cares a twopence, as he said, which party wins?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: On a point of information, Sir, what is the notice about? We do not understand what the situation is.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I read it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): Mr. Sundarayya referred to the point and I said that it will be looked into. Mr. Sundarayya is repeating it for the benefit of the hon. Minister who was not here at that time.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: This House is not seized of the notice.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): All that will be looked into by the Chairman. And I think just a passing reference may be made by him and he may come to his main point.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Then there was no necessity to refer to it at all.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I would like to ask Dr. Katju whether that was in consonance with the Constitution to disregard this House, to disregard the Constitution which says that a proclamation should be approved by both the Houses, and is it right, before both the Houses have approved of the Proclamation, to give notice of a Bill investing the President with the powers of the Andhra Legislature? Is it right? Is it constitutional? Is it not insulting the Constitution? Is it not making a mockery of the Constitution to give notice of a motion to move a Bill investing the President with the powers of the Andhra Legislature before both the Houses have approved of the Proclamation? It may be said that they may not care because they are so sure of their absolute majority and that after all the discussion in this House, was only a formality. They may be dead certain that the Proclamation will be approved.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): May I ask for some information?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: On what basis, Sir, is he asking for information? Is it a point of order? I am not yielding.

This is the way in which the Congress Government had been functioning which has been, from the beginning till the end, setting at naught the whole of the Constitution which they themselves made. It means that by hook or crook they want the Congress to be in power in the Centre as well as in all the States and, therefore, by the Constitution by which they have got this huge majority, they want to twist it as they like, whenever they like only to suit their needs, thus setting at naught the British practice of Parliamentary democracy, the French practice of Parliamentary democracy. In spite of all this, they say that we should swear by the Congress democracy. We are not prepared to swear by the Congress democracy; Dr. Katju, the

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

Home Minister, said that the Opposition parties had said, "Either call upon us to form a Government or else dissolve the Assembly". We never said that. When you had decided to dissolve the Assembly then the slogan that we raised was, "We are going to the people and we will tell the people—'last time you have voted against the Congress. Out of 140 seats the Congress got only 40.'.....

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, will there be no time limit? There are only two hours left.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: No time limit was laid down.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): This is a Resolution for approving the President's Proclamation and, on a Resolution like this, there is no time limit fixed, but I would suggest that Mr. Sundarayya may wind up and economise in the time as there are others also who would like to speak.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I would certainly have taken the Chair's advice and normally would have economised my speech but the way in which this Government is treating this House does not help the situation. They are so very cocksure that they will be able to pass this Resolution by five today that they have given notice in the other House of a Bill investing the President with all the powers of the Andhra Legislature. In the circumstances I would like to take as much time as possible.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: That notice is always subject to the provisions of the Constitution and to the passing by this House of this Resolution.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Where has that been stated? I did not see that in that notice.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): I think there need be no

further discussion on the point of the notice of the Agenda of the Lok Sabha. As I said, the Chairman will look into the question. Let Mr. Sundarayya proceed with the speech; otherwise we shall not be able to carry on with the debate here.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Dr. Katju says that we should swear by the Indian democracy. I certainly swear by the Indian democracy but not by the democracy that the Congress preaches. We never said that either we should be called upon to form the Government in Andhra or that the Legislature should be dissolved. We did not say that; we have been, from the beginning, saying that once the Ministry was defeated, the Leader of the Opposition, as the Leader of the first party in Andhra, as the Leader of the biggest single party in the Assembly, should have been asked to form the Government. We also said that if we were given the chance, we would face the Assembly in three days.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ: With a one-third majority?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: If the Congress can rule with 40, we can certainly rule with 50. In Travancore-Cochin, if a party with 19 Members can rule, we certainly can rule with 50. Do not go on in that way. If you can rule the whole of India with 44 per cent. of the votes then certainly we can rule in Andhra with 50 Members. Let us not go into arithmetical calculations; we have got plenty of them and we know them very well. When Dr. Katju made this same statement that we wanted either to be asked to form the Government or else wanted the Assembly to be dissolved, a Member of our Party challenged him and also denied such a statement. Nowhere did we make such a statement and once again I say that we have not made any such statement. When the President, on the wrong advice given by

the Home Ministry (*Interruption*)—it is also the Ministry for States, Home and States—

AN HON. MEMBER: Ministry of Home Affairs, not Home.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: It does not matter; I am not very particular about Home or Home Affairs. This does not make much difference.

When the President decided to take over the administration, the slogan we raised was that there should be a caretaker Government to assure fair elections. Now, Dr. Katju comes and says, "How can there be a caretaker Government? The Congress and the Communist parties do not see eye to eye with each other. They are not prepared to sit in the same Cabinet. There is no love lost between the P.S.P. and the Communist Party—their ideologies are different. How can there be agreement? The K.L.P. have not made up their mind whether to be in the caretaker Government or not." Of course, today he read the statement of the Leader of the K.L.P. before the Governor, most probably. The representative of the K.L.P. says that that statement is wrong. He will reply to this. I do not know from where these documents come. It is another matter whether all the parties are prepared to join in the caretaker Government or not. Now you want to set up a new convention. Then why not one convention and that is if a Ministry is defeated there can be a caretaker Government of all parties till the next elections are over? Agreed. But why do you want a Governor to be the dictator? Why do you want the President's rule to be dictatorial? Do you think one man's rule will be assuring more fair elections than would be the case under a caretaker Government? It will be a Government of all the parties for a temporary period without formulating any new policy. It should be there at least to guarantee and to see that free elec-

tions are there; it will be composed of all the parties that are represented in the Assembly. Why can't you do that? Did you at least make an effort to form a caretaker Government? No. You did not make even an effort. If after making an effort, if certain parties do not agree to come in let them not. The Congress Party would not like to be there. What does it matter? They have their own Governor and they have their own Central Government. But this is the solution that a caretaker Government of all parties should be in office till the next elections are over. Why do I say that caretaker Government is absolutely essential? Even when you dissolve the Assembly, if the Ministry is defeated, if you want fair elections to be held and if you want to give assurance to the people and give confidence to the people that the elections are going to be really free and not going to be weighted against one party or other, then the appointment of a caretaker Government of all parties is the minimum that should be done. But, Sir, you have not even thought it proper to examine it and to do all these things. Sir, Dr. Katju in the other House said: I will give you an assurance that the elections will be free, that the elections will be fair and will be held as soon as possible. Sir, this assurance we take it for what it is worth. Sir, I would like to repeat that it is necessary because the situation in the Andhra State is such and the Congress press there has started the bogey of instigating violence. I would like to say in this connection on the floor of this House, that six months before the Government was defeated, Shri Sanjeeva Reddy and Shri Gopala Reddy have been going round calling Congress workers meetings and saying: Why are you afraid? You beat up the Communists. The police is with us. The Government is with us.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): I had suggested previously

[Mr. Vice-Chairman.]

that no such statement should be made in this House against people who are not Members of this House and I do also suggest to Mr. Sundarayya that let anything that he wants to say be said in an indirect manner as otherwise the speech will rather get very much protracted and it would not contribute to the healthy conduct of the debates.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: All right, Sir. I will put it indirectly. Previously I had named those Ministers and the leaders of the Congress Party. Now I will put it indirectly. Responsible Ministers and responsible Congress leaders have been going round calling their own party members meetings and saying: You do whatever violence you can do against the Communists.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Violence?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Yes, violence.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I thought it was the monopoly of the other side.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: They speak of non-violence but they live a life of violence.

DR. K. N. KATJU: That is a matter of opinion.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: They were doing that thing.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN (Madras): Your preaching and your actions are different.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): Order, order. Please proceed, Mr. Sundarayya.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: They have been doing it and now they want to create a bogey of violence and then take every kind of measures, and some of the landlords have taken their advice during the last six months and already murdered three

of our comrades. Of course naturally we are not landlords; we do not have *goondas* with us; we do not have the army with us; we do not have the police with us. So naturally we may have to suffer for some time like this. But if you want free and fair elections I only want you, don't resort to these methods.....

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: And leave you to do it.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA:because it is not going to help. It is not going to help the country. If you think we can do it you would not have allowed us at all to come here. You know that we cannot do it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): I think you will allow the speaker to address the Chair and not have a cross conversation in this House.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Now, Sir, when certain rabid anti-Communists try to pull my legs like this I have got also to pull their legs if not anything more.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): Not physically.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Yes, if it comes to that. I only tell them not to play that game. You tried during 1948—51 that trick and it did not pay you and it is not going to pay you also now if you do that thing.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: We never tried it; on the other hand you tried it.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: It is you who started the game, the Congress had started the game and Mr. Rajagopalan is a part of that and the Andhra people cannot forget it. The Andhra people have not forgotten it and they will never forget the atrocities of the Congress Government, the police atrocities of the Congress Government, the rape and loot committed by them and the way in which our people in the

villages of Kattur and Yellamarlu and other villages where the whole villagers were stripped naked and marched naked to Gandhiji's .

SHRI G RAJAGOPALAN How many were murdered by Communists?

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA How many have you murdered? You tell that In defence we fought that

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V K DHAGE) I think there should be no such provocation given and no interruption made when the speaker is on his legs In that way I think we shall not be able to finish the debate very smoothly, Mr Sundarayya

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN But Mr Sundarayya should be relevant and not refer to things which would excite others and excite himself

DR R P DUBE On a point of information How long will the speech continue, Sir? Will it continue as long as the Governor's rule continues in Andhra?

SHRI B GUPTA The speech is nitting them hard and that is why one after another comes to defend Dr Katju

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA I was only trying to point out to them the fears which have been engendered by their action and I only want to point out to them that it won't pay them nor the Indian people nor anybody Therefore be careful Don't be carried away by the local landlords and don't do things indiscriminately because the police are with you Be careful about it Now what is the wrong in my saying a fact? Why are you getting panicky when I say you should not adopt these methods? After all we know what methods the ruling party normally adopts in elections So what is wrong if I ask you to really honour your election pledges and promises and if I voice the call

of the electorate to ask you not to indulge in these things simply because you have got the power, because you have got the money, and because you have got the authority? What is wrong in that? Why do they get so much angry when I make a normal suggestion? It is because I have given a story which is not very savoury for the Congress I have given only a few typical instances

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY Story!

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA If you cannot understand the word 'story' I may tell you the history—the real history that is being enacted before our own very eyes in Andhra during the last year and a half, how they have butchered the Constitution, how they have butchered every decency and how they indulged, in the words of the great Home Minister, in tomfoolery, bribery, insult and mockery of the Constitution And I have narrated who indulged in all these things. (*Interruptions*) I only appeal to this House not to accept this proclamation which is completely unwarranted Revoke it, once you do not approve of it it automatically follows that it is revoked So do not approve this. With these few words, I conclude my speech for the time being

SHRI BISWANATH DAS (Orissa): Sir, we have heard the two speakers very very carefully and with due attention The Government side was very well and fully explained by the hon the Home Minister making a plea in support of the proclamation which the President has issued Sir, the Home Minister combines in him the responsibility of the Home as also the lucidity of a great jurist and the analysis that he has placed before the House goes to prove that the Governor or the President had no alternative under the circumstances than to do what is being proposed. Sir placing the other point of view the leader of the Communist Party, my hon friend Mr Sundarayya has

[Shri Biswanath Das.]

tried to make a point to accuse Government for not having called upon him and his party—by him I mean the Andhra Communist Party—to form the Ministry.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I did not want the Andhra Communist Party but the Leader of the Andhra Assembly Party to be called.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: I meant the Andhra Assembly Communist Party. Therefore all the analysis that my hon. friend has been able to place before us goes to prove that there should have been a call to the party to form the Ministry. He finds in us Congressmen—in the Assembly Congress Party and in Parliament—a pack of villains, scoundrels who have no other occupation than to deceive the people the electorate and the country. Sir, I give him the consolation. We are not a party come here to attack anybody. We have no objection to be attacked but we are not out to soil our tongue and to attack others with expressions with which we are not so very familiar.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I used only those expressions which Dr. Katju had used; not a single word extra.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: There are two things which I am not able to follow from the speech of my hon. friend. He finds fault with the Government for not having called them to office and at the same time says that they are out to get the maximum number of votes and maximum number of elected representatives in case of election. If this is true the Government have only helped them to attain that end. Call it a minority or the biggest group in the fluid conditions of the dissolved Andhra Assembly; whatever it is, if what my hon. friend has stated and the analysis by which he was anxious to prove that he and his party alone com-

mands the confidence of the masses, is true, then I would plead with him and say that the Government has merely helped him to attain that end. Why accuse then the unfortunate Congressman and much more the Ministers? They have only helped him. Sir, if I were to speak only as an Andhra Congress M.L.A., I have more grounds to complain against the Ministry and against the Government and against the Proclamation than anyone in this House, but I refuse to do it. Having stated that I have also a complaint against the Ministry, it is fair that I should say straightway that the Andhra Ministry has failed on the no-confidence motion which was mainly directed on its policy of prohibition. I would therefore take a little of your time and hon. Members will forgive me if I take them to our election pledge. Since the year 1837 we have given an assurance to the electorate that we stand for prohibition. In the Madras State elections were carried out on this assurance, on this undertaking given to the electorate, and votes were secured. In 1937 the Congress majority party assumed office and then carried on its programme of prohibition taking the necessary steps in that direction. Prohibition is therefore an essential part of our programme. If the country wants Congress, if the country has confidence in Congressmen, it is because of prohibition. We stand or fall by prohibition. Therefore what the Ministry has done is it has merely followed up the pledge that we as Congressmen or the candidates that stood for election had given to the electorate. Therefore the programme of prohibition is nothing short of the fulfilment of the assurance that the candidates have given to the electorate. It is in consonance with that assurance that prohibition was introduced. We had to meet the immense opposition of the merchant classes by imposing for the first time in Madras and subsequently in other States sales tax to make good the loss of revenue. Time and anon we had to face storms. We were kicked by the British. What did they do? In 1939 soon after the Assemblies were dissolved, they wiped

off prohibition but kept on the sales tax just to put us into disgrace in the eyes of the electorate. Sir, that we have survived. Then came the election of 1946. I would refer to my hon. friend to our election pledge wherein the Congress as an organisation and all the candidates who were put up on behalf of the Congress—gave this very pledge of prohibition. Therefore when the Congress Ministries came back in 1947, they did nothing short of keeping up the promise that they had given to the electorate. The Andhra Legislature is but a reflex of the Madras Legislature. It was a part of the Madras Legislature. Therefore the members from Andhra were bound by the pledge given to the electorate. My hon. friend might have no regard for election pledges but we as honest Congressmen have to stand by our pledges.

SHRI B. GUPTA: May I know if the hon. speaker is aware that a Deputy Minister in West Bengal was killed while driving a car dead drunk?

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: It would be too late in the day to withdraw our pledge. We cannot do so as I have stated. I repeat we stand or fall by our pledge that we have given to the electorate. Therefore, my hon. friends, the Members of the Treasury Bench and the Members of the Assembly took the unusual step of facing the Assembly and taking the consequences.

My hon. friend was busy in analysing votes. Does he not know that one vote made or marred the Ministry? And what is that one vote? If you believe the Deputy Chief Minister of Andhra, the one vote was occasioned by one 'independent', which will probably go in history as a great act. What is that great act? A sub-inspector of Police, who was dismissed by the Government—for misconduct and mischief perpetrated on the people—was insisted upon by this particular Member of the Assembly to be installed in office. The result was that the vote went against the Ministry and

the Ministry had to go out of office. Would he accept that?

(Shri R. U. Agnibhoj stood up to interrupt.)

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: If I have not yielded to interruption from my hon. friends on the other side, I will not also oblige you. So, you will please pardon me if I do not. Therefore, the result is that the Ministry goes out of office. Have not my hon. friends read the statement from two members of the Andhra Congress Assembly party, party who have voted against the Ministry and with the opposition, namely, that they would have voted if the P. C. C. had directed them? In the absence of a direction from the P. C. C. they voted with the Opposition. This very statement goes to show that the allegation that the voting was not correctly given is true and correct for Congress party. If so, why should the Ministry go out of office? The Government stood not on party considerations, but on constitutional principles. They may be right or they may be wrong, but as a party man I should have demanded that the Government should have given them a chance to get a vote of confidence. There was a call from a number of independent members from Andhra, on Mr. Sanjiva Reddy to take a vote of confidence. But Congressmen preferred election. My hon. friend speaks of Constitution. I should like here, in this House, to have a clear statement from my hon. friend whether he stands by the Constitution. You have different notions of Government and Constitution. We understand you and we acknowledge frankly, do admit and stand by that. I do not quarrel with you. You are wedded to a different ideology. You have to stand by it, whether you like it or not.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: At the moment we are interested.....

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: I know at the moment you are interested. That is the Communist strategy. That is their strategy.

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA Are we to understand from you that we should never make any attempt to amend the Constitution or change the Constitution?

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI V K. DHAGE) Please proceed.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS Do you stand by the democratic principles of this Constitution?

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI V K. DHAGE): Let him have his say

SHRI BISWANATH DAS Sir, my friend speaks of independents. When he speaks of 'independents', he goes in his analysis to show that so many 'independents' were there and they would have stood by the Communist Party, if only this pack of politicians, the Central Ministers, had not allowed the dissolution of the Assembly. I do not want to make any personal reflection on any one but a great Andhra leader no other than the late lamented Dr C R Reddy, Vice-Chancellor of the Andhra University, once gave in Berhampore a clear definition about 'independents'. His definition of 'independents' I think holds good for all times. And what was his definition? His definition was "independents are independent enough to give up their independence". Why should any force on earth rely on 'independents', of a nature or of a type, that they will be in league with one party one day and with another party the next day? If this unfortunate Governor could not rely on these independents

SHRI S MAHANTY (Orissa) What happened in Orissa?

SHRI BISWANATH DAS I cannot explain this logic. Are you to tolerate men with warring ideologies and programmes to go together for office?

Even the most reactionary legislator of an imperialist country, the British Government in their Act of 1935 and in the Instrument of Instructions to

the Provincial Governors, had laid down that they should not do anything to minimise the responsibility of the elected members to the electorate. If that is what they inculcated in us, are we—as free citizens—to take any steps, or do anything which will minimise the electoral responsibility on the members? I think, my hon friend claiming democracy, claiming popular representation and popular will, should not have pleaded in the way that he chose to do. My respect for him would have been heightened and would have been many times more had he thanked the Government and the Governor, for having undertaken the task of proclaiming and dissolving the Andhra Assembly and leaving it to fresh election. I would have congratulated him, but I must frankly confess that the leader of the Communist party has belied my expectations and much more of the people, of whom he was so eloquently speaking today. Sir, we are out for democracy. I have stated that, speaking as a legislator from Andhra I have a grievance against the Proclamation. But speaking as a Congressman and also as one wedded to democracy, I always stand or fall by the will of the electorate, by the popular will. What has this Proclamation done? It has left me in the hands of the electorate. In defending the Proclamation, the hon Home Minister has stated that he will not take more than three or four months for holding the elections and for the people to choose their representatives. What is the wrong? Why then complain? Sir, I think the Government could have done nothing more than what they did under the circumstances.

Sir my hon friend speaks of "Prohibition and Ramamurthy Award". So much has been stated about prohibition. Assuming that the recommendations are to be carried out, what is the procedure? The country has given you a direction that prohibition, and nothing short of prohibition is the goal. That will of the electorate stands. How can you wipe it off? Is it by a vote of the Legislature? Then I refuse

to go by what my friend says. The will of the people cannot be wiped off by a vote of the Legislature. That may be a thing common in countries other than democratic countries. But with us, we stand or fall by the will of the people, irrespective of consequences and considerations. The Ministry fell on the issue of prohibition. Therefore the dissolution of the House. There is no other way out. If my hon. friend wants that people should take today. I do not quarrel with him. In fact, I hold very strong views on the question of prohibition. I am not happy. I am wedded to prohibition but I laugh within myself to see that in one State there is prohibition, and in the neighbouring State there are open liquor shops. India is one undivided whole. I would like to have prohibition throughout India, if you have to have prohibition. Otherwise, according to me, prohibition is and will be a costly failure. That is the principle to which I am wedded. And if any one is going to hear me, I think of prohibition, total prohibition, throughout India. I do not think of prohibition Statewise. So, having that end in view, and having stated my own feelings in the matter, I cannot see any other way out in this muddle. Here is the electorate that has given a direction to the elected to carry on prohibition. The Ministry falls on the vote with regard to prohibition. What else is there left except dissolution? Sir, considered from any point of view, on the score of prohibition or on any other consideration. I feel that the Government at the Centre, or the Governor or the President, had no other way out except the dissolution of the Assembly. Therefore, I strongly support the Proclamation and heartily congratulate the hon. Home Minister, and his sense of democracy, for having given us the promise that he would undertake to carry on elections very soon—by the close of March. Sir, this promise is enough for me, and I thank him for the same.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Sir, the Resolution before the House has been discussed at some fair length in the

other place, and the point of view of my Party was explained there. The reason why, nevertheless, I intervene in this discussion is that there are certain constitutional issues involved which deserve an answer. It is unfortunate that the hon. the Home Minister did not answer those questions in the other House, and I do hope, if I frame them, that he will be good enough to give a reply here.

My friend, Mr. Sundarayya, in a very impassioned speech, delineated the activities of the Congress Party in Andhra which are disruptive of good and honest administration. I agree with him that not only in Andhra, but also in other States, the Congress Party has indulged in acts which have been aptly described as acts of political piracy, and if there has been a deterioration in the moral standard of public life in the country today, the Congress Party must accept its due share of responsibility.

Sir, however interesting the background picture, which Mr. Sundarayya offered us, may be, the real issue is the Proclamation. With all due respect to my friend, Shri Biswanath Das, the issue is not the dissolution. The issue is the Proclamation which says that constitutional Government had become impossible in Andhra, and therefore, it had become necessary for the President to assume the powers of Government. The dissolution is not the issue. We support the dissolution, because we feel that it is necessary that there should be elections to clear the atmosphere in that State. But that is not the issue. I should like to remind the hon. Members here that the issue is as to whether it was necessary for the President to promulgate this Proclamation which says that "he is satisfied that a situation has arisen in which the Government of that State cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution." Now, there has been one difficulty here which had been referred to in the other House. We have not been provided with the information as to how the Governor, in his report,

[Shri B. C. Ghose.]

came to that conclusion. What has been stated in the report, we do not know.

DR. K. N. KATJU: The Governor gave only factual information, which I have communicated to the House.....

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: If I am to understand that he only gave the factual information about the position of the Parties then I shall deal with that presently. If that was the only information, I do not understand why the hon. the Home Minister should be so chary of presenting that report to the other House, so that Members could have a full and clear picture of the situation that obtained in Andhra, because that is nothing very secret, and he has himself said that.....

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: He has refused it in this House also. I asked for information and he said that it was secret. And now he says "it is factual".

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Now the position is that we have to examine as to whether a constitutional Government could or could not be carried on. That raises the issue as to how it was that the Governor in Andhra found that an alternative Government could not be formed. Here arises the constitutional issue, which is very important, and I do hope that the hon. the Home Minister will provide us with some guidance as to how any situation of this nature should be handled. It is not my intention to quote from books on constitutional precedents and so forth. They were quoted at length in the other House and anybody who is interested might have a look at Jennings Keith or other authorities. But I believe that the constitutional practice in Great Britain is that, if a Government should resign, the Crown sends for the Opposition Leader except in very exceptional cases. It is not my point here to suggest that we should accept the British constitutional practice, but if we do not accept the British constitutional practice and

conventions, then we must be told what conventions we should accept or we should try to formulate. Let me first explain what the position according to the British constitutional practice should have been. If a Government resigns, the Leader of the Opposition should have been sent for. That is the practice in Great Britain except in such cases where there have been defections in a party or when the leader of the party dies, in which cases the Crown may have some discretion. Now, this convention which in course of time has hardened into a rule, has been evolved for this very good reason, viz. that the Crown should not take any active part in party politics. I should like to know if the Home Minister thinks that it is a good principle that we should also follow in this country. Now, if that is good, then the necessity for evolving and implementing some such principle is all the greater in this country for this reason that in Great Britain they have a Crown who is not a party man. He stands outside all parties. Here the President or the Governor who takes action acts on the advice of the Ministry, the Central Ministry. The President is elected by the people and may belong to some party although it is quite true that like the Speaker on assumption of office, he becomes a non-Party man, but even so he acts on the advice of the Government. Therefore political parties can exercise some influence on him. It is in this context that I think it is extremely desirable and necessary that we should have some conventions developed in this country. Here there have been, as you know, some Ministries which have fallen in different States. There have been three or four such cases, e.g., in Madras, where there had been no one absolute-majority party. There has been in these cases no discernible pattern or policy. I should like to know from the Government as to what the policy is that they want to pursue in such cases. The reason, as I said, why in Great Britain the Leader of the Opposition is sent for is this fact, that it is generally accepted that the duty of the Crown is not to form a

Government but only to secure a Government, because if the Crown were to form a Government, the idea is that he would be taking part in active politics. In order to prevent him from doing that, it is accepted that his duty is only to secure a Government. He sends for the Leader of the Opposition, and if the Leader of the Opposition accepts the invitation, well and good. If he does not get the majority for it, he has to resign. There have been cases also in Britain when an Opposition leader had come in, failed to get a majority and advised the Crown to dissolve Parliament and the Crown had accepted that advice. The Crown did not prevent the Leader of the Opposition from forming a Government on the ground that he had not got a majority in the House. Now, we have to know as to why we do not follow that practice, because we say that we have in this country a democratic Government. I am quite prepared to concede that my friends on the left are not really interested in our form of democracy, that they quote the scriptures only when it suits them and that they would be only too willing to undermine our form of democracy should the occasion ever arise. I admit all that, but I say, Sir, that it is not they but we who are on trial, because we say that we believe in this form of democracy. They do not believe in our form of democracy, as we do not believe in their variant of people's democracy. When we say that we believe in democracy, then it is only fit and proper that we should act according to democratic principles. My friends of the Communist Party do represent some people and we cannot, under our Constitution, put them out of the pale of democratic society, although I am quite sure that if they ever form a Government of their own, many of us would be liquidated, because that is their idea of democracy. I know what will happen to me and to many of the people who are even within the Communist Party.

SHRI B GUPTA We will invite you to serve the people

SHRI B. C GHOSE But they are not on trial. We are on trial as to how we are working our democracy. Therefore, I say that there has been a wrong action on the part of the Government or of the President who has been advised by the Ministry in not calling upon the Leader of the Opposition in Andhra to form a Government. Now, I quite appreciate the point which the hon the Home Minister made. He asked, "Do you want a situation when we should have allowed the other party, say the Communist Party, to form a Government and then get a majority by the distribution of loaves and fishes?" I do not say that that is not a serious danger, but here there are certain other practices which we might have followed. We may have developed conventions on the French model. The hon the Home Minister may know that in France, whenever a Government has to be formed, the President commissions a person who is usually a Deputy of the French Parliament to get a mandate from the National Assembly to form a Government. As soon as a Deputy is designated as the Prime Minister, he does not form a Ministry. He has first to obtain a majority vote from the National Assembly before he proceeds to form a Government. If the hon the Home Minister is afraid that the Opposition would by distributing loaves and fishes, get a majority, why didn't he develop that convention?

SHRI R U AGNIBHOJ And have a new Government every six months?

SHRI B. C GHOSE You will have time to speak when you get your opportunity. I was saying, "Why did not the Home Minister ask the Leader of the Opposition to get a mandate from the House to show that he had a majority?" Now, it may be argued in the opposite way that even though the person concerned might not straightaway appoint Ministers, he will be distributing ministerships and thereby on the hopes that he might give, obtain a majority. In the French constitutional practice, there is a

[Shri B C Ghose]

remedy to that as well, because what you have to do in France is that the person who is designated as Prime Minister will first have to get a mandate from the National Assembly before he forms a Government, and then when he forms a Ministry, that Ministry also has to obtain a majority by convention. This is now a hardened rule. He could have applied that I don't see why these practices were not adopted, because by not adopting them, the Government has made it self liable to the criticism that they are making that the President or the Governor takes part in party politics, which is a very highly undesirable thing. I do hope that the hon. the Home Minister realises the importance of this issue and that he will try to answer some of the questions which I should like to put to him. My first question is whether or not he thinks that it is good that the executive, whether it is the President or the Governor, should not in the formation of a Government take any active part or in other words whether or not his first duty should be to secure a Government and not form a Government. I may give here an incident in British history. What happened in 1923? The Home Minister knows very well and the gentleman who sits behind him knows it even better. I think that when Baldwin fell—when the Conservative Government fell—I am told that Chamberlain had advised the King—at least it is reported in Jennings—to call upon both the Labour and Liberal leaders and confront them as to how they would form a Government. The advice was that he should send for both MacDonald and Asquith.

DR K N KATJU Why go to Britain? Why not confine yourself to India?

SHRI B C GHOSE The King sent for both the leaders. He did not send for Asquith only because under the conditions then obtaining in England, if MacDonald had not been sent for it would have been construed that the Crown was interested in keeping the

4 P.M. Socialists out of office. Now in order not to be open to that charge, although MacDonald had not a clear majority, he was the only person who was called for. Therefore I ask the hon. Minister whether he does not think that it is desirable that the Governor or the President in our country should not take any part in the formation of the Government but should only try to secure a Government? And if that principle were accepted should not he have sent for the Leader of the Opposition in the Andhra Assembly and exhausted the possibility as to whether or not he could have formed a Government? Now, if that principle is not acceptable

DR K N KATJU What should he have done?

SHRI B C GHOSE. Who should have done?

DR. K N KATJU The Governor.

SHRI B C GHOSE The Governor should have sent for the Leader of the Opposition and there need not necessarily have been a Proclamation of this nature. Since the Prakasam Ministry were not willing to undertake the responsibility of Government—if the Prakasam Ministry were willing no question would have arisen—but since the Prakasam Ministry refused, then the Governor's duty would have been, during that interim period to send for the Leader of the Opposition and permit him to form a Government if he could. Then there need not have been this Proclamation. The elections as fixed would have taken place and during the interregnum, there would have been another Government.

DR. K N KATJU What about 356?

SHRI B C GHOSE There would have been no 356 (*Interruptions*). The gist of my argument is that 356 would not have been necessary and we have

not been given sufficient facts to ascertain whether it was unavoidable or essential. My third point is, if the principle which I have enunciated is not acceptable to the hon. Home Minister, may I know as to how in such cases the Government should function, as to what conventions we should develop in this country. There should be certain conventions. If the hon. Minister feels that in all such cases the Ministry should resign and it should be in the hands of the Governor during the period that the elections will take place, then will he accept the principle in cases even before the general elections? When the general elections come, let there be 356 in all the States. Or is it only to be applicable in cases where a Ministry is defeated and has resigned? I hope that the hon. Home Minister.....

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not listening.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: He will listen to.....

DR. K. N. KATJU: I am sorry, I was feeling thirsty

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: The hon. Home Minister has so many ears and he will be listening to me even while he is talking.

Finally, I wish to say about our Party that as all the facts have not been placed before us and we are not convinced as to whether there was any absolute necessity for the Proclamation to be issued, we refrain from taking part, if there should be any voting, on this issue.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Mr. Chairman. I do not indulge in calling a particular person who happens to be occupying the Chair by his designation. Any person, in my estimation, who occupies the Chair is the Chairman even though she happens to be a woman. Now, Sir, the House has heard with profound sympathy the tale of woes and lamentations, misery and frustration and abject helplessness recounted by my hon. friend Mr. Sundarayya.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Come and see in Andhra.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: The reason for it is that the very Ministry of the Andhra State which he thought was within his fingers, has slipped out. I remember the statements that he issued soon after the Ministry was defeated on the 6th of this month that there was no other choice for the Governor but to call for the Leader of the Communist Party and to request him to form a Ministry. As it so happened, that thing could not materialise—I do not know who stood between the wishes, the aspirations and the hopes of my hon. friend Mr. Sundarayya and the Andhra Ministry. Something went wrong somewhere and the Ministry could not be formed. The Assembly was dissolved and the consequential effect of it was the Proclamation by the President of having taken over the functions of the Government of that State which we are now called upon to approve, as moved by my hon. friend the Home Minister.

Sir, I beg to state at the very outset that I do not possess in my armoury that inexhaustible stock of vituperation and diatribe, acid and venom which my hon. friend Mr. Sundarayya possesses and therefore I cannot spread it in this House. Suffice it to say that these things are quite safe in his possession which he can use for the Congress and the Congress people whenever he so desires.....

DR. K. N. KATJU: Inexhaustive.....

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA:in an exhaustive manner. I don't see anything else that could have happened except the taking over of the functions of the Government by the President.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: How can you say?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: This is the second case in which the President has been compelled to take over.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Third case.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: PEPSU was the first

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Punjab was the first.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: That happened long long ago probably. It was in a case of extreme emergency that the President acted under article 356 (1) of the Constitution; and as the hon. Home Minister said while moving the Resolution, it was not a pleasure to the President to go against democracy but then as the President of the Indian Union, he has got to discharge some duties even though they be unpleasant. Now, Mr. Sundarayya gave an analysis of the things that could have happened and would have happened had certain other things also had happened. Now this wishful thinking does not help anybody. For his own convenience and for the purposes of his arithmetic, he raised the number of his Party to 73 and argued that it was very easy for the Communist Party to get together a strength of 73 in a House of.....

SHRI B. GUPTA: He only pointed out.....

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I am not going to yield to Mr. Gupta. He must take it from me that I am not going to yield. I had a sort of misgiving when this unfortunate State was formed about a year and a half ago—and it was formed on a linguistic basis, a basis to which I am intrinsically and temperamentally opposed. Now, unfortunately it has so happened that within a very short period of its formation, it has fallen on bad days and it has been dissolved. It has proved to be a still born child which I was afraid it would be.

Mr. Sundarayya posed the question: "Who has insulted the Constitution? Who made a mockery of the Constitution?" This question had better be replied to by himself.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Yes, I replied to it.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: It is they, he and all his tribe, who have been insulting and who have been making a mockery of the Constitution, day in and day out. Telangana is part of modern Indian history and it cannot be forgotten. I am ashamed to speak of it, but then, Sir, there are occasions when one has got to speak.....

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: We are ashamed of having the Nizam.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Sir, are we going to have another.....

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: No, I am not yielding. No amount of interference or disturbance can uproot me. You cannot dislodge me from the position which I am now occupying. I am the master of the House.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: On a point of order, Sir, can an hon. Member be master of the House? Can he say that he is the master of the House?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Yes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): He was merely meaning to say that he was in possession of the House.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: My hon. friend Mr. Sundarayya has heard only one expression—being in possession of the House. But being master of the House means the same thing. They do not mean two different things. Here is my hon. friend a great constitutionalist—Diwan Chaman Lall—and Mr. Sundarayya can enquire from him if he has got any doubt about it

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): Proceed on.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Sir, "tom-foolery", "mockery", "corruption". "bribery", "falsehoods"—these words

my hon. friend used seventeen times during the course of his speech.

SHRI B C GHOSE. No, eighteen times

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I went on counting and counting till I came to the number seventeen. I am not capable of doing it, I can assure him. But I still long for the day when he will be converted to the right way of thinking. Let him shed off his perversity and come to love his country, shedding off his extra-territorial allegiance and so on and so forth.

SHRI B GUPTA. He seems to have been inspired by a speech made yesterday, looks like it

SHRI H P SAKSENA: I never came across anybody who ever succeeded in inspiring me.

Sir, this taking over of the Government of a State by the President is after all undemocratic and I was very much relieved when the hon. Home Minister while moving the Resolution assured us that the matter was only for a very short duration, only for a few months' time. A few months are nothing very long in the history of a nation and in a few months' time the elections will be held and there will be a trial of strength between my hon. friends on the right and my hon. friends on the left, and whosoever wins will go to occupy the Andhra "gadi" whether it be Shri T Prakasam or my friends of the type of Shri Sundarayya.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA. God save Mr Prakasam.

SHRI H P SAKSENA. You may sneer at him, but I love him, I revere him.

Sir, I find sometimes that Satan comes forward to preach the Gospel. I was told here that the Congress should learn the ethics of morality and courtesy. I do not know in

which sense the last word was used. Courtesy and morality I understand, but if our friends who believe in totalitarian methods, who worship at the feet of one individual, for whom this country has nothing to offer, if they come forward and say that the Congress should learn lessons of morality, may I enquire what morality is it? Is it the morality of Telangana, the morality of murders, the morality of loot, arson and rapes? That the Congress is not going to learn at any cost at any time whatsoever.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: The morality of having Rajpramukhs.

SHRI H P. SAKSENA: I may tell them that their dream of forming a Government on even an inch of land in India is not going to come true. That is not going to happen, I can assure my hon. friend, Mr Sundarayya, because this country's mind is sound. There is nothing wrong with it and the people are not going to listen to this advice of destruction and damage and all that. Even our Prime Minister who is always so tolerant, so patient, is fed up with these people and only yesterday he went out of his way to complain of it in a public meeting that. . .

SHRI B C GHOSE: That is the inspiration

SHRI H P. SAKSENA: He complained about the activities of these friends. You will remember that for about three years or more I have been fondling these people, I have been cajoling them, trying to impress them and to bring them to the rational way of thought. But they would not listen. What can I do? I again appeal to them and ask them to do as I advise them to do, and all will go well with them.

Mr. Sundarayya talked of a coalition Government. Now, if he understands anything of politics, he will know that a coalition Government is formed on the basis of certain points

[Shri H. P. Saksena.]

of agreement. That is one thing. The other is that when there is a national danger, when there is an emergency, then and then alone is a coalition Government formed. Otherwise the general rule with all democratic countries is that the majority forms the Government, and the Opposition, of course, there is to oppose that Government and to replace it if it can, by means of persuasion and education and all that. That means is open to our friends. But then I have a sort of feeling that their success would be phenomenally less in the next elections than even in the last elections, because they have exposed themselves. Their tactics have not been approved by the people at large and therefore the obvious conclusion is that their strength which stood at about 40 in the dissolved Assembly will be reduced to not more than fifteen or twenty.

So, the Congress Government is again coming in Andhra. They should clean their weapons and keep themselves in readiness to face that challenge. With these words, Sir, I support the Resolution.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is always difficult to speak after Mr. Saksena; however, I will try.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. C. GUPTA) in the Chair.]

Now, Sir, I rise to oppose this Resolution which, according to me, reflects the ominous intentions of the Congress to monopolise all political power of this country into its own senile hands by throttling all other Opposition parties by Machiavellian machinations and to confine it to themselves under the facade of the emergency provisions of the Indian Constitution. Sir, before I try to present my own views on this Resolution, I have formulated four questions which I will lay before the House and in trying to answer those questions I might be able to justify my own opposition to this Resolution.

Number one is, whether a situation had arisen in Andhra in which the administration could not have been carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution? Number two is, if so, what objective tests were applied to determine that? Number three, whether those conditions did exist at the time of the formation of Andhra in October 1953, and number four, if so—if they existed at that time—why fresh elections were not ordered in the interests of the stability of administration? These are the four questions and I think that in trying to answer those four questions I will be able to justify my opposition to this Resolution.

The first point is, how is this Parliament in a position to determine whether a situation had arisen or not in the absence of factual data which can stand an empirical test? In the absence of such data, we are perfectly entitled and I think we will not be entirely wrong if we depend upon our own hypothesis or our own surmises. It can be said that a situation had arisen in the sense that the Opposition parties were a heterogeneous group and that, even though numerically they may be said to be in a majority, it was supposed that they would not be able to continue to maintain that unified front. If that is so, I am not going to dismiss that kind of surmise. The Home Minister is very chary of presenting the report of the Governor which would have gone a great way in clarifying the situation; he is not going to do that and, therefore, I think probably this might have been the hypothesis of the Governor of Andhra on which the whole case is based. If that is so, let us analyse what the Party position was. As Dr. Katju has given it out, the position was as follows: Communists 40; K.M.P. 8; P.S.P. 7; two dissidents from the Congress—and I congratulate them—two members from the Andhra Praja Party, two dissidents from the Communist Party and one Scheduled Castes Federation. The voting was 69 for

and 68 against. Please remember those who talk in season and out of season of morality, those who go to preach morality not only in India but beyond the borders of India, those who have got the wheel of the Dharma Chakra as their national symbol, to them I say that the 68 who voted for the Party in power were not a homogeneous group. They were originally something like 43 or 47 but then, some how or other, by some curious magic, that figure was made into 51 and then started horse trading. This kind of horse trading is not the sole pattern in Andhra. If you go to Orissa—I don't think it will be quite besides the point if I try to illustrate the point—you will find that a man who has not passed even the matriculation examination, is made a Member of the Public Service Commission. You seduce him away from his party in the opposition, on the eve of a vote of no-confidence and you make him a member of the Public Service Commission. There is a ruler in the Orissa Assembly; he is in the Opposition. He was returned as an independent candidate. Now, the Congress wants to bolster up its strength and it offers him, "if you join us we will give the religious endowments estate with an annual income of Rs. 3 lakhs or so for you to manage. If not, then this Government will take over the administration of that religious endowment estate." They go to yet another man, an independent. He is the brother of a ruler in one of the States in Orissa. They say that they will double his brother's allowance.....

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: We are dealing with Andhra, not with Orissa.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Andhra is adjacent to Orissa. Do not get impatient. Don't think that this is a one-party Parliament. There will be more hard things for you to listen to. Wait. After all, truth is always hard.

There is another man and they double his allowance because it is not the Privy Purse which has been

guaranteed by the Constitution, which has been determined by the Constitution but it is an allowance for the brother of a ruler which is within the discretionary power of the Government of which Dr. Katju is the head. The allowance of that ruler's brother is doubled. Similarly, if you go to Rajasthan, you will find that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, after a vote of no-confidence has been brought against the Ministry, is seduced away and is made a Member of the Bench in Rajasthan. Therefore, it is not only in Andhra that this is happening; this is the pattern everywhere. You are seducing the administration; you are seducing the judiciary and you are obstructing the free flow of justice. All these for what? It did my heart much good when I listened to my esteemed friend Mr. B. Das speaking eloquently about prohibition but does he not know that power is more intoxicating than an innocent glass of whiskey? If not, he will probably live longer to learn it. Let him remember that power is more perverting, more intoxicating and more degenerating than all your liquors. A man drinking whole goblets of toddy will not be as mad as the Home Ministry which is running amuck from this end of India to that.

This is how the Congress whose original strength was something like 43.....

SHRI V. VENKATARAMANA (Andhra): It was 40.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Well, that makes their case much worse.

There was the Governor—all respect to him because he was once the Governor of Orissa—who was confronted with a political situation which can be equated with a crazy quilt of various kinds of coloured rags—the Congress, less than the Communists, the Andhra Praja Party, the K.L.P. and so on and so forth. If,

[Shri S. Mahanty.]

at that time, a fresh election would have been ordered in view of the fact that no single party had absolute majority, the Andhra State should have started on a sounder basis

The Congress should not have been allowed to indulge in this kind of horse-trading which has completely perverted man's faith in justice, man's faith in honest administration and man's faith in everything that is proper, just and good. Therefore conversely I say that a situation, if it did not exist at that time, if it did not exist on the 13th October 1953 to justify Governor's rule and a fresh election, it does not exist also today. I should ask, Sir, Did the Governor call upon the various leaders of the Opposition parties to ascertain if they were able to join a Government did the Governor give them a chance? I would have liked the Governor to summon the Leader of the Opposition and the leaders of the various other groups and to have asked them: Are you in a position to form a Government? If they had said that "we" are not in a position to form a Government, well, public opinion would have been overwhelmingly in favour of this Proclamation. But I should ask Did the Governor give them a chance? No. If the Governor did not give them a chance on this occasion, may I know on what justification did the Governor call upon the Leader of the Congress Party with a strength of less than 40 on the 13th October 1953, to form a Government?

DR K N KATJU Where?

SHRI S MAHANTY In Andhra, just adjacent to Orissa

Therefore, Sir, my humble suggestion is that no situation existed in Andhra where the administration could not have been carried on according to the provisions of the Constitution. There are no objective facts which we can examine for ourselves empirically. We are simply told that the Governor sits there like a metaphysical concept, like the

Brahma of Indian philosophy, that whatever he mutters, is Vedas. You cannot question it. Here you are confronted with a similar kind of situation. There is absolutely no empirical standard by which we can judge for ourselves. I do not know why the Home Minister is so chary of placing the Governor's Report before this House. Thirdly the question is whether those conditions which existed at the time of the formation of the Government in Andhra exist today or not. Now the condition which according to the Governor, justified clamping down of article 356(1) of the Indian Constitution, was that no party was in absolute majority in Andhra. I say, Sir, if no party is in majority today, in October 1953 also no party was in a majority (*Interruptions*)

Now, Sir, public memory is short and the memory of the Congressmen is shorter. Sir, last year—I do not know, it may be 1952—the Home Minister came to this House with a Resolution for clamping down President's rule in PEPSU. I think that this House would remember that at that time in PEPSU the conditions of Andhra did not exist. There was the Rarewalla Ministry and Mr Rarewalla had not a narrow majority but he had a comfortable majority. He had not only a working majority; he had a comfortable majority. But what was the justification at that time for dismissing his Government? What were the reasons adduced? In order to refresh the memory of the House I can tell that at that time the great doctor said that "we value morality in our political life." Even though crossing of the floor is an established and well-known parliamentary practice, the great doctor was pleased to say: "Look here. Here is a batch of fellows. Yesterday they were saying: We are with the Congress and today they are saying: 'We have joined with Rarewalla.' How is the country going to rely on these persons?" Therefore from the morality point of view, even though Rarewalla had a comfortable majority, that Ministry was dissolved and

the President's rule was clamped down. Now, Sir, I ask what morality has been followed in bringing away Mr. Prakasam, in seducing away other members from the opposition and thereby bolstering up the Congress strength from 40 to 68, an increase of 28 members, by offering loaves and fishes of office. Therefore, Sir, let it also be made very clear that under the circumstances obtaining in Andhra at the moment probably nothing better could have been done than dissolution of the Assembly. But, Sir, before that dissolution, before the Presidential Proclamation, the Opposition parties should have been given a chance. If they would have missed the chance then probably public opinion would have been overwhelmingly in favour of President's rule. Therefore, for this procedural lapse, for this technical breach, I cannot support this Resolution.

And before I conclude, once again I would like to make myself clear that these conditions did not emerge today; they existed since the very inception of the Andhra State. If this consideration had weighed with the Governor and if he had not been influenced by extraneous political considerations, fresh elections would have been ordered. Then probably the Andhra people would have been spared all this kind of political acrobatics and horse trading. Thank you, Sir.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I listened carefully to the speech Mr. Sundarayya made, and he gave the numbers of members who voted on each side. I would like to tell him that two of the members who came on his Party ticket like Mr. C. V. K. Rao, have said that it would be better if the Assembly is dissolved and new elections are held in spite of voting on the motion of no-confidence against the Ministry which clearly showed....

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: And I would like to tell you that Mr. Rokkam Narsimha Rao with a group of five

who voted with the Congress against the no-confidence motion said that he was prepared for a coalition.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: That is another matter altogether. What I was saying was that members who came on his party ticket and who have left their party now, have announced in spite of voting for the no-confidence motion, that they will prefer an election rather than an alternative Government to the Government that was defeated.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: What about Shri Sankara Reddy and Shri Subramanyeswara Rao who were elected on the Congress ticket?

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: Then, Sir, Mr. P. V. G. Raju, the leader of the Praja Socialist Party also announced, in spite of voting for the no-confidence motion that he would prefer an election than call on any other party to form a Government for the simple reason that it was not possible for any party to form a stable Government. And besides this, article 356 of the Constitution has been specially put down in our Constitution in order to meet emergencies of this kind. We must realise that though we may be following the British precedents of parliamentary Government, we are governed by what is put in in our Constitution itself.

My friend, Mr. B. C. Ghose, was asking: Why was not the British parliamentary precedent or even the French procedure followed; and he quoted that in France it is usual for a person who is nominated as the person to form a Government that he should get the confidence of the French Assembly before he forms the Government. That is true, but we are not following that precedent here.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: "Why are we not?" that was my question.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: We have got special provisions in the Constitution. We choose not to do it because we have got article 356 in our Constitution and we are following what is put down in article 356.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Article 356 could have been invoked if no other party was able to form a Government.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: It is not a question of nobody being able to form a Government. It is a question whether the Government could exist if it came into power. For instance Mr. Sundarayya was quoting Mr. N. V. L. Narasimha Rao wanting another Government under Mr. Prakasam, not under the Communist Party or under the leader of the Opposition but under Mr. Prakasam.

But Mr. Prakasam's Government had itself been defeated and Mr. Prakasam exercising his power as the Chief Minister who was defeated did advise the Governor that dissolution would be the best thing. Of course, Mr. Ghose was quoting Parliamentary precedent that if such was the case then Mr. Prakasam's Ministry should have remained. But they chose not to remain. My friends opposite themselves did not want, during the Travancore-Cochin crisis, a caretaker Government. They said that a caretaker Government existing as it did under Mr. John would influence the elections. Today they have been given the opportunity and the chance to prove who has got the electorate behind them.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: What is the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee—between the caretaker Government under Prakasam and one under the Central Government which is also a Congress Ministry?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. C. GUPTA): Please let him go on.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: Because the Central Government is responsible to the Legislature here.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: But tomorrow all the power will be invested.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. C. GUPTA): I think there should be no talk across the Table.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: As I said, article 356 is there and under the circumstances that have arisen in Andhra the Government have done the right thing in applying article 356 and bringing in President's rule.

As my friend Mr. Biswanath Das explained, the Ministry was defeated by one single vote. I am not going into the details which my hon. friend went into as to why those two Congressmen voted against the Government. But what has happened is that it is impossible for any party to exercise the powers of Government at the present stage and that is what is provided for in article 356.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: But how do we know that it is not possible?

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: Because the Governor after giving thought to the situation and consulting various people came to the conclusion that it is not possible. It is only on the Governor's advice that this action has been taken. As my hon. friend Dr. Katju explained, the Governor gave facts about what had happened during the no-confidence motion and on that there was no other conclusion except to apply article 356 and.....

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: But why was that report kept back?

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: As I have said, you have been given the opportunity today of going before the electorate. I can assure you the Governor is above all parties. He is not going to interfere in the election at all. You have been given the opportunity today of proving what was said by my friend Mr. Sundarayya during the course of his speech that the Congress will be defeated and defeated badly. I am sure if that happens, the Government will accept the decision of the electorate. You have today got the chance to show that the electorate is behind you. That

is what you wanted. What you wanted has been given. When we do things which you do not want, you criticise us; but when we do things which are to your own liking and of which you have been talking about, you again criticise us. Of course you go on the old theory that the Opposition's business is to oppose. I agree, but at the same time I want you to realise that what has been done is in the interests of good Government so that the electorate will decide for themselves what kind of Government the people of Andhra want. Therefore I support the action of the Government wholeheartedly.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: May I ask why they did not do this one year back?

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: That was a period of trial. After all the Ministry existed for one year and the fact that it existed for one year in spite of the many trials proves that we were correct at that time.

श्री आर० यू० अग्निभोज : उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं, राष्ट्रपति जी ने जो घोषणा की है और उसके लिए डा० काटजू ने हमारे पास जो प्रस्ताव उपस्थित किया है, उसका समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। बात यह है कि हमें प्रजातंत्र राज्य अपने प्रान्तों में और देश में चलाने हैं। जब आन्ध्र प्रान्त की स्थापना हुई, तब हमने यह सोचा था कि इस प्रान्त में सभी दल के लोग मिल कर बहुत ही जिम्मेदारी से प्रजा के हित में शासन चलायेंगे। मैं आप से कहूँ कि १३ महीनों तक आन्ध्र में कांग्रेस मंत्रिमंडल ने जो काम किया है उससे हमें संतोष ही होना चाहिए। यदि मंत्रिमंडल को कार्य करने में बाधा पहुँची और मंत्रिमंडल के टूटने की नीवत आई तो उसकी जिम्मेदारी आन्ध्र की उन राजनीतिक

पार्टियों की है जिन्होंने बहुत ही गौर जिम्मेदारी के साथ आज आन्ध्र की सरकार को तोड़ने में सहायता की।

मैं आप से कहूँ, मेरे मित्र सुन्दरैया जिनका नाम बहुत ही सुन्दर है, बहुत ही असुन्दर भाषा में कांग्रेस की सत्ता को बातें सुनाई। आखिर वह कौन सा प्रस्ताव था जिस पर उन्होंने यह सब कहा? उन्होंने कहा कि, उन लोगों को शर्म आनी चाहिए जो गांधी जी का नाम लेते हैं, उन्हें लज्जा आनी चाहिए। मैं सुन्दरैया जी से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि महात्मा गांधी का सब से पहला सिद्धान्त, और असहयोग के जमाने में लड़ाई का सब से बड़ा अस्त्र जो था वह था शराबबन्दी। इसी शराबबन्दी के लिए महात्मा गांधी ने और कांग्रेस ने दुकानों पर पिकेटिंग किए, शराबबन्दी के हेतु प्रदर्शन किये। और यह एक बहुत ही अच्छी बात थी कि जो आन्ध्र प्रान्त महात्मा गांधी के जन्म दिन के शुभ अवसर पर पैदा हुआ—२ अक्टूबर, १९५३ के दिन—वह प्रान्त, वहाँ की कांग्रेस सरकार महात्मा गांधी के शराबबन्दी के सिद्धान्त का पूर्णतः पालन करके शराबबन्दी की दिशा में ऊँचा कदम उठाती। परन्तु जो मंत्रिमण्डल टूटा वह किस आधार पर टूटा? हमारे विरोधी मित्रों में से कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के, किसान मजदूर पार्टी के, और दूसरी भी स्वतंत्र पार्टियों के लोग हैं।

मैं मानता हूँ कि कांग्रेस के सिद्धान्तों में चाहे कुछ बुरे भी हों, आज सम्पूर्ण राष्ट्र ने और देश की प्रान्तीय सरकारों ने भी उन्हें ग्रहण किया है। परन्तु कांग्रेस के खिलाफ जो पार्टियाँ हैं, जो कांग्रेस की संस्था को गालियाँ देती हैं, उनसे मेरा यह कहना है कि आपके

[श्री आर० यू० अग्निभोज]

सिद्धान्त डिस्ऑर्डर्ली हैं, और आपकी पार्टी का माइंड डिस्ऑर्डर्ली है, इसलिए अगर आपके सिद्धान्तों को लिया जाय जिनके आधार पर आपकी पार्टियों का गठबन्धन हुआ और जो अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव में शरीक हुए। तो फिर मैं यह कहूंगा कि आन्ध्र की अपोजीशन पार्टी (विरोधी दल) डिस्ऑर्डर्ली माइण्ड्स का क समूह है (A bundle of disorderly minds) जिसने कि इस अद्भुत सिद्धान्त के नाम पर कि हम ज्मिना को शराब पिलाना चाहते हैं, शराब बन्दी का जो निर्णय आन्ध्र की सरकार ने किया वह गलत है, इस बात पर २० लाख की ताड़ी की पैदवार करने वाली जनता की हिमायत करने के नाम पर एक आवाज उठाई जिससे तमाम प्रान्त के लोगों को शराबबन्दी के खिलाफ भड़वाने और उन्हें शराब पिलाने की कोशिश करें, सरकार के विरुद्ध उसकायें और इस तरह शराबबन्दी करने वालों के पैर खींचें। इससे तो सिद्धान्त को और जनता के हितों को आघात पहुंचता है।

SHRI B. GUPTA: Sir, we take serious objection to this sort of speeches being made. When Mr. Sundarayya spoke, he never made such a suggestion, and the hon. Member is attributing to him something which he has never uttered. I would ask him to write to the Chief Minister of West Bengal and find out whether a Deputy Minister died while driving a car stone drunk.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: You can't understand what he is speaking in Hindi.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. C. GUPTA): Order, order.

श्री आर० यू० अग्निभोज: मैं आप से अर्ज करूँ कि आप यह समझ लीजिए कि—

"The demagogue may mislead all people for some time; and some people for all time; but the demagogue cannot mislead all people for all time."

आप कांग्रेस का सिद्धान्त के नाम पर विरोध करते हैं, मगर जब आप कहते हैं कि राष्ट्रपति जी ने यह घोषणा करके संविधान का अपमान किया है तो मैं कहता हूँ कि आप राष्ट्रपति जी का अपमान करते हैं। आप संविधान का भी अपमान करते हैं क्योंकि राष्ट्रपति ने जो कुछ किया यह संविधान की धारा ३५६ के अनुसार किया और इसलिए यह वाम संविधान के मुआफिका है, कंस्टीट्यूशनल है। कोई व्यक्ति उसे अनकंस्टीट्यूशनल नहीं वह सवता। महात्मा गांधी के जीवन काल में केवल दो व्यक्तियों ने महात्मा गांधी के नाम की उपाधियां धारण की थीं—एक बिहार के गांधी जी बाबू राजेन्द्र प्रसाद, दूसरे फ्रंटियर गांधी खान अब्दुल गफार खां।

SHRI B. GUPTA: Now Dr. Katju also claims it.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ: Yes, he will, if you behave like this.

तो मैं आप से प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि महात्मा गांधी जी के पद चिन्हों पर चलने वाले राष्ट्रपतिजी, जिन्होंने अपना सारा जीवन महात्मा गांधी जी के सिद्धान्तों और आदर्शों पर चलकर बिताया है उनके ऊपर किसी तरह का यहां पर आरोप नहीं किया जा सकता है। इसी तरह से श्री चन्द्रूलाल त्रिवेदी, जिनको मैं बीस साल से अच्छी तरह से जानता हूँ, जो बीस साल पहले एक बड़े भारी प्रान्त के एक बड़े जिम्मेदार मफसर थे, उनके विरुद्ध किसी तरह की बात करना शोभा नहीं देता है। मैं आप से यहां पर फिर कह देना

चाहता हूँ कि श्री चन्दूलाल त्रिवेदी जैसा गवर्नर हमारे देश में आपको नहीं मिलेगा। वे एक कुशल शासक, प्रबन्धक और लगन के साथ काम करने वाले अफसर हैं जिस की मिसाल बहुत कम मिलती है।

SHRI B. GUPTA: Do I understand, Sir, that the Congressite Governors are worse than the I.C.S. Governors?

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ: My friend, you do not know—Mr. Chandulal Trivedi is an I.C.S. Governor. He was Chief Secretary in Madhya Pradesh in 1935-36. He became Governor thrice—he became Governor of Punjab, Orissa, now he is Governor of Andhra.

तो मैं आप से यह प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि आन्ध्र के बारे में जिस व्यक्ति ने घोषणा की है, इस घोषणा में जिन लोगों का हाथ है, उसमें देश के महान से महान व्यक्ति हैं, जिन्होंने देश के संविधान की रचना की तथा हमारे राष्ट्रपतिजी ही उसके प्रधान थे। इस तरह के व्यक्ति से आप क्या यह आशा कर सकते हैं कि वह संविधान को पांव के तले डाल देगा और संविधान का अपमान करेगा? मैं इस सम्बन्ध में आप से यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि आप लोगों ने ही संविधान का बार बार अपमान किया है और आज भी, जब कि एक वैधानिक चीज आप के सामने आई है, तो आप उसको अवैधानिक कहते हैं। आप लोग बार बार जो यह कहते हैं कि "संविधान" का अपमान किया जा रहा है, मैं समझता हूँ कि आप लोग "संविधान" का मतलब ही नहीं समझते हैं। इसलिए संविधान का अपमान करना या सम्मान करना, आप लोगों को सीखना है तो २५ वर्ष तक राष्ट्रपतिजी के कदमों में बैठकर सीखना होगा।

श्री एस० एन० मजूमदार : आप लोग जिन्दगी भर बैठेंगे।

श्री आर० यू० अग्निभोज : हम लोग बैठे हैं और भविष्य में भी बैठेंगे, हम डंके की छोट पर कहते हैं कि उनके कदमों में बैठकर हमें कभी भी धोका नहीं हो सकता है, धोका तो आप लोगों को ही हो सकता है।

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Mr. Vice-Chairman, is it right to drag in the names of personalities of the President and Governors in any discussion?

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Your hon. colleague has done that.

श्री आर० यू० अग्निभोज : मैं आप से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि जो कदम उठाया गया है उससे आप लोग घबराते क्यों हैं? आप लोग शायद यह समझते होंगे कि आप लोगों के हाथ से एक चीज खिसक गई जो कि अच्छे या बुरे तरीके से आप लोगों को मिलने वाली थी किन्तु वह मिलने वाली नहीं है। हमने आप लोगों को फिर से जनता के पास चुनाव के लिए भेजा है, इस तरह से हमने जनता का सम्मान ही बढ़ाया है डिमोक्रेसी का आदर किया है, हमने उन मतदाताओं की कीमत को बढ़ाया है जिन्होंने तेरह महीने पहले एक नये प्रान्त के लिए अपना मत दे कर एक सरकार की स्थापना करने में मदद दी थी। आज हम फिर उसी जनता से अपना मत व्यक्त करने के लिए कह रहे हैं ताकि वे अपना मत दे कर एक नई सरकार की स्थापना करें। इस प्रकार जनता के मत के साथ, जनता की असेम्बली और शासन के साथ, आप खिलवाड़ नहीं कर सकते हैं।

एक वहावत प्रसिद्ध है, "कहीं की ईंट, कहीं का रोड़ा, मानमती ने कुनवा

[श्री आर० यू० अग्निभोज]
जोड़ा"। इस तरह से आप एक आदमी को यहां से पकड़ लायें, दूसरे को दूसरी जगह से और तीसरे को तीसरी जगह से, इस तरह से आप लोग चुनाव लड़ते हैं।

SHRI B. GUPTA: That has been your business. You look at the election list when you put up the candidates. How many people do you gather from various quarters?

श्री आर० यू० अग्निभोज: यही तो मैं कह रहा हूँ कि फिर से चुनाव लड़ने के लिए असेम्बली को भंग किया गया है, आप इस पर नाराज होकर इतनी तैश की बात क्यों करते हैं? मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमने आपको मौका दिया है, आह्वा दिया है, चुनौती दी है कि आप जनता और मतदाताओं के पास जायें और उनसे मालूम करें कि शराबबन्दी के बारे में प्रांतीय सरकार जो कार्य कर रही थी वह ठीक कर रही थी या गलत कर रही थी। जनता आपकी इस बात का ठीक उत्तर देगी।

श्री एस० एन० मजूमदार: नई दिल्ली की शराब की दुकानों को बन्द कीजिए।

श्री आर० यू० अग्निभोज: वे सब बन्द होंगी। आप इस बात पर क्यों खोफ दिखाते हैं। मैं आप से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि इस देश में शराबबन्दी होगी, जरूर होगी, चाहे जल्दी हो या मन्दगति से, जनता का भविष्य सुधरने वाला है, इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है। जनता इस बात को अच्छी तरह से जानती है और समझती है। मैं आप से अर्ज करूँ कि आपकी पार्टी में सब तरह की पार्टी के लोग हैं, जो कभी इधर या उधर हो जाते हैं। आपकी पार्टी का कोई निश्चित

सिद्धान्त नहीं है, न कोई कार्य ही है, आपकी पार्टी का जो साथ देगा वह पोलिटिकल बैंगबैण्डस का साथ देगा।

इसलिए मेरी यह प्रार्थना है कि राष्ट्रपति जी का जो प्रस्ताव है, घोषणा है, वह ठीक है और उचित है। आन्ध्र प्रान्त में तीन चार महीने के लिए जो गवर्नर का राज्य कायम किया गया है वह वहां की जनता के हित में ही है। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि गवर्नर के राज्य में प्रत्येक पार्टी से, चाहे वह कांग्रेस की हो, चाहे कम्युनिस्ट की हो, कोई भी हो, वैधानिक रीति से व्यवहार किया जायेगा। कांग्रेस सरकार और राष्ट्रपति जी चुनाव में किसी प्रकार भी आड़े नहीं आयेंगे। हमारा जो भी कार्य होता है वह ईमानदारी और शान्ति के सिद्धान्तों के ऊपर ही होता है। हमारी राजनीतिक लड़ाई केवल जनता की सेवा करने के लिए ही होती है किन्तु आप लोगों की लड़ाई शक्ति को अपने हाथ लेने के लिए होती है। इसलिए हम सेवा के लिए ही जनता के पास जायेंगे, शक्ति प्राप्त करने के लिए नहीं जायेंगे और मुझे विश्वास है कि आन्ध्र की जनता आप लोगों को संतोषजनक उत्तर देगी।

अन्त में, मैं डाक्टर काटजू को इस प्रस्ताव को लाने के लिए बधाई देता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि सदन इसको स्वीकार करेगा।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. C. GUPTA): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 30th November 1954