

[Mr. Speaker]

Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1964-65".

The motion was adopted.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I introduce the Bill.

RESOLUTION RE: PROCLAMATION IN REGARD TO KERALA—contd.

12.54 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: Further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri Hathi on the 22nd September 1964, namely:—

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 10th September 1964, under article 456 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Kerala".

1 hour and 40 minutes have already been taken and 3 hours and 20 minutes remain. Shri Khadilkar may continue.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): Yesterday in the short time at my disposal, I was giving the background to the present breakdown of the Constitution in Kerala. I had said that instead of levelling accusations—that is, one side accusing the Congress, the Congress accusing the Communists, and the Jan Sangh accusing the Congress that because they entered into some sort of alliance with the Muslim League, the present most tragic situation has arisen—we must apply our mind afresh to the problem.

I was saying yesterday that the time has come, taking into consideration the experience we have gained during the last 15 years through

constitutional breakdowns in Kerala, to see whether the present pattern does not need some modification at the State level, whether the parliamentary pattern we have adopted in this country does not require certain modifications regarding procedure and soon in order to deal with the present realities of the situation. The time has come to give some serious thought to it. When this Resolution is before the House, it is the responsibility of this House to try to analyse the past situations, reach some conclusions and try to devise some sort of a way out, at least search for it. This is my purpose in taking part in this debate.

Shri Nath Pai (Raipur): Mr. Speaker, are we not expected to have at least the Minister of State or Minister here? The debate becomes purposeless if the Minister is not here to listen to the points made. Then we find that this becomes a dialogue carried on in two different halls, because the Minister reads the prepared brief and ignores the points that we urge. Neither the Minister nor the Minister of State is here—only the Deputy Minister is here. Either this is a serious matter or it is not.

Mr. Speaker: It is expected that some one of them must be here, at least the Minister of State.

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri L. N. Mishra): The Minister of State was here. He is in charge of the Resolution. He will be coming now.

Shri Khadilkar: I was talking in terms of the broad perspective to stir the mind of this House and make them aware of their responsibility in the matter. It is not, as I was arguing, a party question. There is a certain amount of flabbiness all round, a certain amount of complacency which

*Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

is a most disgusting phenomenon in our country. There is an attempt to conform to the western standards; whether they are applicable to this country or not, we do not mind—in politics, economic institutions, not only that, but morals and manners. If these are in some way approximating to the western standards and comparable to them, then we feel satisfied because we get a certificate from the west, "Oh, India is making a great experiment in democracy, and in everything". If tomorrow we were to adopt the new fashion of 'topless' of course I am certain some pattern will come here approximating to the topless then our morals and our manners will rise in the estimation of the west, and we also will feel satisfied.

Shri Alvares (Panjim): It would be interesting to see Shri Khadilar in topless!

Shri Khadilkar: I entirely agree with the point raised by Shri Nath Pai. This debate should be taken by Government and every Member of the House very seriously, because it is not only a question of breakdown. After six months, there will be an election. Again the same situation will arise; because three parties are pitted against each other. Communities and castes are so rigid that there is no possibility of a compromise, no possibility of a consensus. All types of opportunistic alliances made on the eve of elections are not going to last, as we know from past experience.

13 hrs.

In such a situation, when we are debating this issue, I would make an appeal. It is not a party issue. I would appeal to this side as well as the other side that they must look at the problem in a proper perspective. Remove the cobwebs in your mind, about parliamentary democracy, representative government and whatever you have got in your mind. I

was very happy to read here the other day—I do not want to mention or say that it is the lunatic fringe of the Swatantra Party as somebody has mentioned it, I do not want to say that regarding Prof. Ranga, but in a saner mood, at some place he has also given some thought to it, and he has said that the time has come when we must give he thought to our pattern of government, whether this instrument of parliamentary democracy that we have adopted . . .

Mr. Speaker: I could not follow. He said certain things.

Shri Khadilkar: I am giving his quotation.

Shri Nath Pai: He said that somebody said that Prof. Ranga is the lunatic fringe of the Swatantra Party.

Mr. Speaker: If it was so said, it is not in good taste.

Shri Khadilkar: He is my honoured friend, and I do not say anything.

So, he has also applied his mind, and it is good that he has said that the time has come when we must think about some new pattern, and he has recommended—I do not agree with him entirely, but he has kept his mind open—some sort of committee government of the Swiss pattern, and he has gone to the length of sitting with the Communists in such a government. I am very happy that at least so far as this new pattern is concerned, he is not bringing in this un-touchability type of attitude.

But the main question today is this. What are we going to do after six months? There will be elections. I predict here and now that unless you apply your mind, after the elections the same conditions will prevail—three warring or two warring parties and some splinter groups coming up, and again the same question will arise..

[Shri Khadilkar]

What is to be done? All sorts of compromises will be made. Therefore, my first submission is that the time has come when this House, and not only the Home Minister, must apply its mind to the pattern that we have adopted, and to the question whether it fits or whether some modification is called for. And I may suggest the type of modifications needed.

In the African continent I find that there is a greater vigour of thought. The President of Tanganyika the other day—I do not quote the whole thing—has given expression to it and he has said that they will have their own pattern of democracy. He says they believe in democracy, not of the Western pattern, they know what it means; he has said that the rule of law must be there, freedom, liberty of expression and everything, but the same pattern they need not copy. He has pointed out a newer pattern.

At the present juncture we should not fail to apply our mind and try to bring forces together, so that this parliamentary government and freedom, these instruments will be useful for making social advance. That is my plea.

Why do I say this? What do we find today? The position today is that the Opposition parties are not prepared to accept the sanctity of the decisions. Excuse me, I am talking frankly and objectively. Even when decisions are taken after discussion, they are free to go out to start *bandhs*, agitations about food prices, strikes etc., but these problems are not solved by one agitation or the other. If you want to bring them into the picture, I say this. Today, our Ministers are guided by the executive. The executive rules supreme. Let there be collective thinking at the ministerial level. For instance, let every Minister have a committee, and before a major decision is taken, some thinking should take

place. That decision has a collective sanction, and that goes out. I am sorry this agitational approach is fast developing out of frustration in the minds of the Opposition, and it is very natural. Therefore, to make a small beginning, this must be made.

Then, there is the question of corruption. Power corrupts, but I would like to point out what Mr. Nyerere has written from his experience. I will read out only a small portion from a letter of his which appeared in the *Hindustan Standard*:

"We aim at building a classless society. In no State is there enough wealth to satisfy the desire of a single individual for power and prestige. When wealth is divorced from its purpose—which is the banishment of poverty—there develops ruthless competition; each person tries to get more wealth, so that he will have more power and prestige than his fellow men. Wealth becomes an instrument of domination, a means of humiliating other people."

If we look at the state of affairs, whatever the rights or wrongs of the charges about corruption, we find that because there is power and prestige, more money is grabbed, and this demoralising atmosphere is being created in this country at the present juncture. If you want to dispel it, if you want to remove it and create a healthy atmosphere, I would suggest by applying our mind to the problem. Why not try to integrate the forces that are there, which agree on the basic programme? As I said yesterday, the national plan is the basic programme. Even the Communists today have come to realise that it is not a question of insurrectionary revolution or violent revolution. They are prepared to accept the framework of parliamentary democracy, at least one wing of the Communist Party has said they are prepared to share power with you. In such matters, let us make a first attempt.

The time has come. After 17 years of our experience, the frame that we have adopted needs a little moulding, a little change, and only if we remove our old classical cobwebs about democracy from our heads or minds, can we apply our mind afresh.

श्री राम मनोहर लोहिया : (फर्द-खाबाद) : स्विट्जरलैंड को नकल कर रहे हो ।

Shri Khadilkar: I am not pleading for anything.

We are discussing the resolution. Governor's rule is there. We are responsible to see what type of Government we are going to offer next. This is the matter before the House. My suggestion is on this basis: why not try from the beginning, not at the time of elections? Alliances at the time of election would prove in the long run to be disastrous, it has proved disastrous. Therefore, my suggestion is that within the framework of a broad national consensus, which is represented by the Congress Party, let us try to enlist the co-operation at all levels, and particularly make the Ministers more responsible immediately to their committees where decisions are taken, so that the Opposition is a party to the decision at every level, and its sanctity is not questioned outside.

I would appeal to the Minister and the Government. Time is very critical. We are passing through a very bad period. As I said the other day, there is a new transition in this country after our great leader's death, and at this hour we should not fail to take the co-operation and understanding of others, and our mind should be applied to the main problem of development.

After all, what is this Government for? All governments are evil, as they say but Government is an instrument to do some service to the people, to give them social welfare, make some social advance. These are the

purposes of Government. I am not concerned whether "A" or "B" sits there on treasury seats; so long as he has character, so long as he has conviction, so long as he is competent, anybody can occupy the seat of power. I am not worried about that, but there must be some basis.

What do we find in this country? I do not blame the Opposition. When I look back on this period of 17 years, I have not come across a single individual in this country, this land of detachment, *Nivriti* as we say, who has resigned as a matter of principle. And those who go out of office, the next morning try to spread frustration, and instead of helping the people, instead of helping the party, they create another problem by spreading the social infective disease of frustration all round.

In such matters, if this Parliament is a sovereign Parliament, if it is to discharge its duty towards Kerala, if it is to give guidance to the people of Kerala who are divided, rigidly divided, this barrier must be broken, all the parties on a minimum basis must be combined, and an attempt must be made to forge ahead on the basis of unity.

I do not want you to scrap the elections nor Mr. Nyerere says, it, but after the election, some attempt should be made. Then alone, democracy will survive. Otherwise, if you do not apply your mind afresh and try to take a rigid attitude on his problem, a sort of conservative attitude, an attitude which is all right in Western eyes, where everything is judged from their own standards, the problem will not be solved.

The last appeal I would make to you and also to this House is this. Let us turn to our people and our conditions and our society, try to draw inspiration from their attitude and their response. That is completely lacking. Therefore, at a certain stage,

[Shri Khadilkar]

one feels that the Government machinery has become rootless; that it has lost its social moorings; that it has lost that life-giving juice that you get from society. Therefore, I would appeal to the Home Minister and this Government on this occasion. It is not a simple formal resolution. Let them apply their mind as the new African nations; they applied their mind and formed new patterns of democracy. Let them do it. With these words, I support the motion.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): I am glad that my hon. friend Mr. Khadilkar has put in a powerful and eloquent plea that this House and this Government and the various political parties and their leaders should try to apply their mind to the need for reorienting our attitude to the way in which our Governments are to be formed at the State level as well as at the Union level. But the solution that he has suggested may not appeal to many; it does not appeal to me. But certainly there is need for giving a careful look at the manner in which the ruling party has been utilising the constitutional provisions and the way in which the rule by parliamentary majority in parliamentary life had been utilised in this country, more especially with special reference to Kerala. This is the third time that the President has had to confess failure of parliamentary democracy by majority rule in Kerala and they had to come to this Parliament to allow him to appoint the Governor to govern there for six months or so.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Sir, on a point of order. I am sure you will agree that when my distinguished colleague Acharya Ranga is speaking, there must be quorum in the House.

Mr. Speaker: Let the Bell be rung—there is quorum now.

There is one thing that I have to say to the hon. Members. It does not look nice that the people should listen to the quorum bell four or five times a day. It is not dignifying. Everyone should try to see that he makes his contribution in making the quorum. Yesterday, I went round when the Bells were ringing, I found that there were two important committees that were conducting their business. I am making the request to them also. They did not move. None of the Members came out when the quorum Bell was ringing. At one time when I was here I found that hardly the quorum could be made up. There were hardly 54 or 55 Members that could be collected after the Bell had been rung

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Six times.

Mr. Speaker: It does not look really well for us that Bells should have to be rung again and again after every fifteen minutes. Members come in and quorum is made and then Members would be seen going out again.

Shri Warior (Trichur): Now-a-days, when the Bell is rung, there is another question that is asked, whether it is the Division Bell or the Quorum Bell. If it is Quorum Bell, they do not come in and they come in only if it is Division Bell.

Shri Khadilkar: What about the convention that during this tea time Members would not raise about quorum.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That is gone.

Mr. Speaker: I tried my best and I also wanted that there ought to be some interval for Members. Now, Shri Ranga may continue his speech.

Shri Ranga: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that this is the third time that it has happened in Kerala. Why is it

that the principle of majority rule has failed in that State? Many experiments have been made. Almost every important party has been charged at one time or the other of making up a majority and running the administration there—the Socialist, Muslim League also, I think, the Communist and the Congress. They worked in a coalition and had a majority. For some time a minority Government was run at the sufferance of the single largest party, I think, the Congress. Later on a coalition came and the Congress, as usual, followed the principle of the crab and killed its partners who came to fertilise it. So much so it began to run the whole show by itself by looting, by robbing or probing, by all sorts of means, by taking people from other groups, from independents also and covering them up in the usual mantle of the Congress, deceiving themselves and deceiving the public that it had a majority and they began to govern. Were there many pre-independence patriots there in the Congress? Not as many as there were post-independence patriots. And unfortunately for them in those areas those who had had the opportunity of carrying on the struggle for Independence under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, under his guidance and training, were in a minority. I think in 1960 the then President of the Congress went there and campaigned and some hon. friends there for whom I have great personal affection and respect had also gone there and run the election campaign. It was a national campaign carried on in the name of all democrats, belonging to all political parties, except the communists. They invited the co-operation of every democratic non-Congress party. They welcomed that co-operation; they appreciated it during the election and it was that democratic coalition that had won the majority. But what had been the result? Bit by bit they swallowed up the other people, demoralised some others and in the end they emerged as the single party Government, as the Congress Gov-

ernment. Some blame is to be placed at the doors of the former Prime Minister. But the present Prime Minister who was then not a Prime Minister was responsible in helping the then Chief Minister of Kerala who was contributed by the PSP to go to your State, Sir, as Governor. And afterwards, they were able to help themselves and they said to themselves: "We have added another feather to our Congress cap of rule, of power, in this country, entirely as a Congress Government." These methods, unholy as they were, immoral as they were, certainly un-Gandhian as they were, have also contributed to the present mess. They wanted to have, as they are having it, only their own party's Government in that State, as they are having it in other States also. But did they keep faith with themselves? Everyone knows that they did not. Therefore, there were groups, as there are everywhere else. But some sufferance is being shown to the minority group in other places, in a higher or lesser degree, but here in Kerala, they found it impossible to show any sufferance between the groups after a time. Therefore, the leader of the minority group within the group has had to resign from Ministership. Recently he died and I was told that crowds of people go to offer their *pranams* at the place of his grave or where he was cremated. I do not know exactly how his ashes were consigned. That shows that he must have been quite popular, and he could not find any place in that Ministry.

Earlier, some of the communist friends raised certain charges against the Congress Ministry. They published them in their papers. Some *golmal* took place between the Ministry and the communist party so much so that the poor communist party was obliged to withdraw those charges from out of the papers.

Shri Warior: The Government was forced to withdraw; not the communists.

Shri Ranga: There was an agreement between them, but the charges were withdrawn. (*Interruption*). The President of the Provincial Congress Committee insisted that those charges should be enquired into. If I am not mistaken, he is not one of the PIPs—Shri Govindan Nair; he is not a post-Independence patriot. I think he is a pre-Independence patriot, I am speaking subject to correction. He insisted upon that enquiry; it was not granted. Later on, my old friend, Pandit Nehru, said, "You send the complaints to me and I shall look into them." He did it on so many other occasions and in so many other places, and the country knows the result. The Das Commission stands as a testimony to those results. In this case also, the then Prime Minister thought there was nothing substantial and therefore he asked Shri Govindan Nair to keep mum, and in that way, they silenced it. But discontent was brewing all the time, and why? Because the people felt there were genuine cases of corruption on the part of number of Ministers including the Chief Minister. Right or wrong, it is another matter, but it has happened that way. Thereafter, what other choice was left now to the poor, helpless opposition or, as they prefer to call it, dissidents within the Congress? In the end, at long last, at least once in the history of these 17 years of democratic rule in our country, the Congress rule in our country, 15 of them had bucked up courage. How did they do it? I do not know, but they bucked up courage to give notice that they were going to vote for the no-confidence motion. They voted against the Ministry and in favour of the motion of no-confidence and brought down this Ministry.

I am told that although there were not as big demonstrations of joy on the present occasion as there were when the communists were driven out of power, the people are happy, I cannot say whether they are in a

majority or a minority but the people are certainly happy in Kerala.

In these circumstances, what is it that one can suggest to the Government? It was in this connection that the press people asked for my views, and I said that let an experiment be made, as Shri Khadilkar is now suggesting. He wants one kind of experiment, and I want another kind of experiment. Certainly an experiment, that method of choosing the Government or having the Government need not necessarily be on the lines on which till now the State Governments have been formed: whichever group or party is able to show that they have a majority, the Governor is expected to call the leader of that majority party or group to form the Ministry. Even there, the Congress has not been always so scrupulous. There were occasions when the Congress did not have a clear majority and yet the Governor called the leader of the Congress party to form the Ministry. After they had formed the Ministry, they were able to get a few more people from among the Independents and from other members also to join them and thus help them to make the majority. I need not get into the details. I am clear in my mind that that method is immoral and is wrong and is undemocratic. The Congress people also realised it and therefore they said, just before the results of the last general elections were announced that wherever they were found in a minority they were not going to invite members of other political parties or even independents to come and join them in order to help them to make a majority and form the Ministry. But, unfortunately, when they actually had to make a decision, in conscience, in Rajasthan, for instance, they stooped to conquer, and managed to get one or two or three Independents to come and support them and in that way they formed their majority there.

Thereafter, that process goes on, the process of political prostitution, this process of procuring members from other groups and other parties and independents in order to fatten themselves. And how do they fatten themselves? It is like a diabetic or beriberi patient growing more and more fat only to be at the disposal of the doctor all the time and his ministrations every day. This is how the Congress show has been going on.

Is it a real Congress in Kerala; it is not the real Congress. It is called Congress. After Mahatma Gandhi's death, they are content, somehow or other, and they are trying to throw the mantle of the Congress on some people and taunt all those others who have been pre-Independence patriots, taunt them saying that "they are not Congressmen and therefore they cannot be looked at; they are not good enough to provide any kind of leadership to the people."

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I want to know whether the hon. Minister of Railways is unusually active by the side of the Minister of State because the Congress party has been derailed in Kerala.

The Minister of Railways (Shri S. K. Patil): I am taking notes.

Shri Ranga: I hope the hon. Minister of Railways will not come to his rescue as he had done at the time of the last general election, especially in view of the hopeless and unwholesome results that those other friends of his have achieved as a result of the success that he has won in co-operation with other friends also for the Congress, because, again and again, he may go. He did it in Andhra; he helped them; he went to Kerala and helped them. He ought to know the results. He should grow wiser after these results and I hope this time he would not make himself responsible for a similar mess to follow if he were to help them once again. Anyhow, it is left to them, and he is in that party. If I had been in that party I know the responsibility, and therefore

I can only pity him if he is forced once again to go there. (*Interruption*).

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah (Adoni): You have paid compliments to the Railway Minister.

Shri Ranga: Is it not time now for the Congress people to begin to realise that it is much better for them to make an experiment at this stage in this problem State, that method of rule, or choosing the Ministry or the Government, which is different from the one that they had adopted till now, that is, by the majority party or majority group? If they are to do it that way, there is one suggestion made by Shri Khadilkar, and that is, the Congress itself should be allowed to go there and they themselves should form a Ministry and that the Ministry should be good enough to appoint committees representing all the political parties and the Opposition should be where it is and it should be content to give them advice and be satisfied with whatever implementation the Ministers can give to it. It is very much like the *Sanyasi* saying that "rice is white and chunam is white; both are one and the same; what does it matter what you take? I will take only rice." That is the way my hon. friend wants it to be once again having the Congress ministry there and the Opposition making a common cause with them and helping them to run the show as they have been running in the same miserable and disgusting manner. I do not agree with this method.

Secondly, he seems to think that there is only one way in the west by which a democratic Government in a parliamentary manner is being run. He is mistaken. There are two principal types—the British and the American. There is the third one, the Swiss type. That is what I have been thinking of. This is not the first time that I have mooted this idea in public. When there was trouble in Orissa and the House was asked to give its sanction to the President's Rule in a similar fashion, I made that suggestion. Earlier when there was similar

[Shri Ranga]

trouble in Kerala, I made a similar suggestion and I repeat it now. Look into the working of democracy in Switzerland, true it is a very small country; the population also is not very big. But at the same time, it is not much smaller than Kerala and the population is not much smaller than that of Kerala. Therefore, an experiment can be made on those lines.

What do they do there? They do not dismiss all political parties. All political parties are free to function. They go to the people and get their votes by proportional representation. If you can possibly introduce proportional representation even as an experiment in Kerala, if it is not too late for you to do it by taking the necessary legislative sanction, please do it; I am in favour of it. If you are not prepared for that, even then allow all these political parties to go and appeal to the masses. When they come back, I hope none of the political parties there functioning at present would be able to get a clear majority. I sincerely hope and pray for it, because this majority rule has done a lot of harm to them. So, I hope none of the parties would come back with a majority. Then there would be so many parties with or without majority. Let them sit together.

13.32 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Let the biggest party be prepared to make some concession by accepting a representation on the Ministry a little less than what is proportionately due to it. Let us agree upon a minimum strength of 5 or 10 members and let all those parties which gain that minimum strength be given proportionate representation in the Ministry. Let each Ministry be assisted by a small representative committee. Let all of them sit together and make a committee cabinet, as they have in

Switzerland. Let them not be too impatient about pushing their own policies and programmes and getting them accepted by a mere majority, but let them try their best to reach a consensus on as many points, as many policies and programmes as possible. In the case of certain things which the bigger groups or the smaller groups consider to be a matter of essential principle and of very great urgency and they cannot agree to be patient enough to wait until a consensus is achieved, let them also agree on some principle; say, that if two-thirds or something like that are in favour of a particular programme or project, it should be taken up. They can work out the various details, but this principle of committee Government must be agreed upon. If it cannot be agreed upon, I do not think you can improve the position in Kerala. If Kerala goes down, I am afraid it would be the beginning for this kind of political rot to spread to other areas also.

My hon. friend, Shri Khadilkar, is saying that the Swatantra Party is opposed to planning. It is not so. I have said it many times and I do not know how my friends on the Congress benches and other friends think it reasonable to go on saying that Swatantra Party does not believe in planning. We believe in planning, but we do not want this Planning Commission sitting here on the top of the Cabinet Ministers as a super Cabinet. The former Prime Minister himself was saying almost the same thing. Secondly, they are also confessing now that they have made so many mistakes, that they have given too much prominence to industrialisation and they should now give higher priority to agriculture. It is on this particular point that Mr. Patil had to part ways with those gentlemen, but in his own friendly and cooperative manner. Now they are coming round to his view as well as my view. Why should these people go on flattering themselves that they are

standing in some kind of heaven and the others are in abysmal depths? Our point of view is that we believe in planning, but of a different type, of a non-Nehruian type, non-Soviet type.

Sir, it is not as if I am putting forward my claim for inclusion in their coalition. My party does not function so far in their elections. But the most important thing is, if this Government, if this ruling party, were to declare itself in favour of the kind of proposition I have made, much good would happen.

All this time, many people have been wondering in this country and abroad as to why it is that such large numbers of people in every State go on voting for the same type or different types of Congress people, in spite of the fact that corruption charges have been levelled against Chief Ministers and other Ministers, and they have been proved to the hilt. Chief Ministers have had to resign; many Ministers have had to resign. Many Ministries have had to change places and all over it is taken for granted that unless a Minister is able to prove his *bona fides* by his general conduct or by whatever he is able to show to the people that he is honest, our Ministers are not taken to be honest today. That is the unfortunate notoriety that the Congress Ministers have won. I pity the other honest Ministers who are mixed up with these bad people.

In spite of all this, people go on voting for them. There are various reasons. There is the name of Mahatma Gandhi and Panditji, which they have appropriated and also the two bullocks—“our bullocks”—which they have taken over. But more than any other reason, there is the reason of the fact that they happen to be the ruling party. In this country democracy has been a new thing. For a very long time our people have been accustomed to supporting and eulogising the people who are there as

rulers. Once you say that you are not going to depend upon mere majority rule, the people would have an opportunity of making a proper choice between Congressmen and Congressmen first of all and next between Congressmen and other political parties, not with the fear or hope that the Congress people will come back again into power, but they will try to find out to what extent they can be trusted and relied upon. A free opportunity would then be given for the first time to the voters in Kerala to make up their mind without being obsessed by this feeling of their being the ruling party. Therefore, I make this suggestion that this experiment should be made, with whatever alterations they would like to make; it is not progressive merely to pick holes in the suggestion I have made.

In conclusion, I would like to say, let them not think that they cannot entrust the governance of a State to a committee government. It would be in actual practice something like a committee government. Let them look at the budget of the London County Council or any of the great cities of the west. They would find that their incomes, their budgets are much bigger than that of Kerala. Their population also, sometimes, is much bigger than that of Kerala. Yet they are running it. There was a time when the Labour Party was in power and Mr. Herbert Morrison was the Chairman of the L.C.C. The Conservatives and Liberals attended the committees there as minorities. They never said they were persecuted in any way. All of them worked together. In some committees Conservatives presided, in some others the Liberals presided and in a majority of the committees the Labourites presided. In every committee the majority group had certainly its own majority. Yet they worked with the aid of consensus, they worked together and that provided a very good government. You have made these State Governments here to appear

[Shri Ranga]

very big, with a legislature, with a Governor and all sorts of things. Actually, is their position better than that of the L.C.C. vis-a-vis their Government? Our State Governments here are deficit governments, bankrupt governments. They depend upon grants-in-aid, subsidies and other assistance that the Government of India is giving. Their powers are also limited to a very great extent. Therefore, let us not break many bones over this difference between a local administration like the L.C.C. and a State Government here. Let the Central Government and Parliament make this experiment and let us see how it would work.

Let, for once, the Congress leadership make up their mind and demonstrate to the people that they are not so keen on governing everywhere at all costs and under all circumstances and that they are prepared to share power with other people, not in the way in which they have done, in the crab-like manner, but in a co-operative, comrade-like, decent, Gandhian manner, when it would be safe for other parties to co-operate with them without the fear of being subjugated, subverted, degenerated and ultimately destroyed.

Shri Kappen (Muvattupuzha): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the motion that is before the House. The happenings in Kerala make a sad story, sad because of the way the Ministry had been brought down and sad because of the events that have been happening. Every Member in this House has got a right to interpret the events according to his liking and give his own colour to it. But we in Kerala are deeply sad over what has happened there. I, therefore, would request the hon. Members of this House to approach this subject in a spirit of sympathy and goodwill towards us and look at it from that angle of affection and love.

When I speak of that, I remember what was said yesterday by Shri Khadilkar. To use the mildest expression, the statements he made were uncharitable. He felt that in Kerala a stable government under democratic set-up is impossible and, therefore, he suggested that Kerala may be split into two and added on to Madras and Mysore. When I heard that speech I was reminded of the learned philosopher who spoke about the transient nature of life and of the futility of weeping over dead people when his neighbour's child died but who wept bitterly when his own child died. I pray to God that Shri Khadilkar may not have an opportunity of experiencing the experience of that learned philosopher.

Sir, the people of Kerala are educated, enlightened, cultured and their political consciousness is of a high order as compared to what is obtaining elsewhere in this country. They cannot be herded together to act in a particular way as somebody would like. The herd mentality is that of the savage and the illiterate. They form their own opinions and act according to those opinions.

After the 1957 elections when the Communist Party came into power much was expected. The Communists went about always speaking in favour of the poor and the downtrodden. But when they got power of office they forgot all that they spoke and utilised the power to fill their own coffers, the coffers of their party and their friends. The notorious Andhra rice deal in which the Communist Party knocked off lakhs of rupees from the coffers of the starving millions is an instance in point. Again, the notorious 'cell rule' that they established, where people were brought before the cell courts and fined, was another instance intolerable to the people. They demoralised the people as a result of which there was no law and order in the country and life and property were unsafe. In spite of all

these, the people of Kerala were patient enough to carry the old man of the sea for 2½ years on their shoulders, when finally they rose as one man and drove the Government out of power.

Now, Shri Khadilkar was speaking in a mood of desperation. When people become desperate they act and speak in a way which may appear strange to others who are not in their circumstances. The fifteen MLA's who crossed the floor were in Shri Khadilkar's mood. The reasons that led them to act like that, their frustrations, their disappointments, the rebuffs they have received, their mental attitude and all these things are matters on which I do not wish to expatiate—I do not consider this is the forum for it.

Various suggestions have been made here by various hon. Members. Shri Ranga himself made some suggestions as to how the Government is to be run in Kerala. Shri Khadilkar made another suggestion. That is all very good. Sitting here, it is easy to make suggestions. When Shri Ranga made certain suggestions, I must tell him that we have tried almost all the methods that he has suggested. For example, at one time the PSP had only 19 members while the Congress had 45 members, and still the Congress allowed the PSP to run the administration of the State. What happened?

Shri Koya (Kozhikode): Why was that support withdrawn?

Shri Kappen: Shri Koya was once the Speaker of that Assembly; he knows better than me.

Shri Alvares: What do you mean by saying "allowed to run the administration"?

Shri Kappen: The Congress allowed them—you will be pleased to underline it—to form the Government. What happened? The people again rose against that Government

and in ten months' time that had to go. All these experiments that have been suggested, I do not think, are going to work now.

After speaking about what has happened there, what has to be done in future is really a matter for serious consideration. One thing I would request this House to remember is that the Ministry that has fallen now remained in office for the longest period. For 4½ years it continued in office. It is after four and a half years' rule that it has fallen. After the fall of the Communist Ministry, from its ashes rose this Ministry, supported by all the genuine democratic forces in the State. For four and a half years it was functioning smoothly. That Ministry gave a new hope to the people, industries sprang up in the State, everybody felt that something good is coming to the people and the people were generally happy. Only the Communists alone were not happy.

Shri A. K. Gopalan led a march across Kerala, the epoch march, declaring that by the time the march reached Trivandrum the foundation of the Congress Ministry would fall and that the Congress Ministry would go to the dogs. But nothing happened and the march ended in a fiasco. Shri Gopalan issued a statement that the police behaved admirably during the march. After the lawlessness that was created during the time of the Communist regime, there was proper law and order and a proper police administration in that State and everybody was happy. At that time, unfortunately, there was a small car accident in which the then Home Minister, Shri P. T. Chacko was involved, which created a hubbub. The Communist Party took that opportunity to create trouble. Unfortunately, some Congressmen also, I must admit with shame, joined hands with them. Even though the Communist Party created all that hubbub, everything quietened down but then a Member of the Congress Legislature Party,

[Shri Kappen]

Shri P. Gopalan, went on fast unto death before the State Legislature, demanding the resignation of Shri Chacko. Finally, Shri Chacko resigned.

This was followed by a series of incidents, unprecedented in the history of Kerala. There was a dispute between Ezhavas and the Christians regarding the Thaikal burial place. That dispute ended in the desecration of the Thaikal Christian church and the Chief Minister, Shri Sankar, made a statement in the State Assembly that the occurrence took place at the dead of night, when there was heavy downpour, and so it was not possible to get any evidence in the case. Immediately after this statement, a series of church desecrations took place. Memoranda, petitions and resolutions were sent up in heaps but nothing happened. So far as the identity of the people involved in the Thaikal case is concerned, everybody knew them; yet the police took two months to arrest the real culprit and the case has gone to the dogs. More than 24 churches were desecrated and in that desecration the object of attack was Eucharist. According to the Christian belief, Eucharist is the body and blood of Christ. That was taken, torn and thrown into gutters or stamped under feet. There was a particular purpose behind these depredations. It went on unchecked and people began to wonder whether there is maintenance of law and order in the State or not. There was real commotion in the State and in the wake of it came the announcement by the Chief Minister, Shri Sankar, that the Inspector-General was going to be transferred. Just after a week of the announcement there was a news item in the papers that a secret file regarding the Inspector-General of Police was going to be published in a particular paper.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamaiah: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, when my hon. friend is trying to inject such vigour

into his speech, he must have a quorum at least.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member might resume his seat. The bell is being rung..... Now, there is quorum. He might continue his speech.

Shri Kappen: Just a week after this new item of the offering of the file for publication in the papers, photostat copies of the secret file appeared in a few Communist dailies. There was confusion in the country and then events followed in quick succession, ending with the fall of the present Ministry.

Now, let us not close our eyes and try to imagine there is darkness. It is a fact, and I am prepared to face it, that there were allegations of corruption against the Chief Minister. But what are those so-called allegations? Do they merit an enquiry? The allegations are that the Chief Minister used his official position to take on lease thousand acres of land at one rupee per acre for 99 years and that this document was registered in the name of "Lakshmikutty and others", Lakshmikutty being his wife, and that he planted 100 acres of land out of this with bud rubber at a cost of Rs. 1,500 per acre and that 50 acres of this was sold at Rs. 20,000.

The second charge is that the Chief Minister acquired six acres of land at Velli, which is kayal land and reclaimed it at a cost of Rs. 20,000 per acre. The third charge is that in the granting of schools bribes were taken, ranging from Rs. 3,000 to 25,000. One person went to the extent of saying "I am prepared to prove this; otherwise, I may be shot". Yet another charge is that one Sukumar Babu, a near relative of the Chief Minister, who is only a petty clerk in the Pewaswam Department, had acquired two fishing boats at a cost of more than Rs. 1 lakh. There are a number of charges like that.

Whoever has said that these charges are not being enquired into? Shri Patil who visited Kerala issued a statement that irrespective of the fate of the no-confidence motion these charges are going to be enquired into. So, I do not understand why so much of heat is generated on this. No one is going to fight shy over this enquiry.

14 hrs.

Something has been said about the shortage of rice in Kerala. It is a fact that there is no rice to be got in Kerala, whatever be the price you are prepared to pay, except one kilo or so from the ration shops for some people. There is really great suffering in that place. Due to incessant rain and due to want of rice which is the staple food of the people there, there is really great suffering. I would request, since the President has taken hold of the administration there, that it should be seen that rice is sent to Kerala immediately to relieve their suffering. In the coastal areas where the labourers live, people are not able to go to work because of rain and they have no money to purchase rice. Even if they have money, there is no rice available. Therefore I urge upon the Government that immediate steps may be taken to see that Kerala is supplied with sufficient quantity of rice.

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the Resolution moved by the Minister of State in the House seeking the approval of the House for the President's Proclamation is a grim reminder of the total, chronic and incurable inability of this Government to learn by experience; of its inability to do anything unless compelled and forced to do and its inability to move unless it is pushed to move. It also reminds us of this Government's superficial understanding of the working of democracy. The Prime Minister, I think yesterday assured somebody that there is 100 per cent democracy in this country because he rules by the consent of the majority in the legislatures and in the nation's Par-

liament. May I, with all respect to him, submit to him that this is a very elementary, rudimentary, very superficial understanding of democracy? I would like to tell him that when democracy flowers and matures, therein lies the glory, the grace and the beauty of democracy; it is the ability to respond to the chord, even if the chord is moving in the slightest measure, in the hearts of the people whom democracy claims to be ruling; it is the discovery of the national consensus. It is not the pursuit of a majority which descends very soon into a brute majority.

I would also like to tell him that the events in Kerala and what is likely to happen in Orissa and in Kashmir are the rumblings, or rather grim rumblings, that the authority of the Centre and of the hierarchy of the ruling party is beginning to erode and weaken faster than they are realising. It is also a grim warning to the ruling party that it will no longer be able to impose its mandate and writ on the people of this country by permutations and combinations of the communal and caste considerations by rushing at the last minute a Patil who will hold before the people of the State either the carrot of favour or brandish the stick of party disciplinary action. That is not likely to happen. That is one more lesson which Kerala has served on the ruling party.

Shri Nanda speaking in this House on the Motion of No-confidence, claimed that his party is the sheet-anchor of stability and the hallmark of democracy. Obviously, he was oblivious of what was happening, when he was addressing this House in such boastful tones, in the State of Kerala. The sheet-anchor and the hallmark of democracy were lying in shambles in the State of Kerala when he was saying that he provides the sheet-anchor of stability and the hallmark of democracy in this country.

Here again I would like to submit— I hope, they will bear with me in

[Shri Nath Pai]

patience—that the Congress has been the unsettling factor in Kerala. It is the main cause of instability in that State. The reason is very simple. The Congress never functioned as a political organisation true to its own ideals, policies and programmes in that State. It was a front which it provided for factors, for forces, for elements which were basically casteist and communal. These casteist and communal leaders of Kerala professed loyalty to the Congress, but basically they remained loyal to the caste and the communal group to which they belonged. It was a marriage of convenience between the bosses of Jantar Mantar and the communal overlords of Kerala. Therein lies the seeds of the continued instability in the State of Kerala.

श्री योगेन्द्र झा (मधुवनी) : केरल में जो आज स्थिति पैदा हुई है, इसमें क्या आपकी पार्टी की जवाबदेही कम है? पहले चुनाव में आपकी पार्टी ने कम्युनिस्टों के साथ मिल कर चुनाव लड़ा, फिर कांग्रेस वालों के साथ मिल कर चुनाव लड़ा और इस बार फिर कम्युनिस्टों के साथ मिल कर चुनाव लड़ने जा रही हैं। इसके बारे में आपको क्या कहना है ?

श्री नाथ पाई : अगर मेरे माननीय दोस्त, पुराने दोस्त और साथी

श्री योगेन्द्र झा : मैं आपका साथी नहीं हूँ ।

श्री नाथ पाई : भूतपूर्व साथी

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : भूतपूर्व ।

Shri Nath Pai: I would plead with you, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, when you come to the pressing of the bell to remember all this. I will always yield if the questions are honest like this one.

अगर मेरे दोस्त मेरे भाषण को सुनते तो उनको इसका भी जवाब मिल जाता । उनको चाहिए था कि आगे जो मैं कहने वाला था उसको भी सुन लेते । इस पर भी मैं आने वाला था । मेरे पास दो प्रमाणपत्र नहीं हैं, एक अपनी पार्टी के लिए और दूसरा दूसरी पार्टी के लिए । एक ही तरह के मेरे पास प्रमाणपत्र हैं । आगे मैं इसके बारे में कहने वाला था । अगर वह यहां बैठेंगे और सुनेंगे तो उनको पता चल जाएगा ।

I was submitting to you, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, what has been the main factor of instability in that State. Time and again it happens, as it has been pointed out yesterday even by speakers belonging to the ruling party, that these highly educated and highly intelligent people of Kerala are denied, what should be their elementary right as fellow Indians, a stable administration, a clean administration and an efficient administration. I think, my hon. friend, Shri Jha is partially right, not completely right, because now that he has crossed the floor he thinks that all the blame can be foisted on one side and all the virtues can be showered on the other side. That is not my approach. All are to blame. But, I think, basically the responsibility lies on those who have been holding the reins of power in this country for the past 17 years. The Congress never tried to function as a political party. Its Members are seeking unholy alliance I think, alliances among parties which have nothing in common and are only for the purpose of getting votes is a fraud on the people. I also will call it unholy. But the Congress basically was an unholy alliance itself in Kerala. Neither its secularism, nor its nationalism, nor its loyalty to democracy, nor to socialism was ever given a play in the State of Kerala. Its constant, perennial, perpetual pursuit was how to bring about a combination, a permutation whereby it will be able to get a majority in the legislature, if not as a majority of the

mandate of the people of Kerala. It was this subordination of the majority to this consensus of the people that should have been given for the people of Kerala. It was this original sin committed by the Congress for which they are today paying the penalty. Kerala will be a warning and it is not unlikely that such a tragic lesson will be repeated. Unless the proper inferences and conclusions are drawn very quickly by the Prime Minister, this hotchpotch remedy of rushing a Patil—I never understood whether he is going to intervene which I would like to know because he was making copious notes—this kind of a last minute remedy is not a solution. It puts the seal because he is likely to intervene, because he perpetually interferes in the affairs of Kerala. I do not deny the right.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Hathi): He is not intervening.

Shri Nath Pai: It is up to you to choose your spokesman. I would like the Prime Minister to think about this matter. Is it any solution to Kerala to try once again to get a majority which all the while carrying the dynamite of dissidency in its own ranks explodes periodically? The Congress carried within its own womb the time-bomb of the dissidents' rebellion in every State and this is becoming a pattern. If they want to stop this, the pursuit of the majority of the votes will have to be given up and the Congress will have to stand courageously, not by seeking the favour of this caste or that caste but by its programme if it is sincere about its programme which it has proclaimed.

I would now like to turn to what has been said by my hon. friend Shri Khadilkar. I wish that he were here. I had suggested to him that I wanted to reply, and I had suggested to him further that he should be present when I spoke. Shri Khadilkar has become a political vagrant of very

long standing. I cannot say that he is an elderly Congressman; actually, I cannot say that Shri Khadilkar is elderly anything, because he has never remained long enough in any political party. He is a Congressman, shall we say, an infant Congressman or a baby Congressman.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Infantile.

Shri Nath Pai: He said something here yesterday about Indian democracy which I feel the House should take very serious note of.

Shri Khadilkar has taken the pledge of upholding the Constitution when he became a Member for the second time in this House. He was flagrantly preaching subversion of the Constitution when he was preaching for the imposition of one-party rule in this country. I think the House should take a very serious note when any Member, under the very roof which is the guarantor of our democracy of the multiparty system, will plead or preach—this is not a matter for rhetoric; the Lok Sabha is not a debating union; it is not a university campus; it is not an academic society—the subversion of the Constitution; it is not a matter to be brushed aside by giving a reply. The matter needs to be very seriously looked into because what he said amounted to nothing short of subversion of the Constitution, inasmuch as he pleaded that we should look to the example being provided by some countries. Are we so fed up with our own democracy? If something is wrong today with our democracy, it is not that there is anything wrong with democracy as such, but it is because of the way the Khadilkar and their leaders have handled this very delicate instrument of democracy. Before democracy is condemned like that that it is not workable in this country, it needs to be handled by people with greater courage, vision, integrity and honesty. It will not do to tell the people of this country that democracy is not workable, and let us try to

[Shri Nath Pai]

have one-party rule. We shall resent that; we shall reject it and I appeal to the House and to all the Congressmen also to ponder seriously over what one of their men was saying.

Shri Khadilkar, however, functions from the edge, from the fringe, from the periphery of the dung-hill of history, as he called it. Once he told us in this House in an effort—I do not know what the effort was; so, I shall leave it at that;—I think he was making a gallant effort during the debate on foreign affairs—that all of us would be sent to the dung-heap of forgotten things of history and only the Prime Minister would be remembered; he meant the revered ex-Prime Minister. Today, he is consigning our democracy to the dung-heap of history again. I would say that he somehow functions from the edge of a dung-heap, and, therefore, he always reaches this kind of wrong conclusion. I hope the House will take serious note of this kind of preaching in this very House.

Now, I would like to ask Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri a few questions. Firstly, I would like to ask why the kind of thing happens in Kerala which really has happened. That is because you are never very careful about the standards which as a ruling party you are required to uphold. I read in the papers that Mr. Kamaraj, who has every right to go to Kerala as the leader of the Congress Party, was accompanied by Mr. U. N. Dhebar. Mr. U. N. Dhebar is not merely an ex-President of the Congress, but if I remember aright, he is the chairman of the Khadi and Gramodyog Commission, which is a statutory body. Are these the standards that we are going to set up before the people? Here is a man who holds such a public office like the chairmanship of a statutory body, but he will not hesitate to go and indulge on party platforms in party-politics. This constant debasement of democratic standards brings about a weakening of the people's faith in this delicate instrument

of democracy. I want a reply. In what capacity is Mr. U. N. Dhebar touring currently the State of Kerala? In what capacity has he gone there and what are his activities there? I want to know whether the Minister, or the Prime Minister, particularly who has only the other day, pledged us that it will be his endeavour to uphold the highest democratic standards, would like to use Mr. Dhebar's antics in Kerala as a shining example of democratic standards. Either he should resign and go, which I can quite understand, or he should not go. He is a Congressman of long standing. His heart is in the Congress Party. But then these divided loyalties would not do. He should resign, step down from the chairmanship of the commission and then go and work for his party. We recognise this right, but this kind of mixing, this kind of constant mixing of the apparatus of the State and the party machine has been one of the banes of this party.

I would like to point out to the Prime Minister what happens as a result of this, and how gradually the whole thing results in the withering away of the faith in democracy of our people.

There is the example, which the Prime Minister should take into consideration, of Goa. Here is an elected government functioning, and the government had its own view. How far is it finding a reflection in the policy that the Government of India is adopting? I cannot wholly hold Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri responsible for that because it is only recently that he has taken charge of it and he has made one or two right moves in the right direction. But I would like to say what happens to democracy, how it becomes a mockery and then it gets overthrown. Congress leaders should remember, and the Congress Benches should remember that democracy gets overthrown not by the sword or the bayonet of a potential dictator, but it gets dethroned from

the hearts of the people and then only its corpse is buried by a dictator as has happened in many neighbouring countries. If we do not want—and I think that here we have something in common in this House—these tragic lessons of the neighbouring countries to be repeated in this country, we must be very careful about this; you may defeat a man here or you may reject the plea of an Opposition Member, but when you basically will run counter to the express wishes of the people of a State or any area, to that extent, you undermine the edifice, the foundation and the structure of our democracy.

There was the small question of appointing the Chief Secretary of Goa. I think Shri Nanda took the position that he would not work with a secretary of whom he did not approve, and I think that he was very right, because the represented a popular government. But the Chief Minister of Goa also does represent a popular government, and nobody should try to foist on him, unless one wants to create an artificial crisis, a chief secretary of whom he will not approve. But there are double standards always. Can you not put up with a small non-Congress government in a single part of this country? It is this kind of example that comes before the eyes of the people which raises a question-mark in their minds, namely 'Will democracy function?', and it is this that gives an incentive and the line to men like Shri Khadilkar to say that this does not work and let us follow the example of Africa and try to impose one-party rule in this country. The remedy does not lie in that. The remedy is something which is very different.

Now, I shall come to another aspect. Shri Achutha Menon—now my hon. friend who challenged me should hear me very carefully—has warned my party in that State that that party should come into a United Front, and he said that if it did not come, his party was going to say 'Bold No' to my party. I want to tell Shri

Achutha Menon that I and my party say 'No' to his United Front, because a United Front in Kerala is what precisely the Congress has been, and the United Front of the Opposition will not be in any way better, because if the Congress is a hotch-potch of alliance and a front of heterogeneous elements which gathered together only for the booty and the loot of office, of the loaves and fishes of office and power and patronage and favour . . .

Shri Bibhuti Mishra (Motihari): What about my hon. friend's party?

श्री नाथ पाई : जरा आप फालो कीजिये । मैं जो कह रहा हूँ उसे सुनिये । अगर आप इतने उतावले न होते और सुनते तो मैं यह कह रहा हूँ ।

This will not do. I have the courage of saying that, that one unholy alliance cannot be countered and defeated by an equally unholy alliance of the incompatibles. Shri Achutha Menon should remember that he cannot bully and frighten some of us into going into the trap of the United Front. We shall reject the United Front. If the people want to choose us on such programmes, such policies and such record as we have, then we shall bow down to their verdict, but we shall not go into this United Front. I am talking for myself. So take it as it is. If it implies criticism of anybody, well, I stand by that criticism. If it implies criticism of the stand of some of my partymen, I stand by it. You try to cultivate such standards that your conscience and your loyalty to this country will always prevail above your loyalty to parties and whips.....

Shri Bibhuti Mishra: We have always been loyal to the country.

Shri Nath Pai:...as I am doing here. I am submitting that I shall be telling Shri Achutha Menon that there is a built-in danger; because of a built-in instability in the United Front, the Congress comes to a quarrel; and even before it begins to administer it begins to disintegrate in

[Shri Nath Pai]

the State of Kerala. Such is the fate of a united front of such heterogenous elements.

Only yesterday, my hon. friend Shri Warrior dismissed all of us as reactionary. Who allied against him in bringing down what he called euphemistically the popular government of the Communist Party? It was a popular upsurge of the people of Kerala, which had risen there and which had swept aside his party. But he condemned them as reactionary. But his party is pursuing that very line; if the pursuit of pleas does not succeed then it wants to threaten and bully; if cajoling and coaxing will not succeed, then intimidation and blackmail will be done. I want to tell him that some of us are not going to bow down because loyalty to the people and the upholding of the welfare standards of the people of Kerala will be the criterion. A party may get a few votes extra by alliances, but Indian democracy does not advance by that. The constant consideration of true democrats and socialists in this country should not be whether a wretched party will get a few more seats in Parliament or in a legislature but whether the seat of democracy, that is, Parliament itself will continue. And if in that process, he has to make a sacrifice, he should have the courage of making that sacrifice. This is the standard that I want to observe; this is the standard I expect others to apply.

I want to say further this. Kerala constitutes a challenge, a challenge not only to the ruling party; it constitutes a challenge not only to Kerala; it constitutes a challenge to the whole country and to all parties. Kerala has become the testing crucible of Indian democracy. We cannot get away by pointing an accusing finger at some malady among Keralites. They are no worse, and in some ways they are better than the rest of India.

The challenge is something like this: what kind of government we en-

visage. I would like to say here that if we look to history, Kerala has something to teach us. Just as democracy is ailing in Kerala, in the past Hinduism was ailing in the whole of the country. And a great and mighty voice came from Kerala and gave a new dimension, a new vigour, a new light, a new lustre to that ailing religion called Hinduism. May be Kerala, which is being condemned as the death-bed of Indian democracy will, if we will have the courage, if we will have the loyalty, if we will have the vision—far from being the death-bed of Indian democracy—prove to be the cradle of the rebirth of a strident Indian democracy where the pursuit will not be by political parties for hopes of a few crumbs of power but the ideal pursuit of the maximum welfare of the maximum number, the consensus of the people of Kerala. To that ideal all parties should address themselves, and that party alone will ultimately succeed, not only in Kerala but in the rest of India, which will have the courage, the vision and the readiness to forgo temporarily, in the interests of this country, what are supposed to be immediately electoral gains. Elections we may lose, but let us be sure that democracy will be preserved: That is the greatest gain for all of us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Kashi Ram Gupta.

श्री क० ना० तिवारी (बगहा) : मैं एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। आपने डिमा-क्रेसी के बारे में इतना कहा लेकिन यह सब जानते हुए भी शेख अब्दुल्ला से नेगोलिएशन करने के लिये कैसे एडवोकेट किया ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have already called the next speaker.

श्री काशीराम गुप्त (अलवर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कल जब श्री हाथी यहाँ भाषण दे रहे थे तो मुझे एसा लगा कि वचन से वह

जाबते की बातें कह रहे थे, लेकिन भीतर से उनका दिल भारी था, और उनका दिल भारी होना स्वभाविक था। इसका कारण यह था कि मंत्री महोदय को यह प्रस्ताव लाना पड़ा केरल की सरकार के बारे में जो कि कांग्रेस की सरकार थी और कांग्रेस जनों ने ही उसका विरोध किया था। और उसी विरोध का यह नतीजा था कि उस सरकार का पतन हो गया।

भारतवर्ष के इतिहास में यह प्रजातन्त्र के लिए एक कालिमा है और इससे किसी को भी खुशी नहीं होनी चाहिए। विरोधी पक्ष को भी इससे कोई खुशी नहीं है। पर मैं देखता हूँ कि कांग्रेस पक्ष इसका मातम मनाने को अभी तैयार नहीं है। वह अपनी गलती को टटोलने को तैयार नहीं है कि क्यों ऐसी स्थिति पैदा हुई। यह ठीक है कि सरकार के खिलाफ भ्रष्टाचार के आरोप आए और भी बहुत सी बातें थीं, किन्तु उन 15 घादमियों को इस प्रकार की हिम्मत कैसे पड़ी इस पर भी कांग्रेस जन सोचने को तैयार नहीं हैं।

मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि एक कारण इस प्रकार की लोगों के हिम्मत करने का यह भी है कि कांग्रेस हाई कमान रोजाना इस प्रकार की नीति अपनाता है जिससे कि विरोधी दलों का पतन होता है, और वह समझते हैं कि इससे कांग्रेस को बल मिलता है। कुछ महीने पहले जब पी० एस० पी० के कुछ सदस्य कांग्रेस में शामिल हो गए तो यहाँ यह नारा लगाया गया कि भुवनेश्वर रिजोल्यूशन के तहत यह सब कुछ किया जा रहा है। समाजवाद को मजबूत करने के लिए यह किया जा रहा है। मैं सोचता था कि अशोक मेहता साहब या और लोग वहाँ जाकर कुछ थोड़े से बर्दमानों को निकाल सकेंगे, और अगर वह कुछ बर्दमान कांग्रेसियों को निकाल सकते तो मैं समझता हूँ कि समाजवाद मजबूत हुआ, लेकिन वह किसी ऐसे कांग्रेसी को नहीं निकाल सके और उनकी स्थिति वही हो गयी जो कि समुद्र में या पानी में डालने पर नमक

1184 (Ai) LSD—6.

की हो जाती है। वे उसी प्रकार कांग्रेस में समा गये।

एक माननीय सदस्य : बर्दमान निकाल दिए जायेंगे तो कौन रह जायेगा ?

श्री काशीराम गुप्त : अभी अभी बिहार में जो स्वतन्त्र पार्टी का कांड हुआ क्या वह भी समाजवाद को मजबूत करने के लिये हुआ था। क्या वे इस प्रकार समाजवाद को मजबूत कर रहे हैं। कांग्रेस पार्टी के रोजाना के कारनामे ही इस प्रकार के भ्रष्टाचार की जड़ हैं। मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यदि यही हालत रही तो जितने भी प्रदेश हैं वे एक दिन इसी तरफ जाने वाले हैं।

मैं राजस्थान की ओर आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। राजस्थान की सरकार बहुमत के आधार पर नहीं बनी। एक घादमी को जो इंडिपेंडेंट था उसको साथ लेकर बनी। क्योंकि हमारे देश में कोई आचार संहिता नहीं है इसलिए इस प्रकार के काम को लोग पाप नहीं समझते।

एक माननीय सदस्य : सदाचार समिति है।

श्री काशीराम गुप्त : मैं उस पर भी आ रहा हूँ।

तो राजस्थान में नतीजा क्या हुआ ? वहाँ सरकार बना ली, वह सरकार चली और उसने कोशिश की कि जिस का भी धर्म भ्रष्ट किया जा सके करो और लोगों को अपनी तरफ लाओ। उस से भी उनको सन्न न हुआ और बेचैनी बढ़ी। जब नन्दा जी ने भ्रष्टाचार के खिलाफ आन्दोलन की बात कही तो वहाँ के कांग्रेस जनों के दिलों में डर हुआ कि कहीं हमारे पाप खुल न जायें, इसलिए एकता का नारा लगाया गया और उसका नतीजा यह है कि आज ऐसे घादमियों को कांग्रेस का टिकट दिया जा रहा है जिनके खिलाफ आरोप थे और जिन को एक जमाने में कांग्रेस हाई कमान बहुत नफरत की निगाह से देखता था। आज एकता के

[श्री काशीराम गुप्त]

नाम पर वहां यह सब कुछ किया जा रहा है। यह सब क्या है। यह अपनी जड़ें खोखली करने की तैयारी है।

मैं निवेदन करूँ कि जब से नन्दा जी ने भ्रष्टाचार विरोधी आन्दोलन प्रारम्भ किया तो कुछ लोगों के दिमाग में यह खयाल आया कि कुछ भ्रष्ट कांग्रेसियों के खिलाफ भी कार्रवाई की जायगी, मुझे तो यह विश्वास नहीं था। लेकिन इस बारे में अग्लबर में बड़े जोर से अफवाह फैली। वहां कुछ ऐसे आदमी हैं जिन के खिलाफ सबूत की जरूरत नहीं है, जनता ने उन का सबूत बोर्ड पर टांग रखा है। अग्लबर में कहा गया कि उन लोगों से एक व्यक्ति गिरफ्तार किया गया है। किन्तु वह व्यक्ति जीप में बैठ कर बाजार में निकला यह दिखाने के लिये कि वह गिरफ्तार नहीं किया गया है। तो लोगों को सूझ आ गयी और उन्होंने कहा कि यह 25 हजार की जमानत दे कर छूट कर आया है। जब सत्ताधारी पार्टी के लोगों के प्रति जनता में यह भावना हो तो प्रजातंत्र की नींव कहाँ और किस के ऊपर टिकने वाली है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यहां आजादी आने के बाद कोई आचार संहिता नहीं बनी कि कोई भी आदमी जिस पार्टी से चुनाव लड़ कर आता है उसी पार्टी में रहेगा और चुने जाने के बाद किसी दूसरी पार्टी में नहीं शामिल हो सकेगा। अगर एसी आचार संहिता बनी होती तो आज यह स्थिति न होती। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस बारे में मैं ने भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री को एक पत्र लिखा था। उसमें मैंने लिखा था कि आप केवल कांग्रेस पार्टी के नेता नहीं हैं, आप राष्ट्र के नेता भी हैं, क्या आपके होते हुए कोई आचार संहिता नहीं बन सकती, अगर आप सारे देश के लिए नहीं बना सकते तो अपने दल के लिए ही बनाओ, और क्या आप के होते हुए कम्पनियों से चन्दा लेने की प्रथा समाप्त नहीं की जा सकती। मुझे उन का जवाब मिला जिसमें

उन्होंने कहा यक तुम्हारी बात सही है, लेकिन मेरा बश नहीं चलता। उन्होंने कहा कि मैं कम्पनियों से चन्दा लेने के खिलाफ हूँ फिर भी प्रधान मंत्री होते हुए उन का बश उसमें नहीं चला। इस प्रकार की बातें क्या जाहिर करती हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि आचार संहिता होनी चाहिये, किन्तु वे इस हालत में नहीं हैं कि सब के लिए आचार संहिता बना सकें, लेकिन कांग्रेस के लिए कुछ करने की कोशिश करेंगे।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, उस कोशिश का नतीजा हमारे सामने है। प्रश्न तो यह है कि अभी भी कांग्रेस की आँखें नहीं खुलती हैं लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे विरोधी पक्ष के जो लोग हैं वह भी किसी कठिनाई में आ कर पड़ हुए हैं। मूल बात यह है कि प्रजातंत्र का मूल आधार यह है कि निजी सम्पत्ति किस रूप में और कितनी किमी के पास रहे। निजी सम्पत्ति को कतई खत्म करना कम्युनिस्ट विचारधारा की बात हो सकती है लेकिन वह प्रजातंत्र की विचारधारा की बात नहीं हो सकती है। दरअसल कम्युनिस्ट्स भी उस को इस देश में खत्म करने के पक्ष में नहीं हैं अलबत्ता सिद्धान्त रूप में जरूर उसे खत्म करने के पक्ष में हैं। इसलिए ही उन से खतरा हमेशा पैदा होता है। लेकिन दूसरी बात यह भी है कि उस निजी सम्पत्ति की कोई न कोई सीमा निर्धारित होनी चाहिए हमारे देश में। सीमा निर्धारण की बात न कह कर आजीविका की सीमा निर्धारण करने और आय को बांधने की बात करते हैं जोकि एक नामुमकिन बात है। जब तक सम्पत्ति की सीमा नहीं होगी तब तक आय को सीमित कर नहीं सकते हैं

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has spoken for eight minutes. We are concerned here with the Kerala proclamation, and not one word has been said by the hon. Member about it.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: I am coming to that, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should be relevant to the main motion before the House.

श्री काशी राम गुप्त : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो केरल की समस्या है, शुरू में जैसे मैंने बतलाया यह सारी कांग्रेस पार्टी की गलत और गंदी नीतियों का नतीजा है और वही मेरा विषय है। खाली मैंने ही नहीं बल्कि रंगा साहब, खाडिलकर और नाथ पाई साहब और कल जो माननीय सदस्य बोलें उन्होंने भी इस बात के ऊपर कहा है। खाडिलकर साहब एक पार्टी रूल की बात करते हैं। इसलिये मैं केरल के सम्बन्ध में ही कहते हुए अर्ज कर रहा हूँ कि यदि हम को इस देश में प्रजातंत्र को सफल और सबल बनाना है तो निश्चित रूप से उन ऊपर बताई गई नीतियों को अपनाना पड़ेगा। केरल के सम्बन्ध में मैं अगर कांग्रेस पार्टी और विरोधी दलों को जानते की बात निवेदन करूँ तो वह यह है कि केरल के अन्दर जो कुछ गड़बड़ी चली और अभी है या भविष्य में जो होने वाली है वह भी इस आधार पर होगी कि किस प्रकार की नीति यह कांग्रेस सरकार और कांग्रेस दल वहाँ पर अपनाता है।

अभी वहाँ पर समाजवादी और कम्युनिस्ट्स आदि मिल कर मोर्चा बनायेंगे। वह जो मोर्चा वहाँ बना रहे है वह इस देश में इस बात की एक परीक्षा होगी हमारी कि किस प्रकार से अगर वह कांग्रेस को वहाँ पर समाप्त कर सकेंगे तो सरकार बना भी सकेंगे अथवा नहीं। इसलिए उन को अभी से सोचना पड़ेगा। यह चुनौती है उन को भी कि किस प्रकार से शासन चला सकेंगे अथवा नहीं चला सकेंगे। यदि केरल के अन्दर शासन नहीं चला सके और फिर इस प्रकार के चुनाव हुए तो मैं फिर कहूँगा कि खतरे की घंटी सारे देश के लिए है केवल एक जगह के लिए नहीं है। आज वह केरल के लिए है, कल वह राजस्थान के लिए हो सकती है। परसों वह मध्यप्रदेश, पंजाब और उत्तर प्रदेश के लिए है। अगर यह हालत चलने दी गई और

बीमारी जारी रही और बढ़ती गई तो तीसरे स्टेज में जैसे कि तपेदिक हो जाया करता है वैसे ही हमारी हालत होने वाली है और यह केन्द्र के लिए भी हो सकती है।

केरल की वर्तमान स्थिति में सरकार के बास्ते दूसरा कोई उपाय नहीं था। केन्द्रीय सरकार के पास में यही एक रास्ता रह गया था कि वहाँ पर प्रेसीडेंट रूल कर दिया जाय। इस नाते यह प्रस्ताव वहाँ पर धाया है तो प्रस्ताव को तो हमें मानना है क्योंकि उस के अलावा और कोई रास्ता नहीं है। लेकिन मैं यह अवश्य निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि अगर हम लोगों ने, सारे देश के विभिन्न नेताओं और इस सदन ने जोकि एक सार्वभौम सत्ता सम्पन्न सदन है, हम सब ने इस प्रश्न पर गम्भीरता से नहीं सोचा कि भारतवर्ष की बीमारी जोकि मल्टी पार्टी सिस्टम की है वह किस प्रकार से समाप्त हो और किस प्रकार से यहाँ दो, तीन पार्टी बन सकें, इस प्रयत्न को यदि हम नहीं कर सके तो हम इस बात के लिए कलकित कहलायेंगे कि हम ने अपने कर्तव्य का पालन नहीं किया।

हम अपने कांग्रेसी साथियों से अक्सर सुनते हैं कि वे चाहते हैं कि एक सबल विरोधी, दल यहाँ पर हो। वे कहते हैं कि कभी कभी उन्हें स्वयं विरोधी दल का काम करना पड़ता है। क्या वह ईमानदारी से यह चाहते हैं कि विरोधी दल यहाँ पर सबल बने? अगर वह दरअसल ऐसा चाहते होते तो इस प्रकार का कर्म नहीं करते। यदि वह चाहते हैं तो केरल में 15 व्यक्ति विद्रोह क्यों कर गये हैं। पाटिल साहब जाते हैं और भी लोग जाते हैं लेकिन वे नाकामयाब रहते हैं। उन लोगों ने पूरा विद्रोह वहाँ पर किया। जिस पार्टी की सरकार हो उस पार्टी के लोग इस प्रकार से खुला विद्रोह करें और फिर भी उस को आप्रजातंत्र के लिए चुनौती न समझें तो मैं यह समझूँगा कि हम ने प्रजातंत्र केवल मजाक के लिए रहने दिया है और उस के ऊपर विश्वास नहीं रखना चाहते हैं। इस लिए यदि हम चाहते हैं कि केरल की

[श्री काशंराम गुप्त]

पुनरावृत्ति न हो तो पहली बात तो यह करनी होगी कि वहाँ जो भूमि सुधार का कानून है उस को पूरा शोच विचार कर के तय करें। उस ने जो वहाँ पर एक खलबली मचा दी है अगर उस खलबली को शांत नहीं किया गया और जनता को संशय प्रदान नहीं किया गया तो एक बड़ी भयंकर स्थिति पैदा हो जायगी। इस चीज को केवल पार्टी लाइंस पर नहीं सोचना चाहिए। किसान के हित में वहाँ क्या बात है उस को अभी से सोचना होगा क्योंकि वही मुख्य समस्या उन के सामने आयेगी।

अन्त में मुझे एक निवेदन और करना है और वह यह कि यह देश इस प्रकार का देश है जिसमें भिन्न भिन्न प्रकार के लोग रहते हैं। इस देश में हम को प्रजातंत्र चलाना है और जमाना है। प्रजातंत्र को हम पार्टी सिस्टम के आधार पर चलाने की बात करते हैं और उस में समाजवाद लाने की बात करते हैं जोकि दूसरे देशों में नहीं है। इसलिए जब तक हमारी अपनी विचारधारा इस प्रकार की न बन जाय जिसके ऊपर अंगुली न उठ सके, भले ही वह किसी पक्ष की सरकार हो, वह प्रजातंत्र को कायम नहीं रख सकती है। मैं इस सदन के तमाम सदस्यों से यह नम्र निवेदन करूंगा कि हमें अब यह बात तय करनी चाहिए कि आया कौन सी बात खराब है अथवा नहीं। अब रहा यह कि कोई मिनिस्टर कोई जमीन ले लेता है या नहीं, कोई और कुछ कर लेता है या नहीं इस से काम नहीं चलेगा या हम केवल यह कह दें कि भाई हमारा खर्चा और आमदनी एक हजार रुपये से ज्यादा नहीं होना चाहिए इससे भी काम नहीं चलेगा। मैंने डा० लोहिया की इस बात को लेना और समझा। उन की बात तो अच्छी है लेकिन मैं सोचता हूँ कि अगर हजार रुपये की आमदनी और खर्च की बात कहेंगे तो यह भी कहना पड़ेगा कि यहाँ पर मोटरकारें नहीं होनी चाहिए और यहाँ जो

सदन में रोज चिल्लाया जाता है कि सस्ती कारें चलायें उस का फिर क्या बनेगा? इस तरह से तो हजार वालों को सस्ती कारें भी नहीं मिल सकती हैं। इसलिए पहले फैसला कर लें कि इस देश का क्या ढांच बना कर रखना है। उस को कारें नहीं चाहिए तो बतों पर चलेगा, साइकिलों पर चलेगा कोई फिफ्ट की बात नहीं है। हमें यह निश्चित करना होगा कि प्रजातंत्री व्यवस्था में हमारा समाजवाद का कौन सा रूप रहने वाला है। हमारी अर्थ व्यवस्था क्या हो इस का फैसला आज तक नहीं हो सका है अलबत्ता अलग अलग दल अपने अपने मत से समाजवादी ढांचे को रख रहे हैं अलग अलग तरह से रख रहे हैं और इसी फैसले के अभाव में केरल में जो हालत हो रही है उस हालत को पनपा रहे हैं। केरल की पुनरावृत्ति अन्यत्र न हो जाय इसके लिए हमें सावधानी बर्तनी होगी और इसलिए इन सब बातों पर विचार करना बहुत ही आवश्यक है और उस का उपाय करना भी अत्यावश्यक है। धन्यवाद।

Shri Koya: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, a Government which started with betrayal ruled with betrayal and died with betrayal, was buried unsung, unhonoured, unwept. And we are driven to the inevitable conclusion that only President's rule is possible for the time being there. Therefore, I did not find anything abnormal in the hon. Minister bringing forward this motion. When the opposition parties could not form a government of their own even after the Governor had asked them to do so, there was no other go but to declare President's rule. Therefore, there is nothing to criticise the Government about.

The speakers who preceded me and by whose speeches I have become wiser gave a background of Kerala's situation. Many of them called Kerala a problem State. Kerala is not a problem State, Sir; it is a pro-

blem-solving State. We have solved many problems which you in the North could not solve. Take, for example, the communal problem. It is a State where mosques and churches and temples go together. It is a State where Hindus, Muslims and Christians live together without there being any untoward incidents. My hon. friend Shri Trivedi was criticising the Muslim League. But this is a State where the Muslim League was working very actively, but we have no communal troubles there.

Shri Bade (Khargone): There the Muslim League was revived by the Congress.

Shri Koya: Sir, of all the people in the world, for Shri Trivedi to oppose communalism is just like a prostitute preaching on chastity. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Bade: Sir, can he refer to a Member and say like that? I want to raise a point of order. Can he compare a speaker, and give the example of a prostitute in this House?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He did not compare.

Shri Bade: He said it was like a prostitute giving a lecture on chastity.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He never called anybody a prostitute.

Shri Koya: It is a pity that the hon. Member does not know about idioms and phrases, and I am very sorry I cannot teach him the dictionary meanings of certain idioms and phrases that we use. I have no objection to bear with interruptions, but the time at my disposal is very short.

This instability in Kerala was not the creation of the people of Kerala. It was the creation of the Congress High Command. It was the tantras and mantras of Jantar Mantar Road that was responsible for all the troubles in Kerala. We gave a very stable Government, we gave them a

very comfortable majority. The Muslim League supported the United Front candidates. Immediately after they got a comfortable majority, we were told: you are not to be in the Cabinet. Still, we pondered over the matter, and in the interests of stable Government in Kerala, we said: you rule, we will support you. Can such magnanimity be expected from any party in Kerala, where even when we were denied a share in Government and we were asked not to be in the Government we supported them in the name of the United Front which was there in Kerala?

Shri Maniyangadan said that there was nothing but an electoral arrangement, there was no such agreement. We thought that we were dealing with gentlemen in Kerala. We thought those who were fighting the elections together, would rule together. Many responsible people like Shri S. K. Patil and the late Shri P. T. Chacko said so, and it was reported in the papers that those who were fighting the election together would rule together. The slogan which was heard in the villages of Kerala was: Pattom Chacko Mannam Sankar Bafakly Thangal Zindabad. But one after another, all the others went away, and Sankar remained, and that Sankar was defeated, and naturally, we are not sorry for that. The betrayers got what they deserved.

As I said, we told them: you rule. Thereafter, they asked us to take up the Speakership. We took up the Speakership. We were in the Joint Parliamentary Party. I was one of the co-chairmen of the Joint Parliamentary Party. Can he deny these facts? If there was no alliance, what was the justification for the Joint Parliamentary Party? Shri Maniyangadan took it very easy. If there was no alliance, what was the meaning of bringing Shri Pattom Thanu Pillay, leader of the smaller party, to lead the Joint Parliamentary Party? We know something about democracy. It is the biggest party with the biggest number that rules.

[Shri Koya]

So, there was this alliance, but there were certain difficulties facing the Congress which they told us, and we asked them to go on. Our contribution to the democratic set-up in Kerala was its Speaker. When the Speaker died, the Congress Party who ought to have consoled us as a sister party, simply declared that we had to give up the Speakership because there was some trouble in Jabalpur, and a resolution had been passed in Durgapur. We were asked to sever our connections with the Muslim League and then take up the Speakership. In the interests of unity, to prevent happening what has happened yesterday, we made a second sacrifice. My humble self severed all connections with the Muslim League when I was assured by the Joint Parliamentary Party that I would be made the Speaker. I severed my connections with the Muslim League Party, and accepted Speakership.

Shri Maniyangadan said we went away from the alliance because they could not help us in parliamentary election. That was not the case. In all the 126 constituencies, we supported them in the elections and when there was one by-election in Kuttipuram, they said there was the trouble of Durgapur, resolution, and they were not going to support us in Kuttipuram. This is the kind of betrayal we got, and after a few more humiliations the time had come when we had to part company, say farewell, and we went away. We had no other go.

Shri Pattom Thanu Pillay was made Governor. Shri Maniyangadan said: after all, we are making P.S.P. men also Governors, we are generous, magnanimous. Was it like that? There were hundreds of P.S.P. and other party men in this country. None of them was made Governor. This was a consolation price for Shri Pattom Thanu Pillay. It was political corruption. In this country such political corruption takes place.

I was told the Governor of U.P. was consulted about the political

situation in Orissa. The head of a State should not be brought into the picture when we have political squabbles. I even object to an ex-Speaker being made a Governor. That is also a bad precedent, which you cannot find in any other country.

Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai was made Governor. The Praja Socialist Party understood that the time had come when they were also to go away. Pattom's party was also given up. Then the Congress said: I am the monarch of all I survey, and we are going to rule.

There were other questions. Shri P. T. Chacko, the great leader of the liberation movement, the gentleman who was responsible for bringing the Congress Government to power, was dropped like a hot potato. The Chief Minister said that he had no confidence in the Home Minister.

There were complaints about the dissidents, and it was said that the dissidents were responsible for all the trouble. There were charges, against the dissidents. Even after we left the Party, even after I was opposed by the Congress Party in elections, when there was a no-confidence motion, the Muslim League Party was neutral. When I was Speaker, there was a motion of no-confidence brought by Shri Janardanan, who is now in the Congress, and in that no-confidence motion, we voted with the alliance. In the second no-confidence motion also, in the interests of a stable Government, we were neutral. Ours is the only party, I claim, which was always striving for a stable Government, and every time the Government fell due to the acts of the Congressmen themselves.

They criticise the dissidents. What did they do? The dissidents gave a memorandum to the Congress High Command. The High Command did not pay any heed to the memorandum. I was told that they did not even get a decent treatment at the

hands of the High Command. The present Congress President has got a *parkkalam* theory, that is, let us wait and see. He waited. The dissidents were fed up. They had no other go but to vote against the Government.

The moment we withdrew our support to the Congress Party, they ought to have resigned, because all the Members of the Congress Party were there because of our votes, the votes of the P.S.P., and the followers of people like Mannath Padmanabhan. Therefore, they had no moral right to rule.

They again lost the right to rule when the Praja Socialist Party, which is now merged into the S.S.P., left them. But they waited and waited until they have got this dishonourable end.

And in those days, what did they do when many people crossed the floor? Narayana Kurup, elected on P.S.P. ticket, joined the Congress, and they welcomed him. Janardanan they welcomed. Kunju Krishna Nadar, who came to the Assembly opposing and defeating a Congressman, they welcomed when he rejoined the Congress. And now, the Congress has already opened its back door to hundreds of maharajas and zamindars in Bihar. Shri Morarka, the other day, was saying that people were standing in a queue to join the Congress. Yes, I find that the people are saying that Congressmen like Acharya Kripalani and Professor Ranga are going out, and maharajas and zamindars are standing in queue to join the Congress, and Shri Morarka will naturally be happy over it. But how can they blame the dissidents?

The dissidents had no other go but to oppose the Government, and it was the Congress High Command which was responsible for this also. It was the High Command which gave the direction that the Muslim League should not be included in the Cabinet, it was the High Command

which was responsible for the unstable state of affairs, it was the High Command which wanted the Muslim League Member to give up his party affiliation to become Speaker.

Why did we go out of the coalition Government? When we were still in a joint party, the then President of the Kerala Pradesh Congress Committee, the late Shri C. K. Govindan Nair, said that those who were saying that we were still in the ruling party must be taken to the lunatic asylum at Oolampara. This is the kind of treatment given to us. The Congress people thought that in spite of all these humiliations, in spite of all these experiences, we would still cling to the Congress Party. That never happened. The people of Kerala were fed up with the Government, the corrupt administration, a Government which believed in political corruption. If the dissidents had been one or two men, they would have made them Governors. It is very difficult in this country to make 15 Members Governors and Ambassadors. The dissidents had no other go but to oppose the Government, and that Government fell.

My hon. friend, Shri Khadiolkar, the leftist of the rightists, was trying to have some alliance with the rightists of the Communist Party. He says, we have got many things in common; it is only the Swatantra Party of Acharya Ranga which is opposed to the Plan; therefore, something like a coalition is possible. I do not know whether Mr. Warrior considers it to be holy or unholy.

Shri Warrior: It is completely unholy.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Koya: Coming from Kerala and interested in Kerala affairs, I request your indulgence a little further.

Shri Warrior said something about the unholy alliance or unholy combination. The Communist Party is

[Shri Koya]

trying for various combinations which according to the theory of Mr. Warrior may be sacred or holy. The group of the Communist Party led by my hon. friend E. M. S. Namboodiripad is considered a very reactionary group by Mr. Warrior's group, that is the rightists. They are now almost forming an alliance which may be a very holy alliance. I know how the Communist Party came to power previously and what all alliances they had at that time. We all know of at least two or three independents who were in the Communist Ministry and who were supported in their elections by the so-called reactionaries according to Mr. Warrior. The Communist Party must thank Mr. Mannath Padmanabhan for getting them the rare opportunity of coming into power in Kerala through the ballot box and when he withdrew his support they lost all these seats in Central Travancore. Therefore, let us not discuss this question of holy and unholy alliance at all.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I was trying to say that the people of Kerala had nothing to do with these things. They gave a stable administration with a creditable majority. It was the ruling party's dissidents, their groupism and their communalism, which was responsible for this situation. They accuse others of communalism. What is the Congress in Kerala if it is not a combination of communal parties? The leader of the SNDP will be a Congressman in the morning but in the night he will be working for the SNDP. The leader of the NSS will be a Congressman in the night and will work for the NSS in the morning. All these people say when the time comes, from the Congress platform: we do not want communalism; communalism must be eschewed. This is the type of sermons that we hear from these people themselves who have no right to preach such sermons. Now, of course, the inevitable has happened in Kerala and the President's rule has come.

We have got certain difficulties with regard to food. Prices have gone up. The poor people of Kerala find it difficult to make both ends meet. Food is not available in many fair price shops and in the open market also. The black market rate has gone up. The stock in the Government godowns is low. There is no Assembly there. People should not be allowed to suffer. Therefore, I request the hon. Food Minister to see that adequate food is supplied immediately to Kerala. The elected Members of Parliament from Kerala may be taken into confidence when the Plan is being discussed. It is not our fault that always when the Plan is discussed and formulated, the Government there falls. The PSP Ministry fell when the Plan was about to be taken up. The Congress withdrew its support then for reasons best known to its own Members. Therefore, we suffered. Government should see that Parliament Members from Kerala are taken into confidence when the Plan is discussed and when other matters also are taken up. I thank you, Sir, for giving me time.

Shri P. G. Menon (Mukundapuram): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the events that happened in Kerala early this month should cause distress to everyone in this House who loves democracy and wants to see that institutions of representative government should grow here, irrespective of the fact whether they belong to the Congress, Communist, SSP or any other Party. I feel that this is not the occasion to grow eloquent about the shortcomings of the Ministry that fell or about the incidents which led to it. If necessary, it would be possible for some of us to speak for hours on that matter. Now, what is it that happened? A no-confidence motion was moved by a member who was a leader of a party of fifteen members, the SSP. Then, there were the Communists who belonged to the right category and to the left category. Then, there were the Muslim League

members and then there were these fifteen friends who seceded from the Congress Party. I am not on this occasion discussing whether there were proper reasons for their secession or not or whether it was good or bad.

But the question is this. It is high time that in India in the Centre as well as in the States we developed conventions and rules regarding no-confidence motions to pull down Governments. The Constitution only says that the Ministry shall be jointly responsible to the Legislature. Is it a politically right? Is it a sign of political maturity that a group of people who can never dream of forming a Government should think of moving a no-confidence motion and bring down the administration? Forget for a moment the view of certain people that that the Congress Government there was bad. I do not want to join issue on that matter in this forum because it will be irrelevant. The members of the Muslim League and the Communist Party, the SSP and all the others was eloquent about the shortfalls of the Congress Party. Was it proper, four or five months before the general elections, when there was not a ghost of a chance of forming an alternate Government, was it proper on the part of the SSP leader to move a no-confidence motion? Was it proper for them to press it to a conclusion? According to me, the constitutional practice that we should follow is that a no-confidence motion is a device to replace a Government. If you want to criticise the Government and find fault with the Government there are other types of motions available. I am not finding fault with individuals but I am only referring to the political immaturity which still prevails everywhere in India including Kerala. There are people who think that this is fun which they can indulge in to walk into the Legislature, and move a no-confidence motion, pull down the Ministry, and then say when the Governor calls them, "No, No; we cannot

form a Government." This kind of tactics should stop in India if we want responsible government to grow. Opposition parties must have the patience to tolerate a government when they cannot form an alternate government. This is what I want to submit.

15 hrs.

I do not agree that on occasions like this the Ministry should be dismissed. I am not opposing this motion: I am just raising at large a question, a policy that should be followed. This frequent imposition of President's rule in the States should stop. This attitude on the part of the Union Ministry that the State Governments are their wards and guardianship can be imposed from time to time depending upon the exigencies of the occasion, will be an obstacle for development of democratic conventions and rights. Now, the Assembly is dissolved. If this happens here—God forbid—what would follow?

An Hon. Member: General election.

Shri P. G. Menon: General election. That is what I say. Unless the people of the State feel, the political parties in the States feel that irresponsible action will be followed by immediate general elections without President Rule intervening and unless the people so adjust their conduct that a stable government will emerge, the people will never learn the lesson of democracy. We must occasionally learn by mistakes.

The Chief Minister of Kerala, belonging to the Congress party, lost his majority because 15 friends of his deserted him; the no-confidence motion was passed because certain—may I use that word—irresponsible elements in the Opposition thought it fit to bring about confusion and anarchy in the country. President's rule is no anarchy, but it is a substitute for the situation of anarchy which the Centre imposes. The Opposition waxes eloquent on the question of the need for a strong Opposition in the country. Is

[Shri P. G. Menon]

this responsible Opposition? I am not speaking with particular reference to Kerala now. I take this occasion to urge upon hon. friends on all sides of this House to have a sense of responsibility and avoid these occasions. It is good that the Congress Chief Minister resigned because it would have been difficult for the Congress, under the situation, to fight the election with the Ministry, over which a no-confidence motion was passed, continuing in office, but correctly speaking, there should be no vacuum, and President's rule should come only when there is no other go. There was a government; that government should continue, should have continued, so long as no one in the opposition was in a position to replace that government. Unless we adopt these conventions, we shall not be able to grow democratically strong.

Shri Koya: What about the Constitution?

Shri P. G. Menon: The Constitution does not say that when a no-confidence motion is passed, President's rule should come. The Constitution only says that when it is impossible to carry on the administration according to the Constitution, then President's rule will come. That situation will arise only when after one or two general elections, it is found that the people of the country still do not behave.

Shri Ranga in his speech referred to Kerala being a problem State. In fact, whenever my State is referred to, it is referred to as a problem State by those of us who come from Kerala and those friends who do not belong to Kerala. What is the problem of Kerala? Unless you understand that, unless the Union Government understands that problem, unless the hon. friends in this House belonging to various political parties and various States in India understand that, the Kerala question cannot be discussed properly. The problem of Kerala is

not political. The problem of Kerala is not even one of caste, as suggested by Shri Nath Pai. The problem of Kerala is economic, and it is out of the economic situation that communalism has developed in Kerala. Look at the situation. No Member who spoke about the Kerala situation referred to the problem of high density of population in Kerala. Have hon. friends in this House ever thought about it? They waxed eloquent....

Shri Koya: That is not relevant here.

Shri P. G. Menon: That is relevant. That is more relevant than many of the irrelevancies referred to by some friends. What is it? Here is a country where the density of population is 1,025 per sq. mile, a place where education is widespread, education with all the hopes of a good and full life given to the people, and unemployment which leads to frustration. The Government of Kerala happens to be the main job-giver, the main source of employment to the people of Kerala, to those educated people of Kerala, and jobs being in short supply and the people clamouring for jobs being too many, communalism has developed there. There is a good deal of truth in what Shri Nath Pai said: communal politics; it is there in the Congress; it is there in the PSP or SSP; it is there in the Communist Party and the only party where its existence need not be referred to is the Muslim League because it is professedly a Communal party. So, on communal lines people are organising so that they may fight for the loaves and fishes of office. That is what is taking place in Kerala. Elsewhere also this situation exists but not to this extent.

Shri Warrior, my hon. friend from Trichur, was saying yesterday that the only party which would give a stable government to Kerala is the Communist party. I have no objection to my hon. friend entertaining that feeling. If after looking right and left and all

around he entertains that feeling, I wish him success; let him succeed. I do not want to say that the Congress party is the only party that can form a stable government in Kerala. I want to say this: the only party in Kerala which can form a stable government is that party which would be able to assure to the people of Kerala a government which would eradicate poverty and unemployment.

Shri Koya: Prosperity and plenty.

Shri P. G. Menon: Situated as we are in India today, the only government that can help to do it is the Central Government. No State Government can do it. If you go to Kerala—and because Kerala is the subject matter under discussion I am referring to it—you will find that there is grievance everywhere. The State feels that it did not get a fair deal from the Centre. The State feels that it has been discriminated against in the matter of development. Therefore, at the time of the elections, the Congress Party would say, "Look here; we are members of the Congress; there is a Congress administration at the Centre; vote us to power, and if we are voted to power, we shall be able to deal successfully with the problems of Kerala." The Congress failed. The Congress failed—not in the administration—to persuade the Centre to do justice to Kerala. The Congress failed....

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Nominated—Jammu and Kashmir): May I know in what direction it failed,

Shri P. G. Menon: I have no time to expatiate upon what I already said. I will come to the question of industrial development. In the matter of allocations under the Five Year Plans, do you know that in the Second Five Year Plan, when more than Rs. 700 crores for development was set apart, what Kerala got is an industry in which the investment was a ridiculous amount of Rs. 75 lakhs.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: How much did the Kerala Government ask for?

Shri P. G. Menon: Unfortunately for Kerala at the time when Five Year Plans are discussed, there would be President's rule there. That is what is happening now also. We asked for much more. In that matter, we did not lag behind.

Then, in 1957, when the Communist party put forward their election manifesto, one of the most catchy paragraphs in that manifesto was, "Like the Congress Party, we shall not shiver before the Central Government in getting the legitimate dues for Kerala. We shall fight the Centre and get what Kerala wants from the Central Government." That is what the communist party said, but the Communist party also failed. The result today is that communalism prevails rampant—not only communalism, but talks of electoral arrangements, etc. I do not want to enter issue with anybody on that matter.

But Mr. Nath Pai grew eloquent against Mr. C. Achuta Menon, who issued an appeal to the SSP that they might join the Communist party in this election. I felt that Mr. Nath Pai was addressing more his friends in Kerala than the Members of this House, because he was fearing that after all, they may enter into that alliance, in spite of him. He also accused the Congress Party that we went after Communal parties; entered into alliances with the Muslim League. Mr. Nath Pai is not here. I wish to assure him that in this matter, our guru was the SSP in Kerala, because even from the very beginning the SSP . . .

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): Erstwhile PSP.

Shri P. G. Menon: The evolution of this party is so involved that I find it difficult. It began with ISP. Then it became PSP. It was KMP for some time.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): There was CSP in between.

Shri P. G. Menon: Yes. Till the time they get to the extreme end of the English alphabet and become ZSP,

[P. G. Menon]

probably these evolutions will take place. But the PSP had entered into an alliance in 1954 with the Communists, in 1957 and afterwards with the Muslim League, and in 1960 with every conceivable party in Kerala, including Congress.

An Hon. Member: Mr. Nath Pai has come.

Shri P. G. Menon: How can communalism disappear? Any amount of sermons from Members or political leadership will not remove communalism either in Kerala or elsewhere, so long as the need, the occasion, the necessity for that kind of feeling among groups remains. The Muslims should feel that they are getting a fair deal. Among the Hindus, there are various castes in Kerala and they organise communally, they would not get their proper share from the Government. That is the reason for communalism in Kerala.

The difference between Kerala and certain other States in India is only this. In Kerala, all the sections of people have become educated and literate and know how to ask for their rights. Later on probably other States also will follow suit. Therefore, I take this occasion, on behalf of my State, to bring to the notice of this House and to the Central Government that that party alone will be able to form a stable administration in Kerala which will be able to promise the people of Kerala that they will be able to develop Kerala out of its present backwardness. That is the position.

It has been admitted on all hands, from the late Prime Minister downwards, that the ills of Kerala can be cured only by industrial development. But what is the position? During the last three or four years continuously for four months in the year, there was a power famine and all the industrial units had to be closed for want of power. Kerala is the only State in India barring Mysore, which can produce power at the cheapest

rate. The States of Mysore and Kerala can produce power, but there is no power. In Madras State, you can produce power only at a much higher rate and Kerala is made to depend upon Madras for power.

Shri Himatsingka (Godda): Because Kerala has power politics.

Shri P. G. Menon: Politics itself is for power. The word 'power politics' is a contradiction in terms. Nobody enters into politics other than for capturing power. The word 'power politics' was developed at a time when political parties wanted to oppose the Government and did not want to enter into office. Then certain persons were accused of being power politicians and of being swayed by power politics. That is not relevant on this occasion. All political parties are for power. I do not want to expatiate on this.

This is the third occasion when President's rule is coming to Kerala. It came on the first occasion in Travancore-Cochin and on another occasion in Kerala. Now on the third occasion, it is coming. It is high time that this Parliament and the Government here think why it is that stable government is not possible in Kerala. The Kerala people are not different from the rest of the Indian people. There is nothing wrong with us. It is because there are certain situations, certain difficulties in the country that we are not able to supply a stable government. Therefore, what should be done on occasions like this is to discuss thoroughly the reasons for the situation. According to my humble reading, it is neither the Communist party nor the SSP nor the Muslim League nor even the warring sections in the Congress Party in Kerala—which is responsible for the situation. Probably we have got a better Congress organisation in Kerala than elsewhere, but the economic situation brings about instability in Kerala, because there is a situation in which the strongest political party will

not be able to form a stable government, because it will not be able to deliver the goods. Therefore, what the Union Government should remember if it should not have President's rule permanently in Kerala, is to see that situations are created where the people of Kerala will feel happy. Elections mean nothing to the frustrated people. Ministries do not mean anything to them. President's rule is as good or as bad as rule by the popular government, because whether it is President's rule, whether it is Congress rule, whether it is Communist rule, whether it is PSP rule or whatever rule it is, the situation is the same. There is a saying in Malayalam—I cannot but quote it now:

"Onam vannalum, Unni pirannalum, Koranu kumbilil kanji."

It means, whether it be the Onam festival or whether there be rejoicing due to the birth of a child in the family, Koran always gets a drop of *kanji* in his *kumbil* made of leaf and nothing further. That is the situation in Kerala. Forget not that, that is the situation and any amount of political discussions, mud-slingings and finding fault with each other will not solve the Kerala problem.

Shri Imbichibava (Ponnani)*. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this is not for the first time that the President's rule is imposed on Kerala State. The ruling party had suspended the Constitution in Kerala in the past on many occasions to suit the selfish interests of the party. It never showed the slightest regard for the democracy in that tiny State.

The present crisis has not emerged as a result of any fault of the people in Kerala. The entire responsibility for this whole debacle lies in the anxiety of the ruling party to keep the monopoly of power in its own hands. A cursory glance at the history of Cabinet formations since independence will bear the testimony for this.

Sir, in the 1948 elections people in the former Travancore-Cochin State voted the Congress Party to power which got 97 seats. As a result of this Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai formed the first Congress Cabinet in the State. In a period of six months due to internal dissensions a no-confidence motion was passed against the cabinet and Shri Paravoor was elected as the leader of the Congress Party who headed the new Ministry. The Ministry was forced to resign in 1951 when serious charges of corruption were made by one of the Congress Ministers against some other Ministers in the cabinet.

The Congress Party, despite its losing face in the public eyes, formed another Ministry led by Shri C. Keshavan. Since it did not include any representatives from Cochin, MLA's from that region submitted their resignation. This compelled Shri C. Keshavan to reconstitute another cabinet by taking representatives from Cochin also.

The First General elections showed the waning influence of the Congress Party in the State. Out of 108 seats Congress got only 44 seats. However, with the help of some independents the Congress formed a Government led by Shri A. J. John. It became a temporary affair and within a period of one year a confidence motion was defeated which toppled down the Government. The Union Government dissolved the legislature and re-election took place.

People rejected the Congress Party once again. It got only 45 seats while the Communist Party emerged as the Second Party in the State with 23 seats. Seeing the possibility of the Left Government, the Congress Party supported PSP and formed a Government under the leadership of Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai.

This opportunist alliance could not work for long and Congress Party

*English translation of speech delivered in Malayalam.

[Shri Imbichibava]

withdrew support to the PSP Ministry which brought down the Pattem Ministry unceremoniously. The new Congress Cabinet with Shri Panampalli Govinda Menon as Chief Minister was formed with the support of Tamilnad Congress Party. Soon this arrangement also failed to work and President's rule was promulgated in the State.

The growing isolation of the Congress Party reached its height and people gradually began to look at the Communist Party as the alternative to the out and out corrupt regime. During the Second General Elections people voted for the Communist Party which got 60 seats and its supported independents got 5 seats.

Though the Communist Ministry was the most stable Ministry during the whole decade, it was wantonly dismissed by the Centre in 1959. The Centre actually instigated the agitation with the view to create an alibi for the Central intervention. We rightly characterised the action of the Central Government as a cold-blooded murder of democracy.

The mid-term elections brought the anti-Communist alliance into power but the voting of the Communist Party went up despite a slanderous campaign against our Party.

It is but natural that the new Pattem-led PSP Ministry could not continue for a long time. Internal disension began to come to the forefront and the Congress took power once again in its hands. Shri Sankar became the Chief Minister but a group was formed against him inside the Party. Serious charges of corruption were levelled against the Chief Minister not only by the Opposition parties but by a large number of members from the Congress Party. Finally, this Ministry was also toppled down recently and we are now having President's rule in the State.

The main reason for dealing with this history is that this record of the Congress Party is the most effective condemnation of the Congress regime.

What is more surprising is that despite this shady record of the Congress Party in a State where the literacy is the highest, the Home Minister says that the Congress Party is sheet-anchor of stability. If the Home Minister makes this statement in Kerala, people would find it difficult to control their laughter. There the people have seen in actual practice that the Congress Party is the monument of instability.

Any honest ruling party would have been frank enough to admit its unfitness to rule over the State. However, the Congress Party is still trying to cling to power, by using all possible dirty tricks.

What is significant is that the State Congress leaders were always protected by the Centre. The corrupt ministers were openly shielded by the High Command with the result that the Party has become a laughing stock in State politics. Now the Central leadership cannot escape the responsibility for this sorry state of affairs because they were a party to the whole bungling.

Even while promulgating the President's rule, Sir, the Congress Party resorted to underhand methods that have nothing to do with democracy. On 15th September the by-election for Rajya Sabha seat was scheduled to be held. The dissolution of the Assembly could have been effected after this by-election. However, the Government preferred to dissolve it only 4 days earlier. This was done only to save the Congress Party from facing another defeat. But this action showed the real love of the Congress Party for democracy and democratic traditions!

Sir, has the Congress High Command ever paid any serious attention.

to the causes of the bankruptcy of the State leadership? I am sorry to state that they have never cared to do so. If they would have searched their hearts, they could have found that the State Congress leadership has no moorings that would link them with the people in Kerala. The High Command would have found that the Kerala Congress has now degenerated to such ridiculous extent that it has become a federation of various communal organisations. The church and the Nair Service Society are the main components of this unholy alliance. The arch communal leaders of the State are now the stalwarts of the Congress Party with the result that the Congress Ministry has always been a pawn in the hands of these arch communal leadership.

Sir, it is a well-known fact that the recent dissension inside the Kerala Congress were not based on political differences but purely on communal basis. The Congress Party will never achieve integration of these forces because their interests collide with the interests of the people in the State.

Sir, I would like to point out in this connection the mission of Shri S. K. Patil who was sent by the Congress High Command to patch up the differences among the Congress MLA's. One is surprised to note that he met many communal leaders with a view to obtain their cooperation to save the tarnished image of the ruling Party. His mission failed miserably because the rivalry among these arch-communal factions had gone beyond dangerous limits. Shri Patil assured the dissident Congressmen of a proper inquiry into the allegations against Shri Sankar. Though nearly three weeks have passed, the Union Government has yet to announce the steps to be taken in that direction. What else can be expected from a Government which requires a no-confidence motion only to give a verbal assurance to investigate into serious allegations of corruption against a Chief Minister.

The Congress Party has tried coalitions with all the parties except our Party. But it has stabbed in the back of every partner to serve its narrow party interests. Now, when all the parties have been thoroughly disillusioned about the nature of the Congress Party, the Congressmen have started stabbing each other in the back and this will have no ending.

Sir, when the Communist Ministry was in power it implemented policies that would serve the interests of the people. It tried to implement the land reforms which the Congress Party failed to implement in other States. Mr. Ledjinsky has categorically pointed out this failure of the Congress Governments in various States. You have overthrown a democratic Government though it had majority in the Assembly. You have overthrown the Government which genuinely implemented Education Bill which went against vested interests and communal elements in the State. How can you maintain your rule after overthrowing our Government to suit such reactionary elements.

The crisis in Kerala will continue till a strong and unified opposition emerges in the State. However, the ruling party with its steam roller majority in the Centre will never allow any democratic opposition Government to rule in a State.

This makes the nature of this crisis more serious. We, however, will not be cowed down by these efforts of the Congress Party. We will continue to fight for the democratic rights of the people and we are sure that day will come when democratic forces will win with flying colours.

Now, that the President's rule is imposed on the State I would like to point out that more attention should be paid to the interests of the people. I have recently received a telegram

[Shri Imbichibava]

from Calicut which says that food situation has become acute. Rice is not at all available in the market. The black-market price has gone up by 25 per cent. In some places rice is being sold at Rs. 77 per bag. District authorities are just expressing their helplessness and people are becoming restless. Similar situation is prevailing all over the State. In the absence of any democratic set-up the Central Government has to pay more attention to the grievances of the people.

I learn that some strikes in Kerala are prolonged for more than two months and the Sankar Ministry failed to intervene in them. I expect that the new administration would show some reasonableness towards peoples' pressing demands. Otherwise, it will have to face stiff mass resistance in the days to come.

15.33 hrs.

[SHRI KHADILKAR in the Chair]

Shri Nataraja Pillai (Trivandrum): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I request your indulgence to make a few observations on the Resolution under discussion.

Kerala has again gone under President's rule. Since the new State of Kerala came into being eight years ago, she had the unique privilege of creating situations in which the Government could not be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. A vote of no-confidence on the Ministry was moved in the State Legislative Assembly, which is, after all, a normal constitutional procedure, and the Ministry was voted out. But the next step of forming an alternative Ministry was found to be impossible, since no party could command a majority in the House. This is the result of social conditions that prevail in that State.

In spite of the continued preaching for secularism and nationalism in our

country, casteism and communalism play their role and create difficulties for the State off and on. Caste or religion cuts across political party affiliations. They are held high and party policies do not get a place and have to yield place for the caste or communal feelings or loyalties.

The population pattern of that State is at the root of the constant political instability and the party equilibrium is lost very often and we see that in the emergence of President's rule in that State.

In that State there are three or four communities of more or less equal numerical strength and equal material resources which makes it impossible for any one community to dominate the scene. Therefore, it is only a group of two or more communities that can command a majority. Under these conditions, if there is any change or shift in the combinations, the majority party or the party in power will be in peril.

The State had the unique distinction to have three periods of President's rule in the short period of eight years. Apart from the unsavoury communal tangle, the economic condition of the State and the peculiar problems that are there, create discontent and dissatisfaction against any government that may function there. Whether the Government is a Government of the Congress, Socialist or the Communist or a combination of these, it loses its equilibrium when it affronts particular sections of the community or fails to satisfy the aspirations of the people.

Apart from that, there are certain problems which face the Government and the administrators in that State. We have there the highest density of population in India. As one of my hon. friends has stated, it is more than one thousand. We are chronically deficit in food production. Our food production is not sufficient to

meet the demands of the people for six months in the year. Rather, 60 per cent of the required quantity of food has to be imported into the State.

श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा (नेता): सभा-पति महोदय, हाउस में क्वोरम नहीं है ।

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may resume his seat. The bell is being rung.....Now there is quorum. He may continue his speech.

Shri Nataraja Pillai: However much we may try, we cannot increase it by 100 per cent in any conceivable future. Agriculture in my State is not primitive. Modern methods of agriculture are in vogue there. That State is one of the most industrially backward areas in India. The percentage of educated unemployed is of the highest order in that State. Percentage of literacy is the highest among the States. Political consciousness is very alive and is kept alert by the large number of newspapers that are being published from our State. In these conditions for any government to function well and to get the co-operation and the goodwill of the people we have to launch upon a massive industrial and economic developmental plan. That alone will give satisfaction to the people. But, unfortunately, so far industrial development in the post-independence period is nominal in our State. People are feeling difficulty to make their livelihood. Moreover, the educated unemployed is becoming nervous. In these conditions, for a stable government to function in Kerala we have to launch upon a programme of development which will meet the needs of the people.

Unfortunately, during the past eight years when the Five Year Plans were being finalised, the State was under civilian rule and the popular representatives were in the woods. Therefore, the position of Kerala Govern-

ment is almost chronically in disequilibrium. That has to be avoided by earnest efforts by the President's rule now in force in the State. Though the President's rule is a constitutional necessity, it wounds the self-respect of the citizen of the State. In a mood of anticipated good I would welcome it with some diffidence. The constitutional boon or benefit conferred on the Indian citizen is lost to the people of Kerala. That is not an enviable position; but, as I said, in the interest of the people and for the continuity of administration, I welcome the President's rule.

I have another reason also to do so at this juncture. When the food deficit is so great and scarcity of food is felt throughout the Indian continent, our position depends upon the goodwill of our neighbours. To open negotiations with State Governments and to import foodgrains is not an easy matter as we have experience of it. The only possibility is the goodwill of the Central Government and their specific interest to see that the country is not starved will alone save the present conditions there. I hope, the food situation will be properly handled and the Plan preparations will be carried on with a realism so that the country may benefit in the ultimate.

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): In order to prove a proposition I had gathered some press cuttings, but I find that it is superfluous for me to quote from any press cuttings in the light of the confessions made by the representatives of Kerala in this House. It is unanimously accepted that the real tangle in Kerala is a communal one.

I wanted to quote from the *Blitz* and the *Organiser*, *Blitz* which speaks for one section of opinion which is called the progressive section, and *Organiser* which speaks for another section of people whose characteristic they say is patriotism. Both these politically-poles-apart papers adduce

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

the same reasons as those adduced by hon. Members of this House regarding this tangle.

In 1948, before the establishment of a popular government in that State, I happened to go there. Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai, the first Chief Minister of the State, had organised a public meeting under his presidency, and I had the privilege of addressing that meeting in Trivandrum. So long ago, as 1948, looking at the scene and the preparations that we were making for framing a Constitution and arranging electoral constituencies, I said in that public meeting: 'If you follow this communal pattern, no government and no Ministry in Kerala would be stable'. Many people criticised me in those days for that speech. But I find today that my apprehension has become so true that we had to resort thrice to President's rule in Kerala.

My hon. friend Shri P. G. Menon who was one of the Chief Ministers complained that the Central Government were not paying proper importance and attention to the economic development of Kerala. Whatever may be the argument, I agree with him that the Central Government here is not taking things all over India seriously enough. When we are discussing the collapse of a whole system of responsible government in a State, how many Members in the Treasury Benches are sitting here? It is a subject which ought to give great headache to the Prime Minister, to the Home Minister and to the top leaders who in season and out of season talk of what is called national integration. Here is a case of four communities going on parallel lines for the last seventeen years. Out of a Ministry here which consists of fifty odd Members, we do not find even five top people here, we do not find even two top people or even one top man here, to listen to what is being said in this House on this all-important problem. In fact, the top leaders of the Congress or the Government

ought to listen to the debate that is taking place here and find remedies in all seriousness.

I find that the charge against the Government that they are not taking these important matters seriously is true. There can be no difference whatsoever. Hereafter at least, I hope that such important problems will attract the attention of the Cabinet Ministers and the Ministers who will be able to forge what is called national integration so that they may be present on such occasions and listen to the debate and modify their opinion and adjust it according to the moving times.

I agree in some way with the proposition you, Sir, made when you were speaking. We have to apply our minds afresh to the problems of democracy in this country. Now that we have had a pattern of government along the British pattern, or a mixture of the British and American patterns, it is not a remedy in itself for all times to come, for all states and for all circumstances. In fact, the system of government must grow naturally with the evolution of the people in their cultural, economic and social progress. Here is a case where in spite of our best efforts, communal integration has not taken place, and we continuously go on blaming inside and outside the communities for it. Even if they are responsible, nobody can throw them either into the Bay of Bengal or into the Arabian Sea. We have to reckon with the castes that exist there. In fact, we have to so evolve a system of government as to see that these communal patterns give way to a really integrated democratic set-up. Nobody has taken that into consideration up till now.

I want to make one suggestion. What we see in its ramifications today in Kerala, the very same characteristic is present more or less in every other State in India, may be

except one or two. It is said in many of the States, that except a person belonging to a particular community, no other person belonging to any other community can become the Chief Minister of the State. That is the hard fact. In fact, I have risen above all these party considerations and spoken many a time at public meetings that we here see Congress communalism clad in khadi. This is a serious problem facing not only the Congress but the country. The Congress, the PSP and the Communist Party, all the parties, as my hon. friend, Shri Govinda Menon and others said, are, for political advantage, conniving at these developments and exploiting these tendencies—in order to get into power. This temptation to get into power has overlooked the dangers inherent in the situation. The present Constitution must be so modified as to meet this new danger of communalism-casteism enthroning itself in seats of power.

Government by majority inevitably leads to what are called communal combinations. And under adult franchise, the ignorant villagers are, as we see, many a time made to vote according to communal patterns. Mind you, as Shri Govinda Menon said in his own way, literacy does not mitigate communal consciousness; on the other hand, it aggravates it, as we see it in Kerala.

Many a time I am enthusiastic about the professions of the Communist Party. It is the one party which diverts people's attention from communal canker to economic policies. Sometimes their extra-territorial loyalty spoils their case in the eyes of people like me. But economic policies ought to govern our view of political matters. The Congress has failed, the PSP has failed and every other party, including the Communist Party, has failed in Kerala. I do not know about the Communist Party in other States. Here is a problem which requires the attention of the best leadership of our

country. If it is analysed and diagnosed properly, any impartial and patriotic person will be able to find a new formula.

The first suggestion I make in regard to Kerala is that ICS people should not be allowed to be the Advisers of the Government. Whenever democracy fails, if ICS people are brought into the picture as advisers in name but rulers in fact of the State for the time being, an impression will be formed in the minds of the people that the officers are the better part of the democratic set-up of this country.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: Better administration.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Even if President's rule is to be imposed upon a State, the people of the State concerned must be able to govern themselves in some other way. It is not the ICS, sent from Delhi, that is to rule the State. In Kerala, I am pretty sure that there are people who are not aligned to any particular party, who are impartial, and who are able administratively and otherwise, and who will be able to work for the people in a much better fashion than these ICS officers drafted from Delhi or other places.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): Is not the speaker making very wise statements without having any substance, and irrelevantly also?—What has he got to do with the ICS people who are, after all, permanent officials?

Mr. Chairman: He is making a valid point by suggesting that instead of handing over the administration to ICS executives, we could have some people from public life to look after the administration.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): Very relevant.

Shri Warrior: He is not casting any aspersion.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: If you are not able to get people from non-official life, make some of the Members of Parliament from Kerala the Advisers. We are living in a democratic age, and if Parliament gets the responsibility to govern Kerala State, why should we not entrust it to the representatives of the people of Kerala?

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool): Even after coming to Parliament, some people have not lost the ICS mentality. I am casting no aspersions on any person.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: If any particular party takes objection that Congress people should not be made the Advisers, I would suggest a panel of members of this House consisting of all the parties to manage the affairs of Kerala State until elections are held. I am totally opposed to this rule of officers. If the rule of officers is good enough for Kerala, I would say this to the Ministers and the Treasury Benches. Many people still feel that many of the ICS officers are much better administrators than the Ministers who sit there. Why should they not take over? What is sauce for the goose, as they say, must be sauce for the gander.

It may require an amendment of the Constitution. The amendment of the Constitution must be so effected in two directions, in order to ensure the rule of the people by the people for the people as we understand it in its true spirit. In the absence of elected representatives of the people managing its own Ministry, a panel of this House must be in charge of the administration.

Secondly, we are not taking the warning of Kerala sufficiently seriously, but it may happen in many other States, and you cannot go on periodically imposing President's rule. If it comes to that, we must have President's rule for a year or two in order to stabilise the affairs in the particular State. Therefore, President's rule must be extended as long as

Parliament finds it necessary to do so. The Constitution must be amended in two ways. It must enable the President's rule to be extended beyond six months' period. Secondly, if it is necessary, a panel of Members of this House on an all-party basis or non-party basis must be constituted to govern the affairs of a State instead of the so-called ICS officers.

16 hrs.

Shri Kapur Singh: Why so-called, Sir?

Mr. Chairman: Dr. Lohia. I request him to stick to the time-limit.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सभापति महोदय, हम लोग यहां लोक-सभा में एक काम करने जा रहे हैं जो अच्छा नहीं है, और मजबूरी में की जा रही है, और जिसे खुद लोक-सभा तीन बरस से ज्यादा नहीं कर सकती, वह इतना बुरा प्राण है। उस पर सोच विचार करते समय कुछ व्यापक चीजों पर ध्यान रखना चाहिए कि क्या है जिम्मेदार हुकूमत, क्या है लोकशाही और न केवल केरल में बल्कि सारे देश में या बाहर भी क्या है उसका सिद्धान्त।

तो, मैं सब से पहले लोकशाही के उस सिद्धान्त की तरफ आप का ध्यान खींचूंगा जो उस का काम है, यानी विवाद। विवाद ईमानदारी से होना चाहिए, सामने वाले की बात सुनी, ध्यान से सुनी और ध्यान से उसका जवाब दो और ईमानदारी से उसका जवाब दो अगर उसकी बात मान नहीं सकते तो। उससे ज्यादा अच्छा है कि अगर सामने वाले की बात में कोई तथ्य है तो उस को माफ़ लो, और उससे भी ज्यादा अच्छा है कि उस पर काम-काज करो। इस कसौटी पर जब मैं इस लोक-सभा की मन्त्रिपरिषद् को कसता हूँ, तो एक मंत्री को छोड़ कर बाकी सब के दिमाग में वह लोच नहीं है जिससे कि वाद-विवाद अच्छा चल सकता है, जड़ दिमाग हैं। एक है, लेकिन उसके बारे में मैं अभी

कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता, कुछ रुकना चाहता हूँ। एक हफ्ते के अन्दर देख लेना है कि क्या सामुदायिक विकास योजनाओं में जीपों का चलना बन्द हो चुका है या नहीं। अगर बन्द हो जायेगा तो मैं तारीफ करूंगा, वरना मैं कहूंगा कि वह भी एक ढपोलशांखी हूँ, जो केवल बात करना जानते हैं लेकिन उस के अनुरूप काम करना नहीं जानते।

श्रीमती यशोदा रेड्डी : वह कौन हैं ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यशोदा रेड्डी मंत्री नहीं हैं लेकिन उनके दिमाग में लचक है। अगर मेरा वश चलता तो मैं उनको इस मंत्रिपरिषद् का एक सदस्य बना देता, हालांकि ऐसा करने से मुझे एक दोस्त का नुकसान हो जाता।

16.04 hrs.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

जहां मैं ये विचार आप के सामने रख रहा हूँ, वहां एक और बात की ओर आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ, और वह यह कि मैं साम्यवाद को बिल्कुल नापसन्द करता हूँ, इतना नापसन्द करता हूँ कि उनको एक भयंकर कीड़े की तरह मानता हूँ। लेकिन वह कहां जनमता है और पनपता है? वह कांग्रेसवाद के कूड़े के ऊपर जनमता और पनपता है। इसलिए मैं ने यह फैसला कर रखा है कि चाहे केरल हो या और कहीं हो, कांग्रेसवाद के कूड़े को साफ करने के बाद ही हम इस कीड़े के साथ जूझ सकते हैं, और शायद उस हालत में वह कीड़ा अपने-आप ही खत्म हो जायेगा। जब मैं ने यह कह दिया तो यह भी आप की खिदमत में अर्ज कर दूँ कि चाहे मेरे विचार पांच दस पन्द्रह बरस में थोड़े से सुधरे हुए हों और मैं कोशिश करता हूँ कि साम्यवादियों और कांग्रेसियों का मित्र बनने के लायक हो सकूँ। लेकिन जो कुछ मैं ने कहा है वह सिद्धान्त के बारे में कहा है, साम्यवादियों या कांग्रेसियों के बारे में नहीं कहा है।

अब इसी के साथ-साथ एक बात इस लोक-सभा और उत्तरदायी शासन के बारे में मुझे यह कहनी है कि भ्रष्टाचार का अक्सर जिक्र होता है। इस लोक-सभा में भी हुआ। प्रधान मंत्री ने भी बहुत सा किया। और मेरा मन उस वक्त ऐसा रहा है जैसे किसी सांप ने चारों तरफ से मुझ को जकड़ लिया हो और मुझ से कुछ बन न पड़ रहा हो, हालांकि सांप का मुँह तो मेरे हाथ में था नहीं तो सांप मुझे काट ही लेता। या इस तरह समझिये कि जैसे कोई चोरी या कत्ल करके भाये और अच्छी तरह से चन्दन तिलक लगा कर पूजा करने बैठ जाये और सभा के बीच में अपाहिज हो कर बैठा रहूँ और कुछ न कर सकूँ न कुछ कह सकूँ कि यह क्या कर रहा है। चारों तरफ भ्रष्टाचार है। सिर्फ यह कह देना कि डेढ़ दो हजार वर्ष पहले का पुराना हिन्दुस्तान, उपनिषद या महाभारत या गीता के समय का हिन्दुस्तान ईमानदार था, मंत्रियों को शोभा नहीं देता, और न कहीं इधर-उधर के किसी साधु का नाम ले देना उनको शोभा देता है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ, पर गुस्से में नहीं—कांग्रेसी मेरे ऊपर गुस्सा न करें—बल्कि ग्लानि से कहना चाहता हूँ कि प्रायः हर एक मंत्री भ्रष्ट है और इस के बारे में वह सोच-विचार करें, मैं किसी का नाम लिए बिना

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप को सब को नहीं कहना चाहिए।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं ने "प्रायः" कहा है, शायद एक-आध अच्छा निकल जायेगा, इसीलिए मैं ने "प्रायः" कहा। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ और जोर से कहना चाहता हूँ कि प्रायः हर एक मंत्री भ्रष्ट है।

मैं यह बताऊँ कि इन मंत्रियों के कहीं के भी रिश्तेदारों की, बेटों की, दामादों की मिलिकियत की जांच की जाये तो

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

पता लगेगा कि इन 15 से 17 बरसों में अपनी दो-चार लाख की मिल्कियत को बढ़ा कर दस-बीस करोड़ की कर ली है, और फिर यह भी पता लगे कि वह किसी आविष्कार के कारण नहीं, वह कोई व्यापार अथवा उद्योग के नये संगठन के द्वारा नहीं, बल्कि ठेके के अथवा निर्यात-आयात के व्यापार के जरिए ऐसे व्यापार से हुई है जो बंधा हुआ है, जो सरकार के परमिट और कोटा के जरिए चल रहा है, मुक्त व्यापार नहीं है, तो मैं जरूर कहूंगा कि वह काम बिल्कुल भ्रष्ट काम है। और इस में कोई शक नहीं है कि आज जो कुछ भी चर्चा व्यापार की और गर्दी की होती है उस वक्त मंत्री कह देते हैं कि मैं क्या करूं मेरा बेटा पैसा कमाता है। मैं पूछता हूं कि क्या तुम्हारा बेटा मुक्त व्यापार से पैसा कमाता है या बन्धे व्यापार से पैसा कमाता है। यह कसौटी है।

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : यह केरल का विवाद है यः भ्रष्टाचार का ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सभी ने यह सवाल उठाया है। जब श्रीों ने उठाया तो आप ने कुछ नहीं कहा, अब मेरे वक्त टोक रहे हैं।

तो मैं चाहता हूं कि केरल और जगह न हो, यहां केरल न हो, काश्मीर में केरल न हो। जरा इस के लिए भी सावधान हो जाओ। खाली केरल हो जाने के बाद ही बहस मत करो। केरल को दूसरी जगह मत आने दो। आज काश्मीर में भी केरल होने जा रहा है। काश्मीर के बारे में यहां कह दिया कि वहां जो कुछ गिरफ्तारी हुई है वह हम से बिना पूछे हो गयी है, यह कोई मतलब नहीं रखता। यह

खदक और खाई का मामला आ जाया करता है। अगर बिना पूछे यह हो गया तो मैं इस सरकार को क्या कहूँ, यह अपाहिज है, यह नालायक सरकार है कि इस के बिना पूछे इतनी बड़ी घटनाएं हो जाती हैं जोकि सारे देश की शान्ति को बिगाड़ने वाली घटनायें हैं। मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि मुझे टोका न जाये।

तो मैं भ्रष्टाचार के बारे में कह रहा था। यह हमारे राजकीय जीवन को नष्ट किये दे रहा है। मंत्री लोग यहां जो हुकम निकाला करते हैं उनके जरिए उनके रिश्तेदार या सम्बन्धी या उनके साथ काम करने वाले व्यापारी बड़ा अच्छा नफा उठा लिया करते हैं। मैं यह जानता हूँ कि सट्टे बाजार या पाट बाजार में बहुत बड़े-बड़े, लम्बे-लम्बे, दो-दो, चार-चार, दस-दस करोड़ के सौदे हुआ करते हैं। उन सौदों में कई दफे आंच आ जाया करती है। एक दफा एक छोटा सा हुकम निकाल दिया कि अब हिस्स को गिरवी रख कर 100 फ्रीसदी कर्ज बैंक से लिया जा सकता है। इस छोटे से हुकम के जरिए न जाने कितने सट्टेबाज बच जाया करते हैं। उन का दीवाला रुक जाया करता है। मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि अक्टूबर 63 में जब ऐसा हुकम इस सरकार ने निकाला था तो कितने लोग बचे थे?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : डाक्टर साहब, मुझे मजबूरून कहना पड़ेगा कि आप केरल से चले, रिश्तत तक गये तमाम हिन्दुस्तान की और इस के बाद अब सट्टे पर आ गये। अब सट्टे से कहां जायेंगे पता नहीं, तो इस तरह से तो हम केरल से बहुत दूर होते जायेंगे।

डा राम मनोहर लोहिया : सट्टे ओ और प्रागे बढ़ने दीजिये । सट्टे में छोड़ता हूँ ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं आप को पीछे लाना चाहता हूँ प्रागे नहीं ले जाना चाहता हूँ ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अब अधिकतर यही है । मैं हुजूर की सेवा में यही आज करूंगा कि इस लोक-सभा को इस लायक बनाया जाय कि हम अपने देश को भी कुछ अच्छा बना सकें । अब मैं इस सट्टे वाले सवाल को छोड़ता हूँ ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब जब आप प्राये हैं तो हमें प्राहिस्ता-प्राहिस्ता लायक बनना पड़ेगा ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : नालायकी इतनी ज्यादा हो गयी है कि कहना नहीं

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अभी जो रास्ता हम ने अखतियार किया है उस पर चलने दीजिये । अलबत्ता आप अभी थोड़ा नीचे आ जाइये तब हम और आप फिर इकट्ठे चलेंगे ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं बहुत नीचे आ गया हूँ । इतना नीचे आ गया हूँ कि अब मेरा कोई साथी नहीं रह गया है । अब उस से नीचे आप मुझ को कहां ले जाकर फेंकेंगे ?

अब यह सब सवाल मैंने इसलिये उठाये कि आप जब नहीं थे तब मैं ने इस केरल के सवाल के साथ-साथ यह सवाल भी उठाया था और मैं ने ही क्या, सभी लोगों ने उसे किया था । खास तौर से खाडिलकर साहब ने यह सवाल उठाया था, डांचे का और जनतंत्रीय सचि का । खाली केरल नहीं, केरल से और ज्यादा चर्चा सभी ने यहाँ की है लेकिन अब

मेरी बात बरा पैती हो जाया करती है— और उस डांचे के बारे में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ माननीय खाडिलकर और उन के जैसे लोगों को कि यह खाली डांचे का या रूप का ही सवाल नहीं है । यह असल में प्राण का सवाल है । प्राण की प्रतिष्ठा कैसे करते हों इस का सवाल है । माननीय खाडिलकर चाहते हैं कि सभी तरह के लोग आपस में सोच-विचार कर के, राय-मशविरा करके कोई फैसला करें और उस पर अनुकरण करें । अब यह तभी हो सकता है जब सभी तरह के लोगों की शक्ति कुछ संतुलित हो । एक तरफ़ राक्षसी शक्ति ही और दूसरी तरफ़ कोई शक्ति हो न तो माननीय खाडिलकर वगैरह को समझना चाहिए कि इस तरह का मशविरा चल नहीं सकता है । इसलिए जरूरी है कि पहले भारत वर्ष में लोकशाही इस हैसियत में पहुंच जाय कि आप लोग भी उधर 100-150 रहें और इधर वाले भी 200, 225 रहें, चाहे बंटे हुए रहें, तभी आपस में यह सलाह-मशविरा हो सकता है ।

श्रीमती यशोदा रेड्डी : यह कैसे हो सकता है ? लोग कांग्रेस को यहां भजते हैं तो हम क्या कर सकते हैं ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं कहां कहता हूँ कि आप मुझ को भेज दीजिये ? हालांकि आप अगर मुझे भेजें तो मुझे तो बहुत आराम मिलेगा । आप मुझ को बुला लेंगी तो ज्यादा आराम ही मिलेगा लेकिन मैं कुछ और कह रहा हूँ ।

एक माननीय सभ्य : वे आप को नहीं बुला भेजेगी ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप कैसे कह रहे हैं कि वह मुझे नहीं चाहती हैं । अब मैं सिर्फ़ यह कह रहा था कि ऐसा वक्त अभी नहीं प्राय्य । अब देखिये, अध्यक्ष महोदय, सब के सब मेरी जो भी हैसियत है उसे सिगाड़ने के लिए खड़े रहते हैं ।

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

अब मैं कोई यह नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि आप यह हैसियत बना लीजिये कोई लोक सभा की, मैं तो कह रहा हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनता का पहले वह मन बनने दीजिये तब खाडिलकर महोदय ऐसा प्रस्ताव यहां पर रखें। उस के पहले कोई इस का मतलब होता नहीं है।

इस के साथ साथ एक बात और कहूँ कि जो ढांचे की बात सोचते हैं तो बजाय इधर, उधर बड़ी चीजों के, एक बात क्यों नहीं कर देते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान में चुनाव क्षेत्र एक, एक अलग सदस्य भेजने के बजाय जो अनुपात मत के प्रतिनिधित्व से आया करता हो वैसे आ जाया करें तब आप देखेंगे कि इसी लोक सभा में आज के ही बोट में यह 380 नहीं होंगे बल्कि मुश्किल से 240 रह जायेंगे आज की लोक सभा में जो जनता का बोट है उस के हिसाब से अगर आयेंगे। आज तो हम लोग अंग्रेजों की नकल कर रहे हैं। अगर यह नकल की होती जर्मनी की या फ्रांस की तो कांग्रेस में यहां खाली 240 होते और इस तरफ 260 होते और फिर मिल मिला कर सलाह मशविरा कर के कोई न कोई रास्ता निकाल लेते। इस तरह की बात सोचनी चाहिए।

इसी तरीके से और ऐसी चीजों पर लोकशाही की रक्षा करने के लिए जरूरी होगा कि हम ध्यान दें वादविवाद की दूसरी शक्तों पर। मुझे कई बार ऐसा लगता है जैसा कि मैं ने कहा भी है कि मंत्री लोग ध्यानपूर्वक बात नहीं सुनते और उन का जवाब नहीं देते हैं। मैं एक मिसाल देता हूँ।

मैं ने कहा था कि रूस और अमरीका दोनों को खुश करने का ऐसा कोई रास्ता निकाला जाये जिसमें कि वे एक दूसरे की मदद से चिढ़ न जाया करें। उसका जवाब क्या था, आप तो अध्यक्ष महोदय, जानते ही हैं। अब इस तरीके से लोकशाही नहीं चला करती है। भरी बात को भले ही न मानो, उसे काटो

लेकिन उसको ध्यान से सुनो और फिर उसकी काट करो। मैं ने तो यह कहा था कि कोई एक रास्ता निकालो जिससे व एक दूसरे से चिढ़ न जाया करें। जवाब यह मिलता है कि हम ने एक दूसरे में होड़ नहीं देखी। अब यही तो मैं ने कहा था कि अगर होड़ हो जाये तब तो अच्छा ही है। तब तो ज्यादा सहायता मिल ही जायेगी।

इसी तरीके से और भी आंकड़ों की यहां पर चर्चा चलती है। माननीय प्रधान मंत्री अक्सर कह दिया करते हैं कि उन्नति हुई और वह कहते हैं कि तीन सेर से पांच सेर हो गया, लेकिन खाली 3 सेर से पांच सेर हो गया, यह कहने से तो काम नहीं चलेगा? यह बतलाना चाहिए कि जो औसत 100 संकड़ों का होता है उस के अलावा 60 संकड़ों का क्या है? यह मैं ने एक रास्ता सुझाया। उस के ऊपर कोई बातचीत नहीं करते हैं। साठ संकड़ा यानी 30 करोड़ आबादी और 100 संकड़ा यानी 48 करोड़ आदमी। 48 करोड़ का औसत यह सरकार यहां बतला दिया करती है लेकिन जो नीचे के 30 करोड़ हैं उनकी औसत नहीं बतलाया करती है। यह सब होता क्यों है? क्योंकि लोकशाही प्राण का पता अभी इस मंत्रिपरिषद् को चला नहीं है वरना ऐसी बात नहीं होती। एक व्यक्ति को ले वर के विश्वविद्यालय देने, सिक्का चले उसके नाम पर और कसम खाई जाय। मैं आपसे कहूंगा, हुजूर यह संविधान कौन सा है? इसमें ईश्वर की शपथ तक को ऐसा माना गया कि उसके लिए एक विकल्प रखा है। मेरे जैसा आदमी अगर ईश्वर की वसम नहीं खाना चाहे तो मैं लिये दूसरा रास्ता यह है कि मैं संकल्प कर लूँ। यह हिन्दुस्तान ऐसा है जिसमें ईश्वर के सम्बन्ध में मेरे जैसे आदमियों के लिए दूसरा रास्ता है कि हम संकल्प कर लें। मेरे जैसे लोगों के लिए जो कि ईश्वर की कसमको खाना ठीक न समझें, बुरा समझें उनके लिए विकल्प का दूसरा

रास्ता रक्खा गया है लेकिन यह मंत्रि परिषद् कैसी है कि यह एक व्यक्ति के नाम पर एक करोड़ विद्यार्थियों और अध्यापकों को क खिलवा चुकी है। ऐसा करके इस लोकशाही के अन्दर एक जहर भरवा चुकी है। इस पर माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ने अभी कुछ नहीं कहा। लेकिन क्या जिस तरह से नेहरू जी ने गांधी जी का सिक्का रक्खाया था क्या हमारे वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री में इतनी ताकत है कि वह माननीय नेहरू जी का सिक्का रक्खा दें। यह सवाल उठ गया और इसके साथ साथ मैं बतलाता हूँ कि कोई भी आदमी

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं आपसे फिर विनय करूँगा कि आप केरल के ऊपर ही रहें। आपको फिर शिकायत होगी कि आपने जो तमाम सवाल उठाये उनका जवाब मंत्री जी द्वारा पूरा नहीं दिया गया। जो चीज सदन के सामने बहस के लिए पेश हो उस से सम्बन्ध न रखने वाली जरा दूर की चीजें जब आप कहते हैं तो उनके कैसे जवाब आयेंगे?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वह तो जवाब अध्यक्ष महोदय, देंगे नहीं; हाँ, यह शायद दे भी दें क्योंकि जैसा मैंने कहा श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री इस मामले में औरों से ज्यादा लचक रखते हैं लेकिन इस बात का शायद वे जवाब नहीं देंगे। वह बात अलग है यह मुझे आपने कहा है। लोकशाही से यह सम्बन्ध नहीं रखती है लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि वह तो लोकशाही की जड़ है। आखिर यह केरल में उत्तरदायी शासन फल क्यों कर गया ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य कहेंगे कि वे बुनियादी चीजों में जा रहे हैं। यह लोकशाही का सवाल है क्या डेमोक्रेसी होनी चाहिए और क्या नहीं होनी चाहिए, यह और इसी तरह की बहुत सी दूसरी चीजें आपके दिमाग में हैं लेकिन अब जहाँ हम बैठे हैं और जो मामला हमारे सामने जेर बहस है

उसी की बाबत ही हम बात करें। गवर्नर ने रिपोर्ट दी है जिसके कि आधार पर प्रेसीडेंट ने एक्शन लिया है और उस मिनिस्ट्री को वहाँ से हटाया गया है और प्रेसीडेंट रूल वहाँ पर जारी किया गया है, इन सब बातों के ऊपर माननीय सदस्य बोलें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मेरे से पहले अन्य कई लोगों ने उन तमाम बातों का जिक्र किया था कि लोकशाही ऐसी हालत में कैसे चलेगी लेकिन मेरी बदकिस्मती कहिये कि मुझ टोका जा रहा है। खैर, मैं छोड़ देता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मेरी बदकिस्मती है कि आपके वक्त में मैं चेर में आ गया।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यही मेरी बदकिस्मती है क्योंकि अगर खाडिलकर साहब रहे होते तो मेरा मामला शायद चल गया होता। अगर थोड़ा देर वे और बैठ जाते तो अच्छा होता खैर, वह भी मैं छोड़ता हूँ। हर रास्ते को छोड़ते हुए अब खाली आपसे एक अपील करना चाहता हूँ केरल के नाम पर, सारे देश के नाम पर कि यह लोकशाही खाली रूप और ढाँचे में नहीं रहा करती है। रूप और ढाँचा आवश्यक है लेकिन उसके साथ-साथ उसके प्राण भी प्रतिष्ठित होने चाहिए और वह प्राण जगह-जगह खत्म किया जा रहा है, यहाँ तक कि एक तरीका जो निकल चुका है कि अगर किसी को कोई शिकायत होती है तो वह शिकायत लेकर आ जाया करता है और हम लोगों के पास आता है। क्या केरल वाले भी शिकायत मेरे जैसे नाचीज के पास आकर कर दिया करते हैं, शायद वे सोचते हैं कि इस आदमी के पास जाने से कुछ मिल जाए मगर मुझे कई दफे लगता है कि कहीं मंत्री लोग तो उन्हें नहीं भेज दिया करते हैं कि शायद हमारे पास भेजने से कोई रास्ता मिल जाया करे। तो यह तरीका निकल आया। इसका कारण यह है कि हिन्दु-स्तान में दौलत का भंडार बहुत कम है। केरल में दौलत का भंडार बहुत कम है।

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

छीना झपटी करते हैं। इंस प्रेश चांहता है कि वह अपना हिस्सा ले ले और बढ़ा ले लेकिन सारे देश के हिस्से को बढ़ाने का काम हो नहीं रहा है। इसलिए केरल के ऊपर सोच-विचार करते समय मैं फिर आपसे कहूंगा कि यह काम हम जो कर रहे हैं और आज करने जा रहे हैं यह बुरा है, अच्छा नहीं है। लोक-सभा खुद इसको तीन साल से ज्यादा नहीं करना चाहती है। और इस पर हम कुछ थोड़ी बहुत शर्म खाएँ, क्योंकि यह उत्तरदायी शासन के फेल करने का सवाल है।

मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

Shri Hathi: Mr. Speaker, Sir, during these four hours and odd we have covered a variety of subjects and a very vast field. Many hon. Members have spoken on democracy, on the system of planning, whether planning is desirable or not, the machinery for planning, the present Constitution, the constitution as prevailing in other countries such as England, America and Switzerland, communalism and casteism, development of State concerns, relationship between the Centre and the State and a number of other subjects. It is not my intention to deal with all the points that have been raised by the Members here. I will restrict myself to some of the points that have been raised. Not that the subjects they have covered are not important—in fact, I have learnt a great deal from some of the speeches, the speech of Professor Ranga, for example—but I do not think I will be able to cover all of them. Then, there were certain things which do not call for a reply. They were not by way of criticism but by way of suggestions, which we can think of. There are certain points which are to be replied to and which have to be replied to but my task has been made easier by some of the Members on both sides, when one had replied to the points raised by the other. Therefore, in a way, I have not much to cover.

I may say that the Government is certainly not happy about this Resolution. It is not a pleasure for us to bring such a Resolution. We want that democracy should function. We want that the representatives of the people should participate in the government of the State. There should be an elected legislature, as in other parts of the country, and Kerala also have rule by its own elected representatives.

Unfortunately, as I said while moving my motion for approval of this Resolution, a motion for no-confidence was tabled and that motion got the support of the majority of members of the House.

A suggestion was made that even then the President should not have taken over the Government of that State and that the party should have been allowed to continue to function as Government. I fail to understand how practically it could have been possible. In any measure that the Government has to bring forward before the House if there is no majority of the party, it will not be able to carry through any of the measures and at every time the measure would be lost.

The Minister of Defence, Production in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): The suggestion was that the Ministry should have continued and the legislature should have been dissolved.

Shri Hathi: What I understood was this. But the constitutional provision and the way in which a democracy or a legislature should function is that the party in power should have a majority. What I mean to suggest is that it is not a pleasure at all for the Government to bring this Resolution.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: They should have continued for five months.

Shri Hathi: But it had to be done. Therefore, it is purely a temporary measure. We shall have elections soon

and naturally we hope that again normal conditions will prevail and we shall again have a rule in Kerala where the people's representatives will have a share in the government of their own State.

There were other suggestions also. I shall start with the last speaker, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia. He did not touch or speak much about Kerala, but he said about so many other things. I will only mention one point. He used the word "prayah" and said, "All Ministers were prayah corrupt." Prayah means generally. Before he came in the House we had not heard any of this comment or appellation. That recalls to me a Sanskrit sloka which says:

प्रायेण अधममध्यमोत्तमगुणाः संसर्गतिः जायेत

It means: Generally, *adham*, *madhyam* and *uttam gunas* are imbibed from *sansarg* or company. Before this we had not heard any of this. Therefore, I do not know how this atmosphere has been created in this House. Anyway; the other subjects that he referred to did not touch or concern the present Resolution.

Mr. Speaker: Is it only the combination that has produced those results, all joining together?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप शायद न हों, कौन जाने। लेकिन "प्रायः" का मतलब "आलमोस्ट" है, जनरली नहीं। इसका मतलब "हर एक" नहीं, "करीब करीब हर एक" है।

श्री हाथी : इसीलिए मैंने संस्कृत के शब्द का प्रयोग किया है - प्रायेण अधममध्यमोत्तमगुणाः संसर्गतिः।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप मुझे अफ़्त साबित कर दें, तो आपका कोई फायदा नहीं होगा। सरकार तो आप चलाते हैं।

श्री हाथी : मैं नहीं कहता हूँ। मैं तो प्रायः का अर्थ समझता हूँ ना।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : एक भाषण आपने खड़े हो कर किया और अब एक भाषण आप बैठ कर कर रहे हैं।

Shri Hathi: Shri Warior tried to bring out as much as he could the deficiencies of the Congress Ministry. He also tried to bring out the achievements of the Communist Ministry as it was then. He expected and hoped that Government would see that there would be an early election which would be free and fair.

I do not want to enter into the various aspects. Nor do I want to blame anybody at this stage for the conditions that are prevailing there or that were prevailing there. There have been periods during the last four or five years, which somehow or other have been the periods of agitation. On one ground or the other, agitations have been carried on. It may be that these agitations were for just cause, or for a political cause or for some other cause but the fact remains that agitations were there. I agree with many of the Members who have spoken that if any agitation is only for the purpose at any moment of usurping power, then that agitation is not at all beneficial or advantageous to the community as a whole, and it is bound to fail; it is bound to have an adverse effect, and it is bound to hamper the progress and development of the country; it is bound to deviate our effort.

All of us today are trying to build up the country. We are trying to develop not only Kerala but the whole of the country. When we are in the midst of this struggle, it is but proper that all of us should co-operate and put forth all the efforts that we can to develop and march towards that goal of perfection and prosperity. If, however, agitations are merely carried on with a view to usurp political power or with a view to give a sort of impression that what a particular party is doing is being

[Shri Hathi]

done for the benefit or welfare of the people, though the ulterior motive may not be that, then any such agitation is bound to fail.

Shri Nath Pai: What is more dangerous in the long run: usurping power by doubtful means or preserving power and clinging to power by any means?

Shri Hathi: I am not going to compare and say what is more dangerous and what is not. I am going to take up a positive role and that positive role is that we must all try and put forth our efforts to develop our country. I put it in a positive way. I have never learnt to have a negative approach and a negative attitude. So, that is my positive approach.

Then, there was one suggestion that Shri Khadilkar made. So far as the Constitution is concerned, that is no doubt there. But apart from the Constitution, do we not want the co-operation of the people at all levels? In a democracy, no Plan can succeed unless it has the co-operation of the people. From whatever level you talk, there should be co-operation. But so far as the constitutional position is concerned, we are bound by it. We cannot deviate from it so long as we have the Constitution as it is, unless of course you amend it, which is a different matter. But so long as it is not amended, so long as it is there, we have to abide by it. Within the framework of the Constitution, whatever can be done in a practical way to seek the co-operation of people, should be done. In the Plan itself it is stated that in no democracy would a plan succeed unless there is willing co-operation of the people.

But the difficulty would be when political ideology comes, when the question is not of plan, is not of development, is not of a constructive attitude, but is something other than a constructive attitude. If we were to take the co-operation of all the parties, as was suggested by Shri Khadilkar, what

happens when there is the question of difference of ideologies? When ideologies differ, it will be difficult to do so, difficult for any group of people to come together and carry out a programme. But as Lohiaji suggested, and rightly, if we can create an atmosphere whereby people learn to adjust themselves, to work together, I think it may be that we may have better days than we have today. I fully agree with Lohiaji that we should try to create not an atmosphere of distrust, not an atmosphere of no-confidence, not an atmosphere of vying against each other, but an atmosphere of goodwill. But is it possible? Can that be done? Was it possible under the circumstances?

We have seen in Kerala after 1960, during 4½ years, that there were as many as seven or eight agitations on one pretext or other. People's minds were distracted and diverted. The whole idea was to distract their attention and try to win them over, trying to show that they were doing something in the interest of the people which really may or may not be so. That is the position. Unless there is the mind and will to work together, unless the ideology is common, the idea, though very noble, as suggested by Shri Khadilkar, may not be workable even in other spheres of activities. I do not mean the Constitution, for so long as the Constitution stands, we cannot do anything else.

He suggested—let us make an experiment in Kerala at all levels. Could that be possible under the present circumstances? Anyway, it is a suggestion.

Shri Khadilkar: Apart from ideology, how to break the caste rigidity? That was one thing.

Shri Hathi: I am coming to that.

Shri Nath Pai: He preached something very different. He had suggested that there should be an experiment as in Africa of one-party rule.

That was an extremely dangerous suggestion in a democracy.

Shri Khadilkar: He is misrepresenting me. What I said was . . .

Shri Nath Pai: Very clear.

Mr. Speaker: He might have misunderstood. Why straightway say that he is misrepresenting?

Shri Khadilkar: When I was not here, he himself spoke and attacked me in that manner, that I was advocating rigid one-party thesis. That is not fair.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): If a Member does not give way, is it proper for another Member to carry on?

Shri Hathi: Shall I give you way?

As I said, so far as any experiment is concerned, it has to be ruled out, because we stand by the constitutional position as it is. But, so far as I have understood Shri Khaldikar, he did not want to make any change or deviation from the Constitution. If that was so, my reply would be that we cannot afford to make any experiment which is not contained in or supported by the provisions of the Constitution. But so far as committees are concerned at different levels, that may be possible. We can have advisory committees; we can have consultative committees.

What does democracy really mean? It means collective wisdom. It means that we have to rule or we have to govern the country, whatever part it may be, but the government of the country has to be carried on by the collective wisdom of the representatives of the people. And actually, what is this Parliament? It is the same thing. There is collective decision; matters are discussed and opinions are expressed on the floor of the House and as a result, we take decisions. This is generally the whole principle of democracy. But it may

not be possible to isolate Kerala and have some sort of experiment which is something different from the provisions of the Constitution. That may not be possible.

Then, Shri Ranga said that we could have another experiment, and that was based on the Swiss system.

Shri Warrior: Kerala becomes a political laboratory now?

Shri Hathi: There are experiments suggested by two of the speakers. What I wanted to say was the same thing, that we are not trying to have various experiments on one particular State. What we are today discussing is the resolution, and I have come for approval of the resolution. As I said, the Members, while discussing it, have covered a lot of ground, quite a number and variety of subjects.

Shri Ranga mentioned about the Plan. I am happy to learn that he believes in planning, but his objection was to the system or method or the machinery as it exists here. This has also no direct relation to Kerala as such. Therefore, I do not think I should discuss that subject more.

Then, one of the speakers said that the Centre had not given sufficient attention to or shown sufficient interest in the development of Kerala. We have the Plan. The Plan is being discussed with the representatives of the State, with the people, and after all, it is the over-all resources available in the country that have to be distributed. So far as power is concerned, he complained why Kerala should depend on Madras for power. This psychology, again, I think we should give up. After all, wherever there is potential for power . . .

Shri Warrior: That is not the point. Whenever the Plan is on the anvil, there is no representative Government. It is up to the Central Government to be responsible.

Shri Hath: Wherever may be the power potential, hydro-electric, thermal or any other, it has to be utilised, but mainly so far as the rivers are concerned, they are national assets, and there, whatever power we can generate is utilised. But all areas should be duly attended to, and therefore, if a particular State is short of power, the reasons have to be looked into, whether it is because there is no potential, or whether the power to be generated there is going to be costlier than in another place. If it is going to be costlier, it can be generated somewhere else.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): It was said that Kerala and Mysore were the cheapest sources of power. That was what Shri Menon said.

Shri Koya: Cheapest in India.

Shri Hath: I know about Mysore, Kerala and Madras. I know about power projects. Kerala has got power potential at Iddiki. That project is coming.

Shri Warior: He was dealing with it formerly.

Shri Hath: I was dealing with all power projects. I think the hon. Members from Kerala all accompanied me when I went to that project.

Shri Maniyangadan (Kottayam): That is the very complaint. Investigations regarding the Iddiki project started in 1951 but the work has not started till now.

Shri Hath: So far as the complaint that the Centre does not give proper attention to Kerala is concerned, I do not think that is justified. Hon. Members referred about plan and the industrial development and they wanted that we should have immediate, fair and free elections. The other question was that the food problem should be tackled: high prices should be checked. I may say that this is

not a problem which is peculiar only to Kerala. It exists in varying degrees in different parts. I can assure hon. Members on that side that equal attention will be paid to Kerala as much as to any other State, according to its requirements. These things will be looked into. The position as at present was explained by me; a vote of no-confidence was carried and the Governor reported to the President and there was no alternative but to do this. Proclamation was issued on the 10th September and I recommend that the Resolution be adopted by the House.

Shri Nath Pai: I had asked a very specific question which had relevance in the maintenance of democratic values. I had asked, Sir, whether it is a fact that Mr. U. N. Dhebar, ex-Congress President and currently Chairman of the Khadi and Village Industries Commission is accompanying the President of the Congress Party, Mr. Kamaraj on election tour and whether it is in conformity with maintaining high standards. It is a very important matter. He has ignored all basic questions and has given us homilies about Swiss constitution. We are entitled to get a reply.

Mr. Speaker: Would it not be more relevant in the next item that we have, conferring of power?

Shri Hath: If he wants me, I can say that now, Sir. It is as you please. It can also be taken up in the next item.

Shri Warior: Several Members had raised the enquiry into the corruption charges.

Shri Banga: There was the question of corruption. All these people who have been there are now out of power. We would like to have an assurance from them on that point. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Hath: Whether it is relevant or not relevant, if the hon. Member wants me, I will reply to it.

Shri Nath Pal: You can at least try.

Shri Hathi: No question of trying. I shall reply to Mr. Nath Pal also.

Shri Warrior referred to corruption charges. Really, I do not want to mention all that has happened in Kerala during the communist regime and the present regime. So far as the charges levelled against the last Ministry are concerned, those charges had been looked into by the late Prime Minister himself.

Shri Hanumanthaya: May I appeal to him not to bring in the name of the late Prime Minister, because, someone will rebut and it would bring the late Prime Minister's name into question. Once and for all, let them not take protection under the name of the late Prime Minister. I appeal to them not to take umbrage under his name.

Shri Hathi: It has been looked into. These charges had been looked into.

Shri Ranga: And the result is this. It was only looked into. Had it been properly and satisfactorily looked into, it would not have resulted in the way it has resulted now.

Shri Umanath: The reference was to the latest assurance given in Kerala namely, that those charges would be gone into. That reference may be replied to.

Shri Hathi: What I said was that there were charges levelled against Shri Sankar, and those charges were looked into, and nothing. . . .

Shri Nath Pal: Shri Patil assured the dissidents when he went on the pacification mission that if they would vote with the Government the charges would be looked into. Those charges seem to be more valid if they vote against the Government!

Shri Hathi: I do not know; I have no information as to what transpired there between them and Shri Patil. I

do not know. (Interruptions). So far as I am concerned and so far as I know, the charges that were levelled against him were looked into. That is all that I can say.

Shri Ranga: Right up to the day of their resignation, whatever charges there were, let them be looked into. What is the use of invoking Jawaharlalji's name, because he committed so many blunders and one of them is this. (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: It is better that I put the question now. The question is:

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 10th September, 1964, under article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Kerala."

The motion was adopted.

श्री नाथपाई : स्पीकर साहब ने आपसे कहा था कि जब इस मुद्दे पर आएंगे तो हमारे सवाल का जवाब देंगे ।

16.53 hrs.

**KERALA STATE LEGISLATURE
(DELEGATION OF POWERS) BILL**

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Hathi): I beg to move:

"That the Bill to confer on the President the power of the legislature of the State of Kerala to make laws, be taken into consideration."

This is a Bill which follows the proclamation issued by the President on the 10th September, 1964 and which the House has just now approved under article 356 of the Constitution. Article 357(1) of the Constitution provides that the powers may be exercised by the President, but for that pur-