

15.39 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE.
PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION IN
RELATION TO THE STATE OF
TAMIL NADU

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY): I beg to move:

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 31st January, 1976 under article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Tamil Nadu."

Copies of the report of the Governor of Tamil Nadu were laid on the Table of the House on the 2nd February, 1976. The Governor, in his report, gave in detail the reasons why he came to the conclusion that a situation had arisen in which the Government of the State could not be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. He has stated about a series of acts of maladministration, corruption and misuse of power, on the part of DMK Government. There was large scale misuse of Government machinery including the use of police force for partisan ends and even collection party funds. The DMK Government allowed frittering away of public resources for financing wasteful and unproductive projects. This resulted in shrinkage of plan outlays and Tamil Nadu, once regarded as one of the most advanced States in the country, slid down in economic and industrial progress. There were serious administrative and financial improprieties. Of the large number of specific allegations against the DMK Government, the Governor has reported that quite a few of them are serious and not without substance. Even a scheme of urgent public importance, like the Veeranam Project for the drinking water supply for Madras, was handled in a manner that smacked of favouritism and malpractice in callous disregard of public welfare. The Project, which was started many years ago, made little progress, and the hon. Members would recall the sufferings

of the people of Madras last year due to water famine.

As the House is aware, allegations of corruption personally against Shri Karunanidhi, the former Chief Minister, and other State Ministers of Tamil Nadu, have been repeatedly made, the latest being a memorandum dated the 1st December 1975, received from Sarvashri K. Manoharan, MP, and G. Viswanathan, MP. The Governor had recommended the appointment of a commission to enquire into the several serious allegations against the former DMK Ministry and, as the hon. Members are aware, a Commission of Inquiry, consisting of a Supreme Court Judge, has since been appointed to inquire into these matters with a view to restoring public confidence in administration.

The affairs in the State of Tamil Nadu had steadily deteriorated, and more particularly during the last few months. After the Proclamation of the Emergency, while an atmosphere was being built up for discipline and orderly progress in the country as a whole, the DMK Government paid little heed to the instructions of the Central Government. The State was turned into a base for propaganda against the Emergency and the measures that followed in its wake, and a refuge for the anti-social and anti-national elements opposed to the Emergency. Censorship regulations were allowed to be violated with impunity, a number of activists of the banned organisations continued to be at large, and the Government made no serious effort to put down the circulation of clandestine literature.

On sensing the utter disillusionment of the public with their performance and their isolation from the people of the State, the DMK leaders sought to whip up sentiments on chauvinistic and parochial considerations. Under the cover of demand for State autonomy, some important

DMK leaders publicly held out from time to time veiled threats of secession, in case the desired autonomy was not granted. Provocative speeches continued to be made in various forums and an atmosphere was sought to be built up for disorder and violence. A stage was finally reached when the continuance of the Ministry in office was causing serious detriment to the interests of the people of the State, and of the country at large.

The Presidential Proclamation in relation to the State of Tamil Nadu, which was issued after careful consideration of the Report of the Governor and other information received in this regard by the Government, has been welcomed by all sections of the people of Tamil Nadu. The feelings of the people were echoed by many of the all India newspapers, including the vernacular press in the State, who welcomed the imposition of President's Rule. A leading English daily published from Madras, stated editorially on February 2, 1976, that the removal of DMK Ministry from office was overdue, and was endorsed by large sections of the people, who had suffered nine long years of such mis-rule.

The most important task ahead, as I stated yesterday in the Rajya Sabha, is now to give the people of Tamil Nadu a clean and efficient administration, responsive to their needs, and to ensure speedy social and economic progress, so that this important State gains its rightful place once again in the country.

I have no doubt that all sections of this House and the people of Tamil Nadu will give us sincere and whole-hearted co-operation in this task

With these words, I commend the resolution for approval by this august House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That this House approve the Proclamation issued by the President on the 31st January, 1976 under article 356 of the constitution in relation to the State of Tamil Nadu."

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam): I thank the CPIM party for giving me their chance of priority so that I can open the discussion from this side.

It has been the most unfortunate and most sad day in my parliamentary life to come before the House to point out the most heinous fraud that could be perpetrated on the Constitution and on the democratic and federal set-up in this country. Because of the limited time available, I shall confine myself to certain points that have been raised by the hon. Home Minister to justify the proclamation that has been clamped on Tamil Nadu.

Two things have happened. One is that under 356 of the Constitution, using the extraordinary power given there, they have dissolved the Assembly and dismissed the Ministry. The second action has been to institute a commission of inquiry to go into the allegations of corruption that have been levelled against the Ministry.

15.46 hrs.

[SHRI C. M. STEPHEN in the Chair.]

The Governor in his report has stated:

"The present DMK Ministry, in a series of acts of maladministration, corruption and misuse of power, for achieving partisan ends, set at naught all canons of justice and equity which are the hallmark of a democratic administration."

I agree with him on the canons of equity and justice for which he too, I am glad, has got some concern even at this stage.

[Shri Sezhiyan]

Before going into the details, let me make myself clear in a general way on one point. I welcome the commission of inquiry if it is going to help cleanse the atmosphere in the country. Irrespective of the persons involved, wherever there are allegations of corruption, they should be looked into. Just because it has been made against the DMK Ministry, I do not say that the inquiry should not be done. If there has been any corrupt activities done by them, they should pay the price for it. Just because they belong to my party, I do not defend them. Similarly, I also want you to see that just because it is an opposition party, you do not use this as a stick to beat the duly constituted representative Government out of that State.

I place the party above individuals and the welfare of the people above the party. If the party stands in the way of the welfare of the people, it cannot thrive. I do not want to subscribe to such a party and if there are certain persons who take advantage of the position of the party, they should also be cleared. After all, we are all here not for any individual party or for some particular individuals. We are here to do some good to the people of the country. That is the final aim and objective of those who come into politics. I am one of those who still believe in the dignity of politics. I am proud to be a politician. Though the word "politics" has acquired a very repulsive and stinking nausea in this country, still I believe honest work can be done in politics as one of the most vital sectors in the life of this country. Therefore, I am not here to defend any corrupt practice perpetrated by this Government or that Government. But I want to know—how the charges of corruption have been taken as proved before any chance has been given to the affected party to defend themselves, how this procedure of a very hasty action against the Government, against the Assembly as a whole, has been evolved?

I should pay tributes to the Congressmen themselves, because in several States, starting from the Kairon days, they themselves have been levelling charges of corruption against their own party Government; it may be out of personal differences or with an honest attempt to cleanse the atmosphere, to root out political corruption in the country. I want to know what the standards are; I want to be enlightened on the norms, on the procedures that you have evolved all these years, because this is not the last Government that is going to be there; probably you may have to topple many more Governments in the years to come; probably you may have to topple your own Government which you may not like! What are the norms you have evolved and the procedure that you are going to adopt at least hereafter to deal with allegations of corruption?

Take, for example, the classical case of Punjab. The first Commission of Inquiry was constituted under Justice S. R. Dass. Serious allegations by the Congressmen themselves were raised in May 1968. But when those charges came to the High Command, to the Central Government, to the Prime Minister, they were set aside as non-sensical, as "fantastic frivolous and absurd." There was one petition of Dr. Pratap Singh which went to the Supreme Court on an allegation of malafides on the part of the Chief Minister, Pratap Singh Kairon. The Supreme Court upheld the petition and decided against the Chief Minister in acts of malafide in that case. Only after that, when the case was decided, the Central Government was forced to move into the matter and they appointed the S. R. Dass Commission of Inquiry to go into the charges of allegations given by some 20—25 persons to the President. I am narrating all these

things to show that even when the Commission of Inquiry was constituted, the Assembly was not dissolved. The Chief Minister continued to be in his post till the Commission of Inquiry went into all these allegations and gave its report.

AN HON. MEMBER: He went under Kamraj's plan.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: After that, I think, there was a change of the Ministry here. Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri assumed the Office of the Prime Minister. About three days later, the report of the Commission of Inquiry came. Even then the Press reports said that the Chief Minister resisted the idea of resigning. The Prime Minister, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri threatened to publish the entire report and he did publish it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Dhauhdhuka): The report came during Prime Minister Nehru's time.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: No, I think the report was submitted when Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri was there.

(Interruptions)

Let us not go into details. When serious charges of corruption were made by the Congressmen themselves, when a Commission of Inquiry was appointed, when even the Commission held certain charges as having been proved, still the Assembly was not dissolved. Only the Chief Minister was allowed to resign, and the matter ended there.

I do not want to quote all the cases because they are galore. State after State, such allegations have been coming. There are allegations not in one or two cases, but so many, in hundreds, have been raised in U.P., in Orissa, in Madhya Pradesh, in Bihar and in so many other places. I may be excused in not knowing all

the States involved, because it would make a long list.

Now, for example, in the State of Bihar, allegations of corruption have been continuously pouring in; still recourse to article 356 was not taken. Allegations of corruption swelled in such large numbers that even one of the Ministers holding office there burst out. This is a report dated May 23, 1972—"Bihar Minister's Outburst Against Party Legislators." It has been reported:

"The Bihar Food and Supply Minister Mr. Theodore Bodra, in an angry outburst yesterday described all legislators, MPs and Ministers of Bihar as 'dishonest'."

Mr. Bodra shouted, "How am I to control the prices of these commodities when right from the Supply Inspectors to the Commissioners, everyone wants a share of the loot. Even legislators, MPs and Ministers are thieves. What can I do as a Food Minister alone? It is a thankless job for me."

This is what he shouted. Again, he said:

"I have suspended 14, but I have not been able to suspend one officer who deserves exemplary punishment because I am getting many telephone calls from legislators and Minister requesting me to stay my hand when an innocent officer has been made a scapegoat to save him."

He himself has revealed the extent to which he has been put to harassment.

Mr. Bhandare who has been our colleague here and who went there as the Governor openly met the press and gave out the stinking report that he was getting the *prima facie* case that he was able to investigate and find out. But article 356 was nowhere in sight before them then. No action was taken either to dis-

[Shri Sezhiyan]
miss the Ministry or to dissolve the Assembly.

Then, the hon. Member here was impatient about Haryana. I should include it also here. The Members of the Opposition gave a memorandum containing charges of corruption. 121 Members of Parliament sent a memorandum backing the charges of corruption and sent it to the Prime Minister and the President. What happened to that one? Here, 2 or 3 Members of Parliament gave a memorandum I have got much respect for them. I suppose two MPs coming from Tamil Nadu command more respect than 121 MPs. It is not the number that matters. I am not counting the numbers. Certain Members of Parliament got serious apprehensions about corruption that has taken place there and, therefore, they gave a memorandum in the case of Haryana, 121 MPs gave a petition. But still it is gathering dust in the shelves of the Home Ministry without any action being taken.

Then, there was a petition against the Karnataka Government also. I think, the petition was given only very recently. The Public Accounts Committee Report of the Karnataka Assembly gave a very horrid picture about the things happening there. In respect of Tamil Nadu, these are all allegations only, still not proved. There may be some substance in them or no substance in them. These are yet unproved allegations only. Here is the Public Accounts Committee, 1974-76, Fourth Report (Fifth Assembly) on the Appropriation Accounts and the Audit Reports for the Years, 1971-72 and 1972-73 and Cooperative Institutions. As everyone knows, the Public Accounts Committee consists of Members drawn from all parties in the State Assembly. That has given a unanimous report. This is the finding of the Public Accounts Committee in p. 534:

"After searching examination and careful perusal of the records of the Federation and the report and evidence submitted before the Committee, the Committee have come to the irresistible conclusion that the President and some of the Directors and its Officers have by wilful collusion and connivance with private persons and firms defrauded funds to the tune of crores of rupees in all the transactions of the business during the years under reference and they have committed breach of trust and utterly failed in their duties and responsibilities in safeguarding the interest of the Federation."

Sir, the painful part of it is that the President alluded to here is now a Minister in the Cabinet, and no action has been taken on this examined and concluded portion of the Public Accounts Committee's report. No action has been taken under 356. The Assembly is still going on and the Ministry remains undisturbed. I understand that as many as 99 charges have been levelled against the Ministry in Karnataka. The Congressmen themselves have given so many petitions and a Committee constituted by the Congressmen have found this to be a priority case for taking action against, but article 356 has not been taken recourse to.

14 hrs.

I want to make one point clear here, that we are in principle opposed to the constitution of a Commission of Inquiry by the Centre. That is why, when the Haryana petitions came and the Karnataka petitions came and they asked me to sign, I said that there may or may not be substance in it, but I don't subscribe to the view that the Centre should constitute an Inquiry Commission to go into the States' affairs because our principle is that, in a federal system, the Government working in the State is responsible

to the State Assembly and the State people. Unless you have got a permanent machinery which is impartial, to go into all the charges without fear or favour and without giving consideration to whether it is convenient for the ruling Party here at the Centre or not, unless some such machinery is devised and some institution is founded, we cannot give the discretionary power to pick and choose to the Central Government. That is why when the petitions came from Haryana and they belonged to the Congress Party to which we are opposed, we did not sign them. And when the Karnataka petitions also came, I refused to sign on the plea that they should take it to the Karnataka Assembly and the people there and to fight it out in a political way in the elections.

Now, Annadurai—our beloved Anna—has, after his death drawn some enconiums from the Minister here. The Home Minister said that Tamil Nadu had suffered for nine long years, under the DMK rule. Probably he forget that in the first two years, Anna was the Chief Minister but because he is dead, they have forgiven him and given him some praise. But, if you care for his views, he was also very much against the constitution of Commission of Enquiry by the Centre on state affairs. He accepted the idea of 'Lokpal' but he included the Ministers also and he said that the machinery should be at the State level. Just as the State cannot hold an enquiry against the Centre, the Centre should not be allowed to hold an enquiry against a State.

I also want to know what happened to the Santanam Commission's report. It made a good study of the subject matter. In the entire Second Five Year Plan they analysed certain

Sectors and they calculated that in one Department of the Central Government—in the constructions and supplies alone—money to the tune of Rs. 140 crores had been lost due to corrupt practices. If anyone cares, they may consult the report. One small department alone cost Rs. 140/- crores to the exchequer by way of corruption. Afterwards, there was a talk of Lokpal and Lokayukta Bill. What happened to that? It was introduced in May, 1968 and was referred to a Select Committee. The Select Committee went through that for about a year, and in September, 1969, it came up for discussion in this House and this House passed that. And when the House got dissolved in 1970, it lapsed. Again it was introduced in 1971. If one sees the bulletin, one will find that that is the first item in the pending Bills from 1971. This Emergency and even the slogan 'work more and talk less' have not produced any results as far as Lokpal and Lokayukta Bill is concerned. I would like to ask the Minister if he is prepared to introduce and finalise this thing. I want an impartial judicial machinery to go into all corruption charges. Here, as far as the Tamil Nadu Government is concerned, they are put under a Commission of Inquiry. Let us wait for their results. If there is anything wrong done by our partymen, to the extent possible our Party will take care of them. If anything is found out which has affected the administration in a malicious way I will not stand in the way of Government taking any action against them after proving. But these charges had been kept almost a secret. They were not published when these charges were handed over to the President. It is to the credit of the Madras Assembly that they took up the matter, the matter was discussed there and they gave the replies also and placed them on the Table of the House. It was the DMK Government that made that public, along with the replies. On that score, I am not saying that everything has been cleared. But they adopted certain

[Shri Sezhiyan]
procedures. Even the common courtesy of making that document public has not been observed by this Government till the date of dismissal of the DMK Government.

If you read the report of the Governor, it will be very apparent. He says:

"I have refrained from referring to these matters in any formal report firstly in the hope that the Ministry might improve its style of functioning and things might take a turn for the better and, secondly, my action may be construed as undue interference in the functioning of a duly elected

That means, he has not made any reports about this earlier. I do not know how he imagined and entertained that hope—because we are not astrologers or mind-readers.—He says: '.....firstly in the hope that the Ministry might improve its style of functioning'—without pointing out what were the defects. How are we to know what are our defects? No report was made by the Governor earlier. The DMK Government was not asked by this Government or by the Governor earlier about these matters. For the first time, in a big way, he comes out with this report.

Here, my basic approach is this. I am not perturbed about the DMK Government going out of power. It has been in power for nine years. It is prepared to go to elections. People may decide this way or that way. You say, 'If election come, we alone will win'. I am not saying anything of that sort. If one party can claim to win all the elections, then elections need not be held at all. But we have been demanding elections in March, 1976 itself. We have said 'Put it before the people' let them decide about the performance of this Government; that is the only proper and

political way to judge a Government'. We have said this. We did not hide away from this; we did not want extension. Even for Lok Sabha we said, 'Go to the people and get their mandate'. At that time one Congress speaker in Tamil Nadu said, "They are talking of elections; we are ready to have elections; we will win the elections, but do not ask 'how'; anyhow we will win the elections!" But I do not say this. People may decide the other way. In some elections, they have decided the other way. In the case of Pondicherry, from the ruling Party, we were reduced to two. And when the President's rule was imposed, when I was fighting the Presidential order and other irregularities in this very House. I demanded that elections should be held, knowing full well that my Party may not win the majority of the seats. . .

SHRI ARAVINDA BALA PAJANOR (Pondicherry): Your partyman was responsible for toppling the Government down.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Constitutionally.

SHRI ARAVINDA BALA PAJANOR: Not Constitutionally; unconstitutionally

SHRI SEZHIYAN: What was unconstitutional there? The Assembly was called. A motion for vote on account was moved. It was not unconstitutional. And majority of Members voted against the Government. It was not unconstitutional.

SHRI ARAVINDA BALA PAJANOR: It was not decent on the part of the ex-Minister belonging to your Party to steal the Budget papers using his previous influence.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Whether another unconstitutionality has been done there, I do not know, otherwise I would have raised that also.

SHRI ARAVINDA BALA PAJANOR: You are demanding elections; what about the ex-Ministry there that never conducted the Municipal elections?

SHRI SEZHIAN: I can show you States where for 13/14 years, municipal elections have not been conducted. Whatever punishment you are giving to those States, give that also to Tamil Nadu. I am prepared to accept that.

When I demand elections, it is not for the convenience of my party, but it is because it is the constitutional duty and the right of the people to choose persons whom they want to occupy the seats of power.

Now about Article 356 and the use of this Article, certain apprehensions were expressed even at the time of Constituent Assembly. I am coming to the very basic question, the question how a new criterion is being created in the Indian constitutional procedure, in the Federation, that a State Ministry has to function not only to the satisfaction of the Assembly, not only to the satisfaction of the people there, it has to function to the satisfaction of the Central Government, of the party in power in the Central Government. This is a new criterion that has arisen and this has been made amply clear by Mr. K. Santhanam, when he issued a statement which has appeared in the Eastern Economist paper. He said that he welcomes the Commission of Enquiry, but it should not be made a political instrument for a biased party to use it at the convenient time and convenient place. Instead of that, he wanted a permanent machinery to go into these charges. I do not have an objection if they create an impartial, permanent judicial body which goes into the allegations of corruption, whosever raises them, against whomsoever they are raised.

When Shri H. V. Kamath raised this question in the Constituent Assembly, he was very categorical and clear. The Constituent Assembly was discussing the present Article 356,—it was then Articles 278 and 278A, and Shri H. V. Kamath said:

"This whole Constitution will be in danger not so much from those who are agitating in the streets as from those who are in power, in case these articles are adopted as they are. If the House wants such a thing to happen, let it say so. Let us not say in the Preamble that we shall have a democratic republic. We are here seeking to destroy the foundations of democracy."

Later on, Pandit H. N. Kunaru put a question to Dr. B. R. Ambedkar :

"May I ask my honourable friend to make one point clear? Is it the purpose of Articles 278 and 278A to enable the Central Government to intervene in provincial affairs for the sake of good government of the provinces?"

The charges that

The charges that Shri K. K. Shah has indicated like mal-administration and other things mean that there was a bad government. It has to be looked into. But the question is, whether the Central Government has a right to intervene in the affairs of a State, if it feels that it is a bad Government. If there is a break down of law and order, you take it over, that is all right. If the particular Ministry does not enjoy the majority in the House, then it becomes possible. Suppose there is an apprehension or a report or a complaint or allegation that it is a bad government, can the Central Government intervene? That is the question that Pandit Kunzru put. The hon. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar said:

"No. no. the Centre is not given that authority".

This is because, it is a political decision to be taken by the people.

[Shri Sezhiyan]

It is a constitutional prerogative of the Assembly to vote down a Ministry and the democratic right of the people to change it by the ballot box if it is found to be a bad government. What will happen if you give these powers to the Centre? Then the State Government will function not only to the satisfaction of the majority of the House, not only to the satisfaction of the people at the elections but it has to function looking for the satisfaction of the centre also to get its benevolent protection....

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Burdwan): That was pre-emergency meaning.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : Explaining these things, Dr. Ambedkar put it very clearly:

"In regard to the general debate which has taken place in which it has been suggested that these articles are liable to be abused, I may say that I do not altogether deny that there is a possibility of these articles being abused or employed for political purposes. But that objection applies to every part of the Constitution which gives power to the Centre to override the Provinces, (i.e. the States). In fact I share the sentiments expressed by my hon. friend, Mr. Gupte yesterday that the proper thing we ought to expect is that such articles will never be called into question and that they would remain a dead letter."

What a pious hope he had: Thirty-six times Article 356 was invoked and at least three Ministries, the Ministry of Kerala in 1959, the West Bengal Government in 1969 and in 1976 the Tamil Nadu Government have been dismissed even though it has not been proved that they have lost the majority inside the Assembly.

Then, proceeding further, Dr. Ambedkar said:

"If at all they are brought into operation, I hope the President, who

is endowed with these powers, will take proper precautions before actually suspending the administration of the province. I hope the first thing he will do would be to issue a mere warning to a province that has erred that things were not happening in the way in which they were intended to happen in the Constitution. If that warning fails, the second thing for him to do will be to order an election allowing the people of the province to settle matters by themselves. It is only when these two remedies fail that he would resort to this Article. It is only in those circumstances that he would resort to this Article I do not think we could then say that these Articles were imported in vain or that the President had acted want only."

Therefore, whenever there is a complaint of a bad government in a State, Dr. Ambedkar who had been the master-mind in the making of the Constitution said that at the first instance the President should warn the erring State of the deficiencies found in the Government of the State there, if the State does not mend itself, the second step will be to allow the electors to decide what should be done with the bad government. Only when these two things fail, the powers given in the Article 356 should be used. That is what Dr. Ambedkar said in the blessed year of 1949 which has been forgotten by this government and its predecessors when they disbanded the Kerala Government, when they sent home the West Bengal Government and when they adopted the same course in Tamil Nadu also.

I said about Kerala. It happened in the year 1959. Even though we were no less unfriendly in the eyes of this Communist Party, we still supported them in our papers and platforms, that a very dastardly action, a fraud on the Constitution was committed when those Governments, the non-Congress Opposition governments wherever they have

been formed, have been wiped out if no other opportunity was available to the Party in Central Government. At that time, Mr. Dange, speaking in this House on 17th August 1956, on the Resolution regarding the proclamation in respect of Kerala, said:

"Therefore, it is true that their idea was not democracy, rule of law, dignity and all that. It was complete hatred for Communist Ministry and a desire to get rid of it somehow. If that is democracy, in that case, I do not know what is dictatorship. If under Article 356 of the Constitution, this is the way in which that Article is applied, if this way is a democratic way, I would like to know what would be the dictatorship."

Probably he was an affected person as the government run by his party was let down in Kerala. At that time, Mr. Khadilkar—I do not see him here.

SHRI P K DEO (Kalabandi) He was in the Opposition then

SHRI SEZHIYAN: He was in the Opposition but he did not side with the Communists. I have gone through the records. He said:

"I do recognize that events had come to a pass when central intervention was inevitable. There is no escape from it."

He painted a dismal picture of Kerala by saying:

"They say that they are disgusted with the party rule once for all!"

Even though he was in the Opposition, he did not see eye to eye in all the matters with the Communist Party. Later on he went to the Congress Party. He was the Deputy Speaker of House, then he became an hon. Minister; he is now an hon. member. He said: "Are we to understand that

this Constitution is to be operated by the Union Government to their convenience. If you are going to support this proposition, in this country there is no possibility of any Government—leave aside the Communist Government—functioning in any State which is not falling in line with the Congress completely."

Therefore, this ruled out completely that no other party can form any Government in any State which does not meet the satisfaction of the party in power in the Central Government.

When the question of West Bengal came in 1968, what was the role of the Governor? I think the hon. member to my right who is a Leftist—Shri Indrajit Gupta—complained very bitterly while speaking on the West Bengal Legislative Delegation of Powers Bill—

"Everything the Governor has done upto now since his induction in Governor's office proves without a shadow of doubt that he is motivated by the sole interest of looking after the ruling party's interest as dictated by the Home Ministry."

What had been his sad experience, I feel the same in the State of Tamil Nadu.

Naw-a-days I find Shri Shah has been one of the most ardent and enthusiastic speaker's, be it a club in Madras, Bombay or in Delhi. He is one of the outspoken spokesman for the Congress (R) Party for emergency and proclamation of this emergency. On 27th February, he has spoken in Madras—which has been reported—

"The Tamil Nadu Governor, Mr. K. K. Shah, today described the President's rule in the State as the 'harbinger of a clean, impartial, efficient, upright and just administration'

[Shri Sezhian]

The whole of Tamil Nadu has celebrated the dismissal of the DMK Ministry as a day of deliverance."

This is the report which has been given by the Governor about ten days ago, in the Collector's Conference.

Our hon. Minister also said that for the past nine years Tamil Nadu has been groaning. Mr. Shah became a Governor in 1971. He spoke in the Collectors' Conference. In 1973 thus:

"My stay in Tamil Nadu for a little over two years now has convinced me beyond any shadow of doubt that the administration is in tune with the declared policy of democratic socialism and giving a lead to other States in recognising the common man as the real master."

In the year 1974, addressing the Annual Conference of Collectors and Police Officers held at Rajahm Hall on 27th July, this is what the Governor said—

"I am also happy that the administration is in tune with the declared policy of democratic socialism, is capable of maintaining healthy standards and giving a lead to other States in recognising the common man as the real master. The efficient execution of Manu Neethi Thutham, the provision of house-sites, the ameliorative measures like campaign against blindness, the anxiety to make beggars useful members of society, the efforts to replace hand rickshaws by cycle-rickshaws, etc. cement the rapport of the masses with the administration and reduce the gap which we otherwise notice between the source of power and those who are far away from them.

On 26th June, 1975 emergency came. It is alleged that afterwards a sudden turn has come in the attitude and functioning of the State Government.

After the emergency at the Collector's Conference held on 5th July, 1975, he said:

"The Government of Tamil Nadu under the dynamic leadership of our able Chief Minister Dr. Kalaignar Karunanidhi has been taking up one scheme after another to help the weaker sections of society . . . Tamil Nadu can take legitimate pride in the fact that considerable progress has been registered in the allotment of house-sites to Harijans."

I can go on quoting many things but I do not have the time. I wish to give the latest one. This is published in the Hindu and this is dated 23-10-75. He said:

"The Tamil Nadu Government's many social welfare schemes for the poor, orphans, and those neglected by society, were praiseworthy and deserved emulation by other States."

This is in October, 1975 where he says, what is done in Tamil Nadu deserves to be emulated by other States. I don't want to go into all these details. It will take time I will give statistics about Veeranam project at the time of the Budget discussion.

Here is a book published by the Government of India "A Hundred New Gains" Take page 21. The heading is 'Land to the Landless'. It says:

"Since the declaration of Emergency, almost all the States have accelerated the redistribution of land. In Kerala, nearly 1,50,000 hectares of land has been distributed among 3,28,500 landless labourers. Tamil Nadu has distributed nearly 10 lakh acres, West Bengal nearly 5 lakh acres, Orissa 2.46 lakh acres and Uttar Pradesh 1.23 lakh acres."

I have got reservations on all the figures but I am giving this statistics which has been given by the Centre

itself. The Governor has been paying so many encomiums to the Chief Minister and even I on the party platform would not have praised him in much profuse terms. On the evening the proclamation was going to be issued. On the 29th he has already sent a report. On the 31st morning in the Gandhi mandap there was a memorial service to Gandhiji in which he said: "The Tamil Nadu Government is following the footsteps of Mahatama Gandhi in the most exemplary way! This is what he said on the 31st January itself.

Mr. Indrajit Gupta says that the Governor has been bluffing us. I do not know whether he has bluffed us or by his report and other speeches he is bluffing the Central Government now. He may keep you in the dark and continue to bluff you.

They have framed certain charges—allegations against the Government—unproved allegations, I should say. They ordered an inquiry because they were not quite sure; at least they wanted to give it a judicial character because allegations by themselves do not call for conviction.

In this case, you dismissed the ministry; you dissolved the Assembly. Suppose the Commission finds later that all these allegations are without basis, how are you going to rectify this? Are you going to bring back the Assembly retrospectively? What is the way out if these allegations are not proved? How can you assume that the Commission is going to find a clear case as you wish? (*Interruptions*). Now I want to raise one basic question. They have made charges against this Ministry. They made those charges to create an atmosphere in the political field. If the Ministry is suspended will it not be enough? Why should you dissolve the Assembly? Why don't you keep it in suspension till some clear picture is available? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA
(Serampore): Because it is in U.P.!

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Because he mentioned the name of U.P. I want to refer to a different procedure adopted there. When the U.P. Ministry resigned on the 22nd February 1968, the Governor sends a report saying that the Ministry has resigned and there is nobody else to take that place.

He advises the President not to dissolve the Assembly on the reason:

"There is also the consideration that as many as 12 Members of the Rajya Sabha will be retiring shortly and the State Legislature has to elect new Members in their place. If the Legislative Assembly is to be dissolved now, new elections may not be possible till some time after the next rainy season and until then, the 12 seats in the Rajya Sabha will remain unfilled. Leaving such a large number of seats from Uttar Pradesh unfilled in the Rajya Sabha will not be in the interest of the State, and for that reason also, I do not think it desirable to dissolve the Legislative Assembly at this juncture, but feel that it will be in the interest of the State if the functioning of the State Legislature is merely suspended."

What is good for U.P. appears to be not good for Tamil Nadu! There also six seats are to be filled for Tamil Nadu in the Rajya Sabha. Suppose the Assembly continues, its normal life would have been till 21st March 1978. You might have held the election and elected the Members. When you apply one logic to U.P. the same logic may as well be applied in the case of Tamil Nadu. Tamil Nadu has got six members, at least half that of U.P. Why don't you show to us half the anxiety which was shown to them?

Now I come to the two serious charges that are being made by the Home Minister. One is the charge of secessionist programme of the DMK,—the other Anti-Hindi'. One funny thing

[Shri Senhayan] is this. If you go through the Governor's Report, many things are not there. Slowly and steadily some of them are being invented and day by day, they are getting new grounds. When the Prime Minister came to Madras, she said that she had information—may be, she had information from the Central Government—because I do not think she personally might be collecting all information. Whatever brief is given, she tries to use that. She said that the Central Government had information that on 1st, 3rd and 5th the DMK had planned violent demonstrations. I do not know who prepared the brief for her. Probably some numerologist who believes in the odd numbers!

The governor sent his report on the 29th. But, that does not contain these dates 1st, 3rd and 5th. Against whom were these demonstrations planned? Did we organise it against our own Government? Actually on the 1st we had a series of meetings that were organised throughout Tamil Nadu to propagate to the people the achievements made by Tamil Nadu in the last nine years. It was an 'Achievement Day' on the 1st, 3rd March was the memorial day—the day of death of our Leader Anna about whom they themselves do not have anything against. I do not think—I say this in all sincerity and honesty—that anything had been planned or thought of for the 5th.

Now about the anti-Hindi "business" the hon Minister said in the other House. He has made it a "business".

It is true and is a past history that DMK started as a secessionist movement. If you go into the background you will find DMK has come out of the DK and DK has been born out of 'self-respect' movement which was started in 1926. The Home Minister said in the other House that DK is the father or mother of DMK, I would like to point out that DK has come out of the 'self-respect' movement and the 'self-respect' movement has

come out of the Congress party. Pariyar Ramaswamy was an ardent congressman. He was the President of Tamil Nadu congress when he left the Congress and started this one. The 'self-respect' movement was started as a revolt against social oppression against caste system, against high born and the low born, against superstitions, against the rituals, etc. It was a social upheaval on behalf of the downtrodden, on behalf of the untouchables, on behalf of the low caste people and on behalf of the people who for thousands of years had been put on the lowest rung in the social system. It was a revolt against social injustices that had been perpetrated for centuries. This movement was called 'self-respect' movement because it fought for the human dignity and created self-respect and self-confidence in the minds of people.

Later on in 1937 when Rajaji came as the Prime Minister of Tamil Nadu province, compulsory Hindi was introduced. This created an upsurge there and an apprehension that the Tamils and their language would be downgraded. Then there was great agitation and it gave birth to the anti-Hindi movement. After that the anti-Hindi movement was converted into Dravidian movement. The concept of the Dravidian group took shape.

Afterwards when Independence came Pariyar Ramaswamy felt that in India as a whole if Tamil Nadu were to remain there, then it would be put to this domination, namely, the linguistic domination. The exploitation of one region by another region will be there. There was this apprehension. He was demanding a separate State. Mr Annadurai differed with this. He welcomed Independence of this country whereas Pariyar Ramaswamy observed it as a mourning day.

In 1949 DMK parted as a political party out of the DK. Slowly and steadily we began to appreciate a few things. We thought if there was a real federal system in this country

based on the democratic principles, each language would have a place, each minority a legitimate protection, each State that has been organised on a linguistic basis can have its own affairs conducted in its own language, in its own traditions. Therefore, there will not be exploitation of one region by another.

Specially when the Chinese attack came, more wisdom dawned on us. We realised that if we got divided, probably we would fall a prey to other powers and we might all be subjugated. At the time, we should remember it was the capacity and far-sightedness of the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru that was responsible for the assurance that was given. Advertisements came in the Tamil Nadu press and throughout the State in wall posters 'Prime Minister's Assurance.' He assured us that English will not be removed as long as the non-Hindi people wanted it. Because at that time people in the south were agitated that their language might be subjugated and replaced.

When I speak on this question, I want to make one thing clear. 'Anti-Hindi' does not mean that I am against Hindi. It is a language spoken by millions of people. Nobody chooses his birth place or his language. It is an accident. Suppose I had been born in Delhi or Patna or Banaras. I might have been speaking Hindi, probably a better Hindi than many of my friends here. Just as you are attached to your mother, you become attached to your mother-tongue also. Therefore, I have no hatred against Hindi. It is fortunate, a fortunate accident that I speak Tamil. It is a matter of convenience; it is convenient for the people of Tamil Nadu to conduct their affairs in Tamil. If somebody imposes some other language, there is resistance.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Ald.):
It is also an accident that you speak in English.

SHRI SEZHIVAN: That is correct. I fully appreciate Shri Vasant Sathe's point. Suppose we had been born in a French colonial territory, probably we would be speaking the French language instead of English. I hold no brief for English. If I were to speak in Tamil here, I would be able to express myself better and pour out my agony, then thoughts from my heart in my own language. That is the trouble.

Therefore, there was apprehension in the minds of the people there. That appeal was made by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. At that time, we were inside jail. Then we came out forgetting our struggles. We immediately started a campaign and went door to door and to street corners collecting money for the Defence Fund. At the time of the Chinese aggression, a crucial time came. We did not betray, the solidarity of the country; we did not betray the federal character of the country, because we felt that in a federal system working on a democratic basis, Tamil Nadu would have its rightful place, the interests of the people of the region would be secured, the minorities, whether linguistic minorities or religious minorities or other minorities, would be protected and all these things would be mutually possible and beneficial. Therefore, the secession idea was not continued. Just because one Party had preached it once, though it has left it once and for all and it has been accepted by everybody, can one make a boggy of it now?

I will quote one instance. In my student days, I used to read very avidly communist literature. Even today I read it, because I have some faith in the humane aspects they preach. At that time, I had read this *Final Bid for Power* published in 1948 by P. C. Joshi, General Secretary of the Party. There it was said:

"The Communist Party puts forward the concept of India as a family of free nations. The CPI

[Shri Sezhiyan]

guarantees every section of our peoples free development of their own choice...."

Because at that time they wanted not one Constituent Assembly; they propagated for 17 Constituent Assemblies for India elected by universal franchise etc.

"The right of full self-determination shall also extend to the people of Indian States not only as their inalienable right, but as an essential part of the plan of real Indian freedom, or the final liquidation of the British rule and its princely agent". At that time, they were talking about 17 Constituent Assemblies

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): It was all long long ago. Why speak of it now?

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Yes, at that time these ideas were there. That was thought of as the best solution in that context. At that time, we had also felt that only separation could solve the problem. But afterwards we found out that we could not cut ourselves away and go into the Bay of Bengal or the Indian Ocean.

MR CHAIRMAN: You have taken one hour; please conclude. There are a large number of speakers.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Therefore, even now I say this. I am not for secession; my party is not for secession. If anybody talked in that way or in a way that gives an impression to that effect, I request the hon. Minister to take penal action against him. When certain persons in my party did like that, we suspended them; our own government prescribed papers in which such feelings were voiced. Recently one such member who was saying such things has gone out of our party. I do not know whether he has joined the Congress party by this time. Sometimes people speak in a rash way. Sometime ago Mr. Shashi-bhushan made a wonderful suggestion that India should have a limited dic-

tatorship. Am I to take it that he speaks for the whole of the Congress Party and that it is the policy of the Congress Government?

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: Why not?

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Let me quote what the Prime Minister has herself said about us in 1970; I am quoting from *The Mail* of June 6, 1970:

"Mrs. Indira Gandhi in a recent interview to the Turkish Press team which visited India had said that the Congress was left—to the—centre party. The Prime Minister was interviewed in regard to party and political issues ranging from centre-state relation to polarisation in the party. She said that the DMK which had earlier put forward the demand to separate the South had given up that demand and integrated itself into the broad national front work."

This is what she said in 1970; of course then we were all very good friends inside the House and outside the House. In 1971 we fought the elections together. If you take our election manifesto of that time, it speaks of State autonomy. Therefore, things cannot have become different.

The Home Minister said: "All the papers and the people of Tamil Nadu have welcomed and supported the action taken." But could I write the other way? Am I allowed to speak differently or to hold a meeting in Tamil Nadu, not in this beach but at least in a small maiden? Will I be allowed to hold a meeting to criticise any step, even within the framework of the emergency?

A group of American farmers met the Prime Minister at her residence on the 20th of last month and she was asked about the liberalisation of the emergency and the Prime Minister said that a lot of persons had been released; she also said: "There is no pre-censorship". I am quoting this

instance to show that the Prime Minister is not well informed of what is happening in the country. There is pre-censorship in the country. I am not accusing her of saying a deliberate untruth. Why is she not kept informed of the true state of affairs? On August 11, 1975 the Press Censor in Madras issued an order to our party paper, *Murasoli* which says :

"Under rule 48(1) of the Defence of India Rules, 1971, I would advise you to submit all material including editorial, feature articles, news stories, advertisements, pictures, cartoons, etc. for pre-censorship with immediate effect from August 11, 1975."

Pre-censorship continues even more not only for *Murasoli* but also for 'Kazhaga Khral' for "Tughlak" and for other papers. I hope the Prime Minister will look into that. Is it being done against her wish, without her knowledge?

We want parliamentary democracy in this country to function on a federal basis without its being impaired, but by such acts, federalism is being cut out and democracy put at naught. The Governor in his report refers to "... Cannons of justice and equity which are the hall-mark of democratic administration...." That is what I want, I want justice and I want equity. I want justice to be done to the persons who had been accused, justice to the government which had been accused. They should be given a chance to explain their stand, what they have done in their short life span of nine years. Possibly they are not very big things. The Governor himself has reported them. We may have given some land to the landless, some cycle rickshaws to hand rickshaw-pullers, artificial limbs to the maimed, some street lights to dark hamlets, little houses and flats to the slum dwellers. All these may look a small thing for you. But they brought some human dignity to those miserable people; for small men they have been great things. But at the Centre

crores of rupees have been spent for nothing.

"Occasional Speeches and Writings" by Dr. Radhakrishnan, there is a worthy passage:

"The democratic approach is by persuasion, argument and adjustment of conflicting views. If there is a difference of opinion, one can say—'agree with me or I will hit you,' or—'let us sit down, understand each other and decide.' The latter is the democratic approach. It believes that love is better than hate, co-operation better than strife, consent better than coercion. In the present world resort to violence is at best a cowardly escape from democratic processes and at worst treason to the future."

I want to know apart from whatever has happened, how are you going to undo the harm that you have done, not to the DMK Ministry, not to the DMK Party, and not even to the State of Tamil Nadu but to the federal system of the Government and to the federal character of the Indian Constitution. You have done an incalculable damage.

Sir, once Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said that "those who crawl do not fall." I say "I may fall, I may be felled, but I refuse to crawl."

SHRI K. GOPAL (Karur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support this motion moved by the Home Minister. We have heard Mr. Sezhiyan who made a very fervent appeal to this House. He has said that democracy has been betrayed and that no norms have been fixed with regard to the dismissal of the D. M. K. Ministry in Tamil Nadu. Sir, I have also gone into the history of the D. M. K. Party and I would like to tell Mr. Sezhiyan that till the year 1967 Congress was in power in Tamil Nadu. We lost the elections then. Here I would like to quote what Mr. C. N. Annadurai himself said in this connection. He said that the Congress lost in the elections not because of their mis-deeds and mal-administration but because they did not tell the people what they were doing for the people

[Shri K. Gopal]
and what their achievements were. If only they had told the people what they had done actually for the people, they would not have been defeated.

Now, Sir, Mr. Sezhiyan welcomed the appointment of an Enquiry Commission and so also some of the leaders of the D. M. K. Party. The only difference is that Mr Sezhiyan did it in sincerity. I do not know whether the same sincerity is there in the case of other leaders of the D. M. K. Party. In the heart of his heart Mr. Sezhiyan would be happy that the D. M. K. Government has been defeated. Mr. Sezhiyan is a very decent and sober person and if everybody in his Party is like him, this contingency in Tamil Nadu would not have arisen

Sir, Mr. Sezhiyan has based his argument mainly on one point. He has said that there was no Constitutional breakdown in the State and there was no break-down of law and order. I would like to ask him what is the break-down of law and order. He means that only violent agitations would create break-down of law and order. If a man in the street takes the law into his hands, it leads to violent agitations. But what happens if people in power take the law in their own hands? The people in power have no order at all whether in the administration or otherwise. Is it not the break down of law and order? Does it necessarily mean that violent agitations should involve destroying of public property. (Interruptions) Therefore, I would like to tell him that the break-down of law and order need not necessarily mean that public property should be set on fire and people should be killed. He was demanding elections in Tamil Nadu. But his party did not hold elections to the local bodies there. The Madurai Corporation was superseded. He also referred to the policy propagation day which they were supposed to observe on 1st, 3rd and 4th February. In the garb of these meetings, was it not their plan to whip up the feelings of the people of Tamil Nadu against the Centre? His party opposed the emergency

by a resolution on 5th July 75. At the same time they said, "As a Government, we will faithfully follow the Centre's directives". In the Coimbatore Conference they said that the elections to the Assembly and Parliament should be held together. The extension of the life of Parliament was because of the emergency. But when you opposed the emergency by a resolution how can you ask for the extension of the life of the Assembly? Till the last minute they tried for extension of the Assembly? They sent one of their ministers to Delhi for that purpose.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: I would quote from the body of the resolution

MR CHAIRMAN: Interruption is no doubt a parliamentary practice, but it should not exceed a word or two. You cannot quote something by way of an interruption.

SHRI K GOPAL: Is it not a fact that on the 10th February which was the date for convening the Assembly session you wanted to pass a resolution on State autonomy, quit the government honourably and tell the people 'We have resigned because we are demanding autonomy for the State from the Centre'?

Sir, with the existing powers they created hell. I do not know what would have happened if more powers were given to them. Only God could save Tamil Nadu. He referred to Periyar—E.V. Ramaswamy Naicker—and Annadurai. I may not agree with the political views of Periyar, but he was a social reformer. He wanted marriages to be celebrated at a cost of Rs 2. He wanted intercaste marriages. Have any of the DMK leaders celebrated marriages at Rs 2? Marriages were held at places like Abbotsbery and lakhs of rupees were spent. If they really follow the teachings of Periyar, may I know how many intercaste marriages have they performed? (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You cannot start getting up every time. Kindly make a note of these points and let your

colleague deal with them when his turn comes to speak.

SHRI K. GOPAL: If they go on quoting Periyar and Anna, one day these two gentlemen will get up from their graves. Anna was a soft person but Periyar would slap them and ask, "Are you really following my policies? Why are you quoting me every time?"

Then, he referred to Tamil culture. Sir, being an Indian one can be a good Tamilian and being a Tamilian, one can be a good Indian. It is not necessary that DMK alone stands for Tamil culture and others do not belong to Tamilnadu. He should change this attitude.

17.06 hrs

I would like to quote a few instances about misuse of powers by DMK. There was a project called the Vcceram Project. More than Rs 20 crores were estimated in the beginning, and tenders were called for. They selected a party whose financial viability was not verified, and whose capacity was not as much as it should be. Still he was selected as a contractor; and they were squeezing money from him. The gentleman suddenly committed suicide. And then in the name of drought relief, how many crores have gone down the drain? Take the case of the drought relief activities undertaken by the local bodies. I will tell a story popular in Tamil Nadu. An Assistant Engineer took charge of an area, and after a year or so, he said that a tank should be constructed for irrigational needs in a nearby area. A few lakhs of rupees were sanctioned. Everything was on paper. Tenders were called for. But finally nothing took place and only money was spent. After two years, that Assistant Engineer was transferred. When the new man asked him: "There is no tank and you have spent so much money," the former gave the reply: "If you are a clever man, you can do anything you like." That man took over; and after six months, he said; The tank is a health hazard there is stagnation of water. It should be

closed." Finally no tank was constructed and no tank was closed. But money was spent. This is a common story. Mr. Krishnan is a union chairman. He knows better. In regard to roads, they would say that Rs 50,000/- were needed for their construction. Hardly Rs. 5,000/- would be spent. But on record, everything would be there. This is what is happening. In the year 1974, the State of Tamil Nadu had acute food shortage. It was only man-made. It was not that the production of food had gone down, 45 lakhs tonnes of food-grains had been produced. But then why did the State go short of food? Deliberately, they removed all controls to see that foodgrains went to States like Kerala. Rice was being sold in Tamil Nadu at Rs. 8/- or Rs. 7/- a Kg. It was due to some party-man in power. Now about admission to profession colleges, There was nothing under-hand in their dictionary. Short of displaying it publicly, they had stipulated that for admission to medical colleges, Rs 40,000 - would have to be given, to engineering colleges, Rs. 10,000/-, to agricultural college such-and-such an amount. This was the state of affairs and without any shame or fear, this was being done by responsible persons. Even poor people had no way out. Even when reservation for scheduled castes was made, only the rich among them could get the admission. Even backward communities had to pay, with the result that the brilliant boys did not find a place in the professional colleges. They were diverting the funds meant for the welfare of the scheduled castes. The funds were not utilized for the purpose for which they were meant. They were used for giving publicity and pushing up the image of some of the leaders. They wanted to see that the treasury was emptied before they left the Government. They lifted the Prohibition. They earned about Rs. 50 crores or Rs. 60 crores. Then they re-introduced it. I do not go into the merits or demerits of Prohibition. When they scrapped Prohibition, they told the Centre: "We are short of money. Why don't you give?"

[Shri K. Gopal]

Now about interference in the affairs of trade unions. I used to tell my Marxist friend Mr. Dinen Bhattacharya: "Have you heard of cycle chain trade unionism?" This was strated in Simpsons. There was a trade union leader by name Gurumurthi. He enjoyed the confidence of everybody. A DMK man was brought in his place. One former colleague of Mr. Dinen Bhattacharya, a Marxist, became the president of the trade union. You know how he treated the people? He was even charged for murder. On the one hand, the DMK did propoganda that they were for the workers. On the other, they suppressed the workers. They took no action to protect the interests of the workers; and the management resorted to lay-offs. Whenever there is any lay off, even though it affects the workers, they never take any action, but keep quiet. But, if their trade union is affected, especially after the Emergency, they used to take action.

We are all aware of what happened to the Vellore Hospital, which is one of the prize institutions of the country. People from all over the world come for treatment there. Just because the hospital authorities did not yield to the request of the State Government that a few seats should be allotted to the State Government to nominate their own people, they wanted to punish them. It started first the pretext of demolishing some wall, which was constructed about 50 years ago. Even the staff of the hospital were not spared. Some women employees were man-handled but the police remained silent spectators. It was nothing but personal vendetta, wreaking vengeance on an institution, which is in all India institution, which belonged to the minority community.

Take, for example, the speeches of the DMK leaders in the Thirunelveli Conference. One gentleman said that in the matter of population, Tamil Nadu will stand 16th in the world among the members of the United Nations. Probably, what he meant was

that Tamil Nadu should become free and it should become a Member of the United Nations. Shri Sezhiyan was saying that just because some DMK leader has said something, you cannot take that as the view of the State Government. In the Coimbatore Conference, in the presence of the Chief Minister and other Ministers, a leader said: "If the life of the Tamil Nadu Assembly is not extended, there is going to be blood-shed and revolution. We will see that we secede from the country." These are speeches, not by third rate speakers but by responsible legislators of the Tamil Nadu Assembly.

The trouble with the DMK, especially the middle and lower level, was that they never realised that there was a Central Government, they never realised that there was a Constitution and they did not know that article 356 was there in the Constitution. I have heard the speeches of some of the leaders of DMK. One gentleman was saying that if the Central Ministers come to Madras tomorrow, we will see that they are hand-cuffed and marched through Anna Salai in Madras. I do not blame them, because they did not realise that there was a provision in the Constitution under which they can be dismissed.

In the name of State autonomy, what were they saying?

"Mujibur Rahman wanted autonomy. You know he got independence. You ask for a autonomy. That is all. More than this, you can guess"

This is the trend of their speaking

Now I come to the situation after President's Rule. If, according to them, the people feel that the dismissal of the DMK Government was unjustified, in spite of all the precautions that any law and order machinery can take, there should have been at least some semblance of an agitation. But, even a blade of grass did not move. Everybody rather welcomed it, as our Home Minister said his speech. The Home Minister has said that he is going to

clean the administration and that he has instituted an inquiry commission to go into some of the charges against the DMK Ministry

We welcome it

The term of the local bodies in Tamil Nadu is going to expire very shortly I would request him not to extend their life, because these are places of corruption

Coming to co-operative societies, after the DMK Government came to power they amended the Co-operative Societies Act in order to enable them to get themselves elected to these institutions They amended the Act in such a way that Government will have the power to nominate members

SHRI J MATHA GODER (Nilgiri)
Only three out of 14

SHRI K GOPAL It is true that it was not done in all cases I am just giving an example They captured all the co-operative institutions in this way in the State which was once boasting to have the best co-operative institutions as well as panchayat unions Today they are in shambles

Temple funds were misappropriated by trustees who were nominated by the Government For God's sake do not extend their lives In their place, appoint people of integrity

I am happy that the Governor has already announced that admission to professional colleges will be strictly on merit

Officials who were hand in glove with the DMK Ministers and connived with them should be dealt with very severely There may be some good officers, who do their duty whichever party may be in power I do not blame them But some District Collectors acted as district secretaries of the party I would request the Home Minister to take action against them.

Interference in the administration in that State has been so much that people have lost faith in the administration itself So, let the Home Minister issue a directive that no individual representation should be entertained by the authorities Anybody can go to the officers for a cause but not for an individual cause If that is done it would restore the confidence of the people of Tamil Nadu and give a clean and good administration

[SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA]

(Serampore) Our friend, Shri Sezhiyan, has very ably placed before the House the real motive behind the imposition of President's rule in Tamil Nadu It is a blatant example of how the Constitution is being subverted by the ruling party at the Centre

The Governor's report mentions that the DMK Ministry in a series of acts of maladministration, corruption and misuse of power for achieving partisan ends set at naught all canons of justice and equity which are the hallmarks of a democratic administration Shri Sezhiyan has dealt with this matter also My Point is can the Home Minister cite a single Government under Congress rule which is not corrupt? Can he prove it here? You will find hundreds of cases of misuse of power against all the Governments under Congress rule I come from West Bengal where they came to power by rigging elections After assuming power they are using it for their party ends without looking to the interests of the common man or showing any respect to the provisions of the constitution You will not find a single appointment there made on merits, or of any man who who does not belong to the Congress party Everywhere you will find the same situation So, why do you bring all this allegations against DMK only Does not your Government at the Centre here use its power for its own interests? When a Minister goes anywhere and the Congress Party holds a meeting the entire Government machinery is engaged to mobilise people People travel free of charge to attend that meeting either by train

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA

or bus. Your Party can address a public meeting and explain their standpoint regarding emergency measures. But the Opposition cannot hold even a single meeting inside a hall. What is your explanation to that? Even the condolence meetings were banned. When an Ordinance relating to bonus was issued, we from the trade union organisations and the organisations belonging to the Opposition Party wanted to hold a meeting in Calcutta Maidan, but your Government did not permit us to do so. I do not know how you will explain your conduct? Mr. Reddy, I understand that the Ministers are given VIP treatment but it is strange that for a person who is neither an MP nor an MLA the whole battalion of the police force and the home guards other officers including the Governor come forward to give a grand reception at the government expense. It has taken place in our State very recently. It is better for Mr. Reddy to talk less of misuse of power by DMK Government. What was the harm if you would have waited only for seven weeks? In the Assembly, the total number of Members is 235. DMK have got 165 even after defection. Is it democracy or is it the way to give respect to the Constitution? You are misusing Article 356. It has never happened before. If you take the real meaning of 356 may I know was there any situation in Tamil Nadu where the law and order situation was not under control? There was nothing of the sort.

Mr. Era Sezhiyan has said that after sending the report to the Centre on 29th January he praised the Tamil Nadu Government on the 31st of the same month. So far as my information goes,—because I do not know how far it is correct—the Governor, in the first instance, did not sign, this report which was prepared here in Delhi, not in Tamil Nadu or Madras. He was forced to sign it. Otherwise, he would have lost his job. So, he thought it better to ditto it and send

it to the Centre. So, what does it matter if the Tamil Nadu Government goes? The Governor is very happy with his post. So, I emphatically state that there was no constitutional necessity to impose President's rule. If you had any respect for democracy, you would have given a challenge to the DMK Government and held election. I think the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu wanted that there should be election. I know my statement is correct, that he wanted to hold an election, he did not want any extension of the Assembly just as you have extended the term of the Lok Sabha without holding any election in the name of emergency. At least, that gentleman did not want that he wanted to face the people there and give an opportunity to the Tamil Nadu people to see that if they had done anything wrong or not good to the people of Tamil Nadu, they would have thrown them out. And the Congress or any other party would have captured power and formed the Government there. You did not take recourse to that. Instead of that you intentionally and very deliberately dismissed that Government which was there for nine long years. In 1971 they were your good bed mates. I deliberately use that term. You could not have won a single seat in Parliament here in Tamil Nadu without getting DMK's help. Now they are not so to your choice. They have become a problem to you. So, you have thrown them out. Why? Because the direction of your Government, the ruling party here is 'one nation' one party and one leader. You will not tolerate any Government which is not run by your own partymen. Even your own partymen, if they in any way differ with your leader, that will not be tolerated.

What has happened here? Mr. Ram Dhan and Mr. Mohan Dharja who was a Minister here are in jail. What is their fault? Nothing. Are they against the policies of the Congress party as enunciated by the founders of the

Congress? I do not think so. They were making very constructive criticisms. That was very much inconvenient to your leader. That is why they are rotting in jail. The very talk of saving Tamil Nadu people from the clutches of demons, as it has come in some papers, is all rubbish and non-sense.

I may tell you, after the President's Rule there what you are doing. Perhaps, many of us know that Mr. Ramani who was an M. P. here in 1967 was being treated in a Coimbatore hospital. On the very first day of the proclamation of the President's Rule there, he was arrested. Then, after a representation made by our Leader, Mr. Gopalan and a telegram sent by him to the Prime Minister and after Mr. Samar Mukherjee sent a representation, he was not released but was allowed to stay in the hospital and that too under police guard. Today, I have got the information it is a shame on your part that even his wife is not being allowed to see him or to give him home-made food. As he could not take the hospital food, he requested that he may be allowed to get some food cooked at home by his wife. Even that is not allowed.

I have got so many examples here. The real police raj has been imposed there. There is no end of terror everywhere. My young friend, Mr. Gopal, was saying something, I have got a copy of representations in which so many cases have been cited by our leaders, Mr. P. Ramamurti who was a Member here and Mr. Bhoopathy who is our leader at the Coimbatore district level. He has made a representation to the Governor. I would like to mention one or two things mentioned in the representation. It says:

"Our worker named Ramaswamy of the cotton Jubilee Mill of Singanallur was arrested on 2nd February 1976. The Inspector of Police slapped him on the road itself and blood came from his mouth. Then, he was taken to Singanallur Police Station and placed along with two other persons of the DMK party.

All the three were then stripped naked. Ramaswamy was beaten again. Then, a Nirodh Cap was forced on his penis and he was beaten on the penis. He was again beaten and thrown naked with the other two into the lock-up. After a lot of appeals, one Dhoti alone was thrown inside for each. Next day, they were charged with the offence of putting up notice boards saying "Down with Fascism".

And they were charged only with the offence of putting up notice boards saying "Down with Fascism." What is wrong with that? May I ask the Home Minister if it is illegal to say "Down with Fascism". The name of Smt. Indira Gandhi was not mentioned; it only said "Down with Fascism." Are you for Fascism?

It is most surprising that he was arrested after the memorandum being submitted to the Governor. He was arrested under the MISA so that he will be there rotting in jail month after month.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before you make a statement, you should yourself see that the statement is not exaggerated. You should first satisfy yourself before making a statement in the garb of reading it. You must inform the speaker first that you want to read it.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA: What is unparliamentary about it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not a question of its being unparliamentary; but if you want to read or quote from any document, you should first intimate, because, in the garb of reading, you can read anything.

(Interruptions)

SHRI H. M. PATEL: Is this a question of pre-censorship?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not a question of pre-censorship; it is a question of conducting the business according to rules.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: I think the only rule that exists is, if you are going to abuse anybody.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is, do you want to place it or lay it on the Table of the House? (Interruptions)

This is the rule about 'laying'. If you want to lay a paper or if you want to quote from it, then you have to intimate two days before....

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah): That rule has no relation with this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is said that a private Member may lay a paper on the Table when he is authorised to do so by the Speaker. The idea is that the Speaker must know beforehand what he is going to lay (Interruptions)

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: I am sorry, you have misunderstood me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you not want that to be a part of the record of the House?

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: I want it. It is a part of my speech.

I want to give another instance. If you hear, you will be horrified what a torture is being perpetrated on the people there, specially on those who are not in the good books of the Congress. He has mentioned:

"I also wish to advert to the arrests and conduct of the Police in Nilgiris District also where persons regarded as supporting the DMK or the CPI(M) were also arrested. The DMK men arrested had their heads half-shaved and the election symbol of the DMK, the rising Sun, was engraved with a knife on their heads. For some of the arrested, one side of the moustache also was shaved

to tease and humiliate them and to jeer at them. It is only after they reached Coimbatore Central Jail that they were neatly shaved."

Mr. Reddy, please hear me. I have my experience. I know what happened after 1970 when you dismissed the West Bengal Government unconstitutionally. You were not there, Mr. Reddy, but Shrimati Indira Gandhi was there. I know how the police behaved. Now, that is going on throughout Tamil Nadu. You say you are protecting democracy! Do not give any stunt in this way. People cannot be fooled. They know what is what. You have extended the life of this Lok Sabha without holding elections, and you want to extend the life of the Kerala Assembly also where you tried various nefarious methods for defections from amongst Muslim League and from amongst Kerala Congress. Here, in the case of Tamil Nadu the Chief Minister was coming forward with a bold statement that if I have done anything wrong, people will throw me out, give me a chance to face the people and hold the elections, but you do not have the courage to face the people. So, you are saying this thing, that thing day in and day out. The Prime Minister is saying that the opposition conspired to topple the legally formed Government, the elected Government. Who has toppled the Tamil Nadu Government? Was it not legally elected? Was it not having an overwhelming majority in the House? You, however, did not feel ashamed and have come forward with this measure. Mr. Reddy, you are very much unfortunate to pilot this most pernicious notification or promulgation that you want the Parliament to ratify. I am sorry for that.

In Andhra Pradesh, when there was agitation for separation of Telengana and there was so much violence, Shrimati Indira Gandhi did not dissolve the Andhra Pradesh Assembly. It might be for the infighting of the party. Why did the Central Government not take any action during that time?

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY:

Did your party want dissolution of Andhra legislative assembly on account of that?

AN HON. MEMBER: The present Home Minister was Chief Minister of Andhra at that time. He himself resigned and there was almost no Government.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: Yes, he himself resigned. Some time Mr. Chavan was sent, some time Mr. Raghu Ramaiah was sent, there was absolutely a goonda raj there, no government, no rule of law.

We are not always of the same opinion, or agree with all the actions that might have been taken. We stand on certain principles. We are not like our CPI friends, who will say on one occasion that you are doing something against the Constitution, on the other occasion for the same action, they will praise the Government. We are not of that batch. We fully stand on principles. The Constitution says that after five years, there will be elections. It was almost at the fag end, only seven weeks were there, you could have approached the Tamil Nadu people, whom they will prefer. There the matter would have ended, but you have taken a decision, which will go down in history as the blackest action and a dark day not only for Tamil Nadu, but for the whole of our country. The hon. Members who are sitting here are not realising the situation today; they will have to realise it, it will boomerang; you will have to repent at that time. The ruling party is dragging our country to one party dictatorship. In the present case, it is a butchery of the very basis of our Constitution, that is the federalism, and you are still shamelessly coming before the House and asking for ratification.

I know, Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan is very much eager to speak and give full support to your motion

AN HON. MEMBER: May be for some other purpose.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: But I know you are a prisoner of circumstances. You are always worried about your service, not about the people but about the post of Minister-ship, the post of Home Minister. Otherwise you will get no berth anywhere. So you are very much anxious to put through this order. Even now it is not late. Some hon. Member was telling that there was no protest. What a shameful utterance it is! What do you expect? Before independence we know what was the British rule. We know how they tortured, but we never experienced this sort of administration where you cannot even hold a closed-door meeting of your own Party, where you cannot publish your own speeches or your own comments. You cannot give your reaction in your own party journal. Our Party could not publish its own reaction on this proclamation of President's rule in Tamil Nadu,

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think now you conclude with this praise for the British.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: I am sorry you took...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I took only one minute if at all. I have made amends for that. You have spoken for more than half an hour. Now, please conclude.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: Further, I want to put it on record that our Party totally and emphatically protests against this undemocratic act which not only our Party but even the honest Congressmen who are sitting here should also oppose. I know that inside the House they may not, but, going out, what will be their reaction? They will say, 'It is bad. They could have held the election.' I know it. Again I repeat that I totally oppose this proclamation from A to Z.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN (Coimbatore): On behalf of my Party and on my own behalf I would like to

[Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan]

say first of all that we welcome the dismissal of this Ministry. We have been asking for this for quite some time. We also welcome the setting up of the Inquiry Commission for the very same reasons that Mr. Sezhiyan himself has mentioned. We have been demanding this Commission of Inquiry and for a pretty long time. It is not only on the 1st of December, 1975 but I would remind the hon. Home Minister that our demand for an inquiry into the corruption of the DMK Ministry is a long standing one. There was a tremendous movement in Tamil Nadu demanding that such an inquiry should take place. Mr. Dinan Bhattacharyya has referred to about police atrocities. But he forgets the atrocities that took place at that time. I would like to remind him that women and children were beaten up. For what? For participating in a demonstration demanding that there should be an inquiry. So, when we talk of police atrocities let us remember that in Tamil Nadu my people are a courageous people. They are not frightened of Police atrocities. They are not frightened of being sent to jail that they will be beaten up, that the women will be raped. They have faced that even under the DMK regime. Therefore, to-day, if after the President's proclamation, there has not been that ferment, it is not because of the fear of the Police. Not at all. Let Mr. Dinan Bhattacharyya remember that my people are courageous enough and had there been a single person who felt that this was a wrong and undemocratic action, that person would certainly have found the support of the common people if they supported the DMK government and the DMK policies as they understand them. They would certainly have found such a movement taking place.

That movement has not taken place. With this you see another strange phenomenon. Rats are leaving the sinking ship and the sailing ship is ready to take them over. I wonder why? I think the sailing ship should

also be aware, you might sink with that weight. The weight is now going from the sinking ship. Please guard against that weight, which is going into your ship. This is what I would like to say in the beginning that in Tamil Nadu to-day it is not only a case of corruption.

I agree with Shri. Sezhiyan that those cases of corruption are there, those charges are there, which do demand immediate action and enquiry. We have never failed in demanding such an action and enquiry. The Kerala Government did take action on such a matter. Two Communist Ministers did resign. A Commission of enquiry was set up and the enquiry was gone into and they were absolved. Of course they would say, why not do the same thing here? That is exactly my point. The reason is—for the past eight months particularly since the declaration of emergency certain serious political developments have been taking place in Tamil Nadu. Various speeches have been made there. I appreciate whatever Mr. Sezhiyan has said here, I agree, that I have never heard of him making such speeches. But certainly at the recent State Provincial Conference held in December in Coimbatore speeches were being openly made by one Member of Parliament who is not here to-day. He is held under MISA. He claimed that 'the DMK is not a small party functioning within the State, it is a great movement of Tamil people all over the world and that Tamilians in other countries look to the DMK as defender of their rights'. This smacks very much of the overseas Chinese and Mao's DMK Government is there to give protection to the Tamils throughout the world—very strange philosophy!

The only other place from where we have heard that philosophy is the erstwhile guruji of Mr. Dinan Bhattacharyya, Mao Tse-Tung and Company who always talk about "overseas Chinese" and you have to look after them. And again "several foreign missions in Delhi and other places.."

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:
Dinen Bhattacharyya and Co., do not believe in guruji. That is your monopoly.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN:
Let me remind him that he was using the word 'company'. I was just trying to use Indian terminology. That is all. That is a particular terminology which he does not understand. I am very sorry. The DMK gentleman further said:

"Several foreign missions in Delhi and other places have sent greetings wishing the conference a success. The American and British diplomats have sent messages of greetings. I will not reveal the contents or their names." What is there so strange in that context? There was a secret meeting that was held in the Taj Coromandel in Madras where under an assumed name the Ambassador of one of these missions had a meeting with the erstwhile Chief Minister Dr. Karunanidhi. For what was that meeting being held of which a report come in the paper. There has been no denial. There was such a patriotism and such an honesty and all that after the emergency! What was cooking there and what was cooked? I do not know what they ate or what they drank.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:
You were cooking there

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN:
You have always undercooked food. I am not yielding to you. I did not interrupt your speaker and I think you would show me the same courtesy. What has happened after June 1975? We, from the communist party, were pointing out that here was a State where as soon as the emergency came there were big mass rallies being held where the Prime Minister was being accused of becoming a dictator and so on and so forth. At that time there was the question of censorship? It was also appearing in

the papers, and we know it very well, that there were some abusive cartoons where the Prime Minister was shown in derogatory terms.

Of Course, I have got my own quarrels with her; I have criticised her; I have no hesitation in saying so when things are wrong; but certainly it is not fascism that we have in this country; and those, who use that word so blindly and so blithely, should understand that it is in Chile that you see fascism today where thousands of people are just being exterminated in concentration camps and so on. Mr. Dinen Bhattacharyya is sitting here and talking about it, but would his voice be allowed in Chile. I would like to know. Of course, there are people who are in jail and we from the communist party have been demanding that civil liberties should be protected and that proper enquiry should be conducted. Those who talk about fascism should understand what has happened in Tamilnadu.

In a village in Tanjore recently on the 18th of January, paid goondas of landlords accompanied by police party entered the village, attacked the agricultural labourers there, raped their women, beating up their children, looted their houses, and so on. These agricultural labourers were only demanding the implementation of the 20-point programme where minimum wage for the agricultural labourers has been assured. This is what happened there and what is their reply to it? Is this the way that Harijans are being protected? All these months, the Central Government and the Governor, like ostriches kept their heads in sand, when we were warning them that this is what is happening there, that this talk about implementation of the 20 point programme there is nothing but a blinking eyewash? How is it that those ostriches have suddenly woken up? Although we welcome their waking up.

[Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan]

After the emergency leafleteering was going on and Tamil Nadu was an asylum for all those who were opposing emergency, for all those that the Central CID was searching. I do not want to go into names, I would also like to say that there were occasions when I have seen the people who should today be in the drag-net of the central intelligence, but I am not that much of a friend of the central intelligence. But that apart, I would like you to come to Tamil Nadu. Even today, if you come you will see on the walls anti-Centre slogans, anti-emergency slogans, slogans describing the Prime Minister in an abusive and filthy language. Is this the way of evolving and propagating the culture of Tamil Nadu? This is only distortion of the culture of Tamil Nadu and any decent Government would have seen to it that these things on the walls are erased then and there because of their vulgarity if nothing else. But after the emergency inflammatory speeches were being made. We were being told that today "he is the Chief Minister and they are trying to dismiss him, but, very soon, he is going to be the Prime Minister of a country."

That does not mean Prime Minister here! Behind it is the thought of nothing less than secession. It is easy verbally to say that they have given it up. But, in practice, certain issues were there and there was, all the time, this undercurrent and, in public meetings, speeches were being made. Unfortunately, the taperecordings are not there. They are with the concerned authorities. These speeches were being widely made and, particularly, after the emergency, there was generally a feeling of uncertainty among the people in Tamil Nadu. More than anything was the stepping up of the anti-Malayalee moves that were being done by the DMK Government during the past three years. Step by step, the feelings against the Malayalees, particularly, against Kerala were being whipped up. I wonder that Mr. A. K.

Gopalan has never mentioned about them here. Time and again memoranda have been given to us. There are ordinary little shops in Coimbatore District, for instance, in Salem and in Madras. Somebody comes from Kerala with a small capital of Rs. 100 or 150 to set up a small pan shop or biri shop and he extends it a little to a tea shop but he is not allowed; the same DMK Government who shouted so much about the Shiv Sena did not raise their finger in order to defend those poor Malayalees who were being beaten up. They have an obsession about Malayalees.

I have had to take up cases of promotion or of increment where they have been discriminated against. There is a case of an Acting Vice Principal of a B.T. College born in Madras, educated in Tamilnadu. Even when the State split up, she chose Tamilnadu service rather than Kerala service. The only sin was that she had the name of a Malayalee. She speaks Tamil better than Malayalam; she speaks Tamil better than English. To-day here case is not set right because she has a Malayalee name. She stands to lose not less than Rs. 30,000. For a teacher Rs. 30,000 is not a small sum. This is the kind of anti-national feeling that was being built up which was reaching a kind of crescendo.

It is very easy, for Mr. Sezhiyan to say very nice things here and to quote about the Kerala Government being dismissed way back in 1959 and to quote from the speeches of my leader, Shri S. A. Dange and to say that what he said then applies to-day. History is not a static concept; history is a dynamic moving concept. To-day when we are talking about Tamilnadu, we are talking about Tamilnadu in a period of emergency when the disruptive forces from abroad have tried to disrupt the national process of our development and our progress. Those disruptive forces to-day could operate from one particular part of our country. The DMK Ministry of 1975-76 is certainly not communist

249 President's Pro- PHALGUNA 19, 1897 (SAKA) President's Pro- 250
clamation in relation to
Tamil Nadu (St. Res.)
clamation in relation to
Tamil Nadu (St. Res.)

progressive Ministry of Kerala of 1959. I reject that parallel for the simple reason that my party has, never at any time worked hand in glove with any foreign agency. It has never at any time worked in order to undermine our national independence. You might disagree with our politics; you might disagree with our policies. But, there is no one who will disagree with our patriotism and loyalty to our country and our independence.

In 1962 when China attacked this country, the Communist Party was first to condemn it as aggression. At that time there were many in the communist movement throughout the world who said 'How can you criticise a communist country?' But, we

said 'no first and foremost, the Communist Party is patriotic.' 'To-day when we say emergency was necessary, we say it because of this intrigue of CIA. We have seen throughout the world how they are trying to operate. Coming as I do from Tamilnadu, I know very well how they have been operating there also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. You can continue tomorrow. The House stands adjourned to meet again at 11 A.M. tomorrow.

18 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, March 10, 1976/Phalguna 29, 1897
(Saka)