

I wish, Sir, he were here to realise his mistake. As I said before, if he had only mentioned this case to me I would have placed all the material before him and he would have been in a position to exercise independent judgment. If he were here, I would have liked to remind him that Oxford oratory and Christian charity might go hand in hand.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty** (Basirhat): Who is a Christian?

[**MR. SPEAKER** in the Chair]

**Mr. Speaker**: I shall now put all the cut motions to the vote of the House.

*All the cut motions were negatived.*

**Mr. Speaker**: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper be granted to the President to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of the following heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof:

Demands Nos. 22, 23, 24, 25 and 119."

*The motion was adopted.*

[*The motions for Demands for Grants which were adopted by the Lok Sabha, are reproduced below:—Ed.]*

**DEMAND NO 22—TRIBAL AREAS**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,10,57,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in the respect of 'Tribal Areas'."

**DEMAND NO. 23—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,81,65,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in the respect of 'Tribal Areas'."

**DEMAND NO. 24—STATE OF PONDICHERRY**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,78,94,000 be granted to the

President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957 in respect of 'State of Pondicherry'."

**DEMAND NO. 25—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,07,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of External Affairs'."

**DEMAND NO. 119—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 25,33,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of Ministry of External Affairs'."

**RESOLUTION RE. PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION RE. TRAVANCORE-COCHIN**

**The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant)**: Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 23rd March, 1956, under Article 356 of the Constitution, assuming to himself all the functions of the Government of Travancore-Cochin."

Sir, I am thankful to you and also to the hon. Members of this House for allowing me to move this Resolution. It has interfered with the programme chalked out for this session to some extent and that indicates the urgency of the matter with which I am dealing.

The step taken by the President had become imperative and inevitable. I regret that the circumstances, which were not altogether edifying, should have led up to this culmination. I would have preferred the normal course of constitutional administration to remain intact.

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

But, unfortunately, our wishes could not stand the developments that took place in Travancore-Cochin in recent weeks.

Travancore-Cochin is a fine, charming territory which has also some strategic importance. It is culturally very advanced; it stands first in the matter of literacy as it does also in the matter of density of population. But, so far as the establishment of stable democratic traditions and conditions is concerned, I find that it has not been able to make as much of headway and progress as one would have expected. It is still suffering from teething troubles.

As hon. Members are aware, Travancore and Cochin were united in July 1949. The members of the representative bodies of the two States then came together under one group and they administered the affairs of Travancore-Cochin State till the last general elections. Those elections did not result in the absolute majority of any party. In fact, the groups there were, perhaps, more numerous than in other States. The Legislature found it difficult to set up a united majority party for administering the affairs of the State. The Congress which was the biggest group in the House, however, wanted to save the situation. It did not relish the idea of the House being broken up and fresh elections being held. It also wanted to avoid, as far as possible, the administration of the State by or under the directions of the President and the Parliament. So, the Congress yielded place and agreed to support the P.S.P. Ministry and Shri Thanu Pillai became the Chief Minister. He remained in office for about a year. Of course, he could continue in office only with the backing of the Congress Party, for the strength of the P.S.P. itself was less than 20 in the House of 118. The Congress withdrew its support and the P.S.P. Ministry resigned from office. Thereafter, the Congress which was the biggest party in the House, the State Congress, that is, the general wing, and the T.T.N.C. between them having a total strength of 58, with a few others, formed the Ministry. And, Congress remained in charge for about a year till the 10th of March. Six members of the Congress Party resigned from it with the result that its strength dwindled to that extent and it ceased to occupy the position of invulnerability which it had previously. So, the leader of the Congress Party informed the Rajpramukh that he was no longer in a position to

discharge the responsibility of the government and advised him to explore the possibility of forming an alternative government. The Rajpramukh had talks with the leader of the Communist Party, which was the second biggest party in the House, after the Congress, having a strength at that time of about 27. The leader of the Communist Party wanted some time and there were parleys, and after three days he informed the Rajpramukh that he was not in a position to form a government. Then the Rajpramukh had talks with the leader of the P.S.P. The strength of the P.S.P. stood at about 15 in a House of 118 but still the Rajpramukh thought that if the P.S.P. could step in, the situation might be saved. The P.S.P. were given time and the leader reported at one time that he had got assurances from the leaders of some of the other parties and also from a few individuals so that he had 59 assurances and he was expecting a few more. Later, he said that he would inform him about the others the next day, but perhaps that did not materialise subsequently. Afterwards, out of the 59, two members withdrew their support and they informed the Rajpramukh that they would not be able to support the Ministry as it was proposed to be constituted.

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur):** Who were the two? What are their names?

**Pandit G. B. Pant:** Shri Seshadri Nath Sharma is one and Dr. Narayanan Potti is the other.

Taking these away,—and there were also some other bits of information with regard to a few others, but I cannot say anything definite about them—the Rajpramukh found that up to the 21st, the total strength that the P.S.P. had been able to muster did not exceed 57, 57 out of 118,—which was arithmetically less than half. So the P.S.P. was not in a position to form a Ministry. So far as the facts go, I have given them along with the figures, and from these one can easily draw the relevant conclusions and also the right guidance as to what the circumstances were and why this step has become necessary and unavoidable.

As I said, there had been one other election in Travancore-Cochin since the general elections were held all over the country. The number of parties in the Travancore-Cochin Legislature came to more than six or eight; the Congress Party including three T.T.N.C. at the time it resigned had a strength of 54,

members who resigned from the Congress Party 6, Communist Party 27, P.S.P. 15, Revolutionary Socialist Party 9, Kerala Socialist Party 3, Independents 3, Speaker 1. The parties had obviously their different programmes and they had their own respective aspirations. Yet it was the wish of the Rajpramukh that if by virtue of any permutation and combination any arrangement could be arrived at which would enable the new parties or the new coalition or association of parties to run the administration, then he will be saved from the necessity of having to undertake greater responsibility on his own shoulders. The mere fact that the numbers were as I have indicated, would by itself show the great difficulty of forming a stable government. In this case, as I said, even a numerical majority for a temporary period was not visible. But even if there had been a majority apparent by one or two, I think it would have been still necessary to see whether the government thus formed would be stable, for if the arrangement thus made were again to break down and to result in a collapse of the government after a few weeks, then no advantage would possibly be ensured by such a kind of hotchpotch arrangement. The difficulties were before the Rajpramukh and before the government that might have been formed. The Budget had to be passed, and if any difficulty had arisen and the voting on account had not been actually confirmed and carried out before the 1st April, then the entire administration would have been placed in an extremely awkward position. There were obvious differences between the parties on matters which are certainly of more than ordinary importance and which on some occasions convulse the country. The Communist Party was in favour of a certain taluk being transferred to Tamil Nad; the PSP was against this. The moment the debate on SRC was initiated in the House, this difficulty would come in the way of any such alliance and it would break down. It is essential that, considering the previous history, whichever Government might have been formed or may hereafter be formed in Travancore-Cochin, it should have a certain amount of stability. Such Governments formed by easy alliances among a number of parties who have different programmes of their own are essentially of a precarious character. The loyalties of the members to their respective parties are bound to be changing and they are put to a still

greater restraint when many such parties join together just to form a Government. When there is a majority of one or two, really every member becomes equal to 58 or 59 of the total strength minus one or two because, if just one withdraws his support, then the Ministry tumbles down; one is equal to 59. So, one has to be treated with the same importance as the entire group of 59 and anyone out of the 60 may have recourse to self-regarding impulses or demands or desires. I would not use the word 'blackmail' because that is not a very respectable practice. Men can be coaxed and men can be coerced.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore):** Men can be bought.

**Pandit G. B. Pant:** Men can be bought too—that is true—not only by one party but perhaps by many....

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** Now by the Congress Party.

**Pandit G. B. Pant:** I would not name any party. I am prepared to accept that Shri Gopalan himself would never descend to that limit.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** Certainly not.

**Pandit G. B. Pant:** That I accept. But about parties, I am not prepared to say anything because parties have individuals of all types and of all classes.

**Shri S. S. More:** Hear, hear.

**Pandit G. B. Pant:** Shri More is saying so because he does not belong to any party; he is answerable for his own conduct and not for his misconduct.

So, the position becomes somewhat intricate and the State has not been able to form a stable administration even after it had had to go to the polls since the last election. After the general election when it was found that the party position remained virtually unchanged, the question of immediately going to the polls did not arise. It would involve a tremendous amount of worry and suspense not only of money but of time and energy. It would rouse passions and perhaps also cause bitterness and irritation. Besides, we are looking forward to the formation of a new State on or about the 1st of October. So, any election held before that date would lose its efficacy and the new State will have

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

to go to the polls again sometime thereafter along with the other States early next year. So, a fresh election is obviously ruled out.

Government by any majority of a suitable character will then be impossible. Even those who had agreed to join hands although they formed only a minority, had not merged themselves into one legislative party even. Every one of them retained his own individual character and entity so that there was virtually no coalition nor any united party even for a limited purpose. In the circumstances, there was no alternative to the issue of the proclamation by which the President has placed the responsibility for the administration of Travancore-Cochin on the Parliament.

I could not call it an altogether undemocratic method because it might have been so in the olden days when we had no Parliament and the Centre was overshadowed and eclipsed by nominated members. Now, in the Parliament which is supreme in the country we have the cream of the choicest men in the country and the affairs of Travancore-Cochin will be directly under their eye and under their supervision. To that extent, if hon. Members are pleased to take interest in the affairs of the State, it will perhaps have a better deal and greater consideration and more of sympathy than it would have if it had been carrying on its affairs separately in an isolated corner of the country.

So, I trust that the hon. Members will agree with the course that has been adopted—the only possible course which circumstances would admit of. Sometimes there is a tendency to refer to what has happened in U. K., Canada Ireland or Timbaltoo but those places have not got any provision like article 357 of our own Constitution. So, any reference to those countries or to any precedents from those countries would be irrelevant. Those countries had not the foresight to have a provision of this character and the authors of our Constitution were wise and shrewd enough to provide for all contingencies and emergencies and this provision here comes to the aid of embarrassed States, when they are in a sorry plight and enables the President to manage their affairs so that they may get the healing balm and healthy medicine and thereby regain their lost vigour.

3 P.M.

That is our hope so far as the Travancore-Cochin State is concerned and we trust that when the President's rule comes to an end the people of Travancore-Cochin will be better placed and better prepared to appreciate the virtues, the benefits and the benedictions of democracy and proceed in a manner which will guarantee a democratic course of events in their country.

**Mr. Speaker :** Resolution moved :

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 23rd March, 1956, under Article 356 of the Constitution, assuming to himself all the functions of the Government of Travancore-Cochin."

Now, there are some amendments which have been tabled. Amendments Nos. 1 and 2 in the name of Shri Kamath are negative ones and so they are not allowed. As far as amendment No. 3 is concerned, I allow it. Does he want to move it ?

**Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad) :** I wish to move all.

**Mr. Speaker :** I am disallowing some amendments and I am allowing amendment No. 3 which I find to be in order. If he wants to move it, it will be treated as moved. Amendment No. 4 is also not allowed. Amendments Nos. 5 and 7 in the name of Shri A. M. Thomas and amendment No. 6 in the name of Shri Velayudhan are in order. So, the amendments that are before the House, which are in order and which are treated as moved are amendment numbers 3, 5, 6 and 7. 4 hours have been allotted for this. We started at 2:35. Hon. Members who are leaders of groups will have 20 minutes and others will have 15 minutes each.

**Shri Asoka Mehta (Bhandara) :** We cannot do it in 20 minutes. There is difference on facts. How can we do it in 20 minutes ?

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat) :** May I suggest one thing ? Yesterday we had calculated 4 hours from 3 and we were to continue up to 7. At least let us sit up to 7.00 so that at little more time will be available.

**Mr. Speaker :** We are not going to go on changing like that. So far as leaders of groups are concerned, if I find that they are not able to finish in 20 minutes I will allow them 10 minutes more.

**Shri Kamath :** I beg to move :

That in the Resolution—

for “approves” substitute “regrets”.

**Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam) :** I beg to move :

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added :

“as that was the only proper course to be adopted for the situation that arose on the resignation of the Congress Ministry headed by Sri Panampilly Govinda Menon.”

**Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes) :** I beg to move :

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added :

“and resolves that the Proclamation shall be revoked before the 30th April, 1956 and Parliamentary Government restored in the State.”

**Shri A. M. Thomas :** I beg to move :

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added :

“and declaring that the powers of the Legislature of the said State shall be exercisable by or under the said authority of Parliament and making certain incidental and consequential provisions detailed in the said Proclamation.”

**Mr. Speaker :** Amendment moved :

(1) That in the Resolution—

for “approves” substitute “regrets”

(2) That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added :

“as that was the only proper course to be adopted for the situation that arose on the resignation of the Congress Ministry headed by Sri Panampilly Govinda Menon.”

(3) That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added ;

“and resolves that the Proclamation shall be revoked before the 30th April, 1956 and Parliamentary Government restored in the State.”

(4) That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added :

“and declaring that the powers of the Legislature of the said State shall be exercisable by or under the said authority of Parliament and making certain incidental and consequential provisions detailed in the said Proclamation.”

3—32 L. S.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan :** Mr. Speaker, I very strongly oppose this Resolution. I also say that the effect of the Resolution in taking the functions of the Government of Travancore-Cochin State is undemocratic, unjust, irregular and against all norms of democratic functioning in this country.

This is not the first time that we have discussed Proclamation of the President in this Parliament. This is the third time. First it was the proclamation whereby the functions of the Government of PEPSU State was taken over. Second time it was Andhra State and this is the third one.

We are told every day that parliamentary democracy in this country is developing and also that we are setting a model as far as functioning of parliamentary democracy is concerned. If the effect of that functioning is that within four years three times the President's rule had to be evoked then I think it is high time that we understand what is happening and how the functioning of parliamentary democracy in this country is.

As far as the arguments of the Home Minister are concerned, the same arguments, though not by the same Home Minister, had been given to us when the question of PEPSU and the question of Andhra came before us. At both the times it was said that that was the only course. The Constitution itself says that the President can take over only when he is satisfied that a situation has arisen in which the Government of that State cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of India. As far as emergency proclamations are concerned, we cannot now say that there is either a threat of war or some other thing. So the only thing is that when there is a Proclamation the President has to say that he is satisfied, and he has got reports and other information from the Governor or the Rajpramukh that there is a constitutional crisis. And in order to say that there is a constitutional crisis it will be always necessary to distort facts and say that this man or that man was not there, the whole group was not a homogeneous one or they could not function like that.

That same reason has been given now because unless that reason is given, if it is said that there was another group

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

of persons who were ready to take in the administration, then certainly there would have been no need for a Proclamation.

So, as far as the facts are concerned we have to say that the facts we have received are entirely different from those that have been placed here. As the Home Minister has said, it may be a difference of one. But the difference of one here is very important. The Home Minister himself has said that the difference of one man will certainly make a big difference. Not only that. As far as the question of Proclamation and taking over the functions of the State is concerned there is another fact which I want to point out because there will be some developments in October. That also had not been taken into consideration.

What has happened all this time, that is what I want to show. What is a stable government? The explanation can be given in any way at any time. Which kind of Government do you call a stable government? In order to form a stable government how many members must be there? What are the groups? Is it a majority group or a minority group that is required? All these are questions which are to be answered and discussed because we have seen that in PEPSU it was in one way, in Andhra it was in another way and it was in a third way as far as Travancore-Cochin is concerned. It was not in the same way here last time after the general elections and also now.

What is the position now? The position now as it had been explained is this. There had been a Congress Ministry. The Congress Ministry resigned because six members of the Congress Ministry said they would not support the Congress and they went out of the Congress.

**Shri Matthen (Thiruvellah):** They did not go out of the Congress.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** "Go out of the Congress" means they went out of discipline of the Congress and did not support it. I did not say they resigned. As far as discipline of Congress is concerned they said: "We will not be with you." They did not resign. Excuse me, "went out" does not mean that they resigned. I would have been very glad if they had resigned. I am not glad of this position. It was better for them to resign and go away from the Congress group rather than remain there. Anyway

I do not want to go into that question.

What I want to point out is only this. I am not surprised that these people will not be in the discipline of the Congress because I know these people specially. Some of them are rank communalists. They are leaders of communal organisations in the country. In order to win in the elections—when I say these facts some of my friends here may be angry—those who were leaders of communal organisations in that place were taken in the Congress; they were given Congress tickets and they were elected as Congress members. If there had been genuine Congress-men who had something to do with the Congress and not communalists like these we would not have been faced with this danger. It is clear now. They have gone out of discipline and these Congress-men are responsible for it.

Anyhow, after these six men went out, the leader of the Communist Party went to see the Rajpramukh. He said that they being the next single majority party will not be able to form a Government but he must be given some time because with the help of PSP and other parties he would be able to form a stable majority of 60 or 61. He asked for two or three days' time so that he may try to form a stable majority. One day after that the leader of the PSP group Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai went to the Rajpramukh. He gave him signed letters of the following members of groups who were ready to support him unconditionally: P.S.P. 16; Leftists all together (Communists, R.S.P. and K.S.P.) 39; Independents 2; T.T.N.C. 2; Congress 2. As far as one Congressman Shri A. R. Menon was concerned, it was said that he sent a resignation. The report was that it was afterwards said by the leader of the Congress Party, Ex-Chief Minister that it may not be his letter. The other people sent word to him. From Madras, he personally came and saw the Rajpramukh and said, this is my letter and I am going to support that. That is the position. As far as Shri Sharma, another T.T.N.C. member is concerned, he gave it in writing that he supported it. The Leader of the P.S.P. gave 61 names. Out of the 61, I referred to one who had been somehow taken away. It is also said that it is not like that. There were stories that he had been kidnapped. There were some stories in the press about it that some searches and other things were made. I do not know whether it is correct or not. There

was this news. Anyhow, he was not seen for 2 or 3 days. That fact was there. He was not seen. Whether he was taken away or he went away, I do not know. He was not seen for 2 or 3 days. It was said afterwards.....

**Shri Achuthan (Cranganur):** The same member concerned has made a statement that he was not hidden by anybody.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** A man who was won away from a party, will he say that he was kidnapped? If I were the person, will I say that I was kidnapped? Certainly not. He will say, I was not taken away; I went away. I do not know why the hon. Member is angry. I only say these are the stories. He will never say that. That is no argument. So, on the 23rd, out of the 61, there were 60. I want to bring to your notice two things. Pattom Thanu Pillai, the leader of the P.S.P. said, these are the signatures of 61 people, with them I am ready to form a Ministry. He handed over the list. I want the Home Minister to say whether the Rajpramukh today can deny that he had seen the signatures of 61 people. Only one was not there. Can he say that he did not get the permission of 60 people who had stood together to form a Ministry?

The other day when I moved the adjournment motion, I had a telegram from the leaders of these groups saying, that Pattom Thanu Pillai went and saw the Rajpramukh, we gave our permission, he was not called, today is the 23rd, we are not at fault. That was the wire. I wanted to bring it to the notice of the House. I did not go into the discussion of the adjourned motion. We know what happened after the 23rd. The Congress understood that two members of the Congress had resigned and joined Pattom Thanu Pillai for the formation of Ministry. The Ex-Chief Minister thought that something must be done. He said that the Rajpramukh called him. I do not say that the Rajpramukh did not call him. I have to take his word. When the P.S.P. leader met him, why is it that the Rajpramukh called Shri Govinda Menon? He said that he was not able to form a Ministry. I say it was because three days' time was necessary and within 3 days something had to be done. What had to be done was not to call Pattom Thanu Pillai and ask him to form a Ministry or verify whether these persons will join. There was election to the Council of States in which the General Secretary of the Congress Party had to be returned here.

For that till the 23rd something must be done. The Assembly....

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** Also the General Secretary of the Communist Party.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** The Communist Party will be there in the election. We do not say that we did not want it. But, it is not for the sake of the Communist Party that the Rajpramukh did it, I am sure. Even if that is so, I am thankful to the Rajpramukh for sending a member from the Communist Party. This was the reason for waiting till the 23rd. When the Rajpramukh knows that there will be a constitutional crisis, when he knows that a list was given, if there was a genuine desire, why not call the Ministry next day? Certainly the functions had to be performed. The voting of demands had to be done. The Assembly can do it easier. Was he not convinced? Why did he wait for 3 days without calling him to form a Ministry? The only reason was, the elections to the Council were to be over and it had already been decided that the Assembly must be dissolved. The first point is there were 61 members. Not only that. There were 60 who had signed.

As far as the first general election was concerned, I want to tell you what happened. That has already been explained. I do not want to go into the details. The P.S.P. was allowed to form the Ministry with the responsive co-operation of the Congress, due to some reasons. I do not want to go into the reasons. Anyhow, it was allowed. Here, the P.S.P. and other parties were 60. Why is it that it is not allowed?

There is another reason also which is most important. The Home Minister just now said, we want that there should not be this constitutional crisis, we want that there must be the ministry functioning. Under article 356 (1)(c), the President can do two things. The President can dissolve the legislature or suspend it in part. If this desire was there the President could have suspended in part. On the 1st of October, according to the present position, if there are no changes, Aikya Kerala will be formed. On the 1st of October, with the formation of Aikya Kerala, the position will be entirely different from what it is today. I think the Home Minister knows that there are 30 Kerala M.L.As. in the Madras Assembly. The position there is, Communist Party 8, P.S.P. 11, Muslim

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

League 5, Congress 4 and Independents 2. So, on the day when Aikya Kerala is formed, if the President had only suspended in part and not dissolved the legislature, there would not be this ugly saying that Aikya Kerala begins with the President's rule. As far as the composition of the parties is concerned, I do not know what the Muslim League will do; if the other parties, the P.S.P., Communists and Independents join together, it comes to 21. There is no question of 1 or 2. In the Madras Assembly the party affiliation is such that there are 21 members. What I say is, there was this possibility. I say it was not done because on October 1st when Aikya Kerala will be formed, there will be a stable Government where the 60 will become 85 or sometimes more than that. The Government wanted to see that that possibility was not there. Aikya Kerala is a thing which the people wanted years ago. That was their dream. They feel even today that they have been neglected by the Centre and the State. So, they say that after the formation of Aikya Kerala, they may be able to do something. As I said, as far as the party position is concerned, if the P.S.P. and the Communists joined together, there was that possibility. It was also necessary for the Government to give a chance to the 30 members from the Madras Assembly in the formation of the Ministry. So, it was not a question of trying to see whether a stable government could be formed. It was not a desire to see a stable government functioning. It was only thought that, if today it is left like that, certainly, with the formation of Aikya Kerala on the 1st of October, there will be a stable non-Congress Ministry in Aikya Kerala. It was only to see that that position is not allowed, I say, this has been done. It was a conspiracy, I would say, to see that such a thing does not happen. So even today, in the name of saying that there was no majority at all, such a decision has been taken.

As far as the first general elections were concerned, as has already been explained, there were: Congress 46, P.S.P. 19, T.T.N.C. 12, other parties together 40. Then also the P.S.P. was called to form a Ministry with the responsive co-operation of the Congress. After that, what happened in February, 1955? Then the Congress plus the T.T.N.C. was only 58, not even 60. One Member joined the Congress Party after the Ministry was formed. It was

not a stable Government, but it was allowed to be formed. We understand the T.T.N.C. is not a part of the Congress. They left it for some time and then joined. The whole basis of this controversy is that there are some differences between the Congress and the T.T.N.C. on some problems. Similarly, there may be differences between the P.S.P., Communists and others, but they are not allowed to form a Ministry. It is incorrect to say that the Congress had a majority when they formed a Ministry in February, 1955.

The practice in Travancore-Cochin, PEPSU and Andhra has shown that where the Congress was in a majority, or where it was helping others, there has been a Ministry, but if the other parties could come together and form a majority, there could be no Ministry. So, it is either the Congress Ministry or no Ministry at all with President's rule.

If Pattom Thanu Pillai had formed a Ministry, how do you know whether only two or more Congressmen would have resigned and supported that Ministry? If you want to encourage democracy, you should allow the opposition to form a Ministry, and then if that Ministry cannot function you can have President's rule. I have already shown you specifically how the last Ministry of the Congress was formed. So, what we cannot understand is this. Why do you say that the other parties will not join together, that they have no programme and leave it. When the Congress wants, they try to get one or two more Members to get a majority and form the Government. When that Ministry falls you say that the opposition parties cannot form a Ministry and there can be no stable Government.

There is a special provision in article 356 which says that the President can suspend the Constitution partly or wholly. Article 356 (1) (c) reads:

"make such incidental and consequential provisions as appear to the President to be necessary or desirable for giving effect to the objects of the Proclamation, including provisions for suspending in whole or in part the operation of any provisions of this Constitution relating to any body or authority in the State:"

I have already explained to you that Aikya Kerala is to come into being on 1st October and that the Congress has only four Members out of the 30 Members elected to the Madras Assembly.

The other parties in the opposition have got more than a majority. So, firstly there was no constitutional crisis. A Ministry could have been formed. Actually, the P.S.P. leader gave it in writing that he could form a Ministry with 61 Members backing him. Secondly, if the Central Government desired that Aikya Kerala should be formed on 1st October with a stable Ministry, there could have been suspension of the Constitution in part, so that we could see whether a stable Ministry could be formed. That opportunity has been taken away. So, it is against the whole people of Aikya Kerala. It is a black mark on the people that there should be President's rule on the day of the formation of Aikya Kerala. This is a very bad lesson as far as parliamentary democracy is concerned.

I know the Home Minister and the Prime Minister will be able, with their command of language, to make fun of us as we have seen before. When there was discussion about President's rule in PEPSU and Andhra, they said there was one man from one party, two from another etc. There is no use saying like that, because the resignation of the Ministry was not the creation of the Opposition. Members of the Congress Party themselves left it. Their purpose is to see that nowhere in India, in any State, is a Ministry formed by the Opposition. Not to allow it even if there is a possibility of the opposition parties coming together to form a Ministry. Government's idea seems to be: wherever such an opportunity comes before the elections, dissolve the legislature, do not give an opportunity to the Opposition to form a Ministry and have President's rule so that after President's rule Congress will come back in a majority. Everywhere it is taken as the final thing that if there is President's rule for six months or one year, the Congress will come back to power.

As far as the discussion on the S.R.C. is concerned, the Home Minister has said something. Whatever it is, it is the duty and the right of the Members there to give their opinion regarding the boundaries etc.

There was an election to 28 Municipalities in Travancore-Cochin. What has that election shown? Has it shown that the people are behind the Congress? Only in some out of the 28 Municipalities is the membership of the Congress half or more than half. It is only in six Municipalities that the Congress is in

power, in all the other Municipalities, the opposition singly or joined together have got the majority. That has also to be taken into consideration. To show that parliamentary democracy in this country is not Congress rule or President's rule, the Opposition should have been given an opportunity to form a Ministry, particularly when they had more than 60 Members, so that the Government could say that they had tried everything. There is no other course open. So, I say that the action that has been taken has created very great resentment among the people. The people of Kerala are the first, so far as poverty and unemployment are concerned. But Kerala at the same time claims the highest percentage of literacy in the whole of India. In such a place, especially, when Aikya Kerala is going to be formed shortly, the imposition of President's rule is bound to create great resentment among the people.

The Congress was proclaiming from the house tops that an opportunity would be given to the Opposition to form the Government. But when it comes to a question of action, it is not adhered to. I therefore strongly oppose this resolution, and warn the party in power that the results of the elections are bound to go against them. The people of Kerala are bound to give expression to their resentment against the action of the Congress in suspending the legislature and issuing the proclamation at a time when Aikya Kerala is going to be formed on the 1st of October.

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to rise to oppose the resolution that has been moved by the Home Minister. The Home Minister is normally an able, eloquent and persuasive speaker, but today he offered us a laboured apology, a laboured apology because he has a weak case, and even this weak case he has been able to present to us by trimming facts and by stream-lining the situation.

Sir, let us look at the proclamation. The proclamation has been made under article 356 of the Constitution. It is an emergency provision. What kind of emergency has arisen in the State? Either there has to be a physical break down of the administration or there has to be a political breakdown. There has been no physical breakdown; therefore, we have to find out whether there has been a political breakdown, and in order to ascertain whether there has been a political break-down or not we look into relevant facts.

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

Now, as I had raised this point on the last occasion, when we were discussing the President's proclamation in the case of Andhra, this question can be decided only when we have before us the report of the Rajpramukh. I do not know why when the Constitution gives this House the power and the authority to approve or to disapprove the proclamation, this House should be deprived of the opportunity of seeing what the Rajpramukh has to say in the matter. Not only that, but evidently the Rajpramukh's report is not very satisfactory. The Rajpramukh's report is not likely to provide all the grounds that are needed for the proclamation that has been made. That is why in the proclamation it is said "the information" that is received. We do not know what the "other information" is. From whom was it received?

You remember, Sir, that in the Constituent Assembly when the authors of this Constitution were framing this particular provision of the Constitution, when this article was on the anvil, it was made very clear by Dr. Ambedkar on behalf of Government as to why this particular expression "otherwise" was introduced into this article. I shall not take the time of the House by quoting what Dr. Ambedkar had to say on the subject, but I will just remind you, Sir, that he had said that this particular word was introduced because of the duty cast upon the Central Government, the duty being "to safeguard the unity, the security and the territorial integrity of India." It is only in those circumstances, that this question, that this information from other sources, becomes relevant, because he had said, "it may be that the Governor does not make a report." There are difficult occasions, critical situations, when you may have to go beyond the report of the Governor or the Rajpramukh. Here not only do we not know what the Rajpramukh had to say, but we are further told that there was other information. God only knows what it is and what the other sources of information of the President are.

**Shri Chattopadhyaya (Vijayavada):** Even he does not know!

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** There has been no physical break-down—that has been admitted. Is there a political break-down? When is this article to be brought into operation? On that point also Dr. Ambedkar was very categorical. Before it is brought into operation, the

President will take proper precautions. Before actually suspending the administration of a province, what is he expected to do? "The first thing that would be done would be to issue a warning to the province that is concerned." If that warning fails, he will order elections, allowing the people of the province to settle the matter. "It is only when the two remedies fail that he would resort to this article." These were the solemn assurances, these were the explanations offered when my friend Shri Kamath and some other colleagues in the Constituent Assembly had raised the question and demanded an explanation and I am sure that Dr. Ambedkar was not speaking in his personal capacity. He spoke at the time as the spokesman of Government, as the spokesman of those who were entrusted with the responsibility of drafting the Constitution.

And what do we find? This particular article, an emergency provision has been used over and over again, deliberately, wantonly, in a calculated manner. And for what purpose? As a rescue operation to save the Congress party. Over and over again, in State after State, this particular provision has been utilised for the purpose of reconstructing the shattered position of the Congress Party. This article is being misused, I say with all the responsibility at my command, that it utilises the deft fingers of the bureaucrats to darn the tattered garments of the Congress Party. That was not the purpose for which this provision was introduced in the Constitution.

What do we find? It is an interesting case, the State of Travancore-Cochin. It would be useful to find out how the policy changes there, how the principles on which the decisions are taken are changed, altered, trimmed, to suit the needs and requirements of the Congress Party. May I with your permission place before the House some of the interesting developments, as they have unfolded in this hapless State in the past few years?

The Rajpramukh has been heeding the advice of the Congress Party and he has been heeding it in a singularly inconsistent manner. Every time the advice is accepted when it suits the Congress Party. In 1952 Mr. John was called upon to form the Ministry, even when he was in a minority. In 1953 Mr. John advised the Rajpramukh to dissolve the Assembly and his advice was accepted. In 1954 when a similar advice was tendered by Mr. Pattom

Thanu Pillai his advice was turned down. In 1955 the Congress was invited to form a Ministry with the support of the T.T.N.C., whose defection had brought down the Government earlier and precipitated the general elections.

The Home Minister was very anxious to tell us that there has to be a stable government. But those very elements who—to use his own expression—had different programmes and different aspirations, could on one occasion pull down and tumble down the administration and on another occasion accepted as a prop to set up the administration. In 1955 February the Rajpramukh asked Shri Govinda Menon to form a Government on being assured that he had the support of 59 members in a House of 117. In March 1956 the Rajpramukh refused the request made by Shri Patten Thanu Pillai even when he said that he had the support of 59 members. We find that the Rajpramukh takes change from time to time.

The Home Minister has waxed eloquent about the need for a stable government. Supposing tomorrow, after the next general elections, in the Parliament, no party commands a majority, will the Home Minister get up and say that because there is no stability, the whole constitution be suspended? What is the meaning of a stable government? Efforts have to be made to form a coalition government, or even a minority government has to be accepted.

Only the other day our Prime Minister held important deliberations and discussions with the Foreign Minister of France. We know what happens in France. Even today the government that is in power, and with whose representative the Prime Minister held these important discussions and deliberations, has only minority support. Is it not a coalition government? Is it not a coalition government which is also a minority government?

**Shri A. M. Thomas :** May I ask the hon. Member whether any attempt was made to form a coalition government?

**Shri Asoka Mehta :** It is not only a coalition government or a minority government but it is a coalition government which is also a minority government. My hon. friend asks me whether any effort has been made to form a coalition government.

I charge the Prime Minister, I charge the Leader of the House, for setting up wrong kinds of practices and wrong

kinds of traditions in this country. He has been so much influenced by the British traditions that he agrees with Mr. Disraeli and thinks that people do not love coalition. That is wrong. Unfortunately the other parties also take their cue from him. It is unwise in this country not to accept coalition governments, where situations of that kind arise. But that is a different question. What will happen if tomorrow no party enjoys a majority here? Would that be an occasion for suspending the Constitution? If there is no majority, and somebody says 'I can form a government', well, let him face the Assembly. If he has the majority, well and good. If he has not a majority, further attempts will have to be made. You know that in France, for two weeks' or even three weeks' time attempts have to be made over and over again until some kind of a majority emerges.

Now, the elections were held in Travancore-Cochin and as a result of those elections, the people decided to return a legislature where no party could command a stable majority. Who are we, and who is even this Parliament, to go behind the wishes of the people of Travancore-Cochin, after their opinion had been ascertained, and after they had decided that they were not in a position to put any single party in power there?

Then again, about those 59 members, my hon. friend Shri A. K. Gopalan has already given us the relevant facts. Not only were there 59 members, but my information shows that there were 61 members. If their names are wanted, I am prepared to give their names, and I would like the Home Minister to check up with the Rajpramukh and find out whether the facts that I am giving are sustained by him or not.

The House enjoyed very much the reference made by Shri A. K. Gopalan to the disappearance of a member. Now, that is a very serious matter. That member is missing even to this day.

**Shri S. S. More :** Has any complaint been lodged?

**Shri Asoka Mehta :** My hon. friend might permit me to proceed. As late as Saturday, the 24th of March, this was the position. The *Matrubhoomi*, the leading Malayalee Congress daily has a great deal to say about it. It says:

"It was at 11 P.M. in the night, day before yesterday, that a rumour spread through the city that the sub-divisional magistrate had issued

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

a search warrant to search the house of the Chief Minister. Newspaper reporters gathered near the cantonment police station. From the police authorities there, they gathered the information that they were starting for the Chief Minister's house. They said that the delay was because of having to wake up the Inspector-General of Police in his residence and take his directions. The R.S.P. leader Srikanth Nair and a posse of police were near the station.

About midnight the police party started followed by the newspapermen. When they reached the gates of the Chief Minister's residence the police party asked the correspondents to wait outside and themselves entered and closed the gates behind them.

After some time, the police party returned and told the newsmen waiting outside, "We searched the place, there is no one there." Everyone then returned. A police officer remarked, "It was a search all right but only for the record; there was not much searching done."

It is very important to note that the letter of withdrawal of the support signed by Mr. Narayan Potti was sent by Mr. Govinda Menon to the Rajpramukh with his own covering letter, and in the covering letter he had said that this particular letter was signed by Mr. Narayan Potti in his presence; and since then Mr. Narayan Potti is missing. Where is he?

On the last occasion, while discussing the President's Proclamation in regard to the Andhra State, I had charged the Leader of the Congress Party that he had been practising the bad politics of piracy. From politics of abduction, political abduction, are we to descend to physical abduction? I do not charge the Chief Minister of having done that. But this is what the Malayalee newspapers suggest. The brother of Narayan Potti has lodged a complaint. Surely, these are things that need looking into.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is a stable government to be built up on such a gentleman as that?

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, every member of that House has a vote. He has been elected by the people. And I do not know whether we should pity the member who has disappeared or pity more the *ex-Chief Minister*, the

quondam Chief Minister, who was the last person who saw him, and in whose presence the signature was taken. Let us not be sarcastic about the poor man whose whereabouts are unknown. Let us rather be careful about the developments that have been taking place there.

Now that I have been reminded of the quondam Chief Minister, may I invite your attention to the various remarks, observations and statements that have been made between 11th March and 26th March by this ebullient and egregious gentleman? On the 11th March, he had declared that he had no moral right to continue in office because he had no majority; he thought it demoralising to face the legislature with only a minority dependent upon the support of a few members of the Opposition. That was the high and mighty tone or attitude that he took up. And what is the latest statement that he has made? "If the Opposition had really wanted to avoid the administrator's regime," he said, "the Opposition could very well have supported the Congress." The full circle has been taken. And in this full circle that has been taken, I say again with a full sense of responsibility that the Mover of the resolution has his share of responsibility.

Mr. Govinda Menon did not advise the Rajpramukh to dissolve the Assembly. The leaders of the next two parties, Mr. Thomas of the Communist Party, and Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai, also had not advised the dissolution of the legislature. I say all of them evidently wanted the Rajpramukh to explore the possibilities of an alternative government.

At that time, the Chief Minister, Mr. Govinda Menon, was in a very sober mood. On the 13th of March, he talks about chastening influence and goes to the extent of coming in sack-cloth and ashes and declaring "Everyone in the Congress Party including myself should get more disciplined".

**Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil):** He must.

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** That is what he said on the 13th March, because he really expected that he would be in the Opposition, and some kind of an alternative government would be formed. Then, he comes to Delhi, and he meets the higher-ups here, and while he meets the higher-ups here, I do not know what new instructions were issued. Mr. Thomas and Mr. Thanu Pillai one after

the other meet the Rajpramukh at his invitation. But by that time, Shri Panapalli Govinda Menon returns from Delhi, and the Rajpramukh invites him and again asks him to form a government, and that too when the Congress Party finds that it is not in a position to form the government, but on the other side, the offer of Pattom Thanu Pillai who has 61 persons to support him,—or even if we accept the letter that is alleged to have been sent by Mr. Narayan Potti he had 60 members to support him—is not ever looked at.

The result is that on the 24th of March, Shri Panapalli Govinda Menon says 'Unless the political parties are willing to play cricket, the future of responsible government is gloomy indeed.' Now, what is the meaning of playing cricket when you choose the umpire, and you change the rules of the game to suit your purposes? So far as playing cricket is concerned, I am only too anxious to play cricket for safeguarding democracy in this country, but the other side, the Treasury Benches, want to play skittle; they want to play ducks and drakes with our endeavours to build up democracy in this country.

Who is responsible for this recurring crisis? It is the Congress Party, and the Congress Party alone. Over and over again, it is because either the Congress Party had disintegrated, either the Congress Party has not been able to retain the support of its allies or the Congress has not been able to maintain the support it offered to somebody else. It is always the policy of the Congress Party playing ducks and drakes that is responsible for the instability in that State. The Home Minister is unwilling to go to the root of the matter and find out why the Congress Party has been functioning in the manner it is functioning.

Shri Govinda Menon ends up by saying:

"President's rule is the direct and logical result of the irresponsible attitude of Opposition groups."

Because President's rule is to be utilised for the purpose of discrediting the Opposition. Shri Udayabhanu, President of the Pradesh Congress, says:

"I hope that as in other States which had the experience of President's rule, stability and order will emerge here also."

Democracy is to be made safe for the Congress by the President's rule. This has been the purpose. It was not that there was no possibility of a stable government, it was not that the alternatives were fully explored, but it was a calculated move, everything working up to a particular climax. But may I point out that this is a shortsighted policy? Suspension of the democratic machinery in Travancore-Cochin is neither good for the State nor for any of the political parties. What is the result? Not only has democracy been suspended in the State, but faith in democracy itself has been shaken in that State.

There are two critical points, as my hon. friend pointed out. There is the question of States reorganisation and there is the question of unemployment. Take the question of States reorganisation. The State will not be consulted. The representatives of the people will not have any say in the matter. You know on this question controversial issues are involved. I can assure you that the people of the State feel that President's Proclamation in the conditions that exist today goes against and violates the self-respect and the interest of the people of that State.

Take the question of unemployment. Can it be solved by the Adviser saying 'It is going to receive my earnest consideration?' This question can never be solved unless you evoke and enlist the co-operation of the people. The Adviser will never be able to evoke and enlist the co-operation of the people. The conditions in that State will continue to go from bad to worse.

**Acharya Kripalani** (Bhagalpur *cum* Purnea): He belongs to Kerala.

**Shri Asoka Mehta**: I believe the Home Minister has harmed not only the politics of the State; he has harmed the Congress Party also. The Congress Party there, as my hon. friend pointed out, has been functioning in a peculiar atmosphere. On the last occasion the Congress Party did not hesitate to put on the cassocks to win the elections. The Congress Party has been making all kinds of alliances with all kinds of groups.

**Shri Nettur P. Damodaran** (Tellicherry): What about P.S.P.?

**Shri Asoka Mehta**: The internal weaknesses, the disintegrating forces that are there in the Congress Party are as strong as ever. On the occasion of the last general elections the full charm of

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

the charismatic leader was turned in the State. He visited almost every constituency. And what was the result? The result was that even then they could not get a majority, the master card was played, but the game was lost. I can assure you that unless the Congress Party is given some spell of wilderness, unless the Congress Party realises what it is to be in opposition, it will not recover its strength. It will not be able to recover once again its lost integrity, its lost cohesion. The Home Minister is unwilling even to have the taste of Opposition for his party in one single State for a limited period.

On the last occasion, I had called the communists, the 'hangmen of democracy'. I would say the rope is still there in their hands, but the hand has lost its former firmness and the heart has lost its former faith. They are in the position of Hamlet. They are today on the forking of the roads. Communists in India do not know whether to move in the direction of parliamentary democracy or to retreat into their old ruts. Here is an occasion when we should have given them an opportunity to move forward in the right direction. But the decision taken by the Home Minister, the decision that has resulted in the advice that has been given to the President whereby he has issued a Proclamation, has made it difficult for those leaders of the communist party who are anxious to direct the party in the desired direction.

What about the P.S.P.? There is my leader, Acharya Kripalani, and my friend, Jayaprakash Narain. These are the men who have been trying to place before the Praja-Socialist party a point of view which would be able to reconcile allegiance to development of the country with its allegiance to democracy in India. They have been trying to evolve inside the ranks a kind of non-partisan attitude. But what is happening? Instead of fostering and helping the development of this kind of forces in the country, instead of strengthening the faith of the people in the democratic efforts and processes, on the plea that there is no stability, you issue a Proclamation. Who says there is no stability? Till the 26th, as my hon. friend, Shri A. K. Gopalan, pointed out, the advisers of the President could wait and allow the State legislature to function. Only on the 26th or the 25th it was suddenly discovered that there was no stability. After all, an opportunity should have been given to those who claim that they

have a majority to face the Assembly and the verdict of the Assembly. It would not have taken a long time. But that opportunity was not given. Deliberately and precipitately, the whole democratic set-up in the State was suspended.

It is contended that it is constitutional. Perhaps it is constitutional, if you only look at the letter of the Constitution. But is it in accordance and in conformity with the spirit of the Constitution? You were one of the founding fathers of the Constitution and I am willing to be guided by your decision on the subject. I would ask whether, when this particular article was introduced into the Constitution, you thought that it would be used in this manner over and over again. After all, the people of the State have elected representatives. Give them a chance to form their own government. But here is a high priest unwilling to permit the people to experiment with democracy, unwilling to let the people of Travancore-Cochin learn from their own experience, and have the kind of government they want. But that experience is also to be denied to them because of the all-wise and all-powerful people sitting there on the Treasury Benches in the Union Parliament.

Therefore, I believe that this particular advice, this particular decision which has resulted in the President's Proclamation has harmed, as I said, the cause of democracy in this country, has harmed political life in the State of Travancore-Cochin and has not helped in any way any of the political parties in the country, nor the real and larger interest of the country. It has helped for the time being the partisan interests of the ruling Party, and it is a matter of the deepest shame and sorrow to me that for partisan considerations, so vital and so abiding principles have been thrown to the winds.

**Shri A. M. Thomas :** Mr. Speaker, Sir, Much has been said about parliamentary democracy by the two previous speakers. Under the circumstances disclosed in the speech of the Home Minister, if Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai, the leader of the P.S.P., was to form a Ministry, I would say it would have been a mockery of parliamentary democracy. I thought that above all people, the leader of the Communist party in this House and also the Deputy Leader of the P.S.P. in this House would have been happy over the assumption of

powers by the President over the administration of Travancore-Cochin. It was the Communist party in Travancore-Cochin that observed a 'protest day' sometime last year when Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai formed a Ministry in Travancore-Cochin with the support of the Congress Party. Now, Shri A. K. Gopalan is shedding tears for not allowing the same Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai to form a Ministry, in March 1956.

**Shri Nettur P. Damodaran :** Only crocodile tears.

**Shri A. M. Thomas :** It is certain that Shri Asoka Mehta was shedding crocodile tears; there is no doubt about it. I shall presently place before the House the resolution passed by the National Executive of the P.S.P. That resolution, *inter alia* says:

"The party does not like to assume power unless, it commands the confidence of the majority of the electorate. But in India where more than two or three parties exist, it is possible that a party may be the largest party without being in an absolute majority. In such conditions, the party may form a government as a necessity and try to implement its policy and programme."

As regards coalition, the resolution says :

"The party may agree to join a coalition government at the Centre, it need not join any such coalition in the States."

**Shri Asoka Mehta :** He seems to know more about my party than I do.

4 P.M.

**Shri A. M. Thomas :** This resolution of the National Executive has been interpreted by the leader of the P.S.P. in the Madras Assembly in the following terms. While welcoming the resolution of the National Executive of the P.S.P. passed at Delhi, Dr. Menon, the P.S.P. leader said : That this decision was the correct one and that any co-operation or any truck with either the Congress or the Communists at this time would be disastrous. The only course that the P.S.P. in the Travancore-Cochin State could adopt was to plough the lone furrow without seeking power. The situation in the Travancore-Cochin State is such that the P.S.P. must try to avoid President's rule and should offer constructive co-operation on merits to any Ministry that was formed on a democratic basis.

Replying to a question, Dr. Menon said that this Ministry muddle ought to be a lesson to those who oppose Dakshina Pradesh. This is how the resolution of the National Executive of the P.S.P. has been interpreted by the leader of the Assembly party in Madras. I do not want to take up the time of the House any more by narrating the inconsistent position that the party at the Central level and the party at the State level has taken.

However much I may bemoan the situation which led to the assumption of powers of the Travancore-Cochin Government by the President, I shall presently place before you facts and figures which will show that it was inevitable and that it was the only proper course, the constitutional and democratic course, that could be adopted. (*Interruption.*) This was a state of affairs which the party to which I have the honour to belong tried to avoid from the year 1952 after the country-wide elections, either by itself assuming power or by allowing any other party to do so.

Before dealing with the constitutional position, I would like to take the House to the background. Facts will speak for themselves. Ever since the advent of responsible government in Travancore-Cochin there have been 6 ministries and 5 Chief Ministers. There have been two general elections under the Constitution under which we are now functioning.

When new governments were formed in the Centre and the States in 1952, what was the position in Travancore-Cochin? Out of a House of 108, the Congress Party was the largest party in numbers and since no other party could form the government at that time, the P.S.P. or the Communist or any other splinter group were not prepared or not able to come together and take up power, the then largest party, the Congress took upon itself the responsibility of forming the Ministry.

**Shri V. P. Nayar :** Wherever the Congress takes power, is it to avoid President's rule ?

**Shri A. M. Thomas :** It had also afterwards the solid support of 14 members belonging to the Tamil Nad Congress Party, which in the matter of ideological or political objective, had no difference with the Congress but had only some difference of opinion with regard to the linguistic formation of States. That Ministry which was the

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

John Ministry, to which reference was made by my hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, carried on for about 2 years. On account of a succession of events there and because of the secession of the T.T.N.C. Party from the Parliamentary Party, the Ministry was defeated in the Assembly on a motion of confidence. No other party, at that time, could form the government. Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai himself, on the floor of the Assembly, said that the only course open was to dissolve the Assembly and then appeal to the electorate and conduct general elections at the earliest possible opportunity. There was an appeal to the electorate. In 1954, February, there was an election. The party position then also was more or less the same. That time also the Congress was returned as the largest party. No party had, even then, a majority. Afterwards, what was it that the Congress did? Shri Asoka Mehta said that whenever Congress wanted to assume power it adopted several tactics and tried to be in power. What was it that the Congress did then? In the political history of any country there is no parallel.

**Acharya Kripalani:** You do not seem to have read history.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** A party of 18 members out of a total of 119 members with Pattom Thanu Pillai as leader was allowed to form the Ministry and the Congress, just to avoid President's rule, offered responsive co-operation. But subsequent events did not justify the trust reposed in the P.S.P. Ministry. I do not want to enter into the circumstances which forced the Congress party to withdraw its support. It is irrelevant for the present purpose. Suffice it to say that it was forced to withdraw the support and it withdrew support and the P.S.P. Ministry was defeated. What were the circumstances at that time when the P.S.P. Ministry was defeated? Shri Asoka Mehta said that by several permutations and combinations the Congress Party wanted to come into power. I would say that that was not the case. The T.T.N.C. which was supporting the Congress Party on a previous occasion—it was a solid block and as I submitted already, it had no difference of opinion at all with regard to the ideology which the Congress was following—offered its support—a solid block of 12 members—unconditional support to the Congress Party. Not only that, the members of that group joined as members of the Congress Party and there was

only one party, the Congress Party of 58 and there was another an independent, Shri Ramaswamy Pillai who also said that he was prepared to give unconditional support to the Congress Party. It was under those circumstances, with a majority of one—it had a strength of 59 out of 117—that the Congress Party assumed for itself power about a year back. That was headed by Shri Panampalli Govinda Menon. (*Interruption.*) Later events are fresh in the minds of hon. Members. I do not want to refer to them in detail. Since there were some defections in the Congress Party, since 6 members of the Congress Party resigned from the parliamentary group, there was not sufficient strength for the Congress Party to continue in power.

**An Hon. Member:** That is why they resigned.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** Panampalli Govinda Menon submitted the resignation of his Ministry. That was, perhaps, the most proper thing to be done in the circumstances and I thought at least the Opposition would have the good sense to acknowledge it with grace. With a strength of 54 members out of 117, the Panampalli Ministry thought that it had no moral justification to continue and it resigned on 11-3-56. Shri Panampalli Govinda Menon then also asked the Rajpramukh that he might explore the possibilities of an alternative Ministry. It may be remembered that at that time the 6 Congressmen who had resigned from the parliamentary party had not made it clear that they would not be prepared to support any other alternative Ministry formed by the Communists, the P.S.P., the R.S.P. or the K.S.P., or any other combination. But, later on, these 6 Congressmen who have been termed in the Press as rebel Congressmen stated categorically that they were not prepared to support any Ministry other than a Congress Ministry.

What was the party position at the time—after the resignation of Shri Panampalli Govinda Menon? The Congress was 54, the Rebel Congress 6, the Communists 27, the P.S.P. 15, the R.S.P. 9, K.S.P. 3 and Independents 3. Of the 3 Independents, 2 were supporting the Congress and 1 was supporting the Communist Party. About the unequivocal position of the rebel Congressmen I have already made a reference. It was then crystal clear that the only course open, as far as Travancore-Cochin was

concerned, was President's rule, especially in the light of the resolution that was passed by the National Executive of the P.S.P. I have read that resolution before you.

I only want to know from Shri Asoka Mehta this. He coined a phrase, that is, politics of piracy, when according to him attempts were made by Congressmen to get persons to that party in Andhra. (*Interruption.*) I would ask Shri Asoka Mehta what he would term this attitude of the P.S.P. to form a government in the State. When the National Executive has passed this resolution, I would say that it is political dishonesty of the worst type, calculated to defraud the public or the people in the country, saying one thing at the national level and saying and promising another thing at the State level. The leader of the main opposition party, that is, Shri T. V. Thomas, approached the Rajpramukh and said that he would be prepared to form a Ministry with the support of the Tamil Nad Congress Party. He said he would come and approach the Rajpramukh on another day. That day came and he wanted one day more. The Rajpramukh gave him one more day and after that one day, he came and said that he was not in a position to form a Ministry. So, the Rajpramukh had to dispose of the Communist Party. It must be said in fairness to him that he said that Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai may be called and asked whether he would be able to form a Ministry. Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai also attended the meeting of the National Executive here, then he reached Madras by plane, and from Madras he did not go by train or by plane, but I am told he went by car. I may also say that P.S.P. adopted the very same tactics—I may use the same phrase, politics of piracy. He went from door to door of several Congressmen and wanted to know whether they would be prepared to support him. He went to Shri Thangayya, a Congress member, and asked whether he was prepared to support him; then he went to Shri Sharma.

**Shri Asoka Mehta :** Did he offer any Ministership to anyone ?

**Shri A. M. Thomas :** I would say that he offered the Finance Ministership to a member in the district which I have the honour to belong to, but I do not want to go further into the matter. It is better that I do not describe the degradation to which politics in my State have gone to (*Interruption*). Whatever it be Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai approached

the Rajpramukh and said that he had the support of 59 people. Who are the 59 people on whom he placed his reliance ? They are—Communist Party 27, his own party 15, R.S.P. 9, K.S.P. 3, and Congressmen 4. These Congressmen were Shri Thangayya, Shri Sharma, Dr. A. R. Menon and Shri O. R. Chumar—these names were given out by the P.T.I. in their report. I must say at this time that the number 61 was not mentioned by Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai when he approached the Rajpramukh. At that time the Rajpramukh could not take Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai's statement at its face value due to several circumstances—the face value of 59—and subsequent events also justified it. Shri Sharma and Dr. A. R. Menon, who were reported to have offered to him their support, attended the Congress Parliamentary Party the next day. Shri Sharma said that he was given to understand that an all-party government would be formed and he offered his support. Dr. A. R. Menon alone said that he was prepared to support him. As far as Sharma was concerned, it was clear that he was not going to support Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai. There is then the case of Shri Chumar. He said that in order to avoid the President's rule and to have an orderly government it is necessary to support some other party, and the P.S.P. is the only party which may at present be tried. So he wanted to make a trial of the P.S.P. That is Shri Chumar's position. The K.S.P. which offered support had a strength of three. Their recognised leader, Shri Mathai Mannuran, who was a member of the Rajya Sabha, in an interview with the correspondent of *Matrubhoomi*, a paper from which Shri Asoka Mehta just now read out, stated that the K.S.P. was not prepared to support Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai—According to him it was all defrauding tactics of the Communist Party and they are not going to be caught in their net.

What was the report about Shri M. P. Menon the K. S. Pleader in the Assembly ? It was reported that he had offered his support. But he is reported to have stated that it was no unconditional support that he had given, and that there was some understanding on which they had offered their support. Then, about Mr. Narayanan Potti, let us take it for granted that Shri Panampalli Govinda Menon forwarded his letter. The story of abduction and other things in this connection is a figment of imagination. It is not real nor true. It is not true that there was a search warrant.

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

There was a Press denial about it. Shri Sengarapalli Potti issued a statement that he was all along in Aristo hotel in Trivandrum and he was surprised that his brother had been instrumental to move such a petition before the Magistrate inspired by the R.S.P. leader, Shri Sreekantan Nair a Member of this House. That is the state of affairs. Let us therefore be clear about the facts. Shri Sengarapalli Potti's position is that he is not prepared to support the P.S.P. Where then is the majority? Is there a remote possibility of forming a stable government, a shadow of a stable government? I am surprised that a person, for whom I have got great respect among the Opposition members—Shri Asoka Mehta—should have advanced such arguments, and if I may repeat the words that I have used formerly, should have shed crocodile tears for not asking the P.S.P. or Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai to form a Ministry there. Take it for granted that Shri Sengarapalli Potti was abducted and under duress he was forced to write to the Rajpramukh. Even then, what is the position? The very next day Shri Sengarapalli Potti could go to the other side.

My humble submission to you is that there was absolutely no possibility of any stable government in Travancore-Cochin under the circumstances then existing, and the Rajpramukh gave of course a long rope and explored all possibilities. As a constitutional head, he ought to have done that.

Some reference was made that this was deliberately done just to see through the elections to the Rajya Sabha.

**Shri V. P. Nayar :** He can deny that.

**Shri A. M. Thomas :** Having regard to the party position at that time, it was very risky for the Congress candidate even to be returned to the Rajya Sabha so that if the period was extended, the candidate who was sure to succeed was the Secretary of the Communist Party. Shri M. M. Govindan Nair with the maximum votes was returned to the Rajya Sabha, and the next place went to the General Secretary of the Congress. So, there is absolutely no substance in the allegations that have been made. What is exactly the legal position? The facts speak for themselves, and there was no other course open to the Rajpramukh but to report to the President that there has been a political breakdown in Travancore-Cochin. We have got a written Constitution and under

article 356, ample powers are given.

The article is worded very widely—

“If the President, on receipt of a report from the Governor or Rajpramukh of a State or otherwise, is satisfied that a situation has arisen in which the government of the State cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, the President may by Proclamation—

(a) assume to himself all or any of the functions. . . .” etc.—

Shri Gopalan said that (c) could have been adopted instead of (a) and (b). The very first condition is that (a) and (b) come first and then only (c) can come in.

**Shri V. P. Nayar :** Oh! Oh!

**Shri A. M. Thomas :** What is that Oh! Oh! ? The Constitution is very clear and I would ask my hon. friend, Shri Nayar just to go through the relevant article once more. The U.K. model, according to me, is not applicable. Even if we borrow the conventions of the U.K., authorities have been cited when the Proclamation of Andhra was discussed in this House that the Sovereign is bound only to call the Leader of the Opposition or any other leader provided he is satisfied that there was possibility of a stable government. I do not want to quote again, because all those have been sufficiently discussed when the Andhra Resolution was discussed. The Rajpramukh exercised his discretion in a judicial way and it was also in keeping with the democratic traditions.

Before closing, I just want to make one or two submissions.

Before I conclude, I want to place before the Home Minister certain points. I am grateful to the Home Minister for the handsome terms in which he has described my State. It is rather unfortunate and it is not with any sense of pleasure that I support this Resolution. It is unfortunate that a State which has got the largest percentage of literacy, which has the largest percentage of voting during the last general elections, a State which has contributed several distinguished men who have distinguished themselves at the national as well as international level, such a State should have the President's rule. This State has suffered because of instability. After 1949, there had been six Ministries and two general elections in two years—all because of this instability. The State has suffered because of that. A little amount

of demoralisation has set in the services too because of this instability.

I do not know whether any of the Members of this hon. House had cared to go through the Budget papers that had been circulated to us. You will find that they were printed at the Government Press, Madras. This was the first of its kind. In Trivandrum, there was a Government press and it was in that press that Budget papers used to be printed for the last so many years. But during this year, the press union which is presided over by an R.S.P. man was not prepared to have the printing in time. They were told that another Ministry is going to come and another Budget is going to be printed. Such was the attitude and the officers of the Finance Department were forced to go to Madras to get them printed. Can there be a more scandalous state of affairs? (*An Hon. Member: Leakage*). When we are speaking on very serious matters, I would request the hon. Members to listen. Does this House wish that this state of affairs should continue. I would request the Home Minister that the first thing required is that there must be a toning up of the administration there. The present rule must act as a tonic.

**An Hon. Member:** It is a wrong tonic.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** These abnormal political manifestations are the outcome of the chronic economic malady in that State and that is what we have to bear in mind.

I am glad to find that the Adviser whom our President has deputed to the Travancore-Cochin State has stated in a Press conference or address to the Secretariat officers that the problem that requires the topmost priority there is the problem of educated unemployment. Now that at least for a brief period the administration will be in the hands of the Centre, I would beg of the Home Minister to devote special attention to the problems of that State. Some treatment as on the basis of the treatment that we have given for refugee rehabilitation should be given to that State. The density of population is the highest; I do not think in any other State the problem of unemployment is so acute; next comes only West Bengal.

I would also say that whatever Shri Gopalan or Shri Asoka Mehta say, ninety per cent of the people in my State welcome President's rule. They are fed up with these political rivalries and opportunism; it has turned to be an

arena of political opportunism. The earlier it is done away with, the better it is for the State. My people welcome President's rule, at least for a time. As the Home Minister has said, it will certainly give a soothing influence to the conditions there.

I would also administer a warning. It was said that the imposition of the President's rule in PEPSU and also in Andhra was all to the good. The problems of Travancore-Cochin are peculiar. High hopes have been raised by the imposition of President's rule and if they are not fulfilled conditions in Travancore-Cochin are not going to be better off.

There are certain Land Bills of which some have been passed in the assembly. Some are at the stage of the Select Committee. Topmost priority should be given to the passing of those Bills. In some parts of the State the erstwhile Cochin area, permanency of tenure has been given to all tenants but it has not been extended to the erstwhile Travancore area. The Home Minister should call the Members from Travancore-Cochin, to whichever Party they belong, and discuss the matter with them and as in PEPSU pass as many Land Bills as possible in the Parliament.

Shri Gopalan referred to the State that is to be formed on 1st October. Having regard that prospect. I would request the Home Minister to associate the Members from Malabar also because that will be very useful so that in the Advisory Committee that would be formed, Members from Malabar may also find a place. Though it has been a painful thing for me to speak on this Resolution; I support this Resolution with all the strength at my command and I also commend the amendment standing in my name to the effect that it was the only proper course to be adopted by the Rajpramukh under the circumstances.

**Shri S. K. Patil** (Bombay City—South): I rise to support the Resolution that has been moved approving the Proclamation of the President. I was wondering in my mind about what the communist leaders and socialist leaders were doing... (*An Hon. Member: P.S.P. Leaders*) I forget. Socialism is a very interesting thing with so many shades. Why should they say that there should not have been a President's rule? The explanation has been provided by the beautiful speech of my hon. friend, Shri Goupalan.

[Shri S. K. Patil]

What is the substance of that speech when analysed? Some miraculous changes are going to happen on the 1st October. I think it is the 2nd of October—birth-day of Mahatma Gandhi. So, the President's rule should not have come from now—very interesting position, indeed. When that change comes he expects that a few more Members from Malabar of his party would come there and then Aikya Kerala—the new State—will have a majority of the Communist Party and the possibility of having their Government. Is this democracy? Because something is going to happen afterwards, we should have taken note of it even from now—six months in advance—and the game of see-saw going on for the last four years in that 'problem State'—as it is called—should have been allowed to proceed. What was the position? The Congress is accused that somehow or other they want to save the face of the Congress and therefore the President's rule has been brought about. May I point out to them the experience of these four years? It is very often that the Congress did not form the Government in that State. The Congress allowed others to form the Government. The Congress co-operated sometimes with other parties to see that the Government is formed. No prestige of the Congress has come in the way of the proper administration of that State.

I have something to do with that State. I do not merely speak here as a Member of Parliament although it would have been enough to do that. I had something to do with their elections. At every election in Travancore-Cochin I have observed the parties and the people, millions of them, in hundreds of meetings. It is a good lot. I like the people. Therefore I really know, partly if not wholly, what the disease is. That State somehow or other functions in a very funny manner. Every year they want to change their Government, no matter what happens. And we call it a democracy.

**Shri Velayudhan** : That is progressive tendency.

**Shri S. K. Patil** : Most progressive tendency of a State ought to be that to suit the convenience of every political party, governments have to change every now and then. We want to repeat the history of France. But, Sir, conditions in France very much differ from the conditions in our country. Otherwise, there would not have been any necessity whatsoever for the enactment

of section 356 of our Constitution. In France, in England and in all progressive democracies such a section or such a provision does not exist.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava** (Gurgaon) : Cannot exist.

**Shri S. K. Patil** : The tendency everywhere, in democratic countries and more especially in progressive democratic countries, is to evolve a two-party system which ultimately will be the basis of a parliamentary democracy and stable government. We cannot just at the present moment lament over the fact that we have not been able to have a two-party system. It does take time—and 8 years' period is not a long period—in order to evolve a two-party system in a country like India with 370 million population and with a variety of political parties to which we have been accustomed. Therefore, the framers of our Constitution rightly thought—and we remember many of us were present when that article was debated and discussed in this House—that at least for some time, 25 years—if it is earlier it is better, but at least for that period—conditions may arise in some of the States where stable governments and stable administration may become impossible. What is the alternative? What is to be done at that time? It is not always that we should go to the people? If that is the thing then surely in Travancore-Cochin every year there shall have to be elections. It is impossible. Election is no small job. Apart from the other inconveniences the continuity of administration is broken. No single party ever feels that it can sit there for a period and look after the good of the people of that State. That is why article 356 was introduced in our Constitution.

That section lays down that under certain conditions when the President and the Government are satisfied that a stable government has become impossible and an administration according to the provisions of the Constitution cannot be carried on that is the time when the President takes over all powers, and functions, not because to save the face of any party, but because a properly constituted party having the capacity to run a stable administration does not exist and therefore the constitutional Government cannot be carried on. That is exactly the scope and purpose of article 356 of our Constitution.

Now, examine the situation in Travancore-Cochin. My friend **Shri Asoka**

Mehta—he is not here just now—is in a very wonderful position. I like really this P.S.P. because I have never seen anywhere in the world that a party having 15 or 18 members out of a total of 118 presumes to take the responsibility of running the administration of a whole State. I have no quarrel with the P.S.P. But unless they have got a very convenient way of administration and adjustment of their conscience I cannot understand as to how a party which is not the first, not the second, possibly third or fourth—I do not know what was their position in the first elections—can think of carrying on the administration. First they were 18 or 19. Now they are 15 or may be 16.

**An Hon. Member : 15**

**Shri S. K. Patil :** With 15 members in a total strength of 118 they want to run the administration. The very basis of it I say is undemocratic because they want to make promises, to make somebody ministers and so on. I cannot understand that. One can understand democracy but that democracy must not be made so ridiculous that it is possible for any party, even such a minority as that which cannot be normally even recognised as a party—I do not know what are the rules in the State, whether 10 per cent or 15 per cent must be the membership to be recognised as a party—to make a Government. At one time they made the Government and the Congress obliged them. At another time they wanted to make the Government but none would oblige them. The third time now they want to make the Government. All that for what? In order to preserve democracy. If democracy is to be preserved in this fashion better let us not have that democracy at all.

Therefore, you see here that in a total of 118, here is our friend Shri Thanu Pillai who comes and says: I have got 59 members. I want to make a little arithmetical calculation in my mind, even assuming that he had those 59 members—out of them somebody said: "I did not sign", another man said that he was kidnapped—the position is like this. It is very very wonderful indeed. In other times we used to hear that somebody else was being kidnapped. Now members of our community and sex also have started to be kidnapped. There is nothing bad about it. But even assuming that out of 118 members 59 were on his side what does it mean? 59 is only just half and when

they elect a Speaker immediately on the very day they become a minority. Can they expect the President and the Parliament to carry on this foolish game, that we should go on experimenting as to who becomes disloyal to his party? Remember, in democracy one thing which we have been doing and which I have never agreed to is this, that once a man has been elected on a particular ticket by common consent of every party he must not be allowed to change party unless he goes back to the electorate and seeks re-election. It has become a cheap fashion everywhere that the people in order to get something for their own self-interest go on angling for something and when they are satisfied that they have got that they at once change the party although they have made a solemn promise to the electorate, hundreds and thousands of people who cast their vote for these men, that they belong to a particular party.

Now we have got to create precedents. We are responsible not only for creating a democratic constitution, we are also responsible for creating precedents that will go down to posterity, precedents that will have the sanction and the sanctity of the entire legislature, whether it is Central or Provincial. What are we doing in this particular case? When the people who are not even 15 in number, who want to take the assistance of other people and then also they come to 59, 60 or even 58, is that the state in which the President could say that a stable administration can be carried on? Why should any motives be imputed to Government? I do not understand. If after six months something is coming there and this has got to be done, then the position can certainly be reviewed after six months. If it is possible in the new state of affairs that a stable government could be formed any government that is really proud of the democratic traditions will say that the President's rule should not be continued because a stable government is a possibility, no matter what party that stable government belongs to. Therefore, is it that for a contingency that may arise after six months we should now start this game once again? Between 59 or 58 members and some members being kidnapped—that source being left open to everybody of kidnapping one or two people—can the Government be carried on and will everything go on well? May I ask, in all humility, whether this is in the interests of the people? When you talk of democracy and all these great things, does democracy consist in

[Shri S. K. Patil]

this that the people should have these different Governments simply because it suits the convenience of a particular party?

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

I agree with the previous speaker that I am quite sure that 90 per cent of the voters of Travancore-Cochin must be really favouring this Proclamation because they must have been tired of the conditions that have been created during the last 4 years, people changing their loyalty one way or the other, and creating situations which are very impossible indeed. Therefore, the President, in making this Proclamation has acted in the highest democratic traditions. Article 356 would be a meaningless provision if it is not to be resorted to in a situation like this. When the President thought that normal administration of the State is impossible, when he saw that the game that was going on between the parties was impossible and would not lead to stability, if that was not the time, and if these were not the circumstances to issue a Proclamation, under article 356, I do not see what is the time and what are the conditions more suitable for that. Therefore, in the larger interests of the State, in the larger interests of democracy, the President has acted very wisely and very correctly and it becomes the duty of this House to give its assent to the Proclamation that has been issued.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri Nettur P. Damodaran.

**Kumari Annie Mascarene** (Trivandrum): I rise to a point of order. How is it that representatives from the State are not given a chance to speak on the subject?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There is no point of order. I assure the hon. Lady Member that that is being kept in view and in the future also, it will be kept in view.

**Shri Achuthan:** Some preference may be given to the Members from that State.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri Damodaran.

**Shri Velayudhan:** He is not from that State.

**Shri Nettur P. Damodaran:** I am thankful to you Sir, for giving me this opportunity to participate in this discussion. The experience of the working of

democratic government has not been very happy in the State of Travancore-Cochin. As the previous speaker, Shri S. K. Patil said, about 99 per cent of the people of Travancore-Cochin are really feeling happy over the imposition of the President's rule in that State. The whole State is now heaving a sigh of relief, except the few leaders of the political parties, both big parties and mushroom parties, the people by and large are very happy that the state of uncertainty in Travancore-Cochin has now ended. The experience of the Adviser's regime in the two other States, namely, P.E.P.S.U. and Andhra has been that stability has been established in its wake. I honestly feel that the uncertain state of affairs in Travancore-Cochin will also end in the wake of the Adviser's regime there.

My hon. friend Shri A. K. Gopalan has been saying that in the event of the Kerala State taking shape as proposed on October 2nd next, our Communist friends, along with their present strange bed-fellows, the P.S.P. people, will be able to form a stable government in the proposed Kerala State. Now, I really pity the lot of the Malabar members of the Madras Assembly who, on October 2nd, will almost become orphans without a house to go to. On the 2nd of October, if things move according to the schedule, the new Kerala State will take shape and the Malabar members of the Madras Assembly, for no fault of theirs will become homeless political refugees. I am really sorry for this state of affairs. In this connection, I am reminded of a certain incident that took place in a Malabar village, in a village which is now represented by my Communist friend Shri A. K. Gopalan, a few years ago. That was before the Partition. In those days, sometimes there used to be troubles between Hindus and Muslims for small things like music before mosques or processions before temples or things like that. An incident took place in that particular village. There was a communal clash between Hindus and Muslims. One innocent person was the casualty. The Hindus claimed that a Muslim had been murdered. The Muslims claimed that a Hindu had been killed. When the person was actually identified, it was proved that was a Christian. In the Hindu-Muslim clash, instead of a Muslim or a Hindu dying it was a poor innocent Christian who became a casualty. By the permutations, and combinations, by the unscrupulous behaviour of some political leaders in Travancore-Cochin, the innocent Mala-

bar M.L.As. of the Madras Assembly are left homeless after the 2nd of October. Anyhow, in an emergency like this, in a crisis like this could not be helped. We can only pity the lot of our poor Malabar members of the Madras Assembly.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** Still, October is far off. Why complain just now ?

**Shri V. P. Nayar :** He is anticipating some homeless friends.

**Shri Nettur P. Damodaran :** Then, Sir, Shri A. K. Gopalan said that the President should have waited till the 1st or 2nd of October to see whether a stable government with the Communist Party at the helm of affairs or the Communist Party playing second fiddle to the Socialist party could function. How is it possible Sir? Even now, I challenge the contention of my hon. friend Shri A. K. Gopalan that a stable government could be formed in the future Kerala State on the 1st of October. Look at the party position with regard to the Malabar members of the Madras Assembly, who number exactly 30 including the one from Kasargode which goes into the proposed Kerala State. Out of the 30 the Communists have a strength of 8, the Praja Socialist Party a strength of 11. Of course, these places were secured in those days when the Praja Party had come to an alliance with the Communists. Out of 11, four were returned on the Socialist ticket and the rest on the Praja Party ticket. I know there are 11 people in the Praja Socialist Party now. As my hon friend Shri A. M. Thomas pointed out, Dr. K. B. Menon, who is the leader of the Praja Socialist Party in the Madras Assembly is not very happy over the developments in Travancore-Cochin and he is not prepared to support the Praja Socialist Party there. I doubt very much whether the Praja Socialist Party from Malabar will join hands with the Praja Socialist group in Travancore-Cochin because Shri Kelappan, who is the leader of the Praja Socialist Party in Malabar, who, unfortunately is absent today and who is undoubtedly the biggest Praja Socialist leader in Kerala does not like to have any truck with the Communist Party. I am quite sure that Shri Kelappan the leader of the Praja Socialist Party in Malabar and Dr. K. B. Menon, the leader of the Praja Socialist Party in the Madras Assembly will never agree to have any truck with the Communist Party in the formation of a Government. There are about 5 Muslim Leaguers there. I do not know whether the Communists and the Praja Socialists could

count upon their support in the proposed Kerala State.

**Shri V. P. Nayar :** How many Congressmen ?

**Shri Nettur P. Damodaran :** Four.

**Shri V. P. Nayar :** Forty-four plus four how much ?

**Shri Nettur P. Damodaran :** There are two Independents. The only development that would take place after the integration of Malabar with Travancore-Cochin will be that the instability which the Travancore-Cochin State is now facing will also be carried over to the proposed Kerala State which will again become a problem State.

One other point that I would like to bring to the notice of the House is the influence of communalism in Travancore-Cochin politics. Shri A. K. Gopalan said that communal leaders took refuge in Congress organisations and got elected as Members of the State Assembly. That is a fact which I concede. It is rather unfortunate that leaders of communal organisations are given Congress tickets, and when they are elected they change sides sometimes to suit the convenience of their communities or to serve their communal purposes. This communal aspect of the problem has something to do even with the last shift in the Congress Party, but I would like to point out that the Congress Party is not the only party which is flirting with communalism this way. The P.S.P. is no exception. In a Delhi Weekly there is an editorial article in which the politics of Travancore-Cochin has been discussed. The editorial says :

"Another reason for instability in that State is the propensity for unprincipled alliances. When the leftist Coalition attained a working majority after the last general elections, the P.S.P. headed by Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai played a discreditable role. Instead of forming a Ministry with all the other parties of the Coalition and thus fulfilling the promises made to the electorate Shri Thanu Pillai created a misbegotten Ministry, which hung on to power at the mercy of Congressmen."

Now, about the leadership of Thanu Pillai, the paper says :

"In this connection it would not be out of place if it is stated that Sri Pattom is neither a Praja man nor a Socialist. He is a proud, aris-

[Shri Nettur P. Damodaran] tocratic Nair at heart and all his actions proceed from this solid strata of the subconscious. And it is a bitter truth that large sections of Nairs in Travancore look at their Pattom as a sort of Chieftain destined to rule and that feeling creates reciprocal vibrations in Shri Pattom's heart."

**An Hon. Member:** Who is running that paper? Another Malayalee?

**Shri Nettur P. Damodaran:** It is a Nair who has written this editorial to the best of my knowledge. It is not a man belonging to any other community. He is, of course, a Malayalee. It is only a Malayalee who is vitally interested in Travancore-Cochin and Kerala politics.

**Shri S. S. More:** It is a Nair, but not V. P. Nayar.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** A man knowing nothing about Travancore-Cochin.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is better if these things are settled outside.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** An impression has been created that I wrote it. I never wrote it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member need not be nervous about it.

**Shri Nettur P. Damodaran:** The Communist Party is perhaps the least communal of the political parties now functioning in Kerala State. I would like to give the devil its due Sir, and I feel the Communist Party is the least communal. That does not mean that it is free from communalism. It largely draws its strength from certain communal forces and organisations at work in Kerala. I mean to say that the Communist Party derives its strength mainly from the Ezhava community and the Harijan community. The P.S.P. draws its strength mainly from the Nair community. In the Congress all communities are there, but of course, communalism has its place in the Congress organisation also in Travancore-Cochin. This is the tragedy of the situation. The sooner we eschew the working of these communal forces from the political arena of Travancore-Cochin the better for the proposed Kerala State and for the whole of the country.

With the addition of Malabar to Travancore-Cochin, another great communal force is going to be released. Perhaps you know Sir that Malabar is the only place in the whole of India where the Muslim League is still functioning. Fortunately the Muslim League has not

become an effective communal force in Travancore-Cochin. With the addition of Malabar, 33 per cent of whose population consists of Muslims who are now under the influence of the Muslim League, this great communal force is again going to come into play in the political arena of Travancore-Cochin and Kerala. Unless these things are taken into account, and remedies found, I am afraid no stable Government is possible even in the future Kerala State.

Now the party position with regard to the various political parties in Travancore-Cochin is sufficiently well known and has been explained by my predecessors. I only want to emphasize the point that President's rule has become inevitable under the circumstances. I earnestly believe and hope that the Adviser's regime will certainly make matters better for Kerala State and the proposed State when it comes into being will have a stable Government.

Shri Asoka Mehta read out the translation of a report which appeared in the *Matru Bhumi*, and he said it is a Congress daily from Malabar. It is not a Congress daily. It is a nationalist daily, of course, by and large supporting Congress views. I am a regular reader of the *Matru Bhumi*. In the next day's issue of that paper the Trivandrum correspondent has reported that the earlier report was not correct. He has contradicted the report that the house of the Chief Minister of Travancore-Cochin was searched to see whether Narayanan Potti, an R.S.P. M.L.A., who was alleged to have been kidnapped and kept in that house, was there.

Shri Mehta has also charged the Congress with making all sorts of alliances. Are the alliances that the Congress has made in Travancore-Cochin in any way less reputable than the alliances the P.S.P. has made in Travancore-Cochin? The Congress has not formed any alliances. Of course, because of linguistic trouble there was some difference of opinion between the Congress and the T.T.N.C. They formed a party in the legislature, but later they joined the Congress legislature party. That you cannot term as alliance. But the P.S.P. first formed its Government by standing on Congress legs. Now, when the Congress withdrew its support, the P.S.P. Government fell to the ground, and they are now trying to stand on Communist legs. So, the history of the P.S.P. in Travancore-Cochin has been that they have always stood on borrowed legs, and never stood on their own legs.

And Shri Mehta now ventures to attack the Congress saying that it has formed all sorts of alliances in Travancore-Cochin. It is not a fact.

In the interests of good Government in Travancore-Cochin and for creating conditions for a stable Government there, the only recourse that the President could take was the introduction of President's rule in that State. I believe that things will improve by the introduction of President's rule and pave the way for a stable Government in the proposed Kerala State.

**Kumari Annie Mascarene :** I thank you for the chance given to me to speak on a subject that concerns my State vitally.

As one associated with the development of political democracy in Travancore-Cochin, I wish to confess that I have got at least 25 years of experience in taking part in its development. None of the speakers who have hitherto spoken have ever had such a long time of experience to feel the pulse or the temperature of political feelings in that State. As one elected from the capital city of Travancore-Cochin State, I have had occasions to come into contact with the feeling of the masses and the opinion of the masses towards the Government they were having. I do not belong to any party. I was elected to this Parliament as an independent member, though I have had life-long association with the Congress, Congress activities, Congress programmes, and Congress agitation till it came into power; and even after it came into power I had opportunities of holding positions in the Cabinet. I wish to voice the opinion of the people today. I may not see eye to eye with the Central Government in many of its activities. But as far as this resolution is concerned, I must admit that they have done the right thing. I wish to impress upon the Home Minister that now an opportunity has come to do justice to the people of Travancore-Cochin State and save them from the exploitation of political parties.

5 P.M.

This is not the first time that I congratulate this Government for taking such a step. There were many occasions in the past—I can trace it back even to 1949, when I was holding a position in the Cabinet there, when I had written to the President of the Republic that President's rule should be introduced in Travancore-Cochin State to bring about

stability and to mould political opinion. That was one of the reasons why I had resigned of my own free will and got out of the Cabinet. Ever since then I have been very actively interested in the political upheavals of that State. If ever the voice of the people has sounded correctly it is now and they are very grateful to this Government for introducing President's rule in Travancore-Cochin. Neither Mr. Gopalan nor Mr. Asoka Mehta knows anything more than their party interests. The people there suffer from these parties. To do justice to them, I must say that there was no other go except to introduce President's rule. The public on many occasions before approached me to voice their opinion with regard to a solution of the political crises happening now and again and I had always written articles at their request of the Press that President's rule was the only solution, and I recall instances of editorial articles supporting me. I can recall instances of letters coming to me asking me to voice my opinion in the Central Parliament. Today I am happy that at last they have decided to take a decision which I had been asking them to do five years back.

**An Hon. Member :** You want eternal President's rule ?

**Kumari Annie Mascarene :** Had they taken this step earlier, there would have been today a strong political party in Travancore-Cochin State. This nebulous situation had been brought about by the exploitation of growing parties. I do not say they are in the wrong. They want to impose their opinion; but they are not prepared to understand the needs of the people or redress their grievances.

Occasions for finding a solution to the problems of our State have arisen before too. Two general elections have taken place, but the parties there had not been able to get a majority. A third election had taken place as in PEPSU. Even then no party could get a majority. There was a strong minority and the nebulous situation in the State had been brought about by the subterfuges and exploitations of that strong minority. So, if the Central Government had taken a wise step, it is to solve this. I welcome this step and I request the Home Minister not to spare any efforts to give the people a just government. Educated unemployment, density of population, a deficit area in regard to food, prices of things going high and low according to party politics—these are all problems which have to be confronted by the

[Kumari Annie Mascarene]

Home Minister. Here is a State with cent per cent literacy, here is a State with growing political feeling, passing through a series of political crises—an example of how a single State in this great country, whose problems can become insoluble on account of communalism.

A previous speaker had referred to communalism. The political crises happening for the last so many years have been the result of that communal rivalry. The Congress Government which had come into existence failed to solve that. On the other hand, the Ministers of the Congress Government individually and jointly helped as much as they could to create and develop communalism. If you watch the appointments made there, you will find that communal favour was the first thing, and next to that corruption. The P.S.P. Government came into existence. Nowhere else in the world could a party with so few representatives have been able to form a Government. Standing on the support of so many other parties they formed a Government. I must do justice to them. I wish to speak the truth and nothing but the truth. The first few months of the P.S.P. Government were very just and the people felt relieved. But it was only for the first six months. After that they fell into their old ways and the people were just waiting to get out of their clutches. Then again I had written articles in the papers inviting the Central Government to establish President's rule; but then the Congress Government came into existence. They too were not able to stand for long. They were in no way efficient. On the other hand it was a case of one Minister disliking the other Minister. The whole administration was corrupted with individual motives, individual favours and great injustice was done to the people.

I wish the Home Minister visited that place to see how that small State on the coast, with great potentialities, with plantations and with beautiful scenery, could be developed and made to stand on its own legs. The fisheries have to be developed; the industries have to be developed. The mineral sands of Travancore-Cochin offers immense scope for development. In the process of industrialisation of the country, Travancore-Cochin has been left untouched. No doubt, the Government have taken up many industries. But I must tell the Home Minister that not all the industries run by Government are on efficient lines. The

industries no doubt are there to give employment to a few officers. I have myself seen heaps of ceramic products being thrown into the sea and into the lakes, because they are not well-made. Machinery worth lakhs of rupees are lying rusting, because there is no one to guide them. I have myself gone into them personally as a representative of the people and have examined and found that most of the industries, like plywood, ceramics, ilmenite, aluminium and so on, and many other industries with great potentialities, which could make that State a first-rate industrial State, are lying there neglected and rotten, because the Congress administration had not looked into them, and the P.S.P. administration had not taken the pains to look into them. They were trying to make each other rich and happy, and not the people. I have had several occasions to hear the voice of the people, and they all say that this is a fact. And they say, we have now got the President's rule, and though the President's rule is not all right, yet we have to put up with only one man, otherwise, we have to put up with the nonsense of so many, if that one man goes wrong, the expenditure is also less, and we can put up with it, or we can voice grievances to this one man some day and he will hear it.

I therefore congratulate you for establishing the President's rule in that State. I would request you as a representative of the people, I request as one who has got the longest experience of political life unblemished, I request you as one who can still command the voice of the people, to look into that State and be just . . .

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** I doubt whether 'I' deserves so many compliments ?

**Kumari Annie Mascarene :** You may have your doubts. Theories can be enunciated . . .

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** These remarks are directed to the Home Minister.

**Kumari Annie Mascarene :** . . . but facts are facts; they are taken from truth, and they survive. I therefore request the Home Minister to be just with those people. They do not expect favour from his hands. I would request him to give them justice, to give them security of life and property, to give them a normal, just way of living with minimum favours and maximum justice.

**Shri Kamath :** The Home Minister, in the course of commending his resolution to the House has tried his best to

humour, if not flatter, the Members of this Sabha by telling us how wise and how good we are. The words used by him were 'the cream of the nation'. And he said, that we could be safely entrusted, that this Sabha could be safely entrusted with the fortunes or with the administration of Travancore-Cochin. I am reminded of the olden days, some decades ago, not so very long ago, when it used to be said by British statesmen of the House of Commons that they too were very wise men, very intelligent people, very able men, and very competent men, who could be safely entrusted with the administration and with the welfare of the millions of people in India. The analogy is, to me, suggestive. Just as the British Parliament used to look after the welfare of India, so does the Home Minister by telling us like this has presumed that here in Parliament, we will be able efficiently, ably and successfully to administer the affairs of Travancore-Cochin.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava :** This is the analogy proper ?

**Shri Kamath :** The worst fears of Dr. Ambedkar, which he expressed in the Constituent Assembly on 4th August 1949 have unfortunately come true. My hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta referred to some of the observations that he made. But the most important observation that he made on that occasion in reply to a question put by me in the course of the debate on this article was this :

"I may say that I do not altogether deny that there is a possibility of these articles"—referring to these two articles—"being abused or employed for political purpose . . . I share the sentiment expressed by my hon. friend Mr. Gupta yesterday that the proper thing we ought to expect is that such articles will never at all come into operation and that they will remain a dead letter."

In less than six years after the inauguration of the Constitution, this emergency power has been invoked more than four times. And though on the last occasions, these proclamations and the assumption by the President of powers under such proclamation, were followed immediately by a general election within three months or four months or five months, but here, there has been, and there will be, no such assurance to the people.

The Legislative Assembly has been dissolved, and it has been made clear that there will be no general elections in the State within a measurable period of time, say, three months or four months, but the people will have to await the next general elections throughout the whole country. Here, I would invite the attention of the House to the proclamation itself. My hon. friend Shri A. K. Gopalan has observed that the legislature of the State need not have been dissolved, because if it had not been dissolved, there would have been opportunity for this Parliament to urge, and to see that their plea is accepted, to urge the revocation of the proclamation, so that the legislature could be summoned to function in the ordinary manner, and on the appointed day, according to the SRC Bill—I will not refer to the day, I do not know what that appointed day will be, there might be dis-appointment earlier,—the new legislature of the Kerala State might have been formed; the picture there would have been different, and the government could have been carried in that new State in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. But now that has been rendered impossible by the wilful act, the *mala fide* act of Government. The President has acted on the advice of the Council of Ministers, and to use the Home Minister's own phraseology, that advice has not been *bona fide*. It is self-regarding, that is to say, concerned with the interest of the ruling party only and not that of democracy as such.

Democracy, according to the ruling party seems to mean the rule of the people by the people for the people, provided that that rule could be carried on by the party itself. In this particular instance of Travancore-Cochin, this conception of democracy was illustrated in the manner in which the government or the Ministry of Travancore-Cochin was not allowed to be changed according to the wishes of the members of the party itself. As for the six dissidents to whom reference has been made, it would appear that they wanted, and they were willing, to support a party Ministry provided that the leader of the party was someone else. But the imposition was made from here, and Government imposed on the party, a leader of their choice, not the leader of that party's choice, and to that extent, Government here stand convicted of scant regard for democracy, and of giving not even a decent burial to democracy in that State.

[Shri Kamath]

It is amazing, if not outrageous, that Parliament today is called upon to approve this proclamation, approve the liquidation of democracy in the educationally most progressive State in India, where literacy is the highest in India. Educationally, it is the most progressive State in the whole Union of India.

The Congress Party did it once two years ago. The President proclaimed—as he has done recently—assuming powers to himself. Now the general election is in the offing. They have deliberately seen to it that President's rule is imposed and the legislature dissolved. President's rule, which is a synonym for Congress rule, has been imposed upon the State.

My hon. friend, Shri S. K. Patil, who is now not here, made certain amusing observations. He stressed the necessity for healthy precedents in political and public life, that no Member elected on a particular party ticket should be permitted or encouraged to join another party, to cross the floor—to use the familiar phrase. But may I ask, was a big and bad precedent not set by the Congress Party itself in Andhra two years ago? The Congress Party itself set this big and bad precedent in encouraging a member of our party, by seducing him, by abducting or kidnapping him—whatever may be the word appropriate—and investing him with the office of Chief Minister in that State.

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** And of discarding him later.

**Shri Kamath:** Yes, as my hon. friend says, of unceremoniously discarding him later without compunction, without any conscience.

So this precedent was set by the Congress Party. Coming as he does from the latest problem State, Bombay, I was not surprised to hear Shri Patil talking about the problem State Travancore Cochin. He has commended the Home Minister's Resolution and asked, is it not very strange that the P.S.P. having a strength of 19 or 15 should form the Government in Travancore-Cochin? It was 19 at that time, but now he says, it is 15. Whatever that may be, may I remind him that the P.S.P. at the time this took place, when it had only a strength of 19 in the Assembly, did not show any anxiety to assume office? If my hon. friend remembers the resolution that we passed then, we said that the party was prepared to assume the responsibility for administration if called

upon to do so. The Rajpramukh was there. He could have been instructed by the Government or the President here not to send for the leader of the party there. It was not that we were anxious to take over the administration. The Government here were responsible for the state of affairs in Travancore-Cochin. The Government here at this time have adopted a different course with regard to the crisis,—I will not say 'crisis',—but with regard to the developments in Travancore-Cochin now.

The Home Minister has tried to mislead the House by saying that even if a Ministry had been formed in Travancore-Cochin by the P.S.P. or by any other opposition party, that Ministry would have fallen on the day the S.R.C. Bill was discussed in the legislature. It is strange that the Home Minister should thus try to mislead the House. When the S.R.C. Bill goes to a legislature, there is no vote taken on that. Article 3 of the Constitution does not prescribe any vote of confidence to be taken on the clauses of the S.R.C. Bill. He knows it very well—there was a discussion on that point in connection with the Bill amending the Constitution in connection with that. All that is required under the Constitution is that the legislature should express its views on the Bill. Apart from what the P.S.P. stands for with regard to that measure—I need not go into that at this stage, though the Home Minister said that the P.S.P. holds different views from those of the Communist party; it is not relevant for the purpose of this discussion to refer to the views or policies of these parties on the subject—the crux of the matter is that no vote is taken, no vote of confidence will be taken, on the S.R.C. Bill when it is discussed by a legislature. The opinions of the House will be forwarded to Parliament and those opinions will be taken for what they are worth when we discuss the Bill in this House and in the other House. Therefore, it is wholly irrelevant, and wholly misleading on the part of the Home Minister to suggest that if a Ministry had been formed, it would have collapsed as soon as the S.R.C. Bill came before the legislature.

Therefore, I would suggest that the Proclamation made by the President in this connection assuming the functions to himself is wholly unwarranted, wholly undemocratic, entirely uncalled for and wholly in dissonance with, not in consonance with, the spirit, if not the letter also, of the Constitu-

tion. May I invite your attention to one or two provisions of this Proclamation? It beats me why in the concluding paragraph a provision of the kind inserted there has been inserted. The Constitution provides for it in a particular manner while the Proclamation has provided for this matter in an entirely contrary manner. The last para in the Proclamation says :

"Any reference in the Constitution to Acts or laws...made by the legislature of the State shall be construed as including reference to Acts or laws made in exercise of the powers of the legislature of the State by Parliament by virtue of this Proclamation or by the President or by any other authority...."

Now, article 357 of the Constitution declares that it shall be competent for Parliament to confer on the President the power of the legislature of the State to make laws. That is to say, Parliament may or may not confer on the President the power to make laws. But here the Proclamation itself has declared that these powers shall vest either in the Parliament or in the President or any other authority. Does it mean that we are divesting ourselves of the powers?

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava :** Both are mentioned, Parliament as well as President.

**Shri Kamath :** Why should it be? We can confer powers on the President. Why should the President arrogate to himself all these powers? That is the point.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava :** Both are there and should be provided.

**Shri Kamath :** It shall be competent for Parliament to confer powers; it is not obligatory.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** The hon. Member may continue to address the Chair.

**Shri Kamath :** Because a senior Member—who is one among the Panel of Chairmen—interrupted, I answered it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** The hon. Member should treat every Member equally.

**Shri Kamath :** I am grateful for the ruling. I shall try to follow it to the best of my ability.

When these articles were debated in the Constituent Assembly, on that day, I had said :

"This is a black day in our history. God save India."

I was taken to task by many of my colleagues on that day for having said that. But now the Home Minister—he was not present in the Constituent Assembly on that day; because of his preoccupations in UP he was not a regular attender of the Constituent Assembly debates—by commending this Resolution to the House, and his predecessors who brought forward similar resolutions on other occasions, have confirmed what I felt on that day. What I said on that day has been vindicated, namely, that these emergency provisions were liable to be abused. And they have been abused.

I will in the end refer to the lack on the part of the ruling party of the spirit of democracy and of the federal spirit, the spirit of tolerance which should animate the Government in this federal Union. If the ruling party insists that throughout all the States of the Indian Union there shall be only one party in power it is in for a sad disappointment in the near future. It is not in tune with the spirit of federal democracy that the party in power at the Centre should be anxious to have its own party in power in the States of the Federal Union. It should develop a spirit of tolerance, a spirit of true democracy, if democracy is to function in our country. (*Interruption*). Co-existence is our policy for export and not for home use or home consumption.

In the end, may I warn the House that we have toyed with this emergency provision too often? The ruling party or the Government has used these powers for its own party interests and not for promoting democracy in this country. It was said by a great American statesman in the last century that "mankind is being crucified on a cross of gold". I am afraid that in our country democracy is being crucified on the cross of the Congress, but I have full faith in my people and I have a certainty that in spite of the crucifixion of democracy by the Congress in this country democracy will resurrect (*An Hon. Member*: Good Friday!) itself by the strength and will of the people of the country. As my friend Shri Asoka Mehta said....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** With resurrection one should stop.

**Shri Kamath :** I would have been happy if it had been resurrection just now (*Interruption*). The Congress Party will not promote democracy in this country unless and until it learns to function for some time, for some years, as

[Shri Kamath]

an opposition party and tolerate, not merely two parties but even more than two parties. Democracy is not necessarily a matter of two parties only. What does it matter if there are 3 or 4 parties? It is not for the Congress Party to suggest what the *modus operandi* of democracy should be in this country. Let them crucify democracy as they will, as they like. But, we will see, the people will see that to it that democracy crucified by them 5 times in the last 5 years, will resurrect and will bear flower and fruit in our country.

**Shri Achuthan :** Deputy Speaker Sir, it was in your State that the ball was first rolled, I mean PEPSU and now, when you are there, in the Chair, I have to speak about the unfortunate incident, in our State. After the President's rule in PEPSU which had its desired effect, next came Andhra. In our State, as was explained by many hon. Members, it has got a different story.

Even from the time of responsible government in Travancore in 1948 till the general elections were there throughout the country, there were 3 ministries. The P.S.P. leader, Pattom Thanu Pillai was the Congress leader then and when the party wanted to change the leadership and votes were taken, he at once left the Congress Party. That is the nature of the particular man, the person who is now the leader of the P.S.P. and then came Shri Narayana Pillai. For some time he carried on the administration and he resigned and Shri Kesavan became the leader of the Congress Party and the situation was going on till 1951 when the general elections took place throughout the country.

After the general elections, there was not a single majority party in our State, even though the Congress had got the majority among the parties. What was to be done? As was stated by every hon. Member, we must see that democracy survives. It is in an infant state there. There were a number of other parties also in our State; it is a peculiar feature of our State. The Congress Party deliberated about that question and finally came to the conclusion that they should try and take up government. We took up government and the T.T.N.C. ~~stayed in the cabinet and the administration~~ went on for some time. Unfortunately, it did not last long. The T.T.N.C. did not remain with us for long and when a vote of confidence was taken we lost it. Then, even Pattom Thanu Pillai and

the leaders of the Communist party wanted the dissolution of the Assembly. The Assembly was dissolved and elections took place. Then, even after the elections in early 1954, the position did not improve. What did the Congress then do? We thought that we should not go in for power; we did not also want power unless we were in a position to carry on the administration in a stable manner for the betterment of the country. Then, we waited. As was stated here, the P.S.P. leader Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai was asked to form the Government. What was the position of the leaders then? For the purpose of election they had an alliance. Shri A. K. Gopalan knows it and even Shri Thanu Pillai expressly stated that he will form the Government with the support of the leftists while the National Executive was deliberating at Madras at that time. Then, from Madras they said: You ought not to form any coalition with the help of the leftists. All the while the Congress waited. It said: We will give you responsive co-operation but mind you are a party of only 15 and we are a party of 45 or 50. Then the Ministry was formed. The Lohia group wanted the resignation of Pattom Thanu Pillai after the firing in South Travancore. Shri Asoka Mehta is here and he will bear me out. But Pattom Thanu Pillai carried on for a year. Then, finally when it came to the question of the existence of the Congress in Travancore-Cochin State by the statement of Shri Thanu Pillai we said we were not going to support that Ministry. We formed the Government and we went on till the 10th March. Of course, Congress has been blamed because of the unkindly attitude, the unprincipled attitude of the six rebel members. But for that this catastrophe would not have happened. But is it peculiar to us alone?

**Shri V. P. Nayar :** What was the reason?

**Shri Achuthan :** Are we going to repeat France here? I say that this is an eye-opener to the political parties as well as the people of Travancore-Cochin State to see what must be done in the next general election. Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai said two days back that an election must be held before April. How can we do that? Supposing we hold the elections before April, what will be the position 6 or 8 months later? Are we prepared to have another general election in a State which wants to see that the Second Five-Year Plan is carried out and many more schemes are put

into operation, to dance to the tunes of the so-called publicmen. That is the question. With all respect, I say, this is the most opportune time for the President to intervene, for the people to raise their heads and to think over it and deliberate over it, to see what party must come into power after the next general elections. I do not say that the Congress must be there. Some purification of the organisation is necessary. The people must realise, the common man must realise, that support should be given in such a way to one of the parties so that the history of France will not be repeated in Travancore-Cochin.

Shri Asoka Mehta was speaking loudly about France. How many days can they carry on? In France in every few months the Ministry is changed. Are we to follow that in Travancore-Cochin? Can Pattom Thanu Pillai with the support he expects to get of 59 members carry on for one week because the S.R.C Report is to be considered? The T.T.N.C. people say that some areas should go to Madras and the Communist party supports it. But, Pattom Thanu Pillai says, at the risk of his life, even committing suicide he won't allow an inch of land of the 4 taluks to go to Madras. How long can there be reconciliation between the Communists and the P.S.P. in the coming Budget session when the States Reorganisation Bill is going to be mainly discussed? I do not understand these things when hon. Members like Shri Gopalan and Shri Asoka Mehta, who speak for the whole of India with their parties behind them, speak in such a silly manner. People there, even school boys ask us this question.

I was in my State during the last 10 days and they were asking me, one after another, how can Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai form a Ministry. What the Rajpramukh has done is the best thing possible. Shri Gopalan was finding fault with the congress party organisation having communalists in it. I do admit that there is that communal feeling there, but what about the Communist Party? We have seen that in the recent Rajya Sabha election, only Nairs have been elected by the Communist Party from Travancore-Cochin and Malabar in the Travancore-Cochin and Madras Assemblies. It is so also in the Lok Sabha. Shri A. K. Gopalan Nambiar and Shri V. P. Nayar are two Nair Members from Kerala. I would not be surprised if at least 5% of the Nairs had supported Communist Party. There was one

Shri N. C. Sekhara Pillai elected after the second year to the Rajya Sabha. Now in the recent election Shri M. N. Govindan Nair and Shri D. Narayanan-Nair have been elected. All three Nairs were elected by the so-called Community Party. I am ashamed at the hewers of wood and drawers of water belonging to other backward communities who say that they are for equality, fraternity and what not. There is a clear case that the Nairs only are chosen for all these high positions. Poor people are being led by these Communist Nairs. In Russia what is done by Stalin is repeated here. The leaders say you keep quiet, follow and we will go on. In the Parliament it seems only Nairs are the mostly fit persons to deliberate on big questions. All the communist Members are simply swallowing what the Nairs say here. Shri A. K. Gopalan Nambair cannot contradict this fact.

I have got one thing to say, that is, about the Adviser. The Adviser has taken his office. Very good. He said that there should be impartiality, straightforwardness, honesty and hard work. I appreciate that. That ought to be so because people have been fed up with these things and everybody says, "Let there be some relief, some solace for the people".

After the integration of the Travancore-Cochin State, there was a lot of misunderstanding and hubbub between the services of the two States. The Cochin people say that their rights, etc., have been lost and the Travancore employees say that their rights and privileges are lost. Please see that justice is done with regard to the services in the integrated Travancore-Cochin State. We get memoranda daily from those people. Moreover, after October 1st, Malabar people are also coming in. Because there is no Assembly, because there is no Cabinet, their interests are less protected. That is the charge that is levelled by them. Nobody is there to look after their interests. When officers are being transferred between Madras and Travancore-Cochin the Centre must take special care to see that no stone is left unturned in the matter of getting all their rights, all their assets and all their proper demands—for the Kerala State.

In the division of assets and liabilities also the Home Ministry should take special attention that the absence of the Cabinet and the Assembly may not make Kerala State weaker or poorer. There is nothing much to grumble about.

[Shri Achuthan]

The Second Five-Year Plan was discussed in the Assembly. The S.R.C. Report has been discussed in the Assembly. The first duty of the Adviser is to see that the Second Five-Year Plan is well implemented. He has taken it in his hand. In a statement to the Press, Shri Rau said that the President's rule, which is necessarily of a temporary character, would give the people of the State respite from politics and will provide an administration, impartial, absolutely above party, above caste and above creed. That is what is expected from the President's rule for at least one year.

**Shri V. P. Nayar :** Why not have it permanently if it is good ?

**Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur) :** Shri Nayar is jealous !

**Shri Achuthan :** In my view it was no use trying to carry on parleys with such members of the Travancore-Cochin Assembly who say that they have 59 now, and may get 61 in a day or two and so on. Actually, if a responsible Rajpramukh has to view these things dispassionately, not even a moment's notice can be given for such vague promises and assurances without getting the support of the members unequivocally and unconditionally. Has any Party said that ? How can any one hope that within one week they could hope to form a Ministry ? Because of the wisdom of the Home Ministry here, because of the wisdom of the Rajpramukh and because of the fact that the people wanted respite from the political rivalries and instability, the President's rule has come in there. Let all political parties rise above their low level, so that after the next elections we may have a stable government. Our view is that the Congress Party will survive and thrive after the elections and will have the majority in the Assembly.

**Shri Velayudhan :** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, . . .

**Shri Anil K. Chanda :** From which bench is he speaking ?

**Shri Velayudhan :** I am speaking from the floor of the House.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** Let the hon. Member make up his mind.

**Shri Velayudhan :** I am sorry to speak on this subject because, as the Members from Travancore-Cochin State and outside have expressed, I am also extremely pained to see that a State like mine

has been taken by the Centre for administration even though it is for a temporary period. I was not much surprised when I heard speeches from some friends from my side but I was really amazed when members like Shri Thomas and Shri Achuthan and others after coming here, tell the House that it is communalism that is the canker and that is responsible for the present state of affairs in Travancore-Cochin.

**Sardar A. S. Saigal :** That is correct.

**Shri Velayudhan :** Of course it is correct ; but who is responsible for the communalism in the Travancore-Cochin State ? The people who are now speaking here loudly against communalism, against the happenings in my State from the Congress side are rank communalists and opportunists and they alone are responsible for what has happened in that State.

I represent 14,00,000 of untouchables in my State, but apart from being a member of a community, I had a little political career and public life in my State and outside. I remember the days when I was a messenger boy to carry letters from one Congress leader to another in my State at Trivandrum. My friends, Shri A. M. Thomas and Shri George Thomas, were no where known at that time. When the State Congress was being suffocated or strangled by the iron hands of an autocratic Dewan and his advisers, where were these gentlemen who adorn Congress Benches now from the T.-C. State. I do not know where they were. When have they taken to Khadi ? It is not even four years since I saw Shri Thomas in very fine foreign silk.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** May I ask the hon. Member to continue his speech without being interrupted ?

**Shri Velayudhan :** I can understand certain things which these people represent, but why should there be this kind of hypocrisy ? Who is going to be deceived by this kind of hypocrisy on the part of the Christians and the Nairs ? They are responsible for the total demoralisation of my people. They are behind the present deadlock. I am here not because of the Christians and the Nairs.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** The hon. Member should not feel disturbed.

**Shri Velayudhan :** I may tell you that people of various shades come here to Delhi and say to others in power or

position that they are not communalists. Shri Thanu Pillai, who was the first Chief Minister of the State at that time, stated that the Christian Communalism was responsible for his fall from position then. He never tolerated the vested interest of the Communal elements in the Congress. He was thrown away because of his stern stand against communalism of the Christians. Everybody admits it and many Christians who work against him there admit it. What is the position today in the Travancore-Cochin State? A. Nair Congress government has come into power.

**An Hon. Member :** How long has the hon. Member been in that Government?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** I assure my hon. friend that if he will face me, he will feel more comfortable.

**Shri Velayudhan :** What has happened thereafter? There was deadlock at every stage of the administration in my State. Shri Govinda Menon, who is a Nair, was manoeuvred into power by the Congress General Secretary, who also is another Nair. The equilibrium has been thus unsettled because of this position effected by two Nairs both in the State and in Delhi. Those people who spoke from here, who shed crocodile tears for the Congress, who stated that they are all against communalism and so on, are bearing in their hearts poison, communal poison, and selfish interest. They feel that by openly supporting the Congress Organisation on the floor of the House, they can curry favours from the Centre. After all it will yield big personal and communal advantages. They were doing the same in our State and that was yielding good fruits. Now they think they can work here for such advantages. I request the Home Minister that by relying on such persons he would be ruining further the Congress organisation in the State. Rank communalism was the order of the day in Travancore-Cochin State where twice Congress came into power. When Shri Thanu Pillai took up the job first I was at Trivandrum at that time. In fact he took me from here in the plane and we went together to Trivandrum. That was three or four days before responsible Government was ushered in Travancore-Cochin State. I could then see how Communal elements were pestering him, threatening him and even making every decision difficult. I am not saying anything about the Proclamation. What I wish to tell here is the result of a series of developments of the past eight years. Is it going to be improved by this

Proclamation? That is what the Treasury Bench should have understood. I warned the House in 1950, 1951, 1952 and 1953; I told the Treasury Bench of the communal elements dominating the political scene in the State. But they did not hear my words. I may say that this Proclamation is not popular in my State; not even the Congress people like it. Some intellectual opportunists and rank communalists are appreciating it—not the people of Travancore-Cochin. Not even ten per cent like it.

**Shri Mathen :** 99 per cent.

**Shri Velayudhan :** You came from Madras State. How do you know the mind of the T.-C. State?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** I will request the hon. Members to listen to the Member with patience; we have to bear with him. The hon. Member also should conclude exactly at 6 and he should see that his time is not wasted.

**Shri Velayudhan :** Shri Thomas was telling that ninety per cent of the people are behind this Proclamation. It is not so. Of course, the people there have the greatest respect for the Prime Minister of India. I know the people of Travancore-Cochin. Shri Thomas comes from a municipality which was dominated by the Christians and all other kinds of reactionaries. What happened in the municipal elections recently there? The Congress was utterly defeated. It is the hometown of the Congress General Secretary Mr. Nair who is said to be behind all the troubles in the State along with his colleagues. What is it so? I told the former Home Minister and the Prime Minister too that the problem of Travancore-Cochin would have to be dealt with in a different way and had told them not to be deceived by the communalists who have joined the Congress who have come here to power ousting their leader. This communalism must be rooted out not by President's rule but by a democratic approach. That is the remedy. If elections took place, I can tell you the Congress is not going to get a majority. We who belong to the left groups will come together. The leftists would form Government after Kerala is formed, if it is formed at all we have got every fear now whether the Kerala State would be formed as the assembly is dissolved.

\* There was no need to dissolve the Assembly. The Government could have left it at that for some time. When Kerala comes into being, you ask them to form a Government. By formation, of

[Shri Velayudhan]

a Left Government in Kerala the whole India would not go out of the Congress control; after all Congress has a great majority in the country. The leftist forces in my State would have done better than the corrupt communalists who belonged to the Congress and who ruled for so many years only to demoralise the people of the State.

People who were once Advocates earning Rs. 300 and Rs. 200 and who used to get money from both parties were in power in the State. Such people have become Chief Ministers. It is said, such a person has got the best building in Ernakulam city today. I am mentioning about the last Chief Minister Mr. Menon. He has built a building which is the best building in Ernakulam.

**Shri A. M. Thomas :** Personal allegations are being made against persons who are not present in this House. Is the hon. Member in order in making such allegations and bringing insinuation into the discussion?

**Shri V. P. Nayar :** Does a statement of fact that a building has been built amount to an allegation?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** There is an insinuation as well; it is not a statement alone.

**Shri Velayudhan :** If there is any insinuation, I withdraw it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** I must say to the hon. Member that the House is in full attention even if he exercises a certain amount of restraint.

**Shri Velayudhan :** Many things about this Chief Minister is being talked in the State. The Central Government also is responsible in a way for encouraging him in his doings. The Food and Agriculture Minister, Shri Jain, knows an affair regarding rice deal in the State. I am not saying these things for propaganda. There were certain other things too in which the Chief Minister was stated to be involved—the last Chief Minister of Travancore-Cochin Mr. Govinda Menon. This was about 5½ lakh rupees for a coconut oil deal.

**An Hon. Member :** It was rice.

**Shri Velayudhan :** That is another one I mentioned earlier. A writ came to the High Court and it was later on withdrawn through the persuasion of the Chief Minister. There were certain allegations from the Congress Party itself about Mr. Menon. Communalism was being practised by the Congress and it was Congress that was responsible for

it. That responsibility has devolved on the Centre's shoulders now. I am not much in favour of parliamentary democracy. I have not got much interest in parliamentary democracy. That is my personal belief; it may not be suitable for India.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** As the hon. Member has taken the oath to work it, he cannot say so now. (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Velayudhan :** If an opportunity is given, I would have wrecked it. Unfortunately, I am an humble being in India today. I wish that the hon. Home Minister should understand this kind of playing by rank communalists who are trying to get some job or the other for this or that man and for them too. That is the position today.

What is the remedy? A Ministry would not have done anything wrong if it was there installed. The Centre has control over it. According to the Constitution, it can exercise every control over mal-administration, or good administration, of a state. Even if Thanu Pillai was in power, the Centre could have put a watch over the state. He was perhaps the best Chief Minister we had.

Why are we against the Congress as a whole in that State? We were fighting for freedom, not like the Indian National Congress outside; we were fighting against the autocracy of a big giant, Dr. C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyer, who was supported by some of the topmost Congress leaders outside the State then. We suffered from that. That is why there is basic hostility towards Congress leadership in that State and Congress alone is responsible for that. It is the communalism of the Congress outside the State that was responsible for the softness exercised by the Congress on Shri C. P. R. Ayar who put thousands of our people in the jails and lockups.

If you want democracy in any form to function in Travancore-Cochin the Home Minister and others will have to understand the basic factors of the conflicts in my State. So far as the Proclamation is concerned I say again that it is thoroughly unpopular and as far as my people are concerned, they will never allow it to function and they will not give any place to Congress to repeat it.

6 P.M.

✓ **Pandit G. B. Pant :** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, as it is the first occasion when I had the opportunity of speaking while you are occupying the Chair you will

permit me to offer you my congratulations on your elevation to this eminent office. Your conduct of the proceedings as Chairman had marked you out for this position and that really guarantees that the business of the House under you will maintain the best traditions that our House have been able to or is likely to build for the future.

Sir, a number of speeches have been made on this Resolution. I am glad to find that, but for the last speaker, everyone who had the occasion to speak on this Resolution from Travancore-Cochin has supported it. Not only have the Members supported the Resolution but some of them have also declared solemnly that in their view 90 per cent. at least of the people of Travancore-Cochin have welcomed this Proclamation and will be glad to make the regime, that is now being ushered in, in every way successful and prosperous. I am thankful to them and I hope the authorities there will be looking to them for co-operation and assistance.

I must make one point clear. Whether it be politics or whether it be democracy, we all have to discharge one supreme duty and that is to see that the common man gets his due and that nobody is made the foot-ball or plaything of political intrigue or insatiable ambitions. So, whatever we do we have to bear in mind the interests and needs of the people and to see that they are served. We will not be swerved from that path by any other consideration.

The Leader of the Communist Party spoke of conspiracy when he started his speech. He was perhaps in his elements. He is better qualified to speak about conspiratorial and underground methods than I can claim to be, but in this case he seems to have over-shot the mark. It was preposterous to connect the Proclamation with the developments that will take place in the month of October. Is it really suggested that the six members of the Congress Party resigned from the Party in order to create a crisis and in order to enable the Rajpramukh to invite the Leader of the Communist Party in Travancore-Cochin and then of the Socialist Party, to keep the offer open for 10 or 12 days only to find that at the end of all the efforts he had no way out but to make this recommendation? Is it really suggested that all this was done with a view to preclude the possibility of the Communists getting any foothold in the month of October in the newly formed Kerala State? Nothing could be more fantastic and nothing could be more imaginary.

**Shri V. P. Nayar :** And nothing could be more real.

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** I did not hear the last word. I think even Shri Gopalan in his sober moments outside this House will realise that this argument does not quite befit him.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

We were told that the attempt of the Congress Party has been to maintain itself in power. I was really somewhat perplexed when this statement came from Shri Asoka Mehta. He spoke with full-throated vehemence and he used all suave expressions like 'piracy', 'partisan-ship' and so on. I was for a moment almost unnerved. But then I found that he keeps his windows open or he does not mind the use of harsh expressions in this House. Last year he himself said—he had made the remark about Communists—that he had no desire to put power deliberately and wantonly into the hands of the hangmen of democracy. He had made it clear that according to him the Communists were hangmen of democracy and he would not deliberately and wantonly put power into their hands. Well, since then he has relented.

**Shri Asoka Mehta :** No, they have changed according to the Leader of the House.

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** Well, anyway he has taken them on their own professions....

**Shri Asoka Mehta :** On the advice of the Prime Minister.

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** And he has no doubts about what they say. At least there is hope for us too; that is what I feel. Then you must change in order that you may win his trust. If you stick to your principles, then he would not like you.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan :** The Communists were not there. It was the P.S.P. that was forming the Ministry, the Communists were supporting them.

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** It was a marriage which neither party is prepared to confess and proclaim they would enter.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan :** Like the marriage of the Congress and T.T.N.C.

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** Whatever it be, in this particular case neither the P.S.P. nor the Communists seem to be enthusiastic about the alliance which they were hatching and which did not materialise.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan :** We took a lesson from the Congress and T.T.N.C.

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** You will have many more lessons hereafter. I see that the process of conversion is proceeding very satisfactorily and speedily. I hold testimony to that and a day may come when you may shed all your prejudices and join the Congress in all sincerity.

**An Hon. Member :** Never.

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** I am prepared to concede all that. But Shri Asoka Mehta used his expressions and I am really surprised that after what he had said about Communists he should have now been shocked to such an extent as to charge the Government here of partisanship because the Communists, the P.S.P. and a few others could not combine together to form a hotch-potch Cabinet in Travancore-Cochin. I was really amazed that after all that he had said, this should have emanated from him.

Then, he talked of principles. I regard him as a man of virtue. I trust him. But, I am reminded of the fact that the P.S.P. had in its policy statement, which was adopted with a fanfare of trumpets, with great solemnity and seriousness, said that they would not accept office in any State except when they were in a majority. In any case, it was unthinkable that they would accept office when they were not the biggest group in any State. That was their declaration made by the executive of the party after due deliberation which remains unamended to this day. Now, to charge the Congress with partisanship and to say that we are influenced by considerations of expediency or otherwise, though nothing that we have done can be said to be inconsistent with our declared policy and programme for the welfare and well-being of the people and the P.S.P. in Travancore-Cochin was departing from and altogether defying the basic principles laid down by the national executive of the party, looks somewhat curious.

Then, Shri Asoka Mehta said that he wished that we had some taste of the opposition. He does not know that we who are here have served our period of probation much longer. I wish he had an opportunity of sitting in the Government Benches. Then he would realise how glibly people talk in the opposition and attribute motives to the Government and are unable to appreciate the very virtuous approach of the Government, even if it is actuated by the best of motives and the highest standards of integrity and morality.

**Acharya Kripalani :** The lady protests too much.

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** That would give him some idea or some measure of all this. When he will have that opportunity, I do not know. But, I hope that when it comes, he will be chastened by his experience.

So far as the real issue in controversy is concerned, it is a very simple one. It has been suggested that the Congress Party has been guided by its own Party considerations in adopting this attitude towards the various developments that have taken place in Travancore-Cochin. We were told that we are here only to boost our party and to suppress everybody else. But, Shri Asoka Mehta forgot that although he had in Travancore-Cochin a following of not more than 19 members, and although the strength of the Congress stood at 50, we allowed the P.S.P. to form the Ministry, to have all Ministers from their own party.

**Shri Kamath :** You could not form one.

**Shri A. M. Thomas :** And the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker also from that party.

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** We supported them and we gave them our unstinted co-operation for a full year. Does that indicate that we tried to intrude upon other people's preserves? Does that in any way suggest that we care only for the Congress Party? Is it not proof positive and conclusive of the fact that we try to avoid any developments which may result in enforcement or imposition of President's rule, and go to the extent of helping those who, judged by any democratic standards, would not be entitled even to be regarded as a party in a particular State? With all these facts before us, to charge us with some sort of partisanship is, to say the least, uncharitable.

We might look at the position in Travancore-Cochin. At the time when Shri Govinda Menon resigned, the Congress Party, including the T.T.N.C., had 54 members. The members who had resigned from the Congress party were 6. The Communist Party had 27, P.S.P. 15, Revolutionary Socialist Party 9, Kerala Socialist Party 3, Independents 3. Now, a party which had a strength of about 50, retired because it had ceased to have an absolute majority. Then, we are told that the strength of the Congress at that time was only 56 and they had a strength of 60. But, hon. Members forgot that there is a difference between a solid party of 56 and a hotch-potch gang

consisting of 5 to 10 parties with 3 or 8 or 10 from each. Why did not these parties combine together and form a united bloc? When the Congress was running the Government? Obviously it was because their principles differed, they could not join hands even in opposition. How could it then be expected that the parties which could not join in the matter of opposition, could work together with such a slender strength as 57? It may have grown up to 58 or 59. But, that shows what was the process and how these things were being managed and manoeuvred. No strength on the 20th; unable to give names even of 50; then, somehow, whether by coaxing or by other methods, you won over one man—just won over to the extent of obtaining his signature; then you go and win over one in the midnight and so on and so forth. Then, you talk of piracy, kidnapping, absconding and what not, when this process of progressive piracy continues. Then I say that it cannot be trusted because it has an element of piracy about it. So, when we deal with the affairs of millions of people, we cannot allow them to be made a victim of the idiosyncracies of a few individuals who have set their eye on a high office. The interests of the people must be regarded as supreme and must have priority over everything else.

I remember,—I am reminded rather of what the leader of the P.S.P in Andhra said at the time when the Congress Party in Andhra was defeated by one vote over the motion on the Ramamurthy report. At that time, in Andhra too there were parties like this. Just as we have 6 or 7 in Kerala, so they were in Andhra. The leader of the P.S.P. then said as follows:

"The alternative is either a successor government or a re-election. A successor government cannot improve the stability of political life in Andhra. To bring conditions of peace and harmony in the political life of Andhra, heterogeneous political groups and elements should be eliminated and this has been long overdue. Good administration is one of the needs of a State and any attempt to form a Government with hotch-potch majorities should be discouraged."

This is from the horse's own mouth; I am only repeating.

**Shri Asoka Mehta:** The horse has run away from the stable.

**Pandit G. B. Pant:** So, when you quote from those who can be treated as authority by your adversary, then I think

5—32 L.S.

you cannot be said to be on slippery ground.

Then, some references were made to the Constitution, and it was said that the Congress Party is determined to throttle democracy. Well, Shri Kamath dreams even during the day time, but I would like to enquire who was responsible for this Constitution, who framed it, who made this provision.

**Shri Kamath:** You and I.

**Pandit G. B. Pant:** Both of us.

**Shri Kamath:** You have forgotten it.

**Pandit G. B. Pant:** Then, I would like you not to misunderstand it or misconstrue it now, as you were one of the authors. (*Shri Kamath:* You should not misuse it.) Obviously when this Constitution was framed this proposition was definitely laid down as we had a number of States in our country. The stages of development varied from State to State. There might be some difficult occasions, emergencies and so on due to political or administrative reasons, and it was necessary to make provision to meet such difficulties. In order to face such emergencies this provision was made in article 356. We were told that it is only when people are fighting in the streets, houses are burnt and there is no order and tranquillity anywhere and everything has gone to pieces, it is only then that we can make use of this provision in the Constitution. We want to make provision so that such a contingency may never arise, so that such disasters may never follow. So, it becomes necessary to make use of it whenever there is a constitutional break-down.

Now, my friends say 57 is an adequate number. Fifty-seven so far as arithmetic goes, is less than half of 118. Half of 118 is 59. So 57 cannot out-vote 61, but leaving that alone, if this number were even below 57, suppose it was only 50 then what would have been the remedy? What would the hon. Members expect the Government to do?

**Shri Kamath:** Hypothetical.

**Pandit G. B. Pant:** Hypothetical it is. I would like you to consider hypothetical cases and to detach your mind from realities which are altogether imaginary.

Shri Kamath says that so far as S.R.C. goes I had misled the House when I said that the Communists and the P.S.P. had different views about vital matters affecting Travancore-Cochin State. He as a constitutional pandit who was in the Constituent Assembly tells us that there

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

can be no voting on these matters, that no such proposition can be placed before the House.

**Shri Kamath** : Not for a vote of confidence. Article 3 is there.

**Pandit G. B. Pant** : I think I will have to re-read my elementary politics under you before I can swallow that lesson. That is something which is altogether, I would not say ridiculous, but preposterous.

**Shri Kamath** : Let us sit down together.

**Pandit G. B. Pant** : Then we were told that we had thrust all this upon Travancore-Cochin, but is it a reality? Is that true? The Rajpramukh of Travancore-Cochin called the Communist Party. We had no prejudice against any one. To say we wanted to keep the Communists out is not consistent with the approach of the Rajpramukh to the Communist Party. They declared their inability to form the Government. The Communist Party was in a majority. As compared with the P.S.P. their numbers were almost double. Still, they could not form the majority. Well, if the P.S.P. had supported the Communists, I think the Communists would have the same stand—whether the Communists had supported the P.S.P. or the P.S.P. had supported the Communists. One cannot understand the difference between communists being unable to form the Government—the P.S.P. being supported by communists, but communists themselves being not supported by P.S.P. What sort of alliance is that, and how can one rely or depend upon that? That by itself shows that there are certain reservations.

**Shri Kamath** : You are supported by the T.T.N.C.

**Pandit G. B. Pant** : The T.T.N.C. would help you, but you were not there, you were in C.P. If you had been in Travancore-Cochin things would have been much easier.

So I say that the fact remains that the communists had not the support of the P.S.P. and the P.S.P. would not really offer their support. The main grievance of the communist party is not that the new Cabinet has not been formed, but they say that sometime in October their forces would gather fresh strength that they would be able to overshadow others. I do not know how they would have done it, because their number is

said to be only 8 out of 34. If 8 out of 34 are added then their ratio does not increase. Still their numbers relatively do not seem to be much different, then they are today. So, how could this conspiracy be hatched in order to anticipate and forestall all this? I think there they are labouring under a misapprehension, because their minds are scattered on matters concerning themselves and they do not care to take a wider view of things.

Sir, the Rajpramukh failed to find anyone whom he could appoint as the Chief Minister for ten or twelve days. He gave ample time. People went about in motor cars, I think at the speed of 80 or 90 or hundred miles during day and during night, but still they could not show on paper sufficient number at least till the 21st, on the day the report was submitted. So, the Rajpramukh having failed to find anybody who could bear the burden of running the Government, reported to the President and we here who owe a responsibility to this House and also to the people outside considered it our duty to make some arrangement which would enable the people of Travancore-Cochin to enjoy the amenities and the benefits of democratic rule. I think, so far as that effort goes, it should carry the goodwill and support of everyone. Let us all devote our energies to the betterment of the people of Travancore-Cochin and make the new regime a success.

**The Minister of Legal Affairs (Shri Pataskar)** : Sir, I beg to move :

In the Resolution moved by the Home Minister—

*for "assuming to himself all the functions of the Government of" substitute "in relation to the State of".*

The Resolution relates to our approving the proclamation. The Resolution mentions "assuming to himself all the functions of the Government of Travancore-Cochin. As a matter of fact, the Proclamation is concerned not only with the assuming of functions of Government, but also with respect to delegating the powers of the legislature to this House and certain incidental provisions. I think the best course would be to omit the words "assuming to himself all the functions of the Government of" and in their place substitute "in relation to the State of". That will make matters simple and clear.

**Mr. Speaker :** The question is :

In the Resolution moved by the Home Minister—

for "assuming to himself all the functions of the Government of" substitute "in relation to the State of".

*The Motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Speaker :** I will put the other amendments moved by hon. Members and then put the Resolution, as amended, to the vote of the House. Does any hon. Member want any of his amendments to be put to vote ?

**Shri Kamath :** Yes.

**Mr. Speaker :** The question is :

That in the Resolution, for "approves" substitute "regrets".

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Speaker :** Now No. 5.

**Shri A. M. Thomas :** I do not press my amendment in view of the amendment moved by the Minister of Legal Affairs and beg to withdraw it.

**Mr. Speaker :** Then there is one amendment in the name of Shri Velayudhan. Does the hon. Member want to press it ?

#### Division No. 1]

Achuthan, Shri  
Ajit Singh, Shri  
Akarpuri, Sardar  
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha  
Balmiki, Shri  
Bhagat, Shri B. R.  
Bharati, Shri G. S.  
Borkar, Shrimati Anusayabai  
Borooh, Shri  
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri  
Chanda, Shri Anil K.  
Chatterjee, Dr. Susilranjan  
Damodaran, Shri Nettur P.  
Das, Shri K. K.  
Das, Shri N. T.  
Datar, Shri  
Deb, Shri S. C.  
Deshmukh, Dr. P. S.  
Deshmukh, Shri C. D.  
Dhulckar, Shri  
Diwan, Shri R. S.  
Dube, Shri Mulchand  
Dutta, Shri, S. K.  
Dwivedi, Shri M. L.  
Eacharan, Shri I.  
Gandhi, Shri Feroze  
Ganga Devi, Shrimati  
Gownder, Shri. K. P.  
Guha, Shri A. C.  
Iyyunni, Shri C. R.  
Jagjivan Ram, Shri  
Jain, Shri A. P.  
Jangde, Shri

Jena, Shri Niranjan  
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra  
Kajrolkar, Shri  
Karmarkar, Shri  
Kaulwal, Shri  
Keshavaingar, Shri  
Khan, Shri Sadath Ali  
Khongmen, Shrimati  
Kirolikar, Shri  
Kottukappally, Shri  
Krishna Chandra, Shri  
Krishnamachari, Shri T. T.  
Krishnappa, Shri M. V.  
Kurreel, Shri B. N.  
Lallanji, Shri  
Malaviya, Shri K. D.  
Malviya, Pandit C. N.  
Mathew, Shri  
Matthen, Shri  
Mishra, Shri L. N.  
Morarka, Shri  
More, Shri K. J.  
Muhammed Shaffe, Chaudhuri  
Mukne, Shri Y. M.  
Musafir, Giani, G. S.  
Naskar, Shri P. S.  
Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal  
Nijalingappa, Shri  
Palchoudhury, Shrimati Ita  
Patakar, Shri  
Patel, Shri Rajeshwar  
Pawar, Shri V. P.  
Pillai, Shri Thanu

**Shri Velayudhan :** Yes.

**Mr. Speaker :** The question is :

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added :

"and resolves that the Proclamation shall be revoked before the 30th April, 1956, and Parliamentary Government restored in the State."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Speaker :** Then, there is Shri A. M. Thomas's amendment. No. 7. Has hon. Member leave of the House to withdraw his amendments Nos. 5 and 7 ?

*The amendments were by leave withdrawn.*

**Mr. Speaker :** I shall now put the Resolution as amended to vote. The question is :

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 23rd March, 1956, under Article 356 of the Constitution, in relation to the State of Travancore-Cochin."

*The Lok Sabha divided : Ayes, 100 : Noes, 25.*

#### AYES

[6-35 P.M.]

Prabhakar, Shri Naval  
Raghunath Singh, Shri  
Raj Bahadur, Shri  
Ram Das, Shri  
Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.  
Ranbir Singh, Ch.  
Rane, Shri  
Rao, Shri P. Subba  
Roy, Shri Bishwa Nath  
Sahu, Shri Rameshwar  
Saigal, Sardar A. S.  
Sakena, Shri Mohanlal  
Samanta, Shri S. C.  
Sanganna, Shri  
Satish Chandra, Shri  
Sen, Shrimati Sushama  
Sharma, Pandit K. C.  
Shivananjappa, Shri  
Shukla, Pandit B.  
Siddananjappa, Shri  
Singh, Shri L. Jogeswar  
Sinha, Dr. S. N.  
Sinha, Shri Jhulan  
Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan  
Snatak, Shri  
Subrahmanyam, Shri T.  
Suresh Chandra, Dr.  
Tewari, Sardar R. B. S.  
Thomas, Shri A. M.  
Tyagi, Shri  
Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Dutt  
Vaishnav, Shri H. G.  
Vyas, Shri Radhelal  
Wodeyar, Shri

**NOES**

Amjad Ali, Shri	Gopalan, Shri A. K.	Mushar, Shri
Basu, Shri K.K.	Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.	Nayar, Shri V. P.
Biren Dutt, Shri	Kamath, Shri	Raghavachari, Shri
Chakravartty, Shrimati Renu	Kriplani, Acharya	Reddy, Shri R. N.
Chatterjee, Shri N. C.	Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta	Rishang Keishing, Shri
Chowdary, Shri C. R.	Mchta, Shri Asoka	Singh, Shri R. N.
Chowdhury Shri N. B.	Mishra, Pandit S. C.	Swami, Shri Sivamurthi
Dasaratha Deb, Shri	More, Shri S. S.	Velayudhan, Shri
		Verma Shri Ramji.

**\*DEMANDS FOR GRANTS ON ACCOUNT—TRAVANCORE-COCHIN**

**Mr. Speaker :** So far as the Demands for Grants on Account are concerned, I will put them to vote.

The question is :

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the Order Paper in respect of Demands Nos. I to XLII be granted to the President on account out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Travancore-Cochin to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of the corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof."

*The motion was adopted.*

[*The motions for Demands for Grants—Travancore-Cochin that were adopted by the Lok Sabha are reproduced below :—Ed.*]

**DEMAND NO. I—AGRICULTURAL INCOME TAX AND SALES TAX**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,35,000 be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Travancore-Cochin, on account, for or towards defraying the charges during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Agricultural Income-Tax and Sales-Tax'."

**DEMAND NO. II—LAND REVENUE**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,87,000 be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Travancore-Cochin, on account, for or towards defraying the charges during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Land Revenue'."

*The motion was adopted.*

**DEMAND NO. III—EXCISE**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,36,000 be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Travancore-Cochin, on account, for or towards defraying the charges during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Excise'."

**DEMAND NO. IV—STAMPS**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 70,000 be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Travancore-Cochin, on account, for or towards defraying the charges during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Stamps'."

**DEMAND NO. V—FOREST**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 23,52,000 be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Travancore-Cochin, on account, for or towards defraying the charges during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Forests'."

**DEMAND NO. VI—REGISTRATION**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,68,000 be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Travancore-Cochin, on account, for or towards defraying the charges during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Registration'."

**DEMAND NO. VII—MOTOR VEHICLES ACTS**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,76,000 be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Travancore-Cochin, on account, for or towards defraying the charges during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Motor Vehicles Acts'."

\*Moved with the recommendation of the President.