[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—CHANGE IN THE DATE FOR RECEIPT OF CUT MOTIONS ON THE BUDGET.

MR. SPEAKER :—" In modification of the announcement made by me on the 27th June 1952, I have to inform hon. Members that the time for receipt of notices of Cut Motions is extended from the 3rd to the 8th July 1952 as His Excellency the Governor has changed the dates for the general discussion of the Budget for 1952–53."

IV.—GOVERNMENT MOTION *RE* VOTE OF CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS—*cont.*

* SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, for the last three days we have been hearing mostly the voices of the Opposition and I had expected, probably wrongly, that the other side also would come forward with their arguments why this Motion has been brought forward at this stage of the proceedings of the House. Even though our Hon. Chief Minister had told us that freedom had been given to his party Members to vote according to their conscience or as the god or gods seated in their hearts told them to do, I find that freedom of lifting their hands only has been given to them and not the freedom of opening their mouths. And that is the reason, Sir, why we find that the only two or three Members who came forward to support the Motion have not been from the Government benches, but from other benches somewhere in the centre of this Hall. The arguments that have been advanced by those who wanted to support the Motion have been peculiar enough and not very much concerned with what the Hon. the Chief Minister has stated in his own statement. They were much more particular of attacking a section of the Opposition, and because they wanted to attack this section of the Opposition, they thought they should vote for the Congress Government whatever might be its policies or its actions or its principles. So, it has happened that the very first hon. Member who spoke in support of the Motion has been Mr. Muthiah Chettiar, a very, very important personage, of course, in this State, who has been very much trying to see, from the date the elections were over, to get, in whatever way possible, the Congress into power. I am not surprised and certainly the Opposition is not surprised at the vehement way in which he supported the Motion, because he knows that his interests and the interests of his class can be protected only by the Government that is now sitting on the Treasury Benches and certainly not by a Government that would come into power if the Opposition is given a chance. Therefore, Sir, that kind of support is a welcome sign so far as we and the people are concerned and I wish many more Members of that type would come forward and speak out what is in their hearts so that people will know as to who stands where.

" So far as the Muslim League's support to the Motion is concerned, it is another welcome sign. The Muslim League thinks that the Congress Ministry is to be supported because it believes

in God. It is wishful thinking or a fear without any foundation, that revolutions are going to take place in all the countries where the Communists and their friends are ruling; and the Muslim League Member therefore thinks that the Communists should not come to power here. He can go on with such arguments and I have no objection. But I would like to remind the hon. Member that God as he thinks, and the people as he thinks, are moving in a different direction, in a direction opposite to that in which he is trying to move. At this stage, I would like to remind all those people who have begun talking of God unnecessarily, in season and out of season, that they are trying their utmost to make the people grope in the dark and not see the realities. In this connection, I may be permitted to read a few stanzas written by our great poet Tagore :

Leave this chanting and singing and telling of beads !
Whom dost thou worship in his lonely dark corner of a temple with doors all shut ?
Open thine eyes and see thy God is not before thee ?
He is there where the tiller is tilling the hard ground and where the path-maker is breaking stones.
He is with them in sun and in shower, and His garment is covered with dust.
Put off thy holy mantle and even like Him come down on the dusty soil !
Deliverance ?
Where is this deliverance to be found ?
Our Master himself has joyfully taken upon Him the bonds of creation ;
He is bound with us all for ever.
Come out of thy meditations and leave aside thy flowers and incense !
What harm is there if thy clothes become tattered and stained ?
Meet Him and stand by Him in toil and in sweat of thy brow.

Sir, that is where we stand in relation to the people and God. I would request them not to go on trying to deceive the people in the name of God by telling them 'Everything will be done by God; I will not be able to do anything; God will help you.' It is not going to bring us any success. Therefore, Sir, the Muslim Leaguers can go on supporting this Government and the people will give them proper reply when they go back to them again.

" Then, Sir, why is it that the Opposition to-day is opposing this Motion? That is a very important factor. We have been told that Sri Rajagopalachari has come forward with this Motion at a time when he has already taken certain decisions and when he is going to take more decisions in future. But we feel he wants to have dictatorial powers in his hands so that he can act as he likes and he can go on with his administration as he thinks fit. It is not a question as to what the people think. It is a question as to what he thinks. He thinks that he has got an absolute majority in this House. What are the circumstances under which he has got the majority? Where do we stand in relation to the people? What is the socio-economic position of our people to-day in our State? You know, Sir, that there is famine in our State. You know, Sir, that unemployment is the biggest cancer in the body politic of our society. As a matter of fact, the Members of the Legislative Assembly have the experience of a number of unemployed people meeting and telling them that they are hungry and that they have not taken meals for the last three or four days. They are all educated people, more educated than most of us. There is

no work for them. At this stage the Government have brought forward their budget in which, of course, there is no programme or plan to provide employment for these people. On the other hand, they have brought in additional taxation proposals to break the people's backs which are already burdened with a top heavy administration, and they may in fact die due to the strain. And the Government think that with this Motion of confidence before the Budget discussion is started, they can get the Budget easily passed and they can even bring fresh taxation proposals.

" Sir, the Hon. Sri Rajagopalachari has told us that Aruppukottai has been an eye-opener to him. I would tell him that, if he goes and sees properly, of course with the idea of seeing, he will find that it is not Aruppukottai alone, but even Coimbatore should be an eye-opener to him, because in Coimbatore where the Congress had won without opposition previously, now after Sri Rajagopalachari had announced his policy of decontrol, the Opposition got 52,000 votes. 11 a.m.

" Coming to the Aruppukkottai bye-election what is it that we find? Mr. Rajagopalachari has come out with an apology as to why he need not take the Aruppukkottai bye-election very seriously. Because according to him only 40 per cent of the voters in that area actually went to the polls and the vast majority of the people have not exercised their franchise, he now comes to us saying: " I need not go to the people again. I only want a vote of confidence from this House to carry on the administration." I would like to tell the Chief Minister that even though only 40 per cent of the voters in Aruppukkottai went to the polls the percentage of votes polled by the Opposition was greater than what they polled previously. This should be an indication to the Chief Minister that the vast majority of the people of this State are in opposition to the Government of which the Hon. Chief Minister is the head. Their opposition is much stronger than what it was at the time of the general elections.

" The same is the case with the Kakinada bye-election. Mr. Rajagopalachariar has told us at the last Assembly session that the main opposition consisted only of the Communists. We have seen in Kakinada that the independent candidate supported by the Congress and all the other parties was defeated. To their utter disappointment and most astonishingly enough the Communist candidate was declared elected by a majority. The people there have given a decisive verdict. It virtually amounts to this, viz., ' The Congress has no place to carry on the Government.'

" I can say to the Hon. Chief Minister that even in Coimbatore, in spite of the fact that the Congress did win the contest, the votes polled by the Opposition had considerably increased. Let me leave it at that.

" Mr. Rajagopalachariar being a man of morals and scruples should take a lesson from the result of these three bye-elections. He asked during the last Assembly session whether anyone of us belonging to the Opposition would be prepared to resign his seat for him to contest that seat. Let me tell him on the floor of this

House this very day that I am prepared to vacate my seat. We the Communists are ready to resign any seat that the Hon. the Chief Minister wants us to resign to enable him to contest that seat. I can give an assurance to this House that we will definitely and decisively come out successful in the elections. Not only that, we are definite that the number of votes that we polled during the last general elections would be outnumbered and that we will get a thumping majority. We will give the Hon. the Chief Minister a decisive answer that he need not be the only man to rule and preserve law and order, but that there are better men who will work for the poorer classes and the humbled and starved masses.

" All these things go to show that we should vote against this Resolution. Let us for a moment see what this Ministry has done ever since it came to office. I have told the Chief Minister during our last session that this Ministry, so long as it goes on keeping the society as it exists at present and is not prepared to introduce fundamental changes in the existing structure, it can never be a stable one. What is the manner in which the Government are functioning? During our first session we found the police vigilance at its top. That was the beginning and a beginning well-done. What is the state of affairs at present? Under section 41 of the Police Act some other order in a different form has been issued; the object is stated to be to preserve public safety at the time the Assembly is meeting. Hence I say that this Government headed by Mr. Rajagopalachariar is a Government of the police force. When a Government does not give opportunities for the public to come to their representatives in the Assembly and represent their grievances, can we say that it is a Government for the good of the people?

" I shall cite an instance. Immediately after the last Assembly sittings, I and Mr. Venkateswarlu went to the Chief Minister's house. We were surprised to find that at the gates we were stopped by the police and asked not to go in. I told the policeman that I had a right to see the Chief Minister. I straightaway began to proceed. The policeman came running after me saying: 'Please do not go in. Otherwise I would be taken to task later.' I told him that inasmuch as the Chief Minister had given us permission to meet him I had a right to go to the Private Secretary and ask whether the Chief Minister was present and whether I could meet him. I ask, is this the way in which the Chief Minister receives the representatives of the people with a police-raj in the background.

" Let me narrate another instance. Fortunately or unfortunately I happened to travel by the same train by which Mr. Rajagopalachari was to proceed to Anantapur. To my utter surprise I found that the whole of Central Station was surrounded by policemen and officials of the C.I.D. The crowd was so much that I was led to think, 'Oh ! in this country there seems to be only policemen all round.' "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" There were only very few police officials."

3rd July 1952]

* SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Apart from the crowd at the Central Station, to my utter surprise I found that at each station two policemen would go in and come out of the compartment to see that the Hon. the Chief Minister was safe. The action of the policemen was as though there was a big revolution going on in that part of the State. Perhaps the Hon. Chief Minister thought that anyone among the people would spring up and shoot him. I am sorry to note that Mr. Rajagopalachari should have made his tour of Anantapur in a ' frenzy of fear.' I venture to submit that there are Communists in every nook and corner of this land who are being driven and tortured by the police under the dictates of this Government. When I alighted at Anantapur, for the first time after I had become a political figure, to my utter surprise I found that that small town which had never seen such a huge array of policemen was besieged by constables. I would ask the Hon. the Chief Minister whether ours is a Welfare State or a Police State? How is it that our Chief Minister finds the company of policemen more pleasing than that of the ordinary men for whom he says he is ruling this State? I am not going to talk on the Budget proposals but am going to touch only upon simple facts, as things are happening at the present moment under the leadership of Sri C. Rajagopalachari.

" Seeing these police activities I can only say that this State is being turned into a pucca Police State, much worse than what it was under the previous Congress Ministry. Our Chief Minister is a clever and tactful man. That is why he has been called a Chanakya. He is working cautiously. He only knows where he is taking the administration of this State. I appeal even to those sitting on the opposite benches to vote against the Resolution. The Leader of the Congress Party has appealed to one and all to vote according to their conscience and as the gods in their hearts would direct them. Let them vote against this Police State. Let them vote against this Government which bamboozles the innocent people by police force. Let the Ministers who are the representatives of the public at large realize this.

" There is another reason why I oppose this Motion. Mr. Rajagopalachari came to power with the intention of establishing unity in his ranks. Unfortunately for him and his followers, in spite of the fact that he did succeed to some extent in maintaining unity, he had been only partially successful. If he pursues his present programmes and policies and alienates the sympathies of the people he will soon find that his own ranks would not follow him.

" Coming to the policies of Government, what is it we find with regard to irrigation? I would ask the Members sitting on the other side whether they approve of the programmes of Mr. Rajagopalachari. Even though the Technical Committee has not yet submitted its report our Chief Minister has come forward to say that this State is ready to take up the Krishna-Pennar Project. I do not see any reason for the hurry. It has been reported in the papers yesterday that the Central Minister for Planning

Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda has said that the Madras Government is really pressing for the implementation of the Krishna-Pennar Project. I would request the Hon. the Chief Minister to go through yesterday's issue of 'Andhra Patrika.' The Technical Committee headed by Mr. Khosla has not published its findings. When such is the case, the Chief Minister has come forward with a statement that the State is ready to undertake the Krishna-Pennar Project. This is a move to disrupt the unity of the people of Andhra and striking their political death-knell. Besides all these, he has now come forward with this Motion asking the House to place confidence in him and allow him to rule over the people. This is just like the story of the monkey and the cats. This sort of blackmail cannot go on for long.

" Speaking in a place in Andhradesa the Chief Minister is reported to have asked the people not to tell lies. He would ask the Chief Minister what he meant by that statement. Does it mean that Mr. Rajagopalachari is the only 'Satya Harischandra' of this Kaliyuga? Why should he dictate to the people to speak truth? Our Chief Minister is never tired of asking people to be morally good. But I can say that this Government which talks of morals only to cover its unscrupulous acts is neither moral nor can it be called by any other analogous term.

" During our last session many of us belonging to the Opposition were very critical of the manner in which the Government were giving relief to the famine-stricken people of Rayalaseema. We told the Hon. the Chief Minister definitely and decisively that the contractors were swallowing up the whole of the money spent, at the expense of the famine-stricken masses. Even the PTI gave a report to that effect. What was the answer of the Chief Minister? 'I do not believe in exaggerated reports' was his remark. Then came out the truth from his own ranks, through Sri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi and Sri P. Ranga Reddi. Now who was speaking the truth? Who has been exaggerating? Were we uttering falsehoods? It is for the people to decide. In the name of maintaining morals and the like the Government are threatening the people so that their voices could not be heard. No doubt Mr. Rajagopalachari is a great moralist. He has a very kind heart no doubt, which never melts!

11-15 a.m. " Where people are suffering and the fact is taken to his notice, he never gives an answer, even the answer of the bureaucrat that he would consider it, the common answer of the white bureaucrat that he would go into it. It means as though telling this House that the people who speak of the sufferings and grievances of the people outside, the common man, are all liars and that he is the only truthful man. If that is the manner and the method of his administration, how is he I ask, Sir, going to unite this country. I say, Sir, that he is not going to unite this State; and for the sake of the unity of the State, for the sake of the different classes of people in the State and for the sake of peace and order in the State, I would request hon. Members with a clear conscience to vote against this Resolution and get rid of this Ministry.

3rd July 1952] [Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

" The Hon. Sri Rajagopalachari has been telling us very often that immediately he came to office, he had a full view of the sufferings of the people of Rayalaseema and that was why four Ministers were given to them, that he loved Rayalaseema and that was why four Ministers have been given to those districts. Well and good. (The Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari : ' I did not say so.') If you, Mr. Speaker want it Sir, I can place the Press report on the table of the House even to-morrow; I am definite about it and there is nothing I am adding by way of comment to what appeared in the Press. There is another small thing that took place in the Tiruchirappalli Central Jail when we were all together there. We asked him why at least one Minister had not been provided for Rayalaseema and why Mr. Koti Reddi, one of the seniormost Congressmen was not provided with a place in his Cabinet. We were told that it could not have been done because Sri Gopala Reddi was the man whom he loved most and he had to be given a place in the Cabinet. I would like to ask him, where was the love and affection for Rayalaseema at that time. Why was it . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" It is a very interesting conversation that happened in jail; but I fear it is totally wrong. I do not remember a word of it and I am sure Sri Nagi Reddi might not remember it. I would only ask Mr. Nagi Reddi to say whether Sri Gopala Reddi was present at that time."

* SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" I think he was there and it was at a time he was leaving that place. People who were there at that time will quite remember what happened and some of the Members sitting on the other side of the House were present and they will also remember. If I could have an answer to that question from those benches it will be well and good. My question has not altered since and it is this : Where was the Chief Ministers's affection for Rayalaseema at that time? It was not there then, but to-day it is there with a purpose and that is to divide the people, the Rayalaseema Andhras from the Circar Andhras, so that he can have his way in regard to the governance of the State and rule in a dictatorial manner. People on this side of the House have explained the situation and my hon. Friend Sri C. Pulla Reddi has fully exposed the move, and I am sure any reasonable man will be convinced by it and there will be no dispute about it. This kind of divide and rule policy which Sri Rajagopalachari is adopting and has been adopting is nothing new; it has been there for a long time. and we also told him even during the last sittings of the House that his contention that he had been asked by the people of the State to be the Chief Minister is all bunkum, and that the people do not require him to divide and rule them, but on the other hand the people want a party or group of persons who can give them food, provide them with employment, give them the return for their labour and make them realize their national aspirations by granting them their demand for linguistic provinces. Just now when answering questions, he was asked whether he would take into consideration the attitude of the important parties in Rayalaseema in regard to the Andhra State question and he replied : I do not know what the

hon. Member means by taking into consideration the attitude of important parties, but the Government would take into consideration the attitude of the people. The parties in Rayalaseema that are for the Andhra State are the Congress, the Communist and the K.M.P. Parties. Which other party is there today with such strength and backing behind it which is demanding the Andhra State? Is there any other party or a group of parties with the backing of the people behind them which say that they want a separate Rayalaseema province? There are of course a few nonentities who raise their voice being sure of the weight and support that Sri Rajagopalachariar wants to give them, on which he may base the finding that the Rayalaseema people are against this question. That is the way, as I said, he is trying to divide the people, so that he may be there permanently and safely and he may not be disturbed from that position either by the people or the Opposition. Sir, taking into account the progress so far achieved in the matter of adopting this divide and rule policy, I say, it is not going to give the State a safe, sure and secure Government, which is what the people have been asking for.

" The Hon. Sri Rajagopalachari has the credit always of speaking in generalization and not in particularization; he is a great adept at generalizing, but he never tries to take the House into his confidence and tell them what exactly he is going to do, for them to vote for him, and as I said, he has no reply to give even on points that we may raise. There have been questions raised in this House both at the last sitting and during this sitting. The point was very pertinently raised by many hon. Members, and they asked if the Hon. Sri Rajagopalachari as a truthful man will come forward and make some enquiries into so many of the police acts which have taken place during the last four years and a half. I gave him an example last time, one in a hundred and a thousand where a brother had been forced to molest his sister; and hundreds of instances have been given by Mr. Gopalan and Mr. Vinayagam regarding incidents in Malabar and Chingleput. There are hundreds of instances in Andhra. He says that he stands for justice and he wants law and order; he speaks of truth, he speaks of God, but I would like to ask him in the name of God, in the name of truth whether he is ready to institute an enquiry into the atrocities that have taken place, and whether he is ready to see that those that have been found responsible for such acts are punished. I ask him if he would be ready to give a feeling of confidence to the people and make them feel: here is a Government which has come forward to remove those people who have been responsible for such atrocities. But what do we find? We find that even when we catch hold of such people redhanded, nothing turns out. In Guntakkal we caught hold of a contractor who was collecting four annas when he had to collect only two annas, and he had actually four anna tickets printed and he had been giving it to the people regularly collecting four annas when he was entitled to collect only two annas by way of cart tax. The matter was reported to the Municipal Commissioner and I personally went to the Police station and handed over the receipts and also gave quite a number

of names for purposes of evidence. To this day, Sir, I do not know what has taken place and the only thing is that an enquiry is being made and something will be done. But four months have elapsed. That is the way the Government move so far as the people's enemies are concerned; if any one were to go with the people's grievances, however justifiable and proper they may be, he is put inside jails or threatened with police force. That is the way the Government act and they even go to the extent of supporting and justifying their actions.

" There is another thing that I would like to say. The Government say one thing in one place and another in another place. I represented to His Excellency the Governor about conditions in Rayalaseema and suggested that joint pattadars should be given loans. In reply to this I got a communication to the effect that joint patta holders would also be given loans. But when we went to the Collector, he told us that such a communication might have been received by Sri Nagi Reddi but it has not been received by him. The fact of the communication from His Excellency the Governor was published in the papers so that the people might avail themselves of loan facilities, but when they approached the Collector, he told them that nothing of the sort had been sanctioned. I ask, Sir, why one kind of report to me and none or another to the Collector of the district. Why was it not sent to the Collector? It has been suggested that truth is very important and that has to be brought to the forefront, but Sir, here is a Government which does not know its own mind, its own programmes and policies. Its policies and schemes are not for the well being of the people, but for dividing the people in all aspects of their national life, so that it will be able to rule the State for quite a long time and the representatives of the landlord classes and others might be safe in their seats of privilege and power.

" In Rayalaseema, the Hon. the Chief Minister was telling the people that land revenue would not be collected from the people. I am receiving telegrams after telegrams from the people that it is being collected. The same kind of reports are coming from Nellore. and Sri Yellamanda Reddi also referred to the fact that collections are being made and people are being threatened that the police would come and make the collections if the people would not pay the tax themselves. Is this the way the Government are trying to function? The Government do not move immediately with the result that the sort of thing that happened in Rayalaseema is happening in all spheres of Government. How is it that the orders of Government are not treated as such and acted upon by those responsible whose duty it is to carry them out? If they do not heed the orders of Government, will the Government be ready to remove them, for having set up a kind of revolt? (The Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari : ' It is wrong.') If what I am saying is true, as I will prove, will he take action against the officers responsible for not giving effect to the orders of Government? Such a thing will not happen as he loves to defend them, and no action will be taken against them, and their acts of omission and commission are ignored. So far as their programmes are concerned, so far as their

policies of rehabilitation and reconstruction go, the Government are not a people's Government but they have been carrying on against the wishes of the people, and we on this side of the House would only request hon. Members on the other side of the House who have not spoken so far, to calmly and seriously give their thought to the situation before they go back to face the people again, so that they may be able to face them calmly and conscientiously. If they vote for the resolution, I am sure people will be ready to give them the proper answer. We say that the whole of the United Democratic Front whether they be independents, K.M.P. Members or T.N.T. Members, we are ready to face any election at any period to prove that not only the members sitting here will come back but we will come back in greater numbers, and that many who are sitting there will not be able to return to this House if they go back to the people and tell them what their policies and programmes are regarding the future. If after voting for this motion, hon. Members on the other side go back to the people, I am sure the verdict of the people would be to their detriment, and that will be the answer that they would be able to get."

* JANAB K. UPPI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Motion moved by the Hon. Leader of the House. Let me begin my speech with a prayer to God, that our country may be saved from those who are expecting to come back in large numbers if there is a re-election in this State. The previous speaker referred to this and gave a warning to the Members of the Muslim League that most of us will not be in the next Legislature if we vote for the Motion. May God save us. But I must tell him that the Muslim League and the Muslims have received many such warnings and challenges throughout their life.

11-30 a.m. " My hon. Friend Mr. Nagi Reddi was dilating upon our State being converted into a Police State. Let him know that in this State we have got the right to speak at least within the four walls of this House and even criticise the Government in power. But can we do so in the country from where he takes his inspiration and directives? What is the state of affairs obtaining in that country? Let me now read to you some excerpts from a book written by a Russian himself who was a Member of the Soviet Purchasing Commission in America. This is what Mr. Victor Kravchenke, in his book, ' I Chose Freedom ' says about Russia, the country about which it is said that every person there is free to do anything as he or she likes :

' The people of my country are in the clutches of the police-state ; they cannot possibly make their views and their hopes and their distress known to the world. In the measure that I can reveal the true physiognomy of the Kremlin dictatorship to the peoples and Governments of democratic countries, I feel that I am helping in a small way to warn the world against self-delusions . . .'

Then he says—

' The Communist dictatorship in the U.S.S.R. is not a problem for the Russian people alone, or for the democracies only. It is the problem of all humankind. The world dare not continue indefinitely to turn its back on the martyrdom of a great segment of the human race inhabiting one-sixth of the earth's surface . . .' "

3rd July 1952]

SRI P. VENKATESWARLU :—" May I know the name of the book. Is it from Koran or Bible? "

* JANAB K. UPPI :—" I have already given out the name and author of the book. The name of the book is ' I Chose Freedom.' It is written by Victor Kravchenko, a member of the Soviet Purchasing Commission in America."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member's speech is inaudible. He may come to the mike used by the Leader of the Socialist Party and speak."

* JANAB K. UPPI :—" Unfortunately for me, I have got a very small voice and that has been the complaint always.

" Sir, the whole world knows that in the past we were the main Opposition. We opposed the Congress. We criticised them. We also supported them when measures intended for the benefit of the people were brought forward. But we never indulged in destructive criticism. Our motto was and is to offer constructive criticism and to see that a stable Government functions in this State for the welfare and prosperity of the people. Of course, in the recent elections we opposed Congressmen and criticized them. At the same time we never believed and declared that the Congress Party was altogether an undesirable party. The Congress is a party which has fought for and brought freedom to this country. But the persons who came to the helm of affairs in this State immediately after the attainment of freedom mismanaged affairs and we were faced with a situation in this State which might have even led to chaos in this State. Fortunately for the people of this State and the country, Rajaji has agreed to run the Government. It is a great sacrifice on the part of Rajaji to have done so for the sake of the country for he had retired from active public life and was leading a quiet and calm life. His reappearance gave us hope and we have decided to support the Government so long as they carry on their affairs in a manner which will be beneficial to the people. Within the last 81 days or so—an hon. Member from the Opposition had referred to the number of days the Congress Government have been in office—they have done things which have emboldened us to repose our confidence in him. He has helped the Non-Gazetted Officers by granting to their children educational concessions. Secondly, he has applied the specific of decontrol for the cancer of control, procurement, etc., that was eating into the vitals of society. The controls had been responsible for the moral deterioration of the people. I ask, was not control and procurement of food a cancer eating into the morals of the whole people of this State? Is there any man who has observed the rules of control strictly and has not violated them. I am sure, even the Members of this House when they left their mufassal stations would not have handed over their ration cards to the rationing authorities when there was control. In that way, they would have committed an offence. But all these things have been removed by the introduction of de-control in this State. This is also one of the reasons why we must repose confidence in Rajaji.

" Sir, certain charges were made against the members of the Muslim League that they have gone back on their solemn pledges that they gave to the electorate. I must say that we have never gone back on our pledge. In fact the pledge that we gave was that we would never co-operate with parties which do not believe in God. It is true that we opposed the Congress in the elections for its commissions and omissions but that does not mean that we must vote against the Congress Party when it does good to the country.

" Sir, yesterday reference was made by one of the hon. Members on the other side to the minimum programme of the United Democratic Front and invited the Muslim League to join the United Democratic Front to work that programme. Unless they are prepared to give us an idea of their maximum programme also we will not touch it with a pair of tongs. I want to know, what is up their sleeves. They have invited us to walk into their parlour; we know it is only to swallow us like the spider. A few days ago it was stated in the newspapers that the Communist Party in this country has received directives from Russia that they should join hands with the nationalists under different names and work their programme. This is their game; that is what had happened in Malabar during the recent elections. At first the Communists did not favour an alliance with the Praja Party on the ground that it was nothing but the Congress Party. But ultimately they thought that by having an alliance with the Praja Party and making common cause with them, they would be able in the end, to make them enter into their parlour and they succeeded in their objective to a very great extent. This is the policy they are now trying to follow. We are not going to fall a prey to their machinations.

11-45 a.m.

" Then, Sir, I have to say something about police atrocities in Malabar, of which much is made here and about which a big list was sought to be made out by one hon. Member. It was in Kottayam taluk of Malabar district that some of these atrocities were committed. That very amsom where those atrocities were committed, happens to be my neighbouring amsom. I ask, were those Communists sitting in their houses doing tapas when the police were committing those atrocities. Did the police unnecessarily go there and molest them? What all atrocities the Communists committed there, only the residents of that amsom know. In fact the residents of those amsoms were really living with their lives in their hands as it were. In short, that was the state of affairs there. In terror and in fright they were living there. One hon. Member was shedding crocodile tears in this House yesterday for one Kunhali's mother and sister. Really what happened was, this Kunhali was a Communist. Orders were issued by the police to arrest him. He went underground. He was going about from place to place by bylanes asking for food, asking for some *kanji* water. If anybody helped him with food, he noted in his book the names of such who gave him food as having given him excellent meals and so on. When the police caught hold of him finally, that note book also fell into police hands. Therein the police saw who had helped him

and immediately they took action against those innocent persons. Thus he brought trouble to many innocent persons who out of their ignorance helped him with food. So, Sir, it is in this way so many Muslims were brought to trouble. Now, Sir, if this Kunhali had some feeling of pity and consideration for his mother he could have come out and saved his mother from trouble. So, Sir, so far as we are concerned we know that we will have troubles from the Communists, and so, we will try to take care of ourselves. We are not afraid even if they kill us; for we, Muslims are never afraid of killing or being killed. We are God's creatures and we feel God will help us. In conclusion, Sir, I feel once more bound to say that we are God's creatures and we cannot have alliances with those who have no belief in God. (Interruption from Opposition Bloc.) You have been inviting us, not only here, but also outside this House to join you even by cajoling, threatening and intimidating.

"Finally, Sir, I feel the Government's policy of excluding religious education from schools is a blunder. If there is no religion in this country, the country will be a devilish State, for a State without a religion will be a devilish State. The whole civilisation of this world is built upon religion; in fact, the bedrock of civilisation has been belief in God. So it is up to this Government if they want to save this country from chaos to inculcate religion in our children, or to give at least facilities for teaching of religions. With these words I once more say we Muslims give our wholehearted support to this Motion of Vote of Confidence and in this step we have the whole Muslim population of this province behind us."

* DR. K. B. MENON :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have before us a very intriguing issue. We are confronted with a demand for a vote of confidence from a Cabinet which has been in office only for three months. What are the facts of the case? What are the conditions under which this Vote of Confidence is sought? Let me first say a few words about the Ministry. The status and stature of the Ministry that is in office solely springs from the person who heads it. As far as the others are concerned, 90 per cent of them have no parliamentary experience like the majority of the Members of this House. It is very difficult to weigh the work and worth of a Cabinet that has been in office only for three months. The demand for a Vote of Confidence is premature. The Ministers will say that individuals do not count, that it is the party that counts and that the individuals or Ministers only carry out the instructions and directions of the party in power. I accept this contention. We all know however the record of the Congress in the last five years. I am quite sure that the Congress itself is not very proud of it. I do not propose however to avail of this opportunity or to make use of the floor of the Assembly to arraign the Congress for all the misdeeds and mistakes of omission and commission that Congressmen have been guilty of in the last five years. I only wish to state that three months are too short a time to correct this record or build up a fund of goodwill. From this

point of view also, my submission is that the demand for a vote of confidence is premature.

" Are there any extenuating circumstances which ease the situation and justify the demand? Let me analyse very briefly the Press interview given by Rajaji. There, he says, in the first place, the deliberate effort on the part of the Opposition to boycott or to be absent from the Joint Session of the Legislature summoned in connexion with His Excellency's Address, has disappointed him, and so he feels that they do not want him to be the Chief Minister. I do not know why the Chief Minister should be surprised at it. That is the attitude which the Chief Minister should certainly expect from the Opposition. To him such methods will be familiar, and so I do not see any reason why he should dislike them. We ourselves do not see eye to eye with the United Democratic Front. We did not abstain from attending the Joint Session. We believe that under the present circumstances walk-outs, boycotts and neutrality positions are weapons of the weak, and we also believe that if these weapons are used without care and caution, and except under exceptional circumstances, we are more likely to express our weakness than exhibit our strength. My submission is, that there is no reason why the Chief Minister should feel disappointed or disgruntled with the attitude of the Opposition. So I feel this demand for a Vote of Confidence is unnecessary and unprovoked.

" Then, Sir, there is another reason urged by the Chief Minister for this Motion of Vote of Confidence, and that is the Aruppukkottai bye-election. Is a bye-election sufficient reason to come to the House for a Vote of Confidence and that a bye-election immediately following a general election? I think not, Sir.

" Analysing the results of the recent three bye-elections—one in Kakinada, the second in Coimbatore and the third in Aruppukkottai, it is obvious that in all of them, the sitting party, if I may use that word, has been invariably returned. For in the Kakinada bye-election it is a Communist candidate who has been returned; in Coimbatore it is a Congress candidate who has been returned and in Aruppukkottai it is a member of the Forward Bloc who has been returned. Sir, this only shows that if a bye-election immediately follows a general election, it will not yield a result very different from that of the general election. So there is no reason, again, for the Chief Minister to be disappointed. So, I see no reason why the Chief Minister should have thrown this challenge. I understand he had a very good reception at Aruppukkottai, when he visited that place recently; and if the election result is otherwise, it is only natural that that result should be expected. From that point of view, again, my submission is that this demand for a Vote of Confidence is unprovoked and unnecessary.

" Now, Sir, whatever be our opinion as far as this Motion is concerned, we are confronted with a demand for a Vote of Confidence. We have to vote for it or we have to reject it. If it were a No-confidence Motion sponsored by the Opposition, the situation would have been slightly different. I am not suggesting, when I

make this statement, that if such a Non-confidence Motion were moved the Socialists would vote with the Congress against the Opposition. For we are committed to vote in this Assembly on a merit basis. I brought this up only to show the difference in the decree of embarrassment the situation would have created.

" As far as we are concerned, we feel as if we are between the devil and the deep sea. We are between the capitalist Congress on the one hand and the fascist Communists on the other. We cannot vote with the Congress on this issue for we feel that if we vote with the Congress, we will be associating ourselves with the capitalist Congress, recording our confidence in the Congress which we do not have. We walked out of the Congress because we believed then and we also believe now, that the Congress is unable to carry out the Socialist programme and that we, the Socialist Party, have an ideology, a programme, a policy, a message and a mission, which is very different from those of the Congress. When we walked out of the Congress, the Congress was the pink of perfection; it was then at the pinnacle of its name and fame. It was the Congress Mahatmaji had built up. We left the Congress because of the courage of our conviction, because we felt that the Socialist policy and programme could only be carried out by the Socialist Party and not by the Congress. It may naturally be asked why we were in the Congress before that and why we left it. We remained in the Congress during all the period of our struggle, because we felt that political independence of the country was of primary importance and that it was a pre-requisite to economic independence. The Communist Party did not believe in that, and that is the reason why they remained outside and built up an organization of their own. The Communist Party had not the interest of the country at heart then nor do they have it now. We remained with the Congress and we fought along with the Congress in the struggle, and after we found a solution to the problem of independence on the 15th August 1947, we came out. We parted company with the Congress then not with any malice, not in any anger, but because we thought it was our duty to say goodbye to the Congress and organise ourselves as an independent party, and because we felt, as I said, that we had an ideology, a programme, a message and a mission very different from those of the Congress. The Congress was a multi-class organization, before the struggle, with all sections of the people in it, but after 15th August 1947 when they accepted office, they ceased to be a multi-class organization and became a monolithic political party. We left it then and we have now organized ourselves as an independent political party. These are general statements, and I should illustrate my position with just a very few examples, although I am afraid I may not have much time to go into details. 12 noon.

" First, take our policy with regard to the various problems in the country. Take for example, the question of land. There again it is not possible for me to go into details; but I may say our approach to the whole problem is quite different from that of the Congress. We approach the problem from two angles of view.

Land in the first place is limited in quantity, and therefore naturally it should not be the monopoly of a few. We do not believe in concentration of land in the hands of a few zamindars or feudal landlords, because we feel that that would tilt the social balance. We therefore feel that there should be a redistribution of land. We claim that there should be confiscation without compensation, not because we wish to see the rich pauperised, not because we wish to push them into the street, but because we believe we should dry up all sources of unearned income. Unless we confiscate without compensation, we would only be converting the feudal landlords into industrial magnates, which would be in no way better. That is with regard to the land question.

" Coming to the question of nationalization, the Congress claims that they have a Socialist programme and that they have nationalized bus transport in the City of Madras. I submit that nationalization without socialisation, the result would be what we have experienced without socialisation, the result would be what we have experienced in the City of Madras—corruption, nepotism, favouritism, and much worse than all that, unemployment. Unless there is nationalization going along with socialisation, the result would be disastrous, because the workers must be taken into co-operation in the industry. It is the worker who knows the weak spots in the industry; it is the worker who will be able to make constructive suggestions; and unless the workers are taken into confidence and their co-operation sought in industry, it would be very difficult to make a success of nationalization. That is the reason why the Congress failed in its attempt at nationalization. Again, where the Government have taken up industries, like the railways, the administration has not been satisfactory, because the Congress lacks that point of view which the Socialists have, viz., the social point of view according to which there should be equality of opportunity which comes from equality of distribution.

" In respect of taxation, also the Socialist approach will be very different from the Congress approach. Imagine the suggestion that is made in the recent Budget proposals of imposing a surcharge on bus-fare. We would never have thought of making the poor bus traveller—and the majority of travellers in the bus in rural areas are extremely poor people—pay a tax or a higher bus-fare. On the other hand, we would have got hold of the bus-owner. On the floor of this very Assembly, I believe Mr. Gopala Reddi made the statement that for every bus-route in this State, there are nearly 200 applicants. If there are 200 applicants for every bus-route in the State, I am perfectly sure that the bus transport is a paying proposition. The bus-owners are not a set of half-starved hungry looking people like me; they are all well-fed and good-looking men; they can afford to make up the deficit in the Budget. I am quite sure the Chief Minister could have collected, not Rs. 2 crores, but Rs. 10 crores from them if only he had taken care to devise some means by which he could squeeze the bus-owner and not the poor bus-travelling public.

3rd July 1952] [Dr. K. B. Menon]

" These are some of the differences between the Congress approach to national problems and the Socialist approach to national problems. We have nothing against the Congress as a party; but our ideologies are different, our programme is different, our message is different and our mission is different. That being the case, how can we go and tell them, ' we have confidence in the Congress, we shall befriend you here, you carry on, and we will support you '. It is very difficult for us to do that.

" The next position we can possibly take is one of neutrality. I have already said that the position of neutrality is a position of the weak. A virile political party can never afford to remain neutral. A virile political party would be expected to give a positive lead and not seek refuge in a negative policy.

" Now I must also make the position of the Socialist Party clear with regard to the U.D.F. and the Communist Party. That we are voting against the Congress is not to be taken as a vote for the Communist Party. Many of our friends have told us that a vote against the Congress is a vote for the Communist Party. It is never so; we do not mean it so; I wish to make that position clear. From the very start of the U.D.F., we have fought it tooth and nail, because we knew that the U.D.F. was organised and led by the Communists, and we fought it because we knew the Communist tactics of the United Front. The United Front tactics may be new to some in India and in the Madras State; but it is not new to the world, and it is not certainly new to the Socialist Party. It is by a tactful and careful manoeuvring of the tactics of the United Front that the Communist Party in the East and South-East Europe succeeded in checking rival parties and in smothering rival political groups. From that kind of tactics, let India be saved! The public of this State may perhaps have a short memory, but the world certainly has not got a short memory; they cannot forget the fate of persons like Dr. Benes and Jan Masaryk; their ill-fated history has been written in rubrics in the World History of the Communist Party; and it is not possible either for us or for others to forget all that, and we do not forget it. Capitalism is a spent force; it has no future; capitalism cannot recover itself; it is disintegrating before our very eyes. The coming struggle in the world is not going to be between capitalists and socialists; the coming struggle in the world is going to be between democratic socialism on the one hand and fascist imperialist communism on the other. Let the naive take note. The Communists do not believe in parliamentary institutions; they have no respect or regard for democratic traditions. In Communist thinking, parliamentary institutions are abominations. It is one of their first revolutionary tasks to get rid of these parliamentary institutions. Their leaders, like Lenin and others, have been very frank, in fact brutally frank, with regard to their intentions. If I may quote from memory, Lenin says ' It is difficult to see anything more vile and abominable and treacherous than a Parliament '. But he does not advise his followers to boycott the Parliament or to shun it; he asks his followers to get into Parliament and work it. He says,

again if I may quote from memory, ' if it is not possible to disperse the bourgeoisie Parliament or such reactionary institutions like the Parliament, get inside them and work them '. Put in popular language, it means, ' legally work inside the Parliament and illegally work outside the Parliament '. That seems to me to be the Communist policy and programme, and it is an exhibition of that policy we have seen in this House in the last few days. Whatever be the mistakes of omission and commission on the part of the Congress, whatever be the sins they have committed in these last five years, I cannot admit that they have bartered away or betrayed democracy. (Cheers.) On the other hand, we have had recent experiences both in this House and also in Parliament, where the moment a voice was lifted against the Communist Party, there were hisses and howls in order to drown the voice of the opposition. The essence of democracy lies in giving your opposition, the man in the opposite party, a chance to express his opinion, however distasteful that opinion may be. It is true that democracy has no worth or meaning for the Communists, and it is also true that the Communist Party has consistently betrayed it. Unless and until the Communists begin to look with love and affection on their own country, until and unless they break away from their moorings abroad, until and unless the Communist Party takes to democratic ways and parliamentary methods which are legal and constitutional—which alone can make a democratic State survive—and until and unless the Communist Party discovers new values of life and new ways of doing things, I am afraid that no party in India that loves India, and looks to India and wishes to serve India, can ever have any truck with that Communist Party. (Cheers.)

12-15 p.m. " Now that is all that I have to say to make my position clear so far as the vote of the Socialist Party against the Confidence Motion is concerned. I have now to say something about where we stand and how we vote. I have made my position fairly clear in my analysis that the demand for the Vote of Confidence was ill-timed, ill-advised, unprovoked and unnecessary. That is the conclusion I have come to after weighing all the facts that the Ministry has placed before us and the facts that are available to us. It is the only conclusion that we can arrive at. I do not venture to go and speculate on the possible motives that the Congress may have in bringing this Motion of Confidence on the floor of the Assembly, for I am afraid, as a public man, that it would be unfair and I would be treading on uncertain and risky grounds. I do not wish to do that. Therefore, judging from the facts that are before us, I politely tell our friends who are sitting on the other side that it is not possible for the Socialist Party to oblige them in this matter."

* SRI P. T. RAJAN :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, after the highly emotional and intellectual discourse of my friend on my right, I find myself in a very difficult and delicate position to speak. I thought, Sir, that after the election of the Speaker and Deputy Speaker the Government as well as this House had settled down

to business and I was convinced in that belief when the Hon the Chief Minister took courage into his hands and removed the control on foodstuffs. Suddenly this Motion of Confidence was thrown at us. As a matter of fact, Sir, I referred to the election of the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker because prior to that election both the Congress and my friends of the United Democratic Front had been trying to form the Ministry. It took two months for them to find out which party was to form the Ministry. Eventually the Congress formed the Ministry, no doubt, with the help of the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari. There is something in common between both the parties in that they could not find a leader who was a Member of this House. The Congress had to go out of this House to find a leader and so also the United Democratic Front. This is, of course, no reflection on my friend, Sri T. Viswanatham, who is capable as well as brilliant. I am happy to see him there to fill the place of that leader and that worthily. In this contest the Congress came out successful. This was really a test between the two parties as to who possessed the confidence of this House. I had the honour to occupy the Chair which you are occupying, Sir, and announce the results. I believe there was a difference—my memory is getting short—of 30 to 40 votes."

MR. SPEAKER :—" There was a difference of 44 votes."

* SRI P. T. RAJAN :—" Thank you, Sir. It was a Vote of Confidence—an indirect Vote of Confidence. No doubt in France when a Ministry is formed the first thing they do is to ask for a Vote of Confidence from the Assembly unlike in the House of Commons where it is presumed that only the party which can command the confidence of the House can form the Ministry. The Hon. the Chief Minister indirectly asked for a Vote of Confidence and he got it. Why should he then spring this surprise on us and invite trouble not only for himself, but for my friends here and for myself also? (Interruption.) My friend says, ' a funny affair '. Sir, as far as I am concerned, I do not think it is a funny affair. My first reaction was that I should keep mum and wait and see what was going to happen. I was not allowed to remain in that happy or unhappy position because a number of young friends came and asked me, ' What are you going to do? Are you going to speak? If so, on which side are you going to vote? ' I thought, being the solitary representative of the Justice Party having no flock to worry myself with and no flock to worry me, I might as well have been left alone. Now I am going to speak and also say how I am going to vote. If I do keep neutral, I will be charged with sitting on the fence. Of course, no fence will be sufficiently strong to bear my weight—I speak metaphorically. I have nothing to seek and so I need not be sitting on the fence. I have never sat on the fence throughout my political career and I am not likely to sit on the fence at this fag-end not only of my political career but also of my life. But, as my friend Mr. Menon, Leader of the Socialist Party, said, a virile party must vote one way or the other, even a man who is not virile must vote

one way or the other. I therefore thought over it. I cannot vote against this resolution for the simple reason that I had the fortune or the misfortune to make a speech, not on the floor of this House but somewhere in this City about two months back, giving a survey of the political situation in this State. There I said that I proposed to give my general support to the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari, Chief Minister of the Government of Madras. The main reason for it was this. My friends here say that the Ministry must command the confidence of the House, must command the confidence of the people, must command the confidence of God; and some others may say perhaps it must command the confidence of the devil; but all the time they forget that there is one other important factor, namely, that the Ministry must command the confidence of the services. No democracy can function in a practical and efficient manner unless it has a well-trained, efficient and contented service. Such a service was the legacy left to us by the Britisher, and thanks to the good work of the members of the services this Government has been functioning till to-day. Unfortunately, after the Britisher left these shores the services were getting—if I may be permitted to say so—demoralized. Political influence was brought to bear on them; partisan influence was brought to bear on them and but for the advent of my esteemed friend, Sri C. Rajagopalachari, things would have gone from bad to worse.

" In this connexion let me point out the Theni incident. I am not going into the details now because I have no time. The fact remains that four or five subordinate officials were taken to task and though the incident took place nearly a year ago these poor devils are still under suspension. Either they should be dismissed once and for all or they should be taken back into service. At least as far as one member of the service is concerned, because he happened to be the Sub-Magistrate-in-charge of that place, the District Collector was asked to enquire into the conduct of this official and to take suitable action, namely, that this officer should either be dismissed from service or be restored to office in case no charge was proved against him. The Collector went into the case carefully and restored the officer. What did the Government do then? The Government which had delegated its power to the Collector took it away from him and said the officer should not take charge of his duties. If the Government are going to treat their services like this, God help them! The kind of interference that had obtained during the last five years had disappeared as if by magic and on this particular ground alone we should stand by Sri C. Rajagopalachari. (Cheers.) This is what happened when I brought this case to the attention of the then Hon. Chief Minister, Sri Kumaraswami Raja. He said that my suggestion that a judicial enquiry be held into the conduct of these officers especially when there was a political controversy attached to the incident was a novel one. I then knew what I should think of this Hon. Minister and I also knew what would be the fate of these poor subordinates. I am now quite sure that the Hon. Sri

C. Rajagopalachari after listening to this point would call for the records of the case and dispose it of one way or the other because this kind of suspense is most demoralizing. Once your services are demoralized, you can never have a Government where you can expect efficiency and justice.

" If I had to go back on my former decision, Sir, I must have sufficient reasons for doing so. Nevertheless this Confidence Motion is uncalled for and unnecessary. There were three bye-elections. The Leader of the House said he never bothered about Kakinada. It was a Communist seat and so it did not matter.

" Next came the bye-election in Coimbatore for a seat that had been held by a Congress candidate. It was fitting and proper that the Congress should set up a candidate there. My friend Dr. Subbarayan's daughter contested there on behalf of the Communist Party. She is a nice, educated and well-behaved girl, though it is long since I have seen her. I would have liked her to get elected political reasons apart. Anyhow she was defeated and the Congress won. Quite rightly they won because it was their seat. 12-30 p.m.

" Next came the bye-election at Aruppukottai. There the position was the reverse. The Congress was represented by a lady and the Forward Bloc was represented by a gentleman. That gentleman, like me, in the first instance, was rejected when he stood as a candidate for this House. Afterwards he was promoted to Delhi. (Interruption.) My hon. Friend, Sri Muthuramalinga Thevar, is giving me the information that Aruppukottai area is included within Mudukulathur constituency. It was said that my friend is the monarch of all that he surveys there. This reference to him was intended only to be complimentary and I see no reason why he should have taken objection to the remarks of the Leader of the House. I call Aruppukottai constituency a pocket borough. It is a rotten borough in the sense it is a pocket borough.

" Unfortunately I find it very difficult to criticise a gentleman who is much senior to me in age and very much more experienced than I am. Mr. Rajagopalachari is wrong in the attitude he has taken, namely, that the Aruppukottai bye-election was a test case for his continuance in office. That is a bye-election for the Parliament and we are not concerned with the Parliament as Members of this House. Individually, Members of this House may take an interest in elections to Parliament but this House in its collective character has no interest whatsoever. Why should the Hon. the Chief Minister make it a test contest? It was not his personal election. Supposing the Chief Minister had stood in some constituency for this Assembly and had been defeated, I can then understand his moving this resolution. The people in Aruppukottai constituency have probably not even seen the Hon. the Chief Minister." (Interruptions.)

[3rd July 1952

MR. SPEAKER :—" Two hon. Members should not speak at the same time."

SRI U. MUTHURAMALINGA THEVAR :—" The people of my constituency have seen Mr. Rajagopalachari from the days of 1937 when he came to my constituency and worked for me against the Raja of Ramnad who contested the election then. Mr. Rajagopalachari then spoke in very many places in my constituency and the people there know him well."

* SRI P. T. RAJAN :—" I am very thankful for the information. What I meant, Sir, is, if Mr. Rajagopalachari had gone round the area where he (Sri Muthuramalinga Thevar) is the uncrowned king (interruption), and then if he had made that election a test case it would have been a different thing. The Hon. the Chief Minister got down at Kovilpatti—a strong centre for the Congress—and spoke a few words. That is all he did and he then takes the defeat of the Congress candidate in that constituency as his. I am not saying anything uncomplimentary to any candidate. All I wish to say is that if a candidate is not known to the electorate of a particular constituency he cannot make it a test case. I think it is wrong on the part of the Hon. the Chief Minister to have ventured to make it a test case and put all of us into trouble. If the Hon. the Chief Minister had stood for election in any constituency, I have no hesitation in saying that he would have been returned with a thumping majority. I can say this from the reception he had received in a district like Madurai which is not his native district. He will be returned from any constituency with a thumping majority in his own Salem district. A bye-election taking place in an unknown corner, taking the whole of India into consideration, should not have been made a test by the Hon. the Chief Minister for his continuance. I will leave it at that.

" During the course of the debate criticisms were made against my friends, the Communists. It was said that they were responsible for chaos and confusion in the country. I am afraid it is wrong to say that they are responsible. Communism and Communists are the product of chaos and confusion (laughter)—I am afraid my friends are laughing before I finish the sentence—confusion brought about by my friends who are to my left during the last five years. If they had managed things as well as they were expected to do, my Communist friends would not have been sitting here. My friend Mr. Nagi Reddi himself admitted that he had been returned to this House because of the mistakes made by the Congress. If someone else had led that Ministry during the last five years, I wonder whether my Communist friends would have come here. Communism will only thrive in chaos and confusion. Communism cannot be put down by the Government by brute force. The Government must bring about a state of affairs where Communists will automatically disappear or where they will change their views and be more sober and be

useful to the public. I was promised the other day that I would follow Mr. Nagi Reddi after he had made his speech, but unfortunately I was not here to listen to the whole of his speech. He had his complaints against the Police and about the formation of a separate Andhra State. Before I come to Mr. Nagi Reddi I wish to deal with my friends, the Communists. I should have been very happy if the Communists had formed the Ministry and Mr. Nagi Reddi occupied the seat now occupied by the Hon. Sri Rajagopalachariar. They could not form a Ministry because they had no majority. For forming a Ministry they must make alliances with other parties. So instead of heterogeneous groups combining into one party and forming a Ministry, it was much easier for a party especially the Congress with a much bigger number than any of the other groups to form a Ministry and run the Government. I hope my friend Mr. Nagi Reddi and his colleagues will wait for sometime and hold their souls in patience before they can occupy the Treasury Benches. I especially wish my Communist friends to occupy the Treasury Benches because people realize their responsibility only when they are in office. It was so with my Congress friends. The Justice Party was the butt-end of their ridicule and they made jokes at its expense. Where are they now? Likewise my friends on my right, once they occupy the Treasury Benches will find themselves in the same position as the Congress. (Cries of ' no, no ' from the Opposition benches.) I am happy to hear their ' no, no '. But I want them to put their professions into practice. I am not against the Communists. In this rotten country for everything done or said motives are attributed. If Sri Rajagopalachariar has become the Chief Minister, he must have some motive, it is said. If Sri Rajagopalachariar has tabled a Resolution of Confidence in his Government, it is said that there must be some motive. In this country for everything a motive is attributed. Our people cannot be generous. For Heaven's sake please change this mentality. Democracy without those finer sentiments is not worth the paper on which it is written.

" As regards the Andhra State, the formation of it is not in the hands of the Hon. Chief Minister. It is in the hands of the Government of India. As far as we are concerned we welcome the formation of the Andhra State at the earliest possible moment. The non-formation of an Andhra State seems to be a stumbling block to the progress of this State. My Andhra friends' minds seem to be functioning under a grievance. When a person feels like that, it is not good either to himself or to others. If it is within the power of this House to vote for an Andhra State—I am quite sure I am voicing the sentiments of all the Members whatever their political leanings may be—all will vote for an Andhra State.

" You, Sir, have given me 45 minutes. I do not know how much time I have taken. I do not propose to talk any more, and I am going to finish my speech, by saying that my vote means that Mr. Rajagopalachariar is best fitted to be the Chief Minister

in the present difficult circumstances prevailing in this State. (Cheers.) That does not mean to say that we approve the whole of his policy or programme. If I am not letting out a secret—I hope I am not letting out a secret, because it was mentioned in the tea-party where there were other friends—the Chief Minister would like to form a Council of Members of this House who would be in a position to advise him. I hope I am not divulging any secret. That is a very good suggestion—a suggestion born out of long experience, and especially at the present moment you cannot conceive of anything better than that. (Interruptions.) Some friends say that there are limitations. My friends are always theoretical. You must be practical men. There is no use of being theoretical. Why has England succeeded where we are
12-45 p.m. failing? It is because they are practical and not theoretical. I would like the formation of such a Council. Then, Sir, the Hon. Sri Rajagopalachari has come out of his retirement not of his own seeking. He has come out in these difficult days and has consented to serve the people of this State. There are people, I know, who will attribute motives. I never attribute motives and I always attribute the best of motives even to my worst enemy and unless the contrary is proved, I take him to be the best of men. In England, law presumes a man is innocent until and unless he is proved guilty; the French law presumes a man to be guilty unless he proves himself innocent. So, I never attribute motives to my friends or enemies. As I said, Sir, the Hon. Sri Rajagopalachari has come to serve the people of this State in difficult times, and he has asked for a Vote of Confidence in him. You can give it. By that you do not approve of every policy of his. For instance, I cannot possibly say, we are supporting the Prohibition policy. No doubt, the Government have been good enough to give me a permit. I do not of course find it necessary for me. There is an erroneous belief that people returning from England must necessarily drink. It is absurd. May I say, it is nonsense? It is absurd and nonsense to say that people who have returned from England must drink. In fact, there is no need for the people going to England to eat meat. My permit is only to see whether the Congress Government would treat me with any courtesy, and as the Hon. Mr. Rajagopalachari has put it, I got it as a test. I do not feel any need for drink. It is not a question of supporting the policy from the theoretical point of view, but even from the practical point of view, if you can actually produce the result which you expect, even if I am inclined to drink, I will give it up for the sake of the country. But the Prohibition policy has been a failure and illicit distillation has become a cottage industry. So, Sir, my vote does not mean approval of all his policies. I do hope that those who want to see progress—no doubt it will be slow—those who want to see an efficient well-organized service in the State functioning well, will support the Hon. Sri Rajagopalachari. By giving that support it does not mean that you will accept his views or his programmes in toto. The House has got a right to vote as it likes, especially when the Budget demand is made.

3rd July 1952] [Sri P. T. Rajan]

" I hope, Sir, I have made my position clear and I am going to vote for the Motion with the reservations I have made."

* SRI U. MUTHURAMALINGA THEVAR :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, first of all I request my Andhra, Malabar and Kanarese friends to excuse me as I am going to deliver my speech in Tamil so that it might enlighten very many Tamil Members including the public from whom emerges the leader of the Congress Party, Sri C. Rajagopalachariar, and they might be in a position to understand the views I express and the news I am going to give, regarding the position of the Congress then and now and the doings of the Hon. Minister and his Colleagues, and the reasons behind this Motion. The Hon. the Chief Minister began his statement by saying that even if he accepted all the policies of the Opposition, they would rather change their policies than support him. With that preamble he started and that proves the agony that is behind the Hon. Chief Minister in spite of his old age. That should not be the procedure to be followed by a great man; that should not be the attitude of a learned man and that should not be the attitude of a man who is calling himself the custodian of God. It will be an insult to the youngsters and it will have an adverse effect on them. Then, unfortunately, the problem of God has come over here. There is a meaning in it, and that is, those who are sitting on his side are having some belief in God and are keeping God in their heart of hearts, while unfortunately, we who are sitting in the Opposition are not having it. I think, however, he might not have meant it at all. I should clear the position there and the Hon. Chief Minister also must listen to this because I want an answer from him also to this point. He is a learned man; he is also proceeding on philosophy and he has also written some books. That is all right. First of all, as the yogis and the philosophers of our country have made the public understand, first is body; second senses; third mind and fourth is intelligence and that which is superior even to intelligence is 'atma'. In this arrangement first of all there is instinct, then only comes intelligence and then comes intuition. These are the three things among living beings. Instinct is there even among the animals, but intelligence is given only to human beings and that is developed according to birth, education and association. Then, Sir, instinct is liable to err and it may fail and it has failed very many times. But, intuition is one which never fails. And, if it fails, it is not intuition. But that intuition is given only to wise men and wise men are those who are opposed to intelligence. First, Aruppukottai election has disturbed him. And if he is a man of wisdom, as he poses himself to be, and if he is above intelligence and had some intuitive knowledge he would have been in a position to understand what things are going to come, and like the Rishis of old and men of wisdom like Swami Vivekananda, Ramakrishna Paramahamsa and Ramalinga Swami of South India, he would have been in a position to know that success would be on the other side. If he was aware of that, he would not have come forward with this challenge. He banked upon his

[Sri U. Muthuramalinga Thevar] [3rd July 1952

intelligence and threw out this challenge by saying, 'If the voters are to vote for me they have confidence in me, and if they do not, I feel they do not repose confidence in me'. That was the challenge that has been thrown all of a sudden. That is the mistake he has committed in throwing the challenge without knowing what is going to happen. That is not superhuman. He is travelling and living within the bounds of intelligence and intelligence alone. He has not crossed the border of intelligence and has not entered into the arena of wisdom to talk about God. He does not therefore know the mind of the ordinary human being. So, let the God-business have a full stop there; let it not bungle and mislead the public and let it not make youngsters feel otherwise.

"With these observations, I wish to proceed with my speech in Tamil. So far I have spoken in English because he ought to understand it since on a practical analysis of it, this battle has been going on on the question of God-business.

"கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே இந்தத் தீர்மானத்துக்கு விரோதமாக பேசவேண்டிய அவசியம் ஏற்பட்டிருப்பதைக் காண்கிற போது நான் ஒரு புறத்தில் சந்தோஷம் அடைகிறேன். மற்றொரு புறத்திலோ துக்கப்படுகிறேன். ஏன் துக்கப்படுகிறேன் என்று கேட்டால் பழைய காங்கிரஸ்காரனுகிய நான், இந்திய நாட்டுக்கு விடுதலை கிடைக்கவேண்டுமென்று ஒரே எண்ணத்தோடு காங்கிரஸ் மஹாசபை செய்யச் சொன்ன தியாகங்களிலெல்லாம் பங்கு கொண்ட நான் அந்த காங்கிரஸ் மஹாசபையினிடத்தில் இன்று காங்கிரஸ் காரர்கள் எவ்வளவு பக்தி காட்டுகிறார்களோ அதைவிட அதிகமான மரியாதை என்னுடைய மனச்சாட்சி சொல்லுகிறபடி வைத்திருக்கின்ற நான் அந்த காங்கிரஸ் மந்திரி சபையின் மீது நம்பிக்கைத் தீர்மானத்தைக் கோறும் போது அதற்கு எதிராக வோட்டு அளிக்கவேண்டியிருக்கிறதே 1952-ஹுடத்திலே என்ற ஒரு காரணத்திற்காகத்தான். என்றாலும் கூட, காங்கிரஸ் மஹாசபையானது என்ன நல்ல காரியங்களை செய்திருந்த போதிலும் கூட, 1937-லே இருந்த காங்கிரஸ் வேறு. அதன் கொள்கைகள் வேறு திட்டங்கள் வேறு. ஆனால் 1952-ம்ஹுடத்திலே காங்கிரஸ்காரர்கள் என்று சொல்லிக் கொள்பவர்கள் செய்யும் காரியங்கள் வேறு. 1937-லே என்னை தேர்தலுக்கு நிற்கும்படி நான் அட்ஹாக் கமிட்டிக்கு மனுப்போடாவிட்டாலும்கூட, 'நீதான் தேர்தலுக்கு நிற்கவேண்டு" மென்று, வற்புறுத்திய காங்கிரஸ் மஹா சபை வேறு. இன்று காங்கிரஸ் காரர்கள் என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்பவர்களின் நடத்தை வேறு. நாட்டிலுடைய மக்களின் நலனைக் கருதியே அஹிம்சா தர்மத்தில் பாடுபட வேண்டுமென்று உபதேசித்த காங்கிரஸ் மஹா சபை வேறு. இன்று பலாத்காரத்தில் மறைமுகமாக கபடமாக இறங்கி மக்களுக்கு இழைத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கும் தீமைகள் வேறு. காங்கிரஸ் மஹாசபை என்னென்ன நன்மைகளைச் செய்யப் போகிறது என்று மக்கள் எதிர்பார்த்தார்களோ அது வேறு. ஆனால் சென்ற ஐந்து ஆண்டில் காங்கிரஸ் ஆட்சியினால் மக்கள் அடைந்த துன்பங்கள், கஷ்டங்கள் வேறு. காங்கிரஸ் கட்சியால் தேர்தலுக்கு நிற்க தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்படவேண்டுமென்றால் ஒவ்வொரு மெம்பரையும் பற்றி அட்ஹாக் கமிட்டி நியமித்து அதன் சிபார்சின் பேரில் ஒவ்வொரு மெம்பரையும் பொறுக்கி எடுத்த காலம் வேறு. ஆனால் எந்தெந்த இடத்தில் தங்களுக்கு சாதகமான ஆட்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். எந்தெந்த இடத்தில் முனிசிபல் சேர்மனுகளோ, ஜில்லா போர்டு பிரசிடெண்டாகளோ வரக் கூடும் என்ற சுயநலத்தோடு ஒருவர் ஒருவரால் நன்மை அடையவேண்டுமென்ற கருத்தோடு காங்கிரஸின் துரோகிகளையும், கங்காணிகளையும், ராஜாக்களையும், ஸர்களையும் மெம்பராக நிற்க வைக்கப் பொறுக்கி வைக்கும் இன்றைய காங்கிரசின் யோக்கியப்பொறுப்பற்ற நடத்தை வேறு. பொது மக்களை காங்கிரஸ்காரர்கள் நினைப்பது போல ஏமாற்றுவது சுலபமான காரியமல்ல,

பொது மக்கள் விழித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். தாங்கள் செய்யும் காரியத்தின் நன்மை தீமையை உணர்ந்து அந்தக் காரியத்தை செய்யக் கூடிய ஆற்றல் அவர்களுக்கு அதிகரித்துவிட்டது. அதனால் காங்கிரஸ் கமிட்டிகளால் தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்பட்ட நபர்களையும்கூட அவர்கள் சீர்தூக்கிப் பார்த்தே வோட்டுப் போடுகிறார்கள். அப்படி அவர்கள் ஒரு யோக்கியப் பொறுப்பற்ற காங்கிரஸ்காரனல்லாத, 1952-ம்ஹுத்திலே காங்கிரஸ் கமிட்டியால் காங்கிரஸ்காரன் என்ற சீலைக் குத்தி தேர்தலுக்கு நிற்கவைக்கப்பட்டிருக்கும் ஒரு நபருக்கு எதிராக வோட்டுப்போட்டு அவர்களைத் தோற்கடித்து விட்டால் உடனே ஜனங்கள் செய்தது மஹாத்மா காந்திக்குச் செய்த துரோகம் என்று கூக்குரலிடுவது. காங்கிரஸ் காரனல்லாத ஒரு யோக்கியப் பொறுப்பற்ற ஒரு நபரை தேர்தலுக்கு நிற்க காங்கிரஸ் கமிட்டி தேர்ந்தெடுத்ததே, அந்த அவமானகரமான செய்கையை மறந்து விட்டு, அவனுக்கு எதிராக வோட்டுப்போட்ட மக்கள் உத்தமன் ஜவஹர்லால் நேருவுக்குச் செய்த துரோகம் என்று கூக்குரலிடுவது. தேர்தலிலே ஒரு யோக்கியப்பொறுபற்ற நபர், பணத்தைக் கொடுத்து காங்கிரஸ் சீலைக்குத்திக் கொண்டு தேர்தலில் நின்ற நபர் தோற்றுப்போய்விட்டால் அது மஹாத்மா காந்திக்கு ஏற்பட்ட தோல்வி, ஜவஹர்லால் நேருவுக்கு ஏற்பட்ட தோல்வி என்று பறைசாற்றுவது வெட்கமில்லையா என்று அந்தப்புறத்திலிருக்கக்கூடிய நபர்களைக் கேட்கிறேன்? இது மிகவும் இழிவான, அவமானகரமான செய்கை என்பதை அந்தப் பக்கத்திலும் இருப்பவர்கள் உணராமல் இருக்கமுடியாது. அவர்களுக்கு உண்மையிலேயே ஆச்சார்யார் சொல்லுகிறதான மனச்சாட்சி இருக்குமேயானால்.

"அதற்கு அடுத்தாற்போல மற்றொரு விவரத்திற்கு வரவேண்டும். 'எப்படி இருந்தபோதிலும் நாங்கள் கவர்மெண்டை நடத்தவேண்டும். நாங்கள் சென்ற காலத்தில் எவ்வளவோ சிறிய சிறிய குற்றங்களை எல்லாம் செய்திருந்த போதிலும் வருங்காலத்தில் எவ்வளவோ பெரிய பெரிய நன்மைகளையெல்லாம் செய்ய திட்டம் போட்டிருப்பதால் நாங்களேதான் மீண்டும் சர்க்காரை நடத்தவேண்டும்' என்று சொல்வது ஒரு மிகவும் புத்திசாலித்தனமான வாதம். ஆனால் மற்ற பேர்களுக்கு சர்க்காரை நடத்தத் தெரியாது என்று சொல்வதோ, மற்றவர்களுக்குப் பேசத் தெரியாது, வாதாடத் தெரியாது என்று சொல்வதோ அறிவுக்குப் பொருந்தியதாக ஆகாது. ஆண்டவன் அருளால் நான் ஊமையல்ல. நன்றாகப் பேசத் தெரியும். ஆங்கிலத்திலும் பேசுவேன் தமிழிலும் பேசுவேன். ஆனால் 1937-ம்ஹுத்திலிருந்து கனம் ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியாரை பிரதமராகக் கொண்ட காங்கிரஸ் மந்திரி சபை பதவியில் இருந்த காலம் வரையில் நான் ஒரு வார்த்தைகூட பேசியது கிடையாது ஒரு கேள்விகூட கேட்டது கிடையாது. என்? அதன் காரணத்தை யாரும் ஆராயவில்லை. ஆனால் எனது காங்கிரஸ் நண்பர்கள் என்னை பற்றி இழிவாக தேர்தலிலே பேசும் பொழுது, 'முத்துராமலிங்கத் தேவரை ஒன்றும் பெரிய ஆளாக எண்ணி விட வேண்டாம். சட்டசபையிலே நாலு வார்த்தை ஒழுங்காகப் பேசத் தெரியாது. மேடையிலே வேண்டுமானால் சண்டப்பிரசண்டம் செய்வாரே தவிர சட்டசபையிலே வாயையே திறக்கத் தெரியாதபோது அவரை தேர்ந்தெடுத்து என்ன செய்வது,' என்பதாகவெல்லாம் பேசிய விஷயங்கள் எனக்குத்தெரியாததல்ல. ஆனால் எந்த நிலையில சட்டசபையில் பேசாமல் இருந்தேன், என் பேசாமல் இருந்தேன், பேச தெரியாதவனா? பேசுவதை புரிந்துகொண்டு பதில் சொல்லத்தெரியாதவனா? ஊமை இல்லையே. அப்பொழுது ஏன் பேசமல் இருந்தேன் என்பதை யாராவது யோசித்துப் பேசினார்களா என்பதை கொஞ்சம் கவனிக்கவேண்டும். நான் ஏன் பேசாமல் இருந்தேன்? அஹிம்சா தர்மகர்த்தாவாகிய, காந்தியின் பிரதம சீடராகிய ஸ்ரீ ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியார் மந்திரியாக இருக்கும்போது அவருக்கு மிகப் பிடித்தமான ஒரு நபரைப் பற்றி எதுவும் கேள்வி கேட்கவோ, மறுத்துப் பேசவோ உரிமை மெம்பர்களுக்குக் கிடையாது என்பது எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். 1936-37-ம் ஹுத்திலே நடந்த தேர்தலிலே காங்கிரஸ் கட்சியின் சார்பாக பிரசாரம் செய்வதற்கு ஆள் கிடையாது. ராமநாதபுரம் ஜில்லா ராஜா ஸர் அண்ணாமலை செட்டியாரும் அவருடைய திருக்குமாரான முத்தையா செட்டியாரும் உள்ள தொகுதியிலே. அவர்களிடம் படை பலம், பண பலம், அதிகாரத்திலிருந்த ஆங்கிலத்துறைத்தனத்தின் சினேக பலம் இவ்வளவையும் கொண்டு அவர்

[Sri U. Muthuramalinga Thevar] [3rd July 1952

அந்தப் பகுதியிலேயே அவருக்கு எதிராக காங்கிரஸ் பிரசாரத்திற்கு வருபவர்களை ஒரு ஆட்டம் ஆட்டி வைத்துக் கொண்டிருந்தார். அதையும மீறி, அவர் செலவுக்கை மீறி, காங்கிரஸ் பிரசாரத்திற்குச் சென்ற போது காங்கிரஸ் காரர்கள் அங்கேயுள்ள பிரிட்டிஷ் கையாளான ராஜா ஸர் அண்ணுமலை செட்டியாருக்கு எதிராகப் பேசுகிறோம் என்பதற்காக போலீஸ்காரர்களால் இழுத்து தள்ளப்பட்டு அவமானம் செய்யப்பட்டார்கள். அந்த அவமானகரமான, இழிவான போலீஸ்காரர்களின் செய்கைக்குத் தக்க தண்டனை கொடுக்க வேண்டுமெனபதாக எங்கள் உள்ளம் குமுறிற்று.

"அந்தப் பிராந்தியத்தில் அப்பொழுது டில்லி சட்டசபை மெம்பராயிருந்த கனம சதசியமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் தேர்தல் பிரசாரத்திற்கு சென்ற பொழுது அவர் மேடையில் பிரசங்கிக்கிற காலத்தில் ஒரு ஹெட் கான்ஸ்டபிள் கையில் ரிவால்வருடன் முன் வந்து 'நீங்கள் பேசினால் கலகம் ஏற்படும். ஆகையால் பேசக்கூடாது,' என்று தடுத்து மேடையை விட்டு இறங்கச் செய்தான். அந்த அளவிற்கு போலீஸ் பலாத்காரம் தலைவிரித்தாடியது. பிரஜா உரிமை இருந்த இடம் தெரியாமல் மறைந்தது. அப்போது நான் அங்கு சென்று ஒவ்வொரு இடங்களிலும் போலீஸ் மிரட்டலை மீறி பிரசங்கங்கள் புரிந்து காங்கிரசை ஜயங்கச் செய்ய வேண்டியதாய் இருந்தது."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The hon. Member may continue his speech after lunch. The House is adjourned till 2-45 p.m. for lunch."

(After lunch—2-45 p.m.)

* SRI. U. MUTHURAMALINGA THEVAR :—"கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே காலையிலே ராஜா ஸர் அண்ணுமலை செட்டியாரின் தொகுதியிலே எப்படி தேர்தல் பிரசாரம் செய்வதற்கு ஆள் இல்லாத நிலைமை இருந்தது, அந்த நேரத்தில் நான் எப்படி என் உயிரையும் மதிக்காமல் அந்த இடத்திற்கு பிரசாரம் செய்ய சென்ற போது போலீசாரால் காங்கிரஸ்காரர்கள் அவமானம் செய்யப்பட்டார்கள் என்பதைப் பற்றி குறிப்பிட்டுக்கொண்டிருந்தேன்.

"இப்படிப்பட்ட சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் கனம் ராஜாஜியை பிரதமராகக் கொண்ட காங்கிரஸ் மந்திரி சபை சென்னை மாகாணத்தில் ஏற்பட்ட உடனேயே அந்தத் தொகுதியில் போலீசாரால் இழைக்கப்பட்ட அவமானத்தை விசாரிக்கவேண்டுமென்பதாக நான் முதன முதலில் ஒரு கேள்வி எழுதி அனுப்பினேன். அந்தக் காலத்தில் யார் கேள்வி கேட்பதாக இருந்தாலும் அந்தக் கேள்வியை முதலில் பார்டிக்கு அனுப்பவேண்டும். பார்டியினுடைய அனுமதியின் பேரில்தான் அந்தக் கேள்வி பின்னர் அசெம்பளி செக்ரடரிக்கு அனுப்பி வைக்கப்படும். எனனென்ன விதங்களிலெல்லாம் மெம்பர்களை கட்டுப் படுத்த முடியுமோ அந்தந்த விதங்களிலெல்லாம் கட்டுப் படுத்தி வைத்திருந்தார்கள். கட்டுப்பாடு இருக்கவேண்டுமென்பது வாஸ்தவம்தான்: கட்டுப்பாடு இல்லாவிட்டால் எந்த பார்ட்டியும் வெற்றிகரமாக இயங்க முடியாது. ஆனால் கட்சியின் தன் மானத்தை அதிகரிக்கச் செய்கின்ற கட்சிக்கு ஏற்பட்ட அவமானத்தை துடைக்க வேண்டுமென்ற ஒரே உத்வேகத்தோடு கொண்டுவரப்பட்ட நியாயமான, ஒரு கேள்வி தலைவர் ராஜாஜிக்கு வேண்டிய ஒரு நபரைப் பற்றியது என்ற காரணத்திற்காக கட்சியின் பொது நோக்கம் குன்றி, கட்சியின் பொது நலனை மறந்து அதை வர முடியாதபடி கட்டுபடுத்தி வைப்பது எனறால் அது மிகவும் அவமானகரமானதாகும்: நான் அனுப்பிய கேள்வியும் அப்படிதான் ஆயிற்று. அதிலிருந்தே நான் எதுவும பேசுவதில்லையென்று தீர்மானித்து விடடேன். சட்டசபையின் தலைவருக்கு, கட்சியின் தலைவருக்கு, நானும் சட்டசபை மெம்பர் என்பதான பலகாரணங்களைக் கொண்டு காங்கிரஸுக்கு விரோதமாக போலீசாரின் உதவியைக்கொண்டு ராஜா ஸர் அண்ணுமலை செட்டியார் செய்த அக்கிரமங்களை விசாரிக்க வேண்டுமென்று நான் அனுப்பிய ஒரு கேள்வியை, இந்த மஹா புருஷர் ஸ்ரீமான் ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியார், கட்டுப் பாட்டுடன் கட்சி இயங்க வேண்டுமென்று அடக்கு முறையை அளவற்று கையாளக் கொஞ்சமும் கூசாத

3rd July 1952] [Sri U. Muthuramalinga Thevar]

காந்தி பக்தர் ஸ்ரீமான் ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியார்; தானே கடவுளின் அவதார மென்று சொல்ல வாய் நடுங்காத அவதார புருஷர் ஸ்ரீமான் ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியார், தனக்கு ராஜா ஸர் வேண்டியவர் என்ற காரணத்திற்காக அந்தக் கேள்வியே கேட்கக் கூடாது என்று தடுத்துவிட்டார். மானம்போன காங்கிரஸ் சபையின் அங்கத்தினர் என்ற அவமானச் சீட்டை, தாங்கிக் கொண்டு நான் அன்று முதல் மந்திரி சபை கலையும் வரையில் பேசுவதில்லை என்று தீர்மானித்து விட்டேன். அப்படியே பேசாமலும் இருந்தேன். இதுவும் இந்த மஹானுபாவரின் அடக்கு முறையினால் தான் தன் மானம் பறி போன காங்கிரஸின மானம் கப்பலேறாமல் இருக்கவேண்டுமென்பதற்காக இரண்டு வருஷம் மௌனம் சாதிக்க வேண்டிய நிர்பந்தம் ஏற்பட்டு விட்டது. அன்றும் எதிர் தரப்பிற்கு போகலாமென்றால் அன்றே எதிர் தரப்பில் அரசியலே கிடையாது. அந்த நிலைமை இருந்து கொண்டிருக்கிற போதுதான் அதற்குப் பின்னால் வருகிறது காங்கிரஸின் கொள்கைக்குத் துரோகம் செய்துவிட்டு வெள்ளையனோடு கூடி குலாவிப் பேசப் போகும் சமஷ்டி திட்டம். இந்தத் திட்டம் முறிந்தபின் தான் அதற்குப் புறம்பான பல விஷயங்களை ஒப்புக்கொள்ள இவர்கள் வற்புறுத்தப்பட்டார்கள். அப்போதுதான் அதை ராஜினாமா செய்துவிட்டு வெளியே வரவேண்டுமென்பதானதொரு தீர்மானம் நிறைவேறிற்று.

"C.R. தாஸ் காலத்தில் இதே ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியார் முதலில் தேர்தலுக்கு யாரும் நிற்கக்கூடாது என்று சொன்னார். சட்டசபைக்கு போக வேண்டுமென்று யாரும் விரும்பக்கூடாது. அங்கே போனால் பிரிட்டனுக்கு போகவேண்டும், பிரிட்டன் என்பது ஒரு மாய வலை. விபசாரம் செய்யும் விடுதியைப் போன்று பாபகரமானது, என்பதாக வெல்லாம் அதற்கு எதிராக பிரசாரம் செய்யப்பட்டது. ஆனால் வி. ஆர். தாஸும், புதுக்கோட்டை சத்திய மூர்த்தி ஐயருமாக தேர்தலுக்கு நிற்கத்தான் வேண்டுமென்பதாக தீர்மானம் செய்யப்பட்டவுடன் என் பிராந்தியத்திலே தேர்தலுக்கு என்னைத் தவிர வேறு ஒரு ஆள் கூட நிற்க முடியாது என்று சொல்லி எனக்கு தேர்தலுக்கு நிற்க டெபாசிட் கட்டுவதற்காக 250 ரூபாய் தந்தி மணியாடரும் உடனே தேர்தலுக்கு நாமினேஷன்பண்ணச் சொல்லி தந்தியும் வந்தது அகில இந்திய காங்கிரஸ் கமிட்டியிடமிருந்து. அட்ஹாக் கமிட்டியை நான் கேட்கவில்லை. தேர்தலில் போட்டியிட்டபோது மக்களிடம் காங்கிரஸ் என்னசொல்லி வோட்டு வாங்கிற்று என்பதை நான் எல்லோருக்கும் புரியவேண்டுமென்பதற்காக ஆங்லத்தில் சொல்லுகிறேன்:

'We are not going to work the Constitution; we are going to wreck it. So, please vote for us; that was the Congress election manefesto in 1937.'

"நாங்கள் கான்ஸ்டிடியூஷன்படி வேலை செய்யப்போகவில்லை. அதை உடைக்க போகிறோம், ஆகையால் எங்களுக்கு வோட்டுப் போடுங்கள்,' என்று 1937மஹாத்திலே ஒவ்வொரு வாக்காளரிடம் காங்கிரஸ் கட்சி சென்று கேட்டது. பிரிட்டிஷ்காரர்களோடு ஒத்துழைக்கப்போகிறோம் என்று வோட்டு கேட்கவில்லை. அவர்களுக்கு கால் வருடியாக இருக்கப்போகிறோமென்று வோட்டு கேட்கவில்லை. ஆனால் வோட்டுக்கேட்டு வெற்றிப் பெற்று உள்ளே வந்த பின் நடந்தது என்ன? காங்கிரஸ் சர்க்கார் பதவிக்கு வந்தவுடன் கான்ஸ்டிடியூஷனை உடைக்கபோகிறார்கள் என்று நினைத்தார்கள். ஆனால் உடைத்தார்களா? இல்லை. காங்கிரஸ் சர்க்கார் பதவிக்கு வரவேண்டுமென்று தன் உயிர், உடல், பொருள் யாவையும் தியாகம் செய்த உத்தமர்களின் தலைகளை உடைத்தார்கள். கை கால்களை உடைத்தார்கள், கடவுளின் அவதாரம்தானே என்று சொல்லிக் கொள்ளுகிற, இருபாகடாக்ஷம் மிக்கவரான நமது ஸ்ரீ ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியாரின் தலைமையில் நடந்த காருண்யமிக்க காங்கிரஸ் சர்க்கார். அவ்வாறு செய்வது மிகவும் தவறு, அநியாயமானது என்று நான் குறுக்கிட்டு கேட்ட காலத்தில் எனக்கு கிடைத்தபலன் சிறைச்சாலை. தன் மானம் மிக்க காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களின் செய்கையா? இது சொன்ன வார்த்தையை நிறைவேற்றி வைக்கும் குணமிருக்கும் என்று யாராவது சொன்னால் அது உண்மையாகுமா? கான்ஸ்டிடியூஷனை உடைத்து, குற்றத் திருத்த சட்டத்தின் எடுகளை சட்டப் புத்தகத்திலிருந்து பக்கம் பக்கமாக கிழித்தெரியப் போகிறோம் என்று

மக்களிடையே வோட்டு கேட்ட காங்கிரஸ் கட்சி ஸ்ரீமான் ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியாரின் தலைமையின் கீழ் மந்திரிசபை அமைத்ததோது, பிரிட்டிஷ் ஆட்சியில் இருந்ததை விட மிக கோரமான அளவில் குரூரமான வகையில் அதே குற்றத்திருத்தச் சட்டத்தின் ஒவ்வொரு ஏட்டிலுமுள்ள விதியையும் மீறிய அளவில், தேசத்திற்கு தியாகம் செய்த தேசபக்தர்களின் மீது உபயோகித்தார். பாட்லிவாலாமீது இந்த கருணாமூர்த்தி, அஹிம்சா, தர்மவாதி, அவதார புருஷரான ஸ்ரீமான் ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியாரின் திருக்கரத்தால். அடக்குமுறையை எதிர்த்துப் பார்த்துப் போராடிய காங்கிரஸ் கட்சியின் தலைவரான இந்த மஹானுபாவன் அரசாங்கத் தலைவராவதுடன் தன் தேசபக்தர்களின் தலையை உடைக்க, மனதைவிட்டு அவர்கள் சொல்லும் அபிப்பிராயத்தை குலைக்க அடக்குமுறைகளை முன்பிருந்ததைக் காட்டிலும் அதிக அளவில் கையாண்டார். தேசபக்தர்களை சிறைச்சாலையில் கொண்டு தள்ளினார், தாங்களே நிரந்தரமாக பதவியில் இருக்கப் போகிறோமென்ற எண்ணத்தில்.

"இப்படி வெறித்தனமான அடக்குமுறையை உபயோகித்து காங்கிரஸிற்கு மற்றொரு மகத்தான கிரீடத்தைச் சூட்டினார், இந்த அவதார புருஷர். பதவிக்கு வருமுன், அடக்குமுறையை எதிர்த்தவர்கள் பதவிக்கு வந்தபின் அதே அடக்குமுறையைக் கையாண்டார்களே, தாங்கள் நிரந்தரமாக பதவியில் இருக்கப்போகிறோம் என்ற எண்ணத்திலா, உடனே இரண்டொரு வருஷத்தில் அவர்களும் ராஜினாமா செய்து எங்களைத் தள்ளின சிறைக்கேதான் அவர்களும் வரவேண்டும் என்று நினைத்திருப்பார்களா? 'கருப்பன் கருப்பன்,' என வெள்ளையனால் நிந்திக்கப்பட்ட, உதாசீனம் செய்யப்பட்ட இந்திய மக்கள் தங்கள் மந்திரி சபையை அமைத்தவுடன் என்ன செய்ய வேண்டும்? யார் நம்மை நிந்தித்தாரோ அதே வெள்ளையனுக்குக் கால் வருடியாகவா, அவன் ஆணைக்கு அடிபணிந்து கொண்டா பதவி வகிப்பது? வெள்ளையனுக்கு விரோதமாகப் பேசி வோட்டு வாங்கி வந்த இந்த காங்கிரஸ் கட்சி என்ன செய்தது? வெள்ளையனை விரோதித்துக் கொண்டதா? இல்லை. பீஹாரிலும் மற்ற இடங்களிலும் அவர்களுக்கு உத்யோகம் கொடுத்து அவன் கட்டளைக்கு அடி பணிந்தது. இந்தியனுக்கு கொடுக்கப்படவேண்டிய உத்யோகம் வெள்ளையனுக்குக் கொடுக்கப்பட்டது பீஹாரில். அப்பொழுதாவது மந்திரி சபை ராஜினாமா செய்திருக்க வேண்டும். அதைச் செய்யாமல் மீண்டும் காங்கிரஸிற்கு அவமானத்தை உண்டு பண்ணினார்கள். அந்த நிலைமை உண்டு பண்ணப்பட்ட பிறகு தான் சமஷ்டியை ஒத்துக்கொள்வது என்ற எண்ணத்தோடு காங்கிரஸ்காரர்கள் ரகசியமாக ஒரு கூட்டம் போட்டு, ஏற்கனவே அவமான முறையில், அவலட்சண முறையில் தன் மானத்தைச் சிதைத்துக் கொண்ட முறையில், சுய மூளையை மழுப்பிக் கொண்டு வேலை செய்தார்கள். அந்த சமயத்தில் ராஷ்டிரபதி தேர்தல் வந்தது. அந்த ராஷ்டிரபதி தேர்தலில் சுபாஷ்சந்திர போஸ் போட்டியிட்டார். அவருக்கு எதிராக பட்டாபி சீதாராமய்யாவை அவர்களுடைய சார்பில் நிறுத்தி வைத்தார்கள். அப்பொழுது என்ன நடந்தது? இப்பொழுது அருப்புக்கோட்டையில் தேர்தல் நடக்கிற காலத்தில் ஆச்சாரியாரைப் போன்ற வயது முதிர்ந்தவர்கள், அறிவு மிக்கவர்கள், அனுபவமிக்கவர்கள் என்ன நினைத்தார்களோ கடைசியில் எப்படி ஏமாந்து போனார்களோ, அதே போலத்தான் அன்று காந்தியடி அவர்களும், பட்டாபி சீதாராமய்யா அவர்களும் ஜெயித்து விடுவார் என்று எண்ணினார். உண்மையில் என்ன நடக்கும் என்று அவர்கள் புரிந்து கொள்ளாமல், ஆனால் புரிந்து கொண்டவர்களைப்போலத்தான் நடிக்கிறார்கள். காந்தியடிகளும் நிச்சயமாகவே தனக்குத் தோல்வி வருமென்று தெரிந்து கொள்ளவே இல்லை. அவர்களும் தேர்தலுக்கு வேலை செய்தார். நாங்களும் வேலை செய்தோம். உண்மையில் யாருக்கு வெற்றி கிடைத்தது? இப்பொழுது அருப்புக்கோட்டையில் நடந்ததுபோல்தான் அப்பொழுதும் சுபாஷ் பாபுவால் பட்டாபி சீதாராமய்யா தோற்கடிக்கப்பட்டார். அருப்புகோட்டை தேர்தலில் காங்கிரஸ் தோற்றுப்போனவுடன் எப்படி இந்த மகானுபாவர் தனக்கு எதிராகவே எல்லோரும் வோட்டளித்ததாக எடுத்துக் கொண்டு இந்த நம்பிக்கை தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்தாரோ, அதைப் போலவே அன்று மகாத்மா காந்தியானவர், 'பட்டாபி சீதாராமய்யாவின்

தோல்வி, என் தோல்வி' என்பதாக அலறினார். சுபாஷ்பாபு ராஷ்டிர பதியாக தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்பட்டவுடன் ஆங்கிலேயனுக்கு இன்னும் ஆறு மாத நோட்டீஸ் கொடுக்க வேண்டுமென்று கோரப்பட்டது, 'Why should we give this six months' notice'? What is the sanction behind it?' என்பதாக காங்கிரஸ்காரர்கள் குமுறினார்கள். ஆறு மாதத்திற்குள் நடந்தது என்ன? வந்தது உலக யுத்தம்.

"தங்களுடைய கொள்கைகளை மறந்து, குறிக்கோள்களை மறந்து, ஜனநாயக சட்டம், ஒழுங்கு முறை யாவையும் மறந்து, பிரிட்டிஷ்காரர்களோடு தொடர்பு கொள்ளக்கூடாது, வெள்ளையனுக்கு கால் வருடிகளாக வாழக்கூடாது என அன்னிய ஏகாதிபத்தியத்திற்கு எதிராகக் குரல் கொடுத்த எங்களை காங்கிரஸ்லிலிருந்து வெளிபேற்றிவிட தீர்மானம் செய்தார்கள். வெள்ளையனை எதிர்த்துப்போராட வேண்டுமென்ற கொள்கையோடு ஸ்தாபிக்கப்பட்ட கட்சி அன்னிய ஏகாதிபத்தியத்தை விரட்ட வேண்டுமென்று ஸ்தாபிக்கப்பட்ட கட்சி, வெள்ளையனை எதிர்க்கின்றவர்களை, ஆங்கில ஏகாதிபத்தியத்தை எதிர்க்கின்றவர்களை, எதிர்க்க வேண்டும் என்று தீர்மானம் செய்தது. உலகம் இவர்களைக் கண்டு நகையாடத்தக்க முறையில் வெள்ளையனுக்கு எதிராக யார் என்ன சொல்லுகிறார்களோ அவர்கள் மேல் ஒழுங்கு நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்றும் தீர்மானிக்கப்பட்டது. இது எப்படி இருக்கிறது என்று பார்த்தால் தாயகத் தன் குழந்தையிடத்தில் அதிக அபிமானம் உண்டு என்பதும், அதிக அன்பு உண்டு என்பதும் எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். தாயைக் காட்டிலும் குழந்தையை நேசிக்கக்கூடியவர்கள் வேறு யாருமே கிடையாது. இருந்தாலும் கூட கற்பை இழந்த தாய், தன் காமத்தை தணித்துக் கொள்வதற்காக பிற ஆடவனோடு சேரும் தாய் அதற்கு விரோதமாக தன் குழந்தை இருக்கிறது என்று அறிந்து கொண்டாளேயானால் அந்தக் குழந்தையிடம் அவளுக்கு அபிமானம் குறையும். அது மாத்திரமல்ல. தன்னுடைய விபசார நடத்தைக்கு விரோதமாக இருக்கிற தன் குழந்தையுமே கொல்ல அவள் ஒரு நாளும சுகமாட்டாள். இதைப் போல வெள்ளைக்காரனோடு விபசார உறவு பூண்ட இந்தக் காங்கிரஸானது காங்கிரஸிற்காகவே உழைத்த எங்களை, காங்கிரஸின் கொள்கை திட்டங்களை நடை முறையில் அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டு வரவேண்டுமென்று பாடுபட்ட எங்களை, கட்சியை விட்டே வெளியேற்றிற்று. பிறகு சுபாஷ்சந்திர போஸ் பேரிலும் ஒழுங்கு நடவடிக்கை எடுத்தார்கள். அந்த நிலைமை வந்தது. அந்த நிலைமை வந்ததோடு நிற்கவில்லை. பின்னால் என்ன நடந்தது? அரசியல் போராட்டமாக தனி நபர் சத்தியாக்ரகம் ஆரம்பிக்கப்பட்டது. அந்த தனி நபர் சத்தியாக்ரகம் ஆரம்பித்தவுடன் அதில் சேர்ந்து கொண்டு போராட முன்வருபவர்கள் காந்தியடிகளிடம் நற்சாட்சி பத்திரம் பெற்றுக் கொண்டுதான் அஹிம்சா முறையில் அதில் ஈடுபட வேண்டுமென தீர்மானிக்கப்பட்டது. தனி நபர் சத்தியாக்ரகம் என்பது என்ன? மக்களை தாங்கள், ஏதோ சுதந்திரத்திற்கு பாடுபட்டுக் கொண்டே இருப்பது போல ஏமாற்றுவதற்காக, நடத்தப்பட்ட அரசியல் நாடகமே தவிர வேறு ஒன்றுமில்லை. மதில் மேல் பூனை போல் அந்தப்பக்கமும் இன்றி இந்தப்பக்கமும் இன்றி அதாவது வெள்ளையனையும தாக்கிப் பேசாமல் அரசியல் கபட நாடகம் நடித்தார்கள். காங்கிரஸ்காரர்கள் என்று சொல்லிக் கொண்டு இப்போது இருக்கிற காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களுக்கும் அவர்களுடைய கொள்கைகளுக்கும் எவ்வளவு வேற்றுமை உண்டோ அவ்வளவு வேற்றுமை அந்தக் காலத்திலேயே, காங்கிரஸ்காரர்கள் சொல்வதற்கும் நடந்துகொள்வதற்கும் வித்யாசம் இருந்தது. வெள்ளையனுக்கு விரோதமாக எதுவும் சொல்வது கிடையாது. சத்யாக்ரகிகள் இன்னதுதான் பேச வேண்டும் என்பதை எழுதிக் கொடுத்துவிடுவார்கள். அதைத்தான் அவர்கள் அப்படியே படிக்க வேண்டுமே தவிர வேறு ஒன்றும் சேர்த்துப் பேசக் கூடாது. ஒருவன் சத்தியாக்ரகம் செய்யப் போகிறான் என்றால் அதை அவன் முன்பே போலீசுக்கு சொல்லுவான். உறவினன் ஒருவன் மாலையை வைத்துக் கொண்டிருப்பான், பக்கத்தில். போலீஸ்காரன் வாரண்டை வைத்துக் கொண்டிருப்பான். இவன் எழுதி வந்திருப்பதை படித்தவுடன் 'போலீஸ்காரன் இம்மாதிரி நீங்கள் பேசியது தப்பு, உங்கள் பேரில் வாரண்டு கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறேன், என்னுடன் வாருங்கள்' என்பான். உடனே அவனுடைய உறவினன் 'போய்விட்டு வாருங்கள்' என்று

மாலையைச் சூட்டுவான். இவர் லாரியில் போய் ஏறி உட்கார்ந்து கொள்வார். இப்படியாக இந்தக் கேலிக்கூத்து ஒரு நாடகமாக நடந்தது. பிறகு போலீஸ்காரர்கள் பார்த்தார்கள். இது என்ன வெறும் கேலிக்கூத்து நாடகமாய்ப் போய்விட்டதே என்று நினைத்து ஒருவரையும் அப்புறம் கைது செய்வதில்லை. இந்த இயக்கத்தில் மிகவும் முக்கியமானவர்களை மாத்திரம் கைது செய்து விட்டு மற்ற காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களை சும்மா விட்டு வந்தார்கள். கைது செய்யப்படாமல் வெளியே விடப்பட்டிருக்கும் சத்யாக்ரக கோஷ்டி எல்லோரும் மந்திரிகள் உள்பட, மாகாண எம். எல். எக்கள் உள்பட; மாகாண கமிட்டி அங்கத்தினர்கள், தலைவர்கள் உள்பட, எல்லோரும் டெல்லிக்குக் கால் நடையாகப் வரவேண்டும் என்று முடிவு செய்தார்கள். காங்கிரஸின் மானம் இன்று பறி போகவில்லை. அன்றே அந்த முடிவு எற்பட்டவுடனேயே பறிபோய் விட்டது. 'ஐயோ, டெல்லிக்கு எப்படி நடந்து போவது' என்று அலறி அடித்துக்கொண்டு ஓடி போலீஸ்காரன் காலில் விழுந்து 'ஐயா, தயவு செய்து என்னைக் கைது செய்யுங்கள், இல்லாவிட்டால் நான் டெல்லிக்கு நடந்து போகும்படி தண்டனை கொடுத்து விடும், நீங்கள்தான் கருணை செய்ய வேண்டும்' என்று கெஞ்சி 200, 500, 750 ரூபாய் என்று பணத்தைக் கொடுத்து கைது செய்யும்படி செய்து கொண்டார்கள். மானம், தன்மானம், மதிப்பு எல்லாவற்றையும் காற்றிலே பறக்க விட்ட காந்தி சிஷ்யர்கள். அன்று அவர்கள் அரசியல் தலைவர்களாக இல்லை. அரசியல் நாடக அரங்கில் தானும் ஒரு நடிகன் என்ற பெயர் வாங்க வியாபாரியாகிவிட்டார்கள், தங்களைக் கைது செய்ய போலீசாருடன் பேரம் செய்து கொண்டு காலம கடத்தினார்கள். இன்று காங்கிரஸ் பெஞ்சியிலே உட்கார்ந்து கொண்டிருக்கிற அநேக காங்கிஸ்காரர்களுக்கு இந்த விவரங்கள் ஒன்றும் தெரியாமல இருக்கலாம். ஏனென்றால் அன்று அவர்கள் எல்லோரும் காங்கிரஸின் பரம விரோதிகளாக பிரிட்டிஷ்காரரின் கண்காணிகளாக காலந் தள்ளினவர்கள்தான் இன்று காங்கிரஸிலே காங்கிரஸ் என்ற seal-ஐக்குத்தி கொண்டு உட்கார்ந்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் நானே இன்று எதிர் கட்சியில் இருந்தாலும் அன்று காங்கிரஸ்காரனாகத்தானிருந்தேன். இதை யாராவது காங்கிரஸ்காரர்கள் ஆக்ஷேபித்தால் நபர்கள் பெயரும். நடந்த விவரமும் புள்ளி விவரங்களுடன் சொல்லத் தயார். மல்லாந்து படுத்துக் கொண்டு மேலே எச்சிலை உமிழ்ந்தால் அது அவன் மார்பிலேயேதான் விழும் என்பதையும் போல, அவைகள் எல்லாவற்றையும் எடுத்துச் சொல்லும் போது நானும் இன்று வெட்கத்தோடு, அவமானத்தோடு தலை குனியத் தான் வேண்டி இருக்கிறது என்பதைச் சொல்லாமலிருக்க முடியாது.

3 p.m. "அப்பொழுது நடந்த அரசியல் தியாகம் ஒரு வியாபார தியாகமாக மாறி விட்டது. எப்படி இப்பொழுது கோவாபரேடிவ் சொசைட்டிகளின் டைரெக்டராகவும் காரியதரிசியாகவும் தங்கள் சுயநலத்தை உத்தேசித்து சுரண்டி சம்பாதிக்கலாமே என்பதற்காக போட்டி போட்டுக் கொண்டு தியாகிகள் வருகிறார்களோ, அதைப்போலதான் அன்றும் அந்த அரசியல் வியாபார நாடகத்திற் தப் பங்கு கொள்ள எல்லோரும் முன் வந்தார்கள்.

"பிறகு நான் வேலூர் சிறைச்சாலையில் இருந்தேன். தனிப்பட்டோர் சத்தியாக்ரகத்தில் ஈடுபட்டதற்காக அப்பொழுது நமது ஆச்சாரியார் கைது செய்யப்பட்டு அவரும் அந்த வேலூர் சிறைச்சாலைக்கு வந்தார். அவர்களை உள்ளே அழைத்து வரும்போது நான் குளித்துக் கொண்டு நின்றேன். அவர் அப்பொழுது- 'என்ன தேவரே, சௌக்யமா' என்றார். எங்கள் இருவருக்கும் எத்தனையோ அபிப்பிராய பேதம் இருந்தாலும் பரஸ்பரம் சிநேகிதர்போலத்தான் நாங்கள் பேசிக் கொள்வோம். என்றும் அப்படியே இருக்க வேண்டுமென்றும் எதிர் பார்க்கிறேன். அதனால் என்னை அவர் சௌக்யம் விசாரித்தபோது நானும் அவரை வரவேற்று, நீங்களும் இங்கே தான் வரவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டவுடன், அதிகாரமே தனக்கு இருக்கும் என்று நினைத்துக் கொண்டிருந்த ஆச்சாரியார் அவமானப்பட்டு ஒன்றும் பேசாது சென்றார்.

"அதற்கு பிறகு என்ன நடந்தது? உண்மையான சுதந்திரம் இவர்களுக்குக் கிடைத்ததா? ஆங்கிலேயர்களைப் பார்லிமென்டில் நேராக எதிர்க்கக்கூடிய திறமை இந்த நபர்களில் யாருக்காவது வந்ததா? இந்தியர்கள் கோழைகள், பேசத் திறமையற்றவர்கள், பிரயோஜனமற்றவர்கள் என்கிற

அளவுக்கு ஆங்கிலேயர்கள் இவர்களை இழிவுபடுத்தக்கூடிய நிலையில்தான் இவர்கள் இருந்தார்கள். இங்கே இருக்கிற அரசியல் வாதிகள் எல்லாரும் 'Very many political leaders are not leaders. They are nothing but dealers' என்று அவர்களை இழிவு படுத்தக்கூடிய நிலையில் இவர்களுடைய நடத்தை மாறிவிட்டது. இந்த நிலைமையில் இவர்கள் வந்து விட்டதன் காரணமாக இவர்களை யாரும் மதிக்கமுடியாது போய்விட்டது.

"இப்படிப் போய்க்கொண்டிருக்கின்ற காலத்தில் யுத்தம் வந்துவிட்டது. யுத்தம் வந்த பிறகு, அந்த யுத்தம் வேகமாக நடந்துகொண்டிருக்கிற காலத்திலும்கூட, வெள்ளையர்களை வெளியேற்றி, நாடு விடுதலையடைய வேண்டுமென்ற நோக்கத்தோடு அது சம்பந்தமான காரியங்கள் நடந்து வந்தன. யுத்தமோ ஐரோப்பா அரங்கிலிருந்து உலகதத்தின் பல பல மூலைகளுக்கும் பரவிக் கொண்டிருந்தது. வெள்ளையர்களுக்கு எதிராக எப்போதும் சவால்விட்டுக்கொண்டிருந்த சுபாஷ் சந்திர போஸ் அவர்கள் உடல் நலம் குன்றியிருந்தபோது, ஏகாதிபத்திய போலீசாரால் சிறைக்குள் போடப்பட்டிருந்தார். இருந்தும், சுபாஸ் பாபு கடைசியாக இந்தத் தேசத்தின் விடுதலையொன்றையே குறிக்கோளாகக்கொண்டு, தேசத்தை விட்டு மாயமாக மறைந்து, ஐரோப்பா நாடு சென்றார். அங்கே ஒரு சுதந்திர இந்திய ராணுவத்தைத் திரட்டி, ஐரோப்பிய யுத்த முனையிலே இந்திய தேசிய வீரர்களை திரட்டியதோடல்லாமல், அங்கிருந்து ரகசியமாக ஜப்பானை அணுகினார். ஜப்பான் அந்த நேரத்தில் சிங்கப்பூர், மலேயா போன்ற பிரிட்டிஷ் ஏகாதிபத்தியத்தின் பிடியிலிருந்த பிரதேசங்களைக் கைப்பற்றி கிழக்கு முனையிலே யுததத்தை வெள்ளையனுக்கு எதிராக மிகத் தீவிரமாக நடத்திக்கொண்டிருந்தது. சுபாஷ் பாபு பர்மா போர்முனையிலே இந்திய தேசிய ராணுவத்தை ஒன்று திரட்டி பிரிட்டிஷ் ஏகாதிபத்தியத்தை இந்திய மண்ணை விட்டு விரட்டுவதற்காக, இந்தியநாட்டின் தலைநகரான டில்லியை நோக்கி படையோடு முன்னேறினார். இந்தியர்களாகிய கறுப்பர்கள் கோழைகள், சண்டை போடத் தெரியாதவர்கள் என்றெல்லாம் மிக இழிவாக இந்தியாவைப்பற்றி எண்ணியிருந்த வைசிராய் வேவல் இம்பால் போர் முனையிலே, பிரிட்டிஷ் படைகளைத் தகர்த்தெறிந்துகொண்டு, 'டில்லி சலோ', 'நேதாஜி ஜிந்தாபாத்' என்ற கோஷங்களோடு முன்னேறி வரும் இந்தியப்படையின் தாக்குதலை சமாளிக்கமுடியாது பிரிட்டிஷ் படைகள் வாபஸ் ஆவதைக் கேட்டு, ஆயுதமோ, யுத்தப் பயிற்சியோ, நவீன டாங்கு விமான வசதிகளோ இன்றி, எப்படிக் கருப்பர்கள் இம்பால் போர்முனையிலே சண்டை போடுகிறார்கள் என்பதைக் காண, விமானத்தின் மூலம் மலேயா சென்றான்; அங்கே குண்டுகளால் தாக்கப்பட்டு, இரண்டு விலா எலும்புகள் ஒடிந்தன; உடனே சொல்லிக்கொள்ளாமல் உயிருக்கு மன்றாடிக்கொண்டு மீனம்பாக்கம் விமான நிலையத்திலே வந்து இறங்கி சென்னை ஜெனரல் ஆஸ்பத்திரியிலே சிகிச்சையடைந்து பூர்ண குணம் ஏற்படுத்திக்கொண்டு, டில்லியை அடைந்தான். ஆனால், அவன் உள்ளத்திலே ஏற்பட்ட பயம், ஆயுத தளவாட உதவியின்றி, இந்தியர்கள் இவ்வளவு கோரமாக யுத்தம் செய்ததால், இவர்களால் பிரிட்டனுக்கும் இங்குள்ள பிரிட்டிஷ் மக்களுக்கும் என்ன ஆபத்து ஏற்பட்டுவிடுமோ என உள் உதறல் எடுத்தது. உடனே, காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களை சமரசப் பேச்சுக்காக சிம்லாவுக்கு அழைத்தான். காங்கிரசை எதிர்த்து மக்களிடம், காங்கிரசுக்கு எதிராகப் போராடுவேன் எனச் சொல்லி வோட்டு பெற்று வந்த ஸ்ரீமான் மாணிக்கவேலர் இன்று எப்படி வாக்காளர்களுக்குத் துரோகம் செய்து, காங்கிரஸ் கட்சியோடு சேர்ந்து கொண்டாரோ அதைப் போலவே தான் அன்றும் ஸ்ரீமான் மாணிக்கவேலரைப் போல் காங்கிரஸ் காரர்கள், 'வெள்ளையனுக்கு விரோதி' யென்று சொல்லிக் கொண்டிருந்த கொள்கையைக் காற்றிலே பறக்கவிட்டு, சிம்லாவிலே வேவல் மகாநாட்டிலே கலந்துகொண்டு, டீ பார்ட்டி சாப்பிட்டார்கள். பலாத்காரத்தின் விரோதிகள், அஹிம்சா தர்மத்தின் கர்த்தாவாகிய காந்தியடிகள் உள்பட இந்தக் காங்கிரஸ்காரர்கள் சிம்லா மகாநாட்டில் முடிவு செய்துவந்தது என்ன? பர்மா-இம்பால் கிழக்கு முனையிலே இந்திய நாட்டை ஜப்பான் ஒரே கடுமையாகத் தாக்குவதாகவும், இந்தத் தாக்குதலைத் தடுக்க இந்திய ராணுவத்தைக்கொண்டே போராட பரிபூரண உதவியைத் தர இந்தியத் தலைவர்கள் தயாராக இருப்பதாகவும், அன்றைக்கு பிச்சையாக வைசிராய் எக்ஸிகூடிவ்

கவுன்சிலிலே இந்தியத் தலைவர்களுக்கு ஒரு மெம்பர் ஸ்தானத்தைக் கொடுப்பதாகவும் ஒப்பந்தம் ஆயிற்று. மந்திரி பதவிக்கு ஆசைப்பட்டு மக்களுக்கு துரோகம் இழைத்த, ஐக்கிய முன்னணிக் கட்சிக்கு துரோகம் விளைவித்த மந்திரி கனம் மாணிக்கவேலரைப்போல் அன்று காங்கிரஸ்காரர்கள் வைசிராய் எக்ஸிகூடிவ் கவுன்சில் மெம்பர் பதவிக்கு இச்சைப்பட்டு, தேச மக்களையும் காங்கிரசின் கொள்கைகளையும் மறந்து அனறே தேசத்துரோகிகளாய்விட்டார்கள். சுதந்திரத்திற்காகப் போராடிய சபை, சுதந்திரத்தைப் பெறப்போகிறோம் என்ற சபை, அவர்கள் அளித்த வாக்குறுதியை நம்பி திருப்பூர் குமரன் போன்ற இளம வாலிபர்களும், பெண்மணிகளும் தூக்குமேடையிலே தங்கள் உயிரை பலியிடும்படிச் செய்த, இந்த காங்கிரஸ் சபை வைசிராய் எக்ஸிகூடிவ் கவுன்சில் மெம்பர் பதவிக்காக மானத்தைவிட்டு, மரியாதையை இழந்து, அரசியல் வாழ்விலே பல்டி அடித்து, பெருமைக்கும் புகழுக்கும் இழுக்கைத் தேடிக்கொண்டது. கிழக்கு முனையிலே போராடி இந்திய நாட்டுக்கு விடுதலையைத் தேடித் தருவதற்காக அல்லும் பகலும் கஷ்டப்பட்டு பெரிய தியாகம் செய்துவந்தவர் சுபாஷ் பாபுவா? அவரது தலைமையின்கீழ் போராடிவந்த இந்திய தேசீய ராணுவ வீரர்களா? அல்லது ஜப்பானியர்களா? என்பது இவர்களுக்குத் தெரியாமலா இருக்கும்? தெரிந்தே அன்று தேசத்தைக் காட்டிக் கொடுத்து சுபாஷ் பாபுவுக்கு எதிராகச்செய்த சிம்லாவில் துரோகக்கையெழுத்து இடப்பட்டது. இதைவிடவா நாட்டுக்கு செய்யவேண்டிய chaos பாக்கியிருக்கிறது? நீங்கள் செய்த துரோகம் ஆண்டவனுக்குத் தெரியாதா? உங்களுக்கு உண்மையிலேயே ஆண்டவனிடம் பக்தி இருக்குமேயானால், (நான் வயதில் சிறியவனாக இருக்கலாம், அறிவிலும் உங்களைக் காட்டிலும் அதிகம் இல்லாதவனாக இருக்கலாம்) அன்று நீங்கள் செய்தது துரோகமென்பதை உணராமலேயா இருக்கிறீர்களே? என்று நான் கேட்கிறேன்.

"ஜப்பானையும், ஜெர்மனியையும் சென்ற மகா யுத்தத்திலே அழித்த அமெரிக்காதான் தான் சுகமாக வாழப்போகிறோமென்று நினைத்தான். ஆனால், இன்றைக்கு அவதிப்படுகிறான். ஆனால், கொரியாவைக் கண்டு நடுங்குகிறான். உலகில் தானே தான் வாழவேண்டுமென்று எண்ணியவர்கள் எவரும் ஒரு நாளும் அவர்கள் எண்ணியதுபோல் சௌக்கியமாக வாழ்ந்ததே இல்லை. இது சரித்திரம் கூறும் உண்மை. அன்று அமெரிக்கா வோடு கொரியா யுத்தத்திலே இறங்கினால், இவ்வளவு நாளாக பெருமையோடு, வாழ்ந்த பிரிட்டனே, ரஷ்ய அணுகுண்டுத் தாக்குதலினால் அழிந்து போனாலும் போகக்கூடும் என்பதாக, நான் அல்ல, இங்கிலாந்து தேசத்தின் தொழில் கட்சி மெம்பர் ஒருவன் பேசுகிறான். ஏழு வருடங்களுக்கு முன்னால் இந்தியாவையும், இதுபோன்ற நாடுகளையும் தாங்களே ஆண்டுகொண்டு இருக்கபோகிறோமெனக் கனவுகண்ட ஆங்கிலேயன் இன்று யுத்தபீதிகொண்டு அழிந்துவிடுவோமோ என்று அலறுகிறானென்றால், அப்புறமுள்ள காங்கிரஸ் காரர்களே! சிறப்பாக இந்தக் காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களுடைய கட்சிக்குத் தலைமை வகிக்கக்கூடிய ஸ்ரீமான் ஆச்சாரியார் அவர்களே! இந்த உலகில் நீங்கள் தான் வாழலாம், வாழ்முடியும்; வாழவேண்டும். நீங்களே அரசாட்சி பண்ணவந்தவர்கள் என்பதாக எண்ணிவிடாதீர்கள் என்று கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன். எதிர்த்தரப்பார்கள் எல்லோரும் அழிந்துபோய்விடவேண்டும், அவர்களை அழித்து விடவேண்டும் என்பதாக நினைக்கவேண்டாமென்றும் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.

"தேசம் இன்று சுதந்திரம் அடைந்துவிட்டது. 'சுதந்திரம் வாங்கிக் கொடுத்தவர்கள் நாங்கள் தான்' என்று சொல்லுகிறீர்கள். அப்படியா? தயவு செய்து அம்மாதிரி சொல்லாதீர்கள். சுதந்திரம் வாங்கிக்கொடுத்தவர்களில் 'நாங்களும் ஒருவர்' என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்ளுங்கள். அதை ஒத்துக்கொள்ளுகிறோம். சுதந்திரப் போராட்டத்திலே பெயர் ஊர் தெரியாத ஆயிரக்கணக்கான வாலிபர்களும், ஸ்திரீகளும் ஈடுபடவில்லையா? மண்டையை உடைத்துகொண்டும், தூக்குமேடையிலும் பலர் உயிரை விடவில்லையா? அஹிம்சையால் மாத்திரம் சுதந்திரத்தை வாங்கிவிட்டீர்களா? உங்களுடைய சுதந்திரப் போராட்டத்திலே பலாத்காரம் சம்பந்தப்படவில்லையா? இன்று எதிர்க்கட்சியில் இருக்கின்ற எங்களிற்பலர் அந்த சுதந்திரப் போராட்டத்

திற்கு உடல், பொருள், ஆவி அனைத்தையும் துறந்தது, போராட முன் வரவில்லையா? நாங்கள் சிந்திய ரத்தமும், ஆயிரக்கணக்கான இந்நாட்டு வாலிபர்கள் கொட்டிய ரத்தமும், இன்று நீங்கள் மந்திரியாக வருவதற்கு உதவவில்லையா? மனச்சாட்சி உங்களுக்கு இருக்குமேயானால், அதைத் தொட்டு யோசித்துப் பார்க்கக் கூடாதா? இன்றைக்கு நீங்கள் மந்திரி களாவதற்கு அன்று நாங்கள் சுதந்திரப் போராட்ட இயக்கத்தில் ஈடு பட்டு மறியல் செய்து, மாணவர்கள் கல்லூரிகளைவிட்டு வெளியேறி, சிறைக்குச் செல்லவில்லையா? இவ்வளவையும் கொஞ்சம் சிந்தித்துப் பார்க்கக் கூடாதா? கிடைத்ததுதான் உண்மை சுதந்திரமாகுமா?

"It is an adjustment. The Britishers know that there will be a Third World War and they are in need of Asiatic soldiers. So, Lord Mountbatten came forward with a plan to give the so-called Independence to India. But what is actually given is only Dominion Status. To call it a Republic is a first-rate lie. When the King has a place in the Constitution it is not a Republic. The Pakistanies and the Ceylonese know that they have only Dominion Status and are not a Republic and say so. To call our Constitution a Republican Constitution is neither forward nor backward but awkward Sir.

"இந்தப் பக்கத்திலிருந்த ஸ்ரீமான் மாணிக்கவேலர் அந்தப் பக்கத்தில் சேர்ந்த பின் அவர் கடவுள் தன்மையை அடைந்து விட்டாரா? உங்கள் பக்கத்திலுள்ள கடவுள், உங்களுக்கு எதிராக நாங்கள் இருக்கிறோம் என்பதறகாக எங்கள் பக்கம் வரமாட்டேன் என்கிறாரா? உங்களுடைய தியாகம், எங்கள் பக்கத்தில் இருப்பவர்களுடையதைக் காட்டிலும் அவ் வளவு சிறந்ததாகுமா? நீடிழிகாலமாக நீங்களே பதவியில் இருப்பீர்கள் என்ற எண்ணத்தில் நீங்கள் செய்து வரும் அக்கிரமங்களுக்கு ஒரு எல்லை தான் இல்லையா? நீங்கள் நினைக்கிற, சொல்லுகிற, உண்மைக் கடவுள் எல்லா இடங்களிலும் என்ன சொல்லியிருக்கிறார்? அதிகாரம் உங்கள் கையில் இருக்கிறதென்பதற்காக தப்பு செய்யக்கூடாது, அதிகாரத்தை வைத்து தப்பு செய்தவன் முன்னுக்கு வந்தது கிடையாது, வருவதும் கிடையாது, இனி வரவும்முடியாது. 'Blessed are those who are meek, for they shall rule the land' என்பதை ஞாபகமூட்டிக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். நீங்களே பொம்பவும் கடவுள் பக்தி யுள்ளவர்கள் போலவும், பாக்கி இருப்பவர்களுக்கெல்லாம், கடவுள் பக்தி இல்லை என்பது போலவும், சொல்லு கிறீர்களே. அது சரியா? அது பொருந்துமா? அடக்கமாக இருக்க வேண்டும் அல்லவா?

"தேசத்தில் பாகிஸ்தான் என்ற பரம பாதகமான நாட்டுப் பிரிவினையை உண்டுபண்ணுவதுபடிச் சொன்னது தாங்கள் அல்லவா? அப்பொழுது என்ன சொன்னீர்கள்: 'பாகிஸ்தான் என்றால் ஜின்னாவுக்கு என்ன வென்றுவது தெரியுமா? பாகிஸ்தானைக் கொடுத்துவிட்டால் அதனால் நமக்குத் தொல்லை இருக்காது' என்று நீங்களே சொன்னீர் கள். 'Pakistan bubble will be pricked' என்று சொன்னீர்களே. பாகிஸ் தானைக் கொடுத்தபிறகாவது இன்று அதனால் தொல்லையில்லாமல் இருக் கின்றீர்களா? காஷ்மீரில் இன்று நடக்கும் காரியங்கள் என்ன? இரண்டாவ தாக, பாகிஸ்தான் கொடுக்கப்படுமானால், அந்தப் பாகிஸ்தானின் பொருளா தாரம் அழிந்து விடுமென்று சொன்னீர்களே, அது என்ன ஆயிற்று? அவர்கள் ஏமாந்தார்களா? உங்களுடைய பணத்தின் மதிப்பைக் குறைத் துக்கொள்ளும்படிச் செய்தார்களேதவிர, அவர்கள் குறைத்துக்கொண்டார் களா? அவர்கள் கணக்கப்படி. உங்கள் ஸ்டர்லிங் நிதியைக் கைப் பற்றிவிடவில்லையா? உங்களுடைய பொருளாதாரம் என்னவாயிற்று? மூன்றுவதாக, பாகிஸ்தான் கொடுத்தவுடனேயே அந்தப் பிராந்திய மக்கள் அந்தப் பிராந்தியத்திலேயே வசிப்பவர்கள் பாகிஸ்தான் பிரஜையாகி விடுவார்கள் என்று சொன்னீர்களே, பாகிஸ்தான் கிடைத்தவுடனேயே 1½ கோடி இந்திய மக்களை அடித்து விரட்டவில்லையா? பாகிஸ்தானைப்

பற்றி நீங்கள் சொல்லியதெல்லாம் என்னவாயிற்று? பாகிஸ்தானை நிலைப் படுத்திக கொண்டுவிட்டான் அவன். பொருளாதாரத்தை உங்களிடமிருந்து அ மானகரமாக உங்களுடைய ஸ்டர்லிங்கைக் முறைத்துக்கொள்ளாமல் உங்களிடமி ந்து அதிகாரதோடு வாங்கினான். நீங்கள கைக் கொடுத்து, விட்டு ஏமாந்துநின்றீர்கள் அல்லவா? காந்தியடிகளுடைய தவருன மரணத்திற்கும் தங்கள் பாகிஸ்தான் யோசனையல்லவா துரானகருவி.

" ஆசாரீயாரே! உங்களுடைய அறிவு அப்போது எப்படி ஆயிற்று? நீங்கள் யாரை ஏமாற்றப் பார்த்தீர்கள்? அவர்கள உங்களிடம் ஏமாந்தார்களா? அல்லது நீங்கள் ஏமாந்தீர்களா? கொஞ்சம் சொல்லுங்களேன். அரசியலுக்கு அறிவு மட்டும் இருந்தால் போதுமா? ஆற்றல இருந்தால் மட்டும் போதுமா? 'Politics certainly needs brain, Sir. But shoulder and head also must combine. Without shoulder, if the head is to proceed, there will be quixotic programmes which will end in disaster. To work in politics, a man must have broad shoulders, a good heart and he must be in a position even to lay down his life at any place and in any moment. Then only he will have some peace. By mere intrigue, a man will not succeed and the country that follows him also will go wrong with him.'

" அந்த நிலைமையிலே, இவர்கள் சுதந்திரம் வாங்கிய பிற்பாடு நாட்டில் ஏற்பட்ட நிலைமை என்ன? பாகிஸ்தானிலே மாட்டிக்கொண்ட 1½ கோடி மக்களின கதி என்ன ஆயிற்று? அவர்கள் நடுச்சந்தியிலே நிறுத்தப் ட்டார்களே? சொத்தை இழந்து, வாழ்க்கை நிலைமை இழந்து, லட்சவி மக்களை இழந்து, அலறித் துடித்தார்களே? அதற்காக இங்க இருக்கும் முஸ்லீம்களை பாகிஸ்தான் ஓடு என்று ஆசார்யார் கிருஷ்டியால் விறட்ட முடிந்ததா? அல்லது அவர்களை தான நீங்கள் பாகிஸ்தான் பிஜை—போ, என்று சொல்ல முடிந்ததா. நாட்டிலே அதைத் தொடர்ந்து ஏற்பட்ட பற்பல தொழிலாளிப் பிரச்னையில் ஒன்றையாவது வெற்றிகரமாக இவர்களால் தீர்த்து வைக்க முடிந்ததா? 150 வருடங்களாக அட்டை போல நாட்டில் ஒட்டிக் கொண்டிருந்த பிரிட்டிஷ் ஆட்சியாளர் நம் இந்திய நாட்டின் செல்வத்தை சுறண்டினார்கள் என்றால், உங்களுடைய ஐந்து வருட காங்கிரஸ் ஆட்சியிலே ஒவ்வொரு இந்திய நாடடின் குடும்பச் செலவத்தையுமே சுறண்டி விட்டீர்களே? அது இலலையா? என்றைக்குமே இல்லாத தரித்திரம் உங்கள் ஆட்சியில் நாட்டைப் பற்றிக் கொண்டுவிட்டதே, இல்லையா? பிரிட்டிஷ் ஆட்சியிலே இங்கே வாழும் மக்கள் ஒவ்வொருவருக்கும் 16 ஔன்ஸ் ரேஷன கொடுத்தார்கள் என்றால், உங்களுடைய ஆடசியிலே கல்லும், மண்ணும், மட்டையும் மயிருமாக 6 ஔன்ஸ் அரிசி போட்டீர்களே, இல்லையா? சில இடங்களில் அந்த 6 ஔன்ஸ் அரிசி போடக்கூட வகையின்றி புண்ணாக்கைத் தின்னுங்கள் என்று புத்திசொல்லவில்லையா, சொந்த புத்தியற்ற மந்திரிகள்?

" இப்போது கனம் ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியார் ரேஷனை எடுத்து விட்டார்கள் என்றால் எல்லோரையும போல நானும் சந்தோஷந்தான படுகிறேன். ஆனால் அதேசமயம் எப்போது ரேஷனை எடுக்கவேண்டும்? எந்த சமயத்தில் ரேஷனை எடுகக்வேணடும்? என்பதை தனக்கே எல்லாம் தெரியும், தானே சாணக்கியத்தில் வல்லுனர், தான் செய்யக் கூடிய காரியங்களில் தவறே இருக்காது என்றெல்லாம் எண்ணி இறுமாப்புக் கொள்ளும் மஹானுபாவர் ஸ்ரீமான் ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியார் யோசிக்க மறந்து விட்டாரே என்று எண்ணுமபோது தான் நான இந்த ரேஷனை இபபோது எடுத்தது சரியாகாது என்று சொல்லுகிறன. அறுவடை முடிந்து எங்கு பார்த்தாலும், தீவிர கொளமுதலும் நடந்த பிற்பாடு கிராமங்களில் கொஞ்சம்கூட அரிசி இலலாமல் மக்கள், விவசாயிகள் எலலோரும ரேஷன் கடைகளை தங்களுக்கு திணைப்படி வேண்டிய அரிசிக்குப் பார்த்துகொண்டிருக்கும்போது சர்க்கார் ரேஷனை ரத்து செய்துவிட்டு, உங்கள் இஷடமபோல் வெளியிலே தானியத்தை வாங்கிச் சாப்பிடுங்கள் என்று சொனனால், இது மக்களுக்குச் செய்த அனுகூலமா? அல்லது மக்களுக்குச் செய்து கொண்டிருந்த பாறுப்பை கைகழுவி விட்டு எகேடு கெட்டாவது மக்கள் போகட்டுமென்ற எண்ணத்துடன் மக்களுக்குச் செய்த துரோகமா என்று நான் கேட்கிறேன்? அறுவடை காலத்தில் நீங்கள்

3rd July 1952] [Sri U. Muthuramalinga Thevar]

ரேஷனை எடுத்திருந்தீர்களேயானால் மக்கள் தங்களுக்கு வேண்டிய தானியத்தை சுலபமாக மலிவாக வாங்கிக் கொள்ளமுடியும். அதை விட்டு கொள்முதல் ஆனபிறகு, இப்போது நடவே ஆகாமல் மறு மகசூல் வருவதற்கு இன்னும் ஐந்தாறு மாதங்கள் இருக்கும்போது இடையே ரேஷனை எடுத்தது நன்மையைச்செய்யாது. அதைவிட அதிகக் தீமையே மக்களுக்குச் செய்யும் என்பது ஸ்ரீ மான் ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியாருக்குத் தெரியாதா? தெரிந்தும் செய்தார் என்றால் அவர் மீது நம்பிக்கை வைத்திருக்கும் மக்களுக்கு ஆசாரியார் செய்த துரோகமே இது.

"கடைசியாக அருப்புக்கோட்டை தேர்தலை எடுத்துக் கொள்ளுங்கள். அருப்புக்கோட்டை தேர்தலில் நிச்சயமாக எனக்குச் ஜெயம் கிடைக்குமென்பது எனக்குத் தெரியும். ஆனால் நான் கர்வம் கொள்ளவில்லை. நான் தான் அவ்விடத்தில் ஜயிப்பேன் என்றும் சவால் விடவில்லை. என்னுடைய தொகுதியில் நிச்சயம் எனக்கு வெற்றி கிடைக்குமென்ற நம்பிக்கையுள்ள நான் எந்த அறிக்கையும் விடாமல் அமைதியாக, அமரிக்கையாக இருந்த போது, கனம் ஸ்ரீ ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியார் என்ன சொல்லுகிறார். 'அருப்புக் கோட்டை தொகுதி மக்களே! இந்தத் தொகுதியில் காங்கிரஸ் ஜெயித்தால் நான் வேண்டுமென்று அர்த்தம். நான் வேண்டுமென்றால் காங்கிரசுக்கு வோட்டுப் போடுங்கள்' என்று சவால் விடுகிறார். 'நான் வேண்டுமென்றால் காங்கிரஸுக்கு வோட்டுப் போடுங்கள் என்றால், காங்கிரஸுக்கு வோட்டுப் போடாவிட்டால் நான் வேண்டாமென்ற அர்த்தம்', என்பது தானே அதற்குப் பொருள். காங்கிரஸ் தோற்றுப்போனால் தான் பதவியில் இருக்கப் போவதில்லையென்று தானே அதற்குப் பொருள். கனம் ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியாரே! அருப்புக்கோட்டை மக்கள் உங்கள் காங்கிரஸ் நபர் வேண்டாமென்று உங்களுக்கு எதிராக, உங்கள் சர்க்காருக்கு எதிராக, நீங்களே வேண்டாமென்று வோட்டுக் கொடுத்து விட்டார்களே. சொன்ன வார்த்தையை சொன்னபடி செய்யும் உண்மை சத்யசந்தர் நான் என்று நீங்கள் சொல்லிக் கொள்ளும்போது நீங்கள் உடனே ராஜிநாமா செய்யவேண்டியது அல்லவா தன்மானமுள்ளவனது கடமை? ஆனால் நீங்கள் ராஜிநாமா செய்யத்தான் பிரியப்படுகிறீர்கள் என்று கேள்விப்பட்டேன். அது உண்மையோ, பொய்யோ எனக்குத் தெரியாது. ஆனால் அதைக் கேட்ட அளவுக்கு நான் மிகவும் சந்தோஷப்படுகிறேன். ஆனால் உங்களுடைய சகாக்கள் தான் உங்களை ராஜிநாமா செய்யக்கூடாது என்று தடுத்துவிட்டார்கள் என்று அறிகிறேன். அப்படியானால் உங்களுடைய சகாக்களுக்காக நீங்கள் சொன்ன வார்த்தையை கடைப்பிடிக்காதவராக, தன்மானம் இழந்தவராக, ஆவீர்கள் என்று, யாரும் தமிழ் நாட்டில், உங்களைப் பற்றி பூர்ணமாக உணராது உங்களுக்குப் புகழ் மாலை கொடுக்கும் அன்பர்கள் எதிர் பார்த்திருக்க மாடடார்கள். தொகுதியிலே தோற்கடிக்கப்பட்ட நீர் இப்போது ஒழுக்கமுள்ளவர் போல இந்த நம்பிக்கைத் தீர்மானத்தை எங்களிடமா கோருவது? மக்கள் கொடுத்திருக்கும் தீர்ப்புக்கு பாதகமாகவோ, சாதகமாகவோ வோட்டுக் கொடுக்கும் கோர்ட்டா இது. **'As far as my knowledge of democracy goes, if anything untoward happens in the Legislature, the proper course is to appeal to the electorate outside and get their verdict. Here is a wonderful democracy coming in through our Hon. Chief Minister? He wants to make the Legislature an appellate Court when he had a knock out in a general constituency. Is this democracy? Is there any answer to this from any side of the House? It cannot be a democracy. It is nothing but demonocracy, if I am not wrong.'**

3–15 p.m.

"தலைவர் அவர்களே! அப்படி தேர்தலிலே தோற்றுப் போய்விட்டு சபையிலே நம்பிக்கை கோருவது விசித்திரமாக அல்லவா இருக்கிறது! இது மாதிரி எங்காவது நடந்ததுண்டா? கனம் ஆசாரியார் அவர்களே! உங்களுக்குச் சட்டங்கள் தடுமாறுகின்றனவா? யோக்கியதைப் பொறுப்பு உங்களுக்கு இல்லாது விட்டதா? அரசியல் சட்டம் கண்களில் படாமல் போய்விட்டதா? எடுத்ததெற்கெல்லாம் ஆண்டவனைக் கூப்பிடுவீர்களே. அந்த ஆபத்பாந்தவன், அனாதரக்ஷகன் உங்களை அனாதரவாக விட்டுவிட்டாரா உங்களை எதிர்த்து வோட்டுப்போட்ட மக்கள் எல்லோரும் பிற்பட்ட இனத்தவர்கள். ஆனால்

உங்களை ஆதரிக்கும் ஜனங்கள் எல்லோருமே அறிவில் சிறந்து விளங்கும் ஐ. வி. எஸ். படித்த உத்தமோத்தமர்களா? இது மானமுள்ளவர்கள் பேசக் கூடிய பேச்சா? உங்கள் குமாரசாமி ராஜா நின்ற இடம் முனிசிபல் எல்லைக்குட்பட்ட ராஜ்யம் ராஜ்யமேயம் தானே? அவர் அங்கே தோற்றுப் போவானேன்? காங்கிரஸுக்கு ஏற்படும் தோல்விக்கு உண்மையான காரணம், அவதார புருஷரான உங்களுக்கே தெரியவில்லையா? என் தெரியப்போகிறது? நீர் உண்மையாக ஆண்டவனின் பிரதிநிதியாக இருந்தால் அல்லவா தெரியும். இன்னும் அகங்காரத்தை விட்டீர்களா? Egoism is the greatest enemy of any man and all the more so to a man who talks philosophy. ஆதலால் எதிர்கட்சியை நசுக்க நீங்கள் ஆண்டவன் பஜனை செய்கிறீர்கள். அதை மக்கள் உணராமலிருப்பதாக நினைத்துக் கொண்டிருந்தீர்களேயானால் மறுபடியும் ஆண்டன் உங்களை மூளையை மழுக்கி விட்டார் என்றே நிச்சயமாகச் சொல்லிவிடலாம்.

"நீங்கள் உண்மையில் உண்மை நிலையை, நாட்டின் யாதார்த்த நிலவரத்தை உணர்ந்தீர்களானால் கூட்டு மந்திரி சபையை அமைத்திருப்பீர்கள். அப்படி அமைக்க நீங்கள் தவறியதோடு, காங்கிரஸின் துரோகிகளையும், பரம விரோதிகளையும் சேர்த்துக் கொண்டு மந்திரி சபையை அமைத்ததோடு, இந்த மந்திரி சபை காங்கிரஸ் மந்திரிசபையேதான் என்று டமாரம் பேசுவதால் தான் நான் இந்த மந்திரிசபையை எதிர்க்கிறேன். கடவுள் பெயரைச் சொல்லி எங்களை நீங்கள் நசுக்கப் பார்த்தீர்களேயானால், ஆனைப் பட்ட சர்ச்சிலாலேயே கூட நசுக்கப்பட முடியாதவர்களான எங்களை ஆசார் யார் அவர்களே! நீங்கள் ஒரு நாளும் நசுக்க முடியாது. அப்படி நினைத்தீர்களேயானாலும், பிறருக்கு இன்னல் விளைவிக்க முயல்பவர்கள் ஆண்டவனாலும் காப்பாற்றப்படமாட்டார்கள். காப்பாற்றப்பட்டதும் கிடையாது. நீங்களும், உங்கள் மந்திரி சபையும் காப்பாற்றப்படவும் மாட்டீர்கள் என்பதை இன்று, இனிமேலாவது உணர்ந்து கொள்ளுங்கள். (Hear, hear.)

"ஆகையால் நாங்கள் உங்கள் மந்திரி சபைக்கு விரோதியே தவிர தனிப்பட்ட நபர்களுக்கு விரோதியில்லை. இந்த மந்திரி சபைக்கு விரோதமாக வோட்டுப் போடுவதின் காரணமாக நான் கம்யூனிஸ்டோ என்று யாரும் எண்ணிவிடவேண்டாம். நான் ஒரு கம்யூனிஸ்டு என்று யாரும் நினைத்து விடக்கூடாது.

"The Communist principle 'from each according to his capacity and to each according to his need' is a principle which I cannot accept. I do not stand for that principle. I want gradation of society.

"As regards God, I belong to the Ramakrishna Mission and I like Swami Vivekananda. I am not an atheist. I want the oriental cult of religion to spread instead of the occidental cult of the atom bomb.

"The position of India is at stake. Asia has come up. In the First World War, the British and the Americans had their victory. Yet it has created a Russia. In the second World War, they had their so-called victory. It has created a China. In the Third World War, they hope they are going to have a victory and the Congress people are hobnobbing with them in the name of the so-called neutrality But it is going to create an India, take it from me. When the time comes, you all will know where you are and whether God is on your side or on the other side. Please feel for the country, please feel for the Asiatic nations, for the non-Whites. Make me serve a national purpose, an anti-White policy, the building up of a sound economy in the State. I am thoroughly for a clean and good Government. No government

can cover its weaknesses by means of audacity. Power politics is wrong. With these words, I oppose the Motion. In the name of the very same God which you possess and with the very same heart of which He is the custodian, I appeal to every Member to vote as per his wish."

64043

SRI V. V. RAMASWAMI :—" Sir, on behalf of the Independent Progressive Bloc, I oppose the Motion."

* SRI S. S. RAMASWAMI PADAYACHI :—" கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே ! கடந்த நான்கு நாட்களாக இந்த மந்திரி சபை மீது நம்பிக்கை தெரிவிக்கும் தீர்மானத்தின் மீது விவாதம் நடந்து வருகிறது. வன்னியகுல க்ஷத்திரியர்களாகிய நாங்கள் மிகவும் பிற்பட்ட இனத்தவர்கள். எங்களுடைய பிற்பட்ட இனமும் எங்கள் போன்ற இனத்தவர்களும் முன்னேற வேண்டும் என்பதற்காகத் தான் நாங்கள் ஒரு கட்சியாக ஏற்படுத்திக்கொண்டு இங்கே வேலை செய்கிறோம். எங்கள் சமூகம் மிகவும் பிற்போக்கான நிலைமையில் இருக்கிறதென்பதையும், எங்கள் சமூகத்தின் முன்னேற்றத்திற்காகத் தான் நாங்கள் உழைக்க வந்திருக்கிறோம் என்பதும் கனம் ஸ்ரீ ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியார் அவர்களுக்கு, நன்றாகத் தெரியும். எங்கள் சமூகத்தவர்கள் யாரும் பெரிய உத்தியோகங்களிலோ, அல்லது படித்தவர்கள் அதிகமாகவோ இல்லை. இதற்கு முன்பு இருந்த சர்க்கார்களிடமும், காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களிடமும் நாங்கள் எங்கள் குறைகளை எவ்வளவோ எடுத்து சொல்லியும் கூட நாங்கள் உதாசீனம் செய்யப்பட்டோம். எங்கள் குறைகள் ஒன்றும் நிவர்த்திக்கப்படவேயில்லை. தலைவர் காந்தி முதற் கொண்டு பிற்பட்ட இனத்தவர்கள் நிலையை எல்லோரும் உயர்த்தவேண்டுமென்று சொன்னார்களே தவிர உருப்படியாக எதுவும் செய்யவில்லை. அதற்குப் பிறகு தான் நாங்கள் சட்டசபையிலே சென்று எங்கள் உரிமைக்காக பாடுபடவேண்டுமென்று தீர்மானம் செய்தோம். கல்வி நிலையிலே, பொருளாதார நிலையிலே உத்தியோக நிலையிலே மிகவும் பிற்போக்கான நிலையில் இருக்கின்ற நாங்கள் முன்னுக்கு வரவேண்டுமென்பதற்காகத் தான் வந்திருக்கிறோம். கனம் ஸ்ரீ ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியாரிடம் இதைப் பற்றி கேட்டபோது உங்கள் சமூகத்தின் பிரதிநிதியாக ஸ்ரீ மாணிக்கவேலர் இருக்கிறாரே என்று சொன்னார்கள். ஸ்ரீ மாணிக்கவேலரைப் போல பல மாணிக்கவேலர்கள் எங்கள் சமூகத்தின் நிலையை உயர்த்துவதற்கு மேல் நிலைக்கு வரும் வரையில் நாங்கள் ஒரு நாளும் ஓய்ந்து இருக்க போவதில்லை. காங்கிரஸ் இவ்வளவு காலமாக எங்கள் சமூகத்தின் நலனைக் கவனிக்கத் தவறி விட்டதின் காரணமாக நாங்கள் காங்கிரஸை எதிர்க்க திட்டமிட்டோம். பிற்பட்ட இனத்தவர்களின் குறைகள் தீர்க்கப்படும்வரை நாங்கள் எதிர் கட்சியில் இருக்கமுடிவு கொண்டுள்ளோம். ஆகையால் தான் நான் இப்போது இந்த தீர்மானத்தை எதிர்க்கிறேன்."

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Motion of Confidence in the Chief Minister Rajaji. Every one, rich and poor including the Communists, will have to applaud that bold measure of Rajaji, the decontrol of food. As Rajaji said in his statement, even if he accepted all the policies of the Opposition, they will discover some other things to differ from Rajaji. As is usual with him, Rajaji, by introducing decontrol of food in this State, has set an example to the whole of India at this critical time. Every State is following suit in the matter of decontrol. Our Communists search for loopholes in this measure, but they cannot find them. They have been challenging Rajaji and many others to resign and stand for election on many different issues. I request the Communists, if they are bold enough, to resign any seat and fight an election on this particular issue of

decontrol. Are they prepared and ready to take up the challenge? If so, I am prepared to resign my seat. Let us go to the people and get their verdict as to whether they want decontrol or not. In the beginning the Communists committed themselves to the position that decontrol was wrong. Later on they corrected themselves. I hope they will correct themselves fully and follow Rajaji in making decontrol a success.

" I was a member of a glorious house built by a great man, till recently. Great men were members of that household and I was an younger brother in that house. We fought many glorious wars and eventually secured independence. After independence, in the glory and pride of success, members of that house went mad, went corrupt. They did not care for the younger brother. They did not care whether the members of the house were properly fed and taken care of or not. They did not care whether the cattle were properly kept or not. They did not even care whether the building itself was properly kept or not. In the feeling that they were masters of the house, they went mad. Many friends who are sitting in the Opposition to-day belonged to that glorious house, and they used to harangue and sing the praises of that house. Their minds were full of Gandhiji and the Congress, and to maintain the glory of these two names, they were prepared to shed their life blood. To-day many an erstwhile good Congressman is sitting in the Opposition. He feels miserable, he feels sad, he feels very sorry that he has come out. He was forced to go out. The leaders went bad and that was why many have gone over to the other side. Some of the Members opposite are trading in the name of Independents. They are not Independents, they are Independents to mislead, they are Communists in the guise of Independents. There are many friends who are ready to step out if a stable government is formed in this State but not a Congress Government. It should be a people's government, a national government. They could have had the pride of having a Congress Government. But they feel ashamed because the misrule of the Congress Government during the last five years brought so much infamy and dishonour. Otherwise, why should any one feel ashamed to call himself a Congressman? Whether one belongs to the Congress, the Communist, the Krishak Lok or any other party, his existence depends upon the goodwill of the people.

3-30 p.m. " It is the goodwill of the people that has made the Congress. As long as the Congress commands that goodwill, it will survive and it will get on. That goodwill of the people is lost to the Congress. But then I for one and many friends on the other side want that the glory of the Congress and the good name of Bapu should be there. Yesterday the hon. Member Mr. Jeevanandam and several others were saying that the Congress organization was the greatest organization. Their leadership was great in the past. But if that name should survive and if that leadership is to be accepted, the Congress must come out in its original colour, and then it will again be a great party—a democratic party in this

country—, even though I do not wish to join it. I would like to get out of politics and see that the Congress becomes a glorious organization. But is that to come about? I doubt. Because times are not favourable to the Congress. Times have changed. Even this construction, in course of time, say, after 50 or 100 years, is bound to go. There is a certain period of life for everything. That period of life for the Congress has gone. In this House we do not find only one dividing wall. There are several walls in this very hall. I would like to see there is only one dividing wall in this House separating the Government side from the Opposition side. It is not the fault of the leader. The leader is there anxious to do all that is necessary. It is the fault of the organization. It is the result of the wrong opinion held by the Congress leadership. I wish there were only two parties in this House—the Opposition party and the party in power. Then, each man will have to form his opinion as to how the administration of this State and also the Centre must be carried on. The time at my disposal is short. But I would like to mention a few things which have taken place. In the past five years of misrule, I was in Vijayawada as Vice-President of the Provincial Congress Committee. Shall I tell you, Sir, what happened in those districts, namely, Krishna, Guntur and the Godavaris? In those four districts, there was no Government. Ask any police officer whether there was any Government there in those years. I have myself heard from police officers and Collectors that there was no Government in those four districts. Why? We know it all. My Communist friends there are experts in propaganda. They are experts in making even poison popular. They have been carrying on propaganda. In the beginning Congressmen were doing propaganda. They have now forgotten that it is by propaganda that they got all the people with them. By propaganda they made all people follow their line of action. They had the people with them to get independence. But after independence, they have forgotten to do propaganda. But my Communist friends who are experts in propaganda carried on propaganda and indulged in many atrocities. I ask, Sir, is it the police or the Communists that are responsible for the atrocities? There is need for an enquiry. I would like an enquiry to be conducted. I would very much welcome an enquiry into the atrocities of the police wherever they may be and at whatever time they may be. There must be impeachment of the guilty person, whoever he may be. It may be the Government or it may be others or it may be a Minister, or it may be Members sitting here after committing crimes and murders. I ask, Sir, who has committed atrocities? When did the police go to assault people? The police is there to preserve law and order. When there is a murder, they have to make enquiries. They are requisitioned then. To detect crimes, they have to adopt certain methods. But there are limits to the way they treat people. I know certain cases in the Circars where police officers behaved like mad dogs. But why did they go there? It is because murders took place there. Members from

Guntur and Krishna have come here. Many Communists also have come here. I ask them this question, namely, what happened in Achampet. Should they go to shoot a mother with a small baby in her breast? If they had anything against a particular Sub-Inspector, they could do anything with him, because they had formed a parallel Government, they had their own people's court, they had their own judgments, and they executed their judgments to the very letter. I know of a case where a particular man was sought to be punished, and the punishment inflicted on him was the removal of his eyes. When the people went out to loot or put into execution the judgment on that particular man, they caught that man after murdering one or two men. Somebody then reminded that the judgment was not to kill that particular person but to pull out his eyes. They removed his eyes, but somehow that person is alive to-day. Hon. Members can see him to-day if they go to Krishna. His name is Basavayya. Probably he is a strong man, and therefore he is alive to-day. The Communists however are defending themselves. If these Communists should come to power, they will use dynamite one day, as Rajaji has said. The hon. Member Mr. K. Krishna Rao was saying that Rajaji was making too much mention of the police and the C.I.D. But for the police and the C.I.D. there would be no Government functioning in this country. I say that this is a fact. In fact I have a charge against the police in this State, especially because they did not discharge their duties fully. They did not investigate the crimes fully. They did not award punishments fully and properly. Just now, about two hours back, at the Cafetaria I was hearing a leader of this State speaking to a leader of all India, 'Why, let them do anything; they will be finished'. Are they going to finish us? Are they going to put dynamite under our cushion? Let them do it. Theirs is the policy of destruction. Theirs is the policy of demolishing the entire country and bringing in men, cattle, implements, and instruments from outside. They may do it, Sir. (Interruption.) Not men from America but from Russia if possible to blow up this country. If India is not to be a satellite of America, they would like it to be a Province of Russia! Is this not their idea? Where does money come to us from? We, some of us, are ryots. When we are engaged in politics, our old parents, brothers and others are struggling to keep the family going. We are not finding the money for them to get on. Of course, some of my friends have got some bus routes. But others in the organization do not have money. Wherefrom does money come to the Communists? Let the proletariat who say that they have got enough money say that they are prepared to go to the lowest standard of life. But then what is the life that is led by them? These things are meaningless, and they may look personal. I do not like to indulge in these things. I can say that they have been trying to dig a hole in the hill to find a rat. They cannot find the rat in Rajaji. They cannot, because he is a man with the greatest capabilities. He has tackled the biggest of

problems and come out successful. On principle, he even fought with Bapuji and has come out successful. We have our confidence in him and not in the Congress Party, nor even in the Ministry, which may not be to our liking. The people have got their confidence in the leader of the present Ministry, i.e., Rajaji. We say that we have our fights also with Rajaji. We have many points on which we are at loggerheads with the Ministry. We will discuss these points when the Budget comes up for discussion. The Ministry has not cared for the ryots. The Ministry has not cared to examine whether the taxation that is sought to be imposed on the people could be borne by the people or not. Rajaji is a leader, and he is a democrat. He is ready to discuss with others problems and policies. If we are prepared to discuss the good and bad with him, and follow the good, he is there ready to discuss with us. He is our leader, your leader, everybody's leader, and the leader of the entire State. With these words, on behalf of my party, I support the motion moved by the Leader of the House."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—"అధ్యక్ష, ఈ విశ్వాస తీర్మానంపై మాట్లాడే ముందు, మొదట ముఖ్యంగా ఈవిశ్వాస తీర్మానం తీసుకొనిరావలసిన అవసరమున్నదా, లేదా అనేవిషయాన్ని ఆలోచిస్తే ఈవిశ్వాస ప్రకటన ప్రతిపాదన లేవలసిన సందర్భ కాలముగాని అవసరముగాని ఇంకా ఆసన్నముకాలేదని ఖచ్చితంగానేను మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ విశ్వాస తీర్మానాన్ని తీసుకొనిరావలసివచ్చినందుకు శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారి గారు కొన్ని కారణాలు చెప్పారు. మొదటిది ఆఇప్పుకోట ఉపఎన్నికలలో కాంగ్రెసు అభ్యర్థి ఓడిపోయినందువల్ల ప్రధానమంత్రిగారు ఆ ఎన్నికలప్పుడు చేసినటువంటి ప్రకటనననుసరించి ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని తీసుకురావలసి వచ్చిందని చెప్పుతున్నారు. కాని ఈ ఎన్నికలవల్ల కొత్తమార్పు ఏమీరాలేదు. మాదృష్టికి సంబంధించినంతవరకూ ఇటీవల జరిగిన ఉపఎన్నికలలోకూడా ప్రభుత్వంపై విశ్వాసము ప్రకటించవలసినంతటి మార్పులుగాని, సంఘటనలుగాని ఏవి జరుగలేదు. ఎటులనగా, కాకినాడ జనరల్ ఎలక్షన్‌లో మొదట విజయము కమ్యూనిస్టు పార్టీదివచ్చింది. తరువాత దాని ఉపఎన్నికలలోకూడా కమ్యూనిస్టుపార్టీ గెలిచింది. అటులనే, కోయంబత్తూరు మొదట జనరల్ ఎలెక్షన్‌లోనూ, తరువాత ఉపఎన్నికలలోను రెండుమార్లు కాంగ్రెసు పార్టియేగెలిచింది. అదేమాదిరిగానే ఆరుప్పుకోట నియోజకవర్గంలోగూడా జనరల్ ఎలెక్షన్‌లో ఫార్వర్డుబ్లాకు పార్టియే గెలిచింది. ఇటీవల ఉపఎన్నికలలోగూడా మరల ఫార్వర్డుబ్లాకు పార్టియే గెలిచింది. కనుక ఇందులో ఒక పెద్దమార్పు కలిగిందని అనుకోవడంగాని ప్రభుత్వము పైగల విశ్వాసాన్నిగురించి అనుమానపడడంగాని చాలాపొరబాటుఅని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ విశ్వాసతీర్మానాన్ని తీసుకురావడానికి వారి కారణాలు ఏమైనప్పటికి ఈ తీర్మానం సభ ఎదుటవచ్చినది కాబట్టి ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని మేము బలపరిచదలచుకొన్నాము అంటే ఇందులో మాఫార్టీయొక్క దృక్పథమువిదో స్పష్టపరచవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. ఈ రాజాజీ ప్రభుత్వనిర్మాణసందర్భంలో కె.యల్.పి. ఫార్టీవారు శ్రీ రాజాజీప్రభుత్వమునకు responsive co-operation ఇస్తామని మొట్టమొదటసారిగా చేసినటువంటి రాజకీయ తీర్మానము సభ్యులందరికి తెలిసినదే. కనుక అప్పుడుచేసిన వాగ్దానం ప్రకారమే మా responsive co-operation continue చేయడానికిగానే ఈ విశ్వాస తీర్మానాన్ని మేముబలపరుస్తున్నాము. అంతేగాని ఈతీర్మానంద్వారా, ఇప్పుడు విర్పడినటువంటి మంత్రివర్గాన్ని ఆమోదించడం అనే ఉద్దేశ్యంతోగాని లేక కాంగ్రెసు

3-45 p.m.

యొక్క ప్రతిష్టకు భంగమువచ్చినాదనేఉద్దేశ్యంతోగాని మేము దీనిని బలపరచడం లేదు. ఇప్పుడు నిర్మింపబడిన రాజాజీ మంత్రివర్గం పట్ల విశ్వాసాన్ని చూపవలసినటువంటి ఆవసరమును మాకు ఎంతమాత్రములేదు. అయితే ఈ రాజాజీ ప్రభుత్వమునకు responsive co-operation ఇవ్వడంలో మా ఉద్దేశ్యమేమని అనుకవచ్చును. ఇది స్పష్టంగా అందరికి తెలిసినటువంటి విషయమే. మొట్టమొదటిసారిగా రాజాజీ లీడరుగా ఎన్నుకోబడినాడు. కనుక ఆయనలో విశ్వాసముంచి ఆయన లీడరుషిప్పును అంగీకరిస్తామని కె.యల్.పి. వార్టీ పక్షతరుపునే ప్రకటించింది. శ్రీ రాజాజీ ప్రముఖ రాజకీయవేత్త. రాజకీయాలలో గొప్ప అనుభవాన్ని గణించినటువంటివారు. అటువంటి రాజకీయ ప్రవక్త సాధారణమైనటువంటి ప్రజాస్వామిక సూత్రాలను ధర్మాలను అనుసరించి మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రములో నిజమైనటువంటి, ఉత్తమమైనటువంటి సుస్థిరమైనటువంటి, ప్రజాస్వామిక ప్రభుత్వాన్ని ఏర్పాటుచేసేద్వారానే ప్రజాస్వామిక విధానాన్ని అవలంభింపగలుగుతారు. గాని ఇవేవరలో అధికారములోఉండి ప్రజావిశ్వాసాన్ని గోల్పోయినటువంటియు, ఎన్నికలలో ఓడిపోయి మైనారిటీవచ్చినటువంటి కాంగ్రెసు పార్టీవారొక్కరితోటే ప్రభుత్వాన్ని నిర్మిస్తామని తలంచినట్లయితే అది చాలాతప్పు. అది ప్రజాస్వామిక విధానానికి విరుద్ధము. కనుక వారుపూర్తిగా నిజమైనటువంటి ప్రజాస్వామిక సిద్ధాంతాలమీద విశ్వాసంకలిగి దానిని క్రియారూపముగా ఆచరణద్వారా ప్రత్యక్షంగా చూపవలనంటే నిజమైన ప్రజాస్వామిక ప్రభుత్వాన్ని ఏర్పాటుచేయుట వారియొక్క ప్రధానకర్తవ్యమని శ్రీ రాజాజీని హెచ్చరిస్తూ ఉన్నాను ఈ విశ్వాసంతోనే శ్రీ రాజాజీ ఏర్పాటు చేసే ప్రభుత్వానికి ఫేర్ట్రయల్ ఇవ్వడానికిగాను వారి ప్రభుత్వమునకు రెస్పాన్సివ్ కోఆపరేషన్ ఇస్తామని చేసినటువంటి తీర్తానం ప్రజలందరికి తెలిసినదే. అయితే మాకువచ్చిన రెస్పాన్సు ఏది అనే ప్రశ్న రావచ్చును. దీనికి సమాధానంగా ప్రధాన సమస్యలలో ఒకటైనటువంటి కంట్రోల్సుమీద రెస్పాన్సు వచ్చిందని చెప్పుచున్నాను. ఈ కంట్రోల్సు చాలా ప్రధానమైన సమస్య అని సభ్యులందరికి తెలిసినదే. మన దేశంలో గత 10, 12 సంవత్సరాలుగా ఈ కంట్రోల్సువల్ల ఎక్కడచూచిన అవినీతి, బ్లాక్‌మార్కెటు లంచగొండితనము ప్రబలిపోయినడని అందరికి తెలిసినటువంటి విషయమే. దీనిని నిర్మూలింపజేయుటకు శ్రీ రంగాగారి నాయకత్వాన కృషిచేస్తూఉన్నటువంటి రైతుకూలీ సంఘము యొక్కసంగతి ప్రత్యేకంగా చెప్పవలసినటువంటిది కాదు. దానికి ఆయన దోహదము ఇచ్చారు. సహకారము ఇచ్చారు. దేశముయొక్క ప్రధానసమస్యలలో ముఖ్యమైనటువంటి ఈ సమస్యలో చూపినటువంటి responsive cooperation మావాగ్దానాన్ని రుజువుచేస్తున్నది. ఇంకా ఇటువంటి అనేక ప్రజావసరమైనటువంటియూ, ప్రజోపయోగకరమైనటువంటియూ, ప్రజాభివృద్ధికరమైనటువంటి కార్యక్రమాన్ని శ్రీ రాజాజీ సాగిస్తారనే ఆశతోనే ఈ respon ive co-operation ను continue చేయడానికి మేము ఇప్పుడు ఈ తీర్తానాన్ని బలపరచడానికి అంగీకరించాము. కాని రాజాజీ ఇప్పుడు ఏర్పాటుచేసినటువంటి మంత్రివర్గాన్ని యథాతథంగా ఆమోదించడానికి దీనిని బలపరచడము ఎంతమాత్రము కాదని మనవి చేయుచున్నాను. అంతేకాకుండా ఇప్పుడు ఈ విశ్వాస ప్రకటన తీసుకురావడానికి ఈ సందర్భము చాలాలేదని ఇది సమంజసము కాదు, సబబు కాదు, అని మాపార్టి దృఢముగా అభిప్రాయపడుతున్నది. ఇట్లు అభిప్రాయపడడానికి మరొక ప్రబలకారణమున్నది. ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వము బడ్జెటులో చూపించినటువంటి హెచ్చు తగ్గుల విధానము మాపార్టీ సిద్ధాంతాల రీత్యా ఎంత మాత్రము సహించరానిదనికూడా మాపార్టీ అభిప్రాయపడుతున్నది. ఈ విధానము రైతాంగము సహించలేదు. భరించలేదు. అది సహించడానికిగాని, అంగీకరించడానికి గాని వీలులేదని ప్రకటిస్తున్నాము. అటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో ఇప్పుడు ఈ విశ్వాస

ప్రకటనను కోరిడం అనేది విమాత్రము సమంజసము కాదని గాఢంగా విశ్వసిస్తున్నాము. కనుక ఈనాడు ఈ విశ్వాస తీర్మానాన్ని బలపరుస్తున్నామంటే, ఈయొక్క బ్జెటులో చూపినటువంటి హెచ్చు పన్నుల విధానాన్ని ఆమోదించడంగాని, ఇప్పుడు రాజాజీ గారు నిర్మించిన మొత్తం మంత్రివర్గాన్ని యథాతథంగా అంగీకరించడంగాని కాదని ఖచ్చితంగా ప్రకటిస్తున్నాము. అందువల్లనే ఈ రెస్పాన్సిబ్ లో ఆపరేషన్ విషయంలో మీకు మనవిచేశాను. ఇప్పుడు కంట్రోలు తీసివేయడానికి మేము దోహదము ఇచ్చామంటే దేశానికి వెన్నెముక అయినటువంటి రైతాంగముయొక్క ఉత్సాహాన్ని పెంపొందించి వారు ఇప్పుడున్నటువంటి హీన స్థితిని బాగుపరచడానికే. చాలామంది కంట్రోల్లు తీసివేసినందుకు అనేక విమర్శలు చేశారు. ఇప్పుడు విధించినవారే ఇంతకు ముందు కంట్రోల్లు ఉండకూడదని చర్చించేవారు. కాని ప్రజల కోరిక ప్రకారము కంట్రోల్లు తీసివేసిన తరువాత, దీనిని గురించి మరల విమర్శించడంలో అర్థములేదు. కంట్రోల్లు రద్దు చేయడంవల్ల అనేక ప్రయోజనాలు విర్పడుతాయి. ధరలు విపరీతంగా పెరిగిపోతాయి, ధాన్యము కొరత విర్పడుతుంది. పెద్ద రైతులంతా వారికి సరియైన ధరలు గిట్టేటంతవరకూ ధాన్యాన్ని దాచుకొంటారు. ఆ విధంగా ప్రజానీకానికి ధాన్యము లభించకుండా పోతుందని చెప్పి ఈ విధంగా అనేక విధాల విమర్శించారు. అయితే, ఇదివరకు గత పన్నెండు సంవత్సరాలుగా ఈ కంట్రోల్లవల్ల ఎంతటి అరాజకము, అవినీతి, బ్లాకు మార్కెటింగు, ఎంత అక్రమాలు ఉద్యోగస్తులలో లంచగొండితనము జరుగుచుండినవో ఎవరికిని తెలియనిదిగాదు. ముఖ్యముగా బీద రైతాంగము, మధ్య తరగతి ప్రజలు, ఉద్యోగస్తులు ఈ కంట్రోల్లువల్ల ఎంతటి అవమానకరమైనటువంటి, సహించరానటువంటి బాధలకు చర్యలకు గురిఅగుచుండిరో చెప్పనలవిగాదు. ఉద్యోగస్తులలో అనేక మంది, కలెక్టరు ఆఫీసు మొదలగు పెద్ద ఆఫీసులలోగూడా పెద్ద పెద్ద గుమాస్తాలు (senior clerks) మొదలగువారు, అహారపదార్థాలు బ్లాకు మార్కెటులో విపరీత ధరలకు కొనుక్కోవలసివచ్చి, దుడ్డు లేక తమ భార్యలయొక్క సొమ్ములు పట్టు పీరగూడా కుదువపెట్టుకొనో, అమ్ముకొనో కాలము గడుపుతూ వచ్చారు. ఇటువంటి సంఘటనలు ఎవరు మరచిపోకూడదు. కంట్రోల్లు ఉండేటప్పుడు బ్లాకు మార్కెటులో అమ్మబడుచుండిన ధరలకు, ఇప్పుడు యదేచ్ఛగా అమ్మబడుచుండిన ధరలను పోల్చి చూస్తే, ఎంత భేదమున్నదో ఇప్పుడు ధరలు ఎంత తగ్గియున్నవో తగ్గడమేకాకుండా, ఎవరికి కావలసినంత ధాన్యాన్ని వారు యదేచ్ఛగా కొనుకొనుటకు గూడా అవకాశమేర్పడింది. ఇప్పుడు కంట్రోల్లను తీసివేసినందుకు ధరలు పెరుగుతాయని ఏమగ్గించేవారు, కంట్రోల్లు ఉన్న కాలములో బ్లాక్ మార్కెటులో అమ్మబడుచుండిన ధరలకు ఈనాడు అమ్మబడుచుండే ధరలకు ఎంత లేడా ఉందో, గమనించకుండా విమర్శిస్తున్నారు. అప్పుడు ప్రజలు రేషను షాపులలో ఇచ్చే ధాన్యము చాలక, బయట బ్లాకు మార్కెటులో మితములేని ధరలకు కొంటూ ఎవరెవరు ఎన్నెన్ని కష్టాలు పడవలసివచ్చిందో, ఒకసారి స్మరణకు తెచ్చుకోవలసినవి కోరుతున్నాను. గొప్ప గొప్ప భూస్వాములు, ధనవంతులు, పెద్ద ఉద్యోగస్తులు ఎంత దుడ్డు అయినా పెట్టికొనవలసిన ఆహార పదార్థాలు కొనగలరు గాని, సామాన్య రైతాంగము, మధ్య తరగతి ప్రజలు మితములేని హెచ్చు ధరలకు బ్లాకు మార్కెటులో కొనలేక, దినమొక్క యుగముగా గడుపుతూ నానావస్థలు పడుచుండిరనుట ఎవరు మరచిపోకూడదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఇట్లు గత పన్నెండు సంవత్సరాలుగా అనేక నిర్బంధాలతో ప్రజలను నానా బాధలకు గురిచేస్తున్న ఈ కంట్రోల్లను తీసివేయడాన్ని జయప్రదంగా సాగించడానికి ప్రతి ఒకరు ప్రభుత్వముతో సహకరించి ఈ కంట్రోల్లను సంపూర్ణంగా నిర్మూలించి తిరిగి ఇవి తల ఎత్తకుండా చేయటకు బదులుగా కంట్రోల్లను రద్దుచేస్తే అనేక ప్రమాదాలు సంభవిస్తాయని లేనిపోని వ్యతిరేక ప్రచారాలు విమర్శలు చేయడమంటే దాని అంత

రార్థమేమో తెలియకున్నది. ఇదేనా, మనకు ప్రజాస్వామిక విధానానికి సోపాన మైసంగు విధానమని వారిని అడుగుతున్నాను. వారి విమర్శలలో ఉద్దేశ్యమేమో మాకు అర్థంకాకుండా ఉన్నది. ఏ రైతైతే దేశానికి సర్వ ప్రజలకు ప్రాణాధారమై నటువంటివాడో, అట్టి రైతుకు తగిన ఉత్సాహాన్నిచ్చి, సౌకర్యాలిచ్చి తన కృషికి తగిన ఆదాయాన్నిచ్చి కాపాడకపోతే అధిక ఆహారోత్పత్తిగాని, ప్రజావసరాలు గాని, భరలదగ్గదలగాని ఎట్లు చేకూర్చనగునో గమనించవలసియున్నది. ఆహార పదార్థాలకు భరలు యథేచ్ఛగా విడిచిపెట్టినసేగాని దున్నేవాడికిని, భూస్వామికిని ఉత్సాహము ఉండదు. ముఖ్యముగా రైతాంగములో చాలామంది రైతు కూలీలు ఉన్నారు. భూస్వాములకు వారి పంటలనుండి ఎక్కువ ఆదాయము వస్తేనేగాని వారి కూలీలకు ఎక్కువ కూలి ఇవ్వజాలరు. కనుక భరలు యథేచ్ఛగా రైతులకు విడిచిపెట్టినసేగాని ఉభయులకు అనగా భూస్వాములకు రైతు కూలీలకు ఇద్దరికినీ ప్రోత్సాహమునుండదు. అధికోత్పత్తికి పాటుపడరు. ఎప్పుడైతే ధాన్యపు భరలు వారి స్వాధీనములో ఉంటాయో, అప్పుడు సహజముగా వారు ఎక్కువ కండించగలరు. అవిధంగా ఎప్పుడైతే ప్రజావసారాలకు చాలిన ఆహార పదార్థాలను పండించగలరో, అప్పుడు భరలు కూడా క్రమముగా, న్యాయముగనే ఉండగలవు. భరలు ఎక్కువ అగుటకు వీలుండదు. అప్పుడే సామాన్య ప్రజానీకానికంతకు ఆహార పదార్థాలు సులభంగా అందగలవు. ఇందువల్ల ప్రజలందరు తృప్తిపడగలరు. ఇదే ప్రజాస్వామిక విధానము. అట్లుగాక, పెద్దపెద్ద ధనవంతులు భూస్వాములు బ్లాకు మార్కెటు వ్యాపారస్థులు మొదలగు వారువారి స్వార్థము చూచుకొంటూ అవినీతిపరులై అక్రమంగా అన్యాయంగా ధనాన్ని అర్జించుకొంటూ, రైతుకు శీరంగనీతులు చెప్పుచూ 'మీరు దేశాన్ని ఉద్ధరించేటటువంటివారు, మీరు కష్టపడి అధికాహారాన్ని పండిస్తేగాని ప్రజలు బ్రతుకజాలరు. మీరు ఈ విధంగానే కష్టపడుతూనే ఉండండి. మేము మాత్రము ఈ విధంగా సుఖపడుతూ ఉంటాము' అని చెప్పితే, ఎంత న్యాయంగా ఉంటుందో ప్రజాస్వామిక సిద్ధాంతాలకు అనుగుణంగా ఎట్లు ఉండగలదో ఆలోచించుకోవచ్చు.

"కనుక సభ్యులందరు రాజకీయ విభేదాలతో నిమిత్తం లేకుండా ప్రజాసామాన్యానికి మేలు కలుగజేసేందుకు ఈ డికంట్రోలు విధానాన్ని బలపరచవలసినదని సవినయంగా మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈనాడు అమలు జరిపిన డికంట్రోలు విధానము పూర్తి అయిన, లోపరహితమైన డికంట్రోలు విధానము కాదు. ఇంకా నాము మాత్రంగానైనా కొన్ని జిల్లాలను జోనుగా విభాగం చేశారు. ఈ విభాగమును కూడా సాధ్యమైనంత త్వరలో తొలగించవలసినదని కోరుతున్నాను. ఆనాడే రాజాజీ తలపెట్టిన ఉద్యమానికి సంపూర్ణమైన ఫలితము సాధించగలము. మన మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రములో కంట్రోల్ను తొలగించిన తరువాత ఈదేవిధానాన్ని యు.పి., బీహారు రాష్ట్రాలు కూడ అనుసరించడం ముదావహం. ఈ విషయంలో మన రాష్ట్రం మార్గదర్శకంగా ఉండడం గర్వింపదగ్గ విషయం. కనుక ఈ విషయంలో ప్రభుత్వానికి తగిన సహకారమిచ్చి కంట్రోల్లు పూర్తిగా తొలగిపోయేటట్లు కృషిచేయవలెనని సభ్యులందరికిని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. కాని రాజాజీ నాయకత్వాన ప్రస్తుతము ఏర్పడిన మంత్రివర్గము సరియైనది కాదని, ప్రజావిశ్వాసమున్న ఒక సుస్థిరమైనటువంటియు, శాశ్వతమైనటువంటి ప్రజాస్వామిక ప్రభుత్వాన్ని మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రంలో ఏర్పాటు చేయగలిగినవాడే ఈ నిరంకుశ అరాజకశక్తులను ప్రతిఘటించడానికి అవకాశముంటుంది గనుక, ఒక మైనారిటీ పార్టీయొక్క మంత్రివర్గంతో నడిపిస్తున్న ప్రభుత్వ విధానము సవ్యమైనది కాదని నేను మరిమరి ప్రకటన చేస్తున్నాను. ప్రస్తుతము ఈ రెండు మాసాలలో రాజాజీ నాయకత్వాన ఏర్పడినటువంటి ప్రభుత్వము మా రెస్పాన్సిబుల్ గోఆపరేషన్

3rd July 1952] [Sri G. Latchanna]

విధానాన్ని సరిగా అర్థంచేసుకొని ఉదారమైన విశాలమైన ప్రజోపయోగకరమైన ఈ డికంబోలు విధానము అమలుపరచారు. వారిచేత ఈ సహకార్యం చేయించగలిగామనే ఉత్సాహంతో ఈ విశ్వాస తీర్మానాన్ని మేము బలపరచడానికి నిశ్చయించుకొన్నాము. అంతేగాని ప్రస్తుతము పెర్వాసివ్ మొత్తము మంత్రివర్గాన్ని యథాతథంగా అంగీకరించడమనే ఉద్దేశంతోగాని, కాంగ్రెసుయొక్క ప్రతిష్ఠకు భంగము వచ్చిందనిగాని, లేక ప్రభుత్వము బడ్జెట్టులో చూపించినటువంటి హెచ్చు పన్నులవిధానాన్ని అమోదించడమనిగాని ఎంతమాత్రము కాదు. కనుక ఈ రాజాజీ ప్రభుత్వము బడ్జెట్టులో ఈ పన్నులవిధానంలో తగిన సవరణలు చేస్తుందనే విశ్వాసంతో మేము ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని బలపరచడానికి అంగీకరించామని చెప్పుచూ ఇంతటితో విరమించుకొంటున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Hon. the Chief Minister will now speak. After he has spoken, the Leader of the Opposition will speak and then the Leader of the House. If the Hon. the Chief Minister wants to have a say again, I shall allow him. I have made this arrangement because the Hon. the Chief Minister may want to say a few words on a point of personal explanation. I shall allow him to speak again, if necessary." 4 p.m.

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" If there is anything requiring personal explanation, he is certainly welcome, Sir. We require his explanation."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, as regards procedure, the Leader of the Opposition wanted very much to speak after me and I have no objection whatsoever to agree to that. I do not wish to get any advantage out of mere time or order or position. Let us go into the merits of the question. What I have asked for, Sir, is confidence in me and I cannot get it by mere debate. I know very well that it is a matter of confidence and not a matter of argument or debate or strategy.

" Before I begin, Sir, you will permit me to tender my congratulations to those who have spoken from the Opposition Benches. I hope that they will not consider that I am patronising them. In spite of my complete opposition to the Communists, in spite of my very frank expression of opinion that their work injures the best interest of the country, in spite of all these, I assure them that my dislike is sweetened by a sneaking affection for the young men who show industry, talent and earnestness of purpose, whatever may be their views. I know very well that we, old people, do not last for all time and that the country will have to be looked after by the younger people, and from that point of view, I welcome ability and earnestness of purpose apart from any opinions that any man may hold at any time. I claim and I fondly believe that the young men opposite know that there is a corner in my heart for them, in spite of everything harsh that I might say about them. I occasionally have to use strong language, for my conviction on those points is as earnest and as sincere as is their own conviction about the ideology for which they stand. Most of the gentlemen opposite, although new to Parliament, new

to its privileges as well as to its rules and restrictions, and although their speeches were all maiden speeches, have done well. We must pardon and ignore the tub-thumping practice that occasionally exhibited itself. That is due to a persistence of habit, for they have indulged in that style of speaking for quite a good long time without any Parliamentary interruption. They are used to that kind of eloquence and old habits cannot be given up easily, but I have no doubt that by and by they will have achieved even that.

" Sir, I have been going about preaching the necessity for belief in God and I am told that I have no right to do it, having accepted office under Government. (Interruption from Sri S. T. Adityan.) Don't be in such a hurry. Did I contradict the hundreds of misstatements and exaggerations that were made? So, things will clear themselves if we permit one another to speak. Sir, has been felt and it has been said also that I was committing an error of judgment in speaking about God, and that I was drawing travelling allowance and misusing that travelling allowance when I was speaking about God. I deny altogether the charge that was made that I was guilty of the great blasphemy of thinking that I was sent down by God or that I was God Himself. It is blasphemy of the uttermost type and I deny that charge. But when a person hears a thing, he hears what is in his own mind, he hears his own prejudices. When a person reads something, he reads what is in his own mind and what is his own prejudice. There is no time, in the present world of great hurry and of suffocating leaflets and literature of that kind, for people to listen clearly, to think clearly and even to read clearly. What I claim and what everyone is told from time immemorial is that every one has a God in his heart, and when I appealed to the members to vote according to the dictates of the god in their hearts, god is not spelt with a capital ' G '; it is spelt with a small ' g ', according to English idiom. I was appealing to what other Members might refer to as conscience. I was appealing to what Socrates referred to as the deity in one's own heart. That is a time-honoured appeal and I was not claiming that the votes of the people should be given as from God Himself. God has a way of His own and we need not appeal to Him in the matter of votes, but I appeal to the men and women who are here to vote according to the dictates of their free judgment and according to what their conscience tells them to do and not anything else. I was told that when I went about preaching the Gita or anything from the Gita—I was told by the hon. gentleman Sri Ramamurthi, I think—I was trying to copy the Great Krishna Himself. Whether he considered him great or not, I consider him great. He also made it appear as if I were trying to imitate Sri Krishna by believing and by saying that I have come down to set *Adharma* right and to bring *Dharma* back again. He quoted from an early chapter, not the chapter on duty but from the preliminary chapter, wherein Sri Krishna says ' God comes down in many forms whenever there is occasion or need for setting things right.' I never imagined and I never said

to anybody anywhere either in private conversation or on the platform that I represented or had a mission from God or anything of that kind.''

(An hon. Member from the Opposition Benches rose.)

MR. SPEAKER :—'' Order, order.''

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—'' Let me tell my Friends here that God is truth, that it is a fact that every one of us is but a tool in His hands and that every little act of ours is His act. Both the votes on this side and on that side are but His activities, and He has His own inscrutable ways. I appeal to my Friends on the other side, ' Do not imagine and charge me with the blasphemy that I was guilty of saying that I was God Himself or anything of that kind.' Because one dislikes the reference to God and because one dislikes the reference to religion, one does not hear properly the things that are said about God. I cannot read a book or understand a book aright unless as I leave my shoes behind before going into a temple, I put aside my prejudices and read the book with respect and sympathy and affection. If we wish to understand one another, we must be humble and we must put aside prejudices. That is the secret of the matter. So many friends who are young and growing, who have got the urge of life in them and the urge of ignoring everything else, do not know the meaning of the laws of Nature. The hon. Gentleman Sri Adityan explained it correctly on my behalf. He correctly explained the position and he wanted me to stick to that position, and I wish he had also added that I would never swerve from that position. It was nothing else that I said and I maintain that God must be kept in our mind. If anybody does not wish to do that I cannot interfere with him; I can only plead.

'' As regards the question whether Ministers of the State or any officer or any man in my position or any of my Colleagues should not preach any particular religion or even religion itself in general because they go about on public business, let me ask, ' Am I not to preach when I go round? Has the salary that I receive or the allowance that I receive bought up my life-breath, my faith, and everything? ' Certainly not. Even as I breathe free air and eat my own food, not under the dictates and regulations of the Travelling Allowance Rules, I must have the right to speak about the God that I believe in and it is part of my breath and faith and, therefore, I do it. The hon. Gentleman, Janab Seethi, correctly answered the argument. He brought out the pith of the matter. Sir, it has been said that I have suddenly taken up preaching about God. Those who did not hear me before, those who did not hear me preaching about God before, those who did not bother about what I wrote or what I said, could not have heard what I wrote or said before and I do not blame them, but they ought not to come to the presumption that suddenly I began to preach God or believe in God. It is a very old habit of mine; even if it is a bad habit, I would like to be excused. I have always talked

about it and preached about it and it is not correct to presume that I suddenly began to do it. The hon. Gentleman Janab Seethi correctly explained, that one acts according to the environment and the necessity of the occasion. Here are a number of people who have been going about for some decades past, preaching that we need not recognize the existence of God, whether He is there or not is no concern of ours and that we had better carry on our work without reference to Him. It is a very reasonable proposition but it is not a good proposition, not good for the world and not good for the country. We must work with love and fear of God every moment. It is not enough to ignore it and to work as if nothing existed but yourself and your surroundings. There must be a law from within.

" Then, Sir, complaints were made that there were too many policemen in the country. I could remove all the policemen if you would accept my advice about God. It is because people do not accept my advice about God that the police are necessary. But however many the policemen may be, it will not be effective unless there is the policeman inside and that is why I make no hesitation in accepting Janab Seethi's advice when he said, ' Do not swerve from the line you have taken? Simply because these young men have flippantly talked about it, I am not going to swerve from it nor do I mind the flippancy of the talk. Even that flippancy will grow into a constant memory and a constant memory will create a constant habit of thought about the subject, and I hope for improvement in that direction even as a result of the debate that has taken place in this House.

" The hon. Gentleman complained that this House has become a *bhajana matam*. Indeed, I wish it had become that. There is nothing else that is wanted. But what are we doing?. We are making new laws of a very superficial character. We are here to make laws of a very superficial and trifling character. If really we become a temple or a *bhajana matam*, much better laws than what we can make will prevail without any exertion on our part, no amendments would be necessary. (Laughter.) If only we followed them, if only the people followed them, there would be no need for further activities on the part of this Legislature. The hon. Gentleman who spoke flippantly about *bhajana matam* had better go to a *bhajana matam*, whenever possible, and it will do him considerable good.

" Then, many people here charged me and found fault with me for attributing to them want of faith in God. I wish I were wrong. I wish that they were right that I had made a mistake at least in a large number of cases. I do wish to be contradicted by a larger and larger number of people by saying, ' No, we are believers in God as much as you. We do not talk about it, but we are pious, we are humble and we are good as you.' I wish every one would tell me that. But I am sorry I have to say that these denials do not have the ring of truth in them. These denials of the charge have a jeer in the heart because there is a flippancy about it. It does not ring true just like a false coin. It has a

ring of mere debate and argument. I wish what they said were true but in many cases it is not true. I do not like the idea of young men accepting positions theoretically and provisionally in order to meet a debate. They should be straight about it.

" I take my hat off—only I have no hat (laughter)—I take my hat off to my old and beloved friend, now my enemy No. 1, Sri E. V. Ramaswami Naicker. I take my hat off because he says, 'I shall preach my No-Godism; I shall continue to preach it in spite of any number of Acharyas.' Let him preach it, but the two together will keep the God alive in the hearts of men. I want that continuous work and that is the meaning of the old story of the man, who was anti-Narayana and who kept a peil attached to his ear so that he might not hear the name of Narayana uttered by anybody. Even he is supposed to have been saved because he continually thought about Narayana while all the time the tendency was not to hear the mention of the name of Narayana. So, there is no flinching on my part and I thank the hon. Gentleman Janab Seethi for putting the vigour of eloquence on that subject and in that connexion.

" Sir, the privilege of Members is very large but there are some limitations. But here in this debate every restriction was put aside. Whether it was the privilege of a Court, whether it was the privilege of a Judge and whether it was the privilege of absent people who could not defend themselves and about whom you make statements here, whatever they might be, they were ignored. I do not mind it. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that you allowed the debate to go on freely because this is a Vote of Confidence and it should not be conducted under restrictions of any kind. I read in this morning's papers that in the Parliament Sri Jayasoorya apologised for having made against somebody a charge which was not substantiated.

" He has done that because of his hereditary qualities and I am glad. But I did not object to such statements made here. Hundreds of statements like that were made here. It would be utterly impossible for me to meet them even by a bare denial or contradiction in each case. However, I do wish to say that there is no point in making such statements without going into any particular case. If a group of people start a riot in a village, or commit a murder, or burn a few houses or pull out the eyes of somebody as stated by the hon. Member Sri Thimma Reddi, the policemen learn the information later and go to the scene. The criminal chooses the time and place for the crime. He knows the time, place, hour and circumstances. But the police could know it only later and they proceed to the place. Afterwards complaints are started of oppression and terrorism in order to discover what had happened. That was the story probably in many cases. But in all these cases, the primary thing is forgotten. For instance, a man might have been killed or a child wearing a few rupees worth of jewellery might have been persuaded to go with a persons as if with a friend and killed. Considerable time elapses

4-15 p.m.

before the young man is charged with the crime and sentenced. It might take six months or one year to bring the person to trial and prove his crime, and if proved, he might be punished. But pity flows like a stream for the young man who is sentenced. What about the little boy who was killed? They talk of police terrorism and all that. They forget the tragedy of the child and the feelings of the parents who lost the child. When the police receive complaints as to certain crimes committed, they go to the scene of occurrence to find out the criminal and thus help the people. Charges are made about the action of the police but the crimes committed earlier by certain groups of people are forgotton. Human memory becomes slipshod. Sir . . ."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" There should be an enquiry."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" There have been enquiries into these matters . . . (Interruption.) Please don't shout. You cannot do that . . ." (Interruption.)

MR. SPEAKER :—" Order, order."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Justice must be done."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have already allowed the hon. Member to speak and he has had his own say in the matter."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Sir, on a point of order, I wish to ask the Hon. the Chief Minister through you whether he can go on speaking about things which we have challenged him to prove in public? Let him come forward and do that and let him not go on referring to such things."

MR. SPEAKER :—" It is not a point of order."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" This is how points of order are raised by the young gentlemen on the opposite side. Let me make the position clear here. They never said, 'Please enquire into this.' They only said, 'Such and such a thing has happened. Therefore don't vote for the Confidence Motion.' When such statements were made by hon. Members opposite, I did not wish to interrupt them then and there, nor raise points of order, unless I wanted to get away with points of order. They have made certain statements and I did not want to contradict them one by one. It is impossible. I may say in general that Courts have gone into cases and have come to certain conclusions and have convicted people. Let me, however, tell the hon. Members here, through you, Sir, that I have gone into the files and have recommended commutation in certain cases under certain circumstances. I have examined cases of crime committed by a party that calls itself now as a party standing for World Peace and as having certain minimum programmes. I have seen the papers in the cases tried in Courts and their results. Therefore, the charge of the Opposition is rather misleading. Apart from that, no policeman or group of policemen enter a village or any other place

except to raid a centre engaged in some illicit liquor programme as referred to in the Gingee case or to raid some other crime centre. It is always easy to make charges against the policemen and circumstances lead some people to think that the policemen are likely to have been guilty of that charge. But they do not go into the crimes that might have actually been committed. However, it would be impossible to contradict or disprove the various statements that have been made one by one. There were people who wanted to speak about those remarks and put forward counter arguments. But I advised them, ' There is no good in doing that, Please do not do that. Let things take their course.' If anyone asks me to go into any particular case which is worth going into and which would be right for me to go into, my practice, as is known to those who know me, is to go into that. I do not refuse to go into such requests, provided they remember the limitations on my time and mortal capacity. I do not refuse anything which I can do.

" It was said that there must be some motive behind this Motion. The expression ' motive ' in a psychological sense is all right. But when that word is used in a debate of this kind, it is something else. What is the motive behind this? I have explained the motive that I had. I have put my reasons clearly in my statement. I have not suppressed my feelings. I have said why I wanted this Motion to be brought before the House. Members on the Opposition Benches one after another have repeatedly tried to discover and explain that there must be some motive other than what I have said. They tried to find some wrong motive behind this Motion. I do not think it is worthwhile for me to go into the analysis that was sought to be made for this Motion. But I do wish to answer one of the charges in connexion with that. The most important motive that they were able to discover was that I brought this Motion in order to get the position of a dictator. Sir, it is not my object to become a dictator of this State. That was not my intention at any time and much less at this difficult time. Even if that was my intention, am I so stupid as to believe that by bringing a Confidence Motion like this before this House, I can get that dictatorship? Surely, if hon. Members will refuse to me good character, at least they must give me credit for a certain amount of intelligence. If I had wanted to achieve dictatorship, there are other ways of getting that, than by bringing a Motion like this before this House. I know there are people who will refuse to give me their vote of confidence and such people who are permanently pledged to that attitude are not going to change their mind. I have referred to this point in my statement also. It is not dictatorship that I wish to secure. My convictions are there. I am asking for this vote of confidence not to get any appreciation for what I have done or to prove that what I have done is right. I have already explained clearly in my statement that I am asking for the vote of confidence not as an attestation of the worth of what I have done or achieved, but to strengthen me in order to do more work in future. I have said that if you give me that vote of confidence, I shall be able to carry the burden on my shoulders more satisfactorily. It is for future use and future work that I

have asked for this confidence vote and not for the past work. Everybody knows that I am asking for this vote of confidence in the very early period of my stewardship. I do not want that you should come to some judgment as to my merit or demerit so early. I know that very well. That is why I explained clearly that I want this vote of confidence in order that I may be enabled to do my work. Therefore I thought that there may not be a debate on this motion, as it was only a case of the expression of opinion by you whether you have confidence in me or not. I believed that the whole thing would be closed in one forenoon or one afternoon. I thought that it was only a matter as to whether you liked me to continue to work or would like somebody else to take my place and that of my colleagues. That could have been done very briefly and could have been over in no time. But Leaders and Groups in the Opposition wanted at the outset 15 days—I do not know whether they wanted a month—and then a week at least and then agreed to four days. We have now gone through the agony for the past 4 days and I think that to-day at least we will be able to close this business. Sir, I am told that because I said at Koilpatti that I wanted the voters of the Aruppukottai constituency to consider the issue as a question put to them whether they wanted me to continue as Chief Minister or not and since that constituency had voted against me, I should resign my office and there was no need for me to ask for this vote in this House. I beg to differ in that. I accept that the constituency of Aruppukottai has given me an adverse vote. I do not propose to analyse the votes nor analyse the reasons that brought about that result. I am a sportsman even in elections. The election is completed and I admit that the verdict is against me. What did I say at Koilpatti? I feel that I must say something about this story of my challenge. I did not make any challenge at all in that connexion. I was not in a mood to challenge. Mr. Muthuramalinga Thevar rightly told the House that I knew him very well and I know the place very well and also know the position that he occupies there. He also said that there had been no right intuition in what I expressed regarding the election in that constituency of Aruppukottai. He is right in saying all those things. But did I say, ' Well, I am going to win in that constituency? ' Then it would have been wrong on my part. I did not say that and so there is no question of challenge. I would like the hon. Member to remember what I said at Koilpatti, where I stopped on my way to Tirunelveli for half-an-hour or so. I closed my speech and sat down without any reference to the Aruppukottai election. Then some friends told me, ' There is election coming. You must speak something about it.' I again got up and said ' Well, there is nothing to be said about the election. The only question for the constituency is whether they want me to continue in office or not.' "

SRI U. MUTHURAMALINGA THEVAR :—" On a point of order, Sir. I did not hear the speech of the Hon. Chief Minister at Koilpatti, and I saw only newspaper reports. The report was like that. If Rajaji is to say in this House that his speech was misreported, then I shall be content with it."

3rd July 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" It is not a point of order."

• THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Mr. Thevar wants me to say that the papers have misreported. I had no time to read what the newspapers have written about it. So I dare not say that they have misreported me. If I said like that, they will take me to task and ask me whether I read the news. I have narrated on the floor of the House what I said. Let the hon. Member judge me on what I say here and not on the report of the newspaper which he says he has read. I said, ' Here is an election coming. There is not much to be said about it. The issue before you is this : If you want me to administer the Province you had better vote for the Congress candidate. If you don't want me, you had better vote against the Congress candidate.' That is all what I said. I made no challenge whatever. Now I accept the results of that election. The vote was against the Congress, seventy to fifty and it showed that they did not want me. That is correct but can I resign on that? Do I have a right to go out on that issue? Here is a House which consists of Members sent from all the constituencies and there are several parties in this House. There is a purpose in my coming before this House with this motion. If I decide to go, I must approach this House and say why I am going. Surely, Aruppukottai constituency is not the whole of India or Madras. Did they appoint me? I must therefore beg leave of the House. I ask the House, ' Do you want me or not? ' The statement I made and the result of the Aruppukottai election were sufficient reasons for me to put the question to this House. I do not ignore it. It may be treated as a sample or random vote so to say. It may also be that I did not select the correct place. Mr. P. T. Rajan said that I was wrong in selecting that place and I should not have selected that place as a test. He may be quite right. But the point is this. I said what I said and the constituency has said ' no ' to it. I therefore put it to the House and ask, ' Do you Gentlemen, 375 people, want me to continue in office or want some one else among you to take over my place and run the Government? ' That is the question that I am putting to the House. I do not undervalue the vote of that constituency. I have frankly and definitely said that so far as that constituency is concerned, it has given me an adverse decision. But that does not entitle me to run away.

" When the constituency has given an adverse vote, it follows that the constituents have no confidence in me and I must take the steps that follow. I submit I have taken these steps. 4-30 p.m.

" When we proceed further with this subject I must recall one important fact. The Members of the Opposition have been saying from the very beginning and repeated it from time to time, ' you cannot get away with a vote of confidence only on your own merits; we have a right to refer to the old Congress Ministry's work—their sins of commission and omission right from the beginning.' One Member, Mr. Muthuramalinga Thevar, went one step further and began from the year 1920. He went through the World War and the Japanese War. I admire his capacity for getting through

foreign policy. I do hope he will get into some Foreign Ministry where he can do well. (Laughter.) But I hope, for the good of our country, he will not get into one (laughter), though from a personal point of view I would love it. Mr. Muthuramalinga Thevar was a young man when he was offered to me by some of my friends. He praised me to the skies and drove me in a car through the sandy and muddy roads of his constituency. It is an interesting story and we shall talk about it in an unofficial manner, not now. What did the Members say? They said that I cannot get away with a vote for this Motion on my own merits and that they have a right to refer to the actions of all the Congress Ministries. I have no objection to this. It is right. They have a right to do so because this is a party Government and they have every right to say, 'We judge you from the group to which you belong, from the party to which you belong and if they have committed wrongs, we expect you to commit wrongs also.' I cannot object. That is why, I listened patiently to what they said from the outset. But I could not understand one thing they said. If I went to the electorate for an election, the electorate had every right to consider the past. It has every right to go into the entire history of the Congress and its merits and demerits. But what I ask here is not in the nature of an appeal which may be made by a Congress candidate or the party in a general election or a by-election. What I say to the House is, 'We are here; do you want me and this Government now'? That is the question and not whether I am a good man or the party is a good party. That has been decided, whatever be the decision. Therefore, we need not put that question to the House here. The only question is whether this House wants the present Government or not, because the House is in charge of the State, in supreme charge of the State. Here is the organization which must appoint its Executive and the Executive holds its place during the pleasure of the House. Therefore it is that the question before the House is not the question that is put by the party to the electorate but this: 'Does this Executive command the confidence of this House?' It is not a party question or one relating to the manifesto of the party. These questions are not relevant here, though I do not wish to object to references being made to them in order to interpret, to understand, and estimate and appraise the Executive's capacity and the like or its motives and programmes.

"Then, Sir, the speech of Mr. Anthoni Pillai comes to my mind. He also said that this Motion was premature. He said that there is no reason whatsoever for the Chief Minister to put this question of confidence at this time to the House. He added: 'Here is an undemocratic man; he made a great change in the Food policy of the State without consulting the House and is he the democrat I am going to vote for confidence in?' Sir, he has answered his own question. Because I made a great change without consulting the House it was necessary that I must come to the House with this Motion if at least for that reason. He has given a good and important reason and I must now put to the House, 'Do you want me, a man who has made this change, or not?' Therefore, Mr. Anthoni Pillai, in arguing against me as

an undemocratic person has proved the need for this Motion in this House at this time. The answer that I got from the speeches of hon. Members on the merits of our Food policy is, I submit, enough for me. Everyone of them has not grudged against it. No one has had the courage to say, 'Decontrol is bad.' What they say is, 'Decontrol is good in itself but will you put prices down also?' They ask 'Will they fall, are they likely to fall?' If they are mere weather prognosticators, I do not mind. I only hope that they do not pray for its failure; I hope they do not wish for the failure of the scheme; I hope they will not work for the failure of decontrol; I hope that they will not try to prove that I am wrong but help to make the country happy and prosperous. If they want to prove that I am wrong, what an unworthy object it would be for the young men who want to govern this country! I want them to prove something bigger. I want them to prove that we can govern this country without controls and without harassment. I want them to prove that we can see, without controls, that the people observe economy and restraint and honesty in trade, business and production. I would ask the young men to work for that and not continually to pray for the downfall of the Chief Minister or for proving that he is wrong. (Sri T. Nagi Reddi: 'We pray for the downfall of prices.') Supposing I am proved wrong, what do hon. Members here gain? I have been proved wrong and right on many matters. These will be forgotten as they have been forgotten. But if decontrol succeeds, we give an example to the whole of India. We give courage to all kinds and classes of people. Let us try to work for that.

"Then, Sir, the argument proceeded: 'Why do you come for a vote now when a clear vote has been already given against the Congress in the election' Member after Member declaimed on this point. This, I submit, is a confusion of the system of democratic voting. It is not always possible for a party to command an overall majority. Because the Congress all these years commanded an overall majority—either expressed in votes or expressed in a general way in enthusiasm—because the Congress had that overwhelming majority, the disappointment or the sharp difference between the number of seats that they have now got at the elections and what they enjoyed before should not be converted into a theory that the Congress has lost. The Congress has not lost. The Congress has not attained that which it sought to get. It was disappointed. That is loss enough. That is disappointment enough with which the greedy Opposition may be satisfied. I grant it straightway. Now take the voting figures. The Congress secured 70 lakhs of votes, never mind the number of seats or the delimitation of constituencies which may be just or more or less unjust. The Congress secured 70 lakhs of votes under adult suffrage. The Independents—not groups like, say, of my friend, Mr. V. V. Ramaswami, who stood each one of them in his own right, got 53 lakhs of votes, all put together. The Communists got 26 lakhs of votes and the K.M.P. 18 lakhs of votes. I need not go into the smaller numbers. (An hon. Member: 'You can do that.') What is the need for it? The proposition has been repeatedly put forward that disunity among the opponents of the Congress gave the Congress

152 seats or 70 lakhs of votes. That is to say, the group that is represented by the Members in the Opposition was by nature united, but because there was a split among them, the Congress took advantage of it and got so many votes. Sir, the position, I submit is totally different. These fifty-three lakhs of votes which the Independents got were given to persons who were careerists, egotists and people with loyalties to different ideas and different aims and whose patriotism narrowed down to love for a particular group or community. If all these persons opposed the Congress, surely, it cannot be imagined that they were all bound together by a high and common ideal and that all their votes should be added up to say that the Congress is defeated and that it was only bad strategy that gave the Congress these 70 lakhs of votes. They could not have united. It is easy to unite in opposition. It is possible after election to unite on a legislative programme and work in Parliament. But it is not so easy to unite and make a common party to get the votes of the people. In the same manner in which my Friends opposite wish to make out by some arithmatical process that the Congress did not secure the overall support of the people, I say that everyone of these groups failed to secure the overall confidence of the public. Everyone of these groups got less than half the total and less than what the Congress secured. They did not secure the confidence of the people by a majority. It amounts to this. If the Congress did not secure an overall majority, the Independents did not also get it, even if they should be treated as one single party from the outset. The Communists did not get a majority either. With the same eloquent force that they employed, but without the noise that accompanied it, I say that the country has totally rejected the Communists' appeal. It has refused to give them anything more than 26 lakhs of votes. This applies to everyone of the groups that are in the Opposition. We have here no overall majority for any party and yet we must make the best of it in order to govern the country properly. This is what I propose should be done and that is my advice also. How it is to be done, is for the Members of the Opposition and others to decide after due deliberation in this House. and the Motion of Confidence is only a step in that direction."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" What is your proposal? "

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" My proposal is that you should confide in me and run the Government. If all the votes which the Congress did not get should be counted against them, all the votes which the Communists did not get should be counted against them also. Similarly, all the votes that the K.M.P. did not get should be taken as having gone against them. This simple mathematical truth has been pointed out by many in public and I have done it now. But it is ignored in the eloquent arguments that are produced—for whose benefit I do not know—by the Opposition. I have no objection to groups combining and voting against the Congress; what I object to is the claim that the country has voted against the Congress. How can I, in the face of the figures that I have before me, accept the proposition that the country has voted against the Congress, a statement which was

made repeatedly by one Member after another? As a matter of fact, the country has given the largest number of seats to the Congress among the various competitors. Let the leaders opposite or the behind-curtain-leaders of those who sit opposite try to unite on a common ideology which is good for the country as they have often said and let them go to the country, get a majority of votes and form a Government. I shall obey the laws of that Government as a loyal citizen. No one will grudge them the votes which they can secure on such a common basis. But they have not secured any comparable number of votes on such a basis. Merely combining now in opposition is totally different from running the Government.

" Now, the Opposition is the champion of every grievance in the country. Of all the vested interests, the worst form of vested interest is the vested interest in the misery or the grievances of the people. Of all the forms of vested interests which we all combine to oppose, the worst form is the vested interest in grievances. I am afraid that that vested interest is now growing apace. We should strive to remove those grievances. We should not strive to thrive on grievances. (Interruption from the Opposition benches.) Put your finger on your heart and listen to me. Let me, Sir, in this connection, say one thing. Whenever I refer to the Opposition it is not always to the U.D.F. that I refer. I refer more often to a particular bloc, the Communist bloc. Let me explain it. When I referred for instance, to not believing in God, I did not refer to many of the Members who protested, very rightly protested, against the remark. It did not include them. I was referring to the Communists and the Communists only because they are the predominant partners in this partnership. I know the strength of their predominance; I know the history of the satellite countries in Europe. I know how the Communists are humble in the beginning, how they are smooth and oily and get into every group and try to get first the G.C.M. as I would call it and then by multiplying it by a convenient figure get the L.C.M (Cheers.)

" The Communists first find out the greatest common measure of everybody who have grievances and take possession of the G.C.M. and then multiply it by a factor which I call exaggeration and the exaggerated G.C.M. becomes the L.C.M., the least common multiple. That is the arithmetical formula of the Communists. (Interruption.) I have not discovered it here. It has been discovered during the last few decades to be the process by which Communists are operating in Eastern Europe. Le me not waste the time of the House too long on that. (Interruption.) It might be contradicted by the other side. The formula has not been discovered by the Communist Party here. The formula has been prepared for them almost like the Ayurvedic formula for preparation of medicines. It has been prepared on the principles laid down in the scriptures of the Communist Party. It is the result of long research in human psychology. They know how to work on human psychology. The thing is there. If you take ginger, jaggery, and peper, grind them up and put the mixture

4-45 p. m.

in your stomach, it produces an irritation which finally increases digestion. In the same way they know the way to put the grievances together, find out the greatest common measure and then multiply it and make it a common policy for everybody. Then the day comes when, just as the small fish are eaten by the big fish and the big fish alone remains, the Communist is the only party there and then comes a police raj worse than any police raj that my Friend Mr. Nagi Reddi has discovered. (Interruption.) I know the history of people who came under the Communist Party. People who left the Communist Party have written and published their experience. I have spoken to them, I have heard them. My dear Friends do not know that I am quite intimate with friends from China and Russia. Chance has given me that intimacy. I have cut many jokes with Communist friends in the Embassies from abroad. Let me not be drawn into all that. Communism works through this G.C.M. method, it gets hold of the people and the industries, and then everything is changed. Let me warn the country and the people as to what will happen in any country where Communists are to rule. After all, the fruit is the test of the tree. Take all the countries in the world. Take the countries where the Communists got hold of the Government. See whether it is the same as three or four policemen standing guard in my house or whether there is not a policeman in every family. In those countries there is a policeman in every house, not in uniform—but they are more loyal to the State than any policeman in uniform. Every citizen is a policeman. In two generations all opposition is wiped out and liquidated. Every child is brought up under the doctrine of a police state and everybody is put on the watch, put under control and regulated. It was said that we controlled and decontrolled food. But if the Communists come to rule through the United Democratic Front and their friends, what will happen is that the Communists will control not only food, but thought, word and action. (Interruption.) Perhaps, I have been infected by the invectives I have been forced to listen to all this time. I apologise for the force of the remarks but unfortunately my remarks are true."

SRI P. VENKATESWARLU :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to know how this anti-communist tirade is relevant to the Motion. Is it on this he wants the confidence of the House? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I am not yielding. You cannot shout me down."

SRI P. VENKATESWARLU :—" Is it on this—whether you like the Communists or not—that you want a vote of confidence? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" Order, order."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, it is not a point of order. It is an argument which I shall answer immediately. The point is this : that the vote of confidence I ask is based on my claim and on my party's claim that it is dangerous

to hand over the country to the United Democratic Front which is dominated by the Communist Members, and it will be more and more dominated as time goes on and power increases.

" Sir, reference was made to my policemen. I confess I do not like so many policemen standing around me. They do not really help me. But the old pomp continues and even if I were to interfere with the pomposity—which I wish to do slowly—I do not wish to say, ' Get away, I am a great man, I am a simple man,' and wear a loin-cloth. I cannot do it. I do not like the observance of these old formalities. I want these practices to be slowly withdrawn. But why are these maintained? Threatening letters are sent by some people. I do not say that any Communist did it because I know those who want really to hurt a man do not send notices to the police. Those who wish to kill a man do not send anonymous letters and make their position difficult. I told Policemen : ' Do not be alarmed.' I know that these people are not going to kill me. If they wanted to kill me they could take me any time unawares, without any difficulty in spite of these gentlemen standing with the bayonet. These policemen with the bayonets cannot move round. They cannot look around. They look only in front. They do not help me. Gandhiji was killed. Where was he killed? He was killed between the bathroom and the prayer-ground, and how can anybody guard inside the compound? If a man has to be killed he could be killed in spite of any number of policemen standing about. Mr. Nagi Reddi referred to some policemen standing at the entrance of the railway carriage in which I was travelling. Those gentlemen thought that they should protect me from being disturbed by my admirers not by my enemies. They have to protect the travellers and make the passage available to them so that they could get into the train. I told them that is what they should do. It may be that they did it. I do not apologise for that. I do not like it. I want to get rid of it. It is no pomp or power. My friends are not so simple as to believe that I am having the policemen there to make me a dictator in the country. The pomp does not help me a bit. It looks ugly, I admit. But the real process of power getting into the head, I say with frankness, is in the process the Communist Members believe most. They have a power which is not exhibited. They have got their stranglehold on the essential services and production in the country. They feel that power and they need not be in uniform. They have exercised that power and that power has gone to their heads. I warn them, it is bad. I warn them, power is bad, in whatever form, if it intoxicates you. I wish I had a Prohibition Act against that kind of intoxication. It is not the Congress which for a time has been enjoying uniformed soldiers' loyalty that is drunk with power. It is the people who have a hold on the production of the country and who have a clientele who are ignorant, who can be easily misguided and operated upon in their plan of exploiting their greed by false promises, allegations and things like that. Power built upon that basis is dangerous. By all means let us organize labour and remove their grievances. Let us go round lecturing, let us protest, let us argue in courts and secretariats and get things

righted. But do not pile up grievances for exploitation and try to build a superstructure of power on that basis. That is wicked. I must say, if that is the object of the Communists, it should not be done. You should work to remove grievances and to maintain industrial activity. But you must drop the desire to build power on the grievances. I do not grudge anybody trying to get grievances removed. But I do not want anyone should make it his profession, so to say, to build power thereupon. What do the opposition want done in their speeches against the Motion moved on my behalf? It is : ' There should be no taxes.' Can the Opposition run the Government without taxes? (An hon. Member : ' Your friends also say so.') Even that does not make your argument right. My hon. Friend rises to interrupt me unnecessarily. I do not mind it. But it should not be treated as a point of order. They say there should be no taxes, not even betterment taxes when irrigation works are carried out. All projects should be completed, all welfare schemes should be undertaken, they say. The time will come when, as my friend Mr. Rajan said, the younger men will take charge of the Government and they will come to the necessary contradiction of the policies they will have then to make if they maintain such propositions now.

" It is the Communist habit in all countries and it is now exhibited here. Their continuous policy is to demand every privilege arising from the concept of democracy in order to forward their own determined plan which finally includes a denial of similar privileges to those who oppose their authority when they should come to be established in power. That is their clear formula. They raise points of order now. When they are in power no one can raise points of order. Survey the countries from China to Peru. You will see, any traveller will see, whether points of order are allowed, whether privileges are allowed, whether freedom of speech is allowed, whether freedom of association is allowed in countries governed by Communists. I need not dilate on this subject. The strategy of the Communists through the United Democratic Front has to be exposed. They claim all the privilege of democracy so long as we are in power, but when they get into power democracy ends and all privileges end. It will not only be so in India, it is the case everywhere.

" Sir, I am a very ignorant man. I am an old fashioned man. But I know something about the Communists, the Communist theory, the Communist policy. They believe that class conflict is necessary and inherent in the present day civilization. (Interruption.) Forgive me if I make a mistake in the jargon. I do not know exactly the jargon. But I am right in substance. It is inherent in the present civilization and now that must be ended—the inherent class conflict—by the transfer of the means of production to national ownership and that is to be attained by force and revolution. I want gentlemen to follow this analysis of mine. It is to be attained by force and revolution and not otherwise. It is not possible otherwise. Subsequent to that necessary solution, there has to be an unlimited period of dictatorship based on open terror.

This is the programme of the Communists. The Socialists do not like that. They think they can attain the same end by different methods, without the things I described. Now the Socialists have decided to vote with the Communists. It was curious to observe that the arguments of Mr. P. T. Rajan on the one side and Dr. K. B. Menon on the other side were exactly the same but it is wonderful, how two intelligent gentlemen could come to opposite conclusions on the same argument, exactly the same argument. (Laughter.) Dr. Menon came to the conclusion long ago, he and his colleagues came to the conclusion that they should never vote with the Communists. They say: 'No truck with the Communists. We are the true blue socialists of the world. No truck with the Communists, but because Rajaji has asked for a vote of confidence and because no virile political party can remain neutral, we must vote with the Communists, that is to say, we must remove Rajaji.' Supposing I lose the vote of Dr. K. B. Menon, what happens? The Communist-dominated United Democratic Front takes charge of the Government. Is that what the Socialists want? I ask them to consult Mr. P. T. Rajan sitting near them before they come to a conclusion.

5-p.m.

"Dr. K. B. Menon does not want any advice or suggestions from me. He knows the Communist Party through and through. The Communist Party has been operating in all satellite countries according to a certain policy. It is this: 'Completely conceal your own policy; do not talk about it or make any public exposition of it during the present period; keep the Communist Party intact and strong and do all that is necessary for it in your own secret conclaves; do not use the labour platform or any political platform; work on the G.C.M. principle.' (Hon. Members: 'From what are you quoting?') I am quoting from my heart. I have noted it down after careful thinking, so that I may not commit any mistake and I am reading it. It is not usual for me to quote. The policy is, Sir, 'Take hold of every grievance and form united front.' All the speeches made from the Opposition Benches have completely demonstrated the correctness of this appraisement. They are the champions of landless labourers; they are the champions of small peasant proprietors. Everybody knows the history of the peasant proprietorship in Russia and how it was changed subsequently. The landless labourers must look to the Communists as their champions; the small peasant proprietors must look to them as their champions; bus-owners must look to them as their champions; passengers must look to them as their champions; even the N.G.Os. must look to them as their champions. Everybody, middle class and upper middle class and even the small capitalist who is allotted the high place in the list, is to be championed by them. This only exemplifies what I have said, 'Take everybody's grievance and make it your own policy.'

"The other gentlemen who are in this group claim, very rightly and genuinely, that they have the right to be independent and that they will not be contaminated. But psychology cannot be ignored; history cannot be ignored; I have no doubt, that many of

the leaders in the Opposition Benches imagine that they are perfectly independent. I must say, however, that their psychology is being unconsciously undermined. We know the history of Communist alliances in other countries and the same will follow here. The wonderful catalogue of claims made by the Communists and other Opposition leaders here is enough to condemn it. The Communists are to-day the champions of language autonomy and linguistic provinces. Some gentlemen referred to my familiarity with Communist friends during a certain period. I know what views they were holding then. I remember a time when they were vigorously arguing against linguistic provinces as parochialism. To-day they are champions of linguistic provinces. They are champions of the handloom industry; they are champions of the mill industry; they are champions of mill workers. I know something of the handloom industry. Had my hon. friends sitting opposite ever brought a broken thread together?"

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"Sir, the Hon. Chief Minister is speaking of spinning. I know spinning and weaving also."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"Then the hon. Member was in the Congress."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"On a point of information, Sir. I have handled a thread right from the earliest process down to the process of weaving, after I left the Congress."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"I am grateful for the information, Sir. The championship of handloom industry is in direct conflict with their ideology about the mills and mill workers, their bonus and emoluments. There is a permanent and inherent conflict in the Communist jargon between the handloom industry and the mills. Whether we are going to solve that conflict and provide a remedy for the grievances, is a different matter. I am amazed at the claims made by them, Sir. Then, they talk of N.G.Os. There was a time when anyone who was working in an office and who was getting a salary without doing anything by hand, was anathema and was a parasite. Now they are champions of poor N.G.Os. It is easy to delude people in distress. They are again champions of economy in administration; they are champions of retrenchment; at the same time they are champions of the retrenched men also. They want economy; they do not want retrenchment. They have suddenly become champions and protectors of *mangalasutrams* of women, to which I was supposed to have referred. How I wish they had more faith in *mangalasutrams*! (Laughter.) There was a time when the Communists had their own views about marriage but they have found by experience . . . (Interruption from Opposition Benches.) The Communist Party knows the trick of making compartments for all these. There is an anti-God society; there is an anti-marriage society; there is a collectivized cultivation society. I do not claim to know exactly the Russian words for them. They give all autonomy except freedom in economic policy. All this autonomy I am quite conversant with. I know about the autonomy

given to autonomous States! We know the jargon. They are now protectors of *mangalasutrams*, Sir. I do not mind all this. When I explained to a very mixed audience, common folk, the principles of public finance, I said that one cannot expect expenditure by the State without giving revenues to the State. I explained that taxes were abominations, but they were necessary for running the State, and if they wanted the State to take up welfare schemes and all irrigation projects, it was necessary that taxes should be levied. I stated at the meeting that the money would be spent for good purposes and that it was worth while their giving away even their jewellery. Far from taking offence, they followed my lesson on elementary principles of public finance with a degree of understanding and pleasure which pleased me also. But now, lo and behold, when I come here, I find that people want to cultivate hatred against me, my colleagues and my Government. All the pamphleteers were out to say. ' Here is a man who wants to take away your jewellery for paying taxes.' Do they not know public finance principles and that taxes have to be paid? The Communists know the way in which one has to put things before common people. They deliberately use my words for the purpose of increasing hatred and developing it with. They will not succeed."

SRI P. VENKATESWARLU :—" You will not succeed either."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I did not say I shall succeed. I said, ' you will not succeed.'

" Sir, when I tell unpleasant truths, I have found that as I speak truthfully and with affection for the people to whom I am addressing, they do not misunderstand me. But when other people read it outside, they think there is material for the G.C.M. method, for increasing hatred against me. They are trying to do their worst. It is puerile. Let us fight as politicians must do and not as people working out intrigues against one another. If the people were really interested in my improvement, they would tell me, ' You should not use such language; you should speak a different language '. There is no use speaking over people's heads. Sir, some hon. Members referred to what I said at Coimbatore that I would put as much weight on the donkey as it can bear. I might have used the word ' camel ' here. But the people in Coimbatore know only what a donkey is; they do not know what a camel is. So, I said, ' I have to take the clothes to the river-bed for washing but at the same time I cannot put more on the donkey than it can bear.' That explains the tax position in their language. Now they say to the people, ' What right has he to call you donkeys? ' and all that. It is wickedness to put things like that and I consider I am perfectly in order to say so, Sir.

" Then they want all the police stations to be abolished. Do you know, why? They do not want these police stations because they desire to have an easy walk-over. I am sorry, I cannot oblige them. The police stations must be there and I am sorry to say that whoever takes my place, will not abolish them. It is idle to

imagine that this large country can be governed without some policemen. There is a policeman, viz., religion that we believe in and you have no use for the police station of religion. Having done away with Mahatmaji who had great moral influence upon the people, can we run the State without police stations? On the contrary, there are not enough police stations. Crime is increasing. The greed of the people is increasing. Everybody wants to make money for everything and even children are murdered for the sake of money. We want not less police stations, but more police stations. We do not want to waste money on them. I know if there were less crime we could save money and spend it for useful productive purposes. But the negative is as necessary as the positive sometimes. So it is that police stations are there and will continue to be there. Let us not undermine the loyalty of the policemen by saying, ' your salaries can be increased if you join the Communist Party.' Let us wish for more loyalty rather than and less loyalty from the policemen. Then only could we reduce the expenditure and not by tirades against me that I am running a Police-Raj.

" Sir, I am quoting from Mr. Panikkar. He said, ' The danger of Communists does not come from the discipline of their organization or their sabotage activities but from the intellectual instability of the educated classes.' The intellectual instability of the educated classes is used and exploited and that is what gives Communism its strength. I think, Mr. Panikkar was right when he said that. I would add that this intellectual instability arises from exclusive occupation with brains to the total exclusion of useful creative physical work. Mere games and movements of the body for relaxation or pleasure are not enough to give intellectual stability to our boys and girls. But given some time to actual useful work for a part of the day, their intellect would not be unstable and they would not be easy prey to anyone who will misguide.

" Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity. I cannot, as I said, go over all that has been covered already. I asked the Leader of the House to move this Motion and it is I that am on defence. But the Leader of the Opposition wanted to speak after me and he may do so. I shall not add to or subtract from what I have said. So many have been interrupting me and I do not mind it. I welcome interruptions. Indeed, I wish there were more interruptions which would have given me more material."

5 15 p.m.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Mr. Speaker, I rise not with pleasure but with a sense of some unpleasantness to say what I have got to say on this Motion. I have great respect for the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachariar. I am sure, that he will not mistake me when I speak what I feel about the Motion.

" The Hon. the Chief Minister has travelled over a very wide ground ; only it was not relevant. Out of my respect for him, I did not interrupt him when he was speaking. The Motion before this House is one of confidence in the Cabinet of which Mr. Rajagopalachariar is the Chief Minister. The Hon. the Chief Minister

was pleased to give us a statement just before this Motion of Confidence was moved. He explained the reasons which had compelled him to seek this vote of confidence. He said in it that he was responsible for changing the order of procedure of the Budget discussion. His statement begins as follows : ' Hon. Members may now be aware of the reasons and circumstances which convinced me that I must seek a clear expression of confidence from this House.' The newspapers widely published another statement of his elaborately. The two main reasons which compelled the Chief Minister to bring in this Motion were, according to these reports, the result of the bye-election in Aruppukkottai constituency resulting in the defeat of the Congress and the boycott of the Governor's Address to the Joint Session of both Houses of Legislature, by the Members belonging to the United Democratic Front. That is the reason why he says, ' Hon. Members are by now fully aware . . .' He goes on further and says that the conditions in which he is working are very difficult. From his point of view he thinks without exaggeration that the conditions around him are difficult for him to surmount. Having alleged that the reasons for compelling him to bring in this Motion were solely the Aruppukkottai election and the abstention of the members of the United Democratic Front, he has now entirely side tracked the issue.''

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I think, the point is misconceived. When I made the statement it was to explain the reasons for the Motion. It is one thing to explain why I am bringing this Motion. And it is another why I should confine the Confidence Motion only to the reasons for my bringing in the Motion. I hope the Hon. Leader of the Opposition understands this.''

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, everything that comes from this side of this House is misconceived. To conceive well is perhaps the monopoly of the other side. With great respect to the Hon. the Chief Minister, I submit that it was not correct on his part to say one thing and do another. Sir, he has told us in Koilpatti, he has said in clear terms, ' Do you want me or do you not want me' . Everybody in the world, everyone in India, everyone who knew English, everyone who knew the meaning of words gave only one meaning to what he had said namely that he would resign if the election went against the Congress. Even the Chief Minister attached only the same meaning as others at the time he uttered these words. While bringing in this resolution he stuck to that meaning. But having brought forward the Motion and having heard the arguments of the Opposition, what does he say now? He changes the meaning, the meaning the world gave, the meaning his own party Members gave, the meaning the Opposition gave, which were all one. His own party Members and supporters asked why he made such a statement. Having made such a statement and having got a clear answer we naturally thought that he would resign.

" Sir, I am not anxious for power or any such thing. The Hon. the Chief Minister is at perfect liberty to change his views. After

all politics are growing not only for young men on this side but they are constantly growing even for elder Members on the opposite side. But having made a deliberate statement, to change it so suddenly, I submit, Sir, is not correct. After all we have all held Sri C. Rajagopalachariar in the greatest respect. He evoked our admiration on many occasions. But only when greatness chooses to embody itself in a smaller vessel and say things which are not acted upon, Members belonging to the Opposition are not able to accept his words. There is no point in his bringing in philosophy into the debate and saying ' I did not mean what you think now.' On the other hand I expected him to stick to what he said at Koilpatti. After all he could have said, ' I am now resigning. You brought me here while I was in retirement. I was not much worried about you at that time. I went to Courtallam to take rest. Because you could not agree amongst yourselves, you brought me in. Having come into the picture I now find that the result of the recent election has gone against me. Therefore I am going. If there is any other method of obtaining the confidence of the people I shall come again. But for the present I am going. You can do what you like afterwards.' That would have been very proper. Actually on the 27th, I was expecting on the floor of this House some sensational news. I thought that the Hon. Chief Minister would be submitting his resignation. Truth would have triumphed in that case.

" The previous day the Hon. the Chief Minister was not aware of the result of the bye-election, even while he was addressing his party meeting. I submit, Sir, it is not the result of the Aruppukkottai election that has disturbed him. It is some other thing which I will refer to later.

" A great man as he is, we expected that he would resign. If it was an ordinary man we would not mind it if he changed his views so quickly. But the greater the man, the greater the responsibility. Therefore I submit, Sir, that the explanation the Chief Minister gives that we have put too much meaning into what he had said is not at all convincing. Our own ancient Rishis have observed ' Satyam param. Param stayam '—Truth is ultimate. Ultimate is truth. There is nothing more ultimate than truth and beyond truth there is nothing ultimate.' I once more submit that the Hon. the Chief Minister was not correct in his trying to treat us through a lecture as though we were all children and explain away what he had said. On the other hand, it is open to him to say, ' I do not now want to do what I wanted to do. Because other events have intervened, I have changed my mind '. While speaking about truth and integrity and preaching morals it is but fitting that the Hon. the Chief Minister should stick to his statements. It is very painful for me to say that he did not do so. I will be untrue to myself if I did not speak out what I feel.

" The Hon. the Chief Minister was pleased to say that we had thrown a challenge against him. But in reality he threw a challenge against the people. What was the answer the people gave, the whole world gave? Surely it was not in his favour. That

being the case, we expected him to resign. If he has not done so, I have no quarrel against him; it is for him to reconcile his words and action. He has somehow got a majority. He could have carried on without this Motion.

" The Hon. the Chief Minister has told us that the conditions in which he was working were very difficult. Why are the conditions difficult? Why is that doubt hanging upon him? Having got in by nomination into the Legislature and thereby committing a constitutional impropriety and having been elected Leader of the Party and taken up the Chief Ministership and having run the administration for nearly three months, how is it that still, doubt is hanging upon him? I submit it is not really doubt. But it is the consciousness of the guilt of the way in which he has become the Chief Minister of this State. We do talk of democracy. But where is democracy?

" The Chief Minister just now expatiated on democracy in order to canvass support in favour of the motion. He said that if the United Democratic Front came into power there would be no democracy at all; there would be no more points of order at all because the U.D.F. is being dominated by the Communists; Democracy would be killed if the United Democratic Front came into power. That is the Chief Minister's contention. But I say that infanticide of democracy had been committed by the very act of nomination of Sri Rajagopalachariar to the Council and when a smaller minority party was called upon to take the reins of administration. Having done this much, if the Chief Minister now tries to confuse the public still further by side-tracking the issue, I can only submit that he is totally in the wrong. What does our Bhagavath Gita say? Great men may be intelligent. But that does not mean that they should confuse others however great they may be. It is not due to any doubt in his mind the Chief Minister has come forward with this motion. It is mainly to confuse the public so as to canvass support for the Congress Minority Government. Anyone who has seen things as they are happening at the present moment and anyone who has got any political conscience can clearly judge the Chief Minister's motive behind his wording. He has told us why power should not be handed over to the Communist-dominated U.D.F. Of course, if the resolution had been worded on those lines we would have been very glad to offer our own criticisms and explanation. But to prejudice the public mind by side-tracking the issue is not fair for anyone.

" By the kind intervention of the Governor a minority party had been handed over power and is now running the administration. Having taken the leadership of the party the Chief Minister wants to strengthen his hands. Members on the other side had been moving hither and thither to gather support for their party. Somehow an artificial majority has been built up. The Congress want to retain that power. They are not for giving up their power. That is why the Chief Minister has come forward with this motion to strengthen his hands still further. This is the

ordinary, simple and plain power politics. The Chief Minister has said, ' Please do not attribute motives.' I for one, am not attributing any motive. When it is correct for him to have become the Chief Minister in an unconstitutional way there is nothing incorrect in my pursuing the motives he has already in mind. But I ask, ' why do you confuse issues by creating an atmosphere of Communism in the U.D.F.? ' As a matter of fact there is nothing akin to Communist ideology in the programme of the U.D.F. Can it be called that the U.D.F. consisting as it does, of about 160 Members is being dominated by the Communists whose strength is only 62? It is ordinary mathematics. Judge the facts. To say that if the confidence motion is lost, power would go to the hands of the U.D.F. only to bring in chaos is absolutely malicious and unwanted. If Members on the other side only looked into the programme of the U.D.F. they would have found no basis for their prejudice against us in their utterances. As a matter of fact, I would have made a present of the copy of our programme to the Chief Minister; but unfortunately I could not get the copy in time just now.

5-30 p.m. " If only Members opposite will cast aside pride and will leave off prejudice and if they go through the programme evolved by the U.D.F. they will find that it is almost the same thing which the Congress has been saying since the date of the Karachi resolution on Economic Scheme. We are told that the U.D.F. is dominated by the Communists. It is not so. There are as many as 100 others who are not Communists. Sri V. V. Ramaswami is not a Communist; we are not Communists. But, of course, the Hon. the Chief Minister complimented us by saying that we are all innocent persons and are being slowly taken into the spider's web. (The Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari : ' I am right.') The Hon. the Chief Minister says he is right but I am saying, Sir, time alone will show that he is wrong. It is the progressive forces in the world joining together and progressive forces in the world are a little too difficult to understand for minds which are deeply imbedded in conservatism. I am myself a conservative to a certain extent; I believe in the right of private property; I believe in God and I believe in orderly progress and I also believe in truth more than anyone sitting on that side. When I said certain things in connection with the adjournment motion last time, things I saw and what actually happened and what the Police people did, the Hon. the Chief Minister was pleased to say that the assertions of Sri Viswanatham, have got to be verified. It deeply pained me that he should have said so despite his association with me for so long. I submit my heart is pure and the words of ten officers cannot under any account falsify what I said as a fact which I saw. I submit I have no false ambition, I have no undue ambition and I have no intrigues of which we are accused. I submit it is not intriguing if we say that the Constitution says that the Government of the State should be entrusted to the elected representatives of the people and that we somehow or other having got the good or the bad fortune of coming here, just as the 152 of the hon. Members on the other side have come to this House, we have got an equal right just as the Members

of the party on that side to run the administration. What was the issue that the electorate had before it? As has been said on so many occasions, and we have been saying it since February, that is the thing which the Chief Minister wants to flout because he is not aware of it. I do not blame him for he was not in the fray; he was elsewhere and he never thought that he would have the misfortune of coming to this Province as the Chief Minister after having held so many high posts. We have been saying that the issue was whether the people wanted the Congress to come again to power and whether they should continue in office. There were independent candidates, Communist candidates and there were other parties which fought the elections and stood against the Congress candidates and in all these cases what was the thing that was put before the electorate? Come to my constituency or any neighbouring one or take out any constituency at random. What was the issue that was placed before them? Ask the peasant, ask the worker, ask the clerk and ask the liberal-minded man. To every one of them the issue was clear and that was whether the Congress should continue in office or not, and there was no denying it, and the result showed beyond doubt that Congress rule was not wanted. Take the results in my own Telugu districts; out of 143 seats only about 40 people were returned on Congress ticket. The issue was there and the answer is there for all to see, but the Hon. the Chief Minister wants to give us tests of his mathematical knowledge and says that no party has got an absolute majority, in fact other parties got fewer votes than the Congress and therefore, the people wanted the Congress to continue in power and run the Government of the State. Sir, we can also create some problems in mathematical jugglery but I wish to submit that politics are not decided by mere arithmetical jugglery. Indeed what is it that happened in Aruppukkottai? When we said in February last that whether the people voted Communist, Socialist or for Independents, they were all anti-Congress votes, our statement was disputed. The opportunity then came at Aruppukkottai and at Kakinada and it was shown at both these places that votes which went to parties other than the Congress party at the General Elections were all anti-Congress votes and therefore, constitutionally and politically, we were right in assuming that in the General Elections in the State, the people gave the verdict that they did not want the Congress Party to continue in office. Those who came from retirement did not know the facts. The Chief Minister came by what I may call an unapproved way. It was not approved even by the Prime Minister of India, the President of the Congress Party, and I believe he is not happy over the way in which Sri C. Rajagopalachariar became the Chief Minister, but that is a matter between them both. Then, what were the conditions under which he came? It was under conditions, as I said when the Congress Party could not agree as to the leadership of the party. And all these things are upon his mind. Constant criticism not only by the Opposition who according to him are intriguing to get into power but by all constitutional-minded persons not only here but in other States, in the newspapers here and outside this State, questioning the constitutional propriety of such a course is sitting

heavy on him. These things are hanging upon his mind. He may not know his own mind, but I am sure what is worrying him is the sense of guilt; the guilt lay in the killing of the infant democracy immediately after the first general election in this State and not all the mathematical figures can wash out a jot of this guilt and it is that that is worrying him.

"Then I have to say a few words about the abstention of Members of the Congress Party from participating in the debate. They never spoke anything. I do not know why there should be this non-co-operation in this House. A Motion is brought on the floor of this House and they say: You take it or leave it, we shall not talk or explain; you do all the talking and we shall be calculating and negotiating for votes. When a Motion is brought in the House both sides of the House must participate. What did the Hon. the Chief Minister say? He said that he has given perfect right for the members of his party, the perfect freedom to vote. Perfect freedom has been given but what is it that they had been told? They were told: 'After all what is it you are going to speak; there is nothing for you to speak about; you will have only to praise me and that is not quite correct and therefore, do not speak.' That was the advice and they have now abstained from speaking. The Leader of the House said that he did not want four days for the discussion of the Motion but that at the instance of the Leader of the Opposition, four days had been given. On what basis did we say that four days would be necessary? We expected and that is nothing out of the ordinary course, that the Legislature Congress Party would also participate in the discussion."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I informed the hon. Member even then that many on this side would not talk."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Not many of us, just a few and just a little—that is the kind of information he gave us. He never told us that the party would abstain; it is quite different from saying many would not talk. The Congress abstained from showing the ordinary courtesy of discussing the motion, simply flinging it at us and saying: 'You go on with your discussion but we will be collecting the chickens into our baskets.' I say, Sir, this is a positive act of discourtesy to the Members of the Opposition. But by that, do I take it and do they ask me to believe that they are all united in their view? The hon. Member Sri Latchanna made an excellent speech; I have carefully followed his speech. Although for certain reasons he is giving his vote for the Motion, he has not approved of the Cabinet. He said it should not be taken as an approval of the taxation proposals of the Government; he categorically said so; but what was he voting for? What is there for him to approve? The personality of Sri Rajagopalachari? It is true I am a very small man compared to the Hon. Sri Rajagopalachari. I am an ant-hill compared to him. But when we are here on the floor of this House we have got to discharge our duties just as he has got to discharge his duties, by the public and the electorate. I would only like to put one small question: The Chief Minister

asked, ' How is it possible for two intelligent men Sri P. T. Rajan and Dr. K. B. Menon to come to opposite conclusions on exactly the same reasons? ' I tell him, ' The same reasons for which Sri Latchanna is supporting the resolution.' What is the reason? While presenting the case, the Chief Minister was confusing the mind of the public. It is all like a battle, such battles as Indrajeet waged, creating the mist and cloud and trying simply to put people in a state of panic and fear. If there was ever any occasion for any Chief Minister to create panic and fear in the minds of the common people for his own benefit, this was the one.

" Sir, he has created a sort of cloud as he was speaking. I was observing my hon. Friends opposite then and felt doubtful whether they were really thinking that the world would come to chaos if Government is handed over to us. ' After me the deluge and without me, chaos '—that was the theme of his speech. He presented the case that if the Government is given over to the United Democratic Front, chaos will come because it is the Communist Party which dominates the United Democratic Front. I submit, it is a wrong conclusion. I can assure every member of this House that there is no domination of any single group in the United Democratic Front. May I ask, whether you are all reading what is appearing in the newspapers or are you reading only Ministers' pronouncements which are often explained away or contradicted? I would refer you to the proceedings of the meeting of the United Democratic Front which were printed in the newspapers on March 29, 1952. We passed a resolution at that meeting with regard to the composition of the United Democratic Front and the status of each group in it, whether the constituent group is a small group like the group headed by Sri Muthuramalinga Thevar or a larger group headed by Sri Nagi Reddi or a comparatively small group headed by Sri Padayachi or by Sri Ramaswami. Sir, the United Democratic Front is not going to be dominated by any party. Each group has equal status and whatever we do, we do only on the basis of unanimity. Apart from the fact that there are Communists in it—assume there are not Communists—do you think that a small group of four members headed by Sri Thevar would be drowned or submerged in a party consisting of 62 members? Would it have been fair on our part to invite Sri Thevar to come and join our party under such conditions? That is not our tactics. We are not exponents of the majority policy. It is the ' dominant group policy ' of the Congress which has driven most of us outside. So, Sir, if anyone is under a misapprehension that our party is dominated by one group or another, let him read the constitution of our party without prejudice; let him give plain meaning to the plain words. Do you expect us to give you credit for your methods, credit for your intelligence and credit for the language you use and the meanings and intentions you express? We do not say that we are superior to you. But you must accept what has happened after the recent elections. After all, things have happened. We said as between the two minority parties, we being the bigger minority were entitled to form the Government. It is not the

5-45 p.m.

monopoly of the Congress alone to possess the capacity to form the Government simply because it has got a majority at Delhi or because it was the majority party in the last Legislature. Sir, things have changed. The Constitution has given us opportunities and rightly or wrongly the issue was decided by the electorate. We did not come here by back door. We all came here, like the Members of the Congress Party, after having fought the elections. But the Congress Party has been invited to form the Government by the kindly intervention of the Governor who, in my opinion, has practically upset all constitutional conventions. In this connexion, I must say this again. The Hon. the Chief Minister is trying to create confusion in the minds of the public by preaching the bogey of Communism. He is misrepresenting the composition of the United Democratic Front. I want him to correct himself and correct other Members of this House who belong to his party. I do not mind what happens to the Resolution before this House. After all we know it will be carried and we will be defeated. We ourselves would have brought a Motion of No-confidence against this Government if we had the marginal strength. After all, your Ministry is not very big as compared to the West Bengal Ministry which has a strength of 30. You have got only fifteen but it can be expanded to 17 to-morrow with some more accretions to your party.

" Sir, it has been consistently misrepresented by an influential section of the Press in this State that the United Democratic Front is dominated by the Communists. I do not say that the proprietors of such Press have got any malicious intention. They are suffering from the same panic which the Hon. Chief Minister wanted to create to-day. They started this panic on February 11th. After the results of the election in the State became known the panic started. They did not know what to do. The Congress Party then said that it would not form the Government and that the Governor should take over the administration. At that time they did not realise the constitutional implications. But gradually came the awakening when they saw that the Opposition was stronger than the Congress. They thought that the Opposition parties would never combine and they called us ' hotch-potch opposition.' The Hon. the Chief Minister complimented us by saying that we are a hotch-potch Opposition as though the Congress Party is not so but is cent per cent Congress Party; 152 became 168. Are the extra 16 members who have joined the Congress Party all cent per cent Congressmen? They created what is called ' associate membership.' The changed the rules also and they created ' Pundarika Vasudevas ' as it were. I understand one of the Ministers has not even joined the Congress Party. He is honest enough to do so. I compliment him. Although he should have been with us, somehow by this panic which has been created presumably by a section of the Press, he has also been misled and he found safety there. It is fear complex. Nothing more. So, it is not quite right on the part of the Hon. the Chief Minister to compliment us by saying that we are a hotch-potch Opposition."

3rd July 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I should not allow Mr. Viswanatham to imagine that I used abusive language. ' Hotch-potch ' is not an abusive word. It was no comparison between us and the other side. I said that I do not recognize the hotch-potch Opposition and that the Communists are my enemy No. 1. ' Hotch-potch ' means that there is a strong central core in the Opposition."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I am glad that the Hon. Chief Minister has intervened. He gives a new definition every time. He is so resourceful that meanings of words and phrases change at a moment's notice.

" Sir, it has been said by the Hon. the Chief Minister that the United Democratic Front has been formed against him. This is not correct. It is true that we are now opposing him but we did not think of Sri Rajagopalachari when we formed the Front. On the other hand we were thinking that the Hon. Sri Rajagopalachari would become the first President of the Indian Union at least after the recent elections. I know there were persons who some time ago collected signatures so as not to allow him to become the President. The same persons now work for him possibly for other purposes. We put the Chief Minister at the level of Delhi but not at Madras level. Sir, we did not think of him either ill or well, but we were thinking of the Madras Legislature Congress Party. Two hundred and twenty-three non-Congress Members were elected to this Legislature. Sir, we were elected with a certain understanding from the electorate. What was the understanding with the electorate? The electorate understood that all who were returned on the non-Congress ticket either as a single party or in combination with others should take over the administration of the State from the hands of the Congress. That was the simple verdict given and we had to meet together and we met on February 12th, a day after the election programme was completed. We drew up our programme and put it before the public. Our party is not dominated by one group or another. I cannot be dominated by Mr. Muthuramalinga Thevar however powerful he may be. I cannot be dominated by Mr. Ramaswami however powerful he may be. Nor can they be dominated by Mr. Viswanatham because I have been in the Legislature for a number of years. All of us on both sides are in a common enterprise. It is a joint enterprise to be carried on in the interests of the people and for the welfare of the people. But prejudices and party walls are there and nothing correct can be seen. Everything is seen by the Chief Minister through . . . I will not finish that sentence. I think prejudice enters into their minds and they act in a way contrary to what they said to the electorate. After the elections were announced, it took nearly five months to form a Government. Is there any example anywhere, where after elections were notified it took nearly five months to form a Government? There is no precedent anywhere. But it has happened in our State. On November 7th summonses

were issued by the Governor to send representatives to the Legislature, and the Ministry was formed only on April 9th. There was an interval of five months. Is it my bad mathematics? By whom was the delayed programme schedule prepared? By those who were in power. It was the Congress. Now, they cannot turn round and say, 'Your mathematics is wrong.' In this connexion, let me refer to what happened in England. When the Attlee Government decided to resign on the 4th October summonses were issued on the 5th October. On October 25th Mr. Churchill saw the King and on the 26th he formed the Government. That is how democracy functions elsewhere. That is how it functions in a country whose procedure we are expected to follow here. But here it took five months to form a Government.

" Sir, we met on February 11th and we gave our common programme to the public. We gave to Congressmen also our programme. So, there is no use trying to pass sneers of ridicule by saying that it is the G.C.M multiplied by exaggeration which will be converted into L.C.M. It is all good dinner talk. The fact is not so. We are not here at a dinner table. And we had no dinners. Luckily for us, being non-Congressmen there were no dinners. Therefore, we were more serious-minded. Though Mr. Rajagopalachari says he is perturbed over the results of the elections and over the conditions which put him here in office, we were equally perturbed as he, and we were equally serious-minded. We are not here to make vested interests of grievances as it is alleged by the Chief Minister. For, is it not open to us to tell the Hon. the Chief Minister that certain tanks have to be repaired or that the labour union is going to start a strike, or that the M. & S.M. Railway workers are threatening to strike work? It is open to Mr. Ramasami Nayudu to draw the attention of the Hon. the Chief Minister to such things as much as it is open to any Congressman to do it. Because we are here in the Opposition, it becomes our greater responsibility to draw the attention of the Hon. the Chief Minister to such things. But, then, Sir, he says, this is all to make vested interests of grievances. Why does he say so? Sir, it is because his mind is not democratic. The mind of the Hon. the Chief Minister, great as it is, great as the Himalaya mountains, still it is not democratic. That is my complaint. If he were democratically minded, would he compel the Commissioner of Police to issue the order under Section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, on the very first day of the meeting of this Legislature after the general elections held after the inauguration of the Republican Constitution of India, and follow it up with an order under Section 41 of the Police Act? I submit, he has done this because his mind is not democratic. That is the trouble with him. The other things that follow from that are all incidental. The other things are the branches, the flowers and the fruits, which are all born of one seed, and that is his autocratic mind. Was he not that great person who when he was the Home Minister there sponsored that great Bill recently in Parliament, the Press Bill against which his best supporters of

6 p.m.

to-day had protested, with the greatest vehemence? Some of those provisions in that Bill have been found to be unconstitutional to-day. Any constitutional point you may raise, he is against it. Ordinary courtesy would require that when the Speaker says there is a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege the Chief Minister should have moved a motion to refer the matter to the Privileges Committee. No, he does not allow it to be done. Why? His mind is not democratic. I do not say that he does consider every time whether his action would be democratic or autocratic. He does not. But the seed is like that; he has been trained to think like that. Sir, I was a member in a small constitutional sub-committee of the Congress appointed to frame certain fundamental rights. I, with his permission, offered and happened to work as an ammanuensis, as a scribe. In that sub-committee, he was the first gentleman to oppose the proposal for the repeal of the death sentence. When country after country was trying to repeal capital punishment our Chief Minister opposed the move, because, he said, if we did that we would be placing the lives of law abiding citizens in the hands of the murderers! I believe, still he has not changed his mind. Because he has in his mind a Police State. His argument is, 'If four policemen are now required to guard my house, if the United Democratic Front come to power every house will have to be guarded by a policeman.' And therefore, I submit, it is his mind that is so framed. Why do I say like that? For, he does not agree to talk with other Parties. He should have the courtesy to speak with others instead of merely saying, 'No, you are all non-Congressmen; if you do not join our ranks or sign our Congress creed I would not have anything to do with you.' He visualizes only the enthronement of Congress, and in doing so he does not give room for other parties in the State to exist. He sees only Congressmen and non-Congressmen. The Hon. the Chief Minister has called all those members of this House who have been returned to this House under the Independent ticket, who have come in here by defeating the Congress candidates as opportunists and careerists. Is it gentlemanly to call them so, I ask? It greatly pained me to hear it. I do not presume to know the world as much as the Hon. the Chief Minister. But I believe, every Member in this House will agree with me when I say that the Hon. the Chief Minister was wrong and unfair in having characterized Independant hon. Members of this House as opportunists. What is it he calls as opportunism? Whatever is done here, on this side of the House, is opportunism. Whatever is done on the other side of the House is not opportunism. If the Congress can rope in people like Mr. Manickavelu Naicker, it is not opportunism: but if some members join the United Democratic Front it must be styled as opportunism."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" Sir, I rise on a point of personal explanation. I would not have risen, if Mr. Viswanatham had not been expatiating on this point. I did not say, that all Independents are opportunists. I shall read to him what I said exactly, because I have got in on paper here. I said, Independents had attachment to communal groups and ideas,

and not the whole lot of them were opportunists. That is my description of them."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Agreed, Sir. The explanation has made the matter worse. I ask, is the Chief Minister an opportunist, because he came here by nomination and contrary to the spirit of the Constitution of India? I ask, if 223 members of this House came here on non-Congress tickets, can I say, they are all opportunists and careerists? Who is an opportunist. They are opportunists who have no leanings towards the creed of the party in power, who had fought it in Elections, but who, at the same time have joined it when it came to power, on a request sent round by the Chief Minister to get people somehow to join his party as associate members. Surely that description would not apply to us. Sir, if the Chief Minister had not mentioned about this, I would not have uttered a single word about this. For, in the field of politics, we are like pieces of wood floating in rivers; we come together and part as the current takes us. Sir, I would not have talked about it but for the fact that the Hon. Chief Minister has roundly abused us in his explanation. His explanation is not at all a mitigation of the offence, if I may so call it.

" Then, Sir, it is said that we have an unholy alliance with the Communists sitting by our side in the Opposition. Where else do you (Government) ask them to sit? If they are not to sit here, on our side, will you ask them to sit on your (Government) side? Does the hon. Member, Mr. Seethi Saheb remember what the history of his Muslim League was when he said we have formed an unholy alliance? Is it holy alliance for the Congress to ally itself with the Muslim League, the Muslim League which stood for the two-nation theory and which continues to exist in spite of the incidents that followed therefrom, to the utter disgust of so many of us? Sir, it is all right for people to criticize; for it is easy always to criticize; but there must be a limit to it. If it is unholy for us to join together, it must be equally unholy for the Congress to bank upon the Muslim League."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member has only five minutes more."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, I thought I would be given one hour. The Chief Minister took us over grounds not covered by the Resolution before us and surely I am expected to cover them in my reply though it may not be strictly relevant to the present Motion. I only request I may be given some more time."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member may take a quarter of an hour more."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Thank you, Sir. Sir, I was on the point that it was the Hon. the Chief Minister who was responsible for the idea of dividing the country. It is true that to-day we all pride ourselves on attaining independence after the

maiming and vivisection of India. But let us see what a future historian has to write about this division of India and the part played by the Chief Minister and the Muslim League in the dissections of the country, the sores of which are still bleeding. Eleven lakhs of people lost their lives thereby. So many would not have died even if there was a civil war. On both sides, there was tremendous loss of life and pools of blood were created in Hindustan and Pakistan. But I shall not go into all that here. I shall briefly wind up in ten minutes.

" Now, what is it that is troubling the mind of the Chief Minister? It is not merely the result of the Aruppukottai election; it is not merely the circumstances in which the Congress has come to power, it is not merely how he came to become the Chief Minister of this province; more than all these, it is the unity of the Opposition that is worrying him. In fact, he ought to have been proud of it. For, he is a true follower of Mahatma Gandhi; and what did Mahatma Gandhi say? He said that constructive activity lay in the process of integration and not disintegration. Following that, the Chief Minister should have said, ' I appreciate the efforts you are making to unite in a body. Democracy can only function in a two-party system. I wish you good luck.' That is what he ought to have said. No, he did not say that. He wants disunity among us and to grow on it. From the beginning he has been declaring, or, at any rate allowing other persons in close association with him to declare that he is coming to this province as its ' Saviour,' and that he is working on no ' Salary.' After all, the Chief Minister cannot claim ' salary,' just at present; even if he does, the Accountant-General is there; when the Salary Bill goes to him he will see that he does not draw his pension as well as the full salary as the Chief Minister. Perhaps, Sir, the Chief Minister should not be made responsible for all this unfounded praise. I agree. But, Sir, certain persons are allowed to tom tom in this way, to beat the drum day in and day out, that unless Rajaji came to the State there will not be a stable Government and that he is the only person who can save this State. I submit this attitude of encouraging this sort of praise is wrong. Mahatma Gandhi did not allow this sort of thing. I remember, some years back, when some Congressmen approached Mahatma Gandhi and told him, ' You are a Mahatma, the saviour of our land,' he replied, ' Never cultivate this sort of hero worship; never allow this personal worship.' Sir, if that was to be said by Mahatma Gandhi, how much more should it be said by Rajaji? No, Sir, all this fuss by him is intended to confuse and bamboozle the people into thinking that it is a Communist dominated United Democratic Front we have in the Oppposition and an alternative to Congress means chaos.

" What is the use of trying to bamboozle the public and deceive the public by raising a hue and cry that the Communist dominated United Democratic Front will land us in chaos and disorder, by expatating on the composition of the United Democratic Front and by canvassing for vote—I am quite certain that the Chief Minister is quite certain of his vote to-day, more certain 6-15 p.m.

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [3rd July 1952

of it to-day than he was yesterday and the day before—by expatiating on the dangers of communism? But where is that communism, I ask? I repeat that a communist-dominated Legislature party is only in the mind of the Chief Minister and he is always thinking about it. The United Democratic Front has got a definite programme, and no one party in it dominates another. I would request the Chief Minister and the Members of his party to come and see all the items in the programme and then say whether any one item means communism. Certain items no doubt are common to all the groups. For the matter of that, in Karachi, a Fundamental Rights Committee was appointed and we wrote to the Committee on the question of the abolition of landlordism. That is what the Congress has been saying and that is also what the United Democratic Front is saying. More than that, we also say that there should be gradual abolition of landlordism. If the Chief Minister does not like us even then, let him say so. He has got a majority; let us wish him God-speed; but at the same time, let him not say that we are out for chaos or we are for G.C.M. first and then we will have it multiplied to L.C.M. and all that. These are all words which will not weigh with any intelligent gentleman. No doubt they are good words to catch the unwary person by the neck.

"I submit therefore that the Members of this House should not be taken in by his eloquent speech and by whatever he has said. If, as free men, you wish to vote for the Resolution, by all means I request every one of you to vote for it. I will not grudge that vote; but please do not vote with the idea that an alternative Government will mean chaos. What I want you to understand is that. I am not worried about it to-day; for I can certainly wait till some other day, till events fructify, till those who are carried away by the Congress slogan are disillusioned, and till the United Democratic Front comes to power and those who are doubtful now and who are away from us now will think of coming back to us tomorrow or the day after and joining the United Democratic Front. Therefore, I am not in a hurry on that point. I am not appealing to you to vote in one way simply because I make an appeal: but for Heaven's sake, do not be misguided by what the Chief Minister has stated. The group system prevails. I agree. I thought he gave freedom of vote to the members of his party, but now I am told that all the members of his party are expected to vote for this Resolution. Of course when great men speak everything is true, but when I speak, everything becomes untrue. As a responsible man he says the Congress should be there if there is to be orderly progress, but that an alternative Government cannot mean orderly progress. Let me take this opportunity and emphatically say that I believe in orderly progress: I do not like jerks and jolts. But I do not believe in stagnation, calling it orderly progress: I do not believe in sitting tight over everything saying that everything is safe in my hands, and prescribing some ordinary palliatives for small troubles. I believe in a good change and a refreshing change. I believe in non-violence: and non-violence is not the monopoly of Congressmen of the present day.

Therefore, let them not say there cannot be non-violence in the United Democratic Front. We believe in progress, we believe in order; and therefore, if all the Members of the party opposite believe in orderly progress, there is nothing to prevent them from casting their vote in our favour like free men. I believe the word 'free' has got a full meaning, and like responsible citizens entrusted with the fate of sixty million people let them vote on the Resolution. Thank you, Sir.' (Cheers).

*THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sure the whole House will share with me the feeling of relief that after all, this discussion is coming to an end. For the last four days, we have had a barrage of abuses and nothing but abuses; and the Leader of the Opposition wanted to know why no speeches were made by Members on this side. Sir, I wanted to know how much and how many kinds of abuses could be heaped upon us by Members sitting on the opposite side. We do not want to indulge in the same kind of stuff. We have got the greatest confidence in our leader and that needs no speech. We shall show that in action when the voting takes place. Therefore, no speech is required on our part for the purpose of showing our confidence in our leader; and that is why no member on this side participated in this discussion.

" Sir, when the Hon. the Chief Minister was telling this House about the strategy of the Communists, some people would have wondered, 'could this be true'? But after the eloquent speech of my hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition, every word of what was said about the Communist strategy has become true and nothing but true. When he was expatiating on the United Democratic Front programme and stating how it was not dominated by any group or party, he was nothing but a victim to that strategy. I also indulged in some thought-reading even as my friend the Leader of the Opposition was indulging in. I was reading the mind of my Friend Mr. Ramamurthi. He was feeling very joyful and thinking, 'How well my strategy is working, the Communist strategy is working; how well I have put Mr. Viswanatham as the Leader of the Opposition by removing Mr. Nagi Reddi. That strategy has worked well.' When my friend says, 'There is no domination, look at our programme,' and when he asks if there is anything wrong about it, I say: 'Yes, that is the further strategy which the Hon. the Chief Minister was mentioning about and which he was warning you about.' But unfortunately, my Friend the Leader of the Opposition is not a free agent; he is a creature of circumstances . . "

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. He says I am not a free agent. I may tell him I have not been purchased, I have not been negotiated with, and no inducement has been offered to me."

THE HON. C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" No; we have not given him any inducement and we are not also prepared to give him any inducement."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I do not want anything from this Government."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" But that is not the point; I said, Sir, that he was a creature of circumstances; he is a disappointed man (Sri T. Viswanatham : 'Question.') Let him question but let him search his heart and he will find disappointment and frustration there. It was fully exhibited in, the bitter speech he has made to-day in spite of the fact that he professes that he has the greatest respect for our leader. But he used the most discourteous language about the leader and it is not becoming of a Leader of the Opposition to talk in that fashion about a leader who is the Chief Minister of a State. But that is quite a different thing."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" May I know what was actually mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition about the Chief Minister? "

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Coming now to the Resolution, both our opponents and some of our well-wishers and supporters have expressed the opinion that the Resolution was quite unnecessary. On the other hand, the Leader of the Opposition even now maintains that it is a minority party which has formed the Government. Sir, whether this is a minority party or not, the Government has got to get the majority support of this House; otherwise it won't exist. That is why, and it is because it is a minority party, we have come before this House again. In spite of additions to our party, we are only 165 to-day, and we do not claim that we are in a majority, while you claim to be 160 and say you have an absolute majority. I say we are not in a majority and that is why we are now coming before this House, so that we may know the mind of the House, whether the House has confidence in the Government and whether we should carry on or not. Therefore, in view of the assertions made by the Leader of the Opposition that we are a minority Government, we have come before you with this Motion. It may be the Aruppukottai election that is the immediate reason for it, but the other reason also has got to be taken notice of, viz., that it is being asserted time and again in the Press, on the platform and even in private conversations, that this is a minority Government. We do not want to continue in this office and in the Government if we do not have the confidence of this House.

" Then again, one hon. Member said, ' We know the result of this Motion.' But then if you know the result already, it is but fair that you should say that we have the confidence of the majority of the House. In such a case, why do you plead with the House, if you already know the result of the Motion? If he knows the result of the Motion, it is but fair on the part of the Leader of the Opposition to concede that the Government does command the confidence of the House. (Sri P. Ramamurthi : ' Not of the people.') I shall come to that. My hon. Friend says we do not command the confidence of the people. Sir, the general elections

took place only a few months back and all the Members of this House were returned by the votes of the people, and they are therefore the representatives of the people. Therefore, whenever a majority of members in the House express confidence in the Government, it means that the representatives of the people have expressed confidence, and that therefore the majority of the people have expressed confidence in the Government. But is it contended that the representatives on that side alone are representatives of the people? Is it their monopoly that they represent the people just because they are in the Opposition? Is it only this mentality that could be expected of the Members on the other side, viz., that they alone are the representatives of the people and nobody else? Sir, I was elected by the people and I am as much a representative of the people as Mr. Ramamurthi is and perhaps a little more than that. There is a good deal of difference between Mr. Ramamurthi and myself. As far as I am concerned, I have been elected by the people; not only elected by the people, but I owe my allegiance to this country, to my people and to my country's flag. I do not parade under another country's flag and I do not receive my orders from another country . . . ''

SRI P. RARMAMURTHI :—'' Sir, the Hon. Minister is cascting aspersion on the loyality of the Members; I would like him to substantiate it.''

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—'' I am quite prepared to substantiate it. The Communist Party has its programmet; it is not laid down by the party here; it is laid down by a party outside this country. (Sri T. Nagi Reddi :—' Wrong, withdraw it.) One question I will ask: Which is your flag? Which is the flag of the Communist Party? The hammer and the sickle. (Cheers from Government benches.) Here is a substantiation which cannot be refuted, I think.''

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—'' Will the Hon. Minister please enquire of Sri Rajagopalachariar who has been acquainted with the Embassy, and find out what is the flag of the Soviet Union? The flag of the Soviet Union is not the flag which the Communist Party here is using at present.''

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—'' Sir, I again assert that the Communist Party's programme is not formulated here in India. It is formulated by a party outside India. Therefore I have got a much greater right to say that I am the representative of the people. (Interruption.) I welcome this shouting; but shouting alone won't do. We must have the verdict of the House; and I am prepared to take the verdict of the House as the verdict of the people; but I am afraid my hon. Friends opposite are not prepared to take it that way. Whenever it suits them, they will say that they have been elected by the verdict of the people; but when they refuse to act according to the wishes of the people, I submit they cease to be representatives of the people.

'' Sir, the allegation was made by the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition that all these four days intrigues were going on and 6-30 p.m.

promises were being made. As far as I am concerned, and as far as the Hon. the Chief Minister is concerned, we did not want any time to be spent on this Resolution. We wanted to move the Resolution and to take the vote within a few hours but who is it, Sir, that wanted ten or fifteen days and who is it, Sir, that came to the Speaker and said we should have at least seven or ten days? It was not at all in our minds that we should take advantage of this occasion to begin negotiations or intrigues. Perhaps it was in the minds of the Opposition that they wanted time for this purpose (Opposition cries of 'Not at all, Sir.') and now that their intrigues did not succeed they are charging us with intrigues and negotiations. The Leader of the Opposition has no business to say that while they were making speeches those on the Government side were indulging in some intrigues. (Interruption from the Leader of the Opposition.) If the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to say something about us he should also be prepared to take it back."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"I am talking about a fact The Government intrigued but we did not."

* THE HON SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—"I am also talking about a fact. You intrigued but you failed. I do not think the dignity of the House is preserved by saying the Government Members are intriguing."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"On the other hand, this is what the Chief Minister said about us."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :"The Hon. the Chief Minister wanted that no time need be spent on this Resolution It was enough if it was moved without any speech and if any hon. Members on the opposite side wanted to speak they could do so for a few hours and it could be voted upon. This was what the Chief Minister thought and wanted. We never wanted any time for the purpose of any negotiation and we have continued in that attitude. I can assure this honourable House that we are not here to cling to power at any cost. We are here with the hope, with the sincere hope and with the honest belief that we will be able to do some good to this unfortunate State and, if the House thinks that we are not fit to carry that burden and someone else should do so, we will gladly give place to others. We are prepared to abide by the verdict of the House and we will not say, when the House votes us out, that these are not the representatives of the people, as Mr. Ramamurthi would put it. As already mentioned by me in my opening speech when I moved the Resolution, we are prepared to take your verdict and take all the consequences following from your verdict. We are not going to say 'This is not the people's verdict' and I think that Mr. Ramamurthi will also sportingly accept it, whatever be the verdict of the House, as the verdict of the people, because here are the chosen representatives of the people.

3rd July 1952] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

" Sir, in opposing this Motion on merits, it was mentioned by more than one Member that this Ministry is after all a continuation of the previous Ministry. Their Budget and everything else is being continued. How else could it be? Could it be said, ' Here is the Bhavani Project; here is the Malampuzha Project and here is the Tungabhadra Project which were all started by the previous Ministry and we are a new Ministry and, therefore, we should not continue them? ' We have made provision in the Budget so that these things could be carried on. We are certainly continuing the work which was started by the previous Ministry. Are we to say that because the schools and colleges were built and run by the previous Ministry we should not continue them? Are we to close all the hospitals, schools, etc , cogitate over them and start afresh after some tmie? After all, the various schemes which have already been started have got to be continued, and as pointed out very relevantly by the hon. Member, Sri P. T. Rajan, the difference lies in the administration and how it is run. I request hon. Members to note this reply and if you are prepared to take the words of Sri P. T. Rajan, it has made a world of difference within these two months. The administration is better and the services are now in a better position to discharge their responsibilities and this is the certificate given by him. It is for you to accept it or not. We are, in our own way, trying to better the administration as far as possible and, Sir, we feel confident that we have turned the corner and we will be able to better the administration. We may have a number of schemes—though it does not depend upon the number—to be placed before the Legislature, but the fact whether an administration is good or not lies in the way you execute these schemes. With even a number of good schemes one may mismanage the whole thing, and on the contrary even with a few schemes one may manage things all right. If, in this manner, hon. Members are able to point out in any of these schemes any defects and say, ' Here is a mistake which you are continuing and which you have not rectified ' I am quite prepared to see that they are examined and rectified.

" Sir, it was also mentioned that the same old Police Raj is continued. I say, ' Yes, the Police are continuing.' Law and Order have got to be maintained whether it be by this Government or by any other Government. Even if my hon. Friend, Sri T. Viswanatham becomes the Chief Minister he will have to administer Law and Order. If there is any mistake in enforcing that Law and Order and if you point it out we are prepared to look into it and, if any error has been committed, to rectify it. After all we are not superhuman beings. We do not claim infallibility. We are ordinary human beings and, as far as we are concerned, excepting the Chief Minister, we are all new to the task of administration. (An hon. Member: ' What about Sri A. B. Shetty? ') He is not as much experienced as the Hon. the Chief Minister. Excepting these two we are just new and we may therefore commit mistakes, but I can give you this assurance. We shall not commit any mistake knowingly, wantonly or for our own selfish purposes. If we have made any mistakes in the execution of

these schemes we are prepared to be told that these are the mistakes which we have committed but, I think, we heard from the other side nothing but mere abuses. What happened in 1949 in Lord Wavell's time or even prior to those historic days were being pointed out. This is not the way in which to criticize the administration. We are prepared to rectify any mistake which is pointed out by the Opposition. Everyday, Sir, after going home I used to go through every speech made on the floor of this House and I wanted to find out whether any particular mistake done by this Ministry was pointed out. I was not able to find any. That being the case, you are still harping upon the past. (Interruption.) I do not say that we are not altogether responsible for the past. As Congressmen we are in a way responsible for that to a certain extent. We are telling you that mistakes have been committed—not that mistakes will not be committed hereafter also—and we feel that these mistakes should be rectified and we are endeavouring in our own way to the best of our ability to rectify them."

AN HON. MEMBER :—" Publish the report on the Salem Jail Shooting Incident."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" If there is any mistake committed in the past, let hon. Members make constructive suggestions and this Government is always prepared to look into them and rectify these mistakes. For example, this morning my hon. Friend, Sri P. Ramamurthi, pointed out to me that the Railway Grainshops were selling rice at Re. 1-3-0 per Madras measure and asked whether this was the way in which decontrol was going to work. We sent for the railway administration, argued and pleaded with them and at once they have agreed to reduce the price to the old level of Re. 0-13-3. Therefore, it is not as if we are not responsive to any representation made from the other side pointing out defects and difficulties. We took immediate action and I may tell hon. Members on the opposite side especially that any representations made or any difficulties pointed out by them receive priority over representations made by others. (An hon. Member : ' We thank you.') I would therefore request them to act in the same manner and to act in a responsive way and say, ' Here are the difficulties, here are the errors committed either by the Administration or by the officers, that have to be rectified.' We are prepared to approach them with an open mind but that is not the attitude the Opposition Members have taken up."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" I made such a representation though it was privately done."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I am glad the hon. Member took that attitude privately but in public discussions in this Legislature my hon. Friend and the Members who follow him do not take up that attitude. They took up an attitude of complete vilification of everything done by us. They said we are not fit to rule this country. (Interruption from Sri P. Ramamurthi.) I know your opinion and it is for the House to say

whether we are fit to rule this country or not and because Mr. Ramamurthi is an interested party, I am not prepared to take his word when he says we are not fit to rule. I know his mind; I know his strategy and I know his opinions and therefore I cannot take his word. That is why I have come before this House and not before Mr. Ramamurthi or the Communist Party as such. We have come before this House to know the decision which it is going to give on this Motion of Confidence.

" Then, Sir, we were attacked on the ground that there are certain proposals for fresh taxation. It was asked, ' Is the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari required for carrying on the Government with fresh taxation? ' After all Government has got to be carried on and, if we want to cut down expenditure, where should it be cut down? There are two ways of doing it. You have either to retrench the personnel in the administration or you will have to give up beneficent schemes which are needed for the welfare of the people. If we cut down any personnel in the administration, at once the plea is put forward that there is retrenchment and therefore hardship to the middle classes. After all, Sir, controls were not intended for the benefit of the Civil Supplies officials. The Civil Supplies officials came for the purpose of administering the controls and they were definitely told that they were taken only for a temporary period as long as controls continued and that the Civil Supplies department would be abolished as soon as controls ended. When we took the decision to abolish controls on foodgrains I am sure, that as far as this was concerned, the whole House was agreed that it was a good thing that controls were going away. As a result of the abolition of controls should we not disband the officials who were administering these controls? Does the Opposition want us to continue these officials even though they are no longer necessary for the purposes of the administration? The general tone of the speeches made by many of the hon. Members was to the effect that retrenchment meant hardship to the people who were employed in these departments. We know these hardships and therefore we are slowing it down as far as possible and we are trying to give as much relief as possible to the retrenched officials

" In spite of all these, if Government have got to be run as a Welfare State and not a mere Police State, it has got to get its revenues for the purpose of meeting the needs of the people and for the purpose of providing necessary facilities for the people. Wherefrom could this money come? It is not as if we can go on printing notes and then go on spending it. That is not possible as far as this State Government is concerned whetever might be done in the Central Government. I have therefore got to get the money from the people. The only question is, from whom should it be got. We have made certain proposals and if you are able to point out that any of these taxation measures is inequitable, that the taxation will fall heavily upon a certain class of people who are already poor and that it will be a heavy burden on them, we are prepared to look into it. Our minds are not shut to the

suggestions that you are going to make as far as these taxation proposals are concerned. It is not as if these taxation proposals come into operation and become law as soon as the Vote of Confidence is passed. It is not so. They have to be brought before this House, discussed and voted upon and, I am sure, if you are able to make out a proper case that certain of these taxation proposals are not in the interests of the common man, the poor man, the Government will be prepared to look into it. I can give you this assurance, if a proper case is made out that any of these taxes is going to fall too heavily on a class of persons who will not be able to bear it, I for one am prepared to consider that aspect. It is only after a good deal of thinking about it and after a good deal of consideration of this subject that we have made these taxation proposals. We might have committed an error of judgment but it is quite a different thing to say that it is our intention to tax more and more the poor people and gave complete relief to the rich people. This is not granting us our bona fides. (An hon. Member : ' We grant your bona fides.') I am glad for that much at least. Please, therefore, do not charge us with this, namely, that we are interested only in taxing the poor and leaving the rich to go as they like. It is not our intention and it is not going to be our policy at all.

6-45 p.m. " Our policy is going to be to tax only those people who are able to bear those taxes and not to take any taxes from people who will not be able to bear them. Therefore hon. Members may take it from me that it is far from our intention to saddle the poor people only with taxes and allow the rich people to enjoy the fruits thereof.

" Much has been made of the statement made by the Hon. the Chief Minister calling upon the people to make greater sacrifices. It was said, ' Here is a Chief Minister calling upon the poor people only to make sacrifices. He is therefore the enemy of the people.' Such an argument amply demonstrated how words could be torn out of their context to create misunderstanding. Even now, without sacrifices on the part of the people, it will not be possible to build up a prosperous State. It can be done only by the willing labour and co-operation of the people of the State. When the Hon. the Chief Minister pointed out that the people should be prepared for sacrifices and to put forth their best efforts for the prosperity of the State, at once it was said by the Opposition, ' Here is a wicked man who has designs to have more and more taxes from the poor people only.' Certainly that is an unjustifiable way of putting things.

" The question of land reform was also taken up to base their attacks on the Government. As a matter of fact we have not expressed any opinion on the land problem. I was a member of the Subramaniam Committee and I can claim a good share in compiling that report. I do not say that is the ideal to which we should all work. As practical men we have only made proposals which could be immediately given effect to. In approaching this problem, we have got to bear in mind, that merely owning land

3rd July 1952] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

is not an end in itself. Land is a means for the production of food. It should be viewed only from this aspect of how land can be utilized and exploited to the maximum advantage possible for the production of maximum amount of food so that our food deficit may be wiped out. Therefore when we approach this problem of land, it has to be approached from this aspect, namely, whether by undertaking certain changes in the land tenures we will be able to increase the production of foodgrains. It is only from that angle that the land problem has got to be approached.

" It has always been said, Sir, that one of the greatest defects in our agricultural economy is the uneconomic holdings which prevent our using land to the maximum possible benefit. No doubt there are great estates, and there may not be any justification for them to exist; but on the other hand, there are a large number of uneconomic holdings. How are we to solve this problem? There should be a movement for consolidation of holdings. When the Members of the Opposition say, ' divide the lands,' they emphasize only one aspect of the problem. The division of lands will only result in more and more uneconomic holdings. This is not a problem for which an easy solution can be given. It has got to be thought out and considered in all its aspects.

" One charge made against the Government by some Members of the Opposition is that they are the agents of landlords. We are not agents of landlords. We are here for the purpose of seeing what is good and what is bad in every problem and in solving this land problem, I am sure, hon. Members will understand that we will take this aspect of increasing food production into consideration. Government will put into operation only those reforms which we consider immediately necessary and which will give immediate results. Hon. Members will agree that this is a matter which cannot be decided offhand. Therefore, as far as this land problem is concerned, I give once again this assurance that after the decontrol of food, the next problem that is engaging the attention of the Government is the land problem, and as far as possible we shall try to find a solution which will be acceptable to all. When I was speaking about decontrol during the last session, I assured the House that we would take a decision about it which would be acceptable to almost all the Members of the House. In pursuance of that Government brought about decontrol of foodgrains. In the same way, we give this assurance and when we announce our solution to the land problem, I am sure the hon. Members will give the verdict that we have found the best solution in the present circumstances.

" Then, Sir, the question of linguistic States was also brought in during the debate by my hon. Friend Mr. Ramamurthi. We are not at all in the way of the formation of the Andhra State. This involves the division of the State into two parts. Can that be done by arbitrarily issuing an order that this part of the Province shall form the Andhra State and that part of the Province

shall form the Tamil State? This has to be worked out by agreement. That has exactly been the attempt made by the Congress High Command to have an agreed solution some time ago. Hon. Members know that the thorny problem which stands in the way of the formation of the Andhra State is the question of Madras City. I would like to know the attitude of the hon. Member Sri P. Ramamurthi on this question of Madras City. (Interruption from the hon. Member Sri P. Ramamurthi.) Please say it now. It is not as if we are not for the formation of an Andhra State. Time in and time out Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has made it clear that he is anxious to form an Andhra State. Very many Andhra Members who have assembled here have stated that Madras City belongs to the Andhras and shall form part of the Andhra State. At the same time there are very many Tamilians who feel more strongly that on no account should Madras be taken out of Tamilnad and that the City should form part of Tamilnad. If we are to arbitrarily decide or to leave it to a third party to decide this issue as to whether Madras should form part of Tamilnad or Andhra State, and some decision is given by it, will it not affect the people living here? Therefore we should come to an agreed solution in this respect. In spite of the geographical facts, the linguistic facts and other things, some Andhra leaders are insisting that Madras should form part of the Andhra State. That only shows that they do not want the formation of an Andhra State in their innermost hearts and are putting forth impossible demands here such as that the City of Madras should form part of the Andhra State, only for the purpose of postponing the issue of the formation of the Andhra State. That is the real truth, Sir."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" The Hon. Minister has not understood the problem . . ."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I do not understand the problem. That is beyond my comprehension and only Andhras can understand it! I know your capacity.

" Almost every other point has been answered by my leader, the Hon. the Chief Minister. But one point I wish to enphasize is this. Again and again we are told that there was a verdict of the people during the general elections against the Congress-raj in this State. I know that all the other forces in this State had combined against the Congress. Whatever might be their ideologies and whatever might be their programmes, they all joined together to defeat the Congress. In spite of that, the Congress was able to secure 70 lakhs of votes. The idea that the Congress has got no mandate to rule the State is a Communist conception, because in their conception there can only be one Party standing for election and all the electors have to say either, ' yes ' or ' no '. As a matter of fact they started this bogey and it has been followed by others who have associated themselves with the Communists. The conception of the Congress is a democratic conception where various parties can exist side by side. In spite of the fact that all the various parties which fought the elections

were interested in defeating the Congress, the latter had emerged as the single largest party in the State. The next best party is the Communist Party which had secured 62 seats. If the Congress had secured less than 50 seats, then there could be some justification to say that the verdict of the people was against the Congress. In spite of the false and malicious propaganda carried on against the Congress, they were able to get 152 seats in the Assembly. The Opposition had the advantage of having remained only in opposition while the Congress had the disadvantage of having been in office and then fighting an election. The Opposition parties have been disappointed because they have not been able to sit on the Treasury Benches and we are not going to yield to them without a clear verdict. I say, once again, the verdict of the people is not against the Congress. It might be as the Chief Minister said that they did not get as many seats as we expected. That is a disappointment no doubt. But that is a different thing from saying that the verdict of the people had been clearly against the Congress and that they should not rule this State at all. On the other hand the single largest party which has been returned is the Congress with 152 Members. The next best party has got only 62 seats. If any Member is under the mistaken impression that the verdict of the people during the last general elections was against the Congress and therefore he should not express his confidence in the Congress or in the Ministry headed by the Hon. Sri Rajagopalachari, I wish to assure him that the verdict of the people was not against the Congress and that he may freely and with a clear conscience vote for this Motion.

" With this appeal, I would also make an appeal to my Socialist Friends. I know they are between the devil and the deep sea, and they have to choose between the two. There is no use in saying that if a no-confidence motion had been brought forward by the Opposition they would have voted with the Congress, and since this was a Motion for a vote of confidence brought by the party in power they would vote against it. That is not a practical attitude to take in dealing with this problem. Here is the Congress running the Government. Here is the Opposition with which they do not agree. And they have to make a choice between the two. I can very well understand their attitude if there has been any other choice, namely, if there has been a possibility of forming their own Government. Then it is a different matter."

SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI :—" Sir, I would like to know which is the devil and which is the deep sea . . ."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" The hon. Member can himself decide which is the devil and which is the deep sea, and come to a correct decision in this matter. With these words I commend the Motion to the House." (Cheers.)

V.—DISQUALIFICATION OF A MEMBER.

MR. SPEAKER :—" Before I put the Motion to the vote of the House, I wish to know whether Sri Saka Venkata Rao is here." 7 p.m.

AN HON. MEMBER :—" He is not here."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I suppose he is not going to vote."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" He is not now in the House and so cannot vote."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have received the following letter from the Election Commission addressed to the Secretary to the Legislative Assembly :—

'I am directed by the Election Commission to bring the following facts to the notice of the Hon'ble Speaker of the Madras Legislative Assembly for such action as he may think fit to take in the matter :—

(i) By a letter, dated the 2nd April 1952, Shri Saka Venkatarao applied to the Election Commission under section 7 (*b*) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, for a reduction of the period of five years referred to in that section, in respect of his conviction for an offence under sect on 304 of the Indian Penal Code and sentence of rigorous imprisonment for seven years passed in 1942.

(ii) The Election Commission, after going through the judgment of the Sessions Judge in that case and considering all relevant circumstances, rejected Shri Venkatarao's application, and he was informed accordingly by letter, dated and issued on the 13th May 1952.

(iii) Despite these facts which render Shri Venkatarao disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of the Madras Legislative Assembly, he has apparently been elected to fill the seat reserved for the Scheduled Castes in the Kakinada Constituency of that Assembly at the recent bye-election, and he has also been permitted to take his seat in the Assembly on the 28th June 1952.'

I wish to know whether the hon. Member, Shri Venkata Rao is here. (An hon. Member : 'He is not here.') If he votes, it will be at his own risk.

" Now, I will read the relevant Article of the Constitution, namely, Article 193 (1)—

'If a person sits or votes as a member of the Legislative Assembly or the Legislative Council of a State before he has complied with the requirements of Article 188, or when he knows that he is not qualified or that he is disqualified for membership thereof, or that he is prohibited from so doing by the provisions of any law made by Parliament or the Legislature of the State, he shall be liable in respect of each day on which he so sits or votes to a penalty of five hundred rupees to be recovered as a debt due to the State.'

I think, the hon. Member is not here."

IV.—GOVERNMENT MOTION *RE* VOTE OF CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS—*cont.*

MR. SPEAKER :—" I will now put the Motion to the vote of the House."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" I submit, Sir, the hon. Member was not here when you made this reference. But, if by any chance he comes later this relevant portion of the Constitution under which he cannot sit or vote, may be brought to his notice before he comes."

MR. SPEAKER :—" But, I do not know the gentleman; that is my difficulty. The question is—

'This House expresses its confidence in the Council of Ministers of which Sri C. Rajagopalachari is the Chief Minister.' "

The Motion was declared carried.