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ANDHRA PRADASH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Monday, the 27th June, 1960.
The House met at Half Past Eight of the Clock.
(Mr. Speaker in the Chair).
Questions and Answers.
(See Part I.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

STATEMENT BY SRI A. C. SUBBA REDDY, M.L.A., REGARDING THE CIRCUMSTANCES RELATING TO HIS RESIGNATION OF THE OFFICE OF MINISTER.
Sri A. C. Subba Reddy (Nellore): Sir, With your permission and with the kind leave of this August House I rise to make a statement in regard to the circumstances which have led to my leaving the present Cabinet. As this Cabinet is collectively responsible to the Legislature under Article 164 of the Constitution it is my duty as a member of the House and as an ex-member of the Cabinet to place the facts before this body and through you before the citizens of this great State, in particular of my own constituency. It is for this reason that despite the great publicity that this incident has received throughout the country and the great provocation which I have received from the statements issued in the press by responsible people that I have scrupulously refrained from making any statement so far.

It was also my hope that the Chief Minister would, in all fairness, to me and to the people of the State issue a statement himself explaining the circumstances which led to this unprecedented action in the history of democracy in this country. In such an event, it would have been easier for me to refute with greater precision any charges that he thought fit to make against me. Unfortunately, he has not chosen this obvious and natural course for reasons best known to himself and his advisers. This leaves me therefore no other alternative but to rely on what has appeared in the press regarding the reasons which have induced them to take this action. As I have the highest respect for the integrity and honesty of our journalists and as none of the reports have, at any time, been contradicted by the Chief Minister or his colleagues, I have to presume that they are all authentic.

Let me at the outset make it clear that the whole episode is an unseemly struggle between a solitary individual trying to assert his just right to liberty of action and a political caucus bent on denying this right. Democracy
has little meaning if its very guardians deny the right to contest a simple election to one of the bodies in the party. To one like me who as a humble member of the Congress for the last 30 years has fought for freedom, this scant regard for even basic democratic principles has come as a great shock. I am confident that the impression on all the lovers of democracy in the State is precisely the same.

The origin of the unhappy episode has to be traced back to the informal meeting of the Ministers held on 2-5-1960, when it was suggested that the panel of names for election to the Andhra State Election Committee put up by the Chief Minister and the President of the A.P.C.C. should be supported. I was not a party to the agreement supposed to have been arrived at the informal meeting of the Ministers on 2-5-1960. Instead, I offered some suggestions and before they were examined, the meeting broke up as it was late. Immediately thereafter in order to put forward my view, I sought an interview with the Chief Minister who asked me to meet him after lunch time. I informed him of my intention to serve on the Election Committee and that in case my name was not found in the panel to be prepared, I should have the freedom to contest for the election. The impression then gained by me was that my name will be found in the list. To assure myself about this, on 3-5-60, I tried to contact the Chief Minister on the phone about ten times between 9 A.M. and 4-30 P.M. but I could not get at him.

At the meeting of the P. C. C. the Chief Minister proposed nine names. To my surprise I found that I was eliminated. It was then that my name was proposed for contest. I was not inclined to withdraw from the contest though the result was a foregone conclusion. As soon as the election was over, I left on camp as per my programme. On 5-5-60, while at Tirupathi, I saw in the
newspapers that the Chief Minister, in his interview to the Press, said that my action in having contested the election as against the panel proposed by the Chief Minister was a serious matter and that it should be dealt with by the Congress Organisation (Golkonda Patrika dated 6-5-60). In reply thereto, on 9-5-60, I issued a statement to the Press that I had, on 2-5-60, i.e., a day before the election, intimated the Chief Minister about my intention to stand for election; that there was no breach of agreement and that the P.C.C. election was purely a matter concerning the Congress Organisation. I have not offended against the rules of the Congress Organisation and in this, I stand fully vindicated by the statement of the President of the P. C. C. issued to the Press soon after his return from Delhi on 19-5-60. Even the High Command have ultimately declared that my contesting the Pradesh Congress Committee Election should not be associated with the issue.

On 11-5-60, as soon as I returned from tour, I was summoned by the Chief Minister to attend a meeting, whereat I was straightaway asked to send in my resignation, which he said I had offered and he had accepted. This surprised me. What was more, the Chief Minister talked to me nothing other than about my resignation. He was, I found, not in a mood to discuss with me and I suggested that he might write to me and I left the meeting.

That afternoon, i.e., on 11-5-60, I received a letter from the Chief Minister stating that in the discussion held that morning, he had agreed to accept the resignation offered by me, but that I wanted a formal letter from him in that regard. He therefore requested me to send my letter of resignation from the Cabinet before 5 P. M. that day. I replied the same day that I would send my reply shortly. When I met the Chief Minister in his Chambers
after 5 P. M. the same day, he asked me to send my reply the next day. Even then he significantly stressed that I should send my resignation without delay.

On 12-5-60, I replied that in the discussions held on the previous day, i.e., on 11-5-60 I did not offer my resignation and that, on the other hand, it was suggested by him. I added that in contesting the party election, I had not the intention to go against the wishes of the Chief Minister.

In his next letter dated 12-5-60, the Chief Minister expressed surprise at my letter. He reminded me that the offer of resignation was made by me on 3-5-60, that he was expecting the letter of resignation all these days and that immediately on my arrival on the 11th May, he told me, when we met, that he had decided to accept the resignation offered by me. He concluded by saying that he did not like any controversy on the subject and desired that I should tender my resignation without any further delay.

In my reply dated 13-5-60, I reiterated that I had no intention to go against his wishes as Chief Minister and so I requested him to reconsider. I had been studiously avoiding any argument, for I know, it would only prolong the controversy and widen differences. It is significant to note that in the two letters dated 11th and 13th May, the Chief Minister was asking me to send my resignation ‘as per my offer.’ In truth, I had not, on 3-5-60, offered to resign as alleged. When in the thick of the election, I was persuaded to withdraw from the contest, I remarked that I would rather sacrifice the Ministership rather than give up the democratic principle of right to contest. This was by no means an offer of my resignation. If my offer of resignation was true, the Chief Minister when he rushed to the press on 5-5-60, instead of telling them that he was
considering what action should be taken against me, could as well have disclosed this fact that he was expecting my resignation. To a specific question from the correspondent of the Andhra Prabha (dated 6-5-60) whether Mr. Subba Reddi has tendered his letter of resignation the Chief Minister is reported to have said he did not receive any such letter and added that he was not aware of any such move. So the theory of my offer of resignation and his readiness to accept it, is clearly an after-thought.

Contrary to the conventions and regulations that govern discipline in the Congress Organisation, the Chief Minister, even before he placed the matter before the Congress Parliamentary Board, informed me by his letter dated 14-5-60 that "with the approval of the Governor, he has taken over the subjects which were hitherto in my portfolio with immediate effect." This action by the Chief Minister is obviously a preplanned one intended to achieve two objects, (1) to disgrace me in the eyes of the public and (2) to create a situation in which even the Congress Parliamentary Board would feel delicate to interfere. According to reports in papers (Golkonda Patrika dated 14-5-60, a Telugu daily edited and published by Sri N Narothama Reddi, President, A. P. C. C.) came to certain final conclusions about the way to deal with me even before my reply dated 13-5-60 to the Chief Minister was delivered to him.

In order to justify the drastic steps taken against me the Chief Minister has been mobilising and searching for causes, where there was none. What had started as a Party affair, slowly developed into charges, some of them in their view, very grave. I have been kept in the dark regarding the charges levelled against me except those gleaned by me through the Press.
The Charges according to the Press reports are (i) that I was unnecessarily interfering in the Portfolios of others (ii) that on a particular day I refused to attend a Cabinet meeting (iii) that in case any of my proposals were not accepted by the Cabinet, I was threatening to resign and last and most important (iv) that having agreed to the Cabinet decision regarding land ceiling, I was canvassing against land reforms and was inducing others to agitate against them.

**Charge No. (i):** It is a matter of common knowledge that the Ministers are jointly responsible to the Legislature. Several articles of the Constitution and the Business Rules made by the Government amply provide for joint or collective responsibility. Article 164(2) states that ‘the Council of Ministers shall be collectively responsible to the Legislative Assembly of the State’. But by the use of the words ‘unnecessary interference’ the persons, who made the allegation, seek to attribute malafides to me in calling for records from other departments. As the constitutional convention that a former member of the Cabinet should not disclose the deliberations of the previous Cabinet or the attitude of any member of the Cabinet including himself is to be respected, I have to refrain from furnishing the particulars of the files I called for, or the opinions I expressed therein. I can only say that I called for, only a few files and expressed my opinions on those files, which I can confidently state, are in accordance with the rules and regulations, principles of equity and natural justice. It is an irony that such a charge should have been made by our own Chief Minister who has a distinguished record in this field far surpassing mine. I wish a Committee appointed by this august House would be asked to go through the files in which case the vicious nature of the allegations made against me in this regard would be brought to light.
Charg No. (iii) :- It is not correct to say that I refused to attend a meeting of the Cabinet. On the other hand, I met the Chief Minister that morning and excused myself on grounds of indisposition. This charge is so trivial that I am almost ashamed to have to answer in this House.

Charg No. (iii) :- I will be able to explain if specific instances are brought to my notice. But I can only recollect that in some matters of public interest, regarding which the Chief Minister and myself had agreed to follow a particular policy, when I found that the Chief Minister had subsequently resiled from that stand for no valid reason, I found myself in a state of utter embarrassment, as I had already taken step to implement the policy mutually agreed upon. In those circumstances, I did informally tell the Chief Minister that it would be better for me to resign than to give up public interest.

Charg No. (iv) :- I flatly deny that either I was against land reforms or that I in stigated others to agitate against them. It is a very serious charge levelled against me. This is evidently to prejudice the High Command and the public that I am working against the accepted principles of the Congress Organisation, viz., the Socialistic Pattern of Society. The Press reports of my speeches will clearly give the lie to the charges. Wherever I went, I have stressed on the need for not only land reform but also for co-operative cultivation and the establishment of service co-operatives. When the Government was proposing to distribute Government land in Nellore District to individual ryots under Pattas, I prevented such distribution with the specific object of forming a Co-operative Farming Society. The many that know me in this House will, I am confident, acquit me of such a charge. They all know that, whether it is a virtue or vice, I have always said what I felt and that I have always practised what said and I would be the last to descend to such levels.
After his return on 19-5-60 from Delhi, the Chief Minister is reported to have said that the issue was not the question of what liberty a Cabinet Colleague could have in organisational matters, but whether he, as Chief Minister could have confidence in a colleague who after being a party to an agreement went back in this manner in public. My statement dated 9-5-60 to the Press is clear. The Chief Minister had not contradicted it. I was not a party to any agreement. Hence there was no question of my going back upon it. There was no ground also for forfeiting the confidence of the Chief Minister.

The Chief Minister has been shifting his ground. He began by saying that my action in contesting the election showed lack of confidence in him (Chief Minister). Later on, he tried to make out that the action against me was the outcome of some accumulated sins of commission and omission, as Minister. And finally it has come to a simple assertion of his want of confidence in me. This reminds me of the story of the wolf and the lamb.

The question has been rightly raised by some that I ought to have resigned as soon as the Chief Minister had asked me to tender my resignation. I am in complete agreement with them that it is a principle that should be normally followed. But certain peculiar features of my case have compelled me not to follow that course at once. Once the controversy came into the open, I was aware that I cannot continue in the Cabinet, but the question then was how and when I should leave it. I felt that a principle was involved. The question was, whether I should meekly submit to the mere caprice of a person, who demanded my resignation without rational justification, when, to my knowledge, there was nothing that can be said against me. All the time I was anxious that the public should get the correct picture of this episode, and I also did not wish to precipitate matters before the Congress.
Parliamentary Board considered this question, as it involves the democratic right of a member of a political organisation who happens to be a member of the Cabinet. In fact I sent my letter of resignation to the President of the Indian National Congress requesting him to take appropriate action. Hence I earnestly plead that the Members of the House and the public should kindly understand me if I could not follow at once the constitutional propriety of tendering resignation as soon as it was asked for.

Coming to the question of lack of confidence in me by the Chief Minister, I am unable to know at what point of time it began. On my part I have been doing everything in my power to enhance the prestige of the Chief Minister and keep up the dignity of the office he holds. As no objective reason for the said lack of confidence has been made known, it is difficult for me to give any rational explanation. However, it has been rightly observed by Thomas Brown in his lectures on the 'Philosophy of the Human Mind' that 'virtue only is stable, because virtue only is consistent; and the caprice, which, under a momentary impulse, begins an eager intimacy with one, as it began it from an impulse, as momentary with another, will soon find a third, with whom it may again begin it, with the same exclusion, for the moment, of every previous attachment.' Sir, I beg to state that I cannot put it better. Otherwise how else can an incident totally unconnected with the Ministerial affairs develop itself into a situation like this?

Before I part with this statement, let me reiterate my faith in my affection and loyalty to the Leader and the Philosopher of the Nation, our beloved Prime-Minister, who is not only guiding the development of the Nation towards the Socialist economy and social security through a bloodless revolution, but also helping to secure lasting peace among the Nations of the world. It is indeed a pity that the glorious precedents set up by him in the practice
of principles of democracy have yet to be understood and practised by some of us.

I thank you very much for all your kindness and I sincerely hope that you will be kind enough to judge me rightly. I am not sorry for my exit from the Cabinet except for the manner in which it was brought about. I can only say before God and man that I only acted conscientiously in the discharge of my duties.

"JAI HIND"

Mr. Speaker: Order, Order. Under Rule 76, the statement has been made by Sri A. C. Subba Reddy for the reasons of his resignation. Now, there shall be no debate on such statement; but after it has been made, a Minister may make a statement pertaining thereto. In this case, I call upon hon. the Chief Minister to make his statement of reply.

The Chief Minister (Sri D. Sanjivayya): Mr. Speaker, Sir,

I thank the hon. Member, Sri A. C. Subba Reddi, for giving me an advance copy of the statement he proposed to make on the floor of the House and I have had the advantage of reading it. Naturally and as was to be expected the whole object of his statement is to convince this House and the public, if possible, that he was right in the stand taken by him and that I was wrong in the stand taken by me as Chief Minister and that he was anxious to vindicate one of the freedoms of democratic Government, namely, freedom of speech and freedom of action.

At the outset I may state this to the Hon’ble Members that I am particularly anxious to maintain the dignity of the House and keep the proceedings at the proper level and not be tempted to get into what may appear to be an
unseemly or unpleasant personal quarrel. I would also like to mention that the oath of secrecy administered to me at the time I was sworn in as Chief Minister prevents me from giving particulars of matters which have a material bearing upon the points referred to in the hon. Member's statement. I shall however try to give such information consistent with the oath of secrecy which will convince any reasonable and disinterested person about the correctness and propriety of the final decision taken by me.

Before I get into details I wish to remind the hon. Members and also the public that all aspects of the issues involved including those which are from the very nature confidential were fully thrashed out and discussed by the Congress High Command and after mature consideration that august body authorised me to take such action as I thought fit in the matter.

It would indeed be surprising to be told that the Congress High Command approved of the correctness of the hon. Member's contention and stand and nevertheless gave me the discretion to act in the manner I should think fit. I shall come to it later. I would like to state a few fundamental facts and I am sure the hon. members and the public would appreciate their full scope and significance. It is a fact as pointed out by the hon. Member that there is joint and collective responsibility on the part of the members of the Cabinet towards the Legislature. I am not a pundit on constitutional law or well versed in the intricacies of constitutional doctrine. But to the extent I have been able to learn and understand the principle it is this: collective responsibility means and implies that every Minister shares the fullest responsibility for the decisions and actions of the Government even if he does not agree with them and even if he is in the minority. If he is not prepared to take the responsibility and support the Government because he holds different views, his duty is to resign.
Even in regard to freedom of speech, collective responsibility imposes a restriction on this freedom the moment a person becomes a Member of the Cabinet. The idea is beautifully brought out in a statement of Lord Palmerston quoted in Cabinet Government by Jennings, 1936 Edition, page 224, and it reads as follows:

"A member of the Government when he takes office necessarily divests himself of that perfect freedom of action which belongs to a private and independent member of Parliament, and the reason is this, that what a member of the Government does and says upon public matters must to a certain degree commit his colleagues, and the body to which he belongs if they by their silence appear to acquiesce; and if any of them follow his example and express as publicly opposite opinions, which in particular cases they might feel obliged to do differences of opinion between members of the same Government are necessarily brought out into prominence and the strength of the Government is thereby impaired".

I would humbly submit that judged by the highest traditions, a person when he becomes a member of the Cabinet loses to a great extent his freedom of action as well which he would otherwise have as a citizen or as an ordinary member of a legislature or even of the majority party. I shall revert to this aspect a little later in its proper context.

I will now crave your permission to state certain facts which I can disclose within the permissible limits without violating the oath of secrecy. I should have very much wished that such a situation is not forced on me. But I now feel I cannot help it. After I took charge as the Chief Minister, I was earnestly hoping and wishing that each one of my colleagues will have absolute respect for every other
member and have trust and confidence in them and all would work as a team. I was therefore much distressed to find that the hon. Member was not only calling for files within the portfolios of another Minister but also making his remarks in writing, in conflict with the decision of the concerned Minister and that occasionally a spirit of resentment and even of bitterness was created in the mind of the concerned Minister.

I cannot give details and I shall not yield to the temptation of giving them. The hon. Member has admitted in his statement that he did call for the files and make his own remarks or suggestions but curiously he has tried to justify his interference on the ground of collective responsibility. I venture to submit that it is a lame excuse. Collective responsibility to the legislature does not mean that every Minister should call for the files of the other Ministers and pass his orders or remarks just because he wants a particular thing to be done or undone. If that should be so, the allotment of portfolios would be meaningless. On account of such interference which was brought to my notice by the concerned Ministers I realised that the hon. Member was creating a very embarrassing and delicate situation for one as Chief Minister and I told him about it.

When a Cabinet is dissolved and a fresh Cabinet is constituted a Minister in-charge of a portfolio is entitled to deal with the orders passed by the Minister dealing with the same portfolio in the dissolved Cabinet. Here again I am very reluctant to speak but I am constrained to say this much that I regard to one order of great importance passed by the previous Minister, the hon. Member as his successor kept it pending for over four months without issuing it and issued it only on the eve of the final episode. I do not wish to say more on this.
On one occasion, the hon. Member as Minister was discussing with me several matters till a few minutes before the hour fixed for the Cabinet meeting but curiously, despite of my request to him to attend the meeting he absented himself from the Cabinet meeting. In the statement made by him today, the fact is admitted but the excuse that he has pleaded is that he was indisposed.

I should like to mention another aspect without again breaking the secrecy. The hon. Member was on some occasions so insistent that what he suggested should be done by another Minister dealing with the file and when his suggestion was not accepted he threatened to resign, obviously to coerce the other Minister to accept his suggestion. Apart from the fact that this was undesirable and claiming for himself more importance in the Cabinet than other Ministers, such attitude and spirit provoked resistance and seriously interfered with the spirit of team work. I shall not mention the occasions or the details. I can say with confidence that they have nothing to do with joint and collective responsibility.

Another matter of importance also referred to by the hon. Member I would like to deal with and that is revealing Cabinet secrets to members of the party and inciting them to act contrary thereto. I repeat the charge with a full sense of responsibility. One glaring instance was the Land Reforms Bill. Shortly after the Cabinet decision was reached, the hon. Member revealed the discussions at the Cabinet meeting to members of the party, informed them about the particular points discussed by the particular Ministers and incited them to raise those very points in connection with the discussion of the Bill. The points discussed by the Ministers at a secret meeting of the Cabinet could not become known to members of the party unless they were revealed to them. The statement of the hon. Member that he was supporting the Bill in his public
utterances is not in itself fully correct but assuming it is so, it is no answer to the charge.

I was feeling unhappy about these situations but was hoping that as some more time elapsed he would change his outlook and attitude and all would go on well. It was against this background and in that atmosphere known to him and to the other members of the Cabinet and myself that the final episode took place. The meeting to elect persons to the Election Committee of the P.C.C. was fixed on 3-5-1960. On the previous day there was a meeting of all the Ministers; the hon. Member was present, the President of the A. P. C.C. was present and it was agreed that the President of the A.P.C.C. and myself should prepare the panel of names to be put up. The hon. Member agreed to this procedure. It may have been that in his mind he hoped that we would include his name also in the panel. After the procedure was thus accepted by all including the hon. Member, myself and the A.P.C.C. President prepared the panel. Probably apprehending that his name may not be in the panel he informed me before the actual meeting on the 3rd May that he intended to contest if his name is not to be found in the panel. I tried to persuade him that it was not the right course. On the 3rd May when the names were read out he declared that he was determined to contest and filed his nomination and when persuaded to desist from that course of action he declared that he would resign the Ministership rather than give up his right to contest in the election. As in fact he declared his intention and proceeded with the contest on the election issue, there was nothing wrong or unnatural in my taking that he was offering his resignation. The attempt of the hon. Member in the laboured argument in his statement that he never intended or offered to resign but that I was insisting upon his resignation is hardly fair to me, and is not consistent with open declarations. I do not wish to get into the details of the subsequent corres-
Statement by Sri A. C. S. Sadasivarao—24th June, 1960—on Resignation

Regarding the circumstances

relative to his Resignation

of the Office of Minister

In correspondence but I can confidently state that I invited him to
render his formal letter of resignation only because he
declared his intention on the 3rd May and he wanted me
to write to him asking him to send a formal letter of
resignation. I also submit that I was justified in the action
that I took and there is nothing undemocratic about it or
against any freedom enjoyed by any Minister. In this con-
text I crave your leave to refer to the freedom of action in
what are called the organisational matters as contended by
the hon. Member. Apart from the fact that the hon. Mem-
ber himself agreed to the procedure namely the preparation
of the panel jointly by the A.P.C.C President and myself,
he could not claim what he calls the fundamental freedom
to contest without serious damage to the prestige and the
reputation of the Congress Organisation. In abstract
theory it may be all right to say that Governmental policies
are different from organisational decisions. But in actual
practice when the whole strength of the Government
depends upon the prestige and reputation of the organisa-
tion it would be a very serious thing for a Minister to
oppose the Chief Minister and it possible to defeat him.
The consequences of a defeat can easily be visualised. It
is a terrible blow to the organisation itself. In this connec-
tion I would like to quote what our beloved Prime
Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said at one of his monthly
Press Conferences. He said that it was not possible to lay
down a rigid rule on the question of freedom of opinion
to Ministers in organisational matters. Normally there
was complete freedom in the congress in organisational
matters. On the other hand, it would be rather absurd
if Ministers functioned in a way opposed to the Chief
Minister under the cover of so-called organisational mat-
ters. The Prime Minister upheld the homogeneity of
Cabinet. The whole basis of the parliamentary system of
Government was based on homogenous Cabinet of which
the keystone was the Chief or the Prime Minister. Pandit
said: “If essentially a Minister cannot co-operate with . . .
Chief Ministers, it is difficult for him to carry on—either the Chief Minister goes or he goes.” The Congress High Command to my knowledge has not declared that from the organisational point of view he was right or justified. They fully considered everything and gave their decision which I referred to earlier. As already said, the Congress High Command would have been stultifying itself if it agreed with the hon. Member’s contention and at the same time gave me unfettered discretion to act in a manner I thought fit.

One word more about the suggestion made by the hon. Member that a Committee of the House be appointed to go into the details of the files etc. I respectfully submit that it would be violating without justifiable reason the secrecy of official files. I am not prepared therefore to accept his suggestion.

The hon. Member stated that I did not issue any press statement explaining the reasons for the decisions taken by me and therefore he felt himself justified in making a statement on the floor of this House. I may state that I was against issuing any press statement for two reasons—one was that a controversy which was set at rest by the Congress High Command would continue, the other was I was reluctant to disclose matters of a confidential nature in order to show that the election episode was the consummation of a course of conduct creating bitterness and hostility. I, therefore, take the full responsibility for my decision not to issue a press statement.

Before I conclude, may I add, Sir, that however unpleasant the affair may have been the hon. Member has enabled me to place the various aspects of the matter before the hon. Members of this House. The hon. Members of this House are the guardians of democratic freedom and I am equally anxious that they should not be kept in the dark, to the extent information can be given
and that they should not get away with the impression that there has been any violation of privileges of a Minister or of the democratic freedom. I thank you for the patience and courteous hearing you have given me.

I appeal to the hon. Member to leave the matters at that and work in full harmony with all of us in the service of the people. --JAI HIND.

Mr. Speaker: Now, the episode is closed.

PRIVILEGE MOTION

re: Speech of Sri C. Rajagopalachari.

Mr. Speaker: We shall go to the next item, viz., privilege motion regarding the speech of Sri C. Rajagopala Chari.

Sri D. Kondatah Chowdary (Kandukur): At the outset I wish to raise a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: First, let me begin.

(1) "The representatives of the Congress in the Legislatures are such people, whom any first class Magistrate would round up"
Privilege Motion

A. Speech of Sri C. Rajagopalachari

...
Privilee Motion
27 June, 1960

"Speech of Shri C. Rangapalachari"

"...

मेकुळ ख्याति के लिए उपलब्ध है।

"...

मेकुळ ख्याति के लिए उपलब्ध है।

"...

मेकुळ ख्याति के लिए उपलब्ध है।

"...

मेकुळ ख्याति के लिए उपलब्ध है।

"...

मेकुळ ख्याति के लिए उपलब्ध है।

"...

मेकुळ ख्याति के लिए उपलब्ध है।

"...

मेकुळ ख्याति के लिए उपलब्ध है।

"...

मेकुळ ख्याति के लिए उपलब्ध है।

"...

मेकुळ ख्याति के लिए उपलब्ध है।

"...

मेकुळ ख्याति के लिए उपलब्ध है।

"...

मेकुळ ख्याति के लिए उपलब्ध है।

"...

मेकुळ ख्याति के लिए उपलब्ध है।

"...

मेकुळ ख्याति के लिए उपलब्ध है।

"...

मेकुळ ख्याति के लिए उपलब्ध है।

"...

मेकुळ ख्याति के लिए उपलब्ध है।

"...

मेकुळ ख्याति के लिए उपलब्ध है।

"...

मेकुळ ख्याति के लिए उपलब्ध है।

"...
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... prima facie case. As in the case with precedents, when the Speaker quoted a ruling in another sitting, Mr. Ayyangar said that the House of Commons relates to a reported derogatory reference by a Liberal member against the Conservatives. The Speaker of the House of Commons...

**Under Article 194 and Parliament under Article 105** we follow the precedents that are observed in the House of Commons. So on a certain facts in the Parliament taken as a precedent in view of the precedence when the Speaker of the parliament has given a ruling on the particular set of facts and when we are bound to follow precedents according to the Constitution, can we give another ruling on this matter? On a motion proposed by Independent member, the Speaker quoted a ruling in the House of Commons in a similar case to say that the alleged imputation did not constitute a breach of privilege of the House, as it was selective in its application and did not amount to a reflection on the whole House, and observed that remedies for such offensive statements regarding the conduct of a party lay elsewhere and not in this House. Mr. Ayyangar said that the House of Commons related to a reported derogatory reference by a Liberal member against the Conservatives. The Speaker of the House of Commons...
held that such motions could be dealt with by the person concerned on the law of defamation. He said that a question of privilege would arise only when imputations were made against the member in the discharge of his duties. He therefore asked members not to be touchy about these matters. That was the ruling and he said that there was no prima facie case. So under Article 105 as well as under Article 194 of the Constitution when we are proceeding on the precedents observed by the House of Commons, and when a superior body like the Parliament of India has given a ruling on this matter on the same set of facts, holding that there is no prima facie case and that there is no breach of privilege, can we give a different ruling. That I want know at the outset.

*Footnote:* Article 105 of the Indian Constitution provides that no question arising from any motion in Parliament, either in the House of Commons or the House of Lords, shall be taken under the rule of privilege. This provision applies to all proceedings in Parliament. The motion referred to in the footnote is the one that was moved by the member in question. The motion alleged Breach of Privilege and was referred to the Speaker for determination.

*Footnote:* The Indian Constitution, Article 105, provides that in the House of Commons or the House of Lords, no question arising from any motion shall be taken under the rule of privilege. The motion referred to in the footnote is the one that was moved by the member in question. The motion alleged Breach of Privilege and was referred to the Speaker for determination. The Speaker ruled that there was no prima facie case and that there was no breach of privilege. Under the Constitution, when we proceed on the precedents observed by the House of Commons, and when a superior body like the Parliament of India has given a ruling on this matter on the same set of facts, holding that there is no prima facie case and that there is no breach of privilege, can we give a different ruling. That I want to know at the outset.
statement in the House. In opposition this party believes. Let us not particularise this in particular. Likewise legislators of all legislatures across the world believe. Hence, the need for a statement. As far as we are concerned, such a statement is necessary. As far as we are concerned, such a statement is necessary. Therefore, in particular, this party believes. Likewise, the need for a general statement is necessary. In general, this party believes. Likewise, the need for a particular statement is necessary. As far as this party is concerned, the Congress M.L.A. party is concerned, the need for a statement is necessary. Likewise, the need for a statement is necessary. In general, this party believes. Likewise, the need for a statement is necessary. As far as this party is concerned, the need for a statement is necessary. Likewise, the need for a statement is necessary.

Privilege Motion re: Speech of Sri C. Rajagopalachari
Privilege Motion
27th June, 1936

P. N. M. of 2nd June, 1936

I have received general statements of non-congruence and con-razance of statements of facts. The House will recall that the
Committee of Privileges has reported on the 2nd of June 1954 on the
particularisation of the terms of the privilege motion. It was stated that
"It is too general, I cannot allow the Privilege Motion" on the
particularisation of terms of privilege. A question of privilege was
raised in the House of Commons on the 21st of June 1954 when
Mr. Emanuel Shinwell, Socialist M. P., published in the Daily Mail that Mr. Shinwell was reported to have said "It
would be an opportunity to get rid of the crazy Tories, the
wretches, the rascals and the rabble rousers."
Mr. Speaker: 'Representatives in the Legislatures'
Privilege Motion
27th June, 1960
re. Speech of Sri C. Rajagopalachari

Representatives in the Legislatures are Legislatures' agents. Every Legislature has its cognizance of and jurisdiction over breach of privilege under the general terms of the privilege. In this reference it is only to be noted that in both cognizance and jurisdiction the general terms are

Sir, Congress Legislators are. Congress Legislators are. It has been pointed out that the declaration of the Congress party as serious and the representatives of the Congress Legislatures and the representatives of the Congress Legislatures have their
cognizance in the House of Commons, ruling and House of Commons, ruling and...
Privilege Motion

31st July, 1960

Mr. Speaker: "On the decline of the Congress, Mr. Rajagopalachari, said that its representatives in the Legislatures were such people whom any First Class Magistrate would round up. They were men without any appreciable means of livelihood" &c. &c. separate sentences.

(Sri. R. B. Ramakrishna Raju rose to speak.)
The Speaker quoted a ruling in the House of Commons in a similar case to say that the alleged imputation did not constitute a breach of privilege of the House, as it was selective in its application, and did not amount to a reflection on the whole House. The remedies for such offensive utterances regarding the conduct of a party elsewhere, "as the Speaker reminded, are selective in its application elsewhere, as a breach of privilege in the House of Congress, as it was, amounted to, and it did not apply to the whole House. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker: But what the petitioners say is not correct: as a petition status? They say that the majority of the Members are rascals. It reflects on the House. 236 out of 302 are rascals and rowdies and deserve to be rounded up. They say it is a reflection on the whole House, aspect and aspect.

in other respects, the powers, privileges and immunities of the Houses of Legislatures of the State and of the Members and Committees of Houses of such Legislatures shall be such as from time to time be defined by the House of 300 members 200 members rascals.

Mr. Speaker: House to reflect aspect and aspect.
Whole House reflect
privileges implied majority of
the members of House because
the Section says "and of the members" and "large body
of members of the House," Their respect and their honour
are also implicated in this matter. So, I say that this does
come under privilege. I also say, Sir, that what you said
In Article 194 is that the powers, privileges and immuni-
ties of the House are like that of the House of Commons.
House of Commons rules apply he may give one ruling, you may give a different
ruling. So, it does not say that the rulings given in the
House of Commons are binding on us, but simply says
"the privileges and immunities are those enjoyed by the
House of Commons." That is all. I, therefore, submit that
this is a reflection at least on a large body of the Members
of this House.

Legal aspect: Legal aspect is in the interest of such
people...
Privilege Motion 27th June, 1960

re: Speech of Sri C. Rajagopalachari

The acting Chief Justice, Mr. N. H. C. Coyajee, at the Bombay High Court dismissed with costs the suit filed by Home D. Mistry, Deputy Editor of the 'Blitz', against Mr. Naifikul Hassan, former Speaker of the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly, the State of Uttar Pradesh, the Commissioner of Police, Bombay, (Commissioner of Police 500) and the State of Bombay, claiming a sum of Rs. 1,03,200 as damages for alleged wrongful arrest and false imprisonment.

"In September, 1951, Mistry was responsible for the publication of a certain news item in the issue of 'Blitz' dated September 29, 1951 in which certain statements were made concerning the Speaker of the Uttar Pradesh Assembly which were considered to constitute a contempt of the Speaker and of the Uttar Pradesh Assembly." As a result a warrant had been issued by the Speaker in pursuance of a resolution of the Assembly that Mistry be arrested and brought before the Bar of the House to answer a charge of contempt."
"In giving judgment, his Lordship said that the main questions to be considered in the first instance were the extent of the powers and privileges of a State Legislature to commit a person for contempt of the Legislature and the issue of a warrant which could be executed in any part of the territory. He considered Article 194 (3) of the Constitution and said that a State Legislature enjoyed the same privileges, powers and immunities which were enjoyed by the House of Commons in the British Parliament."

His lordship then considered Article 194 (3) of the Constitution and said that a State Legislature enjoyed the same privileges, powers and immunities which were enjoyed by the House of Commons in the British Parliament. We cannot protect rights of the members of the Council. Lok Sabha is concerned only with the members of the Lok Sabha, not even of Rajya Sabha. Article 194 (3) of the Constitution is binding on both House. All are equal. We are equal to Lok Sabha. We are equal to Rajya Sabha, and any Legislature in the 14 States is equal to one another. The privileges enjoyed by the House of Commons included the privilege to commit persons for the contempt of the House, which was an essential privilege for maintaining the dignity of the House. Therefore, the U.P. Legislature had the right to commit a person for contempt of that House.
It was next contended on behalf of the plaintiff that the warrant had not been addressed to such a person as it
was intended. It was contended that the place of residence
of the defendant was the place where the offence was
committed and not the place where the warrant was ad-

dressed to. "Said the learned judge, as the case
amounts to a breach of privilege, the place of residence
of the defendant is not relevant."

*Sr S.K.V. Krishnavatharam (Tadipalligudem general).
The offence consists in publication. So, there is no ques-
tion of territorial jurisdiction here because wherever it is
published it amounts to an offence. The place of residence
of the defendant is well as the place where publication is
made and where the offence is said to have been committed
should be taken into consideration. So, as the hon. Speaker
said, there is no question of territorial jurisdiction
involved in this matter.

Mr. Speaker: That is with reference to defamation
cases and we are far beyond defamation cases. The Indian
Express publish an articleummy. The point is, "When a
contempt or breach of privilege is made against a House of
Legislature, they can take action against the person outside
the State.

"In his Lordship's opinion, therefore, a State Legisla-
ture in India was not only entitled to issue a warrant for
the arrest of a person beyond its territorial limits, but such
a warrant could be executed against a person outside the
territorial limits of the State." (Interruption) 33333. 33
3333. "His Lordship observed that if this was not to be
the position, then it would be open to any person beyond
the territorial limits of a State and attack the Legislature of
a State without being amenable to a punishment at the
hands of that State..." 33333. 33. 33333. 33333. 33333.
legal question 333333.
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"ostensible means of livelihood"..."whom any First Class Magistrate might round up"
Privilege Motion
27th June, 1908
re: Speech of Sri C. Rajagopalachari

Sri. Dr. Rajendra Prasad: In the First-class Magistrate's Court, one of the First-class Magistrates might round up any First Class Magistrate might round up...
To,

The Hon’ble the Speaker of the Legislature,
Andhra Pradesh Hyderabad.

Sir,

I have just today received your Assistant Secretary’s letter dated April 27, 1960....
(a) My speech was at a reception given to me by the Bar Association of the High Court of Punjab. It was not a public meeting."

"The words quoted are not a correct report of what I said." And again, "I never said these words" as emphasise the facts.

"I dwelt on the defects in the present system of representation of the people. I said that for a good and efficient body of law makers qualified to deal with the economy of the country and to make laws on the basis of a Welfare State, we should have duly elected representatives of all the productive occupations in the country and referred by way of contrast to the present members of the legislatures who were mostly people not engaged in any productive occupation but who seek to make laws affecting all professions."

"Emphasising my point and by way of a humourous remark I referred to the provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code which enables Magistrates to bind over persons who have no ostensible occupation."

"As mentioned in the notice of Motion, this very matter was considered and disposed of by the Hon. Speaker..."
of the Lok Sabha, Delhi, who can be regarded as the protector of the privileges of all the legislatures in India."

"The man who has been described as the father of the Lok Sabha, who can be regarded as the protector of the privileges of all the legislatures in India."

"..."
Privilege Motion  
Re: Speech of Sri C. Rajagopala Chari  

The Minister for Health and Medical (Sri P. V. G. Raju):  

With the permission of my leader, I rise to request that the matter that is before us may be considered more deeply than in an open debate, Sir. As you know, Sir, 4 members of the House have raised an issue of privilege. They have raised it on the ground that the party to which I belong...
has been criticised. The main question before us is whether these four persons have been sufficiently aggrieved by the statement made and whether any criticism made of them by virtue of the fact that they belong to any particular party affects the privileges of the whole House. Belonging to the same party, Sir, I may say that my enthusiasm for defending the rights and privileges of my own party would not extend to the extent that I would express the view that the privileges of my own party would represent the privileges of the whole House. Again, Sir, if we feel that the privilege of the whole House is affected—and, after all, you have to make the final decision on this question—then, the correct thing to do, Sir, if I may crave your indulgence, is to have consultations with all the leaders, and after that is over, to place the matter before the House. That is my humble submission, because, the moment we try to make the privilege of a single section of the House the privilege of the whole House, whatever our loyalty or, what we may call, historical relationship to the party concerned, the difficulty arises as one of technicality. The technical instances of the past would be brought into consideration; and apart from this....

Mr. Speaker: Also some hon. Members have raised that the Members’ privileges have to be considered apart from the question of party....

Sri P. V. G. Raju: In this particular statement, reflection was not about the whole body of the Members, as you know. Members raised the question....

Mr. Speaker: But they have the individual Member’s rights....

Sri P. V. G Raju: Of course, if the expression was “that all the Members of legislature” etc., we of course, the House has the right....

Mr. Speaker: Even if he did not use the expression “all Members”, that would make no difference. He said....
"Congress members of the Legislature". Have not the Congress members individually any rights? That is not the question.

Sri P. V. G. Raju: According to democratic practice they have a right to express counter views about the person who made the statement, not necessarily in this House. The public platform is available for them to vindicate the honour that, they have felt, they have lost. This House is not the forum for them to vindicate their individual honour. It is a collective forum. As you know, they have a right to vindicate their honour. If, in this particular instance, the venerable gentleman spoke in the Bar Association (Chunigur), nothing precludes for our honour to be defended through the agency of another Bar Association anywhere in the country. That is the position, Sir.
Privilege Motion
re: Speech of Sri C. Rajagopalachari

27th June, 1960

Representatives of the Congress in the Legislature" and the Communist Party in the Legislature" charge that the Congress Party's "loyal" and "loyal" nature to the Legislature's democratic processes have been falsified. Representatives of the Congress organization in the Legislature also made a similar charge at the Congress Conference held in 1960.

breach of privilege

The motion was moved by the Minister of Public Works, Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, who stated that the motion was based on the speech given by Mr. Rajagopalachari at the Congress Conference held in the year 1960. The motion was debated and finally adopted by a majority of votes.

The motion was moved by the Minister of Public Works, Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, who stated that the motion was based on the speech given by Mr. Rajagopalachari at the Congress Conference held in the year 1960. The motion was debated and finally adopted by a majority of votes.

The motion was moved by the Minister of Public Works, Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, who stated that the motion was based on the speech given by Mr. Rajagopalachari at the Congress Conference held in the year 1960. The motion was debated and finally adopted by a majority of votes.
No one has taken notice of it. Otherwise, I would not have taken notice of it. I want to hear all sides before I give my decision with regard to sending the motion to the Committee of Privileges.
Privilege Motion

re: Speech of Sri C. Rajagopalachari

27 June, 1960
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Privilege Motion
re: Speech of Sri C. Rajagopalachari

Sri D. Sunjivayya: I would like to submit that the suggestion made by the Hon. Minister in charge of Health seems to be really desirable. Would you kindly consider it, Sir?

Mr Speaker: No. Because when a point of order or a law point comes up before me, I have to decide it. How can I consult merely the leaders and decide? It has nothing to do with the joint consultation of leaders. You may oppose, that is a different matter—let it go—but how can I say all right when a question of law comes up. It is a legal question. That is the thing fortunately or unfortunately.

Leader of the House: The Leader of the House consulted the statement of the Hon. Minister about breach of privilege. There was nothing in the procedure of the House and the Chamber.

Leader of the House: The Chamber is clear now...
Legal position is: Opinion given on a question is not a breach of privilege. There was a ruling on a breach of privilege on the floor, but this does not automatically mean that the House is in disorder. Leaders of the parties must light a torch in the House.

Leaders must, collaboratively, ensure the House is not in disorder.

It is not that, a breach of privilege occurs. That is why, there must be a Prima Facie breach of privilege. It is not because there was a breach of privilege, but a contest to prevail over. It is because House proceedings are so Rules of Procedure. A Prima Facie breach of Privilege by the House is the question. Admittedly it is difficult to determine breach of privilege. For example, Leader of the House may argue, the Leader of the House says it, the Leader of the House says this is not a breach of privilege.

Adjournment Motion, Privilege Motion cannot be debated in the House. Therefore, the question is. The adjournment question is.

Sir, is there a motion before the House or are you taking the House into confidence in order to give a ruling whether there is a prima facie against Mr. Rajagopalachari so as to refer the matter to the Privileges Committee. It may be that some Members have sent a
motion to you, but it does not become a motion before the House. There are three procedures here.

Mr. Speaker: I am going on the presumption that they are making a motion.

Sri N. C. Seshadri: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: He has told me. I shall ask him to move a motion.

Sri R. Lakshminarasimham Dora: The motion may either be considered by you as Speaker and on the authority of the Speaker referred to the Committee of Privileges or rejected or you may place the motion before the House and ask the House to decide whether there is a prima facie case for the motion to go before the Privileges Committee. These are the two positions which are before the House. I think we have not come to the latter position; we are still in the first position, namely, that the matter has been referred to you for giving your opinion whether this matter should come before the House or it should go to the Privileges Committee, in which case, you may take us into confidence here and give a ruling yourself. Or, if you want to adopt the latter course, namely, placing the motion before the House and asking the House to decide the matter you have sufficiently seen the consensus of opinion on this issue: the Leader of the House has spoken, another member of the Cabinet has spoken and the leaders of the various other parties have also spoken.

Apart from all these considerations, I wish to bring to your notice, Mr. Speaker, the legalistic approach to this question. There are two things. Mr. Rajagopalachari is stated to have made a speech at a certain place defaming the Congress Legislative party members. The question is whether Mr. Rajagopalachari made such a statement. It is only after we decide that such a statement has been made by Mr. Rajagopalachari that we can proceed with
the matter, because we have got two pieces of evidence here: one is the publication in the press and the other is Mr. Rajagopalachari's own statement addressed to you in response to a question put to him. Now, are we to go by the press statement or are we to go by the statement addressed by Mr. Rajagopalachari to you in response to a question calling upon him to say whether he had made such a statement. I understand—

Mr. Speaker: It has not come in a positive way. If he categorically says, "I never made that statement" and sends in an affidavit, we shall accept. That is different. But he wants to go on technical points. I would really wish Mr. Rajagopalachari claiming to be a Gandhian or a follower of Gandhi saying either 'I have made that statement; I am sorry' or 'I have not made that statement; that boy has concocted.' Let him say it definitely. That is the end of the matter. Instead of that, he says 'I joked' this and that. That is the point.

Sri R. Lakshminarasimham Dora: I respectfully submit to you, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that Mr. Rajagopalachari has addressed to you saying that the statement alleged to have been made by him is not correct.

Mr. Speaker: The joking is correct. That portion is there unfortunately. I have referred to him asking to whom has he referred in the speech. Therefore, let him categorically say 'Yes; I made that statement; I am sorry' or 'I have not made that statement; that boy has concocted.' Let him say that. We want a clear statement.

Sri R. Lakshminarasimham Dora: Mr. Rajagopalachari has stated that the statement attributed to him is not correct. If it is correct, then only the question arises whether it constitutes a libel or not. If it is not correct, how can the question arise?

Then, the next question is whether it is a breach of privilege. There are three privileges. Questions are being
section of the House. As we are not going to argue across the table between ourselves, it comes as a breach of privilege of a section of the House. I do not deny the fact that if there is a breach of privilege committed in respect of any member or a body of members of a collective body of members, such a breach can be brought to your notice or it can be brought to the notice of the House and it can be referred to the Privileges Committee, and it can be dealt with according to the Rules of our Legislature. But the question is, the members of the Legislature are also members of society. You, as a veteran lawyer, Mr. Speaker, will know that there is what is called libel or otherwise known as defamation in Indian Penal Code. Here, Mr. Rajagopalachari by abusing, may be an individual or a collective body of individuals, that they do not possess ostensible means of livelihood and that they are liable to be rounded up under Section 109 of Cr. P. C. is said to have committed a libel or said to have defamed a certain body of people. The question is, whether these individuals, members of the Legislature are anything different from ordinary members of the society in the matter of this defamation. It is always my opinion, I want to submit Mr. Speaker, Sir, that a member of the Legislature is not a privileged individual in society; he is as good as any other member of the society. If any other person is defamed like that, he has the right of preferring an action in a proper channel, namely, court of law. The members of Legislature also are members of society and if they are defamed or if libellous statement is made against them and they think that they have sustained any loss or if it is per se defamatory, they have a right of action, but the question is whether these members of the Legislature by having been called certain names can say that their privileges or rights in respect of the House are violated. The privileges in respect of my speech or of my conduct are only protected by the Constitution. I do not carry any privileges in the streets. If I do not pay the rickshaw walla, he may give me a slap. Can I say, as a member of
Sri R. Lakshminarasimhan Dorai: What applies to the collective body must apply to the individual concerned. In the collective body if 10 people are defamed, every one of them must feel that he is defamed. In the collective body, as a member of the Legislative party, I am included in that. If it does not apply to me, how does it apply to you? If it does not apply to some individuals and if it applies to only the body of all the individuals, I fail to understand the logic of it. So, whatever applies to me must apply to him. I must substantiate by means of parliamentary precedents that it was a violation of the breach of privilege by calling me a person without appreciable means of livelihood and that I am liable to be rounded up under Section 109 Cr. P. C. So, the emphasis is on this: The breach must be in respect of the member's conduct in the House or the member's speech in the House; and not the member's life in society nor his political creed. The privilege is only here and here alone in this House, for whatever I say or do here, nobody should malign or defame me, nobody should prevent me or obstruct me. It is only in these cases privileges arise, and I hope you will give right guidance in this matter. My honest opinion is there is much ado about nothing. Mr. Rajagopalachari might have said it; it might be prudent or imprudent because such general statements made against all the Members or a large body of Members is no good especially coming as it does from the mouth of such an eminent man like him, but whatever it is, we have to see whether he has violated any privilege which parliamentary precedent has shown us.

*Sri R. B. Ramakrishna Raju: Mr. Rajagopalachari made reference to the capacity of the members of the Legislatures to make laws. He made a reference to that. If that is so, then Mr. Lakshminarasimham's argument has no stand.
Mr. Speaker: By his next statement, he has said that he was talking about their capacity, about their position as Members. So, he has unfortunately made his case worse by his statement. Both Houses will punish not contempts arising out of facts of which the ordinary courts will take cognizance, but those of which they cannot, such as contemptuous insults, gross calumnies of foul epithets by word of mouth not within the category of actionable slander or threat of bodily injury. This is with regard to members. Here the report relates to the members of the legislature. That is the point. If you like, you can excuse him: that is a different matter. You can pass a resolution; "He is a big man, why should we bother or trouble him"—that is a different thing.
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Sri S. K. V. Krishnavatharam: I agree with you, Mr. Speaker, Sir. As a written statement in a case....

Sri S. K. V. Krishnavatharam: I agree with you, Sir, that he did not traverse in an unequivocal manner that he....
did not make such a statement. All the same, the denial is there, and the denial may be taken by us and the denial may be accepted. The mere fact, Sir, that there is not a specific and unequivocal denial of a particular statement made by him may not be taken to mean that it was an evasive answer.

Sri S. K. V. Krishnavatharam: He cannot contradict in papers; but he has written to you, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I feel it is evasive.

Sri S. K. V. Krishnavatharam: I request the Hon. Speaker, not to be too sensitive about it. Let us not be too meticulous about it. Let us be broad-minded. He is an old and aged gentleman. He has addressed the Bar Association, Chandigarh. His attention was drawn to a statement reported to have been made by him; and he says 'I did not say that'.

He said 'it is incorrect'.

Sri S. K V. Krishnavatharam: That is enough. To say that it is incorrect is enough. When he stated that it is not correct, it means and implies that the statement attributed to him has not been made by him.

Mr. Speaker: I am now inclined to postpone it for further discussion.
Sri S. K. V. Krishnavatharam: May I suggest to you, Sir, that you may be pleased to address him on this point, namely, whether he has uttered such and such words. Let us ask for a reply as to the words he exactly said, in categorical terms. Let us address him.

Sri P. Sundarayya: Why should we address him?

Sri S. K. V. Krishnavatharam: Let us address him and see what he says.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker would not write to any individual however important or great he may be. I do not write. The Speaker is above everybody. Therefore, I do not lower my dignity. I shall send summonses or even a warrant, if you all feel like that.

Sri S K V Krishnavatharam: Supposing if the opinion of the Members or of the House is that the Hon. Speaker should address the gentleman in order to exactly know the position, because the Speaker is not satisfied with the answer given?.....

Mr. Speaker: Even then I am free. Till a resolution is passed by the House, I am free. When a resolution is passed, it is binding on me and I have to speak or act as only the mouth-piece of the House. But when you suggest, 'Why not the Speaker write to him', why should I write? If the House thinks that the Speaker should write, I shall certainly do that. It is for the House.

Sri S K V Krishnavatharam: Even if you find there have been laches or lapses somewhere, they need not be taken notice of by you, Sir. So I beseech you and beseech the House not to proceed with the matter any further and leave it off there, without taking notice of the matter.
Mr. Speaker: I have adjourned. I shall put the date for continuing the debate, a week hence.

(Sri P. Sundarayya, Leader of the Opposition, stood up in his seat)

Mr. Speaker: I have decided and therefore I am not going to listen now even to the Leader of the Opposition. We can have this again on 4th July 1960. Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition will be the first member to speak that day and I shall then listen to what all he says.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES OF EXPENDITURE FOR 1960-61

The Chief Minister (Sri D. Sanjivayya): Mr. Speaker, Sir, On behalf of the Minister for Finance, I rise to present the first batch of Supplementary estimates of expenditure for the current year.

These Supplementary estimates relate to the following categories:

1. New Service Schemes sanctioned during the course of the current year.
(2) A Few New Service Schemes sanctioned during 1959-60 for which advances from the Contingency Fund were sanctioned that year but Supplementary grants could not be obtained from the Legislature.

2. Details of the Supplementary Estimates are given in the explanatory note, copies of which have been placed on the table of the House. ‘New Service’ means a ‘service’ which is not contemplated in the budget for that year and for which a Supplementary statement of expenditure should be presented to the Legislature.

3. These Supplementary Estimates fell under 15 different grants, 10 relating to Revenue Account, 5 to Capital and 1 to Debt and Deposit Heads. The total of these items pertaining to the Revenue Account comes to Rs. 8.06 lakhs while that relating to Capital and Debt Heads comes to Rs. 21.35 lakhs. All these amounts included in the present Supplementary estimates fall entirely under ‘voted’. As stated in the Introductory Memorandum to the Supplementary estimates which I have presented, a token grant of Rs. 100 has been proposed in respect of “New Service” schemes except where advances have been sanctioned from the Contingency Fund. In the latter cases amount equivalent to the advance sanctioned from the Contingency Fund have been included in the Supplementary statement so that these advances may be repaid to the Contingency Fund. In respect of schemes the expenditure on which can be met by reappropriation within the grant also, only token sums of Rs. 100 each have been included in the Supplementary statement.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary Estimates presented. Cut motions may be given before 3.00 P.M. on 5th July 1960.

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE GOVERNOR
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the administrative report of the Government of the State reorganisation of the State with the medium project of the State reorganisation of the State confectionary.
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Reforms Comm: started & by R. M. V. S. L. 5% of the population. The objectives of the scheme are to improve the administration of the colony and to promote social And economic development of the area. The scheme envisages the establishment of a Special Administration, which will be responsible for the administration of Tottenham. The scheme is expected to bring about far-reaching reforms in the administration of the colony.

3. Tottenham Scheme administration: The objectives of the scheme are to improve the administration of the colony and to promote social And economic development of the area. The scheme envisages the establishment of a Special Administration, which will be responsible for the administration of Tottenham. The scheme is expected to bring about far-reaching reforms in the administration of the colony.
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Reforms Committee's reform measures and acts. Reform measures regarding non-officials are to be
fostered. The Governor has directed the Administration to prepare a comprehensive report
on the subject. It is expected that the reforms will be implemented within the next
administration and will be reflected in the subsequent cabinet rules. Madras Cabinet Rules
of Business are to be reconsidered and amended to include Collective Responsibility in the
administration. The Governor has directed that the cabinet rules be reviewed and
amended to include Collective Responsibility. The Governor has also directed that
additional financial resources for Telangana be considered. The Governor has directed
the Regional Committee and its sub-committee to consider additional financial
resources for Telangana.
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Regional Committee Secret to divulge the report of the 27th June 1940 meeting. The committee has 25 resources to Plan commitment. In addition, the regional committee recommended additional financial resources to be idle. The Plan committee has recommended that the regional committee expand the plan. Osmania University, Fertilizer Factory, and Osman Ali University have been recommended to the regional committee. The recommendation for irrigation projects has been reiterated. The power supply has been highlighted as a major concern. The average consumption of 11 units has been recommended to be increased. The electricity supply has been recommended to be increased. The recommendation for electrify the area has been reiterated. The demand for land has been highlighted as a major concern. The demand for land has been reiterated.
Additional Financial Resources for Medium Size Irrigation Projects

The Government has decided to make additional financial resources available for Medium Size Irrigation Projects within the time target. The Chief Engineer has recommended that a Project Pool be created to finance such projects. The machinery required for these projects will be obtained from the Foreign Exchange fund. The projects will be financed within the time target.

(Sri P. Rajagopala Naidu in the Chair)
Karnataka has been divided into five regions. The decision for States re-organisation was made under condition that every region should have a fair share of resources, population, and development. The regions were to be demarcated based on demography, economic potential, and cultural heritage.

States Re-organisation was based on village unit as the basis for the formation of regions. The condition was to ensure that each region had an equitable distribution of resources. The decision was made to establish a zonal council for each region. The vecinos were to be elected by the people of each region. The zonal council was to be responsible for the development of the region.

The decision was made to ensure that each region had a fair share of resources, population, and development. The regions were to be demarcated based on demography, economic potential, and cultural heritage.
settle your case. This is the sort of thing which must be done urgently, and I hope that you will be able to get the necessary action taken at the earliest possible moment. As regards the second point, which is, in fact, a more urgent matter, I am afraid that I cannot help you. However, I will do all that I can to assist you.

...extend our gratitude to the Government for the manner in which it has been handled. It is to be hoped that the Education Department will take steps to ensure that these conditions are fulfilled. It is the duty of the Government to ensure that the necessary provision is made for the development of education. In this connection, June, July and August are crucial months. The Government must take steps to ensure that the necessary provision is made.

Up grade Primary Schools in Middle Schools up-grade are not being made at the same time. It is, therefore, necessary that the Education Department should take steps to ensure that the necessary provision is made for the development of education. In this connection, June, July and August are crucial months. The Government must take steps to ensure that the necessary provision is made.

...extend our gratitude to the Government for the manner in which it has been handled. It is to be hoped that the Education Department will take steps to ensure that these conditions are fulfilled. It is the duty of the Government to ensure that the necessary provision is made for the development of education. In this connection, June, July and August are crucial months. The Government must take steps to ensure that the necessary provision is made.

*Sri K. Koti Reddy (Lakkireddi Palli):* Sir, I would heartily support the motion of thanks to the Governor's address. I may make a few suggestions in that connection. I am glad to see Sir that we find a statement in the Governor's address that sufficient progress is being made with regard to the High Level canal. I am very sorry, however, Sir, to note that in answer to a question in the Legislative Assembly, it was stated that an area which could only be irrigated under the high level canal and for which the waters of Krishna could never be utilised is omitted from the purview of the high level canal. I do not know whether the Government has
any idea to using the waters of Pennar for that particular area. I believe it is not possible to do so. The only hope of the people of Pulivendula taluk and portions of Cuddapah District in Jammalamadugu is that the waters of Tungabhadra could be utilised. Sir, in this connection I may have to refer to a very important controversy that is now going on in the country, viz., the utilisation of the waters of Andhra Pradesh, whether any surplus waters will be available for other States. As a bald statement that surplus waters can be utilised in other States, nobody can contravert. If really the waters of Andhra Pradesh are going into waste into the sea, could any sensible man have any objection to utilise those waters for others, besides the people in Andhra Pradesh. Recently Sir, we are informed on the floor of this House that as a result of the request of the Planning Commission, a tentative Master Plan has been prepared by the Chief Engineer of Andhra Pradesh for the utilisation of the waters of Andhra Pradesh. We are told that an extent of 141 lakhs of acres at a cost of 650 crores could be utilised. But so far no indication has been given to us whether after satisfying the needs of Andhra Pradesh there will be any surplus waters available. As a bald statement nobody could object to it, but what exactly is surplus water nobody, so far as I know either on behalf of the Government or public knows. So far as I could see as a layman, I am convinced of the facts that I am afraid that very little water if at all, could be supplied to other States after satisfying the needs of Andhra Pradesh. I have been giving, Sir, some attention to this problem of irrigation in Andhra Pradesh. We all know that under the great Tungabhadra project of which much work is expected and which was planned for utilising the waters of Tungabhadra for the needs of the then known ceded Districts known as Rayalaseema, not much of land could be brought under irrigation. I am afraid not much. I believe only about 4 lakhs of acres in Ceded districts will be brought under irrigation. The fact that it was planned under that project for only a sort of mixed scheme or
rather mainly dry scheme was due to the fact that there is not enough water in Tungabhadra and Pennar to satisfy the needs of that area through which Tungabhadra and Pennar are flowing. By some means or other the waters of Tungabhadra and Pennar can be augmented for utilization of that famine affected area, which was been subjected to a series of famines for centuries and centuries. This year, particularly the whole majority of the area is fatally affected by famine. Those waters, I would claim should be first utilised for the needs of that area. I can probably give some indication of the large area that could be brought under cultivation even in that portion of Andhra Pradesh. To-day something like 26 T. M. C. feet of water is being supplied to the Krishna area. Under the K.C. canal to-day we are expecting to have about 3000 cusecs of water for the supply under the K. C. canal. It is a well-known fact that so far as waters of Krishna are concerned, not a drop of it will be available for us. The only hope and which reliance is placed on that hope by our friends in Madras I should think is that waters of Godavari can brought into Krishna and from Krishna into Pennar and from Pennar to supply our neighbours. I should, as I have already said, have no objection at any moment for the utilisation of surplus waters. Our Chief Minister Mr. Sanjeeva Reddi has often referred to the fact outside our legislature that surplus waters would be certainly supplied to them. But if surplus waters mean waters which could be spared after satisfying not only the present needs but the future needs of Andhra Pradesh, I am afraid we would not have enough water not only in Krishna but also in Godavari to spare for other States. Vast areas under both Krishna, Godavari and Pennar are to be brought under cultivation. Not only that. As I have already indicated the Tungabhadra was planned as a dry scheme to supply water for only one-third of Sirivella area. The rest of it is only for dry cultivation. What was it so? Because it was felt that it was known that there was not enough water in Tungabhadra. Even Nagarjunasagar
Project is not completely a wet scheme because there may
not be enough water in Krishna. In Krishna river water
is supplied for only dry irrigation to a large extent. We
know as a fact that wet cultivation would certainly give us
more food, more agriculture produce as against dry cul-
tivation. It is computed by Engineers and others that wet
land requires 3 times as much water as dry lands. As I
have already expressed, large areas under these big projects
will have to be cultivated with dry crops only because at
present as computed, there is not enough of water in these
rivers. If Godavari waters can be spared for Krishna area
after satisfying the needs of the area commanded by Godavari
in Telangana districts, those waters which are now utilised
for Ceded districts if Godavari waters could be taken into
Pennon. To-day, large areas in Cuddapah district, parti-
cularly Badvel and Siddahout taluks have no water. It is
very easy to have the waters of Tungabhadra and Krishna
and Godavari to cultivate that area and Cuddapah district
also large portions of which are brought under irrigation.
With all that, I would request the Government to go
thoroughly into this matter, whether after all any water
could be spared. I am afraid Sir, that before the Govern-
ment takes any steps and commits itself with regard to
the utilisation of these waters, opportunity must be given
to this Assembly to debate on this question. Why do I
say that? I know that the opinions of the Engineers some-
times differ from the opinion of a layman. To quote one
instance, under the Krishna-Pennon project an area of
6 lakhs acres in one taluk in Kurnool district viz., Sirivella,
can be irrigated. But the proposal was to irrigate only 3
lakhs of acres. Sirivella taluk is a plain and very little acreage
could be reserved for village construction for roads or
housing. I do not know how the Engineers said that
3 lakhs of acres only could be brought under irrigation. I
only cited this instance to bring to the notice of the pubic
that after all the view of the Engineers who might say
that after irrigating so much area in Andhra Pradesh, no
more area could be irrigated. Not only that, we have
got enough water in Andhra Pradesh and if big reservoirs
that are now proposed to be constructed could be utilised
for purposes of supplying water for second crop, any
amount of water could be utilised here. My final request
would certainly be that a copy of the report that has been
submitted to the Planning Commission recently, might be
placed before us as early as possible and an opportunity
be given to the members of this Assembly and to the public
to discuss it and then only the Government, could, it at
all, commit itself to any particular position with regard to
the utilisation of the waters of Andhra Pradesh. If we can
spare any waters to our neighbours after meeting our
requirements and future needs, nobody has objection, but
in the case of supplying drinking water for Madras or for
any other town, I should think there could not be much
objection even at the cost of a little bit of detrimental
interest to Andhra Pradesh. Drinking water could be
supplied to Madras or any other town outside Andhra
Pradesh. Thank you Sir.

* * *

Supply of water from the reservoirs is also possible to
Madras. It would not affect the local interests. The
reservoirs have sufficient water. About 80 fishermen
may be able to catch fish to the extent of 1,000 tons.

Thank you Sir.
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The Governor

We are assembled here today to address the Governor. It is customary to welcome the Governor with garlands and speeches. However, today, we are gathered to address the Governor without any garlands or speeches. We are here to express our thoughts and feelings towards the Governor.

We believe that the Governor is a representative of the people. We are grateful for the services rendered by the Governor. We appreciate the Governor's efforts in maintaining peace and harmony in the country.

We are concerned about the current state of affairs in the country. We feel that there is a need for change. We believe that the Governor has the power to bring about change. We request the Governor to take necessary steps to address the current issues.

We are confident that the Governor will listen to our concerns and take appropriate actions. We are grateful for the Governor's leadership and guidance.

We believe that the Governor is a symbol of hope for the people. We are grateful for the Governor's commitment to the welfare of the people. We request the Governor to continue to serve the people with dedication and sincerity.

We are convinced that the Governor will take the necessary steps to address the current issues. We are confident that the Governor will lead the country to a brighter future.

We are grateful for the Governor's leadership and guidance. We request the Governor to continue to serve the people with dedication and sincerity.

We are confident that the Governor will take the necessary steps to address the current issues. We are convinced that the Governor will lead the country to a brighter future.
25th June, 1930

Motion on Address by
the Governor

Irrigation

Estimates in regard to development of irrigation schemes
in the Governor's Department have been submitted to
the Governor for consideration. The estimates are
as follows:

1. The construction of minor irrigation schemes in
   the Governor's Department has been estimated at
   Rs. 50 lakhs for the current financial year.

2. The Chief Engineer Office is responsible for
   the construction of minor irrigation schemes.
   The Supervising Engineer Office is responsible
   for the implementation of the schemes.

Estimates for the investigation of minor irrigation schemes,
construction, and implementation have been
submitted to the Governor for consideration.

The Governor has directed that the estimates
be submitted to the Public Works Department for
further consideration.

The Governor has also directed that the estimates
be submitted to the Finance Department for
further consideration.
Motion on Address by
the Governor

27th June, 1960

Mr. Speaker,

On the motion of Mr. E. R. G. J. S. Fernando, seconded by Mr. T. S. de Mel, for the consideration of the Programme Committee, the following reforms were recommended to be introduced in the Budget:

1. Reform in the administration of the Budget
2. Reform in the Taxation System
3. Reform in the Education System
4. Reform in the Health System
5. Reform in the Housing System
6. Reform in the Transport System
7. Reform in the Communication System
8. Reform in the Energy System
9. Reform in the Water System
10. Reform in the Tourism System

I hereby move that these reforms be implemented in the Budget as soon as possible.
Motion on Address by the Governor

25th June, 1960

The Opposition party feels that the August Revolution was a failure due to the slow implementation of the promised reforms. The Opposition party would like to thank the non-official members of the Reforms Committee for their valuable suggestions. Decentralisation is needed to ensure that the local people are involved in the administration. The Opposition party feels that the failure of the August Revolution was due to the lack of proper machinery. The Opposition party requests the Governor to expedite the implementation of the promised reforms.
Motion on Address by the Governor
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ಅನೆಯರು ಇದರ ನಿಸರ್ಗದ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿ ಪ್ರತಿ ಬುದ್ಧಿಮಾನ.

ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರ ಮನೆಯ ಪ್ರಾಂಕ್ಕುತ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿ ಪ್ರತಿ ಬುದ್ಧಿಮಾನ.

ಆರು ಮಹಾಸಾಗರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿ ಪ್ರತಿ ಬುದ್ಧಿಮಾನ.

ಅರು ಮಹಾಸಾಗರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿ ಪ್ರತಿ ಬುದ್ಧಿಮಾನ.

ಆರು ಮಹಾಸಾಗರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿ ಪ್ರತಿ ಬುದ್ಧಿಮಾನ.

ಆರು ಮಹಾಸಾಗರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿ ಪ್ರತಿ ಬುದ್ಧಿಮಾನ.

ಆರು ಮಹಾಸಾಗರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿ ಪ್ರತಿ ಬುದ್ಧಿಮಾನ.

ಆರು ಮಹಾಸಾಗರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿ ಪ್ರತಿ ಬುದ್ಧಿಮಾನ.

ಆರು ಮಹಾಸಾಗರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿ ಪ್ರತಿ ಬುದ್ಧಿಮಾನ.

ಆರು ಮಹಾಸಾಗರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿ ಪ್ರತಿ ಬುದ್ಧಿಮಾನ.

ಆರು ಮಹಾಸಾಗರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿ ಪ್ರತಿ ಬುದ್ಧಿಮಾನ.
27th June, 1960

Motion on Address by the Governor

(Title)

(Statement of the Governor)

(Opening remarks)

(Complimentary remarks)

(Closing remarks)

(Signature)
Motion on Address by the Governor.
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The Governor is pleased to state:

Somewhere at the beginning of the year, the Governor called a meeting of the Cabinet to discuss various matters. In this regard, the Governor stated:

The Cabinet has been instructed to:

1. Examine the report on the recent floods in the area.
2. Discuss the measures to be taken to prevent future floods.
3. Review the current relief operations.

The Governor emphasized the need for:

1. Immediate action to tackle the flood situation.
2. Coordination between the different departments involved.
3. Public awareness campaigns.

The urgent need for:

1. Additional relief supplies.
2. Medical and health services.
3. Rehabilitation of affected areas.

The Governor concluded that:

The relief operations must be:

1. Timely.
2. Effective.
3. Transparent.

Relief works should be continued until all relief supplies are exhausted.
Motion on Address by the Governor

...


corporation

...

Finance Corporation

...

...
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...
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_minor Irrigation, Medium Projects_

Agricultural purposes
(The House then adjourned till Half Past Eight of the clock on Tuesday, the 28th June, 1960.)