

PROCEEDINGS
of
THE TRAVANCORE SRI MULAM ASSEMBLY.

THIRD ASSEMBLY.

FIRST SESSION—1944/1120.

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

Tuesday the 22nd August 1944/7th Chingom 1120.

The Assembly met at 12 of the Clock, the President presiding.

NEW MEMBERS.

The following official members took the oath and signed the rolls:—

Dr. S. John (*Surgeon-General*).

Mr. E. G. Salter (*Director of Transport*).

Mr. S. N. Ure (*Public Service Commissioner*).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

*Dispensary along the coastal tract between Trivandrum
and Chirayinkil.*

109. *MR. J. T. MORAES (*Neyyattinkara cum Trivandrum*): Will the Government be pleased to state whether there is any Government dispensary anywhere along the coastal tract between Trivandrum and Chirayinkil?

DR. S. JOHN (*Surgeon General*): There is a dispensary at Valiathura. Government are contemplating the opening of a dispensary at Andoorkonam which will be beneficial to the inhabitants of:—

Pallipuram,

Kadinamkulam,

Menamkulam and a few other pakuthies.

MR. J. T. MORAES: May I know, Sir, whether Andoorkonam is coast line area?

DR. S. JOHN: It is lying inland.

MR. J. T. MORAES: What is the distance between the coastal tract and Andoorkonam?

DR. S. JOHN: About 7 miles.

Government Dispensary at Puthenthope.

110. *MR. J. T. MORAES: Will the Government be pleased to state whether they have received any representation from the public of Puthenthope, Vettiyathura, Puthukkara, etc., in the Menankulam pakuthi, Trivandrum taluk, for establishing a Government Dispensary at Puthenthope?

DR. S. JOHN: Yes.

Aryanad and Vellanad Hospitals.

111. *MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil cum Nedumangad*): Will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) the average daily attendance of the patients in the Aryanad and Vellanad hospitals in the Nedumangad taluk;

(b) whether they are aware that a single doctor is not able to cope with the work in both the hospitals and the public are put to difficulties; and

(c) whether there is any proposal for appointing separate doctors for both these institutions?

DR. S. JOHN: (a) Daily average for Mithunom 1119:—

Vellanad.
26.2

Aryanad.
30.7

(b) The answer is in the negative.

(c) No.

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI (*Mavelikara cum Kunnathoor*): Is the attendance of the persons increasing or decreasing?

DR. S. JOHN: It is now decreasing.

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: Has the member investigated the causes of the decrease?

DR. S. JOHN: Malarial fever comes only during certain parts of the year and not always.

Pulaya candidates registered for appointment.

112 *MR. T. T. KESAVAN SASTRI (*Nominated*): Will the Government be pleased to state the number of Pulaya candidates whose names have been registered for appointment in the lower division as per Public Service Rules and the number thereof advised for recruitment in the lower division during the period from Chingom 1119 to the end of Edavom 1119?

MR. S. N. URE (*Public Service Commissioner*): The number of Pulaya candidates registered for appointments in the lower division of the Public Service during the period from Chingom 1119 to end of Edavom 1119 is 62.

The number of recruitments advised during the period is 41.

MR. T. T. KESAVAN SASTRI: May I know from the honourable member how many men and women are there in this figure 41?

MR. S. N. URE: I am afraid I must ask for time to answer that question. I think there are no women included in it.

Supply of tyres for the Transport Department.

113 * MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI: Will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether a contract has been entered into by the Government with a Firm for the supply of tyres for the Transport Department;

(b) if the answer is in the affirmative, the name of that Firm;

(c) the date and terms of the contract; and

(d) whether the contract was given after tenders were invited and whether any other person or firm had submitted tenders?

MR. E. G. SALTER (*Director of Transport*): (a) Yes.

(b) Messrs. Ardeshir & Co., Madras.

(c) 21-2-1938. Supplies are made on a mileage contract basis.

(d) Tenders were invited but no other firm quoted rates.

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI: May I know what is paid per mile for these tyres?

MR. E. G. SALTER: Sir, I would refer the honourable member to the proceedings of the budget session held in Karkadagom 1113 where the whole question of tyre contract was discussed in its fullest details.

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI: Is there any time limit fixed for the contract?

MR. E. G. SALTER: The time limit for the contract and all other questions were answered then.

Rate charged by the State Transport.

114 * MR. K. A. MATHEW (*Tiruvalla*): Will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) the rate per mile charged by the State Transport Department in their bus service; and

(b) the rate per mile charged by the private bus companies in the following line services:—

(i) Alleppey-Quilon;

(ii) Alleppey-Aroor;

(iii) Kozhencherry-Tiruvalla; and

(iv) Chengannur-Kayamkulam?

MR. E. G. SALTER: (a) 1. 10 cash for ordinary services (approximately).

2. 50 per cent. above the ordinary services for Express (approximately.)

3. 1½ Chs. for City Services (approximately).

(b) (i) 12½ cash approximately.

(ii) 1 Ch. 3½ cash approximately.

(iii) 1 Ch. 2 cash approximately.

(iv) 1 Ch. 7½ cash approximately.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: May I know whether the Government have considered the advisability of getting the rates of private buses conform to the Government rates?

MR. E. G. SALTER: The question of Government taking action under the powers vested under the Motor Vehicles Act is under consideration.

Charge per mile fixed by the Transport Department.

115. ***MR. K. R. NARAYANAN** (*Nominated*): Will the Government be pleased to state the charge fixed per mile for the Express Bus?

MR. E. G. SALTER: 1 Ch. per mile (approximately.)

MR. P. K. KURIAKOSE (*Muvattupuzha cum Devicolam*): The distance between Alwaye and Kothamangalam is 22 miles and the rate is Re. 1-14-0. According to the answer, the rate should be only Chs. 22. But now the charge is double that. May I know the reason for the same?

MR. E. G. SALTER: The express fares are purposely arranged to discourage intermediate traffic.

Through tickets issued by the Transport Department.

116. ***MR. K. R. NARAYANAN:** Will the Government be pleased to state whether through tickets are issued for the ordinary bus in the Trivandrum-Kottayam line; and if not, the reason thereof?

MR. E. G. SALTER: No. There is no through service between Trivandrum and Kottayam by the ordinary bus.

Medical aid in Todupuzha.

117. ***MR. P. M. VARGHESE** (*Minachil cum Todupuzha*): Will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether they are aware of their declared policy that medical aid will be supplied within every six miles radius; and

(b) whether that policy has been ever applied in Todupuzha taluk which is the most malarial in the State?

DR. S. JOHN: (a) No such policy has been declared.

(b) This question does not therefore arise.

Parur Government Hospital.

118. ***MR. E. K. MADHAVAN** (*Kunnatnad cum Parur*): Will the Government be pleased to state the number of sanctioned beds in the Government Hospital, Parur and the number of inpatients at present accommodated in the hospital?

DR. S. JOHN:

Number of beds ... 46

Number of inpatients now accommodated ... 80

MR. E. K. MADHAVAN: May I know how this increasing number of persons is accommodated in the hospital?

DR. S. JOHN: They are put on the floor.

MR. E. K. MADHAVAN : Are they given sufficient clothing and beds?

DR. S. JOHN : Certainly.

MR. K. A. MATHEW : Does the honourable member think that allowing the patients to lie on the floor is good for them?

DR. S. JOHN : There is no other way of accommodating them.

MR. K. A. MATHEW : Does not the honourable member think that this is not the proper way of accommodating them?

DR. S. JOHN : When the new system of having three or four first class hospitals and keeping all the others as minor feeding hospitals, comes into force this question will not arise.

MR. K. A. MATHEW : Does the honourable member mean thereby that the patients will have to suffer in the meantime?

PRESIDENT : That is undoubtedly a grievance. In the General Hospital there were 500 patients while there were only 300 beds available. Therefore 200 of them had to remain on the ground. The result was that the Government ordered that nobody should be accommodated on the floor and the extra patients were sent to the Peroorkada Hospital. Government thought it better not to admit these patients rather than admit them under indifferent conditions. That will be the policy of Government in the future.

MR. E. K. MADHAVAN : Are the patients protected from the inclemency of weather?

DR. S. JOHN : Yes, Sir.

MR. E. K. MADHAVAN : As far as I know, they are not protected.

PRESIDENT : That statement is questioned.

In-patients in the Parur District Hospital.

119. ***MR. P. O. THOMAS** (*Kunnatnad cum Parur*): Will the Government be pleased to state the number of in-patients admitted into the Parur Hospital in 1109 and 1118?

DR. S. JOHN :

Year.	In-patients.
1109	1391
1118	2062

Diet in Parur District Hospital.

120. ***MR. P. O. THOMAS :** Will the Government be pleased to state the allotment for diet in the Parur District Hospital for the years 1109 and 1118?

DR. S. JOHN :

	Rs.
1109	700
1118	1595

Hospital for Women and Children.

121. *MR. T. T. KESAVAN SASTRI: Will the Government be pleased to state the number of women and children who underwent treatment at the Thycaud Hospital from 1-1-1119 to 30-11-1119 and the number of women among them who sought maternity aid?

DR. S. JOHN:

	<i>Out-patient.</i>	<i>In-patient.</i>
Women	39,333	7,040
Children	17,506	1,281
Women who sought maternity aid	2,691	

Dieting in the Government Hospital, Parur.

122. *MR. E. K. MADHAVAN: Will the Government be pleased to state the amount spent per year on dieting in the Government Hospital, Parur?

DR. S. JOHN: The average expenditure on dieting in the Parur Hospital in 1118 was nearly Rs. 4½ per day.

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: May I know whether the sum of Rs. 4 1/2 per day was sufficient for all the patients together?

DR. S. JOHN: We do not feed all the patients; we feed only indigent patients.

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: What would be the average number of patients per day?

DR. S. JOHN: 50 to 60 on the average.

Government Ayurveda Hospital, Trivandrum.

123. *MR. T. T. KESAVAN SASTRI: Will the Government be pleased to state the number of patients treated in the Government Ayurveda Hospital, Trivandrum from the 1st Chingom 1119 to the 30th Edavom 1119 and the number of in-patients among them?

MR. C. P. GOPALA PANICKER (*Secretary to Government*):

Number of patients treated in the Government Ayurveda Hospital, Trivandrum from 1st Chingom 1119 to 30th Edavom 1119. } 64025*

Number of in-patients treated in the Government Ayurveda Hospital, Trivandrum from 1st Chingom 1119 to 30th Edavom 1119. } 815

Recognised and Grant-in-aid Vaidyasalas.

124. *MR. T. T. KESAVAN SASTRI: Will the Government be pleased to state the number of Vaidyasalas recognised and the number of Vaidyasalas given grant to by Government in 1118 and 1119?

*This does not include repetitions but only gives the number of new patients.

MR. C. P. GOPALA PANICKER :

	<u>1118</u>	<u>1119</u>
Number of Vaidyasalas recognised	7	Nil.
Number of Vaidyasalas to which a grant was awarded.	2	3

'Kalanidhi' Examination.

125 ***MR. T. T. KESAVAN SASTRI:** Will the Government be pleased to state the number of candidates who passed the 'Kalanidhi' examination in 1118 and 1119 respectively from the Ayurveda College, Trivandrum?

MR. C. P. GOPALA PANICKER: Number of candidates passed
in 1118 ... 37
Number of candidates passed in 1119 ... 27

Medical College in Trivandrum.

126 ***MR. VARKALA K. MADHAVAN** (*Neyyattinkara cum Trivandrum*): Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table the report of the Committee appointed to enquire into the advisability of establishing a Medical College in Trivandrum?

MR. C. P. GOPALA PANICKER: No Committee was appointed for the purpose stated in the question.

MR. VARKALA K. MADHAVAN: May I know whether Dr. Thirumurti was asked to enquire into the question?

MR. C. P. GOPALA PANICKER: No, Sir.

MR. VARKALA K. MADHAVAN: May I know whether the Government have enquired into the question?

MR. C. P. GOPALA PANICKER: No, not yet.

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN : തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ നിന്നും പ്രതിവർഷം മെഡിക്കൽ കോളേജിനേക്കായി അടയ്ക്കപ്പെടുന്ന വരുടെ നമ്പർ എത്രയാണെന്നു പറയാമോ ?

MR. C. P. GOPALA PANICKER : ശരാശരി, നാലായിരുന്നു.

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN : അതിൽ പരീക്ഷ പാസ്സായ ആളുകൾക്ക് എന്തെങ്കിലും ഉദ്യോഗം ഇതുവരെ കൊടുത്തിട്ടുണ്ടോ ?

MR. C. P. GOPALA PANICKER : ഇതേവരെ ആ പ്രശ്നം വന്നില്ല. വന്നാൽ അതിനെപ്പറ്റി അന്വേഷിക്കാം.

Cardamom lands unexplored.

127 ***MR. P. S. MOHAMED** (*Nominated*): Will the Government be pleased to state whether there are large areas of cardamom lands unexplored even now?

MR. G. NARAYANAN TAMPI (*Secretary to Government*): No.

Trivandrum—Poovar Bus Service.

128 *MR. VARKALA K. MADHAVAN: Will the Government be pleased to state the reason why the Trivandrum-Poovar bus service was stopped?

MR. E. G. SALTER: There has never been a Trivandrum-Poovar Bus service.

MR. VARKALA K. MADHAVAN: May I know whether there was any bus service from Vizhinjam to Poovar?

MR. E. G. SALTER: As far as I know there never was a bus service from Vizhinjam to Poovar.

Shuttle service between Trivandrum and Attingal.

129 *MR. K. A. MATHEW: Will the Government be pleased to state whether they are aware of the necessity for the starting of a transport shuttle service between Trivandrum and Attingal?

MR. E. G. SALTER (*Director of Transport*): Yes. But due to shortage of rolling stock it is not possible to start such a service at present.

MR. A. NESAMONY (*Kalkulam cum Vilavancode*): May I know who fixes the various bus stops on the various roads?

MR. E. G. SALTER: The bus stops are fixed in reference to the public need. But when buses come heavily over-loaded it is not possible to stop them on the route.

MR. A. NESAMONY: Has any representation been received from the people of Nagercoil that certain bus stops should be restored?

MR. E. G. SALTER: Yes, Sir.

MR. A. NESAMONY: Has any action been taken in the matter?

MR. E. G. SALTER: No, Sir.

State Transport.

130 *MR. VARKALA K. MADHAVAN: Will the Government be pleased to state whether they have decided to extend the State Transport from Quilon to Alleppey?

MR. E. G. SALTER: No.

MR. VARKALA K. MADHAVAN: May I know the reasons for not extending the service?

MR. E. G. SALTER: I would suggest, without being offensive, the reasons are so obvious. The Transport Department would be failing in its duty to the public of Travancore if it starts new routes when it is not able to maintain service on the existing routes fully.

Waiting room at the Tiruvalla Bus stand.

131 *MR. K. A. MATHEW: Will the Government be pleased to state whether they are aware of the inconveniences caused to the travelling public owing to the want of a proper waiting room at the Tiruvalla Bus stand?

MR. E. G. SALTER: There is a waiting room at the Bus stand.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: May I know whether the present waiting room is also used as a garage?

MR. E. G. SALTER: No, Sir.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: Will the honourable member kindly enquire and find out whether it is used as a garage or not?

MR. E. G. SALTER: It is too small to be used as a garage.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: I know that the room that is now called waiting room is used as a garage.

MR. E. G. SALTER: I have certainly seen it. There are two garages one on each side and in between there is a waiting room. The room is perhaps too small for a waiting room.

Plywood Factory Ltd., Travancore.

132 ***MR. A. P. UDAYABHANU** (*Karunagapalli cum Kartikapalli*): Will the Government be pleased to give the following information regarding the Plywood Factory Ltd., Travancore:

(a) whether the Travancore Government have taken any shares in it;

(b) what is the proportion in which the shares of the company are held by Travancoreans and non-Travancoreans;

(c) whether there is any contract between the Government and the Company, and if so, the terms of the contract;

(d) whether the company is paying any income tax to our Government;

(e) who are the managing agents of the Company;

(f) has any Travancorean submitted a proposal to start and conduct a similar concern; and

(g) have the Government invited any one in Travancore to take up the industry?

RAO BAHADUR T. V. VENKATESWARA AIYAR (*Conservator of Forests*):

(a) Yes.

(b) 50 per cent. each.

(c) Yes. A copy of the agreement is placed on the Secretary's table.

(d) Yes.

(e) Sir Chinubhai & Sons, Travancore, Ltd.

(f) No.

(g) It was and is quite open to anyone in Travancore to start such an industry.

MR. A. P. UDAYABHANU: May I know whether any private industrial magnates in Travancore offered to take up the Plywood concern?

RAO BAHADUR T. V. VENKATESWARA AIYAR: No, Sir.

MR. A. P. UDAYABHANU: Have the Government taken the first step of calling indigenous talents before they went in for outside capitalists?

RAO BAHADUR T. V. VENKATESWARA AIYAR: Government considered the best interests of the factory.

PRESIDENT: Before further questions are put I want to make the position clear. This is not a monopoly factory. As I have mentioned if any other entrepreneurs wanted to start Plywood factories, there is no objection to start any number of such factories. Government came

[President.]

to the conclusion that a firm which has done successfully a work which was done so unsuccessfully before in Travancore, viz., the work connected with the Rubber factory might be given a chance to start a Plywood factory. That does not prevent any Travancorean starting a Plywood Factory. I have promised 4 or 5 of them that exactly the same or better facilities will be given, but till now no steps have been taken by those who have approached me.

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: May I know the amount of income tax paid by them every year?

PRESIDENT: It is a well known law that nobody can know the amount of income tax paid by any person. It is a law recognised by all Governments and in most courts. The names of the various persons and the amounts paid by them are entirely confidential and any person who divulges that information is acting against the general trend of the law in this matter. If any officer divulges the income tax or super tax or excess profits tax paid by anybody he is liable to instant dismissal. It may be that higher officials may send for information or papers for certain purposes, if there are criminal or other proceedings in which the information will be useful. But otherwise the Head of the Government is not aware of the income tax paid by anybody in the State.

Appointment in the Public Service.

133 * **MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI:** Will the Government be pleased to state the policy underlying the appointment in the Public Service of the State:

(a) of non-Travancoreans; and

(b) of non-Travancoreans above the age of 55?

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: (a) and (b) Such appointments are made when the needs and exigencies of service require an exception being made to the general rule regarding recruitment to public service.

Non-Travancoreans in Government Service.

134 * **MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI** (*Neyyattinkara cum Trivandrum*): Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a list of Non-Travancoreans who have been appointed to places in Government service carrying a pay of Rs. 100 or more during the last five years and will the Government be pleased to give the reason for such appointments?

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: The time and labour involved in the preparation of the answer are disproportionate to its possible utility.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: May I know whether it is because the number is so large that it is not easy to supply the information.

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: The answer is there and it is self explanatory.

Extension of service.

135 * **Ms. K. A. MATHEW:** Will the Government be pleased to state the principle pursued by Government in sanctioning extension of service to officers due to retire?

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: The member is referred to Article 304 T. S. R.

Officers on Rs. 200 and above appointed in Travancore service from outside.

136 *MR. K. A. MATHEW: Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing:

(a) the names of officers drawing Rs. 200 and above appointed in Travancore service from outside the State from the year 1112 onwards;

(b) their qualifications and age;

(c) the names of such of those officers as had been retired from other States or Provinces; and

(d) how many of them are covenanted officers?

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: (a) to (d) The time and labour involved in collecting the required information are out of proportion to its possible utility.

Demands for grants—(contd.)

DEMAND IV—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION EXCLUDING FINANCIAL SECRETARIAT, ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE, LEGISLATIVE BODIES AND LOCAL FUND AUDIT DEPARTMENT.—(contd.)

Motion No. 4.—(contd.)

PRESIDENT: Before I call upon Mr. Sankara Pillai to continue his observations, I may say that what he has stated yesterday has been considered by Government. Government are greatly indebted to the honourable member for the serious grievance that he has brought to the notice of Government. Orders have been passed that every lock-up in the State should be provided with a latrine before the end of 1120.

MR. C. K. SANKARA PILLAI (*Thiruvalla*): I thank the Government for the assurance. In addition to providing latrines and lavatories in every lock-up, my submission is that orders may be immediately issued so that persons in the lock-ups should not be taken along the roads and asked to case themselves on the roads and thus cause nuisance to the travelling public. It is nuisance not only to others but to their own morality and their own sense of responsibility. In the light of the assurance given by the Chair I do not press my motion.

The motion, by leave of the House, was withdrawn.

Motion No. 5.

MR. VARKALA K. MADHAVAN:

To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,75,832 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

(To urge the necessity of lifting the ban on tapioca powdering).

MR. VARKALA K. MADHAVAN: Though I do not want to move the motion standing against my name, I want to bring to the notice of Government that it is only during the war period that the industry has got any chance of development. Government should consider that aspect of the matter.

Motions Nos. 6 to 10.

PRESIDENT : Before I call upon Mr. T. K. Narayana Pillai, I may make a statement. There are 4 or 5 cut motions by members belonging to the State Congress party.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI :

To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,75,832 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

(To discuss the statement of the Dewan re : the Travancore State Congress.)

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI :

To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,75,832 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. XAVIER VINCENT :

To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,75,832 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

(To discuss about the policy of the administration in general.)

MR. V. I. IDICULLA :

To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,75,832 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Rs. 5.

(To discuss about the policy of the administration in general.)

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI :

To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,75,832 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Rs. 5.

(To discuss the administrative policy of the Government in general.)

Regarding the motion of Mr. Nataraja Pillai "To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,75,832 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1" because the object of the motion is not mentioned, it is out of order. Others are token motions to discuss the administrative policy of the Government. The rule on that matter has been stated thus :—

It is a well known practice that token motions or substantial motions involving a review of the general administrative policy of the Government may or may not, at the discretion of the Government, be taken as motions for a vote of want of confidence on the Government. Having regard to what has happened, Government have decided to regard these motions as motions for the vote of want of confidence in the Government, and the procedure regarding the ordinary motions for the vote of want of confidence in the Government will be valid for the motions now tabled. I shall call upon the honourable members who have to move that vote of want of confidence and they will be answered by other honourable members, if they choose to intervene and later by members of the Government. A vote will be taken at the end of that motion and the whole House will be at liberty to vote. This is therefore treated as a motion for a vote of want of confidence in the Government.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI : Sir, to begin with, I may state that the motion which I intend to move is not intended as a no-confidence motion. I made it clear the other day that I must get a fair opportunity to discuss the statement made by you as the Dewan-President.

MR. A. K. BHASKAR (*Quilon cum Kottarakara*): May I know which of the statements the honourable member is referring to? There are many statements made by the Dewan-President.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: If the honourable member had exercised a bit of patience he would have understood what I really meant by the Dewan-President's statement. I mean the statement made by you, Sir, on the second of this month; the statement in reply to the alleged interference of government officials in respect of the elections to the legislature. ✓

PRESIDENT: It comes to this. In regard to the alleged interference, Government said that subordinate officials have repudiated any charge of interference. Government have made themselves responsible for certain statements about certain allegations which had no evidence on the one side or the other; but if the policy adopted by Government is wrong, honourable members are at perfect liberty to move a vote of want of confidence. Whether the honourable member says it is for a vote of want of confidence or not—on a matter of that fundamental importance, *viz.*, the liberty of elections—honourable members have to put forward their theory that the Government have not pursued an even tenor. Then, it is definitely a charge of wrong doing; in other words, the motion is one for the vote of want of confidence in the Government. ✕

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: I want to make my position once more clear. I want only one matter to be discussed and nothing more, and that alone was meant by me. In other words, I want the statement made by you as Dewan to be discussed. You made certain allegations against the State Congress, in respect of the allegations made by the State Congress that Government officials interfered in the matter of the recent elections. I want to meet that point. I want to place before the House certain material points regarding the charges levelled against the State Congress. In passing a vote of confidence or no-confidence, what I wish to bring to the notice of the House is that more materials than now in possession of the members of the House are necessary. That will be made clear in the course of my remarks. That being the case, to pass a motion for recording confidence or no-confidence in the Government, more materials must be placed before the House than I am prepared today. In respect of my motion I will make my position clear. There are allegations on the one side and denials on the other side. To offer a fair criticism, there must be full materials before the House. We say that there was interference by Government officials in the recent elections. No doubt, Government would say that there is no interference. Then an impartial tribunal must be set up to enquire into the matter. ✓

PRESIDENT: I fully realise the cogency and the relevancy of the honourable member's observations. The honourable member's case in fact is that the State Congress is putting forward one group of allegations and the Government are putting forward another group of allegations. The public are at a loss to choose between the veracity

[President.]

of one statement and the other and therefore a public enquiry is needed. From the time of the receipt of the letter from Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai, the President of the State Congress, when he made the allegations, till today, I think that that was the case of the State Congress and Government have decided not to have a public enquiry. That is definite. Therefore the honourable member may proceed with his further observations on the basis that the Government have decidedly negatived the idea of a public enquiry, and therefore if the Government are at fault in having negatived a public enquiry, if the Government have not fulfilled their duty, by turning aside the request made by the State Congress, honourable members are at perfect liberty to attack Government on that basis.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Mine is not a motion of no-confidence on the Government. In order to discuss that question I will have to place more materials than the materials I am prepared to place before the House by reason of the motion which I have placed before the House. That being the case, so far as my motion is concerned, I will confine myself to one matter and no other.....

PRESIDENT: As a matter of fact, all these token motions can be taken together. In other words the motions of Messrs. T. K. Narayana Pillai, Nataraja Pillai, Xavier Vincent, Idiculla and Chellappan Pillai for discussing the administrative policy can be taken together. By that, certain honourable members will be discussing one aspect of the matter. They are at perfect liberty to do so. Other honourable members will put forward any other aspect of the matter that may occur to them and a vote of want of confidence in the Government will be taken after all these motions are disposed of.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: As I understand the constitution, there is no point in putting forward and carrying a vote of no-confidence so long as there is not a removable executive. A no-confidence motion has its legal effect when there is a removable executive.

PRESIDENT: The honourable member apparently has not been paying much attention to the proceedings of the central Legislative Assembly which I was reading. I have been in the central Legislative Assembly myself and I have had a motion for want of confidence moved against me when I was the leader of the House. That will be seen from the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly. Another vote of want of confidence against the Government was moved when I was the leader of the Council of State. That can also be seen from the proceedings of the Council of State. A removable executive is effectively dealt with by a vote of want of confidence because on the passing of the vote of want of confidence the executive resigns, but even in the case of an irremovable executive as in the case of the American Legislature and as in the case of the Indian Legislature, a vote of want of confidence means that the people do not consider that Government are doing their duty. That is the meaning of the vote of want of confidence in an ir-removable executive.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Then I take it that this House has jurisdiction to pass a vote of no-confidence on the executive.

PRESIDENT: Only in this way; that is, a vote cannot be directed by a motion that the Dewan be removed. That will be irrelevant. In fact I go further and say that all appointments above Rs. 500 are not even votable. It is not open to this House to say that the Chief Secretary, The Excise Commissioner, Mr. Salter, or Mr. Ure be removed from office. That will be out of order. But to move that the policy of the Government is wrong as indicated in the Indian Legislature can be done by a token cut in the General Administration Budget. That is the only occasion on which an opinion about Government policy would be possible. In no other budget item can, what may be called the general opinion of the House as to the policy of the Government be given. It is only on the General Administration Budget and that by a token cut that it may be done.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: I will now proceed with the subject matter under discussion. You made a statement in reply to certain allegations about the interference of Government officials in the recent elections against certain members set up by members belonging to my party. By those allegations we wanted to elicit an answer from the Government whether Government officials have interfered in the elections as against the candidates set up by the State Congress.

The reply given by the Chief Secretary to Government was that there was no interference. You will remember that that was the very first statement that you made on the opening day of this Assembly in this new year. We the members of the State Congress, expected from you, Sir, the soft words which would turn away wrath. But instead, we found words which were to a very great extent wounding to our self-respect. You made very serious charges against the State Congress, and we may honestly confess before you Sir, that we were stunned and stupefied at that statement. We were really not prepared for that statement.

Now, I proceed to consider the various aspects of that statement. Your statement, as well as the reply given by the Chief Secretary, must be read together. What does that indicate? You said in your statement that the State Congress was an organisation whose activities led to mob violence in 1933, 1940 and 1941. Further, you say that the State Congress is an organisation which is setting up labour and student movements so as to create unrest in this country, and thirdly you said that you have made this view of the Government clear to the officials so that even if they have interfered in the matter of elections, there would be justification for such interference.

PRESIDENT: It is not correct. What I said was that the officials were forbidden to interfere in the elections. But it would not be correct to say that the attitude of the Government—which naturally would be reflected to a certain extent in the attitude of the officials—would be to say that the State Congress as a body is guilty of what I have

[President.]

indicated. At the same time, the honourable members will realise that I proceeded further in that statement to say that notwithstanding this opinion of Government, Government were convinced that there was a body of people in Travancore who held those opinions and were members of the State Congress, and that the Government wanted their opinion to be represented on the floor of the House. This matter was also equally made obvious, and was communicated to the officers. That is the position.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Now, Sir, if your statement did really mean to say—I have no other reason to assume otherwise—that in spite of the fact that the attitude of the Government was made known to the officials and in spite of the fact that you have given strict instructions to the officials not to interfere in the elections, there was some interference unwittingly on the part of officials, it would have been no grievance to us. But my point is this. I understand that statement to mean that even if the Government officials did interfere, it was a matter for which they were not to be blamed but that you as the Head of the Administration would take the responsibility upon yourself. \wedge

PRESIDENT: No. I deny that with great respect. I no doubt took upon myself the responsibility. The responsibility which I assumed is the responsibility for those two views, on the attitude of the State Congress. The first is that the State Congress was in the opinion of Government—this opinion is borne out by the materials before them and is not capricious—primarily responsible for acts of violence and sabotage. I may, in this connection, say that the year 1939 will have to be carried back to one more year, namely 1938. And so the Government were convinced of the fact that the State Congress incited the students, and collaborated with certain subversive leaders of the labour movement—a collaboration which I wish again to say continues today. At the same time I said that the Government were nevertheless anxious that the State Congress should be adequately represented on the floor of this House. This is the second view. If officers have not understood both those statements and have misconceived the intentions of Government the honourable member is at perfect liberty to point out such instances.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: I was trying to analyze the statement, Sir, which you made on the second of this month. I submit that in the first place you said that the State Congress was responsible for the disturbances of 1939, 1940 and 1941. The question is whether there were alleged disturbances for which the State Congress was directly or indirectly responsible. The second question is, granting for a moment that there were such disturbances, is it a matter for consideration at this stage and in this Assembly? Is it a matter on which a statement should be made to us? Is it a matter on which a warning should be given to us especially on the day when the Session opened? \wedge

As a matter of fact, there were allegations on the one side and denials on the other. The Government said that there were disturbances and those disturbances originated from the State Congress. The State Congress denied it and repeatedly asked for enquiry on the matter. Till now, there has been no enquiry and the matter rests where it was. Even granting for a moment that there were disturbances and they had indirect connection with the State Congress, is it a matter for contemplation now, in the year 1944? Three years have elapsed since those alleged occurrences took place and is it a matter for contemplation at this stage?

MR. K. A. MATHEW: May I know from the honourable member whether the Government withdraw the case against those who were alleged to have been connected with the State Congress in Chengannur?

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: I shall deal with it. There was a serious charge against a large number of people before the Sessions Court, Quilon, and the case has since been withdrawn. The allegations were that they indulged in many illegalities such as breaking open locks, damaging culverts and bridges, preventing people from entering the town, etc., which proved to be unfounded.

What I wish to urge is: Is it a matter for contemplation at this stage? The State Congress has a constitution of its own. The State Congress has got a written constitution. It has got a Working Committee called the "All Travancore State Congress Committee." Has it ever been proved that the disturbances to which reference has been made were connected with the members of the Committee? X

Now, Sir, you referred to the Indian National Congress. What is the attitude of the British Government towards the Indian National Congress? What is it that we find in British India? In the year 1921 Mahatma Gandhi made the following statement in respect of the activities of his own followers at one stage. I will read that portion. "I have said times without number that a Satyagrahi admits no violence no pillage, no incendiarism. Still, in the name of a Satyagrahi, you burn down buildings, extort money, stop trains, cut telegraph wires kill innocent people and plunder shops and private houses." That was what Mahatma Gandhi said. And in the following year, 1924, we found his followers entering the Central Assembly and the Provincial Assemblies. Pandit Motilal Nehru and a group of followers entered the Assembly and you, Sir, cannot be unaware of their activities, very useful activities, in the Central Assembly in 1924 and onwards.

Simply because that some insignificant members of the State Congress, some unimportant members of the State Congress, some years past, were connected with violence, is it right that we, the present members of the State Congress, should be condemned? Is it the reason that we would not behave with any sense of responsibility. My submission, therefore, is that the reason given for condemning the State Congress—the first reason given for condemning the State Congress—cannot stand scrutiny.

[Mr. T. K. Narayana Pillai.]

I would then submit before this House that in the year 1930, Mahatma Gandhi declared his Civil Disobedience Movement, and the movement lasted for one year. In the year 1935, we found Congressmen, who were guided by Mahatma Gandhi entering the Legislatures all over British India and forming Ministries. In eight out of the eleven provinces they formed their own ministries and they were treated as trusted Ministers. But what were they doing in 1922 and 1930 and in the years that preceded? In 1921, Mahatma Gandhi started his non-co-operation movement. What was the avowed object? It was to mend or end the British Government in India. He called the Government 'satanic'. Nevertheless, in 1935, we found the Congressmen forming ministries. My point is that by the activities of a few violently-minded followers of an organisation, the whole organisation cannot lose its integrity. If, Sir, there were disturbances in Kadakkal or in some other place, the whole organisation cannot be condemned. An organisation like ours cannot be indicted on that ground. Therefore, my submission is that the first point in your statement about condemning our organisation cannot bear scrutiny. X

The second point is that we were inciting the student and the labour population in the State in order to create unrest. In the first place, the statement has never been accepted by us. We have repudiated that time and again. Labour has its own organisation in the State. The students too have their own organisation. We have never interfered with those organisations. It is not our object to enter into the activities of their organisations. But, if the students and the labourers sympathise with the State Congress and join us, can it be our fault? Can the waters of a river flow anywhere else except towards the great Ocean? And therefore I ask: Is it a wonder when the student and the labour population which form the most progressive elements in the State sympathise with and join the only political organisation in the State? My submission therefore, is that the second point urged by you in order to condemn our organisation cannot also stand scrutiny.

The third point is in fact the most important point, viz., the interference in elections. If there was any interference in the elections as a matter of fact, there was much - was there any moral or legal justification for it? As I submitted before, there are very definite and clear allegations as regards the Government interference in the elections. But I shall not complain about what happened in my own constituency, not because I have no grievance, but I do not want to make any complaint about anybody. I am prepared to suffer without making any complaint. I have been insulted. I have been subjected to all sorts of humiliations. Nevertheless, I do not complain because I am not one of those who believe on punishments at the hands of an earthly tribunal. I leave it to higher powers than man.

Sir, I humbly submit that there is a deep felt grievance throughout the country about what took place in this city of Trivandrum. About the nature of the complaint and what it means, I will do well to explain it by quoting a letter which the President of the State Congress sent to you, Sir, and it has been placed on the table under your direction. This is what Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai says :

" It is with regret that I address you on the present state of affairs in the city consequent on the conduct of Government Officials in relation to the coming election to the Sri Mulam Assembly. Officers such as "Mr. K. G. Kunju Krishna Pillai, the Legal Remembrancer, Mr. Oosman the local D. S. P., Mr. Sankaranarayana Iyer the city A. S. P., Mr. Oomen the Cantonment Inspector of Police, Mr. Chandrasekharan Nair the Corporation Commissioner, Mr. Sankara Menon, Welfare Officer and a host of other officers of the Excise, Police, Education and other Government Departments are freely and openly canvassing support for Mr. C. S. Lekshmana Aiyar the candidate opposing the State Congress Candidate Mr. K. Gopala Pillai. These officers openly declare that Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar is really the Government's candidate and that any body who votes for Mr. Gopala Pillai will be found out and severely dealt with by Government. Departmental heads, it is said, have instructed their subordinates to vote for Mr. C. S. Lekshmana Aiyar. The Director of Public Instruction and the Excise Commissioner are prominently mentioned in this connection. An Assistant School Inspector by name Mr. K. Thanu Pillai is said to have visited even the High Schools of the city with a voters' list and taken signatures of teacher voters, compelling them to vote for Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar. The officers have succeeded in instilling in their subordinates the fear that if they did not vote for Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar, they would lose their jobs. The fear is also widespread that trouble would befall any one who does not vote for the "Government Candidate". The Chief Secretary himself is said to have exerted his influence in favour of Mr. C. S. Lekshmana Aiyar. The officers go to the extent of telling people that Government will, after the election, violate the sanctity of the secret ballot, scrutinise the ballot papers, find out those voters that did not support Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar, dismiss such of them that are in service and otherwise harm others. The wonder is that they do not realise that the propaganda brings Government into great contempt.....".

Well, Sir, these are very serious allegations.

PRESIDENT : The honourable member having read that letter, according to ordinary rules of debate, he would be doing well if he reads the reply also.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI : Yes, Sir.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI : Since my name has been mentioned, I may be given an opportunity to make a reply.

PRESIDENT : That shall be done.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI : In fairness, I must read that letter. The reply is :

"Your letter of the 6th instant contains serious allegations against many officials of the State to whom I shall communicate its contents though it is difficult for me to believe that they will contravene the instructions of Government or would try to influence the elections. (Of course, you will realise that Mr. K. G. Kunjukrishna Pillai is a part-time employee of Government and is not an official in the usually accepted meaning of the term.) That the Government have taken a neutral attitude must be evident from the fact that, for instance, your wife and the wife of the Trivandrum candidate Mr. Gopala Pillai

[Mr. T. K. Narayana Pillai.]

are both Government servants notwithstanding your attitude and the attitude of the State Congress towards this Government and towards the Head of the Administration. You may also remember that during the period of elections, complaints such as those outlined in your letter are very common. (This does not mean that they will be ignored.)

For example, reports of alleged talks by you with several persons have reached me, and in some cases from the very persons to whom you have spoken. Among such complaints are ; (a) that when approaching certain Nairs (whose names have been given to me) you have asked them to vote for the Nair candidate so as to preserve Nair self-respect ; (b) that Mr. Gopala Pillai is only a name lender in this election and that he will resign so as to enable you to stand for election as soon as practicable. I have not myself paid any credence to such rumours.....".

MR. K. A. MATHEW : Sir, in this connection may I know whether Mr. K. G. Kunjukrishna Pillai is a part time officer of Government?

PRESIDENT : Of course, yes.

MR. K. A. MATHEW : Then, may I know how he is nominated to this House as an official member?

PRESIDENT : The position of a person who is either a part time or full time official is that he can sit on the official bench. The Advocate General is a part time official and having occupied the position of Advocate General and having sat on the official bench, having nevertheless voted against the Government of the day in the Hindu Religious Endowment Bill, I quite see that the position of part time officials of Government is peculiar. The honourable members may be aware that there are certain members who are not asked to give up their practice but who are given certain official positions. The Advocate General, Government Pleaders in certain jurisdictions, the Attorney General in England are all in this position. The matter will be made clear by the circumstance which I referred to. As the Advocate General of Madras, I differed from the Government of the time being with regard to the Religious Endowment Bill. I was sitting on the official bench. I took the permission of Government to vote against the measure. The honourable members who may see the report of the proceedings of the Legislature on the Bill will find that an official member voted against Government on an official bill. ✓

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI : Now, Sir, therefore these allegations are very serious and very definite allegations have been made. It was alleged by the Chief Secretary the other day that.....

MR. E. G. SALTER : Sir, the honourable member made mention of certain heads of departments and said that they interfered in the elections. I take the strongest objection to that suggestion for this reason.

PRESIDENT : This is not the time to defend. Let the member finish his speech. Having regard to the importance of the subject and the position of Mr. Narayana Pillai as the leader of the party, I have given him some considerable time and perhaps as much time as he wanted. So, he would try to finish soon.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Now, in reply to the letter of the Dewan, the State Congress working committee passed a resolution. It was also forwarded to Government. It will be in the fitness of things if I am allowed to read that resolution also for the information of the House. This is the resolution: X

"This joint meeting of the working committee and the Parliamentary Board considered the correspondence that passed between the President of the State Congress and the Dewan on the question of official interference in the Trivandrum city election in the Sri Mulam Assembly, and the nature and extent of such interference in the various constituencies in which State Congress candidates contested. It is clear that Government officers threw their weight against State Congress candidates almost everywhere. In the city of Trivandrum interference by Government officials in the election went so far that it appeared that the State Congress was being opposed by a Government candidate. Even though the Dewan wrote to the President on 7-7-1944 that the attitude of Government was neutral, interference by Government officers continually increased in volume and intensity till the polling was over. Government officers in the city, as a rule, interested themselves in favour of Mr. C. S. Lekshmana Aiyar, many of them going out canvassing support for him. The Police, Revenue, Excise, Corporation and other staff made house to house canvassing and distributed Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar's cards among the voters and on the polling day took voters to the polling stations. The officers created among voters the wide-spread fear that the Government would scrutinise the ballot papers, dismiss Government servants who or whose relations did not vote for Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar and otherwise effectively harm others who did not do so. They even threatened that ration card would be cancelled as a penalty for not voting for Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar. Officials such as the Chief Secretary are said to have ordered their subordinates to go out and do canvassing. It was universally recognised that Mr. C. S. Lekshmana Aiyar was the Government candidate and the Government were bent on sending him returned. High officers are said to have promised jobs to so many non-officials and secured their support. On the polling day the cars of some Government officials were used for taking voters for Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar and a large number of taxis were also used for that purpose. While all this was being done, the police had effectively prevented taxi cars and even jutkas from being available for the use of State Congress workers. Mr. K. G. Kunjukrishna Pillai, the legal Remembrancer whom the Dewan characterises as only a part time employee of Government and who was openly canvassing support for Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar, went round the polling stations and gave directions to the polling officers so that polling might take place as much in Lekshmana Aiyar's favour as possible. To these polling officers he said that voting could very well be done in the direct presence of such officers, evidently with a view to securing the vote in his candidate's favour. False personation was allowed to take place with the help of Corporation employees who were the identifying officers, so much so that even the Mayor of the City was personated and when he went to the polling station to vote he had to tender his vote. This widespread interference by officials calls for an open and impartial enquiry and this meeting requests Government to be pleased to institute one."

So, my submission is this.

MR. M. L. JANARDHANA PILLAI: The reply to that may also be read.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Yes, Sir. It is fair I read that also. It reads:

"I have just received your letter of 5-12-1119/20-7-1944 communicating resolution passed at the joint meeting of the Working Committee and the Parliamentary Board of the Travancore State Congress.

[Mr. T. K. Narayana Pillai.]

I am enclosing a copy of my letter to you dated the 7th July 1944 and a copy of the Government Circular on the subject. If, as stated in your letter, there have been infractions of these directions and instructions, the only course contemplated by the law is to proceed under Rule 31 of the Electoral Rules which lays down that "Save as provided in Rule 24 or 24A, no election shall be called in question except by an election petition presented in accordance with the provisions of Part VI of the Electoral Rules". The rules also prescribe the time limit for election petitions and the procedure in respect of them.

As a lawyer, you will, no doubt, realise that such an enquiry as is asked for would not only be against the letter and spirit of the above provision but may gravely prejudice the result of any election petition. It is hardly necessary to point out that if, after investigation and enquiry, Government should come to the conclusion that the allegations are not borne out by the facts, the conduct of the election petition may be gravely prejudiced.

In these circumstances, Government can only await the results of any election petition that may be filed and cannot, in the nature of things, comply with your request."

Now, Sir, it is clear from this correspondence that very serious allegations are made and the Government reply is that there was no interference. Even if there was, it would be proper that it must be enquired into by an election tribunal. Now, Sir, two questions arise. In the matter of election petition, the validity of the election is contested. It may be that nobody is prepared to contest for the election. As such if Mr. Lekshmana Iyer or any body else is here, does not matter. It may well be that there may be nobody here. Whatever that be, nevertheless, there is the conduct of the officials which is so seriously alleged in this complaint. It is a matter which must certainly be enquired into. Otherwise, it would reflect on the conduct of the administration and the period of the administration.

PRESIDENT: Order, order. As the honourable member has already read the last paragraph, he would have realised that what the Government said was this, and nothing more or less than this. If an election has been canvassed, a certain exclusive and primary legal procedure is prescribed for putting it right. It is not possible for Government to embark upon an enquiry into the general character of the elections so long as there is the possibility and the great chance of an election petition being filed. The honourable member will no doubt realise that the time for filing has not yet elapsed. Even now there is time for filing that petition.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Sir, I quite see the point, but my submission is this. What the State Congress leader wanted was that the officials were interfering in the election from day to day and it must be enquired into. Sir, we are not so much interested in the result of the election as in the conduct of the officials. If that were true, it would go to show that there was no such thing as the rule of law existing in the State. The rules are very clear in that the officials shall not interfere in any manner, directly or indirectly. Those rules are

based on reason and commonsense. These rules are scrupulously observed in England where we see the people glorying in their democratic institutions. In that matter there is a definite rule of law.

PRESIDENT: If the honourable member had seen the elections for the County of Derby in England, perhaps the member would revise his opinion.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Even if it is true... ..

PRESIDENT: I do not say this in justification. I was just saying that even in the home of liberty, there is room for allegations against the conduct of elections. This very matter of election for the County of Derby came up and it was pointed out that 18 people controlled the election of 110 members of Parliament.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: But is that not an exception rather than the rule?

PRESIDENT: I am not justifying anything. I am only stating that it should not be taken for granted that in England there is no room for allegations against elections. The allegations may be untrue or may be true.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Any way, if such a check had been made in British India, it is clear that the National Congress would never have been able to be returned in such large numbers as they have actually been returned and enabled to form ministries in eight out of eleven Provinces. I say, therefore, these complaints, according to the allegations contained in them, make it clear that the rule of law has been violated in this country. The right of franchise in this respect, has been infringed and there is practically no safety for a self-respecting citizen in the country. These are very grave allegations to maintain, and Sir, it is only in the fitness of things that a proper enquiry is made and the result announced to the public at large. And this correspondence reveals that the Government is not prepared to make such enquiries. The Chief Secretary stated that an enquiry was made into the allegations, but he also admitted that it was done behind the back of the complainants. That shows that there is involved in this an infringement of the moral codes of decorum. It is almost as if the man has been condemned behind his back.

And when all is said and done, the matter resolves itself into this. Was there any justification, legal or moral... ..

PRESIDENT: I know that I have interrupted the honourable member more than once. Nevertheless the fact remains that the honourable member has spoken for 32 minutes. The honourable member will be given five minutes more.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Yes, Sir.

When all is said and done, the matter comes to this. You made an allegation against us on the very opening day of the New Year. Was there any justification to make that statement. The statement,

[Mr. T. K. Narayana Pillai]

when analysed, comes to this: you 11 members of this House cannot be treated with the consideration.....

PRESIDENT: With very great respect, No. I want that to be made absolutely clear. So long as any honourable member sits here in this house, as a representative of his constituency, he is entitled to as much consideration and honour as any other member either a Government officer or anybody else. It would be in the highest degree derogatory to the position of Government and contradictory to fundamental principles to treat honourable members, so long as they are here as members of the Legislature, otherwise than with the utmost consideration and respect. That is very different from saying that outside this house, they represent, and in the opinion of Government, unfortunately represent, a body as to whom Government have a certain opinion. That opinion has reference to the conduct of the political body as such political body. It is taken for granted that honourable members, speaking within the house, will speak as representatives of their constituencies fearlessly and freely and be entitled to equal treatment with every other member.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Sir, the point that I was trying to develop is this. There was no justification for the statement that you made. What, after all, was the occasion for making that statement? Certain interpellations were put up for answering. Sir, I ask is it not our inherent right to put questions? The questions may be unpleasant, the questions may be unreasonable, the questions may even be malicious; but have we not the right to put malicious questions, if we wanted?

PRESIDENT: That is why they were not disallowed. But I can say thus much; malicious questions, insinuating questions should not be put.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: I do not challenge that. But they can be overruled.

PRESIDENT: And also the supplementary statements on the questions.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: My submission is that the matter will rest there.

PRESIDENT: The question is, if there is a right on one side to put malicious questions, is there not a right on the other side not to give malicious but strong and emphatic answers. The answer is Yes.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: If malicious questions are put, they are not placed before the house. But certain questions were placed before the house and your statement arose out of those questions. It is clear from the fact that these questions were placed before the house, that they were not malicious. Have we not the right to put inconvenient, and unpleasant questions? Is that not a right inherent in us?

Sir, on the New Year's day, instead of welcoming us, instead of offering us some soft words, you turned on us in wrath.

PRESIDENT: I am not sure. I did not certainly give a stock answer to the honourable members. I offered co-operation to every member. That offer still stands.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Now therefore my submission is that the statement that was made was unjustifiable. It was unjust to the organisation which we represent.

And what, after all is our organisation? This organisation began five years ago in response to a resolution passed by the Haripura Congress Session. The Indian National Congress, which claimed to represent the whole of India, thought fit not to interfere with the affairs of the Native States. They said that the Native States must form their body to.....

PRESIDENT: The honourable member has exceeded his time. The honourable member has spoken for 36 minutes already.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: The Haripura Congress passed a resolution and stated that the Native States must develop their own institutions. Is it not, Sir, quite in the fitness of things that this State should also try to set up its own institution?

PRESIDENT: The honourable member may have half a minute more.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: I stop, Sir.

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI: Sir, the other day I was painfully following your words. When emotions are up.....

PRESIDENT: I want to make the position clear. I am calling upon all these honourable members, Messrs T. K. Narayana Pillai, Nataraja Pillai, Xavier Vincent, Idiculla, and Chellappan Pillai who have given notice of their motions to speak in respect of the policy of the administration in general. The honourable member, therefore, need not confine himself to this question of elections.

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI: When emotions are up, passion and prejudice cloud our vision. Sir, we are debating a proposition and of course, the function of this house is to debate too. That presupposes the fact that we approach the question to argue it logically and reasonably. Let us not forget that.

We are now considering the opinion that was expressed here by the head of the administration about the State Congress. I claim to be a member of that organisation. The opinion expressed was that the organisation indulged and indulges in subversive activities. If there is conviction behind that, if there are irrefutable proofs to substantiate it, we should not be here debating but should be defending ourselves before a Court of Law or sitting in the spacious jails. We should have been the companions of the convicts there and not the colleagues of the head of the administration here. As long as that was not done and as long as we are allowed to be here, I am forced to think and say that the Government have not the courage of conviction to hold an open enquiry and to prove the charges that have been made.

[Mr. P. S. Nataraja Pillai]

Then, Sir, the unfortunate incidents that took place in 1941 and 42 are attributed to the propaganda carried on by the State Congress. The spasmodic, isolated acts of violence on the part of a mob cannot, reasonably be attributed to an organisation unless there are irrefutable evidence to prove that the organisation actively engaged itself in such propaganda. On the other hand, the State Congress as such, even from those days, has repeatedly asked for an open impartial enquiry into the causes of those unfortunate incidents, but Government have not so far held an open enquiry and it can only mean that there are no evidence to prove the suspicion. Personalities are imported, prejudices begin to function and charges are made. Viewed from this standpoint it is, to use the mildest language, unfair to us and unfair to the minister in whom His Highness has placed his trust.

These accusations do not and will not carry us anywhere but to futilities.

Now, may I, with your permission, bring to the notice of this house, one other relevant fact. That irrepressible Indian national.....

PRESIDENT : I take it that the honourable member is addressing the house only with the aid of notes. The honourable member is not entitled to read from a manuscript.

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI : I am using only notes.

✓ That irrepressible Indian national aspiration, personified in the Indian National Congress, cannot be confined to the other side of the Ghats and naturally the consequence was the cry for responsible Government here. The Haripura Congress decision on Native States gave birth to Travancore State Congress.

✓ In every political movement there are and bound to be phases which are dictated by changing circumstances and environments. But the objective of the movement persists and if it is good, it is bound to thrive in spite of set backs on its way.

✓ Sir, the State Congress stands for a clear objective,—for responsible Government-- and with the good will of the people it is bound to succeed in the long run. It is the common lot of political workers and political organisations to be classed as anti-Government agitators and anti-Government organisations. But, Sir, we have also known of persons who were considered dangerous to carry on propaganda on the free English soil and turned back at Malta being invited to represent the Empire at Geneva. We have known of persons convicted for sedition being received by His Majesty the King-Emperor. We have also heard of rebels of yesterday becoming ministers of the Crown to-day. Let not passion and prejudice cloud our reason and vision and mislead us. May I ask you Sir not to forget facts of history.

We were dubbed as the three tailors of the Tooly street by an eloquent honourable member of this house. I have neither the capacity nor the mind to reply him in his words. I will be doing an injustice to myself if I do so. But may I in all humility invite your notice

to the fact that in a correct analysis of the composition of this house, you will find these benches representing more than one third of the population. One third of the population may be to one who thinks that he represents the whole state and population, the famous tailors of that famous street, but I respectfully beg this house to take note of the implications of that fact. ✕

The State Congress was considered by the Head of the Administration as subversive and anti Government in its outlook. And it was said that fact was not kept secret from the public and the Government servants. What is the implication? Sir, I from my personal knowledge, can charge the Government servants with active interference during the recent elections. I do so with a sense of responsibility. In the light of the statement of the Dewan I refrain from mentioning the names of the officers since the Head of the Administration has taken up the responsibility for that. (*President's Bell.*) I leave it at that. ✓

MR. XAVIER VINCENT (*Ambalapuzha cum Shertalai*): സർ, ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട പ്രസിഡൻ്റ് അവാർകൾ കഴിഞ്ഞ ഒരഭിവൃദ്ധി പരയുകയുണ്ടായി പൈതൃകമായ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് മന്ത്രിമാരുടേതായ തൊഴിലാളികളെക്കുറിച്ച് ഞാൻ ആദ്യകാലങ്ങളിൽ വിചിത്രമായിട്ടുണ്ടായിരുന്നു. അതിനു വിപരീതമായ ഒരു നയം അദ്ദേഹം തൊഴിലാളികൾ അങ്ങയുടെ ഭ്രഷ്ടിയിൽ എങ്ങനെയാണു് സ്റ്റേറ്റ് മന്ത്രി വിധേയമാകാതെത്തന്നെ എനിക്കു മനസ്സിലാകുന്നില്ല. ഈ അടുത്ത അവസരത്തിൽ നടന്ന ഇലക്ഷൻ സംരംഭങ്ങളിൽ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് കാൺഗ്രസിനെ പ്രത്യേകമായും, പരോക്ഷമായും സഹായിച്ചു എന്നുള്ളതാണ് അവരുടെ കററകെങ്കിൽ ഞാൻ അങ്ങയുടെ ഭ്രഷ്ടിയിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരുന്ന ഒരു സംഗതി മറ്റൊന്നുമല്ല, സ്റ്റേറ്റ് കാൺഗ്രസ്സ് പ്രകടപത്രികയിൽ വിശദമായി വിളിച്ചു പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ളതു് തൊഴിലാളികൾക്കു കർഷകർക്കും വേണ്ടി ആ സംഘടന എന്നും നിലകൊള്ളുമെന്നാണ്. കാൺഗ്രസിൻ്റെ ഈ അഭിപ്രായം തൊഴിലാളികളും കർഷകരും കേട്ടുകിൽ, അഥവാ കേട്ടു് തെറ്റാണെങ്കിൽ അതിൻ്റെ കാൺഗ്രസ്സും തൊഴിലാളിസംഘടനകളും തെറ്റുകാരായിട്ടുപോകുന്നതു എങ്ങനെയാണെന്നു് മനസ്സിലാകുന്നില്ല. സർ, തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ഏറ്റവും രാഷ്ട്രീയ പ്രബുദ്ധതയുള്ള ഒരു ജനവിഭാഗത്തെ ഉൾക്കൊള്ളുന്ന സംഘടനകളാണു തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ തൊഴിലാളിസംഘടനകൾ. സുസമ്മതമായ നേതൃത്വത്തിൽ വ്യവസായപരോഗമനത്തിൽ ഏൽപ്പിച്ചു പ്രദർശിപ്പിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു് മുന്നോട്ടു് പോയ്കൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന

[Mr. Xavier Vincent]

തൊഴിലാളിസംഘടനകളോടു് അവിടുന്ന് എടുക്കുമെന്നു ഞങ്ങൾ ഭയപ്പെടുന്ന നയം ഭയമായി മാറണമെന്ന് അപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നു. സർ, തൊഴിലാളി സംഘടനകൾക്ക് ഈ സമയത്ത് പ്രതിനിധ്യം അനുവദിച്ചുകൊടുക്കണമെന്ന് പല പ്രാവശ്യവും സംഘടനകൾ ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുണ്ട്. എന്നാൽ അഖിലതീരവിതാംകൂർ ട്രേഡ് യൂണിയൻ ഓൺഗ്രസ്സിനു ചീഫ് സെക്രട്ടറി അവർകൾ അയച്ച ഒരു കത്തിൽ പ്രസ്താവിക്കുകയുണ്ടായി മി. വൻസൻറും, പി. കെ. കുഞ്ഞും നിങ്ങൾക്കു ഉണ്ടല്ലോ എന്നു. സർ, വിൻസൻറും, പി. കെ. കുഞ്ഞും തൊഴിലാളികളും മുതലാളിമാരും ഉൾപ്പെട്ട പലതാല്പര്യങ്ങളും ഉൾക്കൊള്ളുന്ന ഒരു നിയോജകമണ്ഡലത്തിൽ നിന്നും തിരഞ്ഞെടുക്കപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുള്ളവരാണ്.

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN: മി. പി. കെ. കുഞ്ഞു് തൊഴിലാളിസംഘടനയിൽ ഒരുഗമാണെന്ന് ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർക്കറിയാമോ?

MR. XAVIER VINCENT: ഞങ്ങൾ രണ്ടുപേരും തൊഴിലാളിസംഘടനയിൽ മെമ്പർ അല്ല.

MR. G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI (*Imbalaipuzha cum Shertalai*) : മി. പി. കെ. കുഞ്ഞു് ഏതെങ്കിലും തൊഴിലാളി സംഘടനയിൽ പ്രസിഡൻറായി ഇരുന്നിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. XAVIER VINCENT: ഇരുന്നിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നാണു എന്റെ വിശ്വാസം. പക്ഷെ, ദിവിധതാല്പര്യങ്ങൾ ഉൾക്കൊള്ളുന്ന നിയോജകമണ്ഡലങ്ങളിൽ നിന്നും തിരഞ്ഞെടുക്കപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുള്ള ഞങ്ങളെ തൊഴിലാളികളുടെ പ്രത്യേക താല്പര്യങ്ങളുടെ സംരക്ഷണത്തിനായിട്ട് ഗവണ്മെൻറിൽനിന്നും നിയമനമുക്കിയതിൽ സന്തോഷിക്കുന്നു, എങ്കിലും തൊഴിലാളികൾക്ക് പ്രത്യേകം അംഗീകാരം ഉൾപ്പെടുത്തണമെന്ന തിരഞ്ഞെടുത്തു് ഓമിനേറ്റു ചെയ്ത പ്രതിനിധ്യം കൊടുക്കണമെന്ന് ഞാൻ ശക്തിയായി വാദിക്കുകയും, ഗവണ്മെൻറിന്റെ ദയാദ്രഷ്ടി അതിലേക്ക് പതിയണമെന്ന് അപേക്ഷിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നു.

തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ബഹുഭൂരിപക്ഷം ജനങ്ങൾ തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ജനാധിപത്യത്തെ നിറയുന്നതായിട്ട് ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട ഫിനാൻഷ്യൽ സെക്രട്ടറി കഴിഞ്ഞദിവസം ഇവിടെ ഒരു സ്റ്റേറ്റുമെൻറിൽ പറഞ്ഞതു് നമുക്ക് അറിയാവുന്നതാണ്. തൊഴിലാളികൾ ഇപ്പോൾ കൂലി കൂട്ടുതൽ കിട്ടുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു് ധാരാളം കുളുകുടിക്കുന്നു എന്നു്. ദീവിതാ

വശ്യങ്ങളുടെ വില മുന്തൂക്കങ്ങൾ നാനൂറുവരെ ശതമാനം വർദ്ധിപ്പിച്ചുള്ള ഈ അവസരത്തിൽ തൊഴിലാളികൾക്ക് ൨൦ ശതമാനം വാർത്താലവ സ്കൂൾ മാത്രമാണ് കൂടുതൽകിട്ടുന്നത്. അല്ലാതെ അവരുടെ അടിസ്ഥാന ക്രമീകരണത്തിൽ യാതൊരു ഭേദഗതിയും ഉണ്ടായിട്ടില്ലെന്ന് അറിയിച്ചു കൊള്ളുന്നു. സർ, ഞാൻ ഒന്നുകൂടി ചോദിക്കുന്നു, എനിക്കും, മി. പി. കെ. കുഞ്ഞിനും തൊഴിലാളി സംഘടനകളെ പ്രതിനിധീകരിക്കാൻ പ്രത്യേകകാര്യമുള്ളതുകൊണ്ട്, എന്ന് ഗവണ്മെന്റ് പരാജയപ്പെട്ട സമയത്ത്, തൊഴിലാളികൾക്ക് നാമിനേഷൻ കൊടുത്തില്ലെങ്കിൽ, മി. വാ. ഗംഗാധരൻനായർ മലയാളരാജ്യത്തിന്റെ എഡിറ്റർ ആയിരിക്കെ മലയാളരാജ്യത്തിൽ മരണാനന്തര നാമിനേഷൻ കൂടി കൊടുത്തത് എന്തിനാണെന്ന്. ഈ നയം അവരോട് കാണിക്കുന്നത് തൊഴിലാളികൾ സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രൂപ്പ് കാരോടു കാണിച്ച സഹകരണമനോഭാവംകൊണ്ടാണെങ്കിൽ ഞങ്ങൾ അങ്ങയുടെ യോഗ്യത പാവപ്പെട്ട ഈ മുകൾക്കൂട്ടത്തോടു കാണിക്കാൻ അപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നു.

ഞാൻ ഒരു മിന്നിട്ടുകൂടി സംസാരിച്ചുകൊള്ളട്ടേ. കുഴിഞ്ഞദിവസങ്ങളിൽ ആലുവയിൽ നടന്ന ഒരു ഭാര്യണമായ സംഭവത്തെപ്പറ്റി തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ പത്രം വായിക്കുന്നവരെല്ലാം അറിഞ്ഞിരിക്കുമെന്ന് വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നു ഏതാനും പില തൊഴിലാളിസഹോദരന്മാർ കൂടുതൽ കൂടി ആവശ്യപ്പെടുകയും മാനേജരോട് ന്യായവാദം ചെയ്യുകയും ചെയ്തതിൽ ആലുവാ പോലീസ് ക്സീഡെ മാനേജർ അവരിൽ ചിലരെ ഭേദപാപദ്രവമേല്പിക്കുകയുണ്ടായി. അതിനെ പ്രതിഷേധിച്ച് അവിടെ ഒരു തൊഴിലാളികൾ ഒരു സ്കൈപ്പിനടത്തി. എന്നാൽ വിശാല മനസ്കരും ഗവണ്മെന്റിനോടു വളരെ യോജിച്ചു പ്രവർത്തനം നടത്തണമെന്ന് ആഗ്രഹിക്കുന്നവരുമായ തൊഴിലാളി നേതാക്കന്മാർ അവിടെ യാതൊരു ശബ്ദവുമുണ്ടാക്കാതെ തൊഴിലാളികൾ ജോലി തുടർന്നുകൊണ്ടു പോകുന്നതിൽ വേണ്ടതു ചെയ്യുകയാണുണ്ടായത്.

PRESIDENT : Your time is up. Mr. V. I. Idicula.

MR. V. I. IDICULA (Pattanamthitta): സർ, മന്ദന്തൻ-ൽ ആണെന്നു തോന്നുന്നു ഞാൻ ഒരു ദിവസം ചെന്നുനോക്കിയിട്ടു കടന്നുപോകുമ്പോൾ സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രൂപ്പിന്റെ നേതാക്കന്മാർ, അതായതു തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ഏതാനും സ്വദേശാഭിമാനികളായ പഴയതൊഴിലാളികൾ, ഒരു മീറ്റിംഗ് നടത്തുന്നതു കാണുകയുണ്ടായി. അവിടെ ചെന്നുനോക്കിയിട്ടും തിരുവല്ലയിലും ഉള്ള ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാർ എല്ലാവരും ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നു. ഒരു വലിയ സംഘം പോലീസുദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരും റിസർവ്വ് പോലീസും അവിടെ ഘോഷിച്ചുണ്ടായിരുന്നു.

[Mr. V. I. Idicula]

മീറിംഗിനുള്ള സമയമായി. നേതാക്കന്മാർ പ്ലാനറുമ്മാറത്തിൽ കയറിക്കഴിഞ്ഞപ്പോൾ പോലീസുകാരുടെ മേൽനോട്ടത്തിൽ ഏതാനും ചട്ടവിമാർ പ്ലാനറുമ്മാറത്തിൽ ചാടി കയറുകയും അവരെ അപമാനിക്കാനും ഭേദമായി പട്ടവമേൽപ്പിക്കാനും ശ്രമിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നതായി കണ്ടു. ഇതെല്ലാം കണ്ടപ്പോൾ നമ്മുടെ ഗവണ്മെൻറുജ്യോഗ സ്ഥന്മാർ തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ കൊള്ളാവുന്നു നേതാക്കന്മാരോടു ഇപ്രകാരമെല്ലാം പ്രവർത്തിക്കുന്നല്ലെന്നു എനിക്കു അതിയായ കണ്ണിതമുണ്ടായി. ഈ ഒരു സംഭവമാണ് എന്നു സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസിൽ ഒരു ഗമായി ചേരുന്നതിനു പ്രേരിപ്പിച്ചത്. സർ, അങ്ങുപറയുന്ന സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസുകാർ വിചാപംസകമാണെന്ന്. ഈ സംഭവം എന്താണ് തെളിയിക്കുന്നത്. സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസുകാരുടെ ഏക ലക്ഷ്യം മഹാരാജാവു തിരുമനസിലെ പരമാധികാരത്തിൻ കീഴിൽ അനുവാദിതപരണം സമ്പാദിക്കുക എന്നുള്ളതാണല്ലോ. തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസുകാർ മറ്റു ആരെയുംകാൾ മാത്രം കേന്ദ്രത്തിൽ ടൂം പിന്നോക്കമല്ലെന്നു പറഞ്ഞുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

MR. C. K. SANKARA PILLAI: സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസ് പ്രതിനിധികളെക്കുറിച്ചു ജനറൽഡിസ്ട്രഷനുള്ള അവസരമല്ല ഇതെന്നു ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർ വിചാരിക്കുന്നണ്ടോ?

MR. V. I. IDICULA : സർ, ഞങ്ങൾ എന്തെങ്കിലും സംസാരിക്കുമ്പോൾ വ്യക്തിപരമായ വിദ്വേഷംകൊണ്ടാണ് സംസാരിക്കുന്നതെന്നു ഇവിടെ പല ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർമാരും പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. ഞങ്ങൾ ഈ ഭാരതത്തിലെ മഹാശയനായ ഒരാളെ ഭാരതരഞ്ചിക്ക് അഭിമനേം കൊള്ളാവുന്ന രാജ്യെക്കുറിച്ചു തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ദിവൻപദം അലങ്കരിക്കുന്ന ഒരു മഹാനുഭാവനെക്കുറിച്ചു ഞങ്ങൾക്കു എങ്ങിനെയാണു വ്യക്തിപരമായ വിദ്വേഷം ഉണ്ടാകുന്നത്. എന്നാൽ വ്യക്തിപരമായ വിദ്വേഷം കൊണ്ടല്ല ഒരാൾശക്തിനു വേണ്ടിയാണ് ഞങ്ങൾ വാദിക്കുന്നത്. അല്ലാതെ വ്യക്തിപരമായവിദ്വേഷം ഇവിടെ നടമാടുന്നില്ല.

സർ, അവിടത്തെ കീഴിലുള്ള ഉജ്യോഗസ്ഥരും സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസ് പാർട്ടിയോടു ഒരു ചിറമ്മനയും അനുവർത്തിക്കുന്നതായി എനിക്കു ഭയം. ഈ തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൻറെ ഒരു നിർഭാഗ്യമെന്നു ഞാൻ കരുതുന്നുള്ളു. അവിടുന്നു ഞങ്ങളെ വിദ്വേഷിച്ചു ഭരിക്കയാണോ എന്ന് എനിക്കു സംശയം തോന്നുന്നു.

ഏതോ ഒരു നിഗ്രഹശക്തി സമുദായസംഘടനകളെ സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാ
 ഞ്ഘസീനെയിരായി ഇളക്കിവിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നാണു ഞാൻ വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നത്.
 ഏതായാലും തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ ശോഭനമായ ഒരു ഭാവി എല്ലാവരും
 യോജിച്ചു പ്രവർത്തിച്ചാൽ ഉണ്ടാകുമെന്നു ഞാൻ പരിചയ്യമായി
 വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നു.

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: Sir, before proceeding I may just request your permission to club together the two motions and I may be given double the time.

PRESIDENT: You have got only one motion. Your motion regarding the raising of the minimum pay of Government servants cannot be taken up along with this. It is not a motion of no-confidence. You have got only five minutes. But if I find that you have got much more to say, I shall give you two minutes more.

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: Sir, we have been called the representatives of marauders, incendiaries and felons; practically in effect. I certainly am very sorry at the unwarranted suggestion that has been made on the floor of this house by the Dewan President on the second day of its sitting. Sir, this is certainly wrong. We are the representatives of an organisation which stands and works under the principle of no-violence as enunciated by Mahatma Gandhi. I am one who watched with a critical eye the working of the State Congress and it was after I was convinced that it was going to work on a non-violent basis that I joined it. That has been made quite clear to me and I have borne the brunt of all troubles on that account. Therefore I can say that it is a sound and non-violent organisation and there is no use in suggesting that it is now an association of criminals and felons. There have been statements by honourable members that we have come here to cast vilification on you. Sir, we repudiate the statement. We come here for the service of the country. The State Congress has a constitution of its own and we are decided to work in terms of that constitution. Now Sir, your opinion about the State Congress is unfounded. Facts have been hidden from you which should never have been done. They have not reflected the opinion in the country. They have reflected only their own opinion that we are here to vilify you. But they are not representing the opinion of the country. If you go from one part of the country to the other you will see the strength of opinion in our favour. There is no use in the dogs barking. The caravan will go on. I do not, by that, mean any malicious insinuation against anybody. I was just quoting a passage from the late Viceroy.

MR. M. K. NILAKANTAN: ചെല്ലപ്പൻപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർ സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺ
 ഗസീനു എതിരായിട്ട് ഡപ്യൂട്ടേഷൻ പോയിട്ടുണ്ടോ ?

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: I have not gone on any deputation against the State Congress.

MR. P. K. KUNJU (*Ambalapuzha cum Sheralai*): ഓരോമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർ സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രൂപ്പിന്റെ പ്രതിനിധിയായി വാർഡാകിൽ പോയിട്ടുണ്ടോ ?

PRESIDENT: Honourable members must realise that when the honourable member was on his legs he wanted some more time and I have promised to give him two minutes more. So a better plan would be to allow him to finish his speech and then put him questions. Mr. Chellappan Pillai will finish soon. He has got 3 minutes more.

MR. P. K. KUNJU: Am I not expected to get an answer to my question ?

PRESIDENT: The answer may be got afterwards.

✓ MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: Every Government rests for its stability on public opinion and if public opinion is not brought to the notice of the persons who rule the country, certainly it will be injurious to the general body politic. Therefore it is those members who said that we are here to vilify the Dewan that do not represent true facts. They do not represent their constituencies. On the other hand they were not doing what they really ought to have done. X Every Government is carried on not by laws, not by violence, but by public opinion. It stands good even from the days when Sri Rama gave up his wife for the cause of obeying public opinion. Even today it stands and it cannot be repudiated. We have come to represent public opinion in the country. It is not our intention to vilify any member of this House including the Dewan President or any official, for that matter. In the light of these facts I am going to criticise the Government for some of its policies. ✓

PRESIDENT: The time for the honourable member is over.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Tiruvulla*): Sir, I oppose the cut motion. I have been anxiously watching the attitude and the trend of discussion of some of the members belonging to the State Congress party and it is my firm conviction that this sort of persistent attempts on their part to avail themselves of all possibilities to attack the Government are not only based on solid and real grounds but also actuated by some ulterior motives. I can boldly assure you, Sir, that the people of this country will ever remember with feelings of pride, gratitude and satisfaction the meritorious services you have been rendering all along.

PRESIDENT: My services do not come within the purview of this debate. The whole question is whether there is reason for want of confidence in the Government.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: That is what I am coming to. There must be some cogent and adequate reason for me to express my opinion whether we have confidence in the present administration or not. You have been rendering meritorious service all these years for the industrial, agricultural and economic advancement of this country and we are all aware of the consequent prosperity of the subjects, of

course under the fostering care and guidance of His Highness the Maharaja. We are also aware of the marvellous progress the State has made during the last one decade.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: May I request the honourable member to speak a little louder.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: We are all aware that the marvellous progress the State has made during the last decade is due entirely to your administrative ability, wise statesmanship and unceasing efforts and I am sure that any malicious attempts to belittle the importance or usefulness of your glorious administration will be of no avail so far as the people of this country are concerned. The very high opinion recorded by those in authority and by very distinguished visitors will bear ample testimony to the far reaching and beneficial results of your patriotic achievements.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: Can the member quote any instance?

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: According to me almost all the distinguished visitors including Mahatma Gandhi have expressed their unequivocal opinion with regard to the facts I have just now mentioned.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: May I have the pleasure of hearing at least one or two instances.

PRESIDENT: I would strongly deprecate that. What Mahatma Gandhi has stated can be known from Mahatma Gandhi's writings and what other people have said have been published and they can be known from those publications. So, I do not think any quotations are necessary.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: With regard to the complaints regarding the official interference in the recent election in the Trivandrum City Mr. C. S. Lekshmana Iyer has already explained his position and it is for the official Bench to refute the allegations levelled against Government. Under these circumstances it is my pleasant duty to express on behalf of my party and also on behalf of the Nair Service Society that the public of this country have absolute confidence in the present administration of the State. As there is very little time for me to dwell upon the details, I do not wish to do so just at present. With these observations I stoutly oppose the motion with all the force at my command and request the honourable members to vote against this frivolous, malicious and unacceptable motion.

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN: സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസുപാർട്ടി നേതാവു, അതിലെ ചില അംഗങ്ങളും കൂടി അകത്തും പുറത്തുമുള്ള ആലോചനയ്ക്കു ശേഷം കൊണ്ടുവന്നിരിക്കുന്ന ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപം അതർഹിക്കുന്ന അവധാനതയോടുകൂടി ഞാൻ ആലോചിച്ചുനോക്കി. ഗവണ്മെൻറു ചെയ്ത അപമാസഞ്ചാരമെന്താണെന്ന് ആരോപണങ്ങളെ ആസ്പദമാക്കി ഞാൻ നോക്കി. ആരോപണങ്ങളുടെ ആകെത്തുക ഗവണ്മെൻറു തെരഞ്ഞെടുപ്പുകാര്യങ്ങളിൽ കൈകടത്തിയെന്നാണ്. ഇക്കാര്യത്തിൽ എനിക്കുള്ള

[Mr. K. R. Narayanan]

അനുഭവവും, അനുഭവമനുസരിച്ചുള്ള അനുമാനങ്ങളും, പ്രസ്താവിക്കുന്നതിനു മുമ്പ്, ചില പ്രബലസമുദായങ്ങളെ ഏതോ നിഗ്രഹശക്തി സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസ്സിനെതിരായി, തിരിച്ചുവിടുന്നുവെന്നുള്ള സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസ്സുപാർട്ടിയുടെ പ്രസ്താവനയ്ക്ക് ഒരു മറുപടി പറയേണ്ടത് അപരിത്യാജ്യമായ ആവശ്യമായി വന്നിരിക്കുന്നു. കാൺഗ്രസ്സുകാർ നിഗ്രഹശക്തിയെന്നു ഒളിവിൽ പറഞ്ഞു. ഒളിവിൽ വെച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന പശുവർഹസ്സു ഏതു മായിക്കൊള്ളട്ടെ. പ്രബലസമുദായങ്ങളെന്നു വിവക്ഷിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നത് ഇവിടെ ഒരു പാർട്ടിയായി നിന്ന് കാൺഗ്രസ്സിനോടു് പല കാര്യങ്ങളിലും യോജിക്കാത്ത, എസ്. എൻ. ഡി. പി., എൻ. എസ്. എസ്. കൂട്ടുകെട്ടിനെ ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചാണെന്നുള്ളതു വ്യക്തമാകുന്നു. ഈ സംഘടനകളുടെ ഉജ്ജ്വലമായ ഭൂതകാലചരിത്രം അറിയാവുന്നവരാരും, ഈ സമുദായങ്ങൾ നിഗ്രഹശക്തികളുടെ നീർച്ചാലുകളിൽക്കൂടി ഒഴുകി സത്യധർമ്മാദികളെ എത്രക്കുവാൻ സന്നദ്ധരായി നില്ക്കുമെന്നു വിശ്വസിക്കുകയില്ല.

MR. C. K. SANKARA PILLAI : എസ്. എൻ. ഡി. പി. യോഗം സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസിന് അനുക്രമമായി നിശ്ചയം പാസ്സാക്കിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN : യോഗം നിശ്ചയം പാസ്സാക്കിയില്ല. യോഗം ബോർഡ് സ്വാഗതം ചെയ്യുന്ന ഒരു നിശ്ചയം പാസ്സാക്കിട്ടുണ്ട്. അതുതന്നെ കാൺഗ്രസ്സ് നിയമലഘനം തുടങ്ങുന്നതിനു മുമ്പാണ്. കാൺഗ്രസ്സ് നിയമലഘനം തുടങ്ങിയതിനു ശേഷം കൂടിയ പൊതുയോഗം, യോഗവും കാൺഗ്രസ്സുമായി യാതൊരു ബന്ധവും ഇല്ലെന്നും കാൺഗ്രസ്സുവക്കിംഗ് കമ്മറ്റിയിലെ അംഗങ്ങൾ യോഗം ബോർഡിൽ അംഗങ്ങളായിരിക്കുവാൻ പാടില്ലെന്നും നിശ്ചയം പാസ്സാക്കിട്ടുണ്ട്.

MR. V. I. IDICULA : മെമ്പർ സ്ഥാനാർത്ഥിയായി നിൽക്കുവാൻ യോഗം ബോർഡിൽ അപേക്ഷ കൊടുക്കുകയും യോഗം അതു നിരസിക്കുകയും ചെയ്തിട്ടില്ലേ?

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN : ഈ ചോദ്യം ഈ പ്രശ്നത്തിനു തികച്ചും അസംഗതമാകുന്നു. എൻ. ടി. ടി. ഇടിക്കളയ്ക്ക് അതറിയുവാൻ ഒരുഭിന്നിഭവശം കാണുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് അക്കാര്യം സംഗ്രഹമായി മാത്രം പറയാം. യോഗം ബോർഡിൽ ഞാൻ അപേക്ഷ കൊടുത്തിരുന്നതു ശരിയാണ്. നിരസിച്ചുവെന്നുള്ളതു ശരിയല്ല. ഒരു ചെറിയ ന്യൂനപക്ഷം വോട്ടോടുകൂടി ഞാൻ പരാജിതനാവുകയാണ് ചെയ്തത്. എന്നെക്കാൾ

സ്വാധീനശക്തിയുള്ള ഒരാൾ യോഗം സ്ഥാനാത്ഥിയായി വന്നതോ, ഞാൻ ഏഴ് കൊല്ലം മെമ്പറായി കഴിച്ചതുകൊണ്ട് മറ്റുള്ള ഒരാളിനു രേഖസരം കൊടുക്കണമെന്ന് ബോർഡ് കരുതിയതുകൊണ്ടോ, ഇങ്ങിനെ സംഭവിച്ചിരിക്കാം. അല്ലെങ്കിൽ ബോർഡ് തെറ്റുചെയ്തിരിക്കാം. ബോർഡിന്റെ ഈ തെറ്റു സമ്മതിച്ചാൽതന്നെ മി. ഇടിക്കളയ്ക്ക് എന്തൊരു മെച്ചമാണു വാദഗതിയിൽ കിട്ടുന്നത്. ജനകീയഭരണസമ്പ്രദായപ്രകാരം നോക്കിയാൽ ബോർഡിന്റെ തെറ്റത്തെടുപ്പ്, ഞാനും കൂടി ഉൾപ്പെട്ടു നടത്തിയ തെറ്റത്തെടുപ്പാണ്. അതിൽ തെറ്റുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ എന്റേയും കൂടി തെറ്റാണ്. ഏനിക്കു വളരെക്കാലം ശീതളമായ തന്ന യോഗത്തിന്റെ കമ്പ്, ഇരിക്കുന്ന മരം മുറിക്കുന്ന ബുദ്ധി കേടുപോലെ, പരിത്യജിക്കുവാനോ മുറിക്കുവാനോ, ഞാൻ അഭിലഷിക്കുന്നില്ല. ഈ ചോദ്യംകൊണ്ട് എന്നെ ഇക്കിളിപ്പിച്ചു, യോഗം കാൺഗ്രസിനെതിരായി ഏതോ നിഗൂഢശക്തിയുടെ മൂക്കുകയറിൽപെട്ടുപോകുന്നുവെന്നു പറഞ്ഞുവാനാണ് ലക്ഷ്യമെങ്കിൽ, അതു തികച്ചും അസ്ഥാനത്തായിപ്പോയെന്ന് എന്നെക്കുറിച്ചുള്ള പരിചയക്കുറവ് ഒന്നുമാത്രമായിരിക്കണം ഇങ്ങിനെ ഒരു ചോദ്യത്തിനിടയാക്കിയതെന്നും ഞാൻ വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നു. ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപംവഴി ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെമേൽ കൊണ്ടുവന്നിരിക്കുന്ന ആരോപണങ്ങളുടെ സംഗ്രഹം ഗവണ്മെന്റു, തെറ്റത്തെടുപ്പുകാര്യങ്ങളിൽ ഉൾപ്പെടുവെന്നാണ്ല്ലോ. തിരുവനന്തപുരം പട്ടണത്തിലെ തിരുത്തെടുപ്പുകാര്യത്തിൽ എനിക്കു നേരിട്ടറിവൊന്നുമില്ല. വൈക്കത്തു് ഒരു സ്ഥലത്തു് ഞാൻ ഏജൻറായി നിന്നു. അവിടത്തെ പ്രിസൈഡിംഗ് ഓഫീസർ കാൺഗ്രസ്സ് സ്ഥാനാത്ഥി ആരാണെന്നുകൂടി നിശ്ചയമില്ലായിരുന്നുവെന്ന് എനിക്കു സൂക്ഷ്മമായി അറിയാം. എന്റെ അയൽ താലൂക്കുകളിലും ഗവണ്മെന്റു യാതൊരു കൈകടത്തലും ചെയ്യാതെ അഭികാമ്യമായ നിഷ്പക്ഷത പാലിച്ചിരുന്നു. രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ ഒരു ഭാഗത്തു് ഈ വിഷയത്തിൽ ഒരു നയവും, മറ്റൊരു ഭാഗത്തു് മറ്റൊരു നയവും, ഗവണ്മെന്റുക്കുമെന്തു ന്യായമായി വിചാരിക്കുവാൻ കഴിയുന്നില്ല. ഗവണ്മെന്റിനു തിരുത്തെടുപ്പിൽ ഉൾപ്പെടുവാൻ സൗകര്യം, പട്ടണങ്ങളിലെക്കാൾ ഗ്രാമങ്ങളിലാണ്. മോഷണം ചെയ്യുവാൻ തീരുമാനിച്ചവൻ ഗ്രാമങ്ങളിലെ അന്ധകാരാവൃതമായ സൗകര്യം ഉപേക്ഷിച്ച്, ആൾത്തിരക്കും വൈദ്യുതപ്രകാശവും ഉള്ള പട്ടണമദ്ധ്യത്തിലേയ്ക്കോ പോരുന്നതു്? ഗവണ്മെന്റിനു കാൺഗ്രസ്സ് സ്ഥാനാത്ഥികളെ തോൽപ്പിക്കുവാൻ വഴിപിഴച്ചു ഒരാൾ വന്നിരുന്നുവെങ്കിൽ, അവരിലൊരാളെന്നും ഇവിടെ കാലുകത്തുവാൻ കഴിയുമെന്ന് ഞാൻ വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നു.

[Mr. K. R. Narayanan]

ക്കുന്നില്ല, അതു സംഭവിക്കാതിരിക്കട്ടെ. കാൺഗ്രസ്സുനേതാവ് പ്രാരംഭ പ്രസംഗത്തിൽ സഹകരണം വാദാനം ചെയ്തു. ആ വാദാനം പാലിക്കുന്നില്ലെന്നുമാത്രമല്ല, എന്തെല്ലാം ശല്യങ്ങൾ അയഥാർത്ഥങ്ങൾ ഉന്നയിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടാക്കുമോ അതെല്ലാം ഉണ്ടാക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നു.

MR. K. A. MATHEW : എന്തു ശല്യമാണ് സ്റ്റേറ്റ് കാൺഗ്രസ്സുകാർ ചെയ്യുന്നത് പറയാമോ?

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN : ബഡ്ജറ്റുപ്രസംഗം തുടങ്ങിയതു മുതൽ ഈ ശല്യത്തിന്റെ മുൻച്ചുരുക്ക മുനകൾ ഇവിടെ പലപ്പോഴും പ്രത്യക്ഷപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുണ്ട്. ഉദാഹരണമായി ഇന്നലെ വഞ്ചിപുവർഫണ്ടിനെക്കുറിച്ചുള്ള ചോദ്യവും ഉപചോദ്യങ്ങളും മതിയാകുമല്ലോ. തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലും പറ്റത്തുള്ള ഉദാരസ്വന്തന്ത്രരുടെ സംഭാവനകൾ സ്വീകരിച്ച്, പാവങ്ങളുടെ പശിയടക്കുവാൻ സജീവമായും ഫലപ്രദമായും നടത്തുന്ന ഒരു പ്രസ്ഥാനത്തെക്കുറിച്ചും ചോദ്യം. ഈ ചോദ്യവും അതിന്റെ ഉപചോദ്യങ്ങളും കേട്ടപ്പോൾ,

ഓ! പാപമോമൽമലരേഖത നിന്റെമേലും
ക്ഷേപിച്ചിതേ കരുണയറകരക്രതാന്തൻ
വ്യാപാർമേ ഹനനമാം വനവേടനങ്ങോ
വ്യാപനമായ് കഴുകനെന്നു കപോതമെന്നും.

എന്ന സ്റ്റോകം ഞാൻ സ്വയം ചൊല്ലിപ്പോയി. കപോതങ്ങളുടെ മേൽ അമ്പെയ്യുന്ന ഈ സാഹസം നിറുത്തിയാൽ കൊള്ളാം. വഞ്ചിപുവർഫണ്ടിനു പണം എവിടെനിന്നും വരട്ടെ. ആരും സൂക്ഷിക്കട്ടെ. പ്രയോജനമുണ്ടോ എന്നുമാത്രം നോക്കിയാൽ മതിയല്ലോ. ഇതാണോ ഇന്നലെ നോക്കിയത്. സർപ്പക്കാവിൽനിന്നാകട്ടെ, ഉദ്യാനത്തിൽനിന്നാകട്ടെ, കിട്ടിയ റോസാപ്പൂവിനു പരിമളമുണ്ടോ എന്നുമാത്രം നോക്കണം. ഇങ്ങിനെ നോക്കാത്തതിനെ, നമ്മയിലും തിരു കാണുന്ന ഈ മനുസ്ഥിതിയെ, ശല്യമെന്നു വിവക്ഷിക്കുന്നതു തെറ്റാണോ? ഗവണ്മെൻ്റ് രാജ്യത്തിനു മേന്മയുണ്ടാകുവാൻ പലതും ചെയ്യുന്നു. നമുക്കു തെറ്റുകൾ മൂണ്ടിക്കാണിക്കാം. നിർദ്ദേശങ്ങൾ കൊടുക്കാം. വെറും വ്യക്തിപരവും അപവാദപരവുമായ നിരൂപണത്തിനു രാജ്യത്തെയോർത്തു വിരാമമിടുക. അങ്ങിനെ ചെയ്യുന്നതാണു കർഷകർക്കു തൊഴിലാളികൾക്കും രക്ഷയെന്നു ധരിക്കുന്നത് ശ്ലാഘനീയമായിരിക്കും. ഈ അഭിപ്രായങ്ങളേടുക്രി ഞാൻ ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപം എഴുതുന്നു.

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI (Nominated): The honourable member Mr. T. K. Narayana Pillai has been trying today the art of winning over the goodwill and confidence both of Government and the other sections of the House. To this extent, I congratulate him, but at the same time, I am sorry for the position in which, according to me, he is now placed. He is, I am afraid, unable to extricate himself from a situation into which he has got. Left to himself, and if he had reasonable influence amongst his party, I do not think he would have allowed them to ask those questions which certainly pulled down the level of the debate which this House had been accustomed for the last several years. That is a point, Sir, which should engage the attention of the House.

There is no use of the Congress Party saying that they have come here for co-operation, but it only stands to reason that co-operation must be extended in the manner in which it ought to be extended. It should also be realised that this House certainly consists of people who can appreciate and understand co-operation when it is extended in the proper manner. Certainly there will be no churlishness on the part of anybody to refuse such co-operation if that was really extended.

Sir, years ago, one gentleman came to me a few days after the burning down of my factory and wanted me to give him a statement to be taken to Mahatma Gandhi. I did not know who he was. But he told me that he was the son-in-law of an Assistant Superintendent of Police who was in service at the time. That gentleman was very vehement in his attacks on the State Congress, on the conduct of the State Congress and on the very many iniquities that the State Congress had wrought in this country.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: May I know who that gentleman is?

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI: He is one of the members of the State Congress Party in this House—Mr. K. K. Chellappan Pillai. He came to me, asked for my statement, took down facts and figures, accompanied me to have a look at my factory, had tea with me and then wanted to have all the information to tell the world how much patience the Government had exercised towards the State Congress and how much havoc was done by the State Congress and the misery that followed in the different parts of the country. Having been.....

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: Does the honourable member know that the gentleman he refers to came for enquiry into the truth of the incidents?

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI: Perfectly true. He took the statement; he told me that he was convinced of the events that took place and subsequently told me after a few days that he had been able to convince Mahatma Gandhi that the Travancore State Congress was not doing the right thing and that it was engaged in committing violence. From this I trust the State Congress party would realise that many things were done for which they ought to be ashamed and for which probably the present members who are here are not responsible according to their own statements. I trust that they will not follow in the footsteps of those people,

[Mr. M. L. Janardana Pillai.]

My friend, Mr. Narayana Pillai, pointed out that in British India in eight out of the eleven Provinces—the Government did interfere in the elections. I do remember that when Mr. (now, Sir) Ramaswamy Mudaliar stood against Mr. Sathyamoorthi, the Congress did complain that all Government officers in Madras were openly canvassing for Sir Ramaswamy Mudaliar; but what happened? Mr. Sathyamoorthi came out victorious. Why so? Because the people of the country stood solidly behind the Congress. What does it show here? Mr. Gopala Pillai at Trivandrum was not able to get sufficient support from the electors to be elected to this Assembly. What does it show? It shows that the country and the electorate are not with the State Congress. It will also be realised that their claim that the whole country is behind the State Congress is not true. The sooner we realise that, the better for all concerned. If, therefore, Sir, it is the attitude on the part of the State Congress Party in this House to initiate a discussion which is derogatory to the prestige of the House, which is not in keeping with the traditions of this House and which is not for the benefit of the country at large, the House will not certainly agree with them. (President's bell). ✕

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: In regard to the point just now raised by the honourable member about me, I request the President to give me an occasion to make a statement.

PRESIDENT: Yes, I will give you an opportunity to make an explanation.

MR. V. K. VELAYUDHAN (*Ambalapuzha cum Shertailai*). സർ, ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ മേൽ സ്റ്റേറ്റുകോൺഗ്രസ്സുകാർ അവതരിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള ഈ അവിശ്വാസപ്രമേയത്തെ ഞാൻ ശക്തിയായി എതിർക്കുന്നു.

സർ, പൊതുജന നന്മയ്ക്കുവേണ്ടി വ്യവസായപരമായും തൊഴിൽ പരമായും മറ്റും ഗവണ്മെന്റിനോടു് സഹകരിച്ചു പ്രവർത്തിക്കാമെന്നു പ്രതിജ്ഞ ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ള ഒരു ഇലക്ഷൻ മാനിഫെസ്റ്റോ സ്റ്റേറ്റുകോൺഗ്രസ്സുകാർ നാട്ടിൽ വിതരണം ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളതു് എല്ലാ ബഹുമാന്യ മെമ്പർമാരും വായിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള ഒരു കാര്യമാണ്. അതിനും പുറമേ ഇവർ, ജനസഞ്ചയത്തിനുള്ളിൽ കടന്ന് പ്രസംഗയോരണികളും മറ്റുംകൊണ്ടു് അവരെ മനംമയക്കി, അവരുടെ വോട്ടും സമ്പാദിച്ചു് മെമ്പർമാരായി ഇവിടെവന്നപ്പോൾ, നാട്ടുകാരുടെ നന്മയേമറന്ന്, രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ ക്ഷേമമെശ്ചയങ്ങളേ മറന്ന്, കോൺഗ്രസ്സ് എന്നുള്ള നാമത്തിന്റെ യഥാർത്ഥമായ അർത്ഥത്തെയും തത്പരത്തെയും മറന്ന്, എന്തവേണ്ട അവർ തങ്ങൾക്കുള്ള വ്യക്തിപരമായ നിലയെ തന്നെയും അവഗണിച്ചു്, ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ഭാഷാവശത്തെ മാത്രം എടുത്തു് കർശമായ നിരൂപണങ്ങൾ

ചെയ്യുന്നത് വെറും വ്യക്തിപരമായ വിദ്വേഷം കൊണ്ടു മത്രമല്ല എന്ന് ഞാൻ ചോദിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു. സമമതിദായകന്മാരുടെ മുമ്പാകെ അവർ വിതരണം ചെയ്ത പ്രകടന പത്രികയിൽ നൽകിയിരുന്ന പ്രതിജ്ഞ ഒരുവിധം, അവരുടെ പ്രവർത്തി മറ്റൊരുവിധം!

ഇതിനകം ഏകദേശം മൂന്നുലക്ഷത്തോളം തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ പട്ടിണിപ്പാവങ്ങളുടെ ജറാഗ്നി ശമിപ്പിക്കാൻ കഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ള വഞ്ചി ഭരണ ഭാനുപണിന്റെ ഉൽഘാടനം, വിശാലവീക്ഷണനും, ഔദാര്യഭാവമുള്ളതുമായ അങ്ങ് നിവ്ഹിച്ചു. അങ്ങയുടെ, കർമ്മകശലത ഒന്നുമാത്രംകൊണ്ട് നാട്ടിനകത്തും പുറത്തുമുള്ള ഉദാരമതികളായ അനവധി മഹാമനസ്കന്മാരുടെ സഹായസഹകരണമുണ്ടായി, അത് വളന്ന് വളന്ന് തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ഭിക്ഷുക്കളേയും പട്ടിണിപ്പാവങ്ങളേയും ആശ്വസിപ്പിക്കത്തക്കവണ്ണം, ഒരു ശാശ്വതനിധിയെന്ന നിലയിലേക്കു ഉയർന്നു. അങ്ങയോടു് അവർ ചോദിക്കുന്ന ചോദ്യങ്ങളും, ഉപചോദ്യങ്ങളും മറ്റും കേട്ടാൽ, ഇവരുടെ ഇടയിൽ ഏതോ അന്തർവാഹിനി ശക്തിയായി പ്രവഹിക്കുന്നുണ്ടെന്നുള്ളതു് സ്പഷ്ടമാണ്.

സർ, രാജ്യക്ഷേമത്തെ പുലർത്തുന്നതിനെന്നു് ഭാവിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു ഇവിടെ വന്നിട്ടുള്ള സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസ്സുകാർ, തങ്ങളുടെ കടമനിറവേറുന്നതു്, ഭരണാധിപനായ അങ്ങയേയും, ഭരണകൂടത്തേയും തകർക്കാനുള്ള ഉദ്യമത്തിലാണെന്നാണു് എനിക്ക് ഈ അവസരത്തിൽ പറയാനുള്ളതു്. ലോകമാറായുദ്ധത്തിന്റെ പ്രത്യാഘാതം മൂലം നാട്ടിൽ പടർന്നു പിടിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള ക്ഷാമബാധയിൽനിന്നും, എങ്ങിനെയെങ്കിലും നാട്ടുകാരെ രക്ഷിക്കണമെന്നുള്ള ത്യാഗബുദ്ധിയോടുകൂടി അങ്ങ് ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ള അവിശ്വാസ പരിശ്രമം എത്രത്തോളം ജനങ്ങൾക്കു് സഹായകമായിരുന്നു എന്ന് നാട്ടുകാർക്കു് വിശിഷ്ട സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസ്സുകാർക്കു് നല്ലപോലെ അറിവുള്ള ഒരു കാര്യമാണു്. അങ്ങ് രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ ശാശ്വതമായ ക്ഷേമമെശ്വര്യങ്ങൾക്കായി ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളതും തുടർന്നു പ്രവർത്തിക്കാൻ ഉദ്ദേശിക്കുന്നതുമായ എല്ലാ മഹൽ സേവനങ്ങളേയും നാട്ടുകാർ മുക്തകണ്ഠം സ്തുതിക്കുന്നതും വിശേഷിച്ചു് ഞാനും എന്റെ പാർട്ടിയും വളരെ ബഹുമാനത്തോടും കൃതജ്ഞതയോടുകൂടി സ്തുതിക്കുന്നതുമാണു്. ഇന്നത്തെ രാഷ്ട്രീയ കോലാഹലങ്ങളെല്ലാം വിസ്മൃതിയിൽ ലയിച്ചു് അങ്ങ് ആസൂത്രണംചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ള ഈ വ്യവസായിക പദ്ധതികൾ പൂർണ്ണഫലപ്രാപ്തിയിൽ എത്തി, ഒരു കാർഷികരാജ്യമായ തിരുവിതാംകൂർ ഒരു വ്യവസായിക രാജ്യമെന്ന അവസ്ഥയിലേക്കു പരിവർത്തനം ചെയ്യപ്പെടുമ്പോൾ

[Mr. V. K. Velayudhan.]

മാവിതലമുറകൾ അങ്ങയുടെ സേവനങ്ങളെ കൃതജ്ഞതാപുരസ്കാരം സൃഷ്ടിക്കുമെന്നുള്ളതിൽ എനിക്കു യാതൊരു സംശയവുമില്ല. ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ ഞാൻ ശക്തിയായി എതിർക്കുന്നു.

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: In view of the statement made by Mr. Janardana Pillai, I have to make this observation.

Sir, I have been a devotee of the Indian National Congress for long, and have been a devotee of non-violence in its entirety in relation to political fight and political agitation. Of course, when the State Congress began its movements here, I was not sure whether the country was prepared to undertake the trials which the Civil Disobedience Movement involved. It was started, so to say, wisely or unwisely, at the time. The repression by the Police soon followed and we had many repercussions.

PRESIDENT: The honourable member cannot go into political chronicling. He can give only a personal explanation.

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: Because I was justly convinced that I should do something in the matter and it is because I wanted to represent to Gandhiji that it was not time for them to start the Civil Disobedience Movement a second time that I went to him and represented matters to him. That is a fact. Later there were people who deserted the Party, but under the leadership of Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai, the Party is really making progress on the lines of 'Ahimsa'.

PRESIDENT: Order, order. The House will now adjourn and meet again at 3 p. m.

The House reassembled at 3 p. m.

PRESIDENT: We have 15 minutes more for the close of the debate and as the names of one or two official members have been mentioned during the course of the debate, in equity for them, I should give them an opportunity to speak.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Legal Remembrancer to Government*): Sir, let me at the outset thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on this occasion. Let me also thank the House and ask them to hear patiently what I have got to say on the matter. The first thing I want to say, Sir, is this. Since I am only a part time officer, the Government have conceded to me all the privileges of a non-official and I sought for it and I got it for the simple reason that the allowance that the Government gives me is hardly sufficient for me to keep that level of comfort and ease which I have been accustomed to these long years. Still, Sir, in this election I should not have taken any part but for two very fundamental reasons. The first reason is this. I have no quarrel with the members of the State Congress party, particularly the younger members who are here and who are probably honest in their convictions. But, Sir, I expect them to concede to others this same liberty of thought and action, this same liberty for convictions and I say, Sir, with the utmost conviction,

that, I for one, do not accept the principle, or the policy, of the State Congress. I do not think, Sir, that loyalty to the Sovereign is a sin. I do not think, Sir, that support to the Government of the day is a sin. Therefore, I say, that notwithstanding.....

MR. K. A. MATHEW: Has the State Congress ever said that loyalty to the Sovereign is a sin?

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: It has said, Sir.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: Where is it?

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: I have no time now. But if the honourable member would meet me this evening, I will give him facts and figures on the matter.

Again, Sir, I have no quarrel with them. I say, Sir, whatever may be the fact in 1943, I was living in fear of my life in the years, 1938, 1939, 1940 and 1941 and I am not a coward. I have faced a crowd; I have faced audiences. Sir, my next door neighbour, a police constable, was murdered. Himself and family and children were living next to my house. The policeman was my class mate. His wife and children are today in the street. I ask, Sir, who is responsible for this ghastly murder?

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Then, why is it that the State Congress was not declared an illegal organisation.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: I am not responsible for that. If I were the Head of the Government, I would have declared them illegal.

PRESIDENT: Hypothetical question do not arise.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: Sir, may I know...

PRESIDENT: It is up to the member to say what his views are; but hypothetical statements uttered by the member need not be depended upon.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: If the same God that the Honourable member for Neyyattinkara invoked awhile ago were to consider this question of violence, that question will be decided much to the unpleasantness and discomfiture of the State Congress. I was speaking about the dead body and I charge the State Congress as responsible for that. I ask, who is responsible for the cold-blooded murder of Kunjukrishna Pillai, the policeman referred to. That is the second point. Thirdly, I supported Mr. Lakshmana Iyer's candidature for another reason. Mr. Lakshmana Iyer himself stated that on the floor of the House.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: One question, Sir.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: Sir, I do not yield. Mr. Lakshmana Iyer stood for election in the city of Trivandrum as early as 1102 or so. I had the misfortune—I confess—then to join hands against Mr. Lakshmana Iyer on a communal ticket. Ever since that time I have been sorry for that. Trivandrum city is the only town where a representative of the minority community like a Brahmin could ever hope to stand for an election.

MR. K. A. MATHEW : One question, Sir.

PRESIDENT : The Chief Secretary will now speak.

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI : Sir, I do not wish to import into the debate the heat and rhetoric which were indulged in by some of my honourable friends on the other side of the House. One is perplexed as to the real stand taken on the other side by my honourable friends of the State Congress party in regard to the object of the motion and their attitude towards the Government. Sir, it is a case of two alternating impulses, whether to co-operate or not to co-operate. At one moment one feels as if they were anxious to co-operate; the next moment, the whole atmosphere changes. It looks as if they were not sure of their own mind.

Sir, they have concentrated on two points; one is on the attitude of Government towards the State congress organisation as indicated in the statement made by you and the other is about this alleged interference of Government-officers in the recent elections. As regards the first, I do not wish to rake up old history, especially as the matter has been dealt with on the floor of the House by previous speakers. Those incidents and tragedies still remain fresh in our minds. It was suggested that there might have been some insignificant members of the State Congress in that episode. May I however ask in all humility, whether Mr. O. Kesavan, and others who were convicted in connection with these incidents can be regarded as insignificant members. Further Sir, I desire to refer the honourable members to the debate which took place on the floor of this House in those days, when these occurrences actually took place. We find that the Dewan had made the following statement then :

"It is a libel on the Government to suggest that the Government have had anything to do, directly, indirectly, proximately or otherwise, with any disturbance at any meeting. Such things have been stated outside the State for purposes into which I need not enter. More atrocious libels upon the people in the State, upon the Government of the State, upon the finances of the State and upon the conduct of the persons in charge of the Government of the State have been uttered than have been heard in India for a very long time, or then could be thought possible in our country and it is not my purpose to deal with those matters now."....."

He added,

"With the fullest sense of responsibility and having regard to the activities of the Congress party, I, as a member and the Head of the Government of Travancore say that, that party has been pursuing disloyal and subversive activities....."

MR. K. A. MATHEW : Sir, was that statement accepted by the State Congress party?

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI : Sir, that statement was accepted by a thumping majority of 49 representatives of the people in this Assembly.

MR. K. A. MATHEW : Anyway, it was not by the State Congress.

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI : I was saying that, this House, a very responsible body, then endorsed that statement.

Again, Sir, recently, the President of the State Congress, Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai wrote to Government about the removal of disqualifications to stand as candidates for the Legislature and the correspondence relating thereto has already been published. In that connection the Dewan observed:

This Government have, on many occasions, declared that the Travancore State Congress must be held to be responsible for and has never dissociated itself from the subversive agitation that was encouraged and conducted by prominent members of that body several of whom were sentenced to imprisonment by the courts. Government have also pointed out that the agitation was revolutionary in character and inevitably led to widespread and serious violence to person and property resulting in murders, grave assaults, incendiarism, destruction of public buildings and of bridges and culverts with a view to break down communications and many other acts of sabotage....."

Now, Sir, this was put into the hands of the President of the State Congress in March 1944 and it was widely published in all the papers. That was the background in which the election campaign was conducted in the country. How can it be suggested that the terrible defeat which the State Congress candidate sustained by a difference of 3000 votes was due to the result of interference on the part of Government officials.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Sir, may I know—

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: Sir, let me conclude my speech and questions may be asked towards the end. Sir, it has been stated in the correspondence which has passed between the State Congress President and the Dewan that the Chief Secretary himself "is said to have" exerted his influence in favour... and given directions to his subordinates. Now I ask is that the sort of statement which should be made by a responsible body like the State Congress. In the second letter also the same vague and baseless statement was made and when it came to the third letter, prominent mention was made of the Chief Secretary, the Director of Public Instruction and the Excise Commissioner. I have already repudiated these allegations as entirely unfounded.

PRESIDENT: The time for the demand having lapsed, this motion has to be voted upon by the House. It is a vote of no-confidence.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: A word of explanation, Sir. I want to make it clear once more that my party does not regard this vote as one of no-confidence on Government.

PRESIDENT: The Government does. This motion is either a vote of confidence or want of confidence in the Government.

It is the privilege of all Governments to treat the voting on any debate or cut motion as indicative of confidence in the Government or the reverse as the case may be. In this matter Government have decided to treat the cut motion as a vote of want of confidence in this Government.

The motion was put to vote and declared lost.

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI: Sir, I demand a poll. A poll was taken with the following result:

AYES—11.

1 Mr. K. K. Chellappan Pillai	7 Mr. S. Sankaranarayanan
2 „ V. I. Idicula	8 „ A. P. Udayabhanu
3 „ K. A. Mathew	9 „ K. Varughese Ithac
4 „ K. T. Michael	10 „ P. M. Varghese
5 „ T. K. Narayana Pillai	11 „ Xavier Vincent
6 „ P. S. Nataraaja Pillai	

NOES—52.

1 Mr. P. C. Adichan	28 Rajyasevanirata K. G. Parameswaran Pillai
2 „ P. R. Atchuthan	29 Mr. G. Parameswaran Pillai
3 „ K. Balakrishna Menon	30 „ K. M. Paul
4 „ A. K. Bhaskar	31 „ J. E. A. Pereira
5 „ M. K. Chandrasekhara	32 „ M. R. Ramakrishna Pillai
6 Rajyasevanirata S. Chattanatha Karayalar	33 „ C. K. Sankara Pillai
7 Mr. V. Gangadharan Nair	34 „ V. Sreedharan Pillai
8 „ M. L. Janardhana Pillai	35 „ K. Sukumaran
9 „ K. C. Karunakaran	36 „ A. R. Sulaiman Sait
10 „ K. G. Kesavan Nair	37 „ S. Thiraviam Nadar
11 „ T. T. Kesavan Sastri.	38 „ J. W. Tolson
12 „ S. Krishna Aiyar	39 „ V. K. Velappan Nair
13 „ V. S. Krishna Pillai	40 „ V. K. Velayudhan
14 „ P. K. Kumaran	41 „ Puliyoor T. P. Velayudhan Pillai
15 „ P. K. Kunju	42 „ Brahmapuram P. Yesudian
16 „ C. S. Lakshmana Aiyar	43 „ P. G. Narayanan Unnithan
17 „ V. Madhavan	44 „ A. Gopala Menon
18 „ Varkala K. Madhavan	45 „ I. C. Chacko
19 „ R. Madhavan Nair	46 „ S. Parthasarathi Aiyangar
20 Sahib Bahadur K. A. Mohamed	47 „ K. R. Narayana Aiyar
21 Mr. M. K. Mohamed	48 Rajyasevapravina G. Parameswaran Pillai
22 „ P. S. Mohamed	49 Rajyasevapravina K. P. Padmanabha Menon
23 „ K. R. Narayanan	50 Mr. K. G. Kunjukrishna Pillai
24 Sry. T. Narayani Amma	51 „ S. Narayana Aiyar
25 Mr. A. Nesamony	52 „ G. Narayanan Tampi
26 „ M. K. Nilakantan	
27 „ N. D. Parameswaran Namboodiri	

NEUTRALS—7.

1 Mr. Chazhikattu Joseph	5 Mr. S. Muthukaruppa Pillai
2 „ P. K. Kuriakose	6 „ D. Thomas
3 „ E. K. Madhavan	7 „ P. O. Thomas.
4 „ J. T. Morais	

The motion was declared lost, eleven voting for, fifty two voting against and seven remaining neutral.

The question that a sum of Rs. 4,49,855 be granted under Demand IV was put and carried.

The Demand was passed and the grant was made.

DEMAND V—FINANCIAL SECRETARIAT, ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE AND LOCAL FUND AUDIT DEPARTMENT. 441

DEMAND V.—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—FINANCIAL SECRETARIAT, ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE AND LOCAL FUND AUDIT DEPARTMENT.

MR. S. NARAYANA AIYAR: Sir, I rise to move for a grant of Rs. 2,88,186 for expenditure in 1120 under Demand V—General Administration—Financial Secretariat, Accountant General's Office and Local Fund Audit Department.

Motion Nos. 1 & 2.

MR. P. S. MAHOMED:

1. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 28,374 for Financial Secretariat by Re. 1. (To speak on certain defects in the working of the department.)

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI:

2. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 28,374 for Financial Secretariat by Re. 1 (To discuss the revision of salaries effected in 111.)

PRESIDENT: The first two motions are out of order.

Motion No. 3.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI:

3. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 8,400 for Deputy Accountant General by Re. 1. (For impressing upon Government the urgent necessity of making the Chengannur Sub Treasury available for receipts and disbursements.)

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: I do not move the motion in my name.

The question that Government be granted a sum of Rs. 2,88,186 under Demand V—General Administration—Financial Secretariat, Accountant General's Office and Local Fund Audit Department was put and carried.

The Demand was passed and the grant was made.

DEMAND VI.—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—LEGISLATIVE BODIES.

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: Sir, I beg to move for a grant of Rs. 88,691 under Demand VI—General Administration—Legislative Bodies.

PRESIDENT: Order, order. Before the debate commences I must point out that certain out motions here are out of order. The object of this Demand is to deal with the Legislative bodies as they are and to deal with their activities. The question of nominations to the Legislature does not arise out of this grant. It would only legitimately arise under General Administration because Legislative bodies do not have any hand in the nominations to the Legislatures which are entirely the responsibility of Government. Hence motion No. 3 which is intended to discuss the policy underlying nomination to Legislature is out of order.

[President.]

Motion Nos. 4, 5, and 8, to discuss the interference of officers in the recent elections' are also out of order for the same reason.

The question of the appointment of members of the Legislature as Government Officers, does not also arise as this body has no hand in making the appointments.

The only motions therefore, which are in order are the motions to discuss the honoraria of Members of the Legislature and the construction of buildings for the residence of members at Trivandrum.

RAJYASEVANIRATA S. CHATTANATHA KARAYALAR (*Deputy President*): I rise to a point of order. An exactly similar motion was ruled out on a former occasion.

PRESIDENT : It is rather otiose, because we have made up our mind not to construct any buildings for some time to come.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : I wish to know whether Government have made up their mind in regard to this.

PRESIDENT : Of course, yes.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : Then I move motion No. 2.

I move to reduce the allotment of Rs. 80,100 for honoraria to the members by Re. 1.

PRESIDENT : Order, order. Before the honourable member proceeds to make his remarks, the position of Government may be reiterated. Government take an absolutely detached view on this matter. They will be guided in their action by the vote of the House. They are asking the Official Members not to take any part in the vote on this motion. The question whether there should be any allowance, if so what it should be, in what form it should be, either a consolidated allowance or an annual allowance is entirely left to the House.

The discussion will, therefore, proceed on that basis.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : സർ, ഈ വിഷയത്തെ സംബന്ധിച്ച് എനിക്കുള്ള സുസ്ഥിരമായ അഭിപ്രായം ബഡ്ജറ്റിന്റെ നീരൂപണപ്രസംഗത്തിൽ തന്നെ ഞാൻ രേഖപ്പെടുത്തിയിട്ടുണ്ട്. നിയമസഭയുടെ ആരംഭകാലം മുതൽ ഇതുവരെയും തുടർന്നു നടന്നുവന്നിരുന്ന പ്രശംസാർഹമായ നയം ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർമാർക്കു അവർ അർഹിക്കുന്ന നിലയിലുള്ള വ്യവസ്ഥാപിതമായ അലവൻസ് നൽകുക എന്നുള്ളതായിരുന്നു. ആ ദീർഘകാലത്തെ നിർദ്ദിഷ്ടമായ നടപടിക്ക് പ്രത്യക്ഷവിരുദ്ധമായി ഈ വിധത്തിൽ ഭരണിർഭേദം ഈ സഭാമുഖ്യാകെ കൊണ്ടുവരുന്നതിന് ഗവണ്മെന്റിനെ പ്രേരിപ്പിച്ച ഏകസംഗതിപര്യയ അസംബ്ളിയിൽ സഭയ്ക്കുതപാർട്ടിയിലെ ഒരു ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർ ഏതാളുടേതായ ഒരു ഖണ്ഡനോപക്ഷേപം അവതരിപ്പിക്കയും

അത് പാസാക്കുകയും ചെയ്തിട്ടുണ്ട് എന്നുള്ളതാണ്. അന്നത്തെ പ്രൊസിഡിംഗ്സ് വായിച്ചുനോക്കുന്നതിനു സൗകര്യമുള്ള എന്തൊരു ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർക്കും വളരെ വളരെ അംഗങ്ങൾ അല്ലെങ്കിൽ സാമാജികന്മാർ അന്നത്തെ വാദപ്രതിവാദങ്ങളിൽ പങ്കുകൊള്ളാതെ മരണം അപഖംബിച്ചിരുന്നു എന്നു പ്രത്യക്ഷമായി കാണാവുന്നതാണ്.

സർ, പ്രതിമാസം ഐ രൂപബലവൻസ് എന്നുള്ള പേരിലായി അന്നാൽ തന്നെയും ശമ്പളം എന്നുള്ള സ്വഭാവത്തിൽ എല്ലാമെമ്പർമാർക്കും നൽകുക എന്നു വരുന്നതു് ആ മെമ്പർമാരുടെ അഭിമാനത്തിനും അന്തസ്സിനും യോജിച്ചതാണോ എന്നുള്ള എന്റെ ബലമായ സംശയം കൊണ്ടാണ് ഇത്തരത്തിൽ ഒരു ചണ്ഡനോപക്ഷേപം അവതരിപ്പിക്കുവാൻ എന്നെ പ്രേരിപ്പിച്ചതു്. സർ, ഈ സംഖ്യയുടെ പവിഷ്ഠതയോ പെരുപ്പത്തോടോ സംബന്ധിച്ചു് ഈ അവസരത്തിൽ എനിക്ക് പ്രത്യേകമായി ഒന്നും പറയുവാനില്ല. സംഖ്യ ഏതുതന്നെയായിരുന്നാലും അതു് ഒരു പ്രതിമാസശമ്പളം എന്ന് അന്യരുടെ ദൃഷ്ടിയിൽ തേന്നത്തക്കവിധം നൽകുന്നതിൽ നിശ്ചയിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള വ്യവസ്ഥയെ സംബന്ധിച്ച മാത്രമാണ് എനിക്ക് അല്പം അഭിപ്രായമേറേയുള്ളതു്. ബഡ്ജറ്റിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചുള്ള പൊതുചിമർശനം നടന്നുകൊണ്ടിരുന്ന അവസരത്തിൽ ബഹുമാന്യന്മാരായ ചില സാമാജികന്മാർ ഈ സംഖ്യ വളരെ കുറവായിപ്പോയി എന്നും ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ അസാധാരണ പരിതസ്ഥിതിയിൽ അതു് വർദ്ധിപ്പിച്ചു് ഡെപ്യൂട്ടി പ്രസിഡൻറിന്റെ പ്രതിമാസബലവൻസിന്റെ പകുതിയെങ്കിലും ആക്കണമെന്നുള്ള ഒരു നിർദ്ദേശം ഇവിടെ പ്രസ്താവിച്ചു കേൾക്കുകയുണ്ടായി. അതിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു് എനിക്കുള്ള വ്യക്തിപരമായ അഭിപ്രായം ഇപ്പോൾ പറയണമെന്നു ഞാൻ വിചാരിക്കുന്നില്ല. എന്നാൽ ഒരു കാര്യം തുറന്നു പ്രസ്താവിക്കണമെന്നു ഞാൻ വിചാരിക്കുന്നു. ഗവണ്മെൻറിലേക്കു് ഏകതമെന്നു തോന്നുന്നപക്ഷം ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ പരിതസ്ഥിതി അർഹിക്കുന്ന വിധത്തിൽ മെമ്പർമാരുടെ യാത്രയും താമസത്തിനും ഉള്ള ബലവൻസ് കൂട്ടുന്നതു് ഉത്തമമായിരിക്കുമെന്നാണ് എന്റെ വിശ്വാസം. എന്നാൽ അതു് ഒരു തരത്തിലും ചില പെരുതരം ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരുടെ ശമ്പളംപോലെ പ്രതിമാസമുള്ള ഒരു വേതനമായി ഗണിക്കത്തക്ക സ്വഭാവത്തോടു കൂടിയതാകാതിരിക്കണമെന്നു മാത്രമേ എനിക്ക് പ്രത്യേകമായി ഇവിടെ പ്രസ്താവിക്കേണ്ടതുള്ളൂ. വിശിഷ്ടം ഈ പദ്ധതി പ്രായോഗികമാക്കുന്ന വിഷയത്തിൽ പല വിഷമതകൾക്കും അസന്തുഷ്ടിക്കും കാരണമായി തീരുമെന്നുമാണു്

[Mr. Puliyoor T. P. Velayudhan Pillai.]

എന്റെ വിശ്വാസം. ഈ പ്രസ്താവനയോടുകൂടി എന്റെ ഈ ഉപ
ക്ഷേപം ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട സാമാജികന്മാരുടെ ഐക്യബുദ്ധിയുള്ള
സീമാനന്തരമായി സാരം അവതരിപ്പിച്ചുകൊള്ളണം.

MR. P. S. MAHOMED : മെമ്പർമാരുടെ ശമ്പളം എത്രയാക്കണമെ
ന്നാണ് മുപ്പത് നിയമം പാസ്സാക്കിയിട്ടുള്ളതു ?

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : ൧൦൦ രൂപയെന്നാണ്.

PRESIDENT : Order, order. Honourable members cannot have
conversations with each other.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : He was asking the
amount of allowance decided upon by the previous House and I was
answering him.

MR. M. L. JANARDHANA PILLAI : I had sent in a motion for the
omission of the whole item. I.....

PRESIDENT : Order, order. The honourable member is perfectly
right in having put forward this. I think the honourable member's
motion is to omit the whole allotment for Legislative Bodies. Under
the Rules of the Legislative Assembly, I think, subject to what the
Legal Remembrancer might say, the motion for the omission of the
total allotment takes precedence.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI : On a point of order raised by
Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai under Rule 72, sub-rule 4, it was ruled
that that motion should come last.

PRESIDENT : Yes, yes. Apparently we are following a different
procedure. The motion will be discussed in the end.

MR. G. K. SANKARA PILLAI : സർ, മി. വേലായുധൻപിള്ളയുടെ
ഉപക്ഷേപത്തിൽ ഇപ്പോൾ നിയമിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന ൧൦൦ രൂപ അലവൻസ്
വേണമെന്നോ വേണ്ടായെന്നോ പറഞ്ഞിട്ടില്ല. അല്ലെങ്കിൽ കേവലം
ഒരു അഭിപ്രായം പറഞ്ഞുപോകുകയെ ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളു.

PRESIDENT : Order order. The honourable member has
presumably, heard the other honourable member. He must either
make up his mind to be persuaded or dissuaded by the argument.
The materials must be before the honourable member himself.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : It is obvious from the
object given under the motion that the intention is to discuss the
desirability of converting this into allowance as before. It is very
clear, as clear as daylight.

MR. P. S. MAHOMED : സർ, മി. ടി. പി. വേലായുധൻപിള്ള
അവതരിപ്പിച്ചതായ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ ഞാൻ പിൻതാങ്ങുന്നു. ഇപ്പോൾ
നിർണ്ണയിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള ശമ്പളം മാറ്റി പഴയപടിയുള്ള അലവൻസു ആക്ക
ണമെന്നു നിർണ്ണയിക്കുന്നതിനല്ല ഞാൻ ഉപക്ഷേപം അവതരിപ്പിക്കുക

നമു്. ഇന്നു നിലവിലിരിക്കുന്ന അലവൻസിന്റെ തോതനുസരിച്ചു നോക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അതു കുറേപേർക്കു ആദായവും മറ്റുചിലർക്കു ആദായമില്ലാത്ത നിലയിലുമാണിരിക്കുന്നതു്. അതിൽ ചിലർക്കു അസുഖമുണ്ടെന്നു എന്നിങ്ങ നല്ലവണ്ണമറിയാം. എന്നാൽ ഇപ്പോൾ ബഡ്ജറ്റിൽ കൊള്ളിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന തോതനുസരിച്ചുള്ള പ്രതിഫലം മാസംതോറും സ്വീകരിക്കുക എന്ന പതിവുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ കൂടുതൽ വാങ്ങിക്കൊണ്ടിരുന്ന ആളുകൾക്കും കുറെ കയ്യിൽനിന്നും നഷ്ടപ്പെട്ടേണ്ടതായിവരും. ഇങ്ങനെ യുള്ള ഒരു വിഷമസന്ധിയാണു ഇതിനുള്ളതു്. കേവലം അഭിമാനത്തെ മാത്രം മുൻനിർത്തി സംഗതികൾ പറയാതിരിക്കുന്നതു എന്നെ സംബന്ധിച്ചിടത്തോളം വിഷമമാണു്. ഡിപ്യൂട്ടി പ്രസിഡൻറിനു ഒരു ആണറേറിയം തീർച്ചപ്പെടുത്തിയിട്ടുണ്ടു്. അതു അദ്ദേഹത്തിനു അഭിമാനക്ഷയമല്ലെങ്കിൽ മറ്റു മെമ്പർമാർക്കു അതു് അഭിമാനക്ഷയമാണെന്നു പറയുന്നതു ന്യായമായ ഒരു കാര്യമാണെന്നു എന്നിങ്ങ തോന്നുന്നില്ല. അതുകൊണ്ടു ആണറേറിയമാണെങ്കിൽ തൽക്കാലം മുമ്പുള്ള ശമ്പളം അനുസരിച്ചുള്ള ആണറേറിയം വയ്ക്കുന്നതു ന്യായമായ നിലയിലായിരിക്കണമെന്നുള്ളതാണു്. ഈ അസംബ്ളി കുറെ വർഷങ്ങൾക്കു മുമ്പു പാസാക്കിയ ഒരു പ്രമേയമനുസരിച്ചു്, പ്രതിമാസം ൧൦൦ രൂപയാണെന്നു പറയുകയുണ്ടായി.

MR. CHAZHIKATTU JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Thodupazha*) : അതു എന്നാണു പാസാക്കിയതെന്നറിയാമോ?

MR. P. S. MAHOMED : തീയതിയും ആണ്ടും എന്നിങ്ങ ഓർമ്മയില്ല.

MR. CHAZHIKATTU JOSEPH : ഏതു കൊല്ലത്തിലാണെന്നു പറയുവാൻ ദയ്യുണ്ടാകുമോ?

MR. P. S. MAHOMED : ഉദ്ദേശം നാലഞ്ചു കൊല്ലമാകും. അതിനു ശേഷമാണു യുദ്ധപരിതഃസ്ഥിതി ഇവിടെ ഉണ്ടായതു്. ജീവിതമാർഗത്തിനുള്ള വിഷമതകൾ വർദ്ധിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന ഈ സന്ദർഭത്തിൽ മുമ്പുള്ള അലവൻസു കൂടുതൽ വാങ്ങിയ സ്ഥാനങ്ങളിൽതന്നെ, ബുദ്ധിമുട്ടുകൾ സഹിച്ചു് ഇവിടെ വന്നു രണ്ടുമൂന്നു ദിവസം താമസിച്ചുപോകുന്ന ആളുകൾക്കു ഒരു രൂപാ മാസപ്പടി കൊടുക്കുകയെന്നുള്ളതു മറ്റുള്ളവരുടെ കണ്ണിൽ വളരെ പരിഹാസത്തിനു പാത്രമായ ഒരു സംഗതിയാകും. അതുകൊണ്ടു ഡിപ്യൂട്ടി പ്രസിഡൻറിനു നൽകുന്ന ആണറേറിയത്തിന്റെ ഒരു പ്രപ്പോർഷൻ നിശ്ചയിച്ചു മെമ്പർമാരുടെ അന്തസ്സിനു ഭംഗം വരാത്തനിലയിൽ ഏതെങ്കിലും ഒരു സംഖ്യ നൽകേണ്ടതാണു്. അപ്രകാരം

[Mr. P. S. Mahomed.]

ഏതെങ്കിലും വിധത്തിൽ നിശ്ചയിക്കുകയല്ലാതെ ആർക്കും ഒന്നിനും തികയാത്ത ശമ്പളം വയ്ക്കുന്നതു ഒരിക്കലും നല്ലതല്ല. ഇത്രയും പറഞ്ഞുകൊണ്ടു ഞാൻ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു.

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN: ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു എന്തെങ്കിലും സംസാരിക്കുവാൻ അല്പം വിഷമവും വല്ലായ്മയുമുണ്ട്. മെമ്പറന്മാരുടെ ഭാവലിംഗ് അലവൻസിനേയും അവരുടെ ഹോണററിയത്തേയും സംബന്ധിച്ചുള്ള ഈ വിഷയത്തിൽ സങ്കോചം വരുന്നത് വെറും സ്വാഭാവികമാണ്. എത്ര സങ്കോചമുണ്ടെങ്കിലും ഒരു സംഗതി തുറന്നു പറയാതെ യാതൊരു നിർവാഹവുമില്ല. അഭിമാനം കൊണ്ടു ആവശ്യം പറയാതിരിക്കുന്നത് അബദ്ധമാണല്ലോ. തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ വടക്കൻപ്രദേശങ്ങളിൽനിന്നും ഇവിടെവന്നു സാമാനങ്ങളുടെ വില വർദ്ധനയുള്ള ഈ കാലത്ത് മെമ്പറന്മാർ അവർ അർഹിക്കുന്ന അന്തസ്സു പാലിച്ച ഈ തിരുവനന്തപുരം പട്ടണത്തിൽ കുറെ ദിവസം കഴിച്ചുകൂട്ടി പോകുവാൻ ഈ സംഖ്യ ഒന്നുകൊണ്ടും മതിയാകുകയില്ലെന്നുള്ള കാര്യം ഗവണ്മെന്റു അറിയേണ്ടതാണ്. എന്റെ മാന്യസ്പേഹിതൻ രാജശ്രീ ടി. പി. വേലായുധൻപിള്ള ആണറേറിയം വന്നാൽ അന്തസ്സു കറയുമെന്നു ഭയപ്പെടുന്നു. ആ ഭയം എനിക്കില്ല. ഏതുവിധമായാലും തരക്കേടില്ല അന്തസ്സായി ആവശ്യങ്ങൾ നിറവേറുവാനുള്ള സംഖ്യയുണ്ടായിരിക്കണം. ഡിപ്യൂട്ടി പ്രസിഡൻറിനു നൽകുന്നതുപോലെ ഒരു വലിയ ആണറേറിയം ചോദിക്കുവാൻ ഒന്നു രണ്ടു വിഷമങ്ങളുണ്ട്. ഒന്നാമതായി ഡിപ്യൂട്ടിപ്രസിഡൻറു ഒരാളാണ്. പിന്നീട് അദ്ദേഹം നമ്മുടെ ഡിപ്യൂട്ടി പ്രസിഡൻറാണ്. ഇപ്പോൾതന്നെ ഏകദേശം രൂ ൧൦൦൦൦ രൂപാ ററി. ഏ. ഇനത്തിൽ ഗവണ്മെന്റു ചെലവിടുന്നുണ്ട്. ൭൫ രൂപാ ഓണറേറിയം ആയാൽ ഏകദേശം രൂ ൧൦൦൦൦ രൂപാ ചെലവു വരും. മി. ചാഴിക്കാട്ടു ജോസഫ് പറയുന്നതുപോലെ ൧൮൦൦ രൂപാ എന്ന് കട്ടംവട്ടം പിടിക്കുവാനുള്ള നിർബന്ധം എന്നെ സംബന്ധിച്ചിടത്തോളം ഇല്ല. “അച്ഛനും കചനും അന്തരം വരാത്ത” രീതിയിലായിരിക്കണം തീരുമാനമെന്നാണു ഞാൻ പറയുന്നത്. ൧൧൧൨-ൽ ഈ അസംബ്ലിയിൽ ൧൦൦ രൂപ ഓണറേറിയം കൊടുക്കണമെന്നുള്ള ഒരു നിശ്ചയം പാസ്സായി. അത് അംഗീകരിച്ചിരുന്നു എങ്കിൽ ഈ യുദ്ധകാലപരിതസ്ഥിതിയിൽ

എന്തെങ്കിലും ഒരു മാറ്റം കൂടി ഇപ്പോൾ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ചെയ്യുമായിരുന്നു. ഈ പ്രതീക്ഷ വെറും ഒരു ന്യായമായ പ്രതീക്ഷ മാത്രമാണ്. അതുകൊണ്ട് ആണരേയമാണെങ്കിൽ മറ്റേ രൂപം എന്നും ഭാവമിംഗ് അലവൻസാണെങ്കിൽ ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ ടി. എ. യുടെയും അലവൻസിന്റേയും അൻപതു ശതമാനം കൂടി എന്നും രണ്ടു നിർദ്ദേശം ഈ സഭയിൽ വച്ചുകൊണ്ട് ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപം ഞാൻ പിൻതാങ്ങിക്കൊള്ളുന്നു.

MR. KADAKAVOOR P. MADHAVAN (*Chirayinkil cum Nedumangad*): Sir, the question of payment of salaries to members of the Legislature is not a new one. In England it can be seen that a member of Parliament is paid £ 600 a year. In the Federal Assembly of Canada the member is paid £ 800 a year. In the Assembly of the United States a member is paid £ 1,500 a year. In Australia a member is paid £ 800 a year. So the question of payment of salaries to the members of the Legislature will not in any way affect the self respect of the members of this august Assembly. Sir, you will know that when the question of travelling allowances and staying allowances is to be considered we are often put to the painful necessity of giving incorrect figures to the Secretary. Moreover, Sir, you will remember that when you said at the out-set that on the question of selecting members to the Committees, for example when a Committee is to be constituted for the purpose of amending the Criminal Law, persons who have no knowledge whatsoever of Criminal Law will be forced to go in because they will go about canvassing votes. But when the salaries are fixed, persons who are capable of standing in Committees will automatically come in. So I say, with full respect to my honourable friends Mr. K. R. Narayanan and Mr. Chazhikatan, the allowance that is fixed, namely Rs. 75, is surely one which wounds the self-respect of every member of this Assembly. The allowance must be at least Rs. 125 so as to meet both ends. We have to come from North Parur and stay in Trivandrum; we have to meet the expenses of our travel and stay at Trivandrum. The cost in 1113, when the resolution was moved to fix the salary at Rs. 100, was 8 or 10 chuckrams for a decent meal? But today we have to pay Rs. 2 for a meal. With Rs. 6 it will not be possible for a decent member of this Assembly to stay in Trivandrum. So the travelling and staying allowances now fixed are insufficient. I support the motion of Mr. Velayudhan Pillai and say that the amount fixed by Government may be raised, if not to Rs. 150 as Mr. Joseph stated, atleast to Rs. 125. The honourable Deputy President is given Rs. 3,600 as honorarium. Members like Mr. M. L. Janardhanan Pillai, who are able to forego that amount, can give that money to the Vanchi Poor Fund which is running for the benefit of the poor people of Travancore. And I ask the members of this august Assembly to forego that amount by giving it to the Vanchi Poor Fund and thus vindicate the

[Mr. Kadakavoor P. Madhavan]

cause of that Fund. So I respectfully submit that the amount must be raised at once. This sum of Rs. 75, as Mr. K. R. Narayanan stated the other day, is only the pay of a senior clerk. That is not sufficient.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI : May I take it that my honourable friend is offering his pay to the Vanchi Poor Fund ?

MR. KADAKAVOOR P. MADHAVAN : I will consider.

PRESIDENT : I will not allow any such interrogatories on the floor of the House which will embarrass both the proponent and the answerer.

MR. KADAKAVOOR P. MADHAVAN : With due respect to my honourable friend.....

PRESIDENT : You may have due respect to your honourable friend, but you need not deal with that matter.

MR. KADAKAVOOR P. MADHAVAN : Sir, if financial considerations will permit me I will consider the suggestion of my honourable friend the Legal Remembrancer. I appeal to the members who are capable of giving it to do so.

MR. CHAZHIKATTU JOSEPH : മെമ്പറന്മാർക്കു കിട്ടുന്ന ആണറേറിയം സംഗതിവശാൽ, ഈ യോഗത്തിന്റെ ആരംഭത്തിൽ ൧൦൦ രൂപാ ആക്കണമെന്നു നിശ്ചയിക്കുന്നതു നല്ലതാണെന്നു ഞാൻ പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. എന്നാൽ ആ അഭിപ്രായത്തിൽ നിന്നും മി. കെ. ആർ. നാരായണൻ പറയുന്നതുപോലെ ൧൨൫ രൂപാ ആക്കുന്നതിനോ മി. ടി. പി. വേലായുധൻചിള്ള പറയാതിരുന്ന തുകയിലേക്കു കുറയ്ക്കുന്നതിനോ തക്കതായ ഒരു കാരണവും ഇതേവരെ വന്നിട്ടില്ല. ആകയാൽ നാലഞ്ചു കൊല്ലങ്ങൾക്കുമുമ്പിൽ ൧൦൦ രൂപാ വരെ കൊടുക്കത്തക്കവണ്ണമുള്ള ഒരു പരിതസ്ഥിതി ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നെങ്കിൽ യുദ്ധപരിതസ്ഥിതിമൂലം ചെലവു വർദ്ധിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന ഈ കാലസ്ഥിതിയിൽ ൫൦ രൂപാ കൂട്ടി ൧൫൦ രൂപാ ആക്കുന്നതു വളരെ ഉത്തമമായിരിക്കുമെന്നാണു എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം. കൂടാതെ എന്റെ മുൻഗാമികളും അസംബ്ലിയിൽ പഴക്കമുണ്ടെന്നു നടിക്കുന്നവരുമായ ചിലർ കാര്യം പറയുന്നതിൽ മടിക്കുന്നുണ്ട്. നാം നമ്മുടെ കാര്യമല്ല പറയുന്നത്. നമ്മുടെ പിന്നാലേ വരുന്ന അംഗങ്ങൾക്കു് എന്തു സംഖ്യ കൊടുക്കണമെന്നു തീർച്ച ചെയ്യുവാനാണു നാം കൂടിയിരിക്കുന്നത്, ആ സ്ഥിതിക്കു നാം ഈ വിഷയത്തെക്കുറിച്ച് ശൗരവമായി ആലോചിച്ചു ഒരു നല്ല തുക കൊടുക്കണമെന്നു തീരുമാനിച്ചു പിരിയേണ്ടതാണു്. ഡിപ്യൂട്ടിപ്രസിഡൻറിനു ൩൦൦ രൂപാ പ്രതിമാസം കൊടുക്കുന്ന സ്ഥിതിക്കു പകുതി സംഖ്യയെങ്കിലും

ബാക്കിയുള്ളവർക്കു കൊടുക്കണമെന്നു പറയുന്നതു ന്യായമാണ്. എന്നാൽ ട്രാവലിംഗ് അലവൻസ് ഏർപ്പാടു നിറുത്തണമെന്ന് ഇവിടെ പ്രസ്താവിക്കുകയുണ്ടായി. കമ്മിറ്റികളിൽ പ്രവേശിക്കുന്നതു സംബന്ധിച്ച ആഭായമുള്ളതുകൊണ്ട് ആ കാര്യത്തിൽ മെമ്പർമാർ തമ്മിൽ വലിയ മത്സരം നടക്കുന്നതായി ടിവാൻജിയുടെ പ്രസംഗത്തിൽനിന്നു മനസ്സിലായി. അപ്രകാരമുള്ള മത്സരം ശമിക്കുന്നതിനു ഇതു സഹായമായിരിക്കും. ഈ എൻറ അഭിപ്രായമുള്ള പലരും ആ അഭിപ്രായം വ്യക്തമാക്കാൻ മടിക്കുന്നതായി ഞാൻ കണ്ടു. അവർ അവരുടെ അഭിപ്രായം മറച്ചുവെച്ചുകൊള്ളട്ടെ. ഏതായാലും ൧൮൦൦ രൂപാ ഭാണദേറിയമായി ഈ അംഗങ്ങൾക്കു കൊടുക്കണമെന്നാണ് എൻറ അഭിപ്രായം. ഇത് ഇതരണ്ടു മാസം കൂടുമ്പോൾ ൩൦൦ രൂപാ വീതം ഒന്നിച്ചു കൊടുക്കണമെന്നും ഇതു നടപ്പിൽ വന്നുകണ്ടാൽ കൊള്ളാമെന്നും ഉള്ള എൻറ അഭിപ്രായത്തെ ഇവിടെ പ്രസ്താവിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

MR. M. L. JANARDHANAN PILLAI : Sir, I am moving for the omission of the total allotment of Rs. 88,691 set apart for legislative bodies. The Dewan President in the course of his remarks on the subject has pointed out the very unhealthy atmosphere that occasionally prevails with regard to elections to committees.

PRESIDENT : The Honourable member may raise his voice.

MR. M. L. JANARDHANAN PILLAI : At the same time it has been observed in the past that there has been a sort of approach made to the Legal Remembrancer from time to time, whether it is the present Legal Remembrancer or his predecessor in office, to get into the various select committees. It was certainly an experience with those who were in the Select Committees to see men who could not be of any real use finding their places there simply for the purpose of extending probably the Legal Remembrancer's patronage for giving them travelling allowance. That was one unfortunate occurrence that did happen. I agree with the various sentiments put forward by the honourable members in the House especially by my friends of the State Congress Party to the effect that we are here to serve the country's interests. If we are here to serve the country's interests then we shall not receive anything from Government whether it be pay or allowance. That is my stand point. We should certainly set up a higher standard for the general welfare of the country by declining to accept even a single pie from Government for the service that we render to the country. We do make money in our own ways. We certainly carry on our day to day life. Each one has his own method of living. Certainly we do not depend for our living on this item of income. Many of my friends including the honourable member Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai are in a position to meet all expenses to come to Trivandrum, give all co-operation to the Government that is expected of us and then go back to Chengannur, without asking a single pie from the Government. We are not here to raise the amount of

[Mr. M. L. Janardanan Pillai.]

emoluments sanctioned to us by the Government. We are here for another reason. We come here on our own expenses, to give the best that we can to the country and to the Government. That is the spirit in which we have to offer our services. Therefore I trust that the whole House will accept my motion and agree that we shall not receive anything out of the allotment made in this direction.

MR. P. K. KURIAKOSE : സർ, ഓണറേ റിയം എത്രതന്നെ ആയിരുന്നാലും വലിയ വിഷമം ഒന്നും നേരിടാനില്ല. തുക എത്രയാണെന്നു ഞാൻ ഇവിടെ പ്രസ്താവിക്കുന്നില്ല. അത് കുറഞ്ഞതാകാതെ കൂടിയതാകാതെ, എന്നാൽ ഒരു സംഗതി ഗവണ്മെന്റു വരുത്തേണ്ടതുണ്ട്. അതു ദേവീകളത്തുനിന്നും വരുന്ന ഒരു മെമ്പർക്കും ഇവിടെനിന്നും വരുന്ന ഒരു മെമ്പർക്കും ഒരേനിലയിൽ ഓണറേ റിയം നിശ്ചയിക്കുന്നതു ശരിയല്ലെന്നുള്ളതാണ്. റി. എ. എന്നു പറയുന്നതു മെമ്പർക്കു കൊടുക്കുന്നതല്ല. മെമ്പർക്കു ചോക്കാറിൽനിന്ന് ബസ്സുകാർക്കും മറ്റും കൊടുക്കുന്ന ഒരു തുക അവർക്കു കിട്ടേണ്ടതാണ്. റി. എ. ഇല്ലാതെയാക്കിയാൽ അത് കച്ചിൽനിന്നും കൊടുക്കേണ്ടതായിവരും. അതുകൊണ്ട് ഓണറേ റിയം എത്രതന്നെ ആയിരുന്നാലും ഓരോ മെമ്പർക്കും യാത്രയ്ക്കു യഥാർത്ഥത്തിൽ വേണ്ടിവരുന്ന തുക അവർക്കു കൊടുക്കുകതന്നെ വേണമെന്നുള്ളതാണ് എന്റെ പ്രധാനമായ അഭിപ്രായം. ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാർക്കു തന്നെ അവരുടെ ശമ്പളത്തോടു് അനുസരിച്ചു യാത്രക്കു വേണ്ടിവരുന്ന ചെലവു് റി. എ. ഇനത്തിൽ കൊടുത്തുവരുന്നുണ്ട്. ഈ പട്ടണത്തിൽ ഉള്ളവർക്കും ദേവീകളത്തുനിന്നു വരുന്നവർക്കും ഒരേ നിലയിൽ ഓണറേ റിയം നിശ്ചയിക്കുന്നതു നീതീകരിക്കത്തക്കതല്ല. അപ്രകാരമാണെങ്കിൽ സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാർ അയച്ചുകൊടുക്കട്ടെ. എന്നാൽ എല്ലാവരും ഒരേ നിലയിലായി. അല്ലെങ്കിൽ യാത്രച്ചെലവു് വേറെ കൊടുക്കണം.

PRESIDENT : I am afraid I did not pay adequate attention to the last few remarks.

MR. P. K. KURIAKOSE : ഒരേ നിലയിൽ മൊബറന്മാരെ എല്ലാം നിർത്തിക്കൊണ്ടുവേണം അവർക്കു ഓണറേ റിയം ഒരേ നിലയിൽ കൊടുക്കാൻ. ദേവീകളത്തുനിന്നു വരുന്ന ഒരു മെമ്പർക്കും ഇവിടെനിന്നു കയറി വരുന്ന ഒരു മെമ്പർക്കും ഒരേ നിലയിൽ ഓണറേ റിയം കൊടുക്കാൻ പാടില്ല. ദേവീകളത്തുനിന്നും വരുന്ന ഒരു മെമ്പർ സഭ കൂടുന്നതിനുണ്ടു മൂന്നു ദിവസം മുന്പേ പുറപ്പെടണം.

MR. CHAZHIKATTU JOSEPH : ഈ നിരമസഭ ഭേദികളത്തേക്കു കൊണ്ടുപോകാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ലെന്ന് ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർക്ക് അറിയാമോ ?

MR. P. K. KURIAKOSE : അതുകൊണ്ടുതന്നെയാണ് എല്ലാവരേയും ഒരേ നിലയിൽ കരുതാൻ പാടില്ലെന്നു പറഞ്ഞത്. വേറെ സ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽ സഭ കൂടാൻ നിവൃത്തിയുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ റി. എ. ആക്ട് കൊടുക്കേണ്ടയാവശ്യമില്ല. ഓരോ തവണ ഓരോ ഡിവിഷനിൽ വെച്ചു കൂടുകയാണെങ്കിൽ വിഷമം എല്ലാവരും അനുഭവിക്കുമായിരുന്നു. അപ്പോൾ തിരുവനന്തപുരത്തുള്ള വടക്കും ഭേദികളുത്ത് പോകേണ്ടതായി വരുമല്ലോ. ഇവിടെ വെച്ച് കൂടുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു ഭേദികളുത്തുള്ളവർ ൨ ദിവസത്തിനു മുമ്പു പുറപ്പെടുകയും സഭ കഴിഞ്ഞതിനുശേഷം സ്ഥലത്തെത്തുന്നതിനു ൨ ദിവസം കൂടുതൽ ചെലവുചെയ്യുകയും ചെയ്യേണ്ടതായി വരുന്നു.

MR. KADAKAVOOR P. MADHAVAN : തിരുവനന്തപുരത്തുനിന്ന് ഒരു മെമ്പർ മാത്രമേ ഉള്ളൂ എന്നുള്ള സംഗതി ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർക്ക് അറിയാമോ ?

MR. P. K. KURIAKOSE : തിരുവനന്തപുരത്തു് ഒന്നോ രണ്ടോ മെമ്പറെ ഉള്ളൂ എങ്കിലും മറ്റുള്ളവർ സമീപത്തുള്ളവരായിരിക്കും.

MR. A. K. BHASKAR : തിരുവനന്തപുരത്തു താമസിക്കുന്ന മെമ്പറും മേൽവിലാസം കൊടുക്കുന്നത് കാഞ്ഞിരപ്പള്ളി എന്നോ വടക്കൻപറവൂർ എന്നോ ആയിരിക്കും എന്ന് ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർക്ക് അറിയാമോ ?

MR. P. K. KURIAKOSE : അഭിമാനവും അന്തസ്സും ഉള്ള മെമ്പറന്മാർ അപ്രകാരം ചെയ്യുകയില്ലെന്നാണ് എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം.

സർ, എല്ലാവരേയും ഒരേ നിലയിൽ നിരത്തിക്കൊണ്ടു ഓണറേറിയം നിശ്ചയിക്കണം. സഭ കൂടുന്നത് ഓരോ തവണ ഓരോ ഡിവിഷനിൽ വെച്ചാണെങ്കിൽ ഈ കാര്യത്തിൽ ഒരു വ്യത്യാസവും ചെയ്യേണ്ട ആവശ്യമില്ല. ഓണറേറിയം കൂട്ടിയാലും ശരി കുറച്ചാലും ശരി ഓരോ മെമ്പർക്കും യാത്രക്കു യഥാർത്ഥത്തിൽ വേണ്ടിവരുന്ന ചെലവു് കൊടുക്കേണ്ടതത്യാവശ്യമാണെന്നുള്ള സംഗതി ഞാൻ ഒന്നുകൂടി പ്രസ്താവിച്ചു കൊള്ളുന്നു.

PRESIDENT : I have to put Mr. Janardanan Pillay's motion first to vote.

The motion was put and lost.

MR. M. L. JANARDHANAN PILLAI : Sir, I demand a poll.

A poll was taken and the House divided as follows:—

Ayes—5.

1	Mr. M. L. Janardanan Pillai	4	Mr. C. S. Lakshmana Aiyar
2	„ V. S. Krishna Pillai	5	„ K. A. Mahomed
3	„ S. Krishna Aiyar		

Noes—17.

1	Mr. P. C. Adichan	10	Mr. P. S. Mahomed
2	„ P. R. Atchutan	11	„ K. R. Narayanan
3	„ K. Balakrishna Menon	12	„ M. K. Nilakantan
4	„ P. S. Gopala Pillai	13	„ K. M. Paul
5	„ Chazhikkattu Joseph	14	„ K. Sukumaran
6	„ K. G. Kesavan Nair	15	„ P. O. Thomas
7	„ P. K. Kunju	16	„ V. K. Velayudhan
8	„ V. Madhavan	17	„ Puliyoor
9	„ Varkala K. Madhavan		T. P. Velayudhan Pillai

Neutrals—48.

1	Mr. A. K. Bhaskar	27	Mr. N. D. Parameswarn
2	„ M. K. Chandrasekhara		Namboodri
	Bhattathiri	28	Rajyasevanirata
3	„ Rajyasevanirata		K. G. Parameswaran Pillai
	S. Chattanatha Karayalar	29	Rajyasevaprvina
4	„ K. K. Chellappan Pillai		G. Parameswaran Pillai
5	„ V. Gangadharan Nair	30	Mr. G. Parameswaran Pillai
6	„ A. Gopala Menon	31	„ J. E. A. Pereira
7	„ V. I. Idicula	32	„ M. R. Ramakrishna Pillai
8	„ K. C. Karunakaran	33	„ E. G. Salter
9	„ T. T. Kesavan Sastry	34	„ C. K. Sankara Pillai
10	„ P. K. Kumaran	35	„ S. Sankaranarayanan
11	„ C. Kumara Das		Tampi
12	„ K. G. Kunjukrishna Pillai	36	„ V. Sreedharan Pillai
13	„ P. K. Kuriakose	37	„ A. R. Sulaiman Sait
14	„ E. K. Madhavan	38	„ S. Thiraviam Nadar
15	„ R. Madhavan Nair	39	„ D. Thomas
16	„ M. K. Mahomed	40	„ J. W. Tolson
17	„ K. A. Mathew	41	„ S. N. Ure
18	„ K. T. Michael	42	„ A. P. Udayabhanu
19	„ J. T. Morais	43	„ K. Varugheese Ithac
20	„ S. Narayana Iyer	44	„ P. M. Varghese
21	„ T. K. Narayana Pillai	45	„ V. K. Velappan Nair
22	„ G. Narayanan Thampi	46	Rao Bahadur
23	Sry. T. Narayani Amma		T. V. Venkiteswara Iyer
24	Mr. P. S. Nataraja Pillai	47	Mr. Xavier Vincent
25	„ A. Nesamony	48	„ Brahmapuram
26	„ H. C. Papworth		P. Yesudian

The motion was declared lost 5 members voting for, 17 against and 48 remaining neutral.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : I beg leave to withdraw my motion.

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN : But my amendment is there.

PRESIDENT : There is no specific amendment. The point is this. I do not want that there must be any mistake about the matter. Government have made a provision on the basis of Rs. 75/. per mensem to each member. Mr. Velayudhan Pillai has put forward the proposition that the old system of allowance would be better substituted for it. So, the question is whether honourable members are willing to take the provision made in the budget or they want a change. Mr. Velayudhan Pillai's motion is for the purpose of a change.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : I want to withdraw my motion.

PRESIDENT : The question is whether the honourable member has the leave of the House to withdraw the motion.

MR. P. S. MAHOMED : I oppose it.

PRESIDENT : Then I will have to take the sense of the House. The motion of Mr. Velayudhan Pillai was put and lost.

The question that Government be granted a sum of Rs. 88,691/- under Demand VI—General Administration—Legislative Bodies was put and carried.

The Demand was passed and the grant was made.

DEMAND VII—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI : Sir, I move for a grant of Rs. 15,39,547 under Demand VII Administration of Justice.

MR. C. K. SANKARA PILLAI : Sir, I beg to move the following motion :—

“To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,73,360 for criminal courts by Re. 1”

(To discuss the necessity of establishing a First Class Magistrate's Court at Mavelikarai).

Sir, at all places where there is a District Court, we find also a First Class Magistrate's Court there. The District Court at Mavelikara was established in 1116. People from various places which are under the jurisdiction of the District Court have to go to Alleppey, a distance of about 29 miles, and some of them have to go to Chengannur also. I, therefore, bring to the notice of Government the necessity for the establishment of a First Class Magistrate's Court at Mavelikara as early as possible. I request the House to support the motion.

MR. P. O. THOMAS : Sir, I beg to move the following motion:—

“To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 15,39,547 for Administration of Justice by Re. 1”

(To discuss about communal representations in the Judicial Service of the State).

[Mr. P. O. Thomas.]

I bring to the notice of the Government the attitude of the Government regarding recruitment to the higher grades of the Judicial Service in the State. The principle of communal representations which was accepted by the Government years back is being overlooked for the last few years. I make particular reference to the community to which I belong, namely, Catholics in the State. As it is, out of the sixteen judges in the State, only one belongs to our community, and out of the 53 Munsiffs there are only four belonging to my community. The Catholics, in point of number, education, culture, wealth and in many other respects form a considerable section of the population in the State. Though the Government have conceded to the principle of communal representations, in actual practice, it is very often overlooked and our claims are not attended to and of late, I am sorry to say that the attitude of the Government towards our community is one of callous indifference in this matter.

This policy is intricately connected with that of importing foreigners into the State.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : I raise a point of order. Sir, the motion now under discussion is that moved by Mr. C. K. Sankara Pillai and it relates to the allotment of Rs. 1,73,360 for criminal courts. This has nothing to do with the recruitment of Munsiffs in the Judicial Service.

PRESIDENT : The honourable member will see that Mr. Thomas has offered a motion for the reduction of total grant.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : It is independent of this.

PRESIDENT : Under the Ruling of yesterday, when a token cut motion under a particular allotment lapses, all the other motions under that Head also lapse.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : Mr. Thomas' motion relates to the reduction of the total allotment of Rs. 15,39,547. That comes under altogether a different Head.

PRESIDENT : Mr. Legal Remembrancer.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI : I am sorry I did not bring that to the notice of the House earlier. Mr. Puliyoor T. P. Velayudhan Pillai is right.

PRESIDENT : Yes. Mr. Sankara Pillai's motion will have to be voted on and then I will have to call upon Mr. Thomas.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI : On this matter, I may assure the honourable member that the Government are keeping an open mind and are making the necessary enquiries. As soon as the data are at hand and if they justify the establishment of a First Class Magistrate's Court at Mavelikara, the Government will certainly take further steps on the matter. I may also assure the honourable member that the Government are very seriously and sympathetically considering this question.

MR. C. K. SANKARA PILLAI : I do not press the motion.

PRESIDENT : Motion, by leave, is withdrawn.

MR. P. O. THOMAS : I say that the policy of Government in importing foreigners into the higher grades of public service is partly

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI : There are two points on which I raise an objection. One is that the appointment to the High Court being the prerogative of the Sovereign, it cannot be discussed. The other is that the question of appointment to the Judiciary on the question of communal representations does not arise.

PRESIDENT : The honourable member, Mr. Thomas, is of course aware that no reference can be made on the floor of the House to the appointments to the High Court. Unless the honourable member suggests that any foreigner has been imported into any other court, that question cannot be raised here, because the appointment to the High Court is the prerogative of the Sovereign.

The honourable member began by saying that the question of communal representation in the Judicial Service is an accepted fact. What is the authority for that?

MR. P. O. THOMAS : I beg your pardon.

PRESIDENT : What is the authority for the honourable member for saying that the question of communal representation in the Judicial Service is an accepted fact?

MR. P. O. THOMAS : In the higher grades of public service this principle was accepted though I cannot state the exact authority.

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI : Sir, Communal representation as such in the recruitment to the Judiciary has not been recognized as a matter of policy. Efficiency is the test for recruitment to the Judiciary. While doing so, it is also the aim of Government and of the High Court on whose recommendation recruitment to the subordinate Judiciary is made, that justice is done and equal opportunities are given to all communities.

MR. P. O. THOMAS : But in actual practice, your predecessors were recognising this principle in the matter of recruitment to the higher grades of the Judicial Service also. Of late, there has been a definite change in the attitude of Government.

PRESIDENT : What are the honourable member's grounds for saying that? Has the honourable member taken the number of Christians, Nayers, Ezhavas, etc. appointed within the last ten years? Does he mean only the Syrian Catholics?

MR. P. O. THOMAS : The Catholics as a whole.

PRESIDENT : Order, order. I take it that the honourable member's observations are not with reference to Christians generally but to Catholics in particular.

MR. P. O. THOMAS : No Second Judge has been appointed within the last twelve years from the Catholic community. Among Government pleaders there is only one belonging to the Catholic community at present.

Without making particular reference to the appointments to the High Court, I can say that the import of foreigners into the higher grades of the Service is partly responsible for this.

PRESIDENT : What is the importation that the honourable member refers to?

MR. P. O. THOMAS : I refer to the importation of non-Travancoreans to the higher grades of the public service.

PRESIDENT : The honourable member must say which are the foreigners who have been got into the State. Who are the foreigners that the honourable member has in mind?

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : Excluding the High Court.

MR. P. O. THOMAS : I refer to a question put on the floor of the House the answer to which definitely indicates that the Government are not willing to give out the names.

PRESIDENT : Order, order. The honourable member knows that he is a resident in the State; and so he must know which are the foreigners who have been imported into the Judicial Department other than the High Court. Can the honourable member mention any single name of a person imported from outside.

MR. P. O. THOMAS : I never stated that any recruitment from outside is made to the Judicial Service.

PRESIDENT : Then, any other remark would be out of order on this ground.

MR. P. O. THOMAS : With regard to the answer given to the question put by Mr. T. K. Narayana Pillai—Question No. 205

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : Does that question arise with reference to this cut-motion?

PRESIDENT : The honourable member will realise that he is speaking on the grant for Administration of Justice. The fact that the Government gave an answer with regard to certain questions is irrelevant. The question whether the Government have imported foreigners into the Judicial Service is relevant. If that is so, the honourable member can mention the name. If that is not so, the honourable member is not justified. The honourable member may conform to the rules of relevancy.

MR. P. O. THOMAS : Sir, I was trying to point out that it has a bearing on this—in this respect that an officer in the higher grades of the public service may be appointed in the judiciary after some time. So, it will have a bearing on this.

PRESIDENT : Order, order. How will a person appointed to some other service be appointed in the Judiciary later on?

Mr. P. O. THOMAS : Sir, for instance, a person may be appointed as clerk in the Secretariat and later on he may be sent out as magistrate and a magistrate may be.....

PRESIDENT : Does the honourable member suggest that foreigners have been recruited as clerks in the Secretariat?

Mr. P. O. THOMAS : No, I do not mean that there are clerks who are foreigners.

Sir, I here refer to the question of Mr. T. K. Narayana Pillai which has been put to Government. I would have been in a better position to answer the point now raised if Government were fair enough to have answered the question of Mr. T. K. Narayana Pillai.

PRESIDENT : Order, order. The honourable member must conform to the rules of debate.

Mr. P. O. THOMAS : When Government were confronted with the question, they declined to answer. And on a defective answer.....

PRESIDENT : Order, order. The honourable member is not entitled to proceed on that basis.

Mr. P. O. THOMAS : Sir, at any rate, I can state that in the higher grades of the Judicial service the representation given to the Catholics is not sufficiently adequate. So, Sir, you may be kind enough to revise your attitude in this matter and satisfy the claims of my community.

Mr. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : സർ, ഈ ഉപദേശത്തെ ഞാൻ ശക്തിയായി എതിർക്കുന്നു. അങ്ങനെ എതിർക്കുന്നത് എത്രകിലും സമുദായത്തിന്റെ ന്യായമായ അവകാശങ്ങളെ വിഗ്നിക്കപ്പെടണമെന്നോ, അവർക്ക് ഉദ്യോഗസംബന്ധമായി നൽകിവരുന്ന ആനുകൂല്യങ്ങൾ കുറയ്ക്കണമെന്നോ ഉള്ള ഉദ്ദേശം കൊണ്ടല്ല. സമുദായ പ്രാതിനിധ്യത്വം മറ്റൊരാൾക്ക് ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിൽ സ്വീകരിച്ചാൽതന്നെയും, എന്റെ വ്യക്തിപരമായ അഭിപ്രായത്തിൽ, നീതിന്യായപരിപാലനത്തിൽ സ്ഥാപിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള ജൂഡീഷ്യൽ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിൽ മുൻസിഫ്മാർ തുടങ്ങി ഹൈക്കോടതി ജഡ്ജിമാർവരെ ഉള്ള നിയമനങ്ങളെ സംബന്ധിച്ചിടത്തോളമെങ്കിലും സമുദായപ്രാതിനിധ്യ വ്യവസ്ഥ സ്വീകരിക്കാതിരിക്കുന്നത് രാജ്യക്ഷേമത്തിൽ അത്യന്തപേക്ഷിതമായിട്ടുള്ളതാണെന്നാണ് എന്റെ പരിപൂർണ്ണവിശ്വാസം. അഥവാ ഈ വാദം തന്നെ സ്വീകരിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു നോക്കുകയാണെങ്കിലും, ഈ ഖണ്ഡനോപക്ഷേപത്തിന്റെ പ്രയോക്താവിന് സങ്കല്പിക്കുന്നതിൽ യാതൊരു കാരണവും ഇല്ലെന്നാണ് എനിക്കു തോന്നുന്നത്. ഈ വിഷയത്തിൽ യഥാർത്ഥത്തിൽ സങ്കടക്കാർ മറ്റു സമുദായങ്ങളാണ്. സർ, ഈ മാതിരിയുള്ള

[Mr. Puliyoor T. P. Vekiyudhan Pillai]

സമുദായപ്രാതിനിധ്യവാദം മുറുകെ പിടിക്കുന്നതായാൽ അത് പല അവസരങ്ങളിലും രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ പൊതുശ്രേയസ്സിനും കാര്യക്ഷമതയ്ക്കും സാധനമായ പ്രതിബന്ധം ഉണ്ടാക്കുകതന്നെ ചെയ്യും. കൂടാതെ ഖണ്ഡനോപക്ഷേപപ്രയോക്താവ് ആദ്യമെ വാദം തുടങ്ങിയതുതന്നെ, ജുഡീഷ്യൽ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചിടത്തോളം സമുദായ പ്രാതിനിധ്യതപം മുമ്പ് സ്വീകരിച്ചിരുന്നു എന്നുള്ള അഭിപ്രായത്തിലേലാണ്. അത് വെറും ഒരു തെറ്റിദ്ധാരണ ആണെന്നാണ് എന്റെ അറിവ്. അതുകൊണ്ട് ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ എതിർക്കുന്നു.

MR. V. MADHAVAN (Valkem cum Kottayam) : സർ, പബ്ലിക് സർവീസിന്റെ അഴ്നപടികളിലെ നിയമനങ്ങളെ സംബന്ധിച്ച പബ്ലിക് സർവീസ് കമ്മീഷണറുടെ നിയമനത്തിനുശേഷം ഒരു വിധം സമാധാനം വന്നിട്ടുണ്ട്. എന്നാൽ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് നെരിട്ടു നടത്തുന്ന ഉയർന്ന ഉദ്യോഗങ്ങളെ സംബന്ധിച്ച ഇടയവസമുദായത്തിനുള്ള പങ്കു കിട്ടുന്നില്ലെന്നുള്ള പരാതി ഇടയവർക്കുണ്ട്. അങ്ങനെയുള്ള ഒരു ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റാണ് ഈ ജുഡീഷ്യൽ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റ്. സർ, എനിക്ക് ഈ കാര്യത്തിൽ പറയാനുള്ളത്, രണ്ടാം ജഡ്ജി മുതൽ മേജോട്ട് ഫൈക്കോടതി ജഡ്ജിവരെയുള്ള നിയമനങ്ങളിൽ, എന്റെ ഓർമ്മ ശരിയാണെങ്കിൽ, കഴിഞ്ഞ എട്ടു വർഷക്കാലമായിട്ട് ഇടയവസമുദായത്തെ തീരെ അവഗണിച്ചാണ് നിയമനം നടത്തിയിട്ടുള്ളതെന്നാണ്. എന്റെ ബഹുമാന്യ സ്പീക്കർ മി. ടി. പി. വേലായുധൻപിള്ളയുടെ അഭിപ്രായത്തിൽ, ചില സമുദായക്കാർക്കു മാത്രമേ ഇപ്രകാരമുള്ള പരാതികൾക്ക് അപകാശമുള്ളൂ എന്ന് സമ്മതിക്കുന്നതും, ഞാൻ ഉൾക്കൊള്ളുന്ന സമുദായത്തെപ്പറ്റി എല്ലാ എന്ന് ഞാൻ വിചാരിക്കുന്നു. എന്നാൽ ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട ചീഫ് സെക്രട്ടറി അവർകൾ പറഞ്ഞത്, ഇതുപോലെയുള്ള നിയമനങ്ങൾ എല്ലാത്തന്നെ കാര്യക്ഷമതയെ മുൻനിർത്തി നടത്തുന്നതായതുകൊണ്ട് സമുദായ പ്രാതിനിധ്യം നോക്കാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ലെന്നാണ്. സർ, കാര്യക്ഷമതയ്ക്ക് ഹാനി വരാത്തവിധത്തിൽ നിയമനങ്ങൾ നടത്തിയാൽ മതിയെന്നുള്ള അഭിപ്രായക്കാരനാണ് ഞാനും. എന്നാൽ ഇടയവസമുദായത്തിൽ കാര്യക്ഷമതയുണ്ടെന്നു ബോധ്യമുള്ള ഇടയവ ഉദ്യോഗാർത്ഥിയെ തിരഞ്ഞു ഈ രണ്ടാം ജഡ്ജി മുതൽ ഉയർന്ന പടികളിലേക്കു നിയമനം കൊടുക്കണമെന്നാണ് എനിക്ക് പറയാനുള്ളത്.

MR. A. K. BHASKAR : I also support the motion before the House. In doing so I wish to point out the inadequate representation of my community in the Judicial service. In the Judicial Department, as in the case of other Departments, efficiency is a thing which ought to be insisted upon. In the matter of efficiency I ask the honourable member whether any person recruited from my community, as second Judge or District Judge is found lacking? If charges are coming, of course, I can adduce proof to refute them. Whenever a vacancy occurs for appointment in the Judiciary, a community should not be barred for the simple reason that he belongs to a particular community. That is rather hard. On the other hand, opportunities be afforded to every community to show their talents and efficiency. If opportunities are afforded to members of my community, I am sure they will prove that they are as efficient as members of any other community. We have real greivances in this matter and it is nearly eight years since a member of my community has been given an appointment in the higher ranks of the Judicial Department. I hope and trust that the Government will remedy this grievance at an early date. With these observations I support the motion.

MR. N. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI : Sir, may I make it absolutely plain at the outset that no appointment to the Judiciary at any rate will be withheld from members of any community because they belong to a particular community. There cannot be any question that the Government have recognised that equality of opportunity should be given to every section of His Highness's subjects and therefore let there be no misapprehension in the minds of honourable members that if an appointment is not given to a member of any one community it is due to the fact that the member belonged to that particular community. One or two facts have to be specially borne in mind in the case of the appointments to the Judiciary. Honourable members will have to consider that efficiency must be the first and prime consideration. In the case of an appointment to the Judiciary, Sir, the test of efficiency is somewhat different from the case of appointments to the I. C. S. or T. C. S. There an examination qualification is taken for all practical purposes to be sufficient to find out the capacity of the candidate. The case of recruitment to the Judiciary is different. Here, all those honourable members who are members of the bar will agree with me that the test of efficiency cannot certainly and invariably be that of academic qualifications or communal representation. The fact that a particular candidate has either stood in the first class for his F. L. or B. L. Examination or that he is the first candidate in that community to pass the M. L. Examination is immaterial so far as recruitments to the Judiciary are concerned. It is his standing at the Bar; it is his work at the Bar and the impression on the clients and the Courts alike that he has created that is the real test. Sir, supposing there are three applicants to the post of a Munsiff, one each from Trivandrum, Nagercoil and Kottayam Districts. What the High Court does is this. So far as the

[Mr. K. G. Kunjukrishna Pillai.]

Nagercoil applicant is concerned, the District Judge of that place will note his merits, and the opinion of the Judge is considered. In the case of the Trivandrum applicant the High Court has an opportunity to watch the career of that man and the appointment is made with reference to the opinion of the Judges.....

MR. A. NESAMONY : Is not practice on the original side of this Court more necessary than the revisional side?

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI : The revisional side is what may be called that portion of the practice which arises on either small questions or big questions of Law on which practice as such must be limited in all cases to the most senior or most junior lawyers.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : Revisional side means appellate side.

MR. A. NESAMONY : Yes, practice on the appellate side.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI : Sir I think the honourable member is not correct. Practice on the revisional side generally goes either to the leaders of the Bar, because there will be some very important questions of Law which may have to be pressed very strongly and before an unwilling court, or because there is nothing in it and some client wants to take his chance. So, the revisional side of the High Court cannot be said to be in itself a test excepting that it indicates sometimes the leaders at the Bar. But the practice on the original side deserves consideration. But, supposing the practice was on the original side in the case of an applicant; then it would be impossible for the High Court to come to any judgement. Supposing A has 100, B, 150 and C, 200 cases: the number of cases alone would be of no value. It is the impression of the Presiding Officer about the capacity of the applicant that will be relevant because the Presiding Officer is in a much better position exactly to gauge the merit of the candidate than anybody else. So, the principle adopted in these cases is to consider the opinion of the Presiding Officers of the District to which the candidate himself belongs. When, supposing the candidates are one a Roman Catholic, another a Nair and a third from some other community, I am sure that if the disparity is not well outside ten per cent, the chance is given to the member of that particular community that has not sufficient representation. That, I can assure the honourable members is the position so far as the appointments to the Judiciary are concerned, including the appointments to Munsiff's places. Higher up in this cadre, in the case of District Judges, this principle is never adopted except in very exceptional cases. But, in the case of the Second Judge, there again, I appeal to the experience of the honourable members of this House who are members of the Bar. There, the real test is the number of cases plus the impression which he has created on the Judiciary. Both his character as a gentleman, because all are agreed that we want the best men, and the number of cases are taken

into consideration. If there is any equality between one candidate and another that candidate who comes from a community where there is less representation will be chosen. The figures and the data are changing from time to time. If you point out to me that there are only two or three Judges in the District Courts from a particular community, I can meet that by saying that another gentleman has been raised to the High Court. These are fluctuating things, but subject to that, the policy of the Government is to appoint on the basis of efficiency and after efficiency has been satisfied to give every chance to communities that had less chance so far.

With regard to the Ezhava community, the question is a very general one. But I can quote a particular instance. My junior at the Bar an Ezhava gentleman has been recently recruited to the Judiciary because he was found to satisfy the test of efficiency and character. The question of the Ezhavas are not taken separately. If at all considered separately, it is in their favour and not against them. Therefore, I submit to the House that the Government have been always adopting a consistent policy in the matter of recruitment to the Judiciary. The first consideration is that of efficiency which is decided on the basis of practice, the impression on the Judiciary and the personal character and status of the candidate and, the second, within these limits that community that has not got sufficient representation will be given special chance provided the minimum is satisfied. That is the principle adopted by the Government in this matter, so that any appeal to individual cases I would submit, will not be very relevant to the consideration of this question. This is the policy that has been followed and announced on the floor of the Honourable House from time to time, and I have the honour to repeat it.

MR. A. NESAMONY : Does the Government follow any fixed principle as to the recruitment of Government Pleaders ?

PRESIDENT : Before this motion is put, I shall deal with this matter of communal representation in the Judiciary. I am going to appeal to this Honourable House not to divide on this matter. The reason is plain. There are two professions in which automatically the fitness of a person for certain places is tested daily. Those professions are the Doctors' profession and the Lawyers' profession. It is true that in other professions there may be the chance of personal qualification or bias or partiality being the ground for a person being chosen to a particular place. For instance, as between two engineers the Government may come to the conclusion that one engineer is better than the other. There are specific data for the purpose. But, so far as the Doctor and the Lawyer are concerned it must be conceded, and it is within the personal experience of many of us, that a client does not choose his Lawyer on the basis that he belongs to one particular community or another. I have known, in fact—and I need not recall the instance—in this very State, I have known of Christian gentlemen

[President.]

enjoying immutably the position of leadership at the Bar. I have known of Ezhava gentlemen keeping very high judicial position; I have known of Nairs keeping very high position at the Bar. This is because whenever a client falls into trouble he goes to the reputed lawyer irrespective of his community. The Government are endeavouring to push that principle so that if a person is required to be recruited as a Munsiff, the High Court will endeavour to find out the opinion of the District Judge of the locality from where the candidate comes. If any young man of the requisite age has appeared before the Judge and has made a good presentation of a case, his name will be noted. If for appointments involving the salaries which are now paid to Munsiffs, Second Judges and District Judges, we do not get men from the Bar who have had actual experience of work at the Bar, the *ratio decidendi* for the recruitment must be different. At the same time, I wish to reiterate what has fallen from the Legal Remembrancer that it has been the very anxious solicitude of the Government to see that no man should consider that he has been left out because he fell within a certain community. I have more than once, said that Government made special advertence to the position of the Syrian Catholics, because in relation to their educational advancement and in relation to their general position in the country their recruitment in the Public Service is in the opinion of the Government inadequate. The Government have said that with regard to other Departments also and there is no reason for Government to depart from that position. But that position cannot be logically applied to the Judicial Department, because if one Catholic has not taken to the Bar and made his mark at the Bar so as to impress the Second Judge, or the District Judge or other presiding officers, it must be taken that he probably prefers other careers. If proper instances are brought to the notice of the High Court and the Government that notwithstanding fairly high efficiency in handling cases at the Bar any person's name has been omitted, then Government are bound to and will anxiously consider those cases. But the adoption of the principle of communal representation as such in the Judicial Department is one which is fraught with much peril.

The question before the House is that Mr. Thomas' motion.....

MR. P. O. THOMAS: Sir, I do not wish to press the motion.

The motion, by leave of the House, was withdrawn,

The question that Government be granted a sum of Rs. 15,39,547 under Demand VII—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE was put to vote and carried.

The demand was passed and the grant was made.

DEMAND VIII—JAILS.

MR. C. P. GOPALA PANICKER: Sir, I move that Government be granted a sum of Rs. 2,52,774 under Demand VIII—Jails.

SRIMATI T. NARAYANI AMMA: Sir, I beg to move that the allotment of Rs. 4,200 for Superintendent be reduced by Re. 1. The object of my motion is to discuss the need for adequate measures being adopted for imparting moral instruction to the inmates of the Jails. Sir, it is well-known that many of the so called prisoners can be reformed by giving well directed and well administered instructions and advice to them. The scheme of moral instruction plays a very important part in reforming the criminals. Under these circumstances it is regrettable to note certain observations made in the Administration Report for the Central Prison. Sir, I may read the following for the information of the House: "The Christian Priests regularly visited the christian prisoners and gave them religious and moral instructions. No instructors from other communities are coming forward probably due to lack of inducements by way of remuneration which was discontinued with effect from 1-1-1118." Sir, the Superintendent adds that a system of giving conveyance allowance to moral Instructors is in vogue in British India, thereby suggesting that such a system may be continued here also. It is therefore highly essential that the moral instructors belonging to the Hindu and Muslim communities must be induced to visit the prisoners belonging to those communities and give them moral instruction. It is to urge the introduction of some such scheme for reforming the criminals that I have tabled this motion.

MR. C. P. GOPALA PANICKER: Sir, it is a fact that Christian missionaries are visiting the Central Prison. Till recently, the Hindus had also their instructions. Mr. K. S. Narayana Iyer has been conducting this work and on account of personal inconvenience he has had to discontinue his lectures. As the honourable member may probably be aware, the jail rules are being revised now and the question will then receive attention.

PRESIDENT: I think I ought to explain the position. It was found by the Government, in so far as the communities in the jails are concerned, that Christian missionaries with great self-sacrifice attended jails and gave moral instructions without claiming any travelling allowance or any payment from the Government. It was found that the Hindu and the Muslim Communities while willing to give moral instruction were not able or willing to pay for the persons who were giving that kind of instruction. The Government came to the conclusion that if the Christian Community had enough public spirit to ask their missionaries or to enable their missionaries to visit prisons and give moral instruction in the tenets of their religion, it behoved the Hindu and the Muslim Communities to take the same steps with regard to the missionaries of their religion. If the Muslim and the Hindu Communities have no public spirit for that, Government cannot subsidise one section rather than another. It is hoped that if the Hindus are anxious for Hindu moral instruction being imparted to the Hindu convicts and the Muslims to do likewise in the case of the Muslim convicts, nothing is easier for them than to collect funds for the purpose, and if they collect some funds, Government will contribute their quota.

SRIMATI T. NARAYANI AMMA: Sir, in view of the elucidation given by the Chair and the Treasury Benches, I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

The motion, by leave of the House, was withdrawn.

The motion that Government be granted a sum of Rs. 2,52,774 under DEMAND VIII—JAILS was put to vote and carried.

The demand was passed and the grant was made.

DEMAND IX—POLICE.

MR. S. PARTHASARATHI IYENGAR (*Inspector-General of Police*): Sir, I beg leave to move that the House be pleased to grant a sum of Rs. 16,77,371 under Demand IX—Police.

SRIMATI T. NARAYANI AMMA: Sir, I do not wish to move the motion standing in my name.

PRESIDENT: Mr. P. S. Mohamed.

MR. P. S. MOHAMED: Sir, I do not move.

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI (*Karunagapalli cum Kartikapalli*): Sir, I move to reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,57,084 for Superintendence by Re. 1 to discuss the inefficiency of the Police Department and to bring to the notice of the Government the necessity of increasing efficiency.

Sir, in moving this motion, I have to bring to the notice of this House that the Department that is responsible for the keeping up of the peace and tranquility of the State is the Police Department. The Police Department is responsible for the maintenance of law and order. Sir, if one is to turn through the pages of the Administration Report presented to us for the year 1118, he will find that the number of crimes have definitely increased from the year 1117. I ask what the reason for this increase in the number of crimes is? The number of murders committed in 1117 was 99. In 1118, the number of murders recorded is 119. Sir, I am not sure whether this will also be attributed to the activities of the State Congress. But I hope there was not a single instance where a State Congress man was charged before a District Court for an offence of murder.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: Sir, one question. Is this not due to the better efficiency of the Department in the matter of detection of crimes?

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: Sir, on a statement of fact, I wish to make this statement. Six of the accused in the Pangode case admitted before the Court that they were members of the State Congress.

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI: Here, you are narrating stories of offences that have been committed long ago. Sir, I venture to question those confessions.

Sir, the honourable member has brought me exactly to the point which I wanted to bring to the notice of the honourable House. Much

is said by honourable member, the Legal Remembrancer that they were State Congress men. I admit that they were arrayed as accuseds, and I will be casting a reflection upon the Judiciary in the State if I say that even the charge of those six accused persons is questionable. There were days when the very fact of being a member of the State Congress was enough reason for the Police to take that person to the Court. That was the way in which the Police were managing things. Moreover, that was the time when the Police Commissioner or the Inspector-General of Police, as he is given title now, was one who was absolutely unscrupulous to the sentiments of the people. He had been brought to Travancore to preach loyalty to the citizens of Travancore. I do not know whether he is preaching loyalty now. I am sure he is not preaching loyalty to our Highness to the people beyond the Ghats.

Sir, to come back, the number of crimes has definitely increased even though the Legal Remembrancer may deny it. My honourable friend Mr. Velayudhan Pillai was telling me that there is an increase in the number of crimes detected. But I say it is not so. The amount of lost property recovered in 1118 is lower than the amount of lost property recovered in 1117.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: But, the number of cases of property lost.....

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI: I shall be very thankful if the honourable member will be more clear in his expressions and louder in his tone.

PRESIDENT: Order, order. I think I have to make one point clear. Quite often, the Chair has requested the honourable members to speak louder. If the honourable members will not accommodate each other by enabling themselves to be heard, it is both the fault of the speaker and of the hearer. But, so far as the honourable member who has just resumed his seat is concerned, the honourable member need not take notice of any interruption. This is the usual procedure.

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI: The most disrespectful way the Police officers behave towards the law-abiding citizens of the State is really scandalous. From the way in which he behaves to the law-abiding citizens of the State, it would seem as though the Police constable, drawing a salary of Rs. 14 or 15—I do not know what it is, but I am sure, it will be only one by one-hundred-and-fiftieth of the salary of the Inspector-General; that much I am sure—feels that he is the “monarch of all he surveys”. Sir, I shall quote any number of instances where absolutely false reports have been made against persons who are innocent. Complaints have been lodged in courts against innocent men. These complaints have been lodged by the Police at the instigation of certain officials of the Government simply because these persons belonged to the unfortunate and unhappy organisation the State Congress. If a citizen happens to be a member of the State Congress, he is pestered by the C. I. D. The C. I. D. follows him wherever he goes and the sacred book of the Government is the C. I. D. report and in

[Mr. S. Sankaranarayanan Tampi.]

accusing the State Congress, chapters and verses are quoted from the C. I. D. reports.

PRESIDENT : No, honourable member may rest assured on that.

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI : Sir, I thank you for the correction. I do not think that instances are wanting where the C. I. D.....

PRESIDENT : Order, order. Now that this matter has been brought to my notice, I wish to make the position clear. I myself have been the object of attention of the C. I. D., I have been for a certain number of years administering the C. I. D. in the Province of Madras, and I could speak with some specific knowledge of the procedure employed in these matters. Government do not rely upon the C. I. D. reports by themselves. They get reports from various sources and it is only if the reports from two or three or more separate sources tally that Government act upon any report. That is the general rule and honourable member might take it that, generally speaking, these C. I. D. reports by some Police officers are not by themselves the motive force.

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI : Sir, to quote one instance, the correctness of which may be questioned from the Chair— I do not know—but, of course if I am taken as a representative of the people you will have to believe me.....

PRESIDENT : Honourable members might be absolutely sure that any statement made on their own responsibility by honourable members will be taken at its full face value unless and until the Government have in their possession material to contradict that statement.

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI : Sir, I state the following on my own responsibility. I have come across with this experience myself. In connection with the recent election campaign, a Police constable on duty at Ambalapuzha took leave for 6 or 7 days and was going about Karunagapalli taluk inducing people not to vote for the State Congress candidate. When that fact was brought to my notice, I called that particular police constable and asked him about the matter. I do not mention the name of the police constable for fear that he might be promoted for that.

PRESIDENT : What does the honourable member mean by saying that if the name of the police constable who did that is mentioned, Government will at once reward him.

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI : May I say—

PRESIDENT : No. What the honourable member just now made is an insinuation. Will the honourable member withdraw that?

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI : Sir, I am prepared to withdraw whatever statement I may make which.....

PRESIDENT : The honourable member has stated with a sense of responsibility as he prefaced in his remarks that, if a certain police

man misbehaved, the honourable member does not wish to bring his name to the notice of this House or the Government, because Government may at once promote him for that misbehaviour. That was the statement which the honourable member uttered in this honourable House, which means that the honourable member makes a charge deliberately against Government. He makes an insinuation in that, the Government are out to promote people who behave badly. That is an insinuation and is against parliamentary procedure. I appeal to the honourable member to withdraw that statement before proceeding further.

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI: Sir, I did not mean that.

PRESIDENT: Will the honourable member withdraw that statement?

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI: A word of explanation, Sir. What I meant by that statement was —

PRESIDENT: No. Did not the honourable member make use of the expression that if the police constable's name was mentioned here, he would be promoted?

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI: Not exactly so, Sir.

PRESIDENT: I now ask the honourable House whether anybody heard Mr. Sankaranarayanan Tampi, an honourable member of this House using the expression "I am afraid to mention the name of the constable because he might be promoted"?

(Cries of "Sir, we heard that statement" from many honourable members of the House.)

Will the honourable member deny the statement uttered by him?

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI: I withdraw it, Sir.

Sir, I approached this constable who was going about the place influencing people and threatening them not to vote for the State Congress candidate. I asked him what he meant by such actions. He said in reply, "Alright, Sir, I know what will happen and how you will be treated by the Dewan." Such was the reply. Sir, now I ask, is this the way in which the administration of the department should be conducted. Is this the way in which a police constable and other officers of Government should behave towards very responsible political bodies. I appeal to the honourable members of the House to view my statements dispassionately, to view them without passion and prejudice stepping in to influence their discretion to vote on this motion. With these words, I commend my motion.

The motion was put to vote and declared lost.

The question that Government be granted a sum of Rs. 16,77,371 under Demand IX—Police Department was put and carried.

The Demand was passed and the grant was made.

PRESIDENT : I am sorry to inform the honourable House that I did not anticipate the speed with which the business of the House has now been transacted. It is learnt now that the cut motions and other relevant papers relating to Medical and other Demands that follow are not ready. I am afraid there is no alternative but to adjourn the House. With the leave of the honourable House, I will give one more hour after 6 o' clock for the purpose of discussion, if there is no objection, on one of the following days. Or, that hour may be distributed for two days at the rate of half an hour each day. I think the honourable House is agreeable to this.

(All members agreed to this view.)

The House adjourned at 5-10 P. M. to meet again at 12—0' clock on Thursday the 24th August 1944.

S. VAIDYANATHA AIYAR,
Secretary to the Sri Mulam Assembly.