

Khan, Shri Ghayoor Ali

Mahata, Shri Chitta

Mehta, Prof. Ajit Kumar

Misra, Shri Satyagopal

Nadar, Shri A. Neelalohithadasan

Nihal Singh, Shri

Pal, Prof. Rup Chand

Rahi, Shri Ram Lal

Rajan, Shri K. A.

Rasheed Masood, Shri

Roy, Shri A. K.

Roy, Dr. Saradish

Shakya, Shri Daya Ram

Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.

Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari

Varma, Shri Ravindra

Verma, Shri R. L. P.

Verma, Shri Shiv Sharan

Yadav, Shri Chandrajit

Yadav, Shri D. P.

Yadav, Shri R. P.

MR. SPEAKER: Subject to correction, the result* of the Division is: Ayes: 118; Noes: 33.

The Ayes have it; the Ayes have it.

The motion is adopted.

The motion was adopted.

12.09 hrs...

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE. PROCLAMATION IN RECACTION TO STATE OF KERALA, KERALA BUDGET, 1982-83,—(GENERAL DISCUSSION).

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS ON ACCOUNT (KERALA), 1982-83

AND

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (KERALA), 1981-82.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI ZAIL SINGH): I beg to move the following Resolution:—

“That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 17th March, 1982 under article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Kerala.”

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution moved:

“That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 17th March, 1982 under article 356 of the Consaitution in relation to the State of Kerala.”

Now we take up the Demands also. Motions moved:

“That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the third column of the Order Paper, be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Karala *on account*, for or towards defraying the charges during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1983, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demand Nos. I to XLIV.”

*The following Members also recorded their votes:

AYER Sarvshri Sobeng Tayeng, Sled Muzaffar Hossain and Rajesh Pilot;

NOES: Sarvshri Chaturbhuj, Daulat Ram Saran, and Baju Ban Riyan.

**Moved with the recommendation of the President.

"That the respective supplementary sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the third column of the Order Paper, be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Kerala to defray the charges that will

come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1982, in respect of heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof against:—

Demand Nos. I to III, V to XI, XIII to XXX, XXXII, XXXV to XLII."

Demands for Grants on Account (Kerala) 1982-83 submitted to the vote of Lok Sabha

Demand No.	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on account submitted to the vote of the House.	
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
1	2	3	
I.	State Legislature	43,69,000	..
II.	Heads of States, Ministers and Head Quarters Staff	3,32,67,300	..
III.	Administration of Justice	3,29,94,400	..
IV.	Elections	24,32,100	..
V.	Agriculture Income Tax and Sales Tax	2,38,45,300	..
VI.	Land Revenue	6,01,02,500	..
VII.	Stamps and Registration	2,01,86,800	..
VIII.	Excise	1,69,08,400	..
IX.	Taxes on Vehicles	51,80,000	..
X.	Treasury and Accounts	1,74,90,400	..
XI.	District Administration and Miscellaneous	2,66,90,400	..
XII.	Police	22,39,16,600	..
XIII.	Jails	90,57,900	..
XIV.	Stationery and Printing and Other Administrative Services	3,05,81,900	..
XV.	Public Works	19,51,06,600	8,28,53,000
XVI.	Pensions and Miscellaneous	21,76,57,400	..
XVII.	Education, Art and Culture	1,35,03,32,500	2,34,45,500
XVIII.	Medical	28,98,82,800	1,84,07,500
XIX.	Family Welfare	3,96,47,800	25,00,000
XX.	Public Health	4,07,65,000	..
XXI.	Public Health Engineering	7,12,10,700	9,38,99,200

1	2	3	
		Revenue	Capital
		Rs.	Rs.
XXII.	Housing	1,87,60,600	1,87,77,500
XXIII.	Urban Development	1,45,05,800	36,37,500
XXIV.	Information and Publicity	48,37,500	..
XXV.	Labour and Employment	8,86,97,700	4,50,000
XXVI.	Social Welfare including Harijan Welfare	26,66,56,500	50,79,600
XXVII.	Relief on account of Natural Calmities	1,59,00,000	..
XXVIII.	Co-operation	3,39,88,300	6,76,63,900
XXIX.	Miscellaneous Economic Services	3,47,70,000	40,00,000
XXX.	Agriculture	22,70,84,600	5,28,18,300
XXXI.	Food	2,04,40,400	3,47,92,000
XXXII.	Animal Husbandry	4,81,14,300	18,90,000
XXXIII.	Dairy	84,65,600	32,75,000
XXXIV.	Fisheries	1,81,98,100	1,60,24,700
XXXV.	Forest	6,21,25,300	75,50,000
XXXVI.	Community Development	17,75,33,200	12,50,100
XXXVII.	Industries	5,06,93,500	11,15,40,500
XXXVIII.	Irrigation	9,31,07,700	25,38,48,500
XXXIX.	Power	13,00,000	20,00,000
XL.	Ports	51,70,400	44,69,000
XLI.	Transport	75,20,100	1,44,00,000
XLII.	Tourism	66,66,700	54,50,000
XLIII.	Compensation and Assignments	46,16,500	..
XLIV.	Miscellaneous Loans and Advances	4,32,92,100

Supplementary Demands for Grants (KERALA), 1981-82 submitted to the vote of Lck Salla

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant submitted to the vote of the House	
1	2	3	
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
I.	State Legislature.	11,50,000	.
II.	Heads of States, Ministers and Headquarters staff	63,95,000	
III.	Administration of Justice	50,20,500	
V.	Agricultural Income Tax and Salestax	36,85,400	
VI.	Land Revenue	1,52,69,000	..
VII.	Stamps and Registration fees	2,00,000	..
VIII.	Excise	100	..
IX.	Taxes on Vehicles	3,34,300	..
X.	Treasury and Accounts	25,34,000	..
XI.	District Administration and Miscellaneous	67,04,700	
XIII.	Jails	11,03,400	
XIV.	Stationery and Printing and Other Administrative Services	32,89,900	
XV.	Public Works	4,86,84,100	2,09,35,900
XVI.	Pensions and Miscellaneous	6,49,21,400	..
XVII.	Education, Art and Culture	1,09,63,000	3,24,50,300
XVIII.	Medical	2,25,21,000	26,86,500
XIX.	Family Welfare	..	4,00,000
XX.	Public Health	18,00,000	..
XXI.	Public Health Engineering	1,16,57,500	2,51,25,000
XXII.	Housing	65,00,000	1,17,77,100
XXIII.	Urban Development	7,12,500	..
XXIV.	Information and Publicity	44,89,200	.
XXV.	Labour and Employment	44,72,000	
XXVI.	Social Welfare including Harijan Welfare	4,54,78,100	1,02,36,500
XXVII.	Famine	19,86,800	.
XXVIII.	Co-operation	26,00,100	2,82,54,400
XXIX.	Miscellaneous Economic Services	5,18,400	..

1	2	3
		Revenue Rs.
		Capital Rs.
XXX. Agriculture		500
XXXV. Animal Husbandry		70,20,000
XXXV. Forest		1,92,88,500
XXXVI. Community Development		80,98,700
XXXVII. Industries		84,01,200
XXXVIII. Irrigation		3,41,12,200
XXXIX. Power.
XL. Ports		1,26,100
XLI. Transport		23,75,000
XLII. Tourism		13,08,200

MR. SPEAKER: We have to discuss 4 items together. Shri E. Balanandan.

12.10 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, some hon. Members have given notices of cut motions. Mr. K. A. Rajan and Mr. M. Ramanna Rai are absent. The other two hon. Members Mr. E. K. Imbichibava and Mr. K. P. Unnikrishnan will move to their cut motions. Now, I call upon Mr. E. Balanandan to speak. Mr. Balanandan, your party has been allotted 13 minutes. The total time allotted for the Kerala Budget is 3 hours.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN (Mukundapuram): Before I participate in the debate, I would request the hon. Finance Minister to make available to us the Budget in Malayalam version.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): I have given both Hindi and English version of the Budget.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: Sir, we are as'ed to approve the Motion moved

by the Home Minister approving the Proclamation issued by the President on 17th March 1982 and also asked to vote for the Demands for Grants on Accounts in respect of the Budget for the State of Kerala for 1982-83 for Rs. 555,90,54,500.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I may inform the House that Items Nos. 4, 5, 6 and 7 are taken together for discussion and voting of the House.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: Sir, before taking up various points for discussion, I want to invite your attention to the fact that the Central Government should know the reason why this kind of situation has arisen in Kerala? All of a sudden, we were told on March 17 that on the recommendation of the Kerala Governor, the President was pleased to dissolve the Kerala Assembly. What was the peculiar situation that arose which led to the dissolution of the Assembly there? We all know just for 80 days, till 17th March 1982, Karunakaran Ministry was in power in Kerala. All of us also know that he was asked to form the Government in Kerala and at that time he had the support of 67

M.L.As of the Kerala Legislature. After sometime horse trading business was going on and ultimately he got the support of 71 MLAs and with the notorious casting vote of the Speaker, the Government could last for 80 days. This situation had arisen because Mr. Nambadan Lonappan left the ruling front and joined the Opposition side. Now, the position had changed, that there were 71 Members in the Opposition. The point I want to make here is that the Opposition got the majority in the Assembly and therefore it was the duty of the Governor to call the Opposition party to form the Government. Or at least, the Governor should have checked up whether the Opposition are in a position to form the Government. It is the duty of the Governor it is the Constitutional duty that the Governor should have given an opportunity to the Opposition for forming the Government. I do not know how he was convinced that they could not form the Government and that is why she recommended for the dissolution of the Assembly. Sir, this has been done to suit the interest of the ruling party at the Centre because a Notification was already made for the election of 3 Rajya Sabha Members from Kerala and the electoral college was the Assembly. It was evident that since there were 71 Members belonging to Opposition parties at least 2 seats would go to the Opposition in the Rajya Sabha election. To scuttle this election, it was recommended to the President for the dissolution of the Assembly and the President's rule was imposed. This step was really against all democratic norms and principles. It is against the Constitution want to make here. Last time I said that in India the Constitutional propriety is not being maintained. The deviation from the accepted principles of the democratic process is made to suit the Congress—I ruling party at the Centre. That is the reason why this step has been taken in so far as Kerala is concerned.

With these preliminary remarks, I would now like to go to the eighty-day rule of Shri Karunakaran.

Shri Pranab Mukherjee, said that he was only asking for a Vote on Account

for Rs. five hundred and fifty-two crores, ninety lakhs, fifty-four thousand and five hundred, and he has not, therefore, given details of the expenditure.

As soon as Shri Karunakaran came to power, he did two or three 'great' things for the Kerala people. Nobody will forget them. If you go through the budget papers, you do not get the details. As soon as Shri Karunakaran assumed office as Chief Minister, he said that there would not be any payment of unemployment allowance given to the unemployed youths of Kerala. Another thing that he declared was that he would stop payment of agricultural workers' pension. If you go through the budget papers, the amount has been kept, but we do not know how much is going to be spent. However, as per the declaration of the then Chief Minister, Shri Karunakaran, who stopped this and on the basis of this experience of eighty days, one cannot predict anything.

As you know, there are no big industries in the Kerala State. The most important industry in Kerala is the coir industry and on it depends about five lakhs of workers. Shri Karunakaran within eighty days of his rule has done one 'great' thing; he immediately dismissed all the coir project officers. What has been the result? All the cooperatives in coir industry in Kerala State have become defunct, have not been working. Coir goods worth nearly fifteen crores of rupee are lying in Kerala. Coir goods worth about eight crores of rupees are lying with the Coir Corporation and goods worth about Rs. seven crores are lying with the private sector. But the Kerala Government did not do anything in this respect. They did not give some cash assistance to lift the stocks, so that some distress sales could be organised. The Coir Corporation in Kerala is headed by a Congress(I) man. He had asked for Rs. four crores, but that amount has not been provided by the Government. Five lakh workers engaged in this industry are in distress. I would like to inform the hon. Finance Minister—he may not know it—that in Kerala, if you do not do something immediately,

[Shri E. Balanandan]

the coir workers, five lakhs of them, would be put to lot of difficulties. A good chunk of them may die of starvation. Already, about twenty children of coir workers have died because of starvation during this period.

Cashew industry is another important industry in Kerala. About one lakh and twenty-five thousand workers are employed in this industry. Many steps had been taken to bring about improvements in this industry, earlier. But all these are being purposely undone by the Centre. I had also discussed this with Shri Stephen he is an expert in the affairs of cashew industry. He had assured me that the Kerala Government would take every step to procure whatever cashew nut is available in Kerala so that sixty to seventy days' work is assured to the cashew workers. But what has been the performance? I am told that during the last year, by this time cashew nuts worth nearly Rs. forty crores had been purchased by the public sector Cashew Corporation, and the Federation, who were entrusted to procure cashew nuts. This year, they have spent only Rs. four crores for this purpose and the total quantity of cashew nuts procured is very meagre. It is only six thousand tonnes, as compared to last year's procurement of thirty-five thousand tonnes during this period. Therefore, the workers engaged in cashew industry in Kerala are also going to starve. This is the situation.

Now I come to the fishermen's co-operatives. Fishermen's co-operatives were doing something there.

The officer who were managing the fisherman's co-operatives have been transferred with the result the co-operatives are now more or less defunct.

That way within 80 days of his rule, five lakh coir workers, one lakh twenty-five thousand cashew workers, lakhs and lakhs of fishermen, the life of all these workers is made miserable and they are facing a very difficult situation. In the coastal belt of Kerala, there will be very

large number of starvation deaths if something is not done immediately.

Shri Pranab Mukherjee, our Finance Minister, was earlier holding the portfolio of Commerce Ministry. Coming to Kerala Plan, I would quote what he has said. He said that there will be 27 per cent rise in the annual Plan for this year for the Central Government and the State Plans also will also have a rise of 21 per cent. This rise will be in all the State. But, Sir, in Kerala alone, and if there is some other State, it is West Bengal, where there will be no rise. Rs. 275 crores was the amount sanctioned last year. This year also it is Rs. 275 crores. That is only for Kerala, the Plan allocation has not been increased. For all other States all over the country, the increase is 21 per cent. But for our State there is no increase.

Now, I come to another point, Sir, Kerala is the major coconut producing State. The total requirement of coconut oil for India is two lakh tonnes and that is being produced in the country. Thirty thousand tonnes of coconut oil is required for industrial purposes and the rest is required for edible purposes. And the total requirement for the country can be met through indigenous production. But what is being done, Sir? Coconut oil is being allowed to be imported and some other dubious name has been adopted by the importers—coconut acid oil. The result is that the price of coconut is going down and lakhs and lakhs, if not crores, of coconut growers in the Kerala State have been affected.

The next major crop in Kerala is rubber. This year 30,000 tonnes of rubber is being allowed to be imported. I don't know what for they want more import of rubber. There is some Statement by some Minister here that they require more rubber this time. That is why it is being imported. But I don't know why it is being imported, when the total requirement can be met through indigenous production. They are allowing 30,000 tonnes of rubber to be imported. So is the case

of Nutmeg, cloves etc. which are produced in Kerala in abundance are also being allowed to be imported. Sir, that would affect the total economy of the Kerala State.

Sir, a claim has been made by somebody in the Kerala State that if the Congress (I) government comes to power in Kerala, the Central Government will give priority to solve all these problems. Sir, is this the correct attitude expected of the Central Government? Not only this, Sir, I must tell you one thing more. Our new Minister, Shri Rahim talked to some pressmen at Cannanore. A Press man asked him when the Naval Academy at Yezhimalai in the Cannanore district is going to start, a decision for the establishment of which has already been taken? The reply of Shri Rahim was that this kind of defence establishment will not be established in States where non-Congress(I) Chief Ministers are there or where non-Congress (I) rule is there. Is it a correct statement Sir.

According to the Constitution of India, any party can come into power in any State. Congress(I) can come to power or the DMK can come to power. But to say that if non-Congress(I) is in power, no defence establishment will be there in Kerala; To put it mildly is atrocious.

I would like to bring to the notice of the Finance Minister another point. In Kerala the number of the unemployed is the largest, and also the number of educated people in Kerala is the largest. It stands first in the number of technically qualified persons. But when we seek public sector employment, we have to fill in a form. I will read it. I am just quoting from the Bio data form. Item 11 of the form asks: "To which State do you belong?" and it asks whether the applicant has stayed in Kerala or West Bengal for more than a year. This column has to be filled in by the applicants who are called for interview by the Defence Electronics Laboratory in Hyderabad. For what purpose is it being asked?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: (New Delhi): This is a serious matter.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: This is the official document I am reading from the photostat copy. If son of Mr. Stephen, our Minister here applies for appointment there... (Interruptions) then there will be special police verification. There is Police verification for Central Government appointment. But to-day double verifications is there, for those from Kerala and West Bengal. If somebody from Kerala applies for a job in the Defence establishment, this will be the fate. This is the situation created by Congress (I). Why do you bother about it? You want India to be one. Does this help? If you consider that Communists are a security risk, then declare it (Interruptions). Coming to the Budget, Kerala, as a State, is being neglected purposely by Central Government. Kerala is going to face a very serious economic crisis. Therefore, I demand that Government of India should immediately come forward with a proposal to give the required assistance to the cashew and coir industries. Steps taken by State Government should be immediately withdrawn. You should revive and strengthen the Fisheries Corporation. The discriminatory attitude towards plan should be stopped. Import of coconut oil should be immediately banned—and also of rubber and other things, which I have mentioned.

The Chairman of the Coconut Board, Mr. Devasi Kutty has demanded an enquiry. Some fishy thing has happened in the matter of import of coconut oil. He is a Congress (I) leader. I also demand an enquiry to be conducted into the import of coconut oil.

In the Budget it is said that Rs. 12 crores more will be provided for Police. I do not know why it is considered that more expenditure is absolutely necessary for police in Kerala. It is the only item on which additional money is to be given. The Minister might find some explanation.

How is the law and order situation in Kerala? Within these 80 days, 35 political murders have taken place there. 25 CPI(M) people have been killed. In

[Shri E. Balanandan]

the State where a Congress (I) Chief Minister was ruling, 25 or 30 Communists have been killed. (Interruptions).

On 8th March, a serious incident took place in Kaniapuram in Trivandrum district, where 24 shops were set on fire by Congress (I) youth leaders. I am saying this from record. It was done because the shop-owners did not give money to these - Congress (I) youths. They demanded some money from the shop owners which they refused to bribe. That is why their shops had been set on fire.

Now, the Congress I Party talks loud about the new political arrangement that they are now having many parties came over to them and many are going to come. Mr. Karunakaran is saying that he will come back to power if the elections are held. I do not know when the elections are going to be held there. But a serious situation is developing in the State because of the Congress I Party's policies and politics by which communal forces in the State are being encouraged and all the communal political parties are brought into the so-called democratic front.

Call for Hindu Unity is made as if Hindus are in danger very seriously. I do not know how. I am or Hindu and I do not feel that we are in danger. But, anyhow, the Vishwa Hindu Parishad is going to have a Vishal Hindu Sammelan on 4th of April; and on 2nd, some other demonstration by Christians is going to be held in Ernakulam where Vishal Hindu Sammelan is being held. With Cross in hands, 30,000 Christians are going to have a demonstration. The Congress I Party is encouraging this kind of communal forces so that they can get more votes and come to power.

If you see to the history of Kerala from 1957 onwards, you will find that the Congress I Party was never in a majority in the Kerala State. (Interruptions). They were coming to power in

Kerala by adjustment with this party or that party; They were utilising the central power to woo somebody. This is a political corruption.

Last time, Mr. Karunakaran started to form a government with 67 MLAs and one MLA's support had been mustered - by giving a district for an MLA and so many things. I do not say about these things here because I do not have documentary evidence with me. This way developing communal passion, caste passion, etc. the Congress I Party will not come to power in Kerala. I declare it here. What are the good things you are doing for the people of Kerala. The agriculturists, who are producing coconut, rubber, etc. are being put to hardship; and the cashew workers, coir workers, fishermen, etc. are being put to starvation. Kerala, as a State, is being neglected. If this attitude is taken by the Government, the unity of the country, I am afraid, will be very seriously affected.

In this House and outside talks about the Bay of Bengal, the Arabian Sea, etc. were there. I declare here that, this politics, this Congress I politics which is encouraging communal parties and the politics by which the Kerala State is being neglected thoroughly, is going to put them into the Arabian Sea by the people of Kerala if the elections are held in the Kerala State.

With these words, I oppose this motion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Hon. members, 3 hours have been allotted. We started it at about 12 P.M. The Minister will reply at 2.30 P.M. Therefore, I request the hon. members to take the time that has been fixed by the Business Advisory Committee.

SHRI E. K. IMBICHIBAVA (Calicut): I beg to move:

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head "Land Revenue" be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to give unsurveyed occupied land near the seashore to the fishermen families.]. (13)

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHINAN (Badagara): I beg to move:

"That the Demand for Grants on Account under the Head 'Police' be reduced by Rs. 1,00,00,000."

[Need to decrease the charges for Police Administration which are totally disproportionate to the outlay on productive schemes and welfare measures]. (14)

SHRI E. K. IMBICHIBAVA: I beg to move:

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Police' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to improve the living conditions of the Police by providing houses]. (15)

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Jails' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to improve the condition in the prisons.] (16)

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Public Works' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to construct bridge on Canoli canal this year itself and one way road in Ponnairi Moniapatty.] (17)

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Public Works' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to expedite the work of Chandragiri Bridge proposed under C.R.F.] (18)

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Public Works' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to reconstruct the weak bridges at Muliya and Adkasthala in Kasargod Taluka.] (19)

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Pensions & Miscellaneous' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to continue the payment of pension to the old agricultural labourers.] (20)

"That the Demand For Grant on Account under the Head 'Pensions and Miscellaneous' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to pay unemployment doll to both education and uneducated youth.] (21)

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Education, Art and Culture' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to conduct a survey and fix the places of priority on starting educational institution.] (22)

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Urban Development' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to create special fund to develop localities of rural nature in the Municipalities.] (23)

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Social Welfare Including Harijan Welfare, be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to start industry for providing job to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.] (24)

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head "Social Welfare Including Harijan Welfare' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to increase hostel facilities to the Scheduled Caste students.] (25)

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Agriculture' be reduced only Rs. 100."

[Need to pay remunerative price to farmers.] (26)

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Fisheries' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to set up fishing harbours at Kasargo, Azikal Bupoor, Ponnani and Kodungalore. (Conganore)] (27)

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Fisheries' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to provide mid day meal to the children of fishermen in the schools in fisheries villages.] (28)

[Shri E. K. Imbichibava]

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Fisheries' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to start cooperative societies in all the villages of declared fisheries.] (29)

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Fisheries' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to start Banks in each district to give loans to fishermen on easy terms and nominal interest on the occasion of death, marriage and confinement.] (30)

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Community Development' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to provide more funds to Kasargod Development Authority.] (31)

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Industries' be reduced by Rs. 199."

[Need to take action and reopen the Vanjinad Leather factory which remains closed due to mismanagement.] (32)

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Irrigation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to take up Kokadavu Project immediately.] (33)

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the Head 'Ports' be reduced by Rs 100."

[Need to construct minor ports at Azikal, Kasargod, Ponnani, Bupoor Kasargod Taluk.] (19)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Xavier Arakal.

AN HON. MEMBER: I suggested four hours. It is all right.

At 2.30 p.m. the Minister will reply.

SHRI XAVIER ARAKAL (Ernakulam): I rise to support the Supplementary Demands and Appropriation Bill. The po-

wers under Article 174 and 356 are called the most eminent prerogatives of the Head of State. Why the Central Government had to resort to these provisions of the Constitution is quite evident from the message of the Governor of Kerala, dated the 17th March, 1982. I quote:—

"I am personally satisfied that there is no possibility of forming an alternative viable and stable Ministry" (*Interruptions*). I am coming to you, Please listen to me.

In order to change the political instability created by the manipulation and the calculated corruptive methods of the Left Front there this had to be resorted to. (*Interruptions*). I shall come to your point.

I was so surprised to hear Mr. Balanandan talking about communalism and casteism. About what they have done in this matter, I shall quote Shri E. M. Sankaran Namboodiripad. Mr. Balanandan, please listen to what Shri E.M. Sankaran Namboodiripad has said about communalism and casteism. I quote Shri E.M. Sankaran Namboodiripad on the question of communalism and casteism:

"However, I could see the reality that, whatever the ultimate goal to which we were moving, we cannot wish away differences and distinctions based on the caste and the religious community. Socio-political organisations dedicated to the cause of serving the lower castes and fighting for reforming the social and family systems of even the upper castes, therefore, had my sympathy."

Who says? Their own leader, prophet of communism in India. He goes further and says,

"All the more so when some of these caste-based organisations started championing political demands, integrating the movements for political democracy with social justice for the oppressed castes."

Therefore, he started it. Now Mr. Balanandan may say who is supporting casteism and communalism; kindly let him answer that. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR (Trivandrum): He is misleading the House. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order. I could not follow him. (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Hon. Members, I want to make it very clear. When an hon. Member speaks, if he does not yield, you have no right to get up and ask for clarifications. Therefore, please do not interrupt. Please do not interrupt. You have got every right to speak and you will be called from the Opposition side and then you can reply to him. That is the democratic procedure. Not this way. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI XAVIER ARAKAL: When the Congress (S) has been constantly refusing the caste elements in our country. (*Interruptions*).

It has been the history, it is the history, I charge the Communist Party that they indulged in this sort of things. I refer to the remark made by Shri Balanandan horse trading. Who did it? Who split the Congress (S) Party? When they *en bloc* went out and joined united Democratic Front, LDF report it. The Janata Party who were elected with the mandate of the people, with the United Front, what happened? (*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: Your own M.L.A. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI XAVIER ARAKAL: Sir, it is so surprising to hear Shri Balanandan talking about horse trading in this House. May I ask him what made Lonappan Nambadan, M.L.A., to jump from our side to their side? It is not a shame that they indulged in it?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I think both of you are wrong, Mr. Arakal and Mr. Balanandan, because there is no horse racing in Kerala. It is there only in Madras and Bangalore.

SHRI XAVIER ARAKAL: I would like to say that the Marxist Parties came into power in Kerala in 1957 and they ruled for a span of less than two years. In 1967 they came again. They

ruled for a small span of time. In 1980, they came. If you analyse the political developments of these periods, you will very well be convinced that they indulged in corruptive, unlawful, immoral and politically unholy behaviour in the periods.

PROF. RUP CHAND PAL (Hooghly): You must be having a dictionary with you.

SHRI XAVIER ARAKAL: We did not send them out. By their sheer immoral activities they were forced to go out. This happened again in 1980.

Mr. Balanandan was talking about this minority Government there. He posed a question that when they had the support of 71 MLAs, why should they not have been asked to form the Government? He has also sarcastically referred to the casting vote of the Speaker. They were ridiculing us when we had got 71 MLAs with us. Now he says that when they were having 71 MLAs, they should have been allowed to form the Government. What is the logic in it? Are you not ashamed of putting forward such a logic?

Mr. K. A. Rajan is here. The CPI is the parasite and power suckers of our political system, which I have never seen in my life. Therefore, it is ironical to put forward such a demand. Mr. Balanandan was talking about political immorality like horse trading and what not. I am not talking a lot on that aspect.

The political situation in Kerala has always been percolating and Kaleidoscopic. That was the 12th Ministry with the fall of the last Ministry in Kerala in the last 25 years, about which an enlightened society cannot and should not be proud of. What are the causes of it? Should we not prevent it? Or should we encourage such a proliferation of parties and Governments? Here we have to find out the causes behind these divisions and factions in our political system. Is it conducive to have such a system? Can this be emulated

[Shri Xavier Arakal]

in other States? If it is emulated in other States, how will our political system survive? Therefore, the methods adopted by caste, communal and other forces should be curbed at any cost. Now the BJP is going to sit with the Left Front there. Till yesterday, the Marxist Party, the Janata Party and the RSS people were fighting with each other. Now, there is a new trend, an unholy trend emerging. Mr. Vajpayee can enlighten us whether they are going to support each other. Alliance of RSS and other religious and communal forces is a dangerous trend. This is a matter which has to be viewed seriously by those who believe in secularism and democracy. We dislike the ideology of the Marxist in the same way as we dislike fanaticism. This has to be done if we have to survive democratically.

A political party called CPI is there in Kerala. Whenever we have got power, they are always with us. With our help they came to power in 1969. In 1969, we allowed the CPI MLA to be the Chief Minister of Kerala. What was his majority then? (*Interruptions*) In 1969, we supported Shri Achuta Menon Ministry. What have they done? Till 1977, we were together. Due to some selfish reasons they left us. Let us examine the role of CPI in the political development and stability of this system in India and in Kerala. There, I charge them as the most opportunist class of politicians in India. I am bringing this to the notice of the House so that we will have a complete picture of what is happening on the political scene of India. This is the time when we take a serious look, a second look, at the role of these political coalition parties in Kerala.

Sir, I have all sympathy for the Janata. Five Members were elected with our support to the Kerala Assembly. May I ask the Opposition United Left Front Government party what there was harmony and everything was they have done in this matter? While the Left Front Government were in power, they were

conspiring to have a split both in Janata and Congress (S), and they had succeeded. When the Nayanar Government collapsed, these groups of both these parties came out. Encouraged by the Left Front Government while they were in power, they split these respective parties. One is under Mr. P. C. Chacko and the other is under Mr. Chandrasekharan. This is the thing which, with a political sense of morality and decency, we have to look down upon. The question is: How and why these two groups were taken away from these parties? How did P. C. Chacko group come out, how did Chandrasekharan's groups come out? These are the facts which we cannot deny. These are the political realities of Kerala where the Left Front Government has a major and decisive role. Therefore, I accuse them for creating instability and disorder in the State of Kerala.

Mr. Balannandan was telling about the coir and cashew industry in Kerala. I ask him: Under whose period, under whose time the traditional industries... (*Interruptions*). During whose time these traditional industries began to go down the gutters?

If you refer to the Budget, you will see an cumulative deficit of Rs. 86 crores. What was the reason for it? From 1980 onwards that treasury was plundered and looted by the Marxists and other people. Therefore, a cumulative deficit of Rs. 86 crores is accounted for. (*Interruptions*). Now they are talking about the cashew and coir industries, which are traditional industries. If I say something very frankly, these traditional industries were strangulated and destroyed by the political manoeuvring of the CPI and CPI(M) in that industry. They were exploiting that class of people and, Sir, he now comes here and says that within the last 80 days of Karunakaran's rule everything collapsed and while they were in power nearly for two years and two months everything was perfectly all right, there was harmony and everything was perfectly well and in order. When Mr. Karunakaran took over the power for 79 days everything was not all right, and went wrong. What is this? They cannot fool the people for many months and

years. The people cannot be fooled. I can tell you one thing. In the next election we will see for whom the people stand, for (*Interruptions*). These are the things we have to highlight, but I can tell one thing very clearly. Only the Central Government can bail out the economy of Kerala. The economy of Kerala is ruined irreparably. Only the Central Government by extending help to the economy of Kerala both in industrial sector and in the agricultural sector can bail out the economy of Kerala. Therefore, in my Budget speech I highlighted the point of Plan allocation. I highlighted the point of giving more aid to the industrial sector of the Central Government. If I say only 2.3 per cent of the total Central Government investment is in Kerala, you can imagine the magnitude of the problem. There is negligible investment of the Central Government in Kerala. I request the Central Government to come forward with a massive industrial and other investments. Otherwise the economy of Kerala cannot survive. The economy of Kerala at present is under ruin beyond any repairable capacity. Though it is said we are earning over Rs. 1000 crores per year as foreign exchange, if you analyse an investment and productivity pattern I would say, there is no improvement. Therefore, my submission is the Central Government is the only authority who can deliver the goods in Kerala, who can bail out the economy of Kerala. The Central Government should come forward.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now they are also supporting.

SHRI XAVIER ARAKAL: They have to support. What I say about Sankaran Namboodripad and Balanandan. They do not get on well. We understand it. Therefore, this is my submission—the present Government impasse in Kerala was created by the calculated and cunning manipulations of the Opposition parties, and the wages of that sine they are going to have in the coming election. Therefore, I support the resolution and the Bills.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Arjunan. Your party has been allotted eight minutes. You finish in seven minutes.

SHRI K. ARJUNAN (Dharmapuri): I support the Budget proposals of Kerala State. The Government of India was left with no alternative except to dissolve the Kerala Assembly in the interest of sustaining democratic ethics in the country.

Kerala State Budget does reflect the hopes and aspirations of the people of Kerala.

The Left Democratic Government in Kerala, in collusion with AIADMK Government in Tamilnadu, did encourage corrupt practices in the sale and purchase of spirit. The LDF Government appointed Sadasivan Commission and the AIADMK Government appointed another Sadasivam Commission. Since the issues involved more than one State, the Centre appointed Ray Commission. Since all these issues are presently before the Supreme Court, I would not go into the details. Sadasivan Commission was wound up whereas Sadasivam Commission is in force. It is right time that the matter should be probed into properly. The amount earned through the spirit scandal is the root cause to topple the Government. Through this scandal they earned huge amount which was utilised to shift the loyalty of Shri Nambadan. This is the root cause to topple Karunakaran Government. It will not be out of place if I point out that one actress in Tamilnadu rushed to Trivandrum for all these reasons. I want you to probe into this matter.

The Communist Party wanted to dissolve Karunakaran Government and demanded elections. Now that demand has been accepted. The demand has been accepted at the appropriate time. They have to face the elections.

The LDF's cult of violence has given birth of cult of RSS in Kerala. This has spilled over in Tamilnadu's southernmost district. The stormy situation has moved towards the east and now it is centred in the southern part of Tamilnadu i.e. Kanyakumari and Tirunelveli. The law and order situation that started in Kerala moved towards Tamilnadu. Now

[Shri K. Arjunan]

there is no difference in situation between Kanyakumari and Tirunelveli. There is violence between Hindus and Christians. As far as my party is concerned, we are above caste and religion. We have no difference between Ibrahim, Abraham and Abiraman. Now the law and order situation which started in Kerala, moved towards Tamilnadu; the southern part of Tamilnadu is in danger. Several times the Opposition parties demanded that the Chief Minister of Tamilnadu should rush to Kanya Kumari. He went there. There were several deaths, arson and what not. All the occurrence was before the Chief Minister. The Chief Minister left Kanya Kumari and rushed to Madras without restoring peace. This situation is moving towards the North. I am afraid entire Tamilnadu will face danger due to caste and religion struggle.

I would like to point out in the three southern districts—Ramanathapuram, Tirunelveli and Kanya Kumari water is flowing from a hillock. The water starts from the west and mingles in the sea. It is not utilised by the Kerala people. It is going waste. I would appreciate if this water is utilised. The ensuing Government of Kerala or the Central Government may persuade the concerned authorities to help in the matter to divert the water towards Tamilnadu. It will be very helpful from energy point of view and from fertility point of view of Ramanathapuram, Tirunelveli and Kanya Kumari.

There is excess current in Kerala. They are selling that at the rate of 45 paise per unit. It is very costly. Tamilnadu is providing rice at a reasonable procurement price. You are giving current and demanding 45 paise per unit! It is too high.

I support the demand for an airport at Calicut and naval base in Cochin.

With this I conclude.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO (Berhampur): I rise to support the statutory Re-

solution moved by the hon. Home Minister in regard to the President's proclamation relating to Kerala. The Governor had no option but to dissolve the Assembly under Article 174(2) and had to report to the President that the Government of Kerala cannot be carried on according to the provisions of the Constitution.

13 hrs.

The proclamation of the President was issued on the 17th of March, as the only alternative open to him. It is now claimed by the Opposition that they had a majority of 71 and they should have been asked to form an alternative Government. When Mr. Karunakaran came to power, he had a majority of 71. (*Inter-ruptions.*) When he started functioning as the Chief Minister, he had 71. He did not lose in the House. Therefore, he had majority. And then, one member of the Ruling Front came out as an independent and went to the Governor and said that he would support the Opposition. This being the history in Kerala, the Governor was right in assuming that the alternative Government was not possible.

Right from 1956, 12 Ministries came to power and went out of power. Political instability is a feature in Kerala's politics. Political stability is a *sine-qua-non* for economic stability and progress. Therefore, the Governor is justified in dissolving the Assembly and reporting to the President to impose his rule.

The Opposition also moved a Motion of No-confidence against the Karunakaran's Ministry but that Motion fell through. That clearly shows that the Opposition would not be in a position to form an alternative Government if it had been allowed to do so. The stability for 80 days or 90 days' Ministry continuing in power and going out of power would not lead to progress in any State and Kerala is an example in India. There is no political stability and no Government is able to stand for a full term of 5 years.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Mr. Achutha Menon was there. He was there from 1972 to 1977.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO: I am coming to that. He was there with the full support of the Congress. Now, no other party was there. Even CPM was not having the support of the Congress.

I am glad Mr. Achutha Menon continued for five years with the support of Congress. No CPM Government continued for a full term of five years. Nor did the EMS Government continue. It is no longer valid to argue that CPM should be allowed to run the Government. Mr. Nayanar could not run the Government. Even the Muslim League was not supporting him. Therefore, there is no point in arguing on technical basis that the Opposition should have been given an opportunity. How long this *see-saw* business will go on there. Therefore, the Governor is justified in dissolving the Assembly and recommending the imposition of the President's rule. I have been following the history of Kerala all these years since I have been in Parliament from 1957. One Ministry comes to power and then goes out of power. It has become a regular feature of Kerala's politics. Therefore, time is ripe for the political parties to realise that there should be stability in the State so that there could be economic progress. Kerala is one of the progressive States in the Indian Union. People are very literate and their percentage of literacy is very high. People are hard working and the economy of Kerala is on a sound basis. But people cannot develop or grow their economy unless and until political stability is there. Therefore, there is no good for CPM Members in this House arguing that they should have been allowed. They cannot function; there is no support in the Assembly. There is no other political party to support. The political history of India shows that no coalition Government, even of two Parties, was not able to last long. In Orissa, there was a coalition Government earlier but it did not last long. Therefore, it had to be dissolved and it had to go to poll again. In Kerala, the multi-party coalition, the Left

United Front, consists of so many groups. Can they continue long? Can there be an agreement on economic policies, let alone the political ideologies?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Your friend had 12 parties.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO: When I justify the action of the Governor, I say the multi-party coalition will not be a success in any State and, therefore, the Governor had no option. He was well justified in exercising her discretion because of the past experience he had of Kerala politics. She did not agree to the demand of the Opposition.

A member of the Mani-Group who resigned from the ruling front first said, he will sit as an Independent and then he goes to the Governor and says, he supports the Opposition. How could the Governor act on such conduct of a member who is not steady? He does not know where he would be today he is here, on this Bench and tomorrow, he goes to another Bench. Therefore, the politics in Kerala is very much vitiated and it is high time that the people of Kerala, including all the political parties, realise that there should be political stability. The coalition will not function anyway in any State, more so in Kerala, because there is the multi-party coalition.

I have nothing more to say on the Budget because it is a Vote on Account. The Central Government takes a general view of all the States while developing the national economy. Kerala also stands to gain. There is no discrimination against Kerala simply because it was led by the CPM Ministry. It is not so; that has not been the case. It is no good saying that Kerala is being discriminated against. There is import of coconut oil; there is import of rubber. The import is not to harm Kerala's economy, but to stabilise Indian economy. We are importing and then exporting. Cashew we are importing from Africa and then we are processing and exporting. It is a continuous process in the national interest, not merely with a view to harm Kerala's economy.

[Shri Jagannath Rao]

I appeal to the members of the Opposition to support the Proclamation because the Governor was justified in sending the report and the President was justified in issuing the Proclamation, to take over the administration of Kerala, so that the Parliament has the jurisdiction over Kerala and the Vote on Account has to be passed.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI (Bombay North West): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, there is one thing in the current situation with which I heartily agree that the legislature of Kerala ought to have been dissolved and has been rightly dissolved. But my grievance is not that the legislature of Kerala has been dissolved. My grievance is that this legislature ought to have been dissolved in October, 1981. It was kept alive for an oblique purpose and that oblique purpose raises questions of grave public propriety.

The Karunakaran Ministry came into existence on the 28th December, 1981. The non-dissolution of the Assembly from the 21st October, 1981 had given it more than two months to carry on nefarious horse-trading and to muster up, any confure up an artificial immoral majority I have always wondered why the outgoing Nayanar Ministry did not advise the Governor to dissolve the legislature. When I made discreet enquiries from my friends, I was told that they committed a somewhat obvious mistake: they forgot to tender this advice at the proper time. That only shows that the Ministry and its outgoing Chief Minister were somewhat inadequate to the task in hand.

My Party stands in a somewhat unique position in that State. Without being offensive, I might say that we are really caught between the devil and the deep sea. On the one hand, we have our friends, the Communist parties and, on the other hand, we have the Congress-I, the ruling party. But I must acknowledge that between the two, we perhaps consider the Congress-I a much greater evil. Both of them are sold out to Moscow. But one thing in favour of my communist friends

is, here they at least acknowledge openly, they do not deny, and, on the other side, there is a pretence maintained, a camouflage and a smoke-screen maintained, by an occasional flirtation with the West. At least, with the Communists, we know where they stand and we know how to deal with them.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH): What a fine argument!

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Both are enemies of democracy. But one thing in favour the Communists is that they will destroy democracy in the future, in the unlikely event of their coming into power, but Cong. (I) are in power and they will destroy it in the present. We propose to deal with the current menace. And that is why, I said, we perhaps prefer the deep sea to the devil.

The question that arises is: What is the conduct of the Governor of Kerala? The Governor of Kerala surely knew the permutations and combinations as they existed in the State, in October, 1981, and yet the Governor refused to take the only wise and statesman like and moral action that ought to have been taken, namely, to dissolve the legislature and ask for a fresh mandate from the people at that time. The same Governor with full knowledge of the facts, by manoeuvring and manipulations, refused to dissolve the legislature with the result that a Ministry ultimately came into existence, a Ministry which was conceived in sin and which ultimately died in sin. They conjured up that majority by engineering immoral political defections and they have ultimately gone out of office by the same kind of immoral defections with which they got into office. So, their birth and death were both sinful and one cannot shed a single tear for them. I am glad, they are gone and, I am glad, the way they have gone is something which they deserve.

The same Governor who was quite happy with finding that there is a possibility of a viable Government with 70 : 70 division and the Speaker hanging in the middle, suddenly developed a new idea of arithmetic. The Governor's report says that the Karunakaran Ministry, with the exit of one gentleman whose name is mentioned—I hold no brief and no particular admiration for that gentleman—there are 69 persons in the United Democratic Front which is the ruling combination in the State. If there are 69 on this side, it is obvious that there are 71 on the other side. So, this Governor considers now that 71 members cannot be invited to form a Government whereas with a lesser majority, the same Governor had concluded that a viable Government was possible. This is a kind of double-standard which we compel our Governors to resort to with the result that ultimately what suffers is public morality; we keep setting up bad precedents in this country and we reduce our Governors to robots, to automations, to mindless morons, who have no loyalty to the Constitution and its spirit, but they have only loyalty to those who appoint them and put them into the position of power.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: You know Smt. Jyoti Venkatachalam is a very respected lady and she was also appointed by this Government as Governor and what reputation she enjoys. I only hope Shri Ram Jethmalani bears with me. When we impute any mala fide intention to the Government, the Governor can act in his discretion, according to the Constitution.

SHRIMATI SUSEELA GOPALAN (Alleppey): He wants expunction.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I am assuming in favour of the distinguished lady that the Janata Government believed her to be a lady of good political character and having believed that she was a lady of good political character, we never put her to any political misuse. The test of the pudding is in the eating. The test is that when she is asked by her new bosses to embark upon an immoral political ven-

ture of this kind, she stands up to it or not.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: She is most entitled.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: We did not put her to such test. They put them to such tests. However, the sound political action by a Governor emerges from the co-existence of two factors. One is the political character of the Governor and the second is the political character of the Cabinet at the Centre which rules for the time being.

(Interruptions)

PROF. P. J. KURIEN (Mavelikara): Governor's name is mentioned and allegations are made. She is not present here to answer. That should be expunged.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will go through the record.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: We are dealing with the Governor's action in recommending the dissolution.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: No, no. You are not talking of the Constitution. I think that you are simply putting a mala fide allegation on the person of Governor.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Governor is following double standards.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will go through the record.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: There is nothing to go through the record. I am entitled to say that the Governor in October, 1981, believed that 70:70 was viable but 69:71 in 1982, is not. Read the report of the Governor. I do not speak until I read my documents. Now, let me say this. I believe as a student of Constitutional law that every outgoing Chief Minister has the right to recommend the dissolution of the Legislature. Even a Chief Minister who has lost the confidence of his Legislature is entitled to appeal to the political sovereign over the head of the legal sovereign and advise dissolution and the Governor is bound to

[Shri Ram Jethmalani]

act in accordance with that advice. Therefore, I am quite convinced in my mind that whatever might be my differences with Mr. Karunakaran's Ministry and whatever be my opinion about its immoral birth and its equally immoral death, the Governor was bound to dissolve the Legislature and he has the Constitutional right to advise dissolution and the Governor, in following that advice, did not act wrongly. But the Governor let the cat out of the bag for she adds one additional reason for having embarked upon that course of action. If she had said that reason number one, namely Mr. Karunakaran has met me today and has conveyed to me the recommendation of the Council of Ministers that the State Legislature should be dissolved and I am, accepting that resignation and proceeding to dissolve the Legislature, I would have no grievance against her action, because Mr. Karunakaran was the Chief Minister, constitutionally competent to advise dissolution. But she proceeds further, 'I am personally satisfied that there is no possibility of forming an alternative, viable and stable Ministry'. Now this statement is factually wrong, in fact, it is so wrong that, I would say, that this is a departure from political rectitude and honesty, for the simple reason that she herself says that on 15th, she came to know about the defection of one Member which converted the majority from 70 to 69, reduced it by one, and then she said that on 17th Shri Karunakaran came and tendered his resignation. When did she make any attempt to call upon those who had a majority of 71 admittedly to form a Ministry and when did she test the viability and stability and strength of the new Ministry. Therefore, the statement is inspired, she could have rest content with the first ground, but the second ground lets the immoral political cat out of the bag and that only reflects the attitude of the Central Government.

Now this raises another serious query. Why is the Congress-I, anxious now to dissolve the Legislature, which it was not, only a few months ago. A few months ago the Governor never received such

advice to dissolve. But we have said that it is our suspicion and it is reasonable suspicion that you are terribly worried these days about the composition of the Rajya Sabha, you are worried about the strength of the ruling party in the Rajya Sabha, that you do not want.....
(Interruptions)

You are worried about every seat because you want to muster up a majority of two-thirds in the Upper House with a view to carry out some nefarious Constitutional changes and amendments to the Constitution of India. We have expressed this suspicion. We have expressed this apprehension and unfortunately, nothing has been done to remove that suspicion and that suspicion, therefore, continues unabated, now in a very accentuated form.

When the motion of thanks to the President was being debated in this House, Prof. N. G. Ranga and Shri H. K. L. Bhagat made a fervent appeal for Opposition's cooperation and on that day, I, as the first speaker on the Opposition side, had got up and said that "We will give to this Government more cooperation than they want. We will give them so much cooperation that they will feel embarrassed". But, we said, "you must perform certain conditions". And I said The first condition was that". Put at rest all the apprehensions of the Opposition and tell the Opposition in forthright, clear and unambiguous terms that you have no intention to tinker with the Constitution and with the Parliamentary form of Government which that great galaxy of statesmen gave to us, that great galaxy of statesmen at whose feet we are not fit to sit and it is a Constitution and a form of Government forged by intellectual giants and, small pigmies in this country today are trying to tinker with the work, with the monumental work of those great men and, they are doing it because they want to camouflage the consequences of their corruption and incompetence. You want other forms in which there will be less scrutiny, less questioning, less exposure of your fraud

and of your misdeeds. The Prime Minister in her reply, all that she could say was that "Yes, the Opposition has now offered us cooperation." And one Member, in fact, put conditions. I am glad that he did not say that his friends should be in the Cabinet before he will cooperate."

If the P.M. wants to praise herself, I have no objection. The Prime Minister is entitled to flatter herself by thinking that "I am prepared to go there like some people who have gone from here."

I can say this that even if my Party comes into power, I shall not become either a Minister or Prime Minister either, because I have better things to do in life.

But if Prime Minister should flatter herself that we are offering cooperation and that we want some seats in her Cabinet, let her understand that we are offering to cooperate only because we find that the problems of the country are not capable of being solved with the kind of talent which you have mustered and in the interests of national progress and in the interests of the country's good, we are prepared to cooperate with you and sit and help you to solve your problems which it is not the normal function of the Opposition.

The part of the Opposition is to point out your incompetence and your misdeeds.

Sardar Zail Singh in his reply to the debate to the Home Ministry's Grants on the 24th, the other day did try to tell us that those people who are apprehending Constitutional changes in this country are living in a world of illusions. He said that there is some *Bharam* in their mind and he wanted to remove it and I wish I could take Sardar Zail Singh seriously because he is in the habit of making irresponsible statements.

When we come to the debate on Assam, I will point out that on a certain day in May last year, in some place in Rajasthan, he said that "Assam problem is solved. I have already found out 3,10,000

illegal immigrants and I am taking steps to remove them." Within seven days, in the same State, he went to another city and he said that "Assam problem is now completely solved. All the 3,10,000 immigrants are already sent out of the country and there is no problem." And there is no such problem. His statements are irresponsible statements and, therefore, I wish I can attach a little more credibility to his statements. But why does the Prime Minister leave this kind of apprehensions to be resolved by others; why does she leave it to Sardar Zail Singh to resolve them? Why does she not make a forthright statement, if not here, at least in England where she is beginning now to swear by democracy?
.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: She has returned.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: She was there. I read her statement, the last statement this morning. She could have said at least there that 'I have no intention of ever making myself into any kind of President'. Everytime we hear questions being asked. The other day somebody asked a question—Do you consider the Presidential form of Government undemocratic? If Mrs. Gandhi declared, 'I want the Reagan type of government.', may be the intellectuals of this country will think. But my suspicion has always been that she is thinking of the Idi Amin type of government and that is a form of government which we cannot possibly support.

You have asked us to vote these grants with which you have come forward. I said before and I shall repeat it that this is a fraud on the financial control of Parliament. It is a fraud on democracy. It is a fraud on the provisions which have been very meticulously forged and put into the Constitution for preserving the financial control of Parliament over the executive's expenses. We are literally being asked to commit a breach of trust with people's money. For example, if you say that we claim a crore of rupees for Police, under the heading of Police we want to know whether it is for giving them additional amenities or improving

[Shri Ram Jethmalani]

the Marxists. There were very serious differences in their conditions of education and living or if you want to increase the strength of the Police force and give them guns for the purpose of killing people and so on. So on these points complete information is necessary and without any complete information of that kind it is a matter on which it is impossible for us to vote rationally. Therefore, we know that today you have put us in a situation in which a vote on account has got to be passed; otherwise there is going to be a chaos. You will pass it with your majority but we shall, in this side of the House, sit in dissatisfaction, in frustration, in agony and tell you, 'Go ahead, Godspeed to you but you shall not do it with our vote.'

SHRI V S VIJAYARAGHAVAN (Palghat): Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, I wholeheartedly support the Presidential proclamation and the vote on account in respect of Kerala. If you look at the history of Kerala since independence, you would find that my friends sitting in the opposition got opportunities thrice to run the administration of Kerala. On all these occasions they could not complete the term. After the reorganisation of Kerala in 1956, election was held to the State Assembly in 1957 in which the Communist party got majority and a Government under the Chiefministership of Elankulathu Menakkal Brahmashree Sankaran Namboodripad assumed office. But before long that Government had to go out of office as a result of a mass upsurge. They say that it was dismissed by the Central Government. What actually happened was that they met the late lamented Panditji and begged him to dismiss them as they were unable to face the public uprising. Again they were given an opportunity in 1957. They fought the election as a united front and were swept to power with a massive majority. But that United Front too could not carry on for long. Serious differences cropped up among the constituent parties on many issues. In-fighting assumed menacing proportions. Allegations and counter allega-

tions against each other freely traded inside the Assembly and outside. Ultimately, that united front also collapsed in 1969. After that Shri Achuta Menon of the CPI became the Chief Minister with the support of the Congress party. Shri Achuta Menon was not a member of the Kerala Assembly. Although he had said in the beginning that there cannot be a Government with the help of the Congress he had to seek the support of the Congress leader Shri K. Karunakaran to form the Ministry. That Ministry continued upto 1970. In the election that was held in 1970, the United front with the Congress party as a major partner romped home. The Government assumed office with Shri Achuta Menon as Chief Minister. It is a well known fact that that United Front could not only complete the full term of five years but could continue in office even after that. In the subsequent election also the United Front in which the Congress party was a major partner, won a comfortable majority and came to power with Shri Karunakaran as the Chief Minister. Unfortunately, he could not continue as Chief Minister and resigned in order to prove his innocence before the court. Now, we know that happened in 1980. The Left Democratic Front came to power, with Shri Nayanar as Chief Minister. The LDF got 93 members in an Assembly of 140 members. Again they could not continue for long. The whole world knows why they could not continue in power and complete the term. The Central Government certainly did not intervene. There was no intervention on the part of Congress too. But the LDF collapsed because Mr. Nayanar the Chief Minister could not exercise any control over his Ministers and constituent units of the United Front. What is more even a person like Shri Achuta Menon who belonged to one of the constituents of the LDF has to say that the 17 ministers of the Nayanar Ministry were 17 different Cabinets. It was a Ministry which had given a go-by to the principle of collective responsibility. The constituent units felt insecure in the company of

ferences among them. Ultimately the Congress-S and the Kerala Congress had to come out of the Government. That was a period of political murders (*interruption*). In spite of the fact that the LDF had a massive majority they could not carry on. Law and order collapsed. Political murders became the order of the day. Situation became so serious that even a member of the Marxists party elected from Telichery constituency felt himself so insecure that he was afraid to walk in the street freely. The United front partners could not move about without the fear of violence. There were many political murders. It was then that the Congress under the leadership of Shri Anthony and Kerala Congress of Mr. K. M. Mani came out of the United Front. (*Interruption*). You can speak when you get the chance. Why do you interrupt me? Either you allow me to speak or I will wait till you have spoken. Sir, what I was saying was that political murder was the order of the day. I do not want to reel out the statistics. Churches and temples were plundered and looted. Thus the law and order machinery totally collapsed. Everyone would admit that during the time of Nayanar and T. K. Ramakrishnan human life had no value in Kerala. After they went out of office a popular Government came to power with Shri K. Karunakaran as the Chief Minister. My friends in the opposition kept up the refrain that the Karunakaran Ministry did not enjoy majority support in the Assembly. But majority has to be proved not in the streets but on the floor of the Assembly. Majority was proved there. The opposition brought a no-confidence motion against the Speaker. That too was rejected. Having met with failure on all fronts they became so desperate that they resorted to horse-trading ultimately. My friend Shri Imbichibava is sitting there, he said that the Centre has intervened in Kerala. I would like to ask him whether it was not his party which indulged in horse-trading and got Shri Nambadon to their side (*Interruption*). The Marxist party was talking about the casting vote. But after the defention of Shri Nambadon, why did not they think about casting vote? Today, they are running wild in the streets of Kerala because they were

not invited to form the Government. They are indeed a frustrated lot, because they could not run the Government and had to resign and go out. What can be done about it. So Sir, I heartily welcome the Governor's action in dissolving the Assembly. She did not encourage house-trading. The Government has taken a perfectly constitutional step. It is no use barking up the wrong tree. Once having got majority they could not carry on. I would ask you why you could not carry on. The Assembly was going to meet in a few days time. They could have brought a no-confidence motion in the Assembly. They could have opposed the budget in the Assembly. My friends are saying that the Assembly was dissolved just before the elections to the Rajya Sabha was due to be held. Why did not you wait till the elections? If you had majority you could have won two seats. But you did not wait till that. The reason is that you had the apprehension that when the Assembly met three from the opposition would come over to the side of ruling front. That is why you were in a hurry to resort to horse-trading. The Governor's action has put cold water on your plan. I wholeheartedly support her action.

History has proved that the Communist party could not provide stability in Kerala even though they got comfortable majority. So far as political stability is concerned, it is only when there was a Government with Congress party as a partner that Kerala got stability and progress. Only the Congress-supported United Front Government completed the full term. First it was the late Shri R. Shankar and his Ministry which completed 4 1/2 years in the early part of 1960's. During this period many important welfare measures were taken. Pension schemes for widows, destitutes and handicapped were initiated for the first time. This period also marked the beginning of legislations concerning agrarian relations in Kerala. The Government headed by Shri Achuta Menon in which the Indian National Congress was a major partner later on initiated land reforms in a significant way. Thus, any-

[Shri V. S. Vijayaraghvan]

one who knows the preliminary lessons of post-independent political history of Kerala could see that it was only a Congress backed Government which brought about significant progressive welfare measures in Kerala. Nobody can deny that. Therefore, in future also only a Government in which the Congress party has a major role will be able to provide stability in Kerala. I challenge my friends in the opposition to come to the political Kurukshetra. Let us see, who wins and who loses. I want to declare with all emphasis at my command that the United Democratic Front will come to power in Kerala with a massive majority in the coming election. Let there be no doubt about it in any one's mind.

Sir, I want to say a word or two about the Kerala budget. Although Kerala demanded a higher plan outlay this year it has not been given. They demanded Rs. 305 crores but were given only Rs. 275 crores which was the amount sanctioned last year. This is enough to meet the plan requirements of Kerala. Therefore, I request the hon. Minister to raise the plan outlay. Kerala is a State which is contributing a very large share of our foreign exchange. Unemployment among educated men and women in Kerala is very acute. In order to provide them with employment more industries should be set up. More Central investment is required for this. My request is that this problem should be taken seriously. Similarly, in respect of railway development Kerala is lagging far behind. The national average is 10 Kms. of railway line for one lakh of population whereas Kerala has got only 4 Kms of line for one lakh of population. This situation should not be allowed to continue. I would remind the hon. Minister about the need of setting up a coach factory in Palghat. I also want that Palghat should be declared as a backward district. Similarly, I demand that a naval academy be set up in Ezhimala. During Nayanar's time the industrial climate was hardly conducive to industrial development. Now that it has changed new industries should be set up. I do not want to take much of your time.

In fact, I want to give more chance to the opposition. The requirements of rice in Kerala should be met fully. (*Interruption*). Yes, Kerala is a part of India. Otherwise, how can Mr. Balanandan and me be sitting here (*Interruption*). Yes, I know that you had no loyalty towards your own country. That is why you are thinking in those terms. My only request is that you must be loyal to your motherland and not to some foreign country. You must think that Kerala is a part of India. Sir, I do not want to say anything more on that. Kerala's requirements must be fully met (*Interruption*) I challenge my friend Mr. Unnikrishnan. Let us see whether his party will be there in the Assembly at all after the next election (*Interruption*). Yes, Neelam's party has fortunately no representation in the assembly. I challenge them to meet in the political Kurukshetra.

Sir, once again I support the proclamation and the budget.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri K. A. Rajan. Your party is given 5 minutes. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The time allotted is there; I have to announce it.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: He has not spoken on the Budget.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Why do you waste his time. I know he will always obey the Chair. Shri K. A. Rajan: Please be brief:

SHRI K. A. RAJAN (Trichur): Sir, I stand to oppose this Resolution tooth and nail. It is, in all respects, immoral, illegal and unconstitutional. While I oppose this Resolution, I may say, I am very glad that the Karunakaran Ministry which came by the back-door with a minority had its natural, premature and immoral death. The day he was installed as the Chief Minister of the State, he was just requested to go on continuing and holding his power in order to pass the vote on account and conduct the new elections in the State. But unfortunately the game did not work. That is why those people are

very much perturbed or worried or just derailing from the very point which we are discussing here. On 17th March, Karunakaran Ministry had to resign. What was the position in the numerical strength of the Assembly? It was quite clear that he had to resign because he was in minority. If you go through the history of the whole democratic process that has been working in the country, you will find that there has never been any deviation from the democratic norms followed in the country. Unfortunately, when the Nayanar Ministry resigned, because it lost the majority, what happened? What was the step taken by the Governor? At that time, it was quite clear that there were 67 Members on the Opposition side. But when Mr. Nayanar resigned, the Assembly was kept in suspended animation. If you look into the various circumstances or the instances, in this country, where non-Congress-I Government quit or resigned, you would know what was the step taken by the Governor. The Assembly was kept in suspended animation for some time. But now when the question of Congress-I Ministry which had to resign, came what step did the Centre take? They dissolved the Assembly. There are so many instances. Why do they adopt different yardsticks? I am not at all worried about what is going to happen in Kerala after the elections. We are not worried about the dissolution also. The point is when at the first instance the Nayanar Ministry quit, he had demanded dissolution of the Assembly and fresh elections in the State. But that was not acceded to. That is not the main problem. The main problem is something else. It is not the question whether we are throwing mud against each other. The question is the fundamental principle that is involved in the democratic set up of this country. There need not be any illusion on the ruling party side. The time is changed now. Not a single party can rule over any State for a certain period of time. That time has gone. Just before the dissolution of the Kerala Assembly, you had formed a coalition Government there. So, we are asking that under the new democratic set-up you have to observe strictly the democratic principles and norms and unless you observe them, it will boome-

rang on you after some time. That is what is going on in other States. What is happening in the States where the Congress-I party is in power? What is happening in Andhra Pradesh? Even within your party, there are so many people who are pulling the legs of your own party Members. Instead of indulging in mud-slinging business, you should think twice, before you say anything about the other parties or what is going on inside your own party.

Sir, our demand was that the Assembly should have been dissolved when Mr. Nayanar quit the Government. He also advised the Governor for the dissolution of the Assembly. But what did they do? It was kept under suspended animation and enough time was given for horse-trading and if you say now that the horse trading would start, that would be wrong to say so. You were in power for 80 days but unfortunately you could not stick on. Never in the history of the country it has happened that the Speaker, sitting in the Chair, had to act as a traffic Police Head Constable conduct the traffic in a busy junction and save the Government. That was a pathetic state we had to watch in Kerala.

Sir, now I am convinced on one point that there should be some accepted principles and norms in all these things. The ruling party with all its power and strength at the Centre should not try to over-rule or bypass the accepted democratic principles and adopt some unfair and illegal practices and make the Governor play in the hands of the ruling party at the Centre. This has happened not only with regard to Kerala, but it has happened with regard to Assam also. In Kerala you have not given even a chance to the opposition parties a try to form the Ministry. That is why we are opposing this Resolution. That is why we are very much concerned with these happenings. We are not worried about the outcome of the elections. You have accused certain political parties in the country. That should not be done. Before I conclude I would like to make one or two points in this House. I am not very much bothered about whether Kerala is under the President's rule or any other party comes to power. All I want to say is that the traditional indus-

[Shri K. A. Rajan]

tries of Kerala are in doldrums at the moment. The major traditional industry of Kerala that is, Coir, which employs thousands and thousands of workers are really facing crisis because large stocks of goods have been accumulated and I would request the Finance Minister to see that immediate steps are taken for lifting these accumulated stocks so that the industry could continue running and the workers are engaged uninterrupted. It regard to the Cashew Industry which employer about 1-1/2 lakhs of workers the Government has adopted the canalisation policy with which we differ and this policy has caused a great havoc to the industry and most of the workers are already starving. I would request the Government to provide some relief to them and take some relief measures so that the Cashew industry is saved.

Sir, the economy of Kerala is in difficulty. You know that Kerala is mainly dependent on agricultural economy. The main agricultural products of Kerala are cocount, rubber, cocoa, cashew, etc. The present import policy is against the interest of Kerala State. The import policy of the Government is against the assurances given by the Prime Minister on the floor of the House. Now, coconut oil is being imported, rubber is being imported, cocoa is being imported. It is done to the detriment of the States economy and the very existence of Kerala people. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to the fact that unless you take steps to ameliorate the conditions of the workers and unless you take steps to stop the present import policy which goes against the interest of Kerala, the whole economy of the State would be ruined and the workers would be thrown out of jobs. The present policy is really creating a havoc to the whole people of the State and I hope that the hon. Minister and the Government will see to it that immediate steps are taken to ameliorate the conditions of the poor people of Kerala and stop the present import policy for the sake of the Kerala State.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN
(Badagara): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir,

while rising to oppose the motion for approval of the Presidential Proclamation relating to the State of Kerala and to the various proposals which are supposed to have been made in the so-called Budget, which my friend Mr. Pranab Mukherjee has laid on the Table of the House, I want to say something to the points which have been raised in this debate regarding the Presidential Proclamation.

Sir, it is very significant that both the Members who spoke from the Treasury Benches did not mourn the death of or early demise of their own Karunakaran Government. I know that at least some of them have felt about it. It is very important because, as my friend, Mr. Ram Jethmalani referred to, this whole Government which is a disgraceful episode in the whole parliamentary history of Kerala was not only conceived in sin but it is a result of the political metamorphosis which I have referred to here. Little did I imagine that I have to refer to this or at any time I would have to say anything about this because it involves a very dear friend of mine, I will consider him to be one of my closest personal friends in life—Mr. Antony. It was a plain defection of this gentleman and his group by which he transformed and added new dimensions to the theory of 'Ayarams' and 'Gayarams' and himself became 'Antonyram' and it was this metamorphosis which brought about a change in the Government, the betrayal of a promise that was given to the people of Kerala when we joined the Left Democratic Front. While I do not want to go into the details...

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: Out of 22 MLAs...

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: I am not yielding... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You note down his points and reply them later when you speak.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: He does not yield to reason, what can I do?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Reason according to him! Is it the reason to remain in power or share the crumbs of power? This is a very important reason; I do concede. If that is your reason, I have no quarrel with it. By all means, have a share in power, I have no quarrel. If that is what Mr. Antony want I have no quarrel. I am not talking of you or your friends in the Kerala Legislative Assembly. Let him say so; I have no quarrel. It will be very good.

The process of Ayaram, Gayaram and Antonyram has completely changed the political landscape of Kerala from what it was in 1980. It is very significant that the 1980 Assembly election took place in Kerala after Shrimati Indira Gandhi had come back to power here with a massive mandate again and she had visited over 70 to 80 constituencies in a whistle-stop tour from district to district, constituency to constituency, but still the electorates of Kerala rejected her because they believed that the Left Democratic Front would survive. One of the most important assurances given on the eve of that election was, that not only they would fight for elections together, but they stood for certain things. I do not know, where you stand in relation to that programme, and where do you stand in relation to that theory which had been widely discussed in public meetings, not privately, that Shrimati Gandhi stood for authoritarianism? Do they still believe in that? Do they still uphold that? Or do they say that she has changed her ways? I have no quarrel, if you have changed. Now, that was the beginning of horse trading. I do not want to go into the details since I do not have the time.

It is important to remember that we in Congress accepted in Kerala the slogan of Left Democratic Front in our conference in Ernakulam in 1978. Shrimati Indira Gandhi was in opposition, then, she was not in power. If

she was a threat to democratic processes in 1978, when she was in opposition, now that she has become the Prime Minister and has the monopoly of power in Union and States, has she ceased to be a threat to the democratic processes, by which you swore till the other day? That is why, I am sorry to characterise that this is playing defection. It is the result of this defection, when it began. Even then they did not have a majority. Shri Karunakaran kept on telling everybody that they had a majority. Some of us asked him: "Where is your number? Would you please tell us the number?" But the Governor was satisfied under Article 164 of the Constitution. Government's satisfaction is subjective, but it has to be a normal satisfaction. Nobody who understood any arithmetic, leave alone the political arithmetic, knew that they had any majority. A Government, as Shri Ram Jethmalani put it, was conceived in sin and was installed without any majority as subsequent developments and speeches of the Janata Party leaders themselves show that they had no majority. It survived with a kind of instrument that my another friend, Shri Jose used, as the Speaker, that is his casting vote, by which he has been reduced, unfortunately, to a footnote in parliamentary history. It survived from day to day, hour to hour, till Mr. Nambadan pulled the carpet. Then again is the question of Governor's satisfaction. Did the Governor think when Mr. Karunakaran advised her that he had a majority and his advice for dissolution of the Assembly was valid? That is the question that I want to pose. Was it not relevant for the Governor to accept his advice? If it was relevant, it is to be clarified how she accepted it? It is a clear instance of a well set pattern that has been settled, whether it is in Assam or in Kerala, Assam will be discussed later, that you can only have the Governments which the Centre decides you will have in the States. The question of majority or minority has become an irrelevant factor and the Governors have been reduced to the levels of abject instruments for misuse of authority and power and constitutional provisions.

[Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan]

That is what we have witnessed in Kerala. The question was did the Governor consult the Opposition? I am not saying anybody claimed, but the normal democratic norm is that she would have called Mr. Nayanar and said what do you feel about it? I say this because he is the gentleman who had crossed over and clearly said that he was going to sit in the Opposition; and that is why the political arithmetic changed.

Now another question I want to raise before I go to the question of Budget, is the question that there was a Notification under the Representation of People's Act regarding the Rajya Sabha election issued on 17th of March even when nominations had been filed....

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT:
(Manjeri): Not filed.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: Oh, yes, Mr. Sait, filed. And the scrutiny was also held.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT:
No, no.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: what no, no? Please don't interrupt. Check the facts. Scrutiny was held in the Secretariat of the Assembly of Kerala on 17th morning in the forenoon before the Governor issued the Proclamation under Article 174. A scrutiny was held and valid candidates were there in the field for the Rajya Sabha on the 17th of March in the forenoon. And in the evening, to subvert the whole electoral process as conceived in the Representation of the People's Act as well in the Constitution, because they would have lost the seat had the Declaration been made...

श्री गिरधारी लाल व्यास (भीलवाडी) :
दूसरी बात गलत है ।

श्री के. पी. उन्नीकृष्णन : गलत क्या है ? सच बोल रहा हूँ ।
I will resign my seat if that is not proved. Put it on the table of the House. What are you talking? (Interruptions)

14 hrs.

Therefore, my contention is that this not only violates certain norms regarding the conduct of the Governor, but it really violates the need for Representation in the Rajya Sabha and which had gone through the electoral process already. It was already initiated. Notification, acceptance of nominations and scrutiny, after all these three process had been gone through, the Governor issues a Proclamation under Article 174 the same evening, obviously at the instance of the Union Home Minister, Giani Zail Singh. So, I charge the Union Home Minister. Whether he is innocent or otherwise of the small niceties as I saw the other day in relation to his reference to the late Nazi, dictator, is another thing. He may be innocent about many things. Somebody might be saying please sign it, well it is necessary for us, for the party. But this is how it has happened. So, Sir, there has been a clear violation of not only the proprieties and constitutional provisions and so on.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: Sir, there is plenty of time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Time is plenty upto 12 O'Clock. But everybody is asking. You must also cooperate.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: So, I oppose this Motion for approval of this.

And as somebody has said we will see it in Kurukshetra. Certainly they have to. There is no means, unless you extend as you did earlier. Certainly we will see and we will certainly accept the verdict, whatever it is the electorate. But the point that I want to make here is that we have two clear Fronts in Kerala. One an enormous kind of Front that has been cooked up of 12 parties. It is not on the basis of any programme. What programme adjustment can there be between the NDP and the SRP on the question of job reservations? Will they accept any programme? Have they accepted it? What

unity can there be between the Joseph group, Mani group and the Kerala Congress? What unity can there be between my friend, Shri Sulaiman Sait's party and the NDP on the question of reservations? And if there is any agreement, we would like to know; we would like to be enlightened about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Front?

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Of course, we will go and go only if we accept (a) a code of conduct and (b) if there is a programme. On this there is no question. The whole State unfortunately has to go through these political vicissitudes. I hope this will end in the next election. I had an opportunity to talk to the former Prime Minister, Shri Morarji Desai once. He argued with me where is the poverty in Kerala? What are you talking about the poverty there? Is it that there is any poverty in Kerala? I wish the other States had the same poverty. That is what the former Prime Minister said. The present Prime Minister, although did not say these things, but the Centre's attitude towards Kerala is very much the same, whether it is in relation to industries or power or various other things. It is the same.

Now, I want to invite the attention of the House to a very significant factor. It is said that Kerala people have reached a high average middle class standard; so not much of attention need to be paid toward that State. Now, see, Sir, in the period between 1961 and 1981 according to the figures of the Planning Commission. In 1961, factory employment in Kerala was one lakh seventytwo thousand; and in Karanataka, it was one lakh seventyfive thousand and in Madhya Pradesh it was one lakh sixtynine thousand a difference of one or two thousands. In 1980-81, Kerala factory employment remains at two lakh ninetysix thousand, whereas in Karanataka it has jumped up to five lakhs fortyseven thousand—three times and in Madhya Pradesh to three lakhs thirtytwo thousands. Nothing is more revealing than this. Why has it doubled

and trebled in Madhya Pradesh and Karnataka respectively, whereas in Kerala it remains stagnant? That is an index of the progress we have made, not to speak of its comparison with Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu or Gujarat. That is in relation to this that our demand for a higher plan outlay acquires significance. Shri Vijayaraghavan said that we had asked for Rs. 310 crores or so and it remains at Rs. 275 crores. I find you have raised it to Rs. 294 crores. Well somebody told me this now. What is this Rs. 275 or even if it is Rs. 294 crores, if you go through the detail of these documents. If we had an opportunity to go through these in depth as we demand this morning, would have exposed the whole case and the attitude of the Centre towards Kerala.

Take for example the question of irrigation. Only 10.4 per cent of Kerala land is irrigated. And the allocation for irrigation in Kerala has been brought down from Rs. 20/- crores in 1981-82 to Rs. 18 crores in 1982-83. There is a peculiarity about our agriculture. I concede we are not good at production of cereals, because the land is intensively used for cash and plantation crops.

Now, I want to invite the attention of the Finance Minister, who was Commerce Minister earlier, to one thing. I know he knows the facts. In Kerala, every party, including his own has been demanding that import of coconut oil should be ended. In the last two years they have been making statements—even the Prime Minister has said earlier—that there are no imports. Occasionally she asks. 'Is there any import?' Very innocently twitting come remarks. But there have been imports—she knows—under RAP licence. What is the result? The result is that, in 1980, the price in Alleppy was Rs. 1840 for coconut oil and Rs. 1800 for coconut and now for coconuts it is less than Rs. 900—in two years—and around Rs. 1000 for coconut oil.

Now Kerala and coconut are not only intertwined in history, not only that we use the maximum of our land for coconut

[Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan]

cultivation because Kerala itself is a land of koras as you are well aware—now, the coconut farmers have lost hundreds of crores of rupees—but as a result of land reforms everybody has a small plot of land, everybody is dependent on this as a cashing crop. Now, what is the response of the Centre? The response is to continue with these imports. He says that it has been in the pipeline—it is always in the pipeline—and it was done earlier. Even his own Kerala Karshaka Congress has asked for an inquiry. I know a gentleman, an official—I do not want to name him—a day before he retired ordered that these licences should be issued.

Similar is the fate of cocoa. Recently when I was there I found that people were thinking of cutting off cocoa plantation and trying to plant something else. I hear that the Bulgarian Government had given them an offer, but there has been no response from the Centre to this offer.

It is very important for Parliament to know what Kerala earns for the country—he might be better off with statistics; from coffee and tea more than a hundred crores of rupees, Rs. 30 to 40 crores from pepper, more than a hundred crores of rupees from marine food—probably it has reached bigger levels—from cashew, from coir, and so on. But what is the response to the hard-working agriculturists of Kerala from the Centre? It is only gestures like import of coconut oil, total neglect of cocoa and various other plantation crops and cuts in plan outlay.

Now a very subtle argument has been used 'what we are importing is the industrial grade of non-edible oil'. But the Customs knows, everybody knows, what is being imported. That is the attitude. The same thing is reflected in their attitude to traditional industries like coir, cashew and handlooms. I would also like him to go into the details of these questions and help the State to recover, far from our political differences.

The same is the case with infrastructure, whether it is railways or national highways. In the case of railways, Kerala is

one State which earns the maximum per density passenger traffic as well as revenue, but there has not been a single.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I think, it is not an election speech.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: These are the issues to be raised if it is a Budget. I said that it was not, but still when you insist that it is, then I have to say all these. Not a single major railway project, even Kayangulam-Alleppey—Cochin line has not been taken up.

I will conclude after raising one or two small things. Take the question of power. What is the investment in this Budget, Plan or non-Plan? There is a myth going around that we are surplus in power. Technically or statistically, at the moment, it may be correct, but it is not true. When you want to emphasize on power development—in the Union Budget there is a very big outlay—what is that you are giving us, whether it is for Idikki, Phase-II or Puyathankutty or any other project? Six projects are waiting for clearance. So, that is where it is very unfortunate that I have to characterize this Budget as a Policeman's Budget. For Police, there is an increase in outlay—I would like to know from him why it is so—of Rs. 12 crores; and there has also been a corresponding increase in the outlays for jails. I don't have any quarrel. There should be facilities in jail. So, for Police and jails, there is a disproportionate increase. For irrigation there is a cut-down, and also for welfare measures.

The Prime Minister, as also the earlier Finance Minister have said that they have squandered money by giving pension to agricultural workers and allowance for the unemployed that is how the Left Democratic Government has behaved.

In conclusion, I say that whatever may be the electoral fortunes of any party, it is the duty of the Union Finance Minister also to attend to some of these pressing problems which, if unattended, can create an explosive situation not only for Kerala, but also for the country.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR (Trivandrum): As a Member of this House representing the capital city of Kerala, I am rather worried that the President's rule has been imposed in Kerala at a time when its annual budget is to be discussed and passed. I put the whole blame for imposing the President's rule in Kerala, on the Congress (I) party and on the Central Government.

As Mr. Unnikrishnan has rightly pointed out, elections to the Kerala Legislative Assembly were held just after the Lok Sabha elections. Mrs. Gandhi returned to power, with the re-emergence of Indira Wave, as some of them may put it. (*Interruption*)

The first task Mrs. Gandhi had done after swearing herself in as the Prime Minister, was to go to Kerala and campaign for candidates of Congress (I) and its allies. As Mr. Unnikrishnan was pointing out, she was touring almost 100 constituencies; but I want to point out that when she toured Kerala for these candidates, she went to all temples—from Padmanabha Swami temple to Guruvayoor temple. She had gone to meet all the heads of churches and mosques and she had knelt down on her knees. Even after doing all these things, her party was able to catch only 17 seats in an Assembly having 140 elected representatives. As Mr. Unnikrishnan stated on the very day on which the Left Democratic Front Ministry was sworn in, the Congress leader Mr. Karunakaran announced at Trivandrum: "We will not allow this Ministry to continue for long. One Cabinet Minister, Mr. C. M. Stephen and the then Minister of State for Home Affairs, Mr. Makwana were deputed, for bringing down the Nayanar Ministry. If I am told correctly, even the Intelligence Wing of the Home Ministry and the Central Government Ministers were deputed there to persuade the people there to defect in order to bring down Nayanar's Ministry. Anyhow, that had happened. After the down-fall of the Ministry, when the Kerala Governor had summoned Mr. Karunakaran to form a Ministry, actually he was having the support of only 67 MLAs in a House of 141 Members. With the horse trading for a long time and horse trading un-

der the leadership of even Shrimati Indira Gandhi going there and giving leadership, they were able to manipulate the strength of only 69 elected members and had made it 70 with the support of one nominated member; and they had survived only because of the casting vote of the Speaker.

Mr. Jethmalani pointed out that this Ministry was formed and had gone down in sins. Nobody shed tears; not even the members of the Ruling Party. The Governor, who had summoned Mr. Karunakaran to form a government only when he was having the support of 67 MLAs, had not found out whether an alternative Ministry could be formed by the opposition who were having a clear support of 71 MLAs. That shows that the Governor of Kerala has been used by the Congress I Party, by the Central Government, as a tool to achieve their political motive.

The problem regarding coconut and rubber was also listed before the House. The import of coconut and rubber is done only in accordance with pro-IMF policy of this Government.

Tea industry in Kerala is also facing crisis. The relief announced by the Central Government regarding full rebate on excise duty on un-blended tea directly exported from the gardens may not benefit the Kerala Tea Industry, because the Kerala tea is mostly used for blending purposes. If this reduction is made for all tea produced in the gardens, only then the Kerala tea will be benefited. I demand such a change.

The unemployment is the main problem in Kerala. As you are all aware, Kerala young men and women are going not only throughout the country but also throughout the world for seeking employment. The industrialisation is the main solution for solving the problem of unemployment. But after independence, Kerala has been neglected in the matter of industrialisation. If this state of affairs continues even without any party politics, the people of Kerala will have a genuine feeling that the Kerala State is being neglected by the Centre. After this, we are going to discuss the budget

[Shri A. Neelalohithadasan Nadar]

of Assam. You know what is going on in Assam. I fear that if this state of affairs continues, this attitude of the Central Government continues,—I fear that—Assam may be repeated in Kerala in some other form.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Yes, Please conclude.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR: The traditional industries of Kerala, coir, cashew and handloom are in a very bad state of affairs. Coir industry case has already been explained by Shri Balanandan. A Cashew Development Scheme submitted in February 1979 to the Central Government is still in cold storage. I am told that already 28 persons of coir industry died due to hunger. Regarding cashew we are in need of raw nuts. Already the State Government headed by Shri Nayanar at that time had taken some initiative to have some cashew nut cultivation. I request the Central Government to finance the cultivation of chashew. Then, about handloom industry, on 24th August 1981 an all-Party delegation from Kerala submitted a memorandum to the Prime Minister. Members of Parliament from Kerala and the State Government of Kerala have taken up the issue, but nothing has so far been done. I am happy to bring to the notice of this House that the left Front Democratic Front Government headed by Mr. Nayanar had stated some important social welfare measures such as giving pension to agricultural labourers.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That has already been mentioned.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR: It was stopped by the minority Government of Karunakaran. I want this to be continued even from the Central Budget, if necessary.

We were having a well-defined public distribution system. As you may be aware, when the whole country was facing inflation and rise in prices, even during the time of festivals like Onam the Nayanar Government was able to distribute through fair price shops and stores all

consumer articles at reasonable prices to the people of Kerala to meet their minimum needs. Similary. (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: On some other occasion I will give you more time.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR: This is the most important occasion as far as I am concerned.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Assam is also coming.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR: Assam Budget will not take much time. Sir, similarly, (*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: We will also want more time.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR: Assam has been discussed several times.

AN MON. MEMBER: No discrimination here.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There are many Members from Kerala who want to speak.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR: During the time of the Democratic Front Ministry the Fisheries Corporation has implemented many welfare programmes for fishermen, such as the scheme of assistance to fishermen for acquiring craft and gear, motorisation of country crafts, subsidised housing schemes, rehabilitating fishermen, developing Kovalam to Vizhigam fishing harbour area, installation of diesel bunks bus service for the fisherwomen, scheme of insurance and gratuity for fishermen... (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Wherefrom are you reading them? Is it an election manifesto or what?

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR: Construction of fish lending centres, etc. These are the programmes which were implemented in Kerala under the Left Front Democratic Government.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You conclude now... (Interruptions)

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR: I demand the continuance of these programmes and financial assistance from the Central Government for these programmes. And we had also formulated at that time, suggestions for the welfare of the fishermen, and suggested a scheme of assistance to have fish lending centres, scheme of assistance to fishermen for having cycle-bound fish vendors, electrification of fishermen's houses, scheme for providing latrines for fishermen, scheme for providing community amenities. I also demand implementation of these schemes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am calling the next Member. I have waited enough.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR: An Artisan Development Corporation has been formed in Kerala. Formerly, it was a scheme of crores of rupees. But I find that only one or two lakh of rupees are being allotted for this purpose. Similar welfare measures should be implemented for palm climbers and tappers. I demand clearance of some important projects of Kerala such as the second and third stages of development of Vizhingam fishing harbour, Vamanapuram irrigation project and a National Institute of Ayurveda at Trivendrum.

An important matter as far as Budget is concerned, is curtailment in expenditure. There is a demand for establishing a Bench of the Kerala High Court at Trivendrum. Thousands of rupees are being wasted as a mode of TA given to those officers of the State Government who go to Ernakulam for representing the State Government in the High Court. This can be avoided if a Bench of the Kerala High Court is established at Trivendrum with filing powers.

Mr. Arakal and others have said that whenever the Communist Party or the Marxist Party came to power, the Ministry had fallen. It is mis-quoting of history. The first Ministry of 1948 of old Travancore headed by Pattara Thianu Pillai had fallen when the Congress was

having an absolute majority in the Assembly....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, you have to stop. Now, Mr. Banatwalla. (Interruptions).

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Pannani): Sir, I rise in support of the motion for approving the Proclamation of the President.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I had announced earlier that the Minister will reply at about 2.30 p.m. Since there are one or two speakers more, he will reply at 3 O'Clock.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the imposition of President's Rule in any State and the dissolution of the Assembly of that State is certainly not a happy occasion. It is not an occasion to rejoice, but the hard realities of the situation are that there was no other option. An objective assessment of the situation prevalent in Kerala and given the shifting loyalties that were there, leads to only one conclusion, an inescapable conclusion, that there was no option but to impose the President's rule and to dissolve the Legislative Assembly there. The criticism of this rightful course of action, I humbly submit, is borne out of the politics of expediency based on most unhealthy and abject aspirations.

Sir, it has been argued that the Governor ought to have explored the possibilities of an alternative Government. In the first place, no party seriously staked the claim to form an alternative Government. Moreover, the need is not merely for an alternative Government, but also for a stable and viable government, and that was what was under the consideration of even the founding fathers of our Constitution.

Sir, I refer to the Constituent Assembly debate Vol. IX, and at page 153 it was the honourable Shri K. Santhanam who had listed so many situations in which

[Shri G. M. Banatwalla]

there can be a constitutional break-down of machinery in a State. At one place he refers and says, and I quote:

“There may be political breakdown. This is a point which requires analysis. A political breakdown can happen when no Ministry can be formed or the Ministries that can be formed are so unstable that the Government actually breaks down.”

Therefore, it is quite in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution that the Governor in Kerala suggested that the President's Rule should be imposed.

Sir, there is the talk about the Rajya Sabha election and therofe, it was argued that the Kerala Assembly ought not to have been dissolved. I must submit that there can be no elections to Rajya Sabha by a State Assembly on the eve of its own elections. When it had become very clear that no stable Ministry could be formed and when it had become very clear that the elections are necessary, then I submit that keeping the Assembly alive only for Rajya Sabha elections would have been a fraud on the electorate of Kerala and it would have amounted to surreptitiously depriving the people of Kerala of the opportunity to send to Rajya Sabha their rightful representatives through an Assembly constituted with their mandate. It is very strange that when the Nayanar Government fell, our Marxist friends and their allies argued that in view of the shifting loyalties in Kerala Assembly, the Kerala Assembly had lost its mandate. They have now come forward with the argument that the same Assembly, which according to them had lost the mandate, should also be allowed to send their representatives to the Rajya Sabha. Sir, I must submit that this is nothing but an exposition of the worst form of political immorality that could be found in our country.

Sir, I submit two important points further for the consideration of this House and the nation at large. There is a precedent of dissolution even after the Notification calling for Rajya Sabha

elections. In the case of Delhi, the Notification for Rajya Sabha elections was issued on March 11, 1980. But despite this notification, the Delhi Metropolitan Council was dissolved on March 21, 1980. Further, I must draw your attention to Section 12 of the Peoples Representation Act, 1951 which is with respect to notifications for elections to Rajya Sabha. The proviso that is there to Section 12 is very important.

“Provided that no notification under this Section shall be issued more than three months prior to the date on which the term of office of the retiring Members is due to expire.”

This proviso clearly indicates the spirit of the Constitution, and our elections i.e. that no Assembly should hold elections to Rajya Sabha three months prior to the date of its own exit. In other words there should be no elections to Rajya Sabha if the Assembly is facing elections. In other words, there should be no elections to the Rajya Sabha on the eve of General Elections in a particular State. That is the spirit of the Constitution but of course I can understand that Marxists and their allies in their company can hardly understand the spirit of the Constitution. I must congratulate the Governor of Kerala for having acted in the enlightened interest of the people of Kerala and for having acted in the enlightened interests of the healthy conventions and the spirit of the Constitution.

A few words about the Budget and then I have done.

The year 1981-82 in Kerala is expected to end with a deficit of Rs. 84.52 crores. The present estimates that are there for the year 1982-83, put the overall deficit during the year at Rs. 1.28 crores. Contrast this projected estimate of Rs. 1.28 crores for 1982-83 with the estimate of deficit during 1981-82 at Rs. 84.52 crores; that shows the spending spree with which the Kerala Government that was there during the major part of the year was motivated. I am happy that the day of deliverance came to the people

of Kerala when the Nayanar Government failed. I am sure that the Marxists and their allies are having nothing but unrealistic dreams if they are thinking of coming to power.

I must also refer to an important point and that is with respect to Calicut Airport. This particular project has been hanging fire for the past sixty years. The Prime Minister had declared at Calicut that the work would commence in 1981 itself. I raised a question here in this House and in reply to my unstarred question I was told that the project is now ready and requires clearance of the Cabinet. Perhaps it requires the clearance of the Finance Ministry. I hope the Finance Minister will to-day get up and declare that clearance has been granted and commencement of the work will be there in April, 1982 this year itself.

We have the demands for grants before us and the vote on account. Here I would require your serious consideration that the vote on account is sought for the first six months of the financial year 1982-83. I submit it would have been more appropriate to have restricted the vote on account for a period of four months only. This would have been proper and in accordance with the usual practice over the year. I feel that asking the vote on account for a period of six months would be a little encroachment upon the rights of the newly elected Assembly which, I hope, would be elected in the near future. I must also emphasise upon the Government to prevail upon the Election Commission to see that the elections in Kerala are held as early as possible.

Sir, Kerala is faced with an important problem of sea erosion. In the last few decades, Kerala lost 3460 hectares of land due to erosion by sea. I, therefore, submit that this problem of sea erosion is as important as defending the land borders of our country. The problem is concerned with a population of 7 millions and who are the poorest section of the people. The Sixth Five Year Plan envisages a total provision of Rs. 45 crores for Kerala but only Rs. 11.40 crores has

been allotted as the outlay for the first two years of the Plan period. Hence, there is need for greater attention and higher allocation.

Sir, then, power projects also need greater attention especially at the present juncture of energy crisis. For this purpose, I will briefly state three points and then conclude. In the first instance, all the pending projects should be cleared immediately. There are as many as 7 projects pending and of them, some have been submitted as early as 1972. Secondly, Sir, it is necessary to exempt the hydro electric projects in the State, from the purview of the Forest Conservation Act, 1980, which is putting a great obstacle especially when the hydro electric projects in the State are located in hills with thick vegetation. Finally, there is need for greater assistance and allocation for power projects in the State. The present allotments of Rs. 15 to Rs. 20 crores for generation of projects and about Rs. 30 crores for distribution and transmission, are totally insufficient.

With these words, and with the remarks I have made with respect to Vote on Account, I support the Budget and the Vote on Account. I also support the Resolution moved for the acceptance of the Presidential proclamation. I once again congratulate, through you, the Governor of the State on having acted with political sagacity and in the interest of Kerala and healthy political conventions.

श्री गिरधारी लाल व्यास : हमारा पार्टी की तरफ से नाम भेजा हुआ है ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have already announced.

(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am allowing the Members from Kerala first. Please sit down. There is some adjustment. In every Bill, you want to speak. I am sorry, you may not be called also. I cannot help it. |

श्री अजित कुमार मेहता (समस्ती पुर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति की घोषणा

[प्रो. अजित कुमार मेहता]

और बजट के विरोध करने के क्रम में मैं आपका और सदन का ध्यान इतिहास के 25 वर्ष पहले ले जाना चाहता हूँ।

1957 में केरल में आम-चुनाव हुए और सरकार बनी। लेकिन सरकार कुछ ही महीनों के अन्दर 1957 में ही बर्खास्त कर दी गई। इसका इनिशिएटिव हमारी वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री, जो कि उस समय कांग्रेस की प्रेजीडेंट थी, ने लिया।

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह गलत बात है।

प्रो. अजित कुमार मेहता : सही बात है, आप इतिहास देखिए। यह गन्दा काम किससे करवाया गया, आज जिनको फादर आफ माडर्न इण्डिया कहते हैं, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जैसे व्यक्तियों से।

हमारी प्रधान मंत्री इंग्लैंड में हो रहे फेस्टीवल आफ इण्डिया की पंटरन हैं, वहाँ इतिहास को झुठलाने का कार्यक्रम किया जा रहा है। वहाँ फादर आफ दि नेशन का कोई उल्लेख नहीं है, लेकिन फादर आफ माडर्न इण्डिया के नाम से पं. जवाहरलाल नेहरू का उल्लेख किया गया है।
(व्यवधान)

श्रीमती कृष्णा साही (बेगूसराय) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, ये केरल के बजट पर भाषण दे रहे हैं या किस चीज पर भाषण दे रहे हैं?

प्रो. अजित कुमार मेहता : मैं उसी रेफ्रेंस में कह रहा हूँ—इतना गन्दा काम उस समय स्वर्गीय जवाहरलाल नेहरू के हाथों करवाया गया। यह चरित्र है—हमारे प्रधान मंत्री का कि उन्होंने जो संवैधानिक ढंग से चुनी हुई सरकार थी उसे असंवैधानिक माध्यम से भंग कराकर प्रजातंत्र का गला घोट्टा है।

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Perhaps, the hon. Member is not aware that there was the Vimochan Sangran Samiti. The entire people of Kerala rose in revolt and they brought down the EMS Ministry. I must tell the hon. Member not to indulge in such invectives.

PROF. AJIT KUMAR MEHTA: That was not correct. That is what he is saying.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You come to the Vote on Account and the Budget.

प्रो. अजित कुमार मेहता : मैं राष्ट्रपति जी की उद्घोषणा का विरोध करते हुए उसी सन्दर्भ में बोल रहा हूँ। अब मैं वहाँ की राज्यपाल के दोहरे मानदण्ड पर अपने कुछ विचार व्यक्त करना चाहता हूँ। वहाँ की राज्यपाल ने अपने प्रतिवेदन में लिखा है --

“मैं स्वयं इस बात से सन्तुष्ट हूँ कि किसी व्यावहारिक, स्थायी या स्थिर सरकार बनने की कोई सम्भावना नहीं है। इन परिस्थितियों से मैं इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुँची हूँ कि राज्य के सर्वोच्च हित में राज्य विधान मंडल को भंग कर दिया जाय और लोगों को फिर अपनी राय जाहिर करने के लिये चुनाव कराये जाय।”

राज्यपाल की यह सन्तुष्टि कुछ महीने पहले कहाँ थी? दोनों पक्षों में 70-70 विधायक थे, अध्यक्ष को ले कर 71 हुए, तब उन को यह विश्वास हो गया कि वह सरकार स्थायी होगी। उन्होंने उन को सरकार बनाने के लिए निमन्त्रण दे दिया, लेकिन जब तक विधायक के टूटने से विपक्ष में 74 लोग हो गये, तब उन को यह बात समझ में आई कि अब स्थायी सरकार नहीं बन सकती। बलिहारी है—इस समझ की।

अब मैं राजनीतिक अनैतिकता के ऊपर कुछ कहना चाहूँगा—श्री बनातवाला जी ने उस की चर्चा की है और भी काफी चर्चा हो चुकी है। श्री बनातवाला एक गलत बात के लिए सफल पैरवीकार हो सकते हैं, लेकिन सफल पैरवी से कोई गलत बात सही नहीं हो जायगी। उन्होंने उदाहरण दिया है राज्य सभा के चुनाव का। उन्होंने उदाहरण दिया है दिल्ली का 19 मार्च, 1980 का। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ—1980 में यहाँ कौन सी सरकार थी? आप अपनी ही बात का उदाहरण देना चाहते हैं और उस से सिद्ध

करना चाहते हैं कि आप जो गलत काम करेंगे वह सही होगा।

राजनीतिक अनैतिकता का एक दूसरा उदाहरण दीखते—मैं जानना चाहता हूँ—क्या यह सही नहीं है कि प्रधान मंत्री के प्रिन्सिपल सैक्रेटरी** ने केरल की बहुत सारी यात्रायों की और बहुत से लोगों से मिले

(Interruptions).

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: You give notice. Why is he mentioning the name without giving notice? (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will not allow. You can criticise the Prime Minister. . . . (Interruptions).

PROF. AJIT KUMAR MEHTA: I am withdrawing the name.

(Interruptions)

PROF. AJIT KUMAR MEHTA: But it is a fact.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will not allow. . . .

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: He can mention it. (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will not allow it. (Interruptions).

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: Under what? (Interruptions)**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You don't talk about the rules. Don't mention the name.

(Interruptions)**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I need not tell you. Please do not record whatever he said.

Do not challenge me. Do not challenge the Chair. I am telling you. You don't challenge the Chair. It is all right. There is a limit. I know everybody knows his limitation. They must know their limitations. (Interruptions).

प्रो. अजित कुमार मेहता : मैं दावा करता हूँ कि मैं ने जो कहा है आप इस को गलत सिद्ध कीजिए। क्या प्रधान मंत्री जी के प्रिन्सिपल सैक्रेटरी ने बार बार केरल की यात्रा की या नहीं। वे इस मंशा से बहां गये थे कि केरल की सरकार को अनैतिक ढंग से तुड़वाया जाए और उन्होंने सरकार को तुड़वाने का गलत काम किया और उस में वे सफल हुए। यह राजनीतिक अनैतिकता है। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

अब मैं संचार मंत्री श्री स्टीफन की इस सारे काम में भूमिका को चर्चा करूंगा। इन को डिफ्यूट किया गया था केरल की सरकार को गिराने के लिए। श्री स्टीफन केरल से आते हैं और उन को वहां पर पांव रखने की भी जगह नहीं मिली और उन्होंने दिल्ली में आ कर शरण ली लेकिन दिल्ली वालों ने उन को वापस भेज दिया। फिर कर्नाटक में कुछ गलत वायदे कर के वे संसद में पहुंचे हैं और यहां संसद में पहुंचने पर टेलीफोन में असफल हो कर इन्होंने केरल में होर्स-ट्रेडिंग का काम किया। होर्स-ट्रेडिंग का अगर मैं हिन्दी में आवाद करूं, तो इस का मतलब होगा घोड़ों का व्यापार। इन्होंने केरल में राजनीतिक घोड़ों का व्यापार किया है। . . . (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude and help me.

प्रो. अजित कुमार मेहता : मेरा बहुत सा समय ऐसे ही चला गया है। मैं फ्री प्रेंस जर्नल, बम्बई, जो कि 7 फरवरी, 1982 का है, उस का एक वाक्य यहां उद्धृत करना चाहूंगा।

[प्रो. अजित कुमार मंहता]

"Free Press Journal: 7th January.

Cochin, Feb. 6—

"Mr Rajiv Gandhi, M.P. said here today that there was nothing wrong in the Karunakaran Ministry in Kerala continuing in office with majority and by the Speaker's casting vote in the Assembly.

Talking to newsmen, he said, he did not agree that the continuance of the Ministry was an unhealthy democratic process. The Constitution permitted it, he added."

मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि केन्द्र में जो दल सत्तारूढ़ है, उस के पक्ष में अगर अध्यक्ष को ले कर 71 विधायक हैं, तो वह सरकार बनाना संवैधानिक है और जब विपक्ष में 71 विधायक हो जाएं, तो पता नहीं उस में कौन सी असंवैधानिक बात हो गई। गवर्नर की रिपोर्ट वहां से मंगवा ली और सरकार को भंग कर दिया। ऐसा लगता है कि संविधान किसी रानी के एक राब की तरह से है, जिस को पीछे से उठा कर लोग चले, तो वह संवैधानिक है और अगर उस राब को पीछे से उठा कर चलने से इन्कार कर दें, तो वह सारा काम असंवैधानिक हो जाएगा। इस में आगे लिखा है :

"Mr. Gandhi said that Mr. Karunakaran was providing an honest and a stable Government in that State. There was, therefore, no need for apprehending about political instability."

अब देखिये, उतने ही मन्बर सत्तारूढ़ दल की तरफ हैं तब तो वहां स्टेबल गवर्न-मन्ट हुई। माननीय सांसद श्री राजीव गांधी के अनुसार जब उतने ही विधायक विपक्ष में चले आये तो वह सरकार स्थायी नहीं हो सकती। बाह र न्याय।

"Replying to a question he ruled out the possibility of an immediate poll in Kerala since the present Government enjoyed majority in the Legislature. Even if he wanted elec-

tions, he would not disclose his mind now, Mr. Gandhi quipped. Mr. Gandhi said that the Congress-I would welcome in its fold the Congress-S Group led by Mr. A. K. Anthony...." etc.

यहां मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि माननीय सांसद ने किस संवैधानिक अधिकार का प्रयोग करते हुए कहा—यदि उनके दिमाग में था कि निकट भविष्य में चुनाव होने जा रहे हैं—तो यह वे बतायेंगे नहीं। वह कौन होते हैं चुनाव कराने वाले। यह एक्स्ट्रा कांस्टीच्युशनल अथारिटी है।

इसकी चर्चा बहुत लोगों ने की है कि राज्य सभा के चुनावों से पहले राज्य विधान मंडल को बरखास्त करना ठीक नहीं था। यह ठीक है।

अब मैं बजट की ओर आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करूंगा। इसमें कहा गया है कि पुलिस की मद में 1981-82 के मुकाबले 1982-83 में 12 करोड़ रुपये ऊपर चला गया है और जेल की मद में 22 लाख रुपये ऊपर चला गया है। यानी इन दोनों मदों के लिए इतना अधिक प्रावधान किया गया है। क्या आप सारे राज्य को पुलिस स्टेट में बदलना चाहते हैं जबकि जेल और विकास की मद में प्रावधान तीन करोड़ रुपये कम कर दिया गया है। इस बजट के बारे में और तो कुछ कहा नहीं जा सकता, जैसा कि श्री सतीशचन्द्र अग्रवाल ने कहा कि यह हवाला बजट है।

मैं केरल का नहीं हूँ, इसलिए विस्तृत विवरण के अभाव में इस पर अधिक न कह कर राष्ट्रपति की घोषणा और बजट का विरोध करता हुआ अपना स्थान ग्रहण करता हूँ।

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA (Bombay South): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the State of Kerala has undergone many political convulsions, but the recent developments have shown that, if there is any State which is the symbol of political immorality on the part of the ruling Party engineered from the Centre, that is the case of State of Kerala.

Right from the beginning, the way events have developed and taken place, it has become a sordid story, a very sorry state of affairs, with regard to the democratic norms in our country.

I do not know what happened. Mrs. Gandhi went there and when the minority Government was imposed and foisted on the people of Kerala, questions were asked by the Reporters of the Prime Minister, 'Why has the Governor taken this decision?'. She said, 'Governors have their own ways to arrive at conclusions on such matters'. (Interruptions). Now I am going to propose your name, Mr. Arakal for the Chief Ministership of Kerala.

15 hrs.

Sir, I would point out certain basic things that have occurred. I think this is an atrocity committed on the democratic norms in the State of Kerala. Now, what are the main events? I would point out the installation of a minority government, the way in which the government was foisted on the people of Kerala—that was not through a democratic process. They said 70—70 and then what happened was that these sordid developments took place.

Now what happened is this. That proverbial instability of government Kerala has been suffering from is there. The spectacle is there. Within 18 years they had 12 governments and 6 Ministries in the last five years. When such an instability prevails it is the duty of the Central Government to see that all democratic norms are maintained. But the only thing they are interested in is that 'We cling to power at any cost, take power in the hands at any cost.' trampling under foot all the democratic norms. That is what they have done in Kerala and because of that not only the people of Kerala but the entire country suffer. Our political morality has gone down and there is deterioration in the political standards and the moral standards....

SHRI XAVIER ARAKAL (Erana-kulam): In 1977 you dissolved 9 Assemblies.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Don't go to that subject.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: I am not going. He is a very good friend of mine. Out of affection he is saying that.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He understands the position.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: Having foisted this minority government, how has this government survived? For 80 days or whatever the period it survived. An unprecedented thing happened. It survived on the casting vote of the Speaker. I can understand the casting vote of the Speaker. There are certain norms to be maintained as far as the casting vote is concerned. I do not understand why within one day seven times the Speaker comes out to save the Ministry. So this raises the question of partiality of the Speaker. The Speaker cannot just try to be partial he cannot be partial. But here it is a clearcut case where the Speaker wanted to continue this Ministry....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is his constitutional duty. As you are mentioning Speaker, I am just telling you.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: You are Deputy-Speaker. You are here is the Centre.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: As the Speaker is being touched, that is why I said.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: Constitutional duty cannot go to this extent.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You cannot criticise the Speaker. He is entitled to perform his constitutional duty.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: Technically, when there is a tie, the presiding authority can cast his vote. That is the casting vote. Now if you do it 7 times in a day and you do it

[Shri Ratansinh Rajda]

with a view to save the Ministry, then I will say that it is political immorality and it is unconstitutional. I would like to submit the way in which it was done shows that there are certain implications behind it. The implications are that when the Speaker is convinced that there is a razor-thin majority and this Ministry cannot survive and only on his casting vote it can survive, to continue that experiment for 7 times....

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH): On the support of his partymen.... (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has left that subject. Please come to vote on account.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: Mr. Venkatasubbaiah is usually a very cool, calm and collected Minister. Today he is out of place.

Now, Sir, I was just trying to say that the role played by the Speaker is highly questionable to say the least. Now, that apart, the Governor's role, the role played by the Governor. Are we having Governors who become a rubber stamp of the Central Government? That is the next question that I am posing. The Assembly has been dissolved and there was a proclamation under Art. 356 of the Constitution on the Governor's report. Now, Sir, under Art. 174 of the Constitution, the Governor dissolved the Assembly. This is the seventh time that Kerala has come under President's Rule.

There are certain basic questions which I would like to pose. They are:

1. Should the Governor act as a rubber stamp of the ruling party at the Centre to serve its political interests?

If such political interests of the ruling party at the Centre are to be served by

the Governor, then, I think, the Governor is not doing justice to that high responsibility and high office for which he is called upon to act.

2. How long will the country be put up with the political defection which was engineered by the ruling party? (Interruptions).

It is you who engineered the defection.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I do not agree with you.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: Through you I express this. Shri Zail Singh is here. Now, Sir, the State's political fabric at grassroots is almost in shreds such a spectacle in the House that the Speaker had to exercise his casting vote as many as seven times on a single day.

Sir, the role played by the Governor was also very dubious to say the least. The way in which the Centre engineered the defection showed that they wanted to cling to power at any cost.

Sir, my friend, Shri Banatwalla, is not here. But, I heard his speech in this House with rapt attention. He was trying to defend what was indefensible. I do not know what stakes he has in Kerala.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is a Member from Kerala.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: That I know. That was why I say that he was trying to defend what was indefensible in the House.

As far as Demands for Grants are concerned, details are not given. Only heads are given. They have not given all the details. Rs. one crore has been allocated for the Home Ministry. Unless we know all the details, how are we supposed to vote all these Demands? This is my objection.

With these few words, I have done.

*SHRI K. KUNHAMBU (Cannanore): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir. I rise to support the Presidential proclamation in respect of Kerala and the Kerala Budget for 1982-83. Although some political parties in the Opposition tried to create some controversy about the dissolution of Kerala Assembly, all those controversies died down soon because the people were convinced about the lack of political honesty in their stand. The people in general have supported the presidential proclamation.

Kerala is a political laboratory. Many important political experiments have taken place there since independence. United front have a history in Kerala. Different political parties having different ideologies come together on a common platform and on a basis of a minimum programme undertake welfare measures for the people. This in fact has been the history of United fronts in Kerala. The left-Democratic front that came to power in 1980 also was formed with the blessings of the people for the purpose of doing good to the people of Kerala on the basis of a minimum programme. I would like to charge the Marxist Party that it was the result of their wrong policies and wrong approach to political problem that was responsible for the ouster of the United Front. Not only that the Marxists did not show tolerance and a spirit of mutual adjustment which is very essential for the survival of any United Front Government, they let lose without any foresight a section of the workers and created maximum public nuisance. However I do not want to go into any details of that. The Marxists Party indulged in such provocative acts like attacking the offices of the constituent parties and beating up their workers. The people of Kerala got fed with them and they genuinely desired to see that that Government goes out of office. Honouring the sentiments of the people the Congress Party had to come out of that Government. It is a primary duty of any party to honour the sentiments and act accord-

ing to the wishes of people. After coming out of the United Front Shri A. K. Anthony the leaders of the Congress party got a such state wide and enthusiastic reception which was enough to show that people approved of what he did.

Sir, Kerala needs a stable Government for its progress. In the present juncture only those parties which believe in democratic values and democratic behaviour will be able to provide a stable Government to Kerala. That is why all those parties which believe in democracy have come together on one platform. They have sunk their differences to save the democratic system and the people of Kerala. The present United Democratic front is going to face the people with a definite programme. I would like to declare it in the House that in the coming election the UDF will come to power with a massive majority.

Coming to the budget, I do not want to say much about the budget as such because it is a vote on account and it is meant for carrying on the routine administration. However, taking this opportunity I would like to place certain problems before the House. I feel that when important problems of Kerala reach Delhi they become less important and I detect an attitude of indifference and neglect on the part of the Government here. The annual plan outlay for the year 1982-83, is the same as that of last year. The neighbouring State of Tamilnadu has got substantial increase in plan outlay this year. I do not really know why Kerala's demand for higher plan outlay was not conceded by the Central Government. Therefore, I hope that the hon. Prime Minister will pay personal attention to this matter.

I want to say a word about the Calicut Airport. This has been hanging fire for a every long time. The hon. Prime Minister while addressing a public meeting at Calicut had assured the people that the

[Shri K. Kunhambu]

Airport would be constructed without any delay. But so far no decision has been taken and it is still in the shadow of uncertainty. It is rumoured that a decision has not been taken due to political pressure from certain quarters. It would be quite unfortunate. Therefore, I request the Government to take immediate decision in this matter.

Another point is about a naval academy. The original proposal was to set up the naval academy in Ezhimala. But this proposal also remains in a state of uncertainty. The site selection Committee had recommended that it should be set up in Ezhimala itself. Therefore, I would request the Government that the naval academy should be set up in Ezhimala and it should not be shifted to other States due to political considerations.

Another point is about the development of Neendakara and Cannanore ports under the Indo-Norwegian Projects. In Cannanore this particular port is known as Moplabay. It has become useless due to heavy silting in the port. The fishermen cannot ply their boats from this port because of this condition. Therefore, I request that the Central Government should take some interest in this matter and help the fishermen by carrying out desilting operations in this port.

Finally, I want to say just one thing about Shri K. Karunakaran the former Chief Minister of Kerala. Many things have been said about him in the context of what happened in Kerala over the past few months. I want to say one thing in this connection. I cannot forget the services that he rendered when he was a Chief Minister in 1977. I want to tell the House that he had appointed directly 40 harijan young men as Sub-Inspectors of police. I want to ask my Marxists friends as to what they have done. My friend Mr. Imbichibava was the Transport Minister in Namboodripad Ministry. They could give only two per cent representation to the harijans. Similarly, immediately after becoming the Chief Minister this time Mr. Karunakaran

appointed the harijan cooperative federation in Kerala. On the contrary what did Shri Namboodripad and his party do when they were in power. In 1957 when they were in power I had to agitate against the eviction of harijans from their land. Sir, I was an MLA at that time. I was arrested and was presented before the court in handcuffs. This is what they did to a member belonging to the harijan community. I do not want to say anything more I conclude by once again supporting proclamation and the budget.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV (Azamgarh): Sir, I think that the situation in Kerala has eased now for a brief period both for the political parties there and also the people of that State. Since the State came into existence, there have been changes of 12 Governments. For the last 21 years, there were 12 Governments in Kerala and now again Kerala State has come under the President's Rule. I think the Governor's action in dissolving the Assembly is indefensible. In my opinion, the Governor had adopted a double standard in Kerala and the Opposition is right in voicing their opinion against the Governor's action, so far as Kerala and Assam are concerned, the Opposition Parties there were demanding that the Assemblies should be dissolved and fresh elections should be held. But at that time the Governor of Kerala did not consider it necessary for the dissolution of the Assembly and allowed the Congress-I Government to function with a very thin majority of one M.L.A. being on their side. What was the result? The result was that Karunakaran Government lasted only for 80 days. The Central Government and the leaders of ruling party were telling that there should be political stability in the State. They were telling that we did not want to go to polls time and again and that enough time should be given for the exploration of the possibilities of forming a Government. Therefore, the right thing would have been that instead of dissolving the State Assembly the Governor should have taken a little more time to explore the possibility as to whether the Government could again be formed by the Opposition Group with

one MLA who defected from the ruling Congress-I coalition Group. When the Governor of Assam could keep the Assembly in suspended animation for months and months together why was it not done in the case of Kerala? It was stated that election for 3 seats in the Rajya Sabha should not take place because the Congress-I Government is not in power there. But when the Congress-I Government was in power, proper notification was issued for the election of the Members to the Rajya Sabha. The Notifications were already issued and the election proceedings have already been started. Had the Congress-I Government been in power, it would have been all right. But now the Congress-I were not in majority, it was a clear case that out of the 3 seats, the Opposition would bag 2 seats and the Congress-I would get one seat only. That was the reason why the dissolution was recommended. It is a small political game, that is, for getting one seat more, they murdered democracy.

Now, what happened in Assam? There the Opposition Group said time and again that they had the strength of 65 Members and they submitted a list of 65 Members signed by them, but they were not allowed to form the Government. At the same time, the Minority Group was allowed to form the Government. When the Assembly was summoned, the Chief Minister did not have political courage to face the Opposition and he had to resign. So, this kind of practice adopted by the ruling party at the Centre has created an impression in the whole of the country that the Government at the Centre is misusing its power and trying to misuse the office of the Governor for its own political ends. This, I think, is not proper. My friends say that the Janata Government did the same thing. If the Janata Party did a wrong thing, are you going to copy that? The Congress Party has a greater responsibility, in my opinion, because it was a Party which fought for the freedom; at least the struggle freedom was lead by the Indian National Congress, and the democratic set-up in this country came into existence because of the understanding and leading of the Indian National Congress.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT (Bharatpur): How many signatures were given for Shri Jagjivan Ram and Shri Morarji Desai, when my senior colleague, Shri Chandrajit Yadav supported Shri Charan Singh to become the Prime Minister? Were not the signatures in support of Shri Jagjivan Ram more than others?

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: I have never agreed with the comparison of the Congress and the Janata Party Governments. I am not interested in that. We should be more interested in solving the issues and problems in which the people of the country are interested. Therefore, irrespect of these things and which party did what, we have to take a correct and balanced view.

Really speaking, the Governor's office was used for a small political gain. The Governor's act was indefensible and biased, which cannot be defended.

I will now come to some other points. Already, the Kerala Assembly has been dissolved, but please do not allow President's rule to continue for a longer period. Even the earlier Congress Chief Minister, Shri Karunakaran had expressed his desire publicly that Kerala would like to go to polls in early May. I think, the Government should fulfil its responsibility and the earliest opportunity should be provided to the people of Kerala to elect the Government of their choice.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The elections are to be conducted by the Election Commission. What can the Government do?

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: I know that. The Election Commission's authority was eroded. The Election Commission had issued a notification for Rajya Sabha elections. By manipulation and by dissolving the Assembly, the entire authority of the Election Commission was completely destroyed. This is what I am saying. The Election Commission's authority should be respected; it was not respected in Kerala.

[Shri Chandrajit Yadav]

Very often, the question is raised about the Communist friends sitting here. I would like to say that all of them, in Kerala, West Bengal and other parts of the country have come only through democratic processes. It is very much undemocratic to attack those forces which have come to this House or have obtained majority in certain States through democratic processes. Therefore saying that they are all anti-democratic or non-democratic is not correct; this kind of gimmicks have been rejected time and again by the people of this country. Instead of resorting to these things, please take care of your own home, look after your own problems. You have not been able to strengthen your party, you have not been able to take up and solve the issues of the masses. That is why, the people did not give you the bigger support. The Congress Party itself decided at that time, and it was a correct decision, to sit with Communists in the same United Front Government, with those forces which you had called anti-democratic and anti-people, and who did not have faith in democracy. This does not behave well.

I would now say only two things, and I hope the Finance Minister will reply to them when he speaks. One of the complaints of the people of Kerala is that when they recommend certain projects, or recommend certain Bills for the assent of the President, or for the consideration of the Government of India, it is deliberately delayed and it is a discrimination against the people of Kerala. I remember that one Land Reforms Bill was recommended by the Left Democratic Front Government long time back, and it was kept pending with the President of India for a long time, and the clearance was not given. It was certainly against the wishes of the people of the State.

Now, there are also a few important projects. There is one important project, which would be in the interest of the people of Kerala; it concerns a large number of people and it can be a very important industry for that State. Cocoa is a very important crop in Kerala. Out of cocoa they feel that they can have

important things like butter, milk, and many other products similar to milk. That project has been lying pending with the Modern Bakeries for a long time. Such a project will go a long way to provide employment to unemployed people.

Now in Kerala almost two lakh educated boys and girls are unemployed. Sir, the Kerala Government has been giving them Rs. 50/- per month as unemployment allowance. And they recommended to the Central Government, the Planning Commission to give Rs. 50/- more so that it can become Rs. 100/-, a moderate unemployment allowance. But the Central Government has been saying that it is a dole. Will you please, Mr. Finance Minister, look into the fact that governments in many European countries, including France, Italy, UK, Scandinavian countries, have been giving unemployment allowance? They do not treat it as doles. But our Government's approach is totally anti-youth. Neither they are able to provide jobs to them, nor do they give unemployment allowance. Please consider this and raise the allowance from Rs. 50/- to Rs. 100/-.

Another thing is that the Civil Supplies Corporation of Kerala is one of the best organisations in the State. It has been admitted by all so far as the public distribution is concerned. Ninety per cent population of Kerala has been covered by the public distribution system. This is a major organisation for the distribution of supplies to the vulnerable sections of the society. They had been getting credit from the Banks. Now, it has been stopped, I am told. Rs. 20/- crores are needed by them for strengthening the public distribution system.

Therefore, I would request you that during the President's Rule steps should be taken to see that at least these things which are in the interest of the common people of Kerala are arranged. I think the Central Government should at least in the future take every care to see that the democratic processes are not throttled; democracy gets strengthened and it does not suffer from any politicking in the interest of the common people.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN (Mavelikara): Sir, I don't want to repeat anything that has already been said, but I have to answer some of my friends.

If I remember correctly, Shri Jethmalani, Shri Neelalohithadasan and Shri Unnikrishnan said that the Kerala Government under the Chief Ministership of Karunakaran was formed with the support of only 69 MLAs.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR: 67.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: O. K. Anyhow. They believed that the Governor invited Shri Karunakaran to form the Government when Shri Karunakaran was in minority.

First, I would like to answer that point. First of all it is not a material fact. The fact is that Shri Karunakaran had the majority of 71 Members, out of 141 in the Assembly. Now, the question is who is to be satisfied about the majority? It is correct that Shri Neelalohithadasan Nadar or Shri Unnikrishnan, or for that matter Shri Jethmalani are not convinced of the majority. But they will never be convinced of that. The question is who is to be convinced about the majority? I have to quote a precedence. In 1970 Shri Achutha Menon formed a Government in Kerala. At that time the Achutha Menon Government was supported by my friend, Shri Unnikrishnan and Shri Neelalohithadasan Nadar.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR: You also supported him.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: Yes, I also supported. But politically you supported. Not as an MLA, but politically.

When Achutha Menon came from Delhi to Trivandrum he announced that he would not form a Government with the support of Karunakaran, the Congress leader. And without Karunakaran, the Congress leader, Achutha Menon was not having a majority. But if Karunakaran's

four MLAs were also added, Achutha Menon would be having a majority of one vote.

(Interruptions)

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: I am not yielding.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: When he is not yielding, it will not go on record.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Whatever he says will not go on record.

(Interruptions)**

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: Shri Achutha Menon declared that he did not want the support of Congress. According to him, the CPI leader, he was having only a minority support. But Mr. Karunakaran met the Governor and said that he was going to support Shri Achutha Menon and the Governor was satisfied. (Interruptions) Why? (Interruptions) How do you know what happened between the Governor and..... (Interruptions) I am not yielding. He is interrupting me.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Do not record, whatever he says.

(Interruptions)**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You must be happy that every member is given a chance to speak. Why did you say that he should not be given a chance?

(Interruptions)**

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: In Kerala, neither Shri Achutha Menon nor the people were convinced about that, but the Governor was convinced, because Shri Karunakaran gave an assurance to the Governor that he would support Shri Achutha Menon. Only Governor's satisfaction was the criterion then for which all these friends including Mr. Nadar and

[Prof. P. J. Kurien]

others supported. Exactly the same situation happened in 1982 also. (*Interruptions*) The Janata Party MLA, gave an assurance to the Governor. (*Interruptions*)

I know. I can challenge it. One MLA told me. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI SUSEELA GOPALAN (Alleppey): This is absolutely wrong. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: One MLA from the Janata Party which declared support to the Congress-I Government told me personally. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI SUSEELA GOPALAN: Shrimati Kamalam supported. They said, "The Janata Party has given the consent." But in the Assembly itself, Shrimati Kamalam declared at that time that she did not give the consent. Only when her party took the decision, she had given the consent. How can he say this? Actually, he is wrong.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. NAMGYAL (Ladakh): I am on a point of order. The other day when Dr. Farooq Abdullah was speaking, I just wanted to clarify certain points which you did not allow. You did not allow anything to go on record, and while Mr. Kurien is speaking you are allowing Mr. Nadar to interrupt his speech, and it is going on record. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I allowed, because Mrs. Gopalan belongs to the weaker section.

SHRI P. NAMGYAL: I mean Mr. Nadar, Sir.

SHRIMATI SUSEELA GOPALAN : I do not belong to the weaker section.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Generally, I am speaking.

SHRIMATI SUSEELA GOPALAN: I do not accept 'women' as weaker section.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: . . . (*Interruptions*) I do not say anything about the statement made by the M.L.A. in the Assembly. All that I said is . . . (*Interruptions*)

You were working with the Congress (I) and you are sitting here, my friend, and you are interrupting me. (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please do not interrupt him.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: All what I said is this: that a certain Janata M.L.A. and their political leader Mr. Gopalan had assured the Governor that they are giving support to Mr. Karunakaran. It is a fact about which I am convinced. I am saying it. May be they are not convinced. I am not worried. I am not worried about it. I am not thrusting my opinion on them. I am only saying this through you to the House. They need not change your opinion. But I am convinced. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: This is another theory of Janata Party!

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: This is another theory.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Kurien you please conclude.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: All what I said is the Governor was . . . (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let him speak.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: According to the Constitution, the Governor has to satisfy about the majority when the House is not functioning; and when the House is functioning, the majority is to be proved in the House. The second point I would like to say is about dissolution, the controversial point. There again I would like to know one thing. Once the Assembly was meeting and the No-Confidence Motion was presented by the Opposition, it was clear that there were 71 members in support of Karunakaran. The

satisfaction of the Governor was proved in the House. That is the question. Now the Governor has to be satisfied; if that is not proved in the House then their allegation will stand. If the Governor's satisfaction is proved in the House....
(Interruptions)

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: With the casting vote of the Speaker.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: No, no, do not mislead me. Not with the casting vote. What I said is, that out of 141 there are 71 members altogether in the Assembly. That fact has been proved in the House. Subsequently what happened? What happened subsequently? When Shri Karunakaran assumed the Chief Ministership, you know the Speaker was elected and all that. What happened? The new Speaker was elected.

AN HON. MEMBER: The new Speaker!

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: He wants always to interrupt.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Come to the subject. That is all right.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: Considering the Speaker apart, Mr. Karunakaran was having 71, Mr. Nayanar was having 69. That was proved in the Assembly meeting.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is taking lot of time.

Because you interrupted me.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have taken much of his time. Please do not spoil him.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: The second point is that when the Assembly was meeting a new Speaker had to be elected and it happened to be 70-70. That is a Constitutional requirement. I am not going into that. (Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: It is also when the M.L.A. crossed.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: Now, as soon as Karunakaran formed the Ministry there came demands from all the then Opposition Parties including the Marxists, CPM, and Congress(S) led by Shri Unnikrishnan, and all the Opposition Parties that the Assembly should be dissolved. From the very moment of assumption of office of Chief Ministership by Mr. Karunakaran, there was strike and public meetings were conducted demanding dissolution of the Assembly and nothing else. This demand continued. What was the plea? The plea was that Mr. Karunakaran had 71 MLAs with him out of 141 MLAs including the Speaker and, therefore, the Assembly should be dissolved. What happened? Subsequently, one day, one MLA crossed the floor. It might be horse trading, I do not know. With the result, Mr. Nayanar had the support of 71 MLAs. Immediately they demanded that they should be allowed to form the Government. (Interruptions) You take today's speech of Mr. Balanandan. He has criticised the Governor for not inviting Mr. Nayanar to form the Government. (Interruptions)

SHRIMATI SUSEELA GOPALAN: Because he was adopting different standards. We did not want to form the Ministry. (Interruptions)

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: It only means that they wanted to form the Government. Is it not double standard that when Mr. Karunakaran is having 71 MLAs, there should be dissolution and when Mr. Nayanar is having 71 MLAs there should not be dissolution? (Interruption)

Then Mr. Unnikrishnan talked about defection. In Kerala out of 22 MLAs belonging to Congress (S), 6 MLAs were with him and 16 MLAs were with Mr. Antony. Then who is the defector? (Interruptions) Further out of 68 members of the KPCC Executive, only 10 members supported his view and 52 members supported Mr. Antony. (Interruptions) Who is a defector?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: You should not go into all these things.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: Is standing with majority a defection? One more thing.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That should be the last thing. *(Interruptions)*

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: Why did he call us defectors? Simply because in Kerala our party with absolute majority decided to withdraw support....*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Prof. Kurien, you should avoid your internal party squabbles.

(Interruptions)

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: Our party withdrew support from the Left Democratic Government and decided to support a Congress (I) Government. *(Interruptions)*..... Sir, what is this? You should control them.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Prof. Kurien, please conclude.

(Interruptions)

PROF. K. K. TEWARY (Buxar): Sir, this is not the way. He should be allowed to speak. They had their say and so he should be allowed.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: Sir, the tension in the House itself proves that there should be more allocation of funds by the Finance Minister to the Kerala State.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: Mr. Unnikrishnan called Mr. A. K. Anthony and all of us as defectors. The reason is only this. *(Interruptions)*. Let me put forward my point, then you can answer.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If you want, you can come to this seat.

(Interruptions)

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: Now you should ask them to sit.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You must avoid making any remarks. You should not interrupt. I am sorry. Mr. Kurien, please conclude.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: Why don't they allow me to speak?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Prof. Kurien, please conclude.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Sir, it is not fair on their part. They should allow the hon. Member to speak. This is most unfair.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: When a Member speaking, if some other Member interrupts, how will he take it? If the same thing happens to him tomorrow, what will happen? Therefore, every Member has to protect himself.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is not the way.

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur): It is most unfair.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please allow him to speak.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: I patiently heard all the speeches including the remarks made on me saying that we are defectors. Even then I did not oppose them. Now you should allow me to answer. If they do not allow, they are the most undemocratic people. Mr. Nadar called me a defector. I kept quiet. Now I must answer. I want to know whether Mr. Nadar is a defector or I am a defector.

(Interruptions)

DR. KRUPASINDHU BHOI (Sambalpur): He is our stolen property. Kindly allow him to speak whatever he wants to speak.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: The only reason for his calling me a defector is that we decided to withdraw from the Left Democratic Front Government and support the Government led by Mr. Karunakaran. That is the reason. For that ...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am sorry, this is not the way.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No, no, I am sorry.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: Why does he say Shrimati Gandhi as an authoritarian? I would ask him... (Interruptions). When he as a Parliamentary Party Secretary went and begged Shrimati Gandhi for supporting their Government...

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Never. He is accusing falsely. (Interruptions) I reserve my right... (Interruptions).

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: You were Parliamentary Secretary. (Interruptions).

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: There were no negotiations.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: He was Parliamentary Secretary of the Party when Shri Y. B. Chavan was the leader. (Interruptions). Government was sworn with the support of Shrimati Gandhi. (Interruptions). So, there is precedence along with him to support or bring support from other party. (Interruptions).

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Our views are well known.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: If taking or giving support to Congress (I) is defection then he is number one defector. (Interruptions).

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: This is wrong. (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have a right to call the Home Minister.

(Interruptions)

Please sit down.

(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Prof. Kurien, you have got to conclude now. Are you going to conclude?

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: What can I do? (Interruptions).

Shri Neelalohithadasan Nadar calls me a defector. (Interruptions).

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR: I am ready to contest in Trivandrum even against Shrimati Gandhi. (Interruptions). I am ready to challenge... (Interruptions).

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: Let anybody talk about defection. My party has decided with a majority decision and we stand by it and by our party decision. That is what I have to say.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Prof. Kurien, I am not allowing you any further. I have to go to the next item.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: All right only two minutes. We have got to go to the next item as everything must be over today.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nobody should intervene.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: I am coming to the Budget since there are only two minutes with me.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: The major part of his speech still remains.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There will be unanimity in it. Since there are some problems of Kerala, there will be no fight now.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: The Budget proposals are for six months. The Vote On Account is for six months. Why to postpone elections? My request is that the elections in Kerala should be conducted at the earliest. That is one of the points, I would say.

Many hon. Members have said, here, about the Plan allocations to Kerala and that the allocations have not yet been enhanced as compared to other States. In all other States, there is an enhancement of the Plan allocation but we have only the same as that of last year. I would request the Finance Minister to reconsider the matter.

Regarding investments in the public sector, I had an answer of an Unstarred

[Prof. P. J. Kurien]

Question yesterday, that only 2.3 per cent of the total investments in the country is made in the State of Kerala. You know, by any calculation, that is very low. I would request that these aspects should be considered. The imbalances with respect to employment, with respect to public sector investment, and with respect to Plan allocations should be corrected. There is a serious allegation that Kerala is being neglected. It is our repeated request to the Central Government and since the Kerala administration is with the Central Government now, they should utilise this time to correct these imbalances and proper and reasonable demand of Kerala should be met.

I do not want to repeat other things since many Members have already mentioned them.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, the Home Minister will reply. (

गृह मंत्री (श्री जल सिंह) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति की उद्घोषणा को मान्यता देने के लिए जो प्रस्ताव रखा गया है, उसके सम्बन्ध में, और बजट के सम्बन्ध में भी मेम्बर साहबान ने अपने विचार रखे हैं। वित्त मंत्री जी मौजूद हैं और मैं समझता हूँ कि मेम्बर साहबान ने उनका काम काफी हद तक कर दिया है। फिनांस के मसलों पर काफी गम्भीरता से सोचना पड़ता है और उस तरफ मेम्बरों ने कम ध्यान दिया है और ज्यादातर पोलिटिकल बातें ही कही हैं। उन्होंने इस बात पर जोर दिया कि केरल में राष्ट्रपति-राज क्यों लागू किया गया और बसेम्बली को भंग क्यों किया गया, और इस बारे में उन्होंने अपने अपने विचार रखे।

मैं इस नतीजे पर पहुँचा हूँ,--खास तौर पर प्रो. कुरियन की तकरीर के बाद--कि कोई ऐसा मसला नहीं रहा, जिसको हाउस के सामने न लाया गया हो और हर तरफ से न लाया गया हो। आज का दिन तो इतना मुबारक है कि सब ने अपने अपने इरादों के मूताबिक बातें कही हैं और इसमें पार्टी का स्थान नहीं किया है। विरोधी

दल के बँचों से ही हमारे विरोधियों को जवाब मिल गया है, लेकिन फिर भी मेरा कर्तव्य है कि जो शंकाएँ यहां पर रखी गई हैं, मैं उनके बारे में कुछ बातें कहूँ।

इस तरह की बातें कही गई हैं कि वहां पर डेमोक्रेटिक सेट-अप को तोड़ दिया गया है, यह अस्सी दिन का राज एक ही वोट से चलता रहा है और वहां की गवर्नर रबर-स्टैम्प है, जो कि बिलकुल गलत है। मैं समझता हूँ कि गवर्नर एक ऐसी पदवी है, जिसके बारे में हमें कोई बात नहीं कहनी चाहिए। लेकिन जो फैसले हो जाते हैं, उनपर विचार किया जा सकता है।

केरल की गवर्नर बहुत दूर-अंधेरे, निष्पक्ष और विद्वान गवर्नर हैं। केरल की सियासत में बारू के करीब पोलिटिकल पार्टियां हैं। उनके नाम एक ही हैं और वे उसके आगे कुछ न कुछ लगा कर गुजारा करती हैं। आपको मालूम है कि केरल सब से पहला प्रदेश है, जिसमें एक पार्टी के नाम से दो-दो पार्टियां बननी शुरू हो गईं, यहां तक कि मुस्लिम-लीग भी दो है और फिर आल-इंडिया से अलहिदा होकर केरल की कांग्रेस बन गई। उसकी भी दो पार्टियां हैं। इस तरह से जब इतिहास को देखा जाए तो उत्तर प्रदेश में सबसे पहले डिफ्रैक्शन शुरू हुआ और छोटी-छोटी पोलिटिकल पार्टियां बनाने की बुनियाद केरल में रखी गई। मैं इस बारे में कुछ नहीं कहता हूँ क्योंकि आज सिर्फ केरल की बात है।

16.00

गवर्नर साहब का सिलेक्शन हुए मुद्दत हुई। यह उस वक्त हुई, जब हमारे बुजुर्गों का यहां राज था और युवावस्था में था। श्री मोरारजी भाई, चौधरी चरण सिंह और बाबू जगजीवन राम--यह इनके वक्त का सिलेक्शन हुआ है। इतने वक्त गवर्नर रहने के बाद वे केरल के हर मामले को ठीक तरह से समझ गई हैं और उन्होंने जो फैसले किए हैं, अपनी मर्जी से किए हैं। यह गवर्नर की हुस्ती को गिराने की बात है कि जो हम चाहें करवा लें, लेकिन हम कैसे करवा सकते हैं। यदि इस प्रकार की बातें आप केरल के गवर्नर के प्रति कह

सकते हैं, तो फिर तो हर गवर्नर के प्रति कह सकते हैं। उन्होंने अपने डिस्क्रिशन से, अपने विचार से केरल के लोगों के भले के लिए, डेमोक्रेसी के हितों के लिए फैसला किया है और वहां की एसेम्बली भंग करने का फैसला उन्होंने लिया है।

डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, स्पीकर के बारे में भी बहुत सी बातें कही गईं कि उन्होंने वोट क्यों दिया और क्यों सरकार को बचाया। आप तो मेरे से ज्यादा जानते हैं और मੈम्बर भी ज्यादा जानते होंगे। दुनिया भर में डेमोक्रेटिक सिस्टम में जब पार्लियामेंट्री सिस्टम का राज था तो स्पीकर का वोट ही ऐसा वोट होता है जो निष्पक्षता से ड्यूटी को निभाता है। वह कोशिश करता है कि अनुशासन ठीक रहे और हर मੈम्बर की इज्जत रहे, लेकिन उसकी ड्यूटी यह भी होती है कि डिस्क्रिप्शन पैदा न होने दे। वह अपने वोट से कभी सरकार को नहीं गिरायेगा और उनको न गिराना चाहिए। मੈम्बर गिरा सकते हैं, तो गिरा दें। जब यह समय आ जाए कि अपने वोट के बगैर फैसला नहीं हो सकता है, तो स्पीकर साहब ने यह हाई ट्रिडिशन कायम की है कि उसने अपने वोट से सरकार को गिरने को कोशिश नहीं की, क्योंकि स्पीकर का काम इन्स्टीबिलिटी लाना नहीं, वह स्टेबिलिटी लाना होता है। इसलिए कोई अन-डेमोक्रेटिक बात नहीं हुई है।

मैं मੈम्बरों से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि केरल के विधायकों को आपको बधाई देनी चाहिए कि हिन्दुस्तान में डेमोक्रेसी इतनी मजबूत हो गई है, यदि कई पार्टियों के फ्रंट भी बन जायें तो एक-एक वोट से 80-90 दिन तक राज चल सकता है। दुनिया के अन्दर यह मानी हुई बात है कि जहां डेमोक्रेसी मजबूत हो जाए, वहां एक-एक वोट से भी कई साल तक राज चल सकता है। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि उनको एतेराज नहीं करना चाहिए।

डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, एक बात यहां पर बड़े जोर से उठाई गई कि राज्य सभा के मੈम्बरों का चुनाव था, इसलिए उसको क्यों नहीं रखा गया। कान्स्टीचूशन में इसकी

कोई बाधा नहीं थी, लेकिन रवायात तौर पर देखा जाए तो गवर्नर ने बहुत ही अच्छा काम किया। जब उनको मालूम हो गया कि यहां कोई भी फ्रंट अकेले तो चल नहीं सकता है, हो भी नहीं सकता था, दोनों फ्रंटों की सरकार देख ली और जो लैफ्ट फ्रंट था, वह लैफ्टजम को छोड़ गया, तो उनके साथ उनके साथी छोड़ गए और अब किसको डिफेक्टर कहें और किस को डिफेक्टर न कहें। दोष हम गवर्नर को देते हैं। मेरे दोस्त माननीय कांग्रेस (एस) के नेता श्री उन्नीकृष्णन जी यहां बैठे हुए हैं। असल में तो इन्हीं की कृपा से सरकार बनी और इन्हीं की कृपा से सरकार गिरी। पहले फ्रंट को गिरा दिया, पहले फ्रंट की सरकार इन्हीं की कृपा से बनी, फिर गिरा दिया। फिर दूसरे फ्रंट की सरकार इन्हीं की कृपा से बनी, उसको भी गिरा दिया। आप दोष हमको क्या देते हैं, दोष तो इन को देना चाहिए, ये अपने यहां अनुशासन नहीं सम्भाल सके, ऐसे किस तरह से शासन चलायेंगे जब आप के यहां अनुशासन चला गया। इस लिए हम को दोष देना अच्छा नहीं लगता है।

मुझे श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव की आज की तकरीर सुन कर थोड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ, अफसोस तो नहीं हुआ, चूंकि वे बहुत दूरअन्दाज हैं, इन्होंने जितने पॉलिटिकल मामलों को देखा है, सोचा है, समझा है, जितनी इन की स्टडी है शायद बहुत कम आदमियों की होगी। ये सारी बातों को देख कर और पहचान कर आये हैं, हमारे साथ रह कर भी देखा है, बाहर भी देखा है और उस के बाद इस नतीजे पर पहुंचे हैं कि इस में कुछ नहीं पड़ा है। ईश्वर की कृपा से उठ कर वहां से यहां आ गये, यहां से वहां चले गये, एक दिन फिर यहां आयेंगे, इस लिए आप को हमारे खिलाफ गुस्ता नहीं होना चाहिये....

श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र हलदर (दुर्गापुर) : वह तो आप भी चलायेंगे....

श्री जैल सिंह : आप जरा खामोश हो कर बैठिये। किसी की गलत बात को सुन लेना भी हासिले की बात होती है। बहादुरी

[श्री जैल सिंह]

के बग़ैर राजनीति नहीं चलती है, वैसे राजनीति में कामलता, कठोरता और सरलता भी चाहिये, लेकिन बहादुरी के बग़ैर कोई चीज़ काम नहीं आती है। बहादुर आदमी ही किसी की बात को बिलेरी से सुनता है, ज़वाब भी दे देता है जब मौका लग जाता है।

मैं यह कह रहा था कि डेमोक्रेसी को बचाने के लिए क्या करना चाहिए? आप हम को डेमोक्रेसी का घातक कहते हैं, लेकिन हमारी कुछ रवायत हैं, हमारी नेता श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी की कुछ नीतियां हैं। जब वह 11 साल पहले राज्य करती थीं, उस ज़माने में हिन्दुस्तान के 9 प्रान्तों में विरोधी दलों की सरकारें थीं। कोई भी दल यह शिकायत नहीं कर सकता, कोई भी प्रान्त यह शिकायत नहीं कर सकता कि उन को फाइनेन्शियल एस्सिस्टेंस न दी गई हो, अमन और शान्ति के लिए उन की पूरी मदद न की गई हो, उन की स्टैबिलिटी को कायम रखने के लिए कोआपरेशन न मिला हो और आज भी हिन्दुस्तान में वेस्ट बंगाल, त्रिपुरा, तामिलनाडू और जम्मू-काश्मीर में जो सरकारें हैं वे हमारी पार्टी की नहीं हैं लेकिन वे यह शिकायत नहीं कर सकतीं हालांकि विरोधी दलों को तो विरोध कर के फर्ज पूरा करना है, लेकिन हमारी सरकार के खिलाफ यह इल्जाम नहीं लगाया जा सकता कि हम कहीं भी उन के साथ डिस्क्रिमिनेशन करते हैं। केरल में भी हमारी पार्टी की सरकार थी और आसाम में भी हमारी पार्टी की सरकार थी, अगर हम ने अपनी पार्टी की सरकारों को हटाने के लिए गवर्नर की रिपोर्ट को मन्ज़ूर कर लिया तो इस में आप को नाराज़गी क्यों है? मैं केरल के नेताओं से पूछता हूँ—जब पहली बार सी.पी.एम. के मुख्य मंत्री माइनारिटी में आये और हम ने गवर्नर का राज्य किया तो उस वक़्त उन्होंने नहीं कहा कि मौका देना चाहिए, बल्कि उन्होंने कहा सस्पेंडेड एनिमेशन क्यों की है, इस को डिजाल्ड करते। लेकिन जब दूसरे मुख्य मंत्री के ज़माने में मौका आया तो कहते हैं कि आप ने उसे भंग क्यों

कर दिया। दो चीज़ों पर एक साथ नहीं चला जा सकता। यहां तो बहुत कम समय हुआ है, 80 दिन में ही बदल गई, भगवान की कृपा है, कितना बदल गया इंसान। वही आर्ग्यूमेन्ट्स जो पहले उस के बुरखिलाफ दिये जा रहे थे, आज उस के हक में दिये जा रहे हैं। यह काम आम तौर पर जो बड़े लायर होते हैं अपने सायल के हक में कर बैठते हैं, लेकिन पॉलिटिक्स में यह बात अच्छी नहीं लगती है।

जैठमलानी जी मरे बहुत दोस्त हैं। हम प्हाले पड़ोसी भी थे—सिन्ध और पंजाब में। जब देश का काँमी गाना गाया जाता है तो पंजाब और सिन्ध ये दोनों नाम पहले आते हैं। और पंजाब का एक बहुत बड़ा हिस्सा दूसरे मुल्क में चला गया और सिन्ध तो सारा ही चला गया। वे हमारे मित्र हैं। उन की गमीं, सदीं और स्वभाव मिलते हैं लेकिन एक बात नहीं मिलती और वह यह है कि वे बहुत लरनेड पर्सन हैं और मैं एक कामनमैन हूँ और यह मरे बस की बात नहीं। मैं जेलों में बैठा रहा और ये रेलों में और कालेज में रहे। यह उन की खुशकिस्मती है कि उन को कहीं जाना नहीं पड़ा लेकिन एक बात मैं उनसे बड़े अदब से कहूंगा कि पर्सन टू पर्सन किसी को कंडेम करना या किसी को नुकसान पहुंचाना, यह कोई उंचे दर्जे की बात नहीं है। कल भी आप ने कर दिया और आज भी कर दिया मगर मुझे खुशी है कि आप शायर भी बन गये। कल तक मैं यह सोचता था कि आप को उदू ज़बान से नफरत है लेकिन आज आप ने एक शेर कह दिया और आप कहते हैं कि खुद बनाया है और मेरा ख्याल भी यही है कि खुद इस को बना लाए है और मेरे लिए बग़ैर रुपया पैसा लिए बहस कर दी। अदालत में दो मिनट के लिए भी बिना पैसे लिए बहस नहीं करते हैं। यहां तक तो मैं खुश हूँ मगर उसके बाद दूसरी तकरीर में भी कृपा कर के मेरा जिक्र किया और थोड़ी सी चोट लगाई। खैर चोट तो लगती रहती है पालीटिक्स में लेकिन पर्सन नहीं लगनी चाहिए।

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I never attacked you personally. We are talking of politics and political character.

श्री जैल सिंह : मैं पालीटीकल करैक्टर, पर्सनल करैक्टर और जिस को हिन्दुस्तान के लोग समझते हैं कि करैक्टर क्या है, वह सब डिस्कस करने के लिए तैयार हूँ लेकिन इस के बारे में अभी कुछ नहीं कहता । मैं तो खुश हूँ लेकिन फिर भी आप की मार्फत इन को कहता हूँ, इनको मश्वरा देता हूँ, मान लें तो मेहरबानी और न मानें तो कोई बात नहीं । मेरा कहना यह है कि भागने वाले के लिए एक जैसा ही मैदान होता है, किसी के लिए ज्यादा और किसी के लिए कम नहीं होता लेकिन कुएं के अन्दर मुंह डाल कर अगर कोई किसी को गाली दे, तो तीसरे आदमी की जरूरत नहीं, कुएं से उसकी वही आवाज आती है । मैं बहुत अदब से कहना चाहता हूँ :

नजरे करम न सही, नजरे गजब ही सही । मगर मैं खुश हूँ कि हूँ तो किसी की नजर में ।।

मैं अर्ज कर रहा था कि यह तमाम मसले जो हमारे सामने आए हैं, इन के लिए एक बात और कही गई कि कांग्रेस सिर्फ अपनी सरकार बनाना चाहती है और सरकार जहां इन को नहीं बनती, ये गवर्नर रूल कर देते हैं और कोई भी हो, कभी भी हो, सारे उसूलों को कुर्बान करके अपनी सरकार को रखते हैं । डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, यह बहुत बड़ा इल्जाम है और यह बिल्कुल बे-बुनियाद है । हम हिन्दुस्तान की हुकूमत जपता की मंजूरी से कर रहे हैं लेकिन उसूलों का, प्रिंसिपलों का पालन करने के लिये राज्य कर रहे हैं । और केवल राज करने के लिए राज्य कर रहे हैं, और केवल राज्य करने के लिए राज्य नहीं कर रहे हैं, लोगों की सवा करने के लिए हमारी नेता को आज तक अपनी जिन्दगी में बड़ी से बड़ी ताकत से टक्कर लेनी पड़ी लेकिन अपने प्रिंसिपलों को कभी कुर्बान नहीं किया । हमारे विरोधी, जिन को हम बहुत अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं और जिन के लिए मेरा दिल नहीं कहता कि मैं कुछ कहूँ, अपनी कुर्सी अपनी जगह छोड़ कर चले जाते हैं और अभी हमारी आन्टरेबिल लेडी मेम्बर, श्रीमती

गोपालन को डा. कुरियन के लेक्चर के दौरान जब 10 बार उठना पड़ा, तो मैं सोचता था कि एक नेता जी, जो सी.पी.एम. के नेता की कुर्सी पर बैठे हैं, वे खुद इस को सम्भाल लेंगे लेकिन उन को भी उन की मदद पर आना पड़ा, अपनी पार्टी के लिए आना पड़ा, और कोई बात नहीं है लेकिन फिर यह कह दिया कि हमें राज की जरूरत नहीं, हम लालच नहीं करते । शायद मैं गलती नहीं करता, यही उन्होंने कहा था । तो इस सम्बन्ध में मुझे एक बात याद आ गई इसी हाउस की ।

SHRIMATI SUSEELA GOPALAN : You are adopting double standards. This is what I said.

SHRI ZAIL SINGH: People know who is adopting double standards. You come in the court of people.

दोखिए फिर क्या होता है ? मैं लेडी मेम्बर का बहुत सम्मान करता हूँ ।

मुझे याद आ गया । हमारी पार्टी के मेम्बर आपस में लड़ रहे थे । एक मेम्बर ने दूसरे की सियासत में दखल दिया । दूसरा मेम्बर आदमी जोरदार था, दिमाग से कुछ कम था, वैसे मजबूत था । उसने कहा कि तुम को यहां से कुएं में फेंक दूंगा अगर हमारे काम में दखल दिया । पहले वाले ने इस बात को जो कर ऊपर शिकायत की । उस वक्त पंडित पंत जी जिंदा थे । जब शिकायत पंत जी तक पहुंची तो उन्होंने दोनों को समझा-बुझा कर कहा कि आपस में लड़ना-भगड़ना अच्छा नहीं है । अब आगे से मत लड़ना । जे जरा मजबूत था उसको डांट भी दिया गया । जब दोनों बाहर आये, वे आज भी जिंदा हैं, मैं उनका नाम नहीं बताऊंगा, तो वे दोनों ढीले थे । उनसे पूछा गया कि सुनाओ जी क्या हाल है ? इस पर दोनों ने जवाब दिया कि अब हमने फैसला कर लिया है कि हम किसी के काम में दखल नहीं देंगे ।

इसलिए मैं अपने सी.पी.एम. वालों से कहता हूँ कि आप अब यह कहना चाहते हो कि हम राज नहीं करना चाहते हैं क्योंकि

[श्री जैल सिंह]

कांग्रेस को समुद्र में फेंक दिया जाए । मैं मिलेगा । वे दिन गये ।

एक दोस्त ने तकरार करते हुए कहा कि कांग्रेस को समुद्र में फेंक दिया जाए । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी समुद्र में भी जूथेबंदी बन गयी है, आसमान पर भी बन गयी है । अगर कभी आप चन्द्रमा पर जाओगे तो वहाँ पर भी आपको कांग्रेस के जूथे मिलेंगे ।

मुझे भी कहा गया है कि किसी न किसी तरह से सोचते रहते हैं कि कहां प्रोजेक्ट रूल हो, इसी बात पर हम ध्यान रखते हैं । उन्होंने कुछ और भी हवाला दिया । मैं इतना ही कहता हूँ कि यह जो फैसला किया गया है वह भारतीय संविधान के अनुसार किया गया है और वहाँ के लोगों के हित में किया गया है और डेमोक्रेसी की शानदार रवायतों को कायम रखने के लिए किया गया है । डेमोक्रेसी वहाँ बदनाम हो रही थी । अगर हम यह कदम नहीं उठाते तो डेमोक्रेसी और बदनाम होती ।

हमारे दोस्त ने कहा कि घोड़ों का व्यापार शुरू हो गया है । घोड़ों का व्यापार कह देना अच्छी बात नहीं है । मैं सब पार्टियों से कहता हूँ कि आप अगर गिनती करने लगें तो पता लगेगा कि सब की पाटी में खरीदें गये हैं । उनकी गिन्ती कहां तक की जाए, यह उनकी हतक है । वे लोगों से चुन कर आये हैं इसलिए लोगों के प्रतिनिधि हैं । किसी प्रतिनिधि को कैसे हम ऐसी बात कह सकते हैं । जब हमारे पास लोग आते थे तो कह दिया कि हम खरीदते थे । अब आपके पास कोई गया तो आप कहते हैं कि आप को खरीदने का मौका नहीं दिया ।

आखिर में हाउस से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि यह प्रस्ताव मंजूर किया जाए ।

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): As most of the observations made by the hon. Members relate to the political aspect of the problem, my task has become easy to reply to some of the general observations

which have been made in the course of the debate.

The first point which has been made is about the plan size of Kerala which is of the order of Rs. 275 crores for the state plan of the 1981-82. The fact was explained on the floor of the House in other connections. As the hon. Members are aware, in regard to adjustment of the overdraft, a decision was taken, that a part of the overdraft would be adjusted towards the plan outlay of 1978-1983. That formula was applied to each and every State irrespective of the political character of the Government in that State. But, when I found out that with the application of this formula in respect of three States, their actual plan would be reduced even compared to the plan outlay of 1981-82, of these three States—one is Kerala, the other is Rajasthan and the third is West Bengal; West Bengal's plan outlay has not yet been finalised—we had to take the decision for that reason, namely, that to protect the State's Plan outlays at least at the level of last year, let us not make an adjustment towards the overdraft of these three States. If we were to apply that formula which had been applied in respect of the other States, then, the actual plan outlay as far as Kerala was concerned would have been much less. Therefore, it is no use pointing out why the plan size has not been increased.

In regard to the Central assistance, there is a set formula. To-day we are discussing Kerala Budget. You might say that you should give more allocation to Kerala. Then, other States will also come with the same plea. They may say that we are giving more to one State and less to another State. So, according to the standard practice, the central assistance was increased by ten per cent in respect of each State. That ten per cent increment was made in respect of Kerala also. Except for maintaining the plan size at the current year's level it was not possible for us to increase it substantially.

Second general point that had been mentioned was this. The import policy which

is being pursued by the Government is affecting the economic interests of the Kerala State. In the last two years or so when I was in the Ministry of Commerce, half-a-dozen times, I have replied and reacted to some of those questions. Still, I am not quite clear as to how it is affecting the economy of Kerala State. Take, for example, the case of rubber. The total production is about 150 to 155 thousand tonnes. But, our total requirement for the industries is about 1,75,000 tonnes. If we import this 20,000 tonnes, how it is going to affect the economy of Kerala? Just tell me that. These were comparisons of the price of natural rubber which we were getting. You compare that with Malaysia or any other rubber producing country to find out whether Kerala was getting more or less for their rubber. If we imported more than the requirements, then, that was the reason why I committed myself on the floor of the House that in 1980 I only canalised that and wanted to regulate it and to see that that situation was not created at any particular point of time... (Interruptions). You had your say. I am expressing my views. It is no use interrupting me. If you want to listen to my views please do so. Otherwise I shall speak and I shall not answer any of your single point.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let him reply to the points raised. He is only replying to your point. Please sit down. Mr. Nadar, kindly sit down.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am giving my views as I understand. Sir, the total requirements was between 25 to 30 thousand tonnes. In fact, I am being criticised by the other side that I am not giving protection to the small scale industries because of this price for the natural rubber. A number of small-scale industries are being shifted from here to free zone in Kerala. That complaint is also coming. That has come from the other side. Therefore, I say that it is not a fact that import policy of rubber is going to affect the economy of Kerala.

Coming to coconut oil, I had explained the position when I was a Commerce Mi-

nister very clearly about the import policy of 1980. There was a snag and that snag was like this. Some of the importers interpreted that the coconut oil was used for industrial purposes and so this could be imported under the O.G.L. But when I revised the import policy which I announced in last April I made it quite clear. In the present import policy any edible oil for industrial purposes or for edible purposes cannot be imported under OGL. It has to be imported through canalising agents and we have not imported coconut oil something was in the pipeline which is coming down; that too is a very restricted quantity. When Prime Minister visited Phillipines we discussed about the trade agreements or commercial terms various countries made so. Naturally, Phillipines was interested in selling their coconut oil and they offered that and asked us whether we are in a position to take it. It is just as we offer our commodities. These are just mutual exchange of views. No decision has been taken to import coconut oil. I do agree that some oil is coming but it is coming because of the fact I mentioned. I am not permitted to do anything. Even the hon. Members are fully aware of a large number of writ petitions which have been filed in respect of edible oil cases. The verdict and judgement of the court has gone to the extent that even if they can produce the postal receipts (that they have sent some letters to the organisation of CCIE) it should be presumed that they have applied before the canalisation, that they made the application before that, and it will have to be treated as pre ban commitment. But this is a different issue. We are fighting against that. But some quantity of imported coconut oil is coming only because of that. But so far as the policy of 1981-82 is concerned I have made it quite clear and I have explained it. Same is the case with cocoa. From some Members suggestions came and they said, you put it in the restricted list. Earlier it was under OGL. I have put it in the restricted list. I have not permitted import of raw cocoa. A limited quantity of cocoa powder was permitted to be imported for blending purposes and to reduce the acidity content. When the earlier

[Shri Pranab Mukherjee]

Government was there—I am not taking of the Karunakaran Government, but the earlier Government—we had discussed it. I told them, I am prepared, as Commerce Minister to extend the cash assistance for exporting your cocoa to the international market, you take some initiative to establish some unit which can make some sort of chemical treatment and reduce the acidity content of the cocoa. But nothing has been done. If a commodity is not sold in the domestic or the international market, it is bound to have its effect. You cannot help it. Therefore it is not the import policy. We have regulated the import policy. We are keeping an eye on those particular areas and we are earning more.

I do agree with Mr. Unnikrishnan that these are areas where we are earning lot of foreign exchange and it is not in our interest to see that these are affected.

The third thing is this. While making their observations some of the Members have suggested certain things and referred to two schemes. One was about pension to the agricultural workers and the other was the scheme of giving pension to the unemployed. None of these schemes has been given up. Why are you politicalising it? Even if you had gone through the condensed document you would find this. The amount which you allocated is the same amount which is now allocated; why are you not looking at it? We have reservations because we cannot confine the scheme to one State. There are many other States. The States' resources are not enough to meet it. The scheme is ideal. There is no denying this fact. As Mr. Chandarjit Yadav has suggested, if we could do it, it would have been an ideal situation. But with the existing economic situation whether we could do it in all the States is the question. Mr. Karunakaran's Government not only continued it, but they wanted to increase it. Therefore it is no fault of them. And they themselves have done it, included it and in the present Budget also it has been included. So, therefore, there is no question of giving up of those two schemes. We are continu-

ing and we have raised the allocation in the Budget itself.

While making this observations, Shri Unnikrishnan just picked up the non-plan outlay on irrigation. That is just a statistical jugglery. Why are you taking only the non-plan outlay on irrigation? If you go through the papers, you will find that it has not decreased. If you are interested in the figures, I can give you. In the budget estimate for 1981-82, it was 51.82 crores, and in the budget estimates for 1982-83 it also 51.82 crores. And the responsibility will have to be taken by the Government which you supported, because Shri Karunakaran's Government was only for eighty days. In the rest of the financial year, either it was your Government or the State was under the President's rule for a short while. The Plan allocation is much more important than the non-Plan expenditure.

Now, I come to another general point which Shri Banatwalla and Prof. Kurien raised. Why are we having a Vote on Account for six months? Normally, we have Vote on Account, Particularly if we are presenting the budget in the Monsoon session, for four months. Sometimes there is a gap between these two sessions, as it is a very long session. There is no intention as the Home Minister has made it clear to delay the elections; we would like to hold the elections as early as possible. There is no intention of prolonging the President's rule there. Technically, if we have four months Vote on Account, that period will be over in July and if the monsoon session does not meet in July, we will be in a tight situation. Sometimes we meet in the third week of July, or sometimes in the first week of August. In order to avert that eventuality, I took the Vote Account for six months. The intention is not to prolong the President's rule in the State.

The last general point which the hon. Members have mentioned is with regard to two projects, about which they are very much agitated. One is Calicut Airport. I am happy to inform that so far as I am concerned, I have okayed it; shortly it is going to the Cabinet, and perhaps in a short time it will be approved. If it has not been already done. It will be done.

The other is with regard to the two railway projects. I am not making any commitment, because we have not been able to make nay allocation. But I have suggested both to the Planning Commission and the Railway Ministry for this; of course, it will not be possible to undertake both the projects. Of these two, one which will be more economically viable and is more important from he economic point of view, is I think, the line which will go to Alleppy. One was to lead to Guruvayur and the other was to Alleppey. I have suggested that the line which will lead to Alleppy should be re-examined, and a reappraisal made. From our side, we will try to see what we can do, how much resources we can make available for this.

There is only : one more point in regard to the increase of Rs. 12 crores in the police budget. Much has been said about this. But you will agree with me that a substantial part in this increment is because of the dearness allowance. Day in and day out, you are shouting against the limited part, the arrears, which I asked the employees to deposit in the provident fund; for that action, you have been criticising the Government. And when some amount increases in the police expenditure head, a part of which is because of the enhanced dearness allowance, why should you mind it? I appreciate that if I had given you the detailed break-up, you would not have objected to it. But I have already explained, why I could not give the details. A part of this amount of Rs. 12 crores, i.e. Rs. 2.36 crores is on account of the dearness allowance, and Rs. 2.75 is to provide for more facilities to replace the vehicles, and to acquire some new vehicles. Those break-ups are also with me. These are the reasons why Rs. 12 crores have been increased in the police budget. Neither the budget is meant for increasing the police force nor for resorting to repressive measure. This is what I wanted to submit.

SHRIMATI SUSEELA GOPALAN:
What is your approach with regard to the traditional industries?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I will only request the lady Member to just go through these bulky questions. All these detailed answers given by my colleague, Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari, I have brought out here. If I had time, I would read each and everything. It is no use placing it on the Table of the House because these are parliamentary papers. Please do some homework and see what steps are being taken to protect the coir industry.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: Sir, one point has not been covered. It is for the Home Minister to reply. In the biodata to be given by the applicants in the Defence Electronics Research Laboratory, Hyderabad, at column No. 11, it is asked whether the applicant has stayed in West Bengal or Kerala for more than one year. What has the Home Minister to say about this? Do you want to say something about that? I want an answer from you. Is it fair?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I shall now put the Statutory Resolution approving the Proclamation in relation to the State of Kerala moved by Giani Zail Singh to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 17th. March, 1982 under Article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Kerala."

The motion was adopted.

I shall now put all the cut-motions to the Demands for Grants on Account in respect of the Budget for the State of Kerala for 1982-83 to the vote of the House together.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: We are not pressing all. Some may be pressed.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Does any Hon. Members desire that any of his cut-motions should be put separately?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: I want my Cut Motion to be put separately.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, I shall put Cut Motion No. 14 moved by Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the demand for grant on account under the head Police be reduced by Rs. 1,00,00,000."

[Need to decrease the charges for Police Administration which are totally disproportionate to the outlay on productive schemes and welfare measures] (14).

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 4] [16.45 hrs.

AYES

Balanandan, Shri E.

Chakraborty, Shri Satyasadhan
Choudhury, Shri Saifuddin

Das, Shri R. P.

Ghosh Goswami, Shrimati Bibha
Giri, Shri Sudhir

Gopalan, Shrimati Suseela

Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra

Imbichibava, Shri E. K.

Jethmalani, Shri Ram

Lawrence, Shri M. M.

Mahata, Shri Chitta

Mehta, Prof. Ajit Kumar

Misra, Shri Satyagopal

Mohammed Ismail, Shri

Nadar, Shri A. Neelalobithadasan

Pal, Prof. Rup Chand

Rajan, Shri K. A.

Shamanna, Shri T. R.

Singh, Shri B. D.

Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.

Varma, Shri Ravindra

Verma Shri R. L. P.

Yadav, Shri Chandrajit

Zainul Abedin, Shri

NOES

Ahmad, Shri Mohammad Asrar

Ahmed, Shri Kamaluddin

Arakal, Shri Xavier

Arjunan, Shri K.

Azad, Shri Ghulam Nabi

Baitha, Shri D. L.

Bajpai, Dr. Rajendra Kumari

Banatwalla, Shri G. M.

Bansi Lal, Shri

Behera, Shri Rasabehari

Bhatia, Shri R. L.

Bheekhabhai, Shri

Bhoi, Dr. Krupasindhu

Bhole, Shri R. R.

Bhuria, Shri Dileep Singh

Birbal, Shri

Brar, Shrimati Gurbrinder Kaur

Brijendra Pal Singh, Shri

Chandrashekharappa, Shri T. V.

Chaturvedi, Shrimati Vidyawati

Chaudhary, Shri Manphool Singh

Chennupati, Shrimati Vidya

Chingwang Konyak, Shri

Daga, Shri Mool Chand

Dalbir Singh, Shri

Das, Shri A. C.

Dennis, Shri N.

Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan

Era Anbarasu, Shri

Faleiro, Shri Eduardo

Gadgil, Shri V. N.

Gadhavi, Shri Bheravadan K.

Gandhi, Shri Rajiv

Gehlot, Shri Ashok

Gomango, Shri Giridhar

Gouzagin, Shri N.

Hakam Singh, Shri

Jadeja, Shri Daulatsinhji

Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.

Jain, Shri Viridhi Chander

Jamilur Rahman, Shri

Jena, Shri Chintamani

Karma, Shri Laxman
 Kuchan, Shri Gangadhar S.
 Kunhambu, Shri K.
 Kunwar Ram, Shri

Laskar, Shri Nihar Ranjan

Madhuri Singh, Shrimati
 Mahabir Prasad, Shri
 Mahajan, Shri Vikram
 Mahendra Prasad, Shri
 Makwana, Shri Narsinh
 Mallikarjun, Shri
 Mehta, Dr. Mahipatray M.
 Mishra, Shri Ram Nagina
 Misra, Shri Harinatha
 Misra, Shri Nityananda
 Mohsin, Shri F. H.
 Muthu Kumaran, Shri R.
 Muttemwar, Shri Vilas
 Muzaffar Hussain, Shri Syed

Nagina Rai, Shri
 Naik, Shri G. Devaraya
 Naikar, Shri D. K.
 Namgyal, Shri P.
 Netam, Shri Arvind
 Nikhra, Shri Rameshwar

Panday, Shri Kedar
 Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
 Panika, Shri Ram Pyare
 Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand
 Pardhi, Shri Keshao Rao
 Parthasarathy, Shri P.
 Patnaik, Shrimati Jayanti
 Pattuswamy, Shri D.
 Phulwariya, Shri Virda Ram
 Poojary, Shri Janardhana
 Pradhani, Shri K.

Raju, Shri P. V. G.
 Ramamurthy, Shri K.
 Ranga, Prof. N. G.
 Rao, Shri Jagannath
 Rao, Shri P. V. Narasimha

Rathod, Shri Uttam
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Ravani, Shri Navin
 Rawat, Shri Harish
 Reddy, Shri K. Brahmananda

Sahi, Shrimati Krishna
 Sajjan Kumar, Shri
 Saminuddin, Shri
 Satho, Shri Vasant
 Satya Deo Singh, Prof.
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.
 Scindia, Shri Madhav Rao
 Shailani, Shri Chandra Pal
 Shaktawat, Prof. Nirmala Kumari
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Sharma, Shri Kali Charan
 Sharma, Shri Nand Kishore
 Shastri, Shri Hari Krishna
 Sidnal, Shri S. B.
 Singaravadivel, Shri S.
 Singh, Dr. B. N.
 Singh Deo, Shri K. P.
 Subburaman, Shri A. G.
 Sunder Singh, Shri
 Suryawanshi, Shri Narain
 Swaminathan, Shri R. V.

Tariq Anwar, Shri
 Tayeng, Shri Sobeng
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri
 Tewary, Prof. K. K.
 Tripathi, Shri Kamalapati
 Varma, Shri Jai Ram
 Venkataraman, Shri R.
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
 Vijayaraghavan, Shri V. S.
 Virbhadrha Sigh, Shri
 Vyas, Shri Girdhari Lal
 Yadav, Shri Ram Singh
 Yadav, Shri Subhash Chandra
 Yazdani, Dr. Golam

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Subject to correction, the result* of the division is:

Ayes — 25

Noes — 123

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now I shall put all other cut motion moved to the vote of the House.

Cut motions Nos. 13 and 15 to 34 were put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the third column of the Order Paper, be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Kerala on account for or towards defraying the charges during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1983, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demand Nos. I to XLIV."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the respective supplementary sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the third column of the Order Paper, be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Kerala to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the

31st day of March, 1982, in respect of heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof against:—

Demand Nos. I to III, V to XI, XIII to XXX, XXXII, XXXV to XLII."

The motion was adopted.

16.45 hrs.

KERALA APPROPRIATION (VOTE ON ACCOUNT) BILL*, 1982

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Kerala for the services of a part of the financial year 1982-83.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, the question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Kerala for the services of a part of the financial year 1982-83."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I introduce† the Bill.

I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Kerala for the services of a part of the financial year 1982-83, be taken into consideration."

*The following Members also recorded their votes:

AYES: Shri D. P. Yadav and Shri Dhanik Lal Mandal;

NOES: Shri Zail Singh and Shri Rajesh Pilot.

* Published in Gazette of India-Extraordinary, Part II, section 2, dated 27-3-82.

†Introduced moved with the recommendation of the President.