

[Shri D. C. Sharma.]

against one item, somebody else gets up and says different thing against a different item. Therefore, I would request you to expand the Business Advisory Committee, so that all kinds of opinions are represented on it, and if you cannot expand it, then I should suggest very humbly that it may be dismantled.

MR. SPEAKER: All parties are represented on the Business Advisory Committee, including the Congress Party, and decisions are taken. Not only the members, but at times if some member comes to me and proposes something, I request him also to attend. After all, there is nothing like a compulsory number. If anybody brings some matter, I ask him to come to the meeting.

The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Fourteenth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 21st February, 1968."

The motion was adopted.

12.20 hrs.

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—*contd.*

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now resume further discussion on the President's Address.

We have been discussing it and we must try to finish it by tomorrow. I shall call the Prime Minister to reply at 2.30 P.M. tomorrow. Most of the parties have availed of their time except for five or six minutes. So also the Congress Party. It has some time. Sreekantan Nair.

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR (Quilon): Sir, the President's address is a lamentation of despair and it bristles with contradictions and hypocritical and pious wishes which the President knows cannot be implemented by

the Congress Government. All the high ideals have disappeared from the Congress Party which now wants to stick to power by hook or crook. We know what these policies had led the country into—violent agitations in various parts of the country.

As the President bewails in his Address, there has been a recrudescence of divisive forces causing conflicts and violence either in the name of region, or language or community. In this House I proposed that Parliament should not pass the resolution along with the Language Bill. It was against the very national interest which this House is expected to maintain. But I was shouted down and I was not the verge of being penalised. What happened after that? This House and the Government thought that the silence maintained by the South was due to the submissiveness of people. No. People revolted in Madras, Mysore and Andhra and even in Maharashtra State. If Kerala and West Bengal have not entered the fray, if they are not on the war path now, it is only because we are slow to move and once we move nothing will stop us.

12.22 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Normally, one would expect the minority to come to power by winning over the people to its side and thus becoming a majority. If that is prevented by some machinations, there will be revolt. During the 1967 elections the majority of States which constitute our Union came under the non-Congress rule. The Congress manoeuvred in such a way that the non-Congress Governments in West Bengal, Bihar and Rajasthan and Haryana had been swept off. Now, they are trying to find ways and means of driving out the Governments which are firmly rooted in Kerala and Madras and other States. But the most dangerous aspects of the Con-

gress move is their inhuman approach to utilise food crisis in deficit areas to upset the non-Congress Governments. This House is aware of the fact that Kerala is a chronically deficit State. We produce only 50 per cent of our requirements of paddy but we produce cash crops which earn more than 10 per cent of the total foreign exchange earnings of this country. Yet, during the past 20 years, not even a fraction of the foreign exchange has been spent for the development of the State of Kerala. All this foreign exchange has been utilised by the Central Government for the development of other States which have a greater pull at the Centre. Up to now, there is not a single unit in my State of Kerala which is of the category of basic or heavy industry. The only major unit which has been offered to us during all these years is the shipbuilding yard. This project has been shunted from the first Plan to the second Plan and from the second Plan to the third Plan and now, it is a will-o'-the wisp in the fourth Plan.

The unemployed and the under-employed of Kerala have been supplied only three ounces of rice for all these years. The Central Government had offered a solemn promise to give us six ounces of rice, but they have never maintained the promise of giving 75,000 tons of rice every month, so much so, we have been forced to issue only three ounces of rice to our people. Even for those three ounces, a subsidy of Rs. 11 per quintal has been taken away by the Centre, so that a year and a half back the Kerala Government decided during the time of the President's rule—not during this Government's time—to put up with the loss and not to pass it on to the people. Naturally, the non-Congress Government which came in its place had to follow suit and we are now bearing Rs. 11 per quintal on the rice we distribute as ration. But on the 1st January, 1968, the Central Government introduced another Rs. 16 as increase in the selling price of rice to the State. So, together with Rs. 11, a subsidy which they have taken away, the over-

all additional price levied by the Central Government is now Rs. 27 per quintal.

In the budget speech of our Finance Minister, Mr. P. K. Kunju, has pointed out that the State will have to put up with a loss of Rs. 25 crores if we have to maintain the present price of rice which is distributed as ration. If we have to lose Rs. 25 crores, that means we have to suspend all our developmental activities and even then, there will be a very serious deficit in our budget. Naturally, the Government has decided not to increase the price of rice. What will it lead to? We will have to run into deficit. The Central Government can refuse us overdraft from the Reserve Bank and the Ministry in Kerala can be kicked out from power and the Central Government can step in. But we decided not to increase the issue price of rice with open eyes, fully conscious of the implications. Our Government is prepared to be kicked out on this issue, so that the Central Government may come in and extract black market prices from the people of Kerala. We want to resist this blackmail which the Centre is forcing on the people of Kerala.

Here there is a very curious phenomenon. We find all over India, clinging to power is the basic or the prime motive of every Ministry of every party. And in Kerala, it may be accused of being a hotchpotch government, but this hotchpotch government is prepared to kick the power from under our feet and challenge the Centre to come and take over power there. What is the basic reason which prompted us to resort to this self-immolation? It is because of the inhuman and diabolic scheme of the Central Government to utilise food as a political weapon against the people of Kerala. I invite the attention of the House to the machinations of the Government on the food front. The non-Congress State of Madras gets Rs. 43, Rs. 45 and Rs. 48 for the three varieties of paddy purchased from

[Shri N. Sreekantan Nair.]

Madras under the levy system. On the other hand, the Congress-administered State of Andhra gets Rs. 46, Rs. 55 and Rs. 70 per quintal of paddy purchased from Andhra. The difference between Madras and Andhra levy prices comes to 45 per cent. Andhra gets 45 per cent more price than the DMK-administered State of Madras. Is it fair? Is it a right approach? Why should the people of Madras be denied an equitable price for their paddy? Is it because they are administered by DMK? I fail to understand this attitude.

Computing that $1\frac{1}{2}$ quintals of paddy give 1 quintal of rice, the levy price would come to about Rs. 72 $\frac{1}{2}$ per quintal for Madras rice, including Rs. 2 for collection and milling and Rs. 6 for transport. On the other hand, it will come to Rs. 77 for Andhra rice. That rice is sold to us at Rs. 96. Just look at the margin. This is over and above the fair margin which the Food Corporation of India gets for collection milling and transport. Does it require Rs. 6 to transport 1 quintal of rice from Madras to Kerala? Even from Andhra it does not require that much. So, there is a fair margin in that. Over and above that, the Central Government takes Rs. 19 as profiteering profit from the Andhra rice and Rs. 23 $\frac{1}{2}$ as profiteering profit from Madras rice.

Therefore, we find two distinct trends in the food policy of India. One is to show favour to the Congress-administered States like Andhra and disfavour against States like Madras in the levy price. Secondly, because of the Communist-dominated Government of Kerala, our people are denied their legitimate rights.

SHRI D. C. SHARMA (Gurdaspur): You are a man of courage.

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR: Not only I, but the people of Kerala in general are people of courage. You are challenging that courage now. Otherwise, why do you make a profit of Rs. 19 and Rs. 23 $\frac{1}{2}$ by selling rice to us

at black-market price? We are a poor people and we cannot afford to pay that much.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please address the Chair.

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR: I am sorry, Sir.

The position is very clear from a reply given to my question No. 591 on 15th February

"Procurement price of paddy for 1967-68 season—

Andhra Pradesh	Superfine Rs. 70.
	Fine Rs. 55.
	Coarse Rs. 46.
Madras	Fine Rs. 48.
	Medium Rs. 45.
	Coarse Rs. 43.

It is admitted here that coarse rice is sold to us at Rs. 96.

There is another very curious phenomenon. They have promised to send us 75,000 tonnes of rice every month, but they send us not even half that amount. They have given conflicting replies to our questions. On 15th February, two questions were tabled by the Kerala Members. In reply to one of them Question No. 467, the Minister replied as follows:

"(a) and (b). Total allotment of rice made from the Central Pool to the Food Corporation of India depots in Kerala for the period November 1967 to January 1968 was 1.37 lakh tonnes. This was against Kerala's monthly estimated distribution requirement of 70,000 to 75,000 tonnes."

The same Minister, on the very same day, in reply to another question No. 600, in statement No. II stated that rice allotted to Kerala during this period, November 1967 to January 1968, was only 90.4 thousand tons. The disparity is more than 50 per cent. Why did these two statements differ?

I raised this question with the Ministry here. They said that what was allotted to the depots of the Food Corporation was shown in the answer given in the first instance and what was handed over to the State was given in reply to the second question. Why is it that the quantity handed over to the depots of the Food Corporation is not handed over to the Government of Kerala? Sir, there is a story in the Vikramadityan Fables, that a prostitute demanded compensation and filed a suit against a man for dreaming of having spent one night with her. So also I am afraid that the Government of India will file a suit against the Kerala Government for dreaming that they have sent additional quantities of rice to the State.

Sir, when I along with other leaders of the parties which constitute the United Front met the hon. Prime Minister on the Second day of this month and submitted to her that adequate quantities of rice at fair prices should be given to us, her question was, what will you do if we cut off our supplies to you. This House knows what my normal reply would have been and would be at that time. But I kept very self-restrained and replied to her: "Madam, already our farmers are converting the land under cash crops into paddy crops, and thus you will lose valuable foreign exchange". That was my reply. Otherwise I would have told her that if she cut off the Centre's supply we would cut off our relations with the rest of India. That is the only logical reply. Look at the attitude of the Centre.

Sir, there was a ceremony in the Rocket Station at Thumba where the Prime Minister came. For that function, our State Ministers also went there. We were insulted on our own soil. The State Ministers were relegated to the back benches and were not allowed to come anywhere near the front. There was dinner before the Prime Minister left to which our Ministers were not invited. Are not the State Ministers to be invited to

such functions in our own State? This is the attitude shown to the State Government.

When we, naturally, went to submit to her that the prices may not be increased and we may be given adequate supplies, she flew into a temper and told us that she would cut off the entire supply of rice to Kerala.

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR (Palghat): Sir, while the Kerala rice position is being discussed, the Treasury Bench is empty.

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR: Sir, there is a proverb in Malayalam: "ariyum thinmu asarichiyem katchu pinneyum patikku murmuruppu". The dog ate the rice in the vessel, bit the woman who was cooking it and even after all that the dog was snarling. So also, our ministers were insulted on our own soil; we were offered the quantity of rice to maintain 6 oz. ration; but we were not given the quantum of rice which was agreed upon; for the rice that is given the Central Government is taking blackmarket price; and even after all this, when we, in a humble mood, go to petition to the Prime Minister, she turns round, flares into a temper and says that they will cut off the entire supply of rice to Kerala. That is the attitude of the Central Government. Along with the divisive forces in the country, along with the Mizo Hills and other areas, another area of two crores of people will be added if the Centre continues this attitude. I want only to warn the Central Government. They cannot play with the lives of the people of Kerala in this matter, they cannot take blackmarket prices for the foodgrains that they supply.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH): The Food Minister will intervene at 3.30 P.M.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA (Bangalore): When I hear the speeches from the opposition I find that some

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

of the speeches are made with sincerity to solve the problems facing the country while some others are made with the partisan view with the in-built irritant arguments. I was very happy to listen to Acharya Kripalani yesterday, when he made a correct assessment of the political situation. He held not only the Congress Party but also the opposition parties responsible for the various difficulties and crises that the country is facing. It will not be right for me to go into meticulous calculation about the percentage of blame that the Congress Party has to shoulder or some other political parties have to shoulder, but we have to approach the problem in a spirit of patriotism, in a spirit of objectivity. I know personally the sacrifices that have been made by my hon. friend, Shri Sreekantan Nair. I know also that the kind of speeches which he usually makes do not really represent his mind. I know that he is as much a patriot as any of us. Many a time he uses words and arguments which overshoot his own point, his own mind and his own heart. Therefore, I am prepared to take all his arguments and threats with a kind of sobriety, so that ultimately we may sit at a table and see how far these problems can be settled by mutual discussion. Acharya Kripalani made a fervent appeal to all of us in this House, irrespective of party affiliations, to sit together discuss and evolve solutions to the problems we face.

Sir, here I would like to say that I would very much wish hon. Ministers, at least when they come here for a few minutes, to listen to our speeches instead of going on talking among themselves. I protest against it. Many a time the behaviour of a Minister is an irritant in this House. Instead of concentrating upon the points made by the opposition parties, if you go on feeling safe that somebody has appointed you as Minister and treat this House with disrespect,

this is the situation you have to face. I have to state a bitter truth here. Having been a Minister myself for some time, I may say that it is the basic duty of the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister and other Ministers to be present in the House when debates of this nature take place. It is during the debate on the President's Address and the budget debate that the grievances of the people are ventilated. If the Ministers say that they have more important work to do, they will be liable to the charge that they are neglecting their responsibility to the House. If the situation today is that they do not command as much respect as they ought to, it is because of their behaviour and their conduct. I have no doubt whatsoever that if they feel that they ought to receive respect in this House, then they ought to be responsive to the suggestions made in this House. Then, I am sure, the political atmosphere would improve and the spirit that Acharya Kripalani envisaged will gather momentum. Such a statement has been incorporated in the President's Address. What is it that is written here? It is:

"Important national problems must be placed above party politics. Government will be ready to sit with Leaders of all Parties and take counsel with them on major issues of interest and importance to the nation."

We have to remember that not only the Government but also all the other political parties sitting in this House have to place important national problems above party politics. Mere accusation that the Congress is taking a partisan attitude would not do any good; nor is it right for any political party here, whether it is the Swatantra or the Jana Sangh or the SSP, to speak in order to strengthen what is called its own position in the country. If they have that in mind, we will not be able to sit with objectivity of approach. Therefore, the first condition laid by the President is that all

important national problems must be placed above party politics.

As the famous saying goes—Mahatma Gandhi repeated it any number of times—there must be harmony between what we say and what we do. Our religious teachers also say that nudi (word) and nade (deed) in my language, and in Sanskrit vachan and hridaya, must be in harmony. If the Government have not incorporated this sentence with that true spirit, they will not be doing their duty by the country and by the oath they have taken under the Constitution. If the Opposition parties all the time blame the Government for not co-operating with them only for the sake of making a charge with no intention of rising above party politics to solve national problems, they are equally guilty of not doing their duty by the country at this hour of crisis.

Some people may not feel alarmed here but I feel unnerved; I have experience of more than a quarter of a century of political life in Mysore. I thought that the people of Mysore were very mild mannered and that nothing would provoke them; they were such sober people. And today on this question of language Bangalore has seen such disturbances! Even in minor mofussil towns there have been agitations. And all the time we sit here and discuss in order to promote our own personal or party interest! This is not the right approach.

I am happy to see that in this House as well as in the other House repeated appeals have been made by Members who have spoken that a national consensus must be evolved on the language question. But in the President's Address I do not find a reference to that appeal. I know personally that the Prime Minister is anxious to evolve a national consensus on this question. But the President's Address says:

"It is Government's earnest hope that all controversies about language will now be ended."

This is not the position that South India will accept. I must honestly and straightforwardly say that. It does not matter to me whether Hindi becomes the national language or English becomes the national language. I am one of those who think, whatever the name used, God is the same; whatever the language used, knowledge is the same. Therefore I am not a stickler to any language. Let me make it plain. But the language question has arisen in this country and it has to be solved. Whether it is the people of Kerala or of Uttar Pradesh, they are all Indians and they have to sit together, discuss it and settle it. There is no other go. And they have to discuss it in an objective manner as Acharya Kripalani has appealed, so that the integrity and the unity of the country will be maintained. Without that approach, this country, I am afraid, will not remain united.

I met the members of the Students' Action Council in Bangalore. I met the students also. They have got their own doubts. It is not mere parliamentary provisions that did or did not satisfy students, whether it is Banaras Hindu University or Bangalore University. Some of us who claim to be spokesmen in Parliament, the spokesmen of the parties, have to meet students and make them feel that their problems have been considered, their future has been taken into consideration and that we are all working for their ultimate good. There is such a sense of hiatus between the students community and the people who are in office that they are not able to have a dialogue. Consequently, they are not able to pacify them when they get angry. Official functions whether it is launching of Thumba Rocket or it is opening of a bridge, are not the forums where the students community or the people in general and the concerned Ministers can have a dialogue. There are different forums. These are official forums, mostly ceremonial, and they are not meant for mutual

[Shri Hanumanthaiya.]

understanding. Therefore, on the question of language, I beg of this House, as a whole, to see that a conference of national leaders, whoever they are, is convened. They must sit day in and day out and see that a formula is evolved which will be satisfactory to all concerned.

I repeat again that the people of Hindi area need not be meticulous. They have gained the substance of their demand when we accept Hindi as the official link language or the national language. They need not worry about the fringes of benefits either to this State or to that State. Take, for example, the stand of the D.M.K. Party. As we know, they wanted to accept the Bill as it was. It is only when certain amendments were accepted by the Government that they took the extreme stand of abolishing Hindi altogether. I only hope that they will be able to revise their stand, as they revised on the language Bill....

SHRI S. XAVIER (Tirunelveli):
Why not suspend the Act?

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: That is exactly the point we have to discuss at the meeting of the national leaders.

SHRI S. XAVIER: Why not ask the Government to suspend the implementation of the Act? The Act itself be suspended till your proposal is accepted and the matter is discussed.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: As you know, the Act passed by Parliament cannot be suspended at least without some non-official direction of this House. We could discuss it if there is such conference.

The political parties continuously accuse that the Congress is trying to topple the Opposition Ministries. (*Interruption*) Let the people understand it. Let us not behave as though we are still in the adolescent stage. The profession of the political parties is to get into power and you cannot get

into power, unless somebody vacates it. You are all the time trying to displace somebody and occupy the place. The Congress is also doing it. This is a fair game. You don't have misgivings over that. But what I object to is the unholy way, corrupt methods and methods not sanctioned by constitutional propriety. These are the very methods that are being pursued by not only the Congress but also by the Opposition political parties. The famous 17 number—I do not know what satanic influence that number has—has played havoc with U.P., with Punjab, with West Bengal and I do not know with what other States it is playing. These floor-crossings also partake of that nature. The Prime Minister some time made an appeal that all the political parties should sit together in order to evolve a code of conduct. The code of conduct should cover not only floor-crossings but also proprieties in the legislature, formation of Ministries and functions. Look at the two Ministers of U.P., while in office, coming and defying law and standing before the Magistrate to exhibit their might! This is an instance which no country in its history has recorded. This is not the way of working a democracy they have a policy, they have a programme, they have got a way, but I cannot really understand what these two SSP Ministers intend to do or what is their approach towards problems. If this is the type of Ministers whose co-operation has to be taken by the other parties, how can it work? Many a Member, including Acharya Kripalani, hoped that ultimately in this country there must be a kind of coalition Government of parties whose political approach or ideology is similar. Very good. But in their practice, if Ministries work in the way they did in U.P. they did in West Bengal, they did in Haryana, they did in Punjab, if the Central Government is formed on that basis and methodology, then, I think, India will go on the certain way of ruin. Therefore, before we ask for co-operation, before

we ask for collaboration, let us clear our hearts, let us clear our minds and reinstate therein well-known Constitutional principles, methods of work and proper ways of tackling the problem. Therefore, national consensus or whatever it is, must be made applicable to political conduct also.

More important than these two is the economic situation. Everybody in this country is complaining about the economic situation, recession, high prices, dearness allowance, and, as Shri Sreekantan Nair said, the problem of rice and food. A time has to come when all parties have to sit together and abolish the zonal system altogether. This zonal system makes for selfishness. It is contrary to the counsels of unity and integrity of this country. We, the people of India, have to be treated as one nation. This zonal system lasts, it is not the DMK that divides the country, but it is the zonal system that will ultimately divide the country. Therefore, every Congressman, who is wedded to the principle of the unity of this country must see that even if the zonal system is adopted, it is a temporary measure and not a long-term measure. It gives umbrage to corrupt politicians, corrupt traders and corrupt officials. Because wherever there is a control and a licence to be given, there is patronage to exercise and patronage inevitably leads many a time to corrupt practices.

Now we encourage labour, we incite labour, having no regard to the productive capacity of the plant and national income. At the same time we want the industrialists to act as trustees. The entrepreneurs are greedy; no doubt, it is their profession to be greedy, to get as much profit as possible. That is a well-known fact. Even Chanakya, 2500 years ago, warned that the merchants are always after their profits. That is their profession...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: May I request the hon. Member to resume his speech after Lunch?

Re: Inquiry into death of
Shri Deen Dayal Upadhyaya

SHRI D. C. SHARMA: He has made a wonderful point. He must be given one hour.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We adjourn for Lunch.

13 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha then re-assembled after Lunch at Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

RE: INQUIRY INTO CIRCUMSTANCES OF DEATH OF SHRI DEEN DAYAL UPADHYAYA

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपकी आज्ञा से मैं एक छोटा सा सवाल उठाना चाहता हूँ। जैसा कि आपको मालूम है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार माननीय दीन दयाल उपाध्याय की मृत्यु के बारे में जांच कर रही है और कुछ न कुछ रिपोर्ट बीच बीच में अखबारों में छपती हैं कि पुलिस ने यह निकाला है और यह किया है तो मैं आपके जरिए से माननीय मंत्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि अभी तक उसमें क्या प्रोग्रेस हुई है—क्योंकि सारे देश के लोग हमारे पास आते हैं, मेम्बरस भी इन्टरस्टेड हैं, किसी पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है—इसलिए उसमें अभी तक क्या प्रगति हुई है उसके बारे में कल अपना बयान दे दें ताकि लोगों में एक तरह की जो एंज्जायटी है वह दूर हो जाए। दूसरी बात यह है कि सेंटर और स्टेट की पुलिस का जो कोऑर्डिनेशन है, जैसी हमारी सूचना है, वह ठीक नहीं है तो वह कोऑर्डिनेशन ठीक हो उसके लिए वह कोई व्यवस्था करें। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से कहूंगा कि वह इस सम्बन्ध में लेटेस्ट प्रोग्रेस रिपोर्ट दे दें।