SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (GENERAL 1991-92) (DECEMBER, 1991)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI SHANTARAM POTDUKHE): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement (in English and Hindi) showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants (General) for the year 1991-92 (December, 1991).

श्री कपिल वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे एक सबमिशन करना है । नवभारत टाइम्स का प्रश्न हम लोगों ने दो रोज पहले इस सदन में उठाया था । लोक सभा में उस पर एक स्टेटमेंट होने वाला है । हम यह चाहते हैं कि इस प्रकार का एक स्टेटमेंट प्राइवेट मैम्बर्ज बिल खत्म होने के बाद यहां भी हो । आप मेहरबानी करके एक डायरेक्शन इश्यू कर दीजिये कि इस प्रकार का स्टेटमेंट यहां भी हो । यह बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण चीज है । हमारे सदन में यह मामला पहले उठा था और बाद में वहां उठा और चेयर ने कुछ इस किस्म की बात कही थी, वह स्पेसेफिक डायरेक्शन तो नहीं थी लेकिन यह बात कही थी । मेहरबानी करके आप डायरेक्शन दें कि इस सदन में भी एक स्टेटमेंट हो ।

श्री विठ्ठलराव माधवराव जाधव : (महाराष्ट्र) : प्राइवेट मैम्बर्ज बिल का जो समय है, उस पर एनक्रोचमेंट नहीं होना चाहिये ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह) : ठीक है, आप रुकिये । Jacob Saheb is here. I tell him if the Minister is going to make a statement in the Lok Sabha, तो राज्य सभा में भी होना चाहिये । You have to convey it.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): Sir, I will find out.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH): Now, Private Member's Business. Further discussion on the Resolution regarding the appointment of a Commission in order to provide more autonomy to the States moved by Dr. Nagen Saikia on 29th November, 1991.

SHRI BHADRESWAR BURAGOHAIN (Assam): The hostages in Assam have been released. I would like to know whether the hon. Minister will make a statement in this House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH): Mr. Vithalrao Madhavrao Jadhav to continue his speech.

RESOLUTION RE: SETTING UP OF A COMMISSION TO GRANT MORE AUTONOMY TO STATE CONTD.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, last time I had just begun my speech on the Resolution moved by my learned friend Dr. Nagen Saikia. Actually I rise neither to support not to oppose this Resolution, but I want to air my opinions about this Resolution. There is no doubt that the entire problem of our nation lies in the Centre-State relations. Today we are facing a lot of problems due to the events and happenings that are taking place in different States of the nation. From that point of view, I want to put some of my thoughts for the consideration of this House and I want and everybody wants that India should be a strong country. Our founding-fathers and the chief architect of our Constitution, Dr. Baba Saheb Ambedkar, had dreamt that secularism should prevail in India and India should emerge as one of the strongest nations of the world. From that point of view, I want to start with the debate which took place in the first Constituent Assembly on 17th December 1946. A Resolution had been brought out by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on 13th December 1946, in the Constituent Assembly. The Resolution reads like this:

[Shri Vithalrao Madhavrao Jadhav]

"(1) This Constituent Assembly declares its firm and solemn resolve to proclaim India as an Independent Sovereign Republic and to draw up for her future governance a Constitution; and

(2) WHEREIN the territories that now comprise British India, the territories that now form the Indian States, and such other parts of India as are outside British India and the States as well as such other territories as are willing to be constituted into the Independent Sovereign India shall be a Union of them all; and

(3) WHEREIN the said territories, whether with their present boundaries or with such others as may be determined by the Constituent Assembly and thereafter according to the Law of the Constitution, shall possess and retain the status of autonomous Units, together with residuary powers, and exercise all powers and functions of government and administration, save and except such powers and functions as are vested in or assigned to the Union, or as are inherent or implied in the Union or resulting therefrom; and

(4) WHEREIN all power and authority of the Sovereign Independent India, its constituent parts and organs of government, are derived from the people; and

(5) WHEREIN shall be guaranteed and secured to all the people of India justice, social, economic and political; equality of status, of opportunity, and before the law; freedom of thought, expression, belief, faith, worship, vocation, association and action, subject to law and public morality; and

(6) WHEREIN adequate safeguards shall be provided for minorities, backward and tribal areas, and depressed and other backward classes; and

(7) WHEREBY shall be maintained the integrity of the territory of the Republic and its sovereign rights on land, sea, and air according to justice and the law of civilised nations; and

(8) this ancient land attains its rightful and honoured place in the world and make its full and willing contribution to the promotion of world peace and the welfare of mankind."

Sir, so many learned parliamentarians and biggest patriots of that time participated in this resolution which was brought forward before the Constituent Assembly on 17th December, 1946. But what are the views of the chief architect of our Constitution, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar? That is very important. I told in the Question Hour the other day that Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar and Mahatma Phule are my inspiration, not to me but to entire Maharashtra and entire nation as such. Sir, I had an opportunity to visit Japan in 1983. I was staying in a hotel. I saw two photographs there, one of Gautam Buddha and the second of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar. I asked a man about these photographs. He said, "Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar was the greatest God of this world. He converted six crores people into Buddhism." Even he has converted more people into Buddhist religion. That man gave me this reply. I pay my tributes to Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar. Fortunately, I happen to be from a State where Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar was born. That is the only reason that when we look towards Maharashtra we have got different types of people, religions, races and creeds. Sir, Bombay is represented not as mini-India, but it is a mini-world. You can find there all types of people. If you compare Bombay with other parts of the country, you will find less riots, less killings and less violence there. I want to put the views of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar on this resolution before the House. He said:

"These principles have become the silent immaculate premise of our outlook. It is therefore unnecessary to proclaim as forming a part of our creed. The Resolution suffers from certain other lacunae. I find that this part of the Resolution, although it enunciates certain rights, does not speak of remedies. All of us are aware of the fact that rights are nothing unless remedies are provided whereby people can seek to obtain redress when rights are invaded. I find a complete absence of remedies. Even the usual formula that no man's life, liberty and property shall be taken without the due process of law, finds to place in the Resolution. These fundamental rights set out are made subject to law and morality. Obviously what is law, what is morality will be determined by the executive of the day and when one executive may take one view another executive may take another view and we do not know what exactly would be the position with regard to fundamental rights, if this matter is left to the executive of the day."

He further said:

"I know today we are divided politically, socially and economically. We are a group of warring camps and I may go even to the extent of confessing that I am probably one of the leaders of such a camp. But Sir, with all this, I am quite convinced that given time and circumstances nothing in the world will prevent this country from becoming one..."

(Time-bell rings)

Sir this is a Private Member's Bill. I don't think there is any time limit. Sir, this is very important.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह) : जाधव जी, आपके बहुत सारे साथियों का यहां पर नाम है । आप जरा जल्दी बोल लीजिए ।

श्री विठ्ठलराव माधवराव जाधव : अभी तो मुझे बहुत बोलना है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह) : मुझे तो कोई एतराज नहीं । आपके ही साथियों का इसमें नाम है ।

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: That is right. It can go to the next session also.

SHRI SYED SIBTEY RAZI (Uttar Pradesh): This cannot go to the next session.

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA (Assam): Sir, it has to be completed today.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह): मैं आपसे निवेदन कर रहा हूं । आप यह नहीं समझे कि मैं कोई वार्निंग दे रहा हूं ।

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA: Sir, my appeal is, if we don't conclude the debate on this resolution today, it will not go to the next session, then it will lapse today itself. Therefore, I appeal to the Members to be brief so that it can be concluded today. We can have a reply from the Minister and I will also get a chance to reply to the debate.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: I will complete within a few minutes. Sir, this is a very historical moment. I would like to congratulate Dr. Nagen Saikia. This is the only issue before the nation today. I am giving the views of very expert parliamentarians and architects of our Constitution. Sir, one thing I would like to say about Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar. He said: "I like a strong United Centre, much stronger than the Centre we had created under the Government of India Act of 1935". Baba Saheb Ambedkar always stood for a strong Centre and

[Shri Vithalrao Madhavrao Jadav] a united India. Sir, permit me to make an observation. The use of force alone ss futile. Violent incidents are taking place everywhere. There is disturbance everywhere and we are using force to control it. I would like to quote here what Baba Saheb Ambedkar had to say on the use of force: "Use of force alone is but temporary. It may subdue for a moment. But it does not remove the necessity of subduing again. A nation is not governed which is perpetually to be conquered". These were the views of the great leader, I happened to go through the debate that took place in the Parliament when the States Reorganisation Bill was introduced in the Lok Sabha then. I carefully read the speeches of Govind Ballabh Pant, C. D. Dehmukh and Bhupesh Gupta. Their speeches are very important in todays context. If you look at India today, it is burning. There is problem in Punjab, in Kashmir and in Assam. These States are burning. Today the country is getting divided in the name of religion and region and some political parties are taking advantage of this situation. They are adding fuel to the fire that is already there I do not want to comment, but I would like to know what this *Ekta Yatra* is all about? Is it essential at all? What is the motive behind this *Yatra?* It has sold the name of Rama in the market. This is not our culture. This is not our Sanskriti Rama, Krishna, Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Baba Saheb Ambedkar, all these people are above religion and region. They do not represent one religion or region. But they represent a united India. The idea of *Ekta Yatra* is totally wrong. It is not correct. In 1956, when the debate on the States Reorganisation Bill was going on in the Parliament. Govind Ballabh Pant said that the Members of the House belong to different States and they should sit together and solve the problems mutually. Efforts should start from the zonal council level. Some time should be given to the Members to settle issues.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH): Mr. Jadhav, you must conclude now, According to Rule 161 a Member is allowed to speak only for 15 minutes in the case of Private Members Bill and that is binding. You may see the rule... (*Interruptions*)... You have already taken more than 25 minutes .. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV. Sir, the rule has been violated hundreds of times...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH): No, Mr. Jadhav, you must conclude. I can allow you only a little more time.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: When the State Reorganisation Bill was being discussed, I would like to quote what Jawaharlal Nehru said:

"As a Member of the House, the dignity of Parliament, the dignity of democratic procedures, the dignity of India and this nation, all these things, I take it are dear to everyone here and to everyone in India. We may make mistakes. Like make many mistakes. But you do not correct it by wrong procedures or by adopting wrong means". These were the feeling expressed by Jawaharlal Nehru. Sir, there are provisions given in the Sarkaria Commission also for the Centre-State relations. Part I of this Commission has some important points.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह) : जाधव जी, अब समय नहीं है। You only refer.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV. The Sarkaria Commission

has also given a number of suggestions and the Government of India has accepted most of them. There might be some differences of opinion. But unless the States are strong, the Centre cannot survive. From this point of view, we should find out why these problems arise. Most of the problems are social and economic problems of the State. When an economic imbalance is created, they get frustrated and tend to become emotional. Even in Punjab and other States, besides communal tension, there are also social and economic imbalances. Even in my State, Maharashtra right from 1956, we have been demanding the creation of Statutory Development Boards for the development of Vidarbha, Marathwada and other parts of Maharashtra. Members from almost all the parties the BJP, the Congress and the Janata Dal-have unanimously supported the demands of our people. We have also made representations to the Legislative Assembly and the Maharashtra Legislative Council for the setting up of the Statutory Development Boards for the development of the economically backward regions of Marathwada and Vidarbha. But I do not know what hitches are there. I along with Dr. Bapu Kaldate, Shri Madhu Dandavate and three other Congress MPs met our hon. Home Minister. He said that if we create the Statutory Development Boards, most of the powers would go the Governor and that we should make some amendments. We agreed to make the amendments. But we want the establishment of the Statutory Development Boards. There is a big backlog in the development of this region. We have stated the problems being faced by the backward regions several times in this very House. One of the requirements is the creation of the National Highways. We have highways covering only one-third of Maharashtra. We have given a proposal for converting the State highway into a national highway. But nothing concrete has been done. so far. So the attitude of the Planning Commission should be changed and the problems of the backward areas of the country should be looked into. Firstly, I would demand that the Statutory Development Boards be created for the development of the backward regions of Maharashtra. Secondly, there are many irrigation projects being carried on not only in Maharashtra but also in other parts of the country. So, irrigation should be made a Central subject. There are some disputes going on for the sharing of water in Karnataka and Tamil Nadu. I would appeal that irrigation be made a Central subject and the Central Government should take care of this. If you could complete all the pending irrigation projects, the country could get the maximum benefit out of it. From this point of view, I appeal through you to the Government to consider irrigation as a Central subject. There are also no proper communication facilities. There is also a demand for the creation of new railway lines in the Marathwada Districts and the Vidarbha Districts in the State of Maharashtra.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH): You have already taken more time.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: I will just take five more minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH): I am helpless. I cannot give you more time. I have already given you half-an-hour.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: I will take only one more minute.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH): You should finish in one minute.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: What are the new railway lines to be laid in the backwards parts of Maharashtra like Marathwada and Vidarbha? The Maharashtra Government made recommendations to

[Shri Vithalrao Madhavrao Jadav]

the Government of India for the creation of new Railway Corporation on the lines of the Konkan Railway Corporation in order to solve our problems.

Then I come to the problems of Bombay City. Bombay city is giving this country 75 per cent of its revenues. Whatever India earns, 75 per cent of that revenue comes from Bombay City alone. Yet Bombay's problems remain unsolved. Half of Bombay's population, viz. 50 lakhs of people in Bombay, are living in slums. Even Rajivji had declared at the Centenary of the Congress that Rs. 100 crores would be provided for the welfare of Bombay, to solve the problems of Bombay slums. However, only not more than Rs. 10 crores have been released. So I request the Government, through you, to give enough financial assistance to Bombay. (*Time-bell rings*) Sir, Bombay is the biggest commercial and industrial centre of this country. It needs a lot of financial assistance. Whatever money was available with the Maharashtra Government through small savings, the Government of Maharashtra has spent it on the city. (*Time-bell rings*) Bombay is not getting its proper share of royalty on Bombay Hign though it is supplying so moch gas to the different parts of the country. (*Time-bell rings*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH): Now you have to sit down, please. I am calling Mr. Anantray Devshanker Dave to speak.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: My friend, Ram Awadhesh Singhji, was saying that Bihar was getting only 10 to 12 paise per tonne of coal which Bihar was supplying to the country. Therefore, the royalty that we are getting on Bombay High is very meagre. (*Time-bell rings*) So I request the Government to consider the problems of Maharashtra and give at least some economic autonomy. I agree with Dr. Nagen Saikia that economic autonomy, developmental autonomy, planning autonomy, are necessary....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH): Now you will have to sit down. I have already given you more than half an hour, Jadhavji. I have called Mr. Dave to speak. Daveji, you please speak.

कुमारी सरोज खापर्डे (महाराष्ट्र): सर, ज्यादा समय नहीं मांगा, तीन बजे तक का समय मांगा और अभी तीन मिनट बाकी बचे हैं।...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह): नहीं-नहीं। चलिए, दवे साहब, शुरू कीजिए।

श्री विठ्ठलराव माधवराव जाधव: सर, यहां आधा-आधा घंटा, एक-एक घंटा बोलते हैं, मैं तो काम की बातें कर बता रहा हूं।....

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह): काम की बातें आपकी सुनी गयी, जाधव जी। आपकी बहुत काम की बातें थीं। उस काम की बातों के लिए मैं बहुत कद्र करता हूं, लेकिन आप भी तो चेयर की रिक्वेस्ट पर ध्यान दीजिए।

श्री विठ्ठलराव माधवराव जाधव:**

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह): अब रिकार्ड पर नहीं जा रहा है। दवे साहब, आप बोलिए।

श्री अनन्तराय देवशंकर दवे (गुजरात): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सैकिया जी जो प्रस्ताव इस सदन में लाए हैं, उनका मैं हार्दिक स्वागत करता हूं और आशा करता हूं कि आज ही उनका जवाब आ जाना चाहिए क्योंकि आगे तो इस रेजोलूशन पर कोई डिबेट होगी नहीं। तो मैं ज्यादा टाइम नहीं लूंगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह): ज्यादा समय न लीजिए। पांच मिनट ले लीजिए।

**Not recorded.

श्री अनन्तराय देवशंकर दवे (गुजरात) : सर, ज्यादा समय नहीं लगा क्योंकि मिनिस्टर का जवाब हम आज सुनना चाहते हैं। फिर तो यह आने वाला नहीं है रेजोलूशन, लेप्स हो जाएगा। इस वजह से मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि सरकारिया कमीशन की जो रिकमंडेशन आज दिन तक सरकार के पास पेंडिंग पड़ी हुई है, उनका जल्दी से जल्दी इंपलीमेंटेशन अब के समय में बहुत जरूरी हो गया है...

श्री विठ्ठलभाई मोतीराम पटल (गुजरात) : 26 तो एक्सेप्ट कर लिया।

श्री अनन्तराव देवशंकर दवे : मुझे पता है। इंटरस्टेट कौंसिल ने यह 27 में से 18 रिकमंडशंस एक्सेप्ट की हैं। मैं उसी पर आ रहा हूं। लेकिन, आज दिन तक कई राज्यों में ऐसी स्थिति पैदा है, जैसा यहां पर हमारे रामअवधेश सिंह जी कह रहे थे कोयले की रायल्टी के बारे में, लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं, जैसा अहलुवालिया जी ने रेजोलूशन पर बताया था कि सबके बीच में जो मुख्य बात है वह है मानव का विकास। यदि मानव का विकास नहीं होगा तो समाज का विकास नहीं होगा और समाज का विकास नहीं होगा तो राष्ट्र का नहीं होग। इसी वजह से इस बात को सोचने का पूरा समय अब हमारे पास आ गया है।

मान्यवर, आज दिन-प्रति-दिन कई राज्यों में जो तनाव पैदा हो रहे हैं, मैं ऐसा नहीं मानता हूं कि सभी राज्यों में आर्थिक तनाव ही है, कहीं पर सामाजिक भी है और कहीं पर सांस्कृतिक

3.00 P.M भी है क्योंकि जम्मू और कश्मीर को पूरा पैसा दिया गया है, तो भी वहां से वही बात निकल रही है कि हमको नहीं मिला है;

An amount of Rs. 75,000 crores has been allotted to the State of Jammu and Kashmir for its development uptill now.

यह बात नहीं है, लेकिन यह समस्या वहां से खड़ी होती है कि लोग कोई न कोई स्वतंत्रता चाहते हैं। स्टेट्स जो अपने प्रोजैक्ट्स बनाते हैं, सभी पावर्स सैंटर के हाथ में रखना ठीक नहीं है। एकरफ हम कहते हैं स्टेट्स को कि आप अपने रिसोर्सेज खड़े करके किसी न किसी तरह से अपनी आमदनी बढ़ाएं, दूसरी तरफ जो प्रोजैक्ट्स स्टेट्स की ओर से सैंक्शन के लिए यहां आते हैं, कई सालों तक सट्रल गवर्नमेंट उनको परमिशन नहीं देती।

मैं एक बात की ओर सरकार का ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूं कि आज नर्मदा प्रोजैक्ट केवल गुजरात का प्रोजैक्ट नहीं रहा, यह नेशनल प्रोजैक्ट है। यदि नर्मदा प्रोजैक्ट पूरा हो गया, पूरा नर्मदा प्रोजैक्ट अगर अमल में आ गया तो उससे पूरे राष्ट्र को फायदा होगा, सिर्फ गुजरात को फायदा होगा, ऐसी बात नहीं है, लेकिन पर्यावरणवादी लोग कोई बात खड़ी करके कहीं न कहीं इस प्रोजैक्ट में रुकावट डाल रहे हैं। मैं तो इस बात की तरफ सदन का ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूं कि कितने पर्यावरणवादी लोग मनीबेली में वहां तक ठहरे हैं? नेक्सलाइट लोगों को वहां आश्रम मिल रहा है, वहां नेक्सलाइट वीपन्स रखते हैं। यदि यह योजना बन जाए और वहां लोग आने-जाने लगें तो उन सबकी प्रवृत्ति बाहर आने वाली है, इसी वजह से वे विरोध कर रहे हैं, दूसरा कोई कारण उनके विरोध का नहीं है। क्योंकि हम जानते हैं कि आज सारे गुजरात में और बहुत सारी जगहों पर पानी की बहुत कमी है, बारिश नहीं है, सूखा पड़ा है, पीने का पानी नहीं मिल रहा है, कच्छ और गुजरात में तो परिस्थिति बहुत भयंकर है और अगर यह योजना बन जाए तो लोगों को पीने का पानी मिलेगा, लेकिन ये लोग नहीं चाहते हैं कि ऐसी योजना बने और इसी वजह से ये लोग इन योजनाओं का विरोध कर रहे हैं।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जो सरकार ने 3, 4 या 5, सरकारिया कमीशन की तमाम सिफारिशें स्वीकार कर ली हैं, उनमें से राज्यपालों की जो नियुक्ति होने वाली है, उस तरफ मैं ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूं कि आप

[श्री अनन्तराय देवशंकर दवे]

किसी पालिटिकल आदमी को उस पर मत रखिए, जिनकी समाज में बड़ी प्रतिष्ठा है, जिनका समाज में बड़ा स्थान है, ऐसे लोगों को वहां रखिए और पूरी टर्म के लिए रखिए, पूरे पांच साल के लिए रखिए क्योंकि राष्ट्रपति और राज्यपाल ऐसे लोग होते हैं जिनकी देश के शासन में दृष्टि लगी होती है, उन पर जिम्मेदारी होती है और अगर हम उन लोगों को बदलते रहेंगे तो परिस्थिति वही होगी कि सैंटर और स्टेट के जो रिलेशन्स हैं, उनमें तनाव खड़े हो जाएंगे। इसी वजह से जितनी आपने सिफारिशें स्वीकार की हैं, उन सिफारिशों को आप अमल में लाइए। ऐसी परिस्थिति मत होने दीजिए कि जब देश में चारों ओर से तनाव खड़ा हो जाए, उस परिस्थिति में आप उन सिफारिशों को स्वीकार करें।

इसलिए सैकिया साहब जो यह प्रस्ताव लाए हैं, मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूं। धन्यवाद।

*DR. NARREDDY THULASI REDDY: (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice Chairman Sir, Unity in diversity is the speciality of our country. India has geopolitical and historical characteristics which has few parallels. Ours is a vast country with 80 crores of population. Apart from that we have different geographical conditions, different cultures, different languages, different customs and traditions. Inspite of all these diversities our country is surrounded by Bay of Bengal in the East, Arbian Sea in the West, Indian Ocean in the South and Himalayas in the North, uniting us as a single entity. We Indians surrounded by these natural toundaries live together in unity and identify ourselves as a separate geographical entity.

Sir, if we recollect our History we come across a number of facts. A number of emperors and kings ruled our country our country had to face brief periods of unity and stability followed by spells of fragmentation. Undue centralisation of power often proved counter productive. An emperor who could rule with broad perspective and foresight, and by decentralising his powers, was proved to be a successful ruler and could rule a vast kingdom. But an emperor who preferred dictatorship and undue centralisation of power had to face secessionist forces. Either during his reign or later the empire got disintegrated. It is a lesson we learnt from our history. The provinces and local governments in the various empires from the Mauryas to the Mughals enjoyed a considerable degree of autonomy. The last of the Mughals, Aurangazeb's empire declined only due to lack of foresight and undue concern for centralisation of power.

Now let us take the case of Britishers. First they tried to rule India from England through centralisation of power. But the policies introduced by Dalhousie led to traumetic consequences which made them realise that undue centralisation is defective.

After scrutinizing our country's history, our constitution makers have framed our constitution with a federal set up strong centre and strong State Government and envisage that this set up would lead our country into a progressive path. Such a set up of strong centre with permanent powers to States can only endure and protect its unity, integrity and sovereignty against external aggression and internal disruption.

Sir, after our independence, the first President of our country Shri Babu Rajendra Prasad had said, once,—"Keep only a few essential powers at the centre and delegate rest of the powers to States." Unfortunately his intensions were never realized. To-day, the whole world is trying to go in a big way for decentralization of power. But, Unfortunately, our country is running for undue centralization of powers.

*English Translation in the Original speech delivered in Telugu.

Sir, the seed of centralization of powers was sown in the early period of our independence when Jawaharlal Nehru was our first Prime Minister. This seed grew into a sapling during Indira Gandhi's period and establish-itself as a huge tree under Rajiv's regime. During Jawaharlal Nehru's regime, the central government achieved a hegemony on the industrial sector. Under the 42nd Amendment, during the rule of Smt. Indira Gandhi, many of the subjects from the State List have gone on the concurrent List. Thus the powers of States have been confiscated. Then during Rajiv's rule the State Governments were set aside and a new policy of centre's direct contact with the districts was initiated and tried. Thus, the powers of Centre are being reduced every day. The centre with its increased powers is behaving like a mother-in-law would behave to a daughter-in-law. The States have been forced to seek sanctions and await instructions from Centre in each and every issue of local government affairs.

Sir, I beg you to consider the pathetic condition of the State Governments at present. The actions of the union have led to over centralization, reducing the States to mere administrative agencies.

Sir, when some natural calamities like floods, cyclones, quakes, droughts occur and when succor and relief has to reach the needy in time, the State Governments remain helpless. They may not have funds, even if they have they hay not have the powers to utilise them. They are reduced to mere beggars aproaching the Centre at Delhi for each and everything. Sir, this has to be taken into consideration.

Sir to construct a public lavatory in a remote village, to lay a road or even to dig a tube well, the State Government has to beg the Centre for funds. Now you can understand Sir, the pitiable conditions in which the State Governments have to function. This situation must change. Such a State of affairs is not good for our country's progress. This is what all the non congress parties have been asking for, night from the early period of our independence.

Sir, now I rightly feel proud of the fact that our Telugu Desam leader Shri Nambudari Taraka Rao has been one of the first to ask for substantial powers to states: Recently, the Chief Minister of Orissa, Shri Biju Patnaik and Chief Minister of Bihar Shri Laloo Prasad Yadav and also many other Chief Ministers of Congress ruled States have openly and vehemently been asking for more powers, funds and financial resources in the light of lack of funds, resource constraints, increased demands and needs of the States.

The Planning Commission, Finance Commission have been designed by the Constitution to give possible suggestions and answers for proper allocation of financial resources between Centre and States. But then, the Central Government, instead of taking and acting on suggestions from these Commissions is actively using them as tools to meet its hegemonic ends. Misusing the article 220 of the Constitution, the Central Government is using 20 per cent of financial resources as per its own wish. They are used to meet political ends but not the real needs of the state. On items like iron, steel, coal etc. it is raising the administrative prices and increasing its financial revenue without giving any share of these resources to the States.

Similarly, through special bearer bonds the Centre is increasing its revenue and not giving any of its share to the States. The Sarkaria Commission has given a recommendation that Planning Commission be made a constitutional body and that

[Dr. Narreddy Thulasi Reddy]

the Centre seek Planning Commissions' approval for using 20 per cent of funds. But then the Sarkaria commission was it self set aside. Similarly, the Sarkaria Commission gave a recommendation that the States be given a share from Corporation Tax. That was also ignored. Similarly, five years back, when Mr. S. B. Chavan was Finance Minister, has proposed that the State Governments be given powers to levy consignment tax but then no action is taken so far.

Thus, there are so many issues and instances and it has resulted only in dissatisfaction and dismay in many States. The feeling of estrangement among the States has been increasing day by day. This is not good for the welfare, progress, unity and integrity of the country. So, the time has come for the Central Government to earnestly look into this issue with foresight and concen. The time has come for the Cabinet Ministers to work with political expertise and not like leaders of a political party, in resolving this issue.

Sir, only with the set up of a strong Central Government and strong State Governments, the country can endure for a long time with Uity and integrity and progress prosperously. Now, the time is ripe for the Central Government to acknowledge this fact. So, there is a great need to review to rethink on the issue of delegation of powers, allocation of financial resources between Centre and States. There is an urgent need to provide substantial financial powers to the States.

Sir, I hope that the Congress leaders of the Central Government will take the initiative and act upon this issue. Supporting this resolution, I thank you Sir, for giving me this opportunity to speak.

श्री सैयद सिब्ते रजी : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, किसी भी संघीय ढांचे में स्वायत्तता या आर्थिक स्वायत्तता की बात कहा जाना कोई आपत्ति और ऐतराज की बात नहीं हो सकती । किन्तु जब स्वायत्तता या अधिक अधिकारों की बात को लेकर टकराव और भारतीय संघीय ढांचे से बाहर निकलने और संविधान के प्रति अविश्वास व्यक्त करने का सहारा स्वायत्तता बन जाए तो निश्चित रूप से यह सारे देश के लोगों के लिए गंभीर चिंता का विषय बन जाता है ।

महोदय, पिछले चंद सालों में अगर हम देश के इतिहास को और मुल्क की तारीख को देखें तो हमें पता चलता है की केन्द्र से टकराव की नीति ही क्षेत्रवाद की राजनीति का मूल आधार बनी और प्रदेशों और क्षेत्र विशेष की जनता में इसका भ्रम पैदा करने का प्रयास लगातार क्षेत्रीय नेताओं ने किया कि शायद केन्द्र में एक ऐसी सरकार बैठी हुई है जो इस क्षेत्र के और इस इलाके के लोगों के हितों की रक्षक नहीं है बल्कि उससे टकराकर और उसे कमजोर करके ही हम कुछ हासिल कर सकते हैं । मान्यवर, आप जानते हैं कि इसके दुष्परिणाम क्या हुए। चाहे धर्म के नाम पर हो, चाहे भाषा के नाम पर हो, चाहे क्षेत्र के नाम पर हो जिस तरह से टकराव की तहरीरें उभरकर आई उससे देश का कितना जानी-माली नुकसान हुआ है, उसका अंदाजा आप जैसे राजनेता बखूबी लगा सकते हैं।

महोदय, पंजाब में आर्थिक स्थिति खराब नहीं थी बल्कि पंजाब की पर कैपिटा इनकम वहां के रहने वाले लोगों की आमदनी देश की बहुत उत्तम आमदनी वाले क्षेत्रों में आती है । जहां तक केन्द्रीय अनुदान का सवाल है, जैसा कि पूर्व वक्ता ने कहा सातवीं योजना के अंदर पंजाब और काश्मीर को विशेष रूप से बहुत ज्यादा आर्थिक सहायता दी गई लेकिन अपने क्षेत्र के खनिज पदार्थों का सहारा लेकर राष्ट्रीय संघीय ढांचे से निकलकर एक आजाद रियासत बन जाने की बात करें तो निश्चित रूप से केन्द्र से टकराव की राजनीति से हर जागरूक इंसान, हर जागरूक नागरिक चिंतित हो जाता है । अभी पूर्ववक्ता ने बीजू

पटनायक का नाम लिया, लेकिन बीजू पटनायक ने उड़ीसा के खनिज पदार्थों का सहारा लेकर, उसका उल्लेख करके भारत के संघीय ढांचे से अलग होकर आजाद रहने की बात कही। निश्चित रूप से आप मेरी इस बात से मुत्तफिक होंगे कि आज एक क्षेत्र क्या, एक प्रदेश क्या, आज की दुनिया में एक राज्य का सवाल नहीं है। आज एक दूसरे पर डिपेंडेंट होकर चलें तो शायद हम रह सकते हैं अन्यथा आजाद रहकर इस खुली हुई दुनिया में इस तरह से नहीं रह सकते कि हम दुनिया से अपने को अलग समझने लगें। आज जिस तरह से कहा जा रहा है कि डिफेंस, फारेन अफेयर्स और करेंसी के बारे में ही केन्द्र को खुदमुख्तार रहना चाहिए, मैं समझता हूं कि यह मौजूदा देश के जो हालात हैं उनमें मुनासिब नहीं होगा। यह जो प्रस्ताव है निश्चित रूप से इसके मंसूबे अच्छे हैं लेकिन किसी नए कमीशन की स्थापना से बहुत लंबा समय लगेगा और उस अलगाव की जो प्रक्रियाएं हैं उसके जो कष्ट हैं उनमें जो परिस्थिति आज पंजाब की है, काश्मीर की है, जो हालत असम की है या तमिलनाडु की है उन चीजों को सामने रखते हुए निश्चित रूप से हम अपने उन रिश्तों के ऊपर जो हमारे स्टेट्स के और सेंटर के हैं विचार करें.... (व्यवधान)

SHRI T. A. MOHAMMED SAQHY (Tamil Nadu): Asking for more powers for the States and separatism are two different things. My learned friend is confusing the issue. We are discussing about the demand for more powers for the States. Not separatism.

श्री सैयद सिब्ते रजी : मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि हमें दुरुस्त इस पर कुछ निर्णय करना चाहिए और जो हालत हैं उन पर विचार करना चाहिए। इस वक्त जो हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार है उसके रुख से यह पता चलता है कि वे नेक नीयत से प्रदेशों और राज्यों के केन्द्र के साथ जो रिश्ते हैं उनको ज्यादा से ज्यादा सुधार के रास्ते पर लाने के लिए जो मुख्य समस्या है उनका निराकरण करने के लिए मुख्य रूप से दिलचस्पी ले रही है। जिस प्रकार के हमारे दूसरे आर्गेनाइजेशन हैं, नेशनल इंटेग्रेशन कौंसिल है, इन्टर-स्टेट्स कौंसिल है, नेशनल डवलपमेंट कौंसिल है उनको दुबारा बनाकर कई महत्वपूर्ण मीटिंगें की हैं। नेशनल इंटेग्रेशन कौंसिल की कई महत्वपूर्ण मीटिंग हुई हैं। इन्टर-स्टेट्स कौंसिल की सब-कमेटी की मीटिंग हुई और उसमें हमारे गृह मंत्री ने जो बयान दिया है वह बहुत ही ज्यादा उत्साहवर्द्धक है। उन्होंने स्पष्ट शब्दों में अपने स्टेटमेंट में कहा है कि सरकार निश्चित रूप से उन तमाम मामलात के ऊपर गौर करेगी जिससे राज्यों और केन्द्र के रिश्तों के बीच में जो कुंठा पैदा होती है उसको दूर करने के लिए एक नये सिरे से सोचना शुरू करेगी। मैं समझता हूं जो दुनिया में आज हालात पैदा हो गये हैं उनको सामने रखकर इस तरफ पुनर्विचार के सिलसिले में हमारी सरकार सोच रही है। निश्चित रूप से जिस तरह से सोवियत यूनियन आज खंडित हुआ है वह बहुत बड़ा प्रश्न हमारे सामने बनता है और बहुत से लोग उसका उदाहरण भी देते हैं। लेकिन मैं इस बात को कहना चाहूंगा कि सोवियत यूनियन की परिस्थितियों में और भारत की परिस्थितियों में काफी अंतर है। सोवियत यूनियन ने अपने देश के राज्यों को एक राजनीतिक विचारधारा के आधार पर जोड़कर रखने का प्रयास किया। उसके विपरीत हमारे देश के अंदर राजनीतिक विचारधारा की खुली छूट, खुली स्वतंत्रता है और उसी की वजह से हमारे देश के अंदर सन् 1950 से लेकर संविधान के अंतर्गत कितने ही चुनाव हुए और लोगों को अपनी राजनीतिक विचारधारा के अनुसार वोट देने का अधिकार मिला। मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि इस प्रकार की कोई समस्या हमारे देश के सामने नहीं है। लेकिन जिस तरह से कश्मीर में, पंजाब में और असम में मिलिटरी के जरिये हमने कोशिश की है कि वहां पर इनसर्जेंसी सबवर्सिनैस अलगाववाद है उसको रोका जाए इसके साथ ही मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह कहना चाहूंगा कि जहां भी

[श्री सैयद सिब्ते रजी]

जितने दिन भी फौज लगी हुई है उसको लॉ एंड आर्डर की व्यवस्था संभालने के लिए ही नहीं बल्कि उस पीरियड के अंदर, उस समय के अंदर इस बात का प्रयास किया जाना चाहिए कि वहां पर एक ऐसी दूसरी राजनीतिक व्यवस्था पैदा हो सके, पालिटिकल प्रोसैस पैदा हो सके जिससे जब वहां से फौज या मिलिटरी हटे तो कोई ऐसा वक्यूम पैदा न हो जो देश का संघीय ढांचा है उसके अंतर्गत हमारा राजकाज न चल सके ।

निश्चित रूप से जो हमारे सरकारिया कमीशन की बात कही गई है तो मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि उसने 247 रिकमेंडेशंस दी है। 12 अमेंडमेंट के सुझाव दिये हैं और 20 नये लेजिस्लेशन लाने की बात की है । मैं मुबारकबाद देना चाहूंगा अपनी सरकार को कि इस नई सरकार ने आने के बाद तुरन्त इस तरफ विचार किया, ध्यान दिया और आशा की जाती है कि बजाय इसके कि हम नये सिरे से किसी कमीशन में जायें, कोई नई प्रक्रिया शुरू करें जो हमारी सरकार है वह जो राजामनार की रिपोर्ट है उसके आधार पर ही हम अच्छे रिश्ते राज्यों और केन्द्र के बीच में बनाये रखने की कोशिश करें । किन्तु यदि इन रिश्तों के नाम पर राजनीतिक सत्ता और राजनीतिक शक्ति हासिल करने का प्रयास किया जा रहा है और केन्द्र से टकराव की परिस्थिति पैदा करने की कहीं भी कोशिश की जाए या ऐसा आभास देने की कोशिश की जाए तो मंत्री महोदय से कहना चाहता हूं कि जो भी ऐसी सरकार हो जो प्रदेश सरकारों के हितकर या राज्यों के हितकर नहीं है उसका डटकर मुकाबला किया जाना चाहिए। आतंकवाद और सपरेटिस्ट की जो टेंडेंसीज है उनका मुकाबला करते हुए और देश की स्वतंत्रता, अखंडता और एकता को बनाये रखने और उसको अक्षुण्ण रखने की जिम्मेदारी केन्द्रीय सरकार की है । उसको बिना किसी झिझक के, बिना किसी शक और शुबहा के इसको पूरा करना चाहिये और पूरी जिम्मेदारी के साथ और सख्ती के साथ उसे इन ताकतों से निपटना होगा । निश्चित रूप से संघीय ढांचे के अंदर विचार-विमर्श से, कंसेसस से, जो हमारी लिस्ट है, चाहे कन्करेंट लिस्ट हो, चाहे यूनियन की लिस्ट हो और चाहे प्रदेश की लिस्ट हो, इस पर नये सिरे से विचार-विमर्श कर सकते हैं । यह विचार कई मर्तबे आ चुका है कि जो हमारी समवर्ती सूची है उस पर हमें दुबारा गौर करना चाहिये । राज्यों की जो सूची है उसके अधिकारक्षेत्र के सिलसिले में उस पर हमें दुबारा गौर करना चाहिये । लेकिन हमें एक बात को मानकर चलना चाहिये कि जो हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार है उसको लेजिस्लेशन में सुपरमेसी, अपरहैंड निश्चित रूप से मिला रहना चाहिये । बहुत सारे क्षेत्रों में कहा जा रहा है कि शिक्षा जो है उसे प्रदेशों को सौंप देना चाहिये, उसको कन्करेंट लिस्ट में नहीं रखा जाना चाहिये, इरीगेशन कंकरेंट लिस्ट में ले आना चाहिये सपोर्ट्स को कंकरेंट लिस्ट में ले आना चाहिए, पावर सप्लाई, पावर डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन को कंकरेंट लिस्ट में ले आना चाहिए । ये काफी ऐसे विषय हैं जिन पर पुनः विचार करने की आवश्यकता है । मुझे आशा है कि आने वाली सरकार जिस नये तरीके से एक कंसेसस, एक दूसरे की राय और मशविरे से देश को आगे ले जाना चाहती है और वह जो इस नीति पर अग्रसर है वह इसका जवाब है, वह इसका नया पृष्ठ है । हमारी भारत की राजनीति में मैं आशा करता हूं कि टकराव की परिस्थितियां खत्म होंगी और समझौते से एक दूसरे को समझने की प्रवृत्ति को बल मिलेगा ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं समझता हूं कि जो सैकिया जी ने यहां प्रस्ताव रखा है वह असामयिक है, उसकी कोई जरूरत नहीं है । बल्कि जरूरत इस बात की है जो कुछ हमारे पास तजुर्बा है, जो हमारे पास रिपोर्ट है चाहे वह जिस भी सूरत में हों उनको ही हमें देखना चाहिये और ज्यादा से ज्यादा समय समय पर इंटरस्टेट कौंसिल के जरिये, नेशनल इन्टीग्रेशन कौंसिल के जरिये जो हमारी एकता और अखंडता का मुद्दा है, जो साम्प्रदायिक सौहार्द का मुद्दा है या जो हमारे टैरो-

टोरियल, क्षेत्रीय मामलात हैं उन पर बातचीत होती रहनी चाहिये । मामला सोचने का और चिंता का तब बन जाता है जब कि बातचीत के दरवाजे बंद हो जाते हैं और जब कोई बात करने वाला या बात सुनने वाला नहीं मिलता है । मुझे आशा है कि हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार इस मामले में पूर्णरूप से सजग होगी । धन्यवाद जो आपने मुझे बोलने एक मौका दिया ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANKAR DAYAL SINGH): Honourable Members, I have just received one letter from the Minister of Coal, Shri P. A. Sangma, addressed to the honourable Chairman:

> "Sir, I wish to make a statement in the Rajya Sabha today in the Rajya Sabha today in the matter of The Times of India Group of Newspapers. Kindly permit me to make this statement."

So, after the clarifications on the statement made by the Minister of State in the Ministries of Parliamentary Affairs and Home Affairs, this statement will be made by Shri Sangma.

Now, the next speaker is Shri J. S. Raju.

*SHRI J. S. RAJU (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, first of all, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak on the Resolution, moved by Dr. Nagen Saikia, that seeks autonomy to states.

The hon'ble Member of the ruling party who spoke a little while ago, clubbed Tamilnadu with Punjab and Assam. Hon'ble Member of my party Mr. Mohammed Saqhy will reply to this point. The reason for the demand of separation in Assam and Punjab is because of the failure of the Centre to give autonomy to the states, of the Union. As far as the D.M.K., the party to which I am wedded to, is concerned, the only way to avert disintegration is state autonomy. The only panacea for disintegration is autonomy to states. We have to think of U.S.S.R. That country has disintegrated after long years of Union. If Congress wants that India should not distingrate....

SHRI M. PALANIYANDI (Tamil Nadu): That was a totalitarian state. There was 75 years of dictatorship. Here, in India, it is a democracy.

SHRI J. S. RAJU: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I can understand what Mr. Palaniyandi wants to say. Even though, the states in U.S.S.R. had the right to secede on will, the Union could not hold and disintegrated. Therefore, denial of autonomy to states will only produce many Gorbachevs in India. I am happy in welcoming this Resolution. Because, federal structure, state autonomy and equality are the basic tenets of the D.M.K. party. When the Centre arrogates all powers to itself, we call the polity unitary. But if the powers are shared between the States and the Centre, then we call it federal. In India, federalism is only on paper, not in practice. The leader of our movement, the late lamented Dr. Anna, once said that in India federalism is only in letter, not in spirit. Since a single party continued to be in the saddle at the Centre and States for long years, the voice for state autonomy was not raised. Even a few of them who felt the need for autonomy did not assert because of party discipline. But when non-Congress parties came to power in some States in the 60s the Chief Ministers came across many obstacles in serving the people of the State. The experience of Dr. Anna after becoming the Chief Minister of Tamilnadu in 1967 was not sweet. There is only bitterness in his observation. He referred to the Constitution as a document

---

English translation of the Original speech delivered in Tamil.

[Shri J. S. Raju]

brought through the back door. On maters of distribution of tax, powers and plan outlay, Dr. Anna wanted a total review so that Centre-State relation could be smooth, sans bitterness.

Our revered leader Dr. Kalaingnar, who succeeded Dr. Anna, felt the need to review and restructure the Centre-State relation. So, he appointed a Committee headed by Mr. P. V. Rajamannar to study Centre-State relation and suggest measures for improving the conditions of the States. There were great personalities like justice Chandra Reddy and Mr. A. L. Mudhaliar in that Committee. The report of the Committee was sent to the then Prime Minister by Dr. Kalaingnar. In reply, the Prime Minister wrote that because of the importance of the matter a conference of the Chief Ministers would be called to discuss the report. But, like other matters, this was also forgotten and put into Cold Storage. Not only D.M.K., but many more parties have demanded autonomy for states. In 1945, Congress made a declaration that the Centre would have only the minimum powers with itself. Again in 1947, while speaking in the Constituent Assembly, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said that the dominions and other provinces that join the Indian Union would function independent of the Constitution. He further said that the residuary powers would be with the states.

When Mahatma Gandhi was asked as to what kind of freedom he would like India to have, he said that he would like the States to have as much freedom as that of the Centre in functioning. Gandhiji went on to say that the powers of the states should be wide just as the base of the temple tower and the powers of the Centre should be limited like the top of the tappered tower. He wanted the States to have as much powers as required without affecting the unity of the Country. But today the Centre is all powerful. Even a legislation enacted by a State Assembly needs the assent of the President to become law. The leftists are soar about the need to have the permission of the Centre to enact laws in the fields of economy and agriculture. I can pael off from my memory a resolution passed by the Karnataka Congress Party in 1972. The resolution said:

> The Congress Party will fight in a determined mannir for State autonomy, for greater autonomy and will also fight all discriminations and the step-motherly treatment by the Centre

This is what even the Congress Party in Karnataka felt.

Sir, the late Shri K. Kamaraj who is regarded by one and all, had expressed his opinion in favour of calling a meeting of all Chief Ministers to review the Centre-State relation. T.T.K. also sought amendment to the Constitution to give more powers to the States. Rajaji said that because of the temptation of the people at the Centre to arrogate powers unto themselves, the States are reduced to the level of municipalities. Political stalwarts like Rajaji, T.T.K., Santhanam, P. Ramamurthy and Namboodhripad demanded more powers to the States. But the Centre has been silent on this matter. Here I would like to refer to Mr. V. P. Singh, He was in the saddle only for a short time. He gave lot of concessions to the states. He came close to the policy of our party in saying that even a single slice of bread should be shared with the brethren-states. But as good ones do not last long, Mr. V. P. Singh's government was toppled soon.

I fail to understand why the Centre wants so much powers? It seems there is no limit to being greedy. The Centre has Defence, External Affairs, Railways National Highways, Ports, Civil Aviation, Posts and Telegraphs, Currency, Foreign Exchange, Reserve

Bank, Lottery, Banks, Insurance, Import, Export, Mines, Company Tax, Oil, Censor, Income Tax, higher education and so on with it. In addition all the residual powers are with the states. There are 161 subjects under State list, 66 under the Union list and 47 under the Concurrent list. In actuality, the concurrent list is also for the centre. Because, if a state legislature enacts a law on a subject under the Concurrent list and subsequently if the Centre enacts another law on that very subject, the law enacted by the State becomes null and void. This is all the power a States has on a subject under the Concurrent list. I would like to lay my hands on the achievements of the Centre during its long innings with sky-high power. Today, in India, 47 per cent of the population is illiterate and 40 per cent live below the poverty line. About 10 Crores of people are unemployed. This all the Centre has achieved.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, expressing concern over the weight of powers the Centre struggled to hold, Dr. Anna said that the Centre would not be able to function effectively because of this centralisation of powers. That has turned out to be true. States could not develop industrially. In Tamilnadu, if there is any sign of some industrial growth, it is because of the long struggle by D.M.K. Because of the efforts and struggle of our party, Lignite Mines of Neyveli and Ordnance Factory and BHEL in Trichi were set up. That is why Shri K. Kamaraj told Dr. Anna once; 'Do not oppose me and try to finish me politically. But make us of me in getting more plans and industries for Tamil Nadu.'

My Friend Mr. Palaniyandi also knows this.

SHRI M. PALANIYANDI: Nayveli Lignite Mines came during the time of Shri Kamraj.

[*The Vice-Chairman (Shri Bhaskar Annaji Masodkar)* in the Chair]

SHRI J. S. RAJU: I don't deny it. But it seems you haven't understood me. Shri Kamaraj told Dr. Anna not to oppose him but to make use of him to bring more industries to Tamilnadu.... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Now you conclude.

SMT. JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, it is a wrong.. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI J. S. RAJU: Sir, I wish to remind one more thing. Shri Kamaraj once said that he was afraid that the centre might distintegrate the country even before Dr. Anna carved out Dravidasthan. To that extent the south was neglected. For example, to set up a Gas Cylinders Industry, the capital required is Rs. 10 lakhs. But the licence for setting up this industry has to be given by the Centre. But Shri Tiwari once said that this would not come under Small Scale Industries.

Sir, we have a Planning Commission. (*Time bell rings*) Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I will conclude soon.

We have a Planning Commission. It pokes its nose in every matter concerning the States. Referring to the Planning Commission Pandit Jawahar lal Nehru said, 'It has turned out to be a parallel Government which I never expected! The Planning Commission intervenes in every field and the States are in a pitiable plight to accept the order of the Commission. I want to say one thing with a sense of anguish. Today the Centre is sandwiched between two parallel governments. On one side there is Planning Commission and on the other side there are black money holders running another parallel government.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to make clear the stand of our party on this Resolution, We are all

[Shri J. S. Raju]

for the sovereignty and integrity of the Country. But the Constitution has to be amended to have a federal set up both, in letter and spirit. Because of Centralisation of Powers, States have become puppets in the hands of the Centre. In the name of integration Centre should not usurp the powers of States. Because of the new economic policy the Centre has assumed more powers which the makers of Constitution never envisaged. This has created genuine concern in the minds of the States. As it is, the States have to come to the Centre with begging bowls. This new economic policy will only worsen the condition of States.

Sir, price rise is the result of the wrong policies of the Centre. But the States have to bear the brunt. When I say this I am reminded of Mr. V. P. Naik, the former Chief Minister of Maharashtra who condemned the Centre for price-rise. He said the misconceived policies of the Centre regarding Cement, Sugar, Clothes and such items result in price rise but the States could feel only helpless without any power to bring down the price.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I will make few suggestions and conclude.

We need not indulge in semantic-nairsptil like, more autonomy or full autonomy. All that the D.M.K. wants is a federation in the real sense of the term. There should be total autonomy to States. Income tax should be shifted to State list from Union List. Articles 256 and 257 of the Constitution which give anormous powers to the Centre to direct the States should be annuled. Also Articles 341 and 342 that give powers only to the Centre for inclusion of more Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in the list should be annuled. It is dangerous that the President should have the power regarding the declaration of Official Languges of the Union. One day under this power he can also say that English has been removed as an associate link language. All the languages listed in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution should be declared official languages. Till that time English should continue to be the associate link language. Subjects like Defence, External Affairs, Inter-State Transport and Currency should be shared with the federal States. In India State Governments have been dismissed umpteen number of times by the Centre. This power should also be taken away from the Centre. Under this Article D.M.K. Government was dismissed in Tamilnadu twice. It was like an arrow shot at a spotted-deer. We are in the plight of that deer.

.... (*Interruptions*) ....

By shouting and having guffaw truth cannot be hidden... (*Interruptions*) ....

AN HON. MEMBER: It may happen to them also sometime or the other.... (*Interruptions*) ....

SHRI J. S. RAJU: During your own rule you have dismissed many State Governments. But I don't have time to reply to Mrs. Jayanthi Natarajan.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): That is all. Now finish.

SHRI J. S. RAJU: So, if you try to pooh-pooh a just demand, the States will have no option but to demand separation. With these words I Conclude.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I object very strongly. Sir, you did not hear what he said. (*Interruptions*). Sir, he has delivered a threat to the House that unless their demands are accepted,... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI J. S. RAJU: Madam, it is the history throughout the world.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN:..We will have no choice but to secede. That is what he has said.

SHRI J. S. RAJU: Wrongly understood. I cannot help you.

SHRI T. A. MOHAMMED SAQHY: The Member is misleading the House. Asking for more powers is not..... (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please resume your seat.

*SHRI J. S. RAJU: I want this to go on record. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru once said that if the States do not find any progress even 10 years after Independence, they shall be free to secede from the Union.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Just look at what he is saying. In the Council of States he says they will secede.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Nothing is going on record.

SHRI J. S. RAJU: †

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please sit down. Shri Moturu Hanumantha Rao.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, I am on a point of order. Please remove those words from the record. Can you allow those words to go on the record of the Council of States?

SHRI T. A. MOHAMMED SAQHY: It is a Private Member's Bill. We are given a chance. You can use your turn to highlight it.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: That does not mean he can say whatever he likes. (*Interruptions*). Tamil Nadu is suffering because of people like them.

*English translation of the remark made in Tamil.

†Not recorded.

AN HON. MEMBER: Panditji has never said like that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please sit down. Now let us listen to Mr. Hanumantha Rao. (*Interruptions*). Let me know the actual words.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir what is there to look into the record? Please give me a ruling.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): I will look into it.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Is it parliamentary? Is such a thing allowed to go on record?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): I do not think there is anything unparliamentary about it.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Do you mean that he can be allowed to secede?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): I still assure you that I will look into the record. (*Interruptions*).

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): Sir, if there is a word 'secession', naturally, it will have to go out of the record. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): I will look into the record. (*Interruptions*).

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA: Sir, I want to submit... (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Dr. Saikia, let me deal with her point of order.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, it is a complete* that Nehru Ji ever said like that. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI T. A. MOHAMMED SAQHY: Sir, the words* is unparliamentary. It must be expunged. (*Interruptions*). The word* is unparliamentary. It should be expunged. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): I will see the record. As far as the word 'secession' is concerned, I don't think it is unparliamentary. If there is anything more, I will find out.

SHRI VITHALBHAI M. PATEL: But Nehru never said it. He has put it in the mouth of Nehru. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): I will see the record. But if you go merely by the word 'secession', it is not unparliamentary.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, I would like to place my strong objection to that word being used. (*Interruptions*). I come from that State.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Several Members express strongly. This is a way of expression.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, I merely want to record my strong objection. I come from the State of Tamil Nadu. I hang my head in shame that somebody from that State used that word in context with my State. It is a shame. I denounce it and I strongly condemn it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): That you can do. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I stand to support Dr. Nagen Saikia's resolution in regard to setting up of a Commission to enquire into the urges of the people of various States. Now it is not really necessary if the Central Government was to take serious lessons out of our own experiences. We need not go to Soviet Union or Yugoslavia. In India we have got enough experience. In fact while recognising the States and various nationalities in our country, the Founding Fathers of the Constitution have provided for States' autonomy. It is called the Union of States and the Central Government as well as the State Governments are called the Governments. So that recognition was there and that autonomy was also there. But in practice it was seen that more and more centralisation was practicised and more and more authoritarianism was exercised in place of autonomy. That is exactly why an appeal has come from various States and democratic forces that there should be an amendment to the Constitution itself giving greater authority to the elected Governments of the States and also to see that all those rights which were alreday there are put into practice. So in that case, really speaking, this resolution is not necessary if they were to take seriously the past experiences. They did not take it seriously. On the other hand, of course, the Sarkaria Commission was set up. It exercised for five years and produced a document of recommendations and those recommendations, of course, did not concede the question of amending the Constitution. But still in practice, so many suggestions were made and they were to be implemented. This Government did not even respect those recommendations. For instance, article 356 is there. In fact, it should not have been there in the Constitution itself. It was taken as an exceptional clause in case the nation is in danger and an emergency of such a nature is there. But it is very frequently used in order to override the elected Governments of the States. The Central Government was making use of this article in an authoritarian way. That is exactly why an amendment of the Constitution was necessary. The Sarkaria Commission did

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

not concede it, but they had suggested other means. Those means were also not implemened in practice. Recently some States were brought under President's rule by means of applying Article 356. All these things are happening. This is exactly why it is all the more necessary now that we should set up a commission in order to collect the views of various State Governments as well as the democratic forces. These things are to be attended to immediately according to Dr. Nagen Saikia's Resolution and I fully endorse that such a commission should be there. On behalf of my party I support it, but it should also be brought to the notice of our country how things are developing in Punjab, Kashmir, Assam and in so many other States. As various separatist tendencies are developing on a large scale in all the States, we must seriously attend to what to do and what the way out is. These things have developed because the Central authority sitting in Delhi was exercising their authoritarianism and they were more and more concentrating power in their hands. In regard to financial resources of the States also they were behaving very badly. The financial resources of the States were usurped by the Central Government. By means of administrative prices they were just denying the share of the States from these resources. They were also denying the authority to the States to develop, and augment their own resources. They have to tax the resources that were there in regard to mines etc. That authority was denied to the States. All these things had come to stay and they were the conditions under which so much of dissatisfaction had grown up among the States.

It is a perversionist idea that because separatist forces are taking advantage of the dissatisfaction which has developed in various States, we are pleading for a strong Centre. We can plead and we should plead naturally for a strong Centre, but with strong State being there. This coexistence was advocated by means of our Constitution. It is not taken into cognisance at all. That is exactly the evil development which has been there, which has prompted these forces to take advantage of the situation and mislead the people to various separatist tendencies. So precisely what we require at this moment is in order to satisfy the people who are urging for their own autonomous rights we have to set up a commission and see that whatever recommendations of the commission are there, they are implemented. That is exactly why an opportunity for setting up a commission has arisen and I hope that the Government, if at all it is serious, will do so. The constitutional amendment also is necessary. There is no use of denying that. If there is an external emergency, I can understand that the entire country is in danger. Under such circumstances we can exercise emergency powers, but making us of this Article 356, in order to get rid of unwanted State Governments, by the Central Government is not at all desirable.

4.00 P.M.

so, a constitutional amendment is necessary and other advices are also to be taken into consideration. In order to draw the opinion of a large section of our people, democratic forces in various States, I think, Dr. Saikia's Resolution would be helpful. I hope that my hon. friend and Minister, Mr. Jacob, will see all these experiences. To control all the States, they are going out of our way, out of our thinking So, if we allow them to develop in the same direction, disintegration would certainly be there.

In order to prevent any disintegration coming up, in order to prevent these separatist forces making the use of the dissatisfaction of the people of various States, it is urgently to be attended to. That is why exactly the Commission is necessary and with this opinion I support Dr. Saikia's Resolution.

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, while supporting this Resolution of Dr. Saikia, I would like to add that the days of partition and attainment of freedom were the days when the Second World War concluded and were the days of much influence of the Russian Revolution and there was a great depression. On the other hand, our Constitution makers were with the Oxford and Edinburgh background. It gave scope to think that a strong Centre was warranted to protect the country's integrity. So, in the Constitution itself enormous powers were bestowed on the Centre at the cost of the State Governments. Much water has flowed down the Ganges since then and a lot of political changes took place in the meantime.

Nowadays, people sitting at the helm of affairs cannot be compared with those of the earlier times. When the late Jawaharlal Nehru was the Prime Minister, Dr. B. C. Roy happened to be the Chief Minister of West Bengal. Dr. B. C. Roy himself challenged the introduction of corporate tax in the court of law. But the relation between Jawaharlal Nehru and B C. Roy never became strained, though Dr. B. C. Roy was championing the cause of the States. Now, pigmies are sitting in high places. Contrary to the rule of Jawaharlal Nehru, when Mrs. Indira Gandhi came to power the process of destabilising the States started. They destabilised not only the non-Congress ruled States but also their own Governments. In several places the Chief Ministers were being appointed by the Centre in Delhi according to their fancies. Some chiefs went to State capitals to choose a particular person as the Chief Minister contrary to the wishes of the elected Legislators of their own party. Thereby the regional leaderships were destabilised and weakened. When Mr. Brahmananda Reddy was the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, contrary to the wishes of the then Legislators, the present Prime Minister was appointed as the Chief Minster and later it led to some agitation and other things.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Why are you saying all this?

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: This is all part of history.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM (Andhra Pradesh): This is all part of the history of Andhra Pradesh. Why are you so fussy about these things?

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: How do you know? You are not in the party. How do you know what the Congress(I) Legislators felt at that time?

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Madam, you don't know the history of Andhra Pradesh. I will tell you that Shri Uma Shankar Dikshit was sent over there.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I would like to know from where you got this information.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: This is the information published in the newspapers.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Ah! Newspaper reports!

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Why? These are part of the history. These are written in the history books.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: This is the history of Telugu Desam. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Dr. Sivaji, please continue. (*Interruptions*).

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: This is the decision of the Congress party. (*Interruptions*). They are entering into quarrel. What can I do?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Now nobody will disturb you. She will not disturb you.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: This is the fact that... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Present Prime Minister was the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I know that. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: You have forgotten all the history. (*Interruptions*).

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: But you are talking about. ... (*Interruptions*).

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA: Newspapers always supply material to write history. Academic class also... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: If you have different facts, you tell us. (*Interruptions*).

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: These facts are wrong. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: This is not right. Ultimately... (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Let us not have cross-conversation. Dr. Sivaji, please continue.

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: Not only that, during the short tenure of Mr. P. V. Narasimha Rao as the Chief Minister, he got a dubious distinction of having made maximum trips to Delhi. In less than a year, it appears, he had made nearly a hundred trips to Delhi to get orders from Delhi. This is how the State Governments are being run. Sir, that is how people get us into power.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: That is how Mr. Rama Rao also could sit there as Chief Minister. (*Interruptions*).

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: Sir, during 1978-83 at least, five Chief Ministers were changed. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: Why are they so concerned about the centralisation and authoritarian rule? We are pleading for States' autonomy. What is wrong with that? Why do you go against such things?

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: He is talking about the Prime Minister. Otherwise I am not getting up. I am sitting quiet all the time.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA (Uttar Pradesh): You mean we should not talk about the Prime Minister? (*Interruption*).

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: He was not talking in correct fashion. (*Interruptions*).

DR. YELMANCHILI SIVAJI: Can you tell me what has happened in the Congress Legislature Party? If you are aware... (*Interruptions*).

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I will tell you the correct facts. Nobody was imposed upon the legislators. They decided on their own. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: This is the greatest travesty of our history. All the Chief Ministers were made here in Delhi and they were un-made here in Delhi. These are the facts. That is the fact which everybody knows. (*Interruptions*). There are midnight Chief

[Shri Mentay Padmanabham]

Ministers. During midnight Congress High Command used to take decision and impose Chief Ministers on the States. There are midnight Chief Ministers. (*Interruptions*).

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Why are they in opposition in Andhra Pradesh now? (*Interruptions*)

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: In 1978 Dr. Chenna Reddy got elected as the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh. He got 175 seats in the Assembly. But soon after Shrimati Indira Gandhi came to power—up to that the Government went on smoothly—but as soon as she came to power he was asked to resign. The funniest part of this is that he was called to Delhi and was asked to resign during August-September, 1980. But somehow what happened? We don't know. Somebody prevailed on the then High Command and a telephone call went to the airport. Dr. Chenna Reddy was contacted at Hyderabad airport. from the Prime Minister's residence. He was asked to stay for a week or so. Within a week Dr. Chenna Reddy completed the question of reference and others and he went out of office. Later Mr. Anjaiah the then Minister at the Centre, was called to Andhra Pradesh. Even without being in the Assembly he was elected as the Chief Minister and the leader. Mr. Anjaiah's tenure lasted for a while. He did not continue for long. After that Mr. B. Venkata Rao, was made the Chief Minister. He was there for five to six months. Mr. Vijaya Bhaskar Reddy, the present Law Minister was asked to be the Chief Minister of Andhra. He was there for another three months or so. All these things happened in one year, that is, in 1983. It was only after that, Telugu Desam came to power. This is how the State Governments are being treated. This is how the Chief Ministers are being treated. Another thing is that the Governors in some States act as *de facto* PCC Presidents. In Andhra Pradesh, we had a lady Governor and the PCC affairs were being managed from her office... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, there is no limit to what they say. They will even talk of the President... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Dr. Sivaji, let us not discuss Governors... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: The National Front removed 11 Governors in one day and now they are taking about us... (*Interruptions*)...

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: The ex-Governor of Andhra Pradesh is now looking after the affairs of the PCC women's wing at Hyderabad. She is settling scores with the warring factions. Is this the dignity of a Governor? Is the Governor required to act as an arbitrator?... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please, Dr. Sivaji, let us not discuss Governors... (*Interruptions*)...

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: The point is that such people should not be appointed as Governors... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Mr. Satyanarayan Reddy, who had torn papers in the well of the House and had insulted me personally, when he can be appointed as the Governor of UP, why cannot she be the Governor of Andhra Pradesh? ... (*Interruptions*)...

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA: Sir, I am on a point of order... (*Interruptions*)... Mrs. Natarajan, referred to Mr. Satyanarayan Reddy, and she has made certain derogatory remarks against him. Since, Mr. Reddy is not in the House, it is not nice of us to take his name here... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Dr. Sivaji can say whatever he likes... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): I will look into the records. If anything is to be removed, I will do it. ... (*Interruptions*)...

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: Sir, I did not mention anybody's name. I just referred to a lady Governor... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I too will not mention any name and just refer to the Governor of UP... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Lady or no lady, that does not make any difference. Please, let us not discuss Governors... (*Interruptions*).

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: That does not mean that all lady Governors would behave like that. I hope, when Mrs. Jayanthi Natarajan is appointed as Governor, she will be have in a more dignified manner... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: She is all right as Vice-Chairman... (*Interruptions*)...

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: I am sure even as Governor she will remain neutral... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Now, please let us not discuss these things. You can continue with your speech... (*Interruptions*)...

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: The office of the Governor should not be used as a spying agent of the Union Government against the State Governments. It is giving rise to so much of friction between the Union Government and the State Governments. The political scenario is fast changing in the country. Those days are gone when the same party was ruling both at the Centre and in the States. Now several non-Congress Governments are functioning in States like Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, West Bengal and several other States. But if the Union Government acts in a way which is against the interests of the State Government, to gain some political advantage, I am very much afraid that it might challenge and endanger the integration of the country. As far as the resources are concerned, the resources at the disposal of the State Governments are meagre and they are not elastic. But resources at the disposal of the Union Government are enormous. Not only that, they have got the advantage of resorting to deficit financing and printing more currency notes in the Government press with frequent extra shifts in the mint. With an enormous fund at its disposal, the Union Government is trying to twist the arms of the State Governments by not sanctioning them the necessary amonut or by not releasing the due share to them. This is endangering the unity and creating friction between the State Governments and the Central Government. The Sarkaria Commission had made certain recommendations and in the Inter-State Council also, 18 of them were accepted and even though they were accepted, a lot of presure had to be made to execute the same and implement them. However, it appears that the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission are not enough to solve the problems between the Central and the State Governments. So, it is now high time to appoint another commission to study the problems in depth so that a favourable solution could be arrived at and the country may not disintegrate giving rise to regional imbalances and allowing the regional forces to come up and take over the supreme position.

SHRI HIPHEI (Mizoram): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I used to restrain myself not to speak because I am not a very good speaker. I thought it would be better for me to listen to the speeches of other hon. Members speaking on different subjects. But today, on this subject, I would like to express some of my view-points because this is a very important resolution. This has been a controversial one for the last so many years and it is a debatable one. If you ask me whether there should be more autonomy for my State, my quick reply would be 'yes'. But if a deeper and a sincere thought is applied in a wider sense, I have to say, 'no' because our country is a unique and a different type of country. It is full of diversities and differences. When the Constitution-framers framed our Constitution, the Union Powers Committee gave its report on 5th July, 1947 to the President of the Constituent Assembly, they declared that the soundest framework of our Constitution should be a federal structure with a strong Centre. A federal State but with a very strong Centre. They had recommended a very strong Centre in order to hold the country together, full of diversities and differences. I have heard many speakers in support of the Resolution saying that more autonomy will bring a better national integration. This, Sir, I doubt. I would like to give one simple example. Today the Jammu and Kashmir State enjoys the best constitutional provisions, the highest constitutional provisions. Are the people of Jammu and Kashmir happy? Are they content with the present provisions they are enjoying? The answer is obvious. So we cannot say that more autonomy will bring a better national integration. Some others said to give more economic powers to the States. Today the economic powers of the States are too meagre. So they are agitating; there are separatist movements, agitationist movements, secessionist movements, due to want of more economic powers. If this is correct, we could have peace and tranquility in the Punjab State. The Punjab State had been once one of the most envied States in India economically. But today it is the most troubled State. So we cannot say that more economic powers to the States will solve this problem. Let us take another example. Among the seven sister States of north eastern India Assam was the most advanced and prosperous State. But today Assam is the most troubled State in north-eastern India. So giving more economic powers to the States will not solve our problem. What we need is a very strong Centre and a strong Centre is also considered necessary not only to protect the independence of the country, to preserve the integrity and unity of the country, but also to coordinate political action between the Union and the States on basic issues of national concern. We need a very strong Government at the Centre to hold the country together. That will be able to hold the country together. That is the need of the hour today. We cannot say that more power will bring national integration. My only fear is that if more power is given to the States, there would be more disparities between States and States. Now we have seven special category States in India which are solely dependent upon the Centre. If more powers are given to all the States, there could be great disparities between the rich and the poor States. Another point is that in every State we have minority groups, poorer sections of the people. If more power is given to the States, the minorities in those States have to suffer. For example, the Balwantrai Mehta Committee had recommended decentralisation of powers to the Panchayat institutions two decades ago. But none of the States is willing to implement that recommendation. They do not like to give more powers to the lower institutions nor like to part with powers, and they do not like to give

more powers to the village-level institutions. So, if more power is given to the States, the minorities will have to remain dominated by the dominant groups of those States. Where will they go? The State has the sole power. Where will they take their grievances? They have to take their grievances to the Central Government only which enjoys all the powers. If more power is given to the States we may be required to create more States because the demand for separate States will be there. So, India will have to be divided into many States like the United States of America. Some day you will have to have fifty or hundred States in India because the demand will be greater. We are not going to avoid that. But, Sir, I do not object to having more States in the future. But, as we are today, more power to the States is not feasible. That is my point. I say this because India is a very old nation, but a young country. As a nation, it is very old; but, as country, it is very young. We do not know one another fully. Last time I went to Southern India. They thought that I belonged to some eastern country like Japan, Korea or Thailand! None of the South Indians took me to be an Indian! Not only in Southern India did this happen, but also in Delhi it happened. Here, in Delhi, once I entered a restaurant in Malcha Marg. They asked me to produce by identity card. I thought that for purposes of some tax they were asking for it. But they thought that I belonged to a foreign country.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Mr. Padmanabham, you must listen to him; you must listen to what he is saying.

SHRI HIPHEI: Sir, what happened to me in Southern India happened to me here in Delhi also. Why? Because India is very young. We have to know each other, we have to understand one another's problems. For example, if our children are separated from childhood, in distant places, their love and affection both one another will be reduced. Today, we are a young country. If more autonomy is granted now, then inter-State visits will be less. So, I only say that the time is not yet ripe, this is not the correct time for it. The time for it will come. Now, some speakers are saying that we have to be a really federal State like the United States of America. How can we copy the United States of America? They are very much advanced They elect their President and every elector is responsible for the election of their own President. Today, in India, we cannot practice this kind of federalism because we have to elect our Prime Minister indirectly. So, we cannot copy the United States of America today. The time will come later. First, let our slum-dwellers be educated, let our villagers be educated. Let them read the newspapers. Let them watch the TV programmes first so that they also know who has to be elected. Then only we can copy the federalism of the United States of America. Today, the time is not ripe for that.

Sir, if more power is given to the States, the power of Parliament will be reduced. Today, for any problem in an particular State, the Central Government and the Home Ministry are blamed. Many questions have been asked by the hon. Members as to why this is done, why is this not done. This morning also, there was a question about Kesari Dal. Three States are not banning this Dal. And for this, the Agriculture Ministry is blamed. But this is within the purview of the States. How can we blame the Central Government? This is not within their purview.

Sir, we have to know India first. What is India today? What are the people of India today? Otherwise, by

[Shri Hiphei]

giving more power to the States, we will never solve our problems.

Sir, now we have the Inter-State Council. I would like to suggest that this can be activised. The recommendations of this Inter-State Council can be implemented. Now, this is being activised by the Home Ministry. The other day, the Home Minister has convened this meeting and they had discussed important matters. So, this will solve some of the problems. Even the Mover of the Resolution has stated that there are many omissions and commissions regarding the implementation of the Constitutional provisions. That only shows that the present Constitution is yet to be implemented properly. If that is the only point, then the Inter-State Council can look after that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please conclude now.

SHRI HIPHEI: So, my only suggestion is that more power will be required for the States some day, but not today. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): The subject is very important as well as serious. The Minister is there. He wants to intervene. Let us listen to him. Thereafter, we will continue. Otherwise, his word will not be available to us.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I was in a way provoked to stand up now and intervene in the course of the debate because with great interest I listened to some of the speeches of our distinguished Members who made some suggestions. Mr. Hiphei was even demanding that there should be 100 States in India, and he was also quoting the United States of America that there are 50 States and so, why have 100 States here.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: So that it can be reduced to districts.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: That shows the importance of the subject and the concern of all of us to see that maximum development takes place all over the country. I am not blaming him for suggesting 100 States...

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: No, it is a smaller States concept.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: We had a history of several hundred States in this country. We had a history of several kings and we had a history of continuous conquests across our borders. Anyone who conqurred India, used to remain in India, and he goes out not at the time when we send him out, but when somebody else comes, and then the first querer goes out. And then the third conquerer comes. I am not unleashing the Indian history now because all of us know what happened during those days in India. It was so because we were divided, because we were smaller, because we never united. Naturally we had to face all these problems in this country. It was, perhaps, the freedom movement that gave a thought to the people of India for the first time that we have to rise and come up to make India together, otherwise again we will be subjected and subjugated and conquerred by other forces in the world. So, our forefathers came to a correct conclusion that we should have a country which should be unparalleled in the world with a vast network of political and democratic institutions. And I am proud when I stand before you to say that our Constitution—you are a Constitutional lawyer and you know— is supposed to be one of the best in the world. It is neither rigid, nor arrogant, nor unwritten. It is a written Constitution flexible Constitution. Our great leader Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru gave a correct direction to the country. Here

is a Constitution which is dynamic, not a static Constitution. And if you want to change anything any time according to the aspirations of the people, you bring about that change. We are fortunate in having a Constitution like this which we have amended several times already, and we can amend it further as and when we feel or the people feel that an amendment is required. So I am proud to be an Indian. In the United States, to which my friend referred, you find people from various nationalities living there, Italians, German, Asians, Japanese, Indian and starting from Englishmen. Even Knnedy was a man from Ireland. So people from various countries flocked in America and they thought themselves as a nation. But you cannot compare India with the United States. India is basically a nation, though somebody tried to make ourselves think that it is a two-nation country, which we discarded. Unfortunately we could not stand the test of that particular moment of history. This is a nation. The best example Prof. Saikia knows because he is also a reader; he has a very good library of his own and he knows the background of India. The historians who came from China, and who came from foreign countries, visited Bengal or Kashmir or South and whenever they did so, they only wrote of it as Indian, not Kashmiri or Bengali or Keralite or Tamilian. That is what Fahian wrote; that is what Huen Tsang wrote. All the records available before us show that we are a one country, one nation and we have maintained our nationality as a nation. This is a major challenge now for which we have made experiments at various times. During the time of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, various States came forward with various suggestions. In the case of Punjab, the Akalis wanted a little more autonomy. People from my friend's, Mr. Saikia's, State also said that more powers should be given to the States.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Would the ladies listen to the Minister? Let them not talk among themselves. Kindly listen to the Minister.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Other States also said that it is necessary. Therefore, in 1983, Mrs. Indira Gandhi decided to appoint a Commission. The Sarkaria Commission was appointed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): I would request the ladies to listen.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: They have not heard you.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Even though my friend, Mr Hanumantha Rao, may not agree with me, I will cite one example. Mr. Dyakov, the famous Communist ideologue, as they say, who wrote a book on India, said that India was a land of different nationalities and that the moment the British went out of India, India would break away into different nations. But, Sir, India has survived as a nation. And it will continue to survive as a nation for hundreds of years. I have no duobt about it. But some indologist who wrote about India...

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: As far as I know, no Soviet indologist had engaged himself in such writings, or, advocated such things. The point is, they were always for a united India. Even Stalin adovcated a united India.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: You can correct me if I am wrong. I am not going to be arrogant in my argument. But I want to point out that it was a written document of Satlin in 1923, wherein he had said that India was a land of different nationalities. And he wrote that after the British went out, India would break into pieces. Dyakov, the theoretician, took the clue from Stalin and wrote the book on India, wherein he said that India was a land of different nationalities and that the moment the British went out, India would break away into different nations.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: Recognition of different nationalities in India is different from dividing India. Different nationalities are there in India, as there are different nationalities in the Soviet Union. Many nationalities are there in India. We must respect their feelings, but India should remain as one nation. That was the idea.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: I am not entering into any arugments now because there is no time. Mr. Nagen Saikia has to give his reply. But the point I am making here is, even those countries, whose theoreticians wrote about India, sitting in those countries, are falling apart into different nations. But India, even today, remains as one nation. We have survived as one nation. This is because India has got a psyche. This is because India has a culture. It is not the religion. It is not the language. It is not the region. It is not these things which constitute India. It is the emotional attachment of a nation. You may call it Hindu philosophy. You may call it Indian psyche. You may call it any way. But the fact remains that Indians feel that they are one wherever they are. When we go out, we do not say that we are Kashmiris, we are Punjabis, we are Keralites; we say that we are Indians. This gives us a feeling of oneness. We want to see how best we can fulfil the aspirations of the people from the different States. According to you, they are nationalities. But I do not accept that term. They are not nationalities. We are a nation of people with linguistic differences, or, other differences, but we are one nation.

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA: The term 'different nationalities' can be used.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: It is all because we are not properly understanding the meaning of this word. When you say 'nationalities', it does not mean 'a separate nation', like India, Pakistan, or, some other nation.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: It has got further connotation. Anyway, I am not going to enter into that argument now. (*Interruptions*). I am prepared to argue it out with you at any place outside the House. I am prepared to listen to your arguments. But I will not accept anything unless I am convinced.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): The Minister is only trying to emphasise the unity of the country.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: I do not accept the theory of nationalities. I do not accept the' two-nation' theory.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: We are trying to see how best the federal structure can be worked. There is no dichotomy in this.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: That is the point I am driving at.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: Will the hon. Minister yield for a moment?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): He has already yielded.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: When we say 'India is a land of different nationalities', it does not mean that India does not remain as a nation. India continues to be a nation, but recognising the fact that various languages, cultures and geographical integrity had been there, even the national movement recognised linguistic States.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nobody denies that.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: But our hon. Minister is denying, that is the trouble. The British Government did not care for this and it suffered. It wanted to divide and create quarrels on the basis of language and it failed. But that was not the method adopted by the Constitu-

tion. The Constitution has taken an altogether different method.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: I think we can debate this subject later on. It is a very good subject. I wanted to give a further thought to this.

So, in spite of differences of language, religion, culture, we wanted to fulfil the aspirations of people from different regions, from different States. Keeping this in mind we arrived at certain modalities. One was, as you know, the setting up of a Planning Commission. This was one of the mechanisms by which you can fulfil the aspirations of the people of the neglected regions. You can see a chapter on regional imbalances in the Second Five Year Plan. Special attention will have to be given to those regions which are found to be neglected regions. Whether we succeeded or not but there is a full chapter on regional imbalances and then it was found that the States are not getting enough financial devolution. A statutory body, not in the Constitution but otherwise, was created to examine how best you can give more money to the States. The Finance Commission came into being and it started this exercise. Even last year when Mr. Salve was the head of the Finance Commision, he gave more funds to the States as compared to the previous years. I still feel that there were opportunities of making further devolution in the course of time. I am not denying the fact that we have to strengthen the States. I support that. The main support of India is the strength of the States and the people of various States. So, I accept this theory. In this context, Dr. Nagen Saikia has sugested appointment of a new Commision to go into the whole question of the devolution. Hhere I would like to draw his attention to the appointment of the Sarkaria Commission which was constituted in 1983, about which I was talking earlier when I went back to the Soviet indologist. This Sarkaria Commission gave its report in 1987. How did they give the report? They contacted all the States, came to various capitals of the States, met the party representatives. I appeared before the Sarkaria Commission in 1984 on behalf of the Indian National Congress. I was one of the two-three representatives who apeared before the Commission and said that these are the requirements. I argued for the State. So, they consulted various political parties, consulted various States and then gave their report in 1987. This report is before the House. This House discussed it in 1988 and Lok Sabha discussed it in 1989. We found that something had to be done about it. That was a general feeling. The recommendations made by the Sarkaria Commission are important. They deal with the legislative aspect, administrative set-up, financial powers including the regional imbalance. All these are very important aspects. This House, in its wisdom, felt that some follow-up action was necessary. The Government accepted and set up an Inter-State Council. That Inter-state Council, after deliberations in various meetings, decided that this aspect will have to be gone into deeper and deeper and so, let us have a sub-committee of the Inter-State Council. So a sub-committee was constituted. That sub-committee is, even now, having that exercise. It met about a month ago and it is again going to meet very shortly. This Council has representatives of various States and "State" means in different political parties. In India today, almost all the major political parties are running one State or the other. Some political parties might not have come to power in a State so far, but that doesn't bar them; they are also taken into account. So, a good representative group sits at it and analyses one issue after another. So, I am only trying to trace the developments and our anxiety to see that India remains as one and how we can correct the imbalances which are existing in various parts of the country, whether it is north-east, south, west or centre. For this purpose, I am of the opinion that the Inter-State Council and the

[Shri M. M. Jacob]

sub-committee would come back to us with their recommendations. Till then, Prof. Saikia should not ask this House to have another Commission now but let us wait for the report of that Commission. It has had a long-time experiment. from 1983 onwards. We have spent almost eight years at various stages. Now if we go in for a new Commission, we will have to wait for another 10 years for the report and various stages of the report.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: May I ask one question?

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Yes.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: In spite of all the recommendations being there, you never respected them in regard to the appointment of Governors and in regard to dismissal of State Governments. So you are going your own way.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: This Government was looking at it and, probably, we were very, very—I must say—honest and upright before you. We never dismissed the Governors the moment we came to power. We never did it.

SHRI MISA R. GANESAN: We are not on any party Governments as such here. We are on the Central Government. That's all. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI M. M. JACOB: He said "Governors."

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: I said "Governors."... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. M. JACOB: When Mr. P. V. Narasimha Rao assumed office, we did not go hunting after the Governors. We wanted some basic. important, things to be delivered to the people here. Price rise was there; that was one major challenge. Our financial structure was in jeopardy; that had to be corrected. Our economic difficulties were there; people like our Finance Minister here, Mr. Rameshwar Thakur, wanted to see how best our financial management could be improved. Our concerns are positive and not negative. We are not hunting after Governors at the moment. So, I am only saying this.

The point before us is, our nation is really a very important nation, and it is important only because of willing cooperation and participation of the people of this great country of ours. So let us not destroy this nation. We have got several challenges to face now. Many countries are not happy with our rise: when other countries are breaking into pieces, why not India break up too? Many people abroad dream of a day when they could see India shattered, because other countries are breaking up. But we don't want to see that happen here. No Indian would like that to happen here. So the only answer is, correct our mistakes, as Dr. Saikia has said. I agree to it—correcting our mistakes by revision, by periodical reviews, by constant discussions and dialogues. Let us make any Constitutional change when we find it necessary.

Mr. Saikia also mentioned about neglect of Assam and all that. Rajiv Gandhi, our late Prime Minister, was gracious enough even to remove our duly elected Chief Minister and the Government of the Congress Party and go in for an election and make your Governmet come to power. Then the Assam Accord was signed. You said, the Foreigners Act must be amended; it was amended. You said. the IMDT Act must be amended; it was amended. You said, an economic package must be given; that package was given. What else did we not do? We did everything posible for a Government—honestly we did it. If there was anything that was not possible, again Mr. Narasimha Rao called a special meeting when Mr. Saikia came here with the Assam officers and the political leadership to see to the rest of the things.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: He said, "If there is anything to be implemented in Assam, let us implement it right now". So, he hastened it up. He had the strength to do so. So, Sir, I have only one request to make to Dr. Saikia now.

SHRI BHADRESWAR BURAGOHAIN (Assam): Till today no action has been taken to implement on the accord by the Union Government. Nothing has been done on the economic front. You are always sermonising us. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI BIJOYA CHAKRAVARTY (Assam): Sir, a point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): What is your point of order? Mr. Hon. Minister, there is a point of order.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: A point of order? You want me to answer about the entire Assam Accord. I am prepared to answer it, but not now.

SHRIMATI BIJOYA CHAKRAVARTY: Only half a minute, Sir. The Resolution of Dr. Saikia is not regarding Assam. It is about the Centre-State relations and grant of more autonomy to the Staes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): There is no point of order.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: For almost 15 minutes Dr. Saikia was mentioning various points about neglect of Assam. I was trying to refer to those points exclusively for Dr. Saikia because I have a great amount of respect for him. He is a very learned person. So, I thought that I should not leave him out.

Sir, with this, at this stage, I conclude with a request to Dr. Saikia to consider withdrawal of his Resolution because we are taking care of those points which he mentioned here.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): I think, looking to the time and the list of speakers, unless I hear Mr. Saikia. this Resolution will lapse. So, Dr. Saikia. what is your view? You can put it within four minutes.

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to the Members who have participated in the debate on the Resolution that I moved on 29-11-91 in the House. Those who are not in favour of giving more autonomy to the States, opposed the Resolution, and those who are in favour of it, supported it. Therefore, there is a vertical division. Those who have opposed, I think, have failed to read the writings on the wall on the present day. Moreover, they have failed very badly to gauge the hopes and aspirations. the feelings of negligence and deprivation of the people almost in every State. They tried to see the whole Resolution with a presumption that if more autonomy would be given to the States, the nation would be disintegrated and that it would be deterimental the whole nation. Moreover, they have tried to advocate strongly for a strong Centre. They have a wrong notion that it would weaken the Centre, and that there may be even a foreign threat to the nation.

Mr. S. S. Ahluwalia tried to equate giving powers to the panchayati raj institutions with autonomy of the States. His basic stand is on a quite wrong footing because the powers proposed to be given to the panchayati raj institutions during the time of the hon. Prime Minister, late Rajiv Gandhi, were meant for a strong Centre because the Centre, through that proposal, desired to have direct contact with the panchayats over the head of the States. It was a step to curtail even the minimum autonomy enjoyed by the States. At this stage of civilisation, the people cannot be fooled in this way.

[Dr. Nagen Saikia]

I should not go into the points made by Ahluwalia Saheb in detail because there is no time for that now.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): You make up your mind on what you want to do.

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA: In my speech, Sir, at the time of introduction...

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Are you going to press for the Resolution. or are you withdrawing it?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): No, he is not withdrawing. Only one minute is there.

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA: Two minutes are there. I will finish quickly.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: There can be no more discussion on this Resolution now.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): You go ahead.

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA: Hon. Members, Dr. Ratnakar Pandey and others, also spoke. Dr. Ratnakar Pandey, of course, supported the Resolution with some reservation. Some Congress Members also supported it partially. All the Members of the Opposition have supported the Resolution wholeheartedly, and I am very much thankful to them.

Gandhiji said, "India is one in many and many in one." I always feel that recognising of these many in one and giving their dues, proper dues, and power to these many, will keep India one and united. When I moved this Resolution. in my speech I said, "To remove a sense of. feelings of secessionism or feelings of partisanship, we shall have to give more autonomy to the States. Otherwise, those feelings will grow up. It will disintegrate the country. It will be deterimental to the whole nation". So, as an Indian, as a true Indian. I feel that it is high time that we think of the matter and take some steps to give more autonomy to the States.

As there is no time and the hon. Minister has stated that he would consider my views in future, once more I want to emphasise that the recommendations made by the Sarkaria Commission are not quite adequate to meet the demands of the present time. As the Minister has said that he would go into its details and would consider my Resolution, with this hope that the Government would come with a Bill to remove the inadequacies that have been found in the Sarkaria Commission's Report, I withdraw the Resolution.

5.00 P.M.

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

CLARIFICATIONS ON THE STATEMENT MADE BY RE: ALLEGED RAPE OF HARIJAN WOMAN BY POLICE IN LAKHIMPUR KHERI, UTTAR PRADESH.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Shri Satya Prakash Malaviya. Not here.

DR. NARREDDY THULASI REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): In the Statement there are five main events. The incident took place on 22nd October. On the same day a criminal case was registered at Police Station Kotwali, Lakhimpur against Shri Badlu, the father of the girl, 18 other named persons and 3-4 unknown persons. On 11th November, a case was registered against Constable Taj Mohammad, Constable Krishna Pal Singh, Mustafa and eight other persons on the report of Shrimati Dhura. On 15th November Mustafa was arrested and on 18th November other two constables were arrested. These are the main five events in the Statement. My doubts are as follows. On 22nd October at what time Constable Krishna Pal Singh and Mustafa had dinner at Village Taparpurwa. Time