

recommendation of the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha do agree to nominate one member from Rajya Sabha to associate with the Committee on Public Accounts of the Lok Sabha for the unexpired portion of the term of the Committee *vice* Shri Kalpnath Rai who ceased to be a member of the Committee on his appointment as a Minister of State, and do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may direct, one member from among the members of the House to serve on the said Committee."

The question was put and the motion was adopted,

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON CENTRE-STATE RELATIONS— Contd.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now the Minister of Home Affairs is here; we will have the reply and then go for the special mentions.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI BUTA SINGH): Hon. Deputy Chairman, I must express my sincere thanks to the hon. Members who have participated in this very important debate. The subject matter is of great importance from the national point of view and the hon. Members have given their valuable suggestions, apart from some of the political comments mainly persuaded by their compulsions of body politic. By and large, the debate has been in keeping with the importance of the subject. As I said in the beginning of this debate, in my opening remarks, Government has an open mind on the recommendations of the Commission and would examine them impartially taking into consideration all the view points that are expressed by hon. Members of Parliament, State Governments and other important persons in all walks of life including the various political parties. As I said in my observations the attitude of the

Government towards the recommendations of the Commission is one of open-mindedness and also trying to see the viewpoints of all the political parties. I must say that the Commission has done a yeoman service to the country.

It is not a Commission in the narrow sense of the term. They have tried to include in their study the viewpoints of all the political organisations, intellectuals, academicians, professionals, Governments and all those who were willing, to offer their valuable suggestions to the Commission. They had a very extensive and indepth study of this vital issue affecting the life of the nation. I myself appeared before the Commission. Most of the stalwarts of different political parties appeared before the Commission. The Commission while interviewing the various personalities and various representatives was very accommodative. The Commission comprised of eminent jurists and other high personages who gave opportunity to everyone whosoever wanted to appear before the Commission. The members of the Commission made suggestions of, which the persons who appeared before the Commission could think in depth and respond to the queries made by the Commission.

The Commission also circulated a questionnaire, a very comprehensive questionnaire, all over the country to all concerned and got their replies in writing. The Commission also solicited the opinion of the various State Governments, whether the Governments were ruled by the same party which was ruling at the Centre or by other political parties. The Commission had the considered opinion of all the political shades in our country. Not only that. After the receipt of the recommendations of the Commission, we also have referred the document, the report of the Commission, to the relevant parties and

[Shri Buta Singh]

the concerned for so that even if the Commission had gone into the detailed memoranda given by the respective parties, organisations and institutions, these people can see how-much of their viewpoints has been covered, how much of it has not been covered and is left to be pondered over after the report is given to the Government. We have given time to these institutions and political bodies to renet upon the report of the Commission and come back with their response, if they want to. We have written to all the State Governments. As I reported to this august House, only nine State Governments have so far reported to us their viewpoints. We expect that the other State Governments will also respon^ to the queries made on the report that have been sent for their consideration.

Therefore, the whole exercise indicates one thing. Not only that we have an open mind. I do not know why Chaturananji describes us as people without a mind. But I think we have a mind at least, a mind to receive. But Chaturananji has to say very cleverly...

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र (बिहार) : हमारा कंट्रिब्यूट था कि जहाँ आप जाते हैं, वहाँ कंट्रोवर्सी खड़ी कर देते हैं। उस सेंस में हमने कहा था। ... (व्यवधान) जहाँ जाइयेगा, कंट्रोवर्सी खड़ी कर दीजिएगा, तो क्या कहेंगे ?

श्री बूटा सिंह : कंट्रोवर्सी तो उसी के ऊपर होगी ना जिसके दिमाग में कुछ होगा जिसके दिमाग में ही कुछ नहीं होगा उसके ऊपर क्या कंट्रोवर्सी होगी ।
He will be a log of wood like you. There will be an controversy. Therefore, only a mind which vibrates gets a controversy. A mind which does not vibrate, which does not send signals, which does not receive signals; how can there be a controversy on such a mind?

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHIL
You can say something and get expunged.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I am only ei joying what you said.

SHRI MURLIDHAR; CHANDRA KANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra; Controversy is the very heart c democracy.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Controversy is one thing which keeps the diaiogn alive. I welcome his remarks, bu only as one of my colleagues, Shri Jagesh Desai, said while participating in the debate.

हमारे चतुरानन जी को जहाँ सूट करता है वह कोटेशन पढ़ देते हैं और जहाँ सूट नहीं करता है, वहाँ नहीं पढ़ते हैं। अपने भाषण में कांग्रेस जनों के बारे में उन्होंने कहा। खैर मैं तो उतना चतुर नहीं हूँ जितना चतुरानन जी हैं, न ही मैं इतना विद्वान हूँ। लेकिन मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह पैरा खाली कांग्रेसमैन के बारे में नहीं है। कांग्रेसमैन के बारे में उन्होंने यह कहा कि शुरू-शुरू में उनके ऊपर स्वतंत्रता संग्राम का असर था, वे लोग परिश्रमी थे, उनको अनुभव था, वे बहुत विशाल हृदय के थे। तो उनमें खाली कांग्रेसमैन ही नहीं थे, बहुत से सज्जन जो आज उधर बैठे हुए हैं, वे भी थे, उसमें उन्होंने आज के पोलिटीशियन की बात कही है, खाली कांग्रेसजनों की बात नहीं है। अगर मसलमैन की बात करते हैं तो वह आपके बगल में बैठे हुए हैं। सी० पी० एम० वाले तो जब

It is about the generation of politi cians. If it is true with the Congress, it is true with the other parties also. Do you deny it? I do not think you can deny it. (Interruptions).

उनके बारे में उन्होंने कहा है।

श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम स्वामी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
आप उंगली इस तरफ क्यों दिखाते हैं ?

श्री बूटा सिंह : मेरा मतलब है कि आप सरकारिया कमीशन के पैरा को ध्यान से देखें जिस पर चतुरानन जी ने कहा कि आज के कांग्रेसी ऐसे हैं। मैं मानता हूँ कि आज के पोलिटिशियंस ऐसे हैं कि उन्होंने कभी सोचा भी नहीं था कि वे इस देश में राज करेंगे। उन्होंने एक ही बात सोची थी कि देश की आजादी के लिए अगर मरना पड़े तो मरेंगे। थोड़े जो लोग उसमें बचे सौभाग्य से इस देश के लिए वह लोग बचे जो इस देश के कर्णधार हैं, जैसे पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू, सरदार पटेल, राजाजी, डॉ. बाबा साहेब अंबेदकर, मोलाना आजाद साहब। ऐसे-ऐसे लोग बच गए जिन्होंने सारा जीवन संघर्ष में बिताया राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी जी के नेतृत्व में उन्होंने त्याग ही त्याग देखा, बलिदान ही बलिदान देखा और पूरा जीवन, अपना पूरा जीवन देश की सेवा में समर्पित किया। उनका जीवन संघर्षमय जीवन था। देश की आजादी के बाद उन्होंने राष्ट्र निर्माण में जो योगदान दिया, वह हमारे सामने एक प्रत्यक्ष सूर्य की तरह हमारे देश के संविधान के नाम से उजागर है। यह संविधान कोई लीगल डॉक्यूमेंट नहीं है। हालांकि यहाँ पर बैठे हुए जो बड़े-बड़े विद्वान, न्यायाधीश बैठे हुए हैं, जो बड़े-बड़े बकील बैठे हुए हैं, वे तो यही कहेंगे कि यह लीगल डॉक्यूमेंट है, मगर देश के लोगों के लिए यह निचोड़ है यह निचोड़ है सौ साल की आजादी के संघर्ष का। यह निचोड़ है हमारी भारत की पुरातन संस्कृति का। यह निचोड़ है हमारे राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी की तपस्या का जिन्होंने अपने पूरे जीवन में सत्य और अहिंसा को अपनाया। उन्होंने और हमारे देश को जो बड़े-बड़े महान नेता थे उन्होंने देश को आजादी दिलाने और अपने पूरी जीवन का अनुभव इसमें भरकर रखा। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे देश का सौभाग्य यह है कि ऐसे-ऐसे महान नेता हमारे देश को मिले। आजादी के वक्त जो न केवल आजादी का ही सोच रहे थे, साथ ही साथ वे यह भी सोच रहे थे कि

हमारे देश का भविष्य क्या होगा। आजादी के बाद हमारे देश के लोगों की सामाजिक बुराइयाँ, भ्रष्टाचारी, जहालत, अनपढ़ता, अस्पृश्यता इन चीजों को कैसे खत्म किया जाएगा। वे बहुत आगे की बातों को सोचने वाले महान पुरुष थे जिनके बारे में सरकारिया जी ने भी अपनी रिपोर्ट में बहुत ही योग्य शब्दों के साथ, बड़ी श्रद्धा के साथ उल्लेख किया है। उन लोगों की बात हुई थी जब पार्लियामेंट की उस वक्त की बात चल रही थी और जो हमारा संविधान है यह कोई एक बहुत संकीर्ण रूप में, एक छोटा सा डॉक्यूमेंट नहीं, यह एक न्याय दर्शन है। इसमें से पैदा होता है हमारे न्याय दर्शन है, यह फलसफा है। इसमें से पैदा होता है हमारे देश का भविष्य, इसमें से पैदा होता है हमारे देश का समाज का निर्माण। इसीलिए स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी जी ने सोच समझकर के हमारे संविधान का जो प्रिम्बल था उसमें उन शब्दों का उल्लेख किया, उनको दर्ज किया। इसी मान्यवर सदन ने उनको स्वीकृत किया क्योंकि यह जो फलसफा है कि देश हमारा कैसा होगा, दुनिया में इसकी क्या छवि होगी, क्या इसके आधार होंगे, क्या इसके मूल्य होंगे, उनका हमारे संविधान का सिरलेख है, प्रिम्बल है उसमें उल्लेख किया गया है। मैं तो अपने संविधान को उन्हीं शब्दों के अन्तर्गत देखता हूँ जब भी मैं संविधान की बात सुनता हूँ या संविधान की बात करता हूँ। हमारे बड़े विशेषज्ञ बैठे हुये हैं, हमारे विद्वान, हमारे मुरली भंडारे जी, मदन भाटिया जी, जस्टिस मसूदकर जी, जस्टिस बहलूल इस्लाम साहिब और बड़े विद्वान हमारे मान्यवर सदस्यों ने हमारे संविधान के ऊपर बड़े अच्छे-अच्छे विचार व्यक्त किए हैं, मगर चाहे वह राज्य के और केन्द्र के आपस में संबंधों की बात हो, अधिकारों की बात हो, अधिकार क्षेत्र की बात हो, इन सबसे पीछे जो तर्क है, जो मूल इनकी धारा है वह है हमारे संविधान की जिस्ट—जो हमारे संविधान की रूह है, जो हमारे संविधान की आत्मा है। किसी ने कांग्रेस की तरफ से यह नहीं कहा कि संविधान मजबूत होना चाहिये राज्यों की कास्ट पर, हमारा यह ध्येय नहीं है।

[श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम स्वामी]

अभी कल बोल रहे थे जस्टिस साहब या हमारे जगेश देसाई जो, उन्होंने अपने भाषण में जो अधिकार राज्यों को मिलने चाहिये, राज्य और केन्द्र यह आपस में राइवल नहीं हैं। यह दोनों ही ऐसी जो एजेन्सियां हैं ऐसे दो साधन हैं जो देश के लोगों की सेवा के लिए लगे हुये हैं। सबसे ज्यादा पहत्व है देश के लोगों को सेवा। यदि आप एक ही प्रश्न को ले लें, जैसे कल बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने सी०डी०एस० का बात की, इन्कम टैक्स की बात और बहुत से ऐसे कर हैं जो गवर्नमेंट आफ इण्डिया बसूल करके वापिस सरकार को देती है।

मैं एक प्रश्न करता हूं। हमारा 20 नुकाती प्रोग्राम है। यह आज से नहीं, यह राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी जी के वक्त से चला हुआ प्रोग्राम है। समय-समय पर जैसे-जैसे परिस्थितियों में तबदली होती है, समाज में तबदली होती है, विकास की आकांक्षाएं बदलती हैं, बढ़ती हैं, आगे बढ़ती हैं वैसे-वैसे इनमें एडजस्टमेंट होता है, मगर यह प्रोग्राम कोई नया प्रोग्राम नहीं है श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी जी ने जब यह प्रोग्राम इस सदन के सामने पेश किया था, मुझ याद है उन्होंने यह कहा कि यह कांग्रेस का उस वक्त का प्रोग्राम है जब कि कांग्रेस स्वतन्त्रता संग्राम में उलझी हुई थी, हमारे देशभक्त जूझ रहे थे, उस वक्त का यह प्रोग्राम है और यह एक ऐसा प्रोग्राम है जिसे भारत सरकार ने केन्द्र और राज्य सरकारों की सहमति से तय किया है, उनके साथ बराबर परामर्श करके तय किया है। इसमें कोई अधिकार क्षेत्र देखना चाहे तो मैं समझता हूं कि यह न तो अकेला राज्य का है और न ही अकेले केन्द्र के क्षेत्र में है, ये तो सम्मिलित रूप में इसको कार्यान्वित करेंगे तभी जाकर के इसका फायदा हो सकेगा। इसमें यदि केन्द्र सरकार 20 नुकाती प्रोग्राम में किसी राज्य सरकार से एक बात पूछ लेती है कि आपकी मानिट्रिंग में यह चीज पूरी नहीं की जा सकी है, इसमें जितना पैसा एलोकेट हुआ था वह आपने नहीं खर्च किया तो उसमें यह माना जाता है कि केन्द्र ने आक्रमण कर दिया। जिस चीज से बाकायदा आपसी परामर्श के साथ बातचीत करके तय किया गया, प्लानिंग कमीशन में एग्री

किया गया, मिनिस्ट्री आफ रूरल डेवलप-मेंट में बैठकर लक्ष्य निर्धारित किए गए, टारगेट फिक्स किए गए, उसके लिए साधन फिक्स किए गए और यह भी माना गया कि केन्द्र सरकार इसको मानिटर करेगी। केन्द्र सरकार जब मानिटर करती है किसी एक प्रदेश से, किसी एक राज्य सरकार से पूछा जाता है कि आपके इस तिमाही में इतने आंकड़े, इतने आपके लक्ष्य जो हैं वह पीछे हैं, इसके लिए आप क्या व्याख्या देना चाहते हैं तो बहुत बड़ा बवण्डर खड़ा कर दिया जाता है कि केन्द्र ने हस्तक्षेप कर दिया, केन्द्र ने हमला कर दिया। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि केन्द्र को अधिकार चाहिए केवल अधिकारों के लिए। जो उसका आदर्श है, जो उसका ध्येय है वह पूरा नहीं होता तो किस का नुकसान होता है? न केन्द्र का नुकसान होता है और न राज्य सरकारों का नुकसान होता है। नुकसान होता है गरीबों का और आदिवासियों का। जो गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे पिसते रहते हैं उनका नुकसान होता है। मैं अनुभव की बात कह रहा हूं। यह खाली कोई सरकारी कमीशन की रिपोर्ट पर टिप्पणी नहीं कर रहा हूं। जिस तरह के आपस में रिलेशंस चल रहे हैं उसकी बात कर रहा हूं। मैं इंडोविजुअल प्रश्न भी नहीं उठाऊंगा क्योंकि मान्यवर हमारे चीधरी साहब, इनका पुराना नाम मुझे याद है, नया नाम भूल जाता हूं, उपेन्द्र जी, इन्होंने कुछ व्यक्तियों के बारे में, हाई, आफिशियल्स के बारे में चर्चा की। मैं नहीं समझता आज की डिबेट उस चीज के लिए है। जब मौका आयेगा उस पर जो भी यथायोग्य जवाब होगा वह मैं दूंगा। एक आश्चर्य सामने आया है। मैं किसी पार्टी को सामने रख कर नहीं कह रहा हूं। यह एक साधारण अनुभव की बात है पूरे राष्ट्र में। जहां तक साधन जुटाने का प्रश्न है बहुत सी राज्य सरकारें यह समझती हैं कि साधन जुटाना केवल केन्द्र का काम है। आप किसी भी सरकार को लें, विशेषकर उन सरकारों के बारे में है जो इस वक्त कांग्रेस रूल्ड स्टेट्स नहीं हैं। यदि आप पिछले 3-4 साल का उनका हिसाब-किताब देखें तो कोई भी

सब कदम लेने से वह घबराई है ।
जहाँ कहीं रिसेंस की बात आती है ...

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh): It is not a fact.

श्री बुटा सिंह: जब आपका मौका आये तो बोल लेना। कहीं-कहीं साधन जुटाने के लिए सख्त कदम नहीं उठाये गये हैं। इस प्रकार की प्रवृत्ति राज्यों में चल रही है। मैं तो पूरे राज्यों की बात कर रहा हूँ। आप क्यों घबरा रहे हैं। जिसे डोल मनी कहते हैं उस पर रहना ज्यादा अच्छा समझते हैं। राजनीतिक सत्ता जिसको पोलिटिकल विल कहते हैं वह नहीं है। मुझे भी थोड़ा सा अनुभव है। मैं भी थोड़ा सा रूरल डेवलपमेंट मिनिस्ट्री में रहा हूँ। बड़ी चर्चा होती है जब कभी कोई आपत्ति आती है, विपदा आती है या कभी भी इस प्रकार की बात होती है तो दस गुना, बीस गुना बढ़ा कर...

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): The Minister is saying "dole." I want to know whose property it is. Who is giving to whom?

... (Intemptions)...

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I will tell you. The property belongs to the people of this country. ... (Interruptions) ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please don't interrupt.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: The people of this country are the masters. If you have cared to read the Constitution of India, the first line is "We, the people of India..."—not the people of Nagaland, or the people of Punjab or the people of West Bengal or the people of Maharashtra. It is the people of India. ... (Intemptions) ... It is the people of India who are the supreme masters. Whether it is the Central Government or the State Government,

we should be seen serving the People of India. That will be the best relationship between the Union and the States.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Why don't you practise what you preach?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: That is what I am telling you, that you should practise in your States also. We are practising it. ... (Interruptions) ... They have a State. In Karnataka they must practise.

What I am trying to say is that the State Governments, in general, fight very, very, shy. They lack the Political will to mop up resources and they always try to fall on the resources of the Central Government very well.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: You are exploiting all their resources. All the States' resource, you are taking away to the Centre.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

श्री महेश्वर सिंह साठर (हरियाणा): शिक्षा तो नहीं दे रहे आप किसी को।

... (Interruptions) ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't interrupt when the Minister is replying. You had your chance to make your statement. Now he has his chance to speak. Please don't interrupt him now. ... (Interruptions) ... This is not the way to interrupt.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I am not blaming any particular State.

... (Interruptions) ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, he is the Home Minister. When you were making your points, he did not interrupt you. When he is making his points, please don't interrupt. Please sit down. ... (Interruptions) ... Please, Professor Saheb, behave well. Please sit down.

SKRI BUTA SINGH: I am not blaming any particular Government. The trend that has developed in the past 39 years is that the State Governments feel that they have no, sometimes they lack, political will, they hesitate to mop up resources. That is why the onus falls always on the Central Government.

Most of the hon. Members have laid stress on the federal character of our Constitution. As you know, I am nobody, I am not an authority on the Constitution. My learned colleagues, Madam Bhatiaji, Bhandareji, Justice Masodkarji have dwelt, at length on the nature of our Constitution, flexibility of our Constitution. But I would like to take you to the Constituent Assembly on this issue. What is the nature of our Union Government?

The Constitution, as it emerged from the Constituent Assembly in 1949, has important federal features, but it cannot be called federal in the classical sense. It cannot be called "unitary" either. It envisages a diversified political system of a special type. According to Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, it is "unitary" in an extraordinary situation, such as war emergency and "federal" in normal times. Some authorities have classified it as "quasi-federal". However these labels hardly matter as both levels of government derive their respective powers from the written Constitution which is supreme, and there is a Supreme Court to interpret our Constitution. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, while speaking on the motion to designate India as a "Federation of States," has explained, and a quote:

" ___ that though India was to be a federation, the federation was not the result of an agreement by the States to join in a federation and that the federation not being the result of an agreement, no State has the right to secede from it. The federation is a Union because it is

indestructible. Though the country and the people may be divided into different States for convenience of administration, the country is one integral whole, its People are a single people living under a single imperium derived from a single source. The Americans had to wage a civil war to establish that the States have no right to secession and that their federation was indestructible. The Drafting Committee thought that it was better to make it clear at the outset rather than to leave it to speculation or to disputes."

This is the character of our Indian Constitution. *(Interruptions)* I can understand the unusual concern extraordinary concern of the hon. Members in this House because this is the Council of States, and we are equally concerned because India is a unit, our Constitution envisages the country as one whole unit and not in parts.

Some hon. Members went to the extent of calling India as a multinational country, state. I am sorry, I

SHRIMATI KANAK MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): He has explained the position.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I am telling you the harm. The harm is
(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI KANAK MUKHERJEE: He should understand the difference between "nation" and "nationality". There are linguistic divisions.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I am happy, the hon. lady Member has put it. Let me tell you refute it with all the strength at my command. We have only one nationality. There is no other nationality in this country. India is one nation.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Why is there fight between Maharashtra and Karnataka?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: What are you talking? *(Interruptions)* Look at the vision of our Constitution makers.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY: When the army revolted, you were nowhere.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Even those who started with various nations, for one country, one State, Have now started demolishing those nations and they are coming together. What is happening across our border? The largest country has started demolishing the theory of various nations. (*Interruptions*)

भारतवर्ष एक राष्ट्र है और हर एक
भारत का रहने वाला भारतीय है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please don't interrupt.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: There is no other nation. I refute this 'thesis. There cannot be any other nation. There can be other languages, races, cultures, everything, but there cannot be any other nation. Let it be understood. (*Interruptions*) If that is the attitude...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't interrupt please.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh): He is creating an artificial controversy regarding federation, of States. It is a very dangerous thing to interpret like that. No body said that. Why are you calling unity in diversity. There are ethnic groups and there is no denying the fact.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: All ethnic groups belong to one nation and that is India. Ethnic groups cannot constitute a nation in our country. (*Interruptions*) Ethnic groups are Indians. They are not beyond India. Let me tell you, Mr. Upendra. Ethnic group is Indian. It is not beyond India. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Why do you call it unity in diversity? SHRIMATI KANAK MUKHERJEE: Madam, I am on a point of order.

In regard to the very concept of unity in diversity, our great Rabindra Nath Tagore says:

विन्ध्य हिमाचल यमुना गंगा उच्छल
जलधि तरंगा

That is our concept. There are many languages, many cultures, many ideas. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: That means many ethnic groups... (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. You have made your point of order.

SHRIMATI KANAK MUKHERJEE: This is the very concept of unity in diversity. The Hon. Minister is distorting it. (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you. There is no point of order. Mr. Minister, you continue.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: It was the Congress which split the Country. It is the Congress which split the parties in the country. We believe in one nation. Why is he creating an artificial crisis in the country?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Subramanian, you will have your time to speak.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Thank you. Give me a lot of time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, I won't.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Yesterday, Shri Aladi Aruna was sitting with Mr. Upendra. He again propounded that we are multinationals, I don't know how... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN (Tamil Nadu): Please, permit me to say that sub-nationality is one thing that has been accepted even in USSR. Any territory... (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member, please sit down. You cannot interrupt like this. (*Interruptions*) Please take your seat. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: What about your National Anthem? It talks of sub-culturest languages, history, sub-nationalites. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY (Andhra Pradesh): If you talk of nationality, why are you talking in English? It is not our mother tongue. First of all let the Minister for Home, who cannot go home, in whose own State there is President's rule, which has violated the Constitution and freedom, where they have imposed Articles 249. (*Interruptions*) Please let me tell you, let him not be proud of gibbling in English which is neither his mother tongue nor my mother tongue. If you cannot speak in Hindi on these floors, don't blame anybody.. (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are running the House. Let the Minister make his point. You had your time and you made your point. That is his Initial speech.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Let me remind the hon. Lady Member that let us not be... (*Interruptions*) This is the most beautiful lady Member.

श्रीमती रेणुका चौधरी : मैं व्यूटिफुल हूँ । मैं व्यूटिफुल नहीं हूँ ।

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Let her say (*interruptions*) Madam, let me in all seriousness. ... (*Interruptions*)... I want to be particular on this point and I want to emphasise this time and against Let the whole House hear what our hon. Member, Shri Jagjit Singh Aurora...

• SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA (Punjab): I am not Shri Jagjit Singh Aurora but Sardar Jagjit Singh Aurora.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Gen. Jagjit Singh Aurora

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: I will accept that.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Madam, let this House realise what havoc, what misery, this loose talk in Punjab has

led to. It was this very slogan that has led to today's bloodbath in Punjab. People have been misled by this nation theory— (*Interrupt\$on»X*)

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE (West Bengal): It was inspired by your party.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: This is very unfair.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: This nation theory has thrown Punjab into such an irretrievable sort of situation that we are finding it difficult. People are getting killed and this kind of loose talk on the nationhood will spell havoc all over the country if we allow it. The Government of India is determined to curb it. We will never allow this idea of multi-nation in our country. Let me repeat it. Yesterday, Mr. Aladi Aruna has raised it and I want to repeat it. ... (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJESH PILOT): You are wrong. Most of your Members___ (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Why he is quarreling on this issue? I cannot understand. Let him reply to the points raised.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: Let me make a submission.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sardar Aurora, please sit down. No submission now. Whatever you speak, I would see to it that it will not go on record. ... (*Interruptions*)... I will not permit you.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: I would like to answer that.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: You said it and that is why I named you. Let me take it.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: The point is that I accepted it at that time. Therefore, what is the point in naming in that?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: It was repeated here.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: That does not matter. I, at that time....

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I accepted it. Your explanation. ...(Interruptions) I am only telling you ... (Interruptions). ..

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: You have accepted it?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: What I am saying is that this kind of loose talk always brings misery to the people.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: I am sorry. Don't talk about loose talk.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I am only cautioning the House. As a Home Minister it is my duty to caution the people, to caution this august House.. (Interruptions)

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE. Madam, loose talk should be expunged from the records of the House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would request the hon. Members to be quiet. . . (Interruptions...I have called the Minister to speak and I cannot ask him to be quiet. Please sit down. No loose talk in the House also.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Madam, with all humility, may I take it since the Members from almost all the political parties sitting on the other side of the House have tried to browbeat me on this issue that this is the programme of the National Front?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Is this the stand of the National Front on the issue of nationhood? Is this the stand of the National Front? Can I take it?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: the first point in National

Front programme deals with the unity of the country and unity in diversity.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Do you hold that India is a multinational State?

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): National Front has no programme and no policy... (Interruptions)

* SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): Because you have attacked the National Front, I only want to clarify...

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I am not attacking. I am only putting what you have said.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : Can you yield for a minute?
... (Interruptions)...

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Your Swamy Ji has spoken on it. Do you disagree with Swamy Ji? He has supported the idea of multi-nation.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : No. On the contrary, I said, your Congress Party have divided the country. I never said it. (Interruptions).

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY ! May I make it clear that on behalf of the National Front and on behalf of my party, because he said, almost all the parties. I do not know which parties he included but he said... (Interruptions) ...

SHRI BUTA SINGH: You know which party is in the National Front.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : May I make it clear? I do not want to score point on this. He has raised a very serious matter.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: No, I have not raised it. Aladi Aruna has raised it and I have to respond. I am responding only.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : I am not scoring a point on that. A very serious matter has been raised in the House, questioning the patriotism and the nationalism of political parties. ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Don't misquote me. I have said, is this the stand of the National Front? *(Interruption)*.. I have not called anybody unpatriotic. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : I am not referring to you. I said, it has been raised. A vital question, a very serious matter has been raised. I want to make it clear, Madam, that we believe in one nation one people. But while saying that, I also say that there are diversities. It is a federal State. India is a federal State. Therefore, the States have rights. When we talk of a nation, we are one nation. When we talk of the Governments, there is the Central Government and there are the State Governments. *(Interruption)*

SHRI BUTA SINGH; You have spoken only for yourself. But if you have heard the CPI(M) Members, the AIADMK Members, Shri Parvathaneni Upendra and others, they have.....
(Interruption)

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Don't mix up the Government with the nation. I would beg of you, don't equate the Government with the nation. The nation is one. The people are one but there is the Central Government and there are the State Governments.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Your political parties which have now formed what is called the National Front, their members have said that India is a multi-nation State. *(Interruption)*.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Who said it? If you are referring to Mr. Aladi Aruna, they are not part of the National Front. If you are referring to the Akali Dal, it is not a part of the National Front. What

are you talking about the National Front. The first point of the National front itself is India is one nation. We believe in unity in diversity. *(Interruption)* ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. When I am on my legs, please sit down *(Interruption)*.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA
RAO Demarcation between nation
and. ... *(Interruption)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have said this thing three times. Now, you do not have to repeat it. You are defying the Chair also. I do not understand why people cannot make their point in one sentence. You have said the same thing three times. Now, will you please allow the Minister to speak or not. Please sit down and do not make any interruption.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY;
surely, we can disagree. If we find something... *(Interruption)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am quite sure that everybody makes a point that others do not agree to.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Madam, I was saying, we do not accept that India is a multi-nation State. *(Interruptions)*. I have to and the hon. Members from one end to the other. ... *(Interruption)* ...

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: There is only one nation. There is no sub-nationalism at all. We talk of the Union and the State Governments. We are talking of the federal polity. We are not questioning the nationalism at all. There is one nation and one people.

(Interruption)

SHRI BUTA SINGH: If they have no objection if they have not objected to it, then, why are they interrupting me? May I take it. that all

mat they have said will be expunged or they will take it back. I wish to reiterate on behalf of the people of this country. ... (*Interruptions*)... as a representative of the people of this country, with all the emphasis, that India is one nation, its people are a single people enjoying single citizenship. (*Interruptions*). Its people are a single people enjoying single citizenship. We may be multilingual. We may be multicultural multiracial. But the question of. ... (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, why are these interruptions? What is the point? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI BUTA SINGH: The question of nationhood rests on all of us so far as the country and the citizenship are concerned. Nobody will be allowed to question this fundamental point. (*Interruptions*). Why are you upset? Yesterday, when Shri Advaniji participated in this debate, I thought he gave expression to his feelings and soon after him Shri Aladi Aruna Spoke. Nobody objected to it.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh); He did not say that.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: The problem with hon. „ Members is this. They accept whatever suits them and they simply forget whatever does not suit them sitting inside the House. (*Interruptions*) . I am now trying to explain to this august House the gist of the Sarkaria Commission report. The gist is that our country is one and the parts; that are States are equally vital. (*Interruptions*).

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Do you know that only after the Sarkaria Commission's report? We know that from the time we were born.

SHRI BUTA SINGH; That may be your attitude. But we give respect to those people whom the nation respects, and this document is one, Madam, if you care to read, which will go down, in the history of our country.

This is a document based on the mature judgment of the people of eminence. You may differ with them. But their sincerity, their anxiety, their commitment to the nation, cannot be questioned and you cannot flout this report as a Government report.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY: Who said that?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: She is saying that.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Not for a moment. I only said you required the Sarkaria Commission's report to remind you of that. I am proud of the fact that I am an Indian.

SHRI BUTA SINGH; Only on the other day hon. Members were criticising the Sarkaria Commission's report. They are free to do it. When a report is presented before the House, its contents, its recommendations, are free for criticism for approval or for disapproval. This august House is supreme. It can approve or disapprove of it. But let me tell you one thing. In the past 38 or 39 years, the working of our Constitution and the relationship between the states and the Union have been excellent, exemplary. Except a few disgruntled parties, who can deny that India has made progress in the last 40 years which is unprecedented? You take any field. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Madam, should there be a running commentary by the other side like this? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Madam, let us take by field. (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please. Will you allow the Minister to make his submissions or not?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Madam, I am on a point of order. (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; Let me hear his point of order.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: We raised a number of points relating to the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission on which the Home Minister is expected to react and give his opinion on what the Government is going to accept or what it is going to do with the report. Instead, he is indulging in all these things starting from Mahatma Gandhi and now going to the progress of India. The progress of India has nothing to do with the report of the Sarkaria Commission. Why is he narrating all these things? Is it an election speech? (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I wish you allowed the Minister to speak. Please do not interrupt.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: May I remind the hon. Member that progress does not fall from the sky? The progress of a country, a nation, a family, is based on the social background, the economic background, the circumstances and how the system has worked. The system that is based on the Constitution of India has worked so well, it has done so well, that we are a proud nation today because there has been a very harmonious functioning of the Centre and the States—

SHRI PARAVATHANENI UPENDRA: Thirtyeight per cent of the population below the poverty line.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I do not want to go back to those other things. My colleague has given me the proceedings of this House, but I do not want to throw them at the honourable Members who are denying their statements. Anyway, the progress that India has achieved is based on the proper climate generated by the working of the Union and the States. And it is this kind of climate which has given confidence to the people. Look at any aspect of our national life, whether it is political, industrial, agricultural, or general development of the people. Is it not a fact that we are the only surviving democracy in his part of

the world? What happened to our neighbours? Is it not an achievement? Should we not be proud of it? We have held eight elections to the Lok Sabha. The States have seen change of hands, change of parties, many times more, and we have survived. Is it a small thing? We should be proud of it instead of being hesitant or diffident. And I should say as a Congressman also that we must be proud of it. (*Interruption*) When you turn political don't you expect others to turn political? I am proud that the country has progressed so well. It is unique in this region of the world. People are jealous people are trying to copy our system, whether it is planning

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): Don't be ignorant of history.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: You should know it. The new world is trying, the new countries that are gaining freedom are trying to catch up with the progress of India. Look at any sector, whether industrial, agricultural or general wellbeing of the people, education,

AN HON MEMBER: Poverty?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: We are fighting poverty. That is our common cause. All the States and the Union should go together to fight poverty not fight among themselves. Poverty is our common enemy. Unity of purpose should be our common goal, whether it is the State Government or the Central Government, this party or that party. Our common goal should be to wipe out poverty from our country, to give respect to the women folk of our country, to look after the children of our country, to look after the weaker sections of our country.

As I said at the beginning, I am purposely not going to comment on the various recommendations because we are still open, Parliament has to discuss it, Lok Sabha has to discuss it (*Interruption*) It is not a matter to laugh at. It is a serious thing. It

Commission

is a document of national importance. I would not like to come before the House, we are not coming to the House, unprepared. We want to listen to the Lok Sabha Members, we want to listen to the State Governments, we want to give thought to the recommendations of the States. The States have yet to respond. Here is a Union Government which says, we will wait till the States give their recommendations. We are termed as being against the States. How is it? We give more weightage to the recommendations of the States because actually the delivery of the whole system is to be through the State apparatus. Some Members questioned why the Prime Minister met the District Magistrates. I do not know what is wrong in it. He has given a new life to the whole planning thinking, that planning must start at the district level.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: In the name of changing the system, if you interfere with them, you only create chaos. That is what I said and I stand by it.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: General, you have seen the command of an army, you have not seen the command of public life.....

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: There is a lot you can learn from the army.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: You have only seen the command of the army. Secondly, the Prime Minister is also heading a department which is called the Personnel Department which controls the whole cadre of the Central Services.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM: That is with regard to the services and it has nothing to do with the functions of the State Government. ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI BUTA SINGH: You know in our administrative set up... (Interruptions) ... in our administrative setup, the District Magistrate is the key figure in the district and the whole of

State Relations

developmental activities go through the District Development Officer. So far we have gone through this system

(Interruption)

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: Correct.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: So far we have gone through this system and, naturally, when we are thinking of national planning for the next Five Year Plan, is it not important to involve that key figure in the district in the process of planning?

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: You mean the Chief Minister has nothing to do there?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: One day the General will have to be a Chief Minister and then only he will know what the problems of a Chief Minister are. You know, consultation is not approval. Ultimately, the Chief Ministers will approve. General Sahib, it is involving the key points, the key figures, the key institutions, in the process of planning. What is the use of sending a plan from Delhi which does not suit? My submission to this august House is that ours is a country in which we have divergent climatic conditions. Now, if we were to plan for agriculture as a whole, we have to consider many things. I have seen as Agriculture Minister how serious drawbacks have come into our planning. We plan only on one pattern, that is, dry irrigation potential. Then what will happen to Rajasthan, what will happen to Andhra Pradesh, what will happen to Karnataka, what will happen to Maharashtra or even Gujarat where there is no irrigation facility in vast areas? Therefore, if we were to plan on the basis of climatic regions it will cut across the States and interaction will have to be there.

Therefore, We cannot just take India as a country in blocks, but as a unit. It has to be a unit and when we take India as a unit, we will have to pool

[Shri Buta Singh] the resources of more than one State. For dry-land farming, you will have to club five or six States. And how you do that? And, with regard to this thesis of States being autonomous, more autonomous than the Centre, if you look at the resolutions passed by the Akali Party, you will see that they become a laughing-stock. They say, Give only two or three subjects to the Centre and leave all the subjects to the States". "We say, "By all means, Yes if the States are able to manage. We are not bothered about having more subjects. But our concern is service of the people. Now, I was trying to explain that if we were to develop agriculture in climatic zones, then all the hill States will have to go in one zone. You cannot have your Punjab agriculture in the hill States because that is a different type of agriculture and you will have to go in for deep water cultivation and in some other areas you will have to So in for terrain cultivation. All these things, do you think, one State will be able to do? Will you say that a State will be able to attend to all these problems? You will have to bring waiter to the whole of the climatic zones and for that the Centre will have to pay Its part. How do you deny that? Otherwise, you will leave your area of your region of your State undeveloped. ...

Then, Madam, there was the thesis or theory of sons of the soil. You know what is happening in the various States now? I am sorry, I have to say something generally... (Inter -rptions)... You know that in certain States the people from within the State are denied employment? Unless they read a particular language, they cannot be employed. May I ask Guru-padaswamyji as to what is happening in his State? His own people are denied employment... (Interruptions-... His own people are denied employment because they do not pass in a particular language. Is it this India that we had envisaged? Is it this India that we had envisaged that the native of

a particular State----- (Interruptions)
is denied employment in his own State
(Interruption)

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alios ARU-
NACHALAM; That is the right of the State.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: These are the hard realities of life... (Interruptions) What is the use of laughing. We want our country to be so developed that any citizen from one part should equally be able to develop in any other part. That is what I want to convey... (Interruptions) ... What are you laughing? I am really sorry for that. If that is your thesis, if that is your... (Interruptions)... then T air, saying that you are living in some other country, not in India. India is one country where every citizen has the freedom to worship, freedom to develop. Any Indian from one part of the country can go to any other part and develop himself. That should be the country—no barrier of State languages and races. There should be no fetters. We can enrich our languages. We have to enrich our culture.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA:
What about the Navodaya schools?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: That also a step towards this kind of India. (In. terruptions'). These are the special arrangements. (Intemptions) you know it better. You cannot equate Karnataka with that.

T purposely not want to touch upon the various points raised by the hon. Members. For example, Mr. . Upendra raised the question of Governors of States. Others joined him. I am not here to defend an Governor or anybody; But madam, it is not a matter of commonsense that if the Chief Minister of a State prefers to have... (Interruptions) I do not under stand, because I have not studied the whole thing. It has come to us T will study it. I do not think there was any

necessity for the Chief Minister to send the papers to the Governor for approval.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: It is in the Act. The Act says that the Governor has to approve.

PROF. c. LAKSHMANNA: If he has not studied it, let him study it. (Interruptions)

SHRI BUTA SINGH: In that case, if the Act so provides, the Act also provides that the Governor shall satisfy. If the Governor has sought certain clarifications, I think he or she is within his or her constitutional rights to write to his or her chief Minister. She is not against her Chief Minister of that State. She is the head of the State in which Shri Rama Rao is the Chief Minister. They have to work together. According to legal representations the Chief Ministers represents the State and the Governor heads the State. And between the two there should be very cordial relations. Only then the State can function. If she has sought certain clarifications, she is turned against the agent stooge, and what not. (Interruptions) I am not going into other things. But let me tell you one thing. There was on occasion—I am not going to throw it at you ————— there was an occasion when one Rashtrapati wanted certain clarifications and the whole Opposition started a hue and cry—some sections of the Press also—that it is the sovereign right, the Government must furnish the information and so on. If that was that sovereign right, how is it that this is not the sovereign right? (Interruptions) That also is in the same Constitution.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA:
You refused. Didn't you refuse?
(Interruptions)

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Now the matter has been referred. The State Government has been lashing out at the office of the Governor. I was accused that I never consulted the

Chief Ministers. I consulted all the Chief Ministers at the time of the appointment of Governors. Nobody has denied that I have not consulted.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: You never consulted. You only threw this lady there. (Interruptions)

SHRI BUTA SINGH: That has been the convention. And I have followed the convention. Mr. Bhatia and Justice Masodkarji will tell me that it is the right of the President to appoint Governors. And the President need not consult anybody. (Interruptions) Whatever the conventions have been there, we have been following those conventions.

Much was talked about our appointing political figures. May I ask you: During the interregnum how many people were appointed Governors? How are you better than that? They criticise me for dismissing Governments through the Governor. Well, I received the reports of the Governors according to the Constitutional provisions. The reports were processed according to the Constitutional provision, and the decisions were taken according to the Constitutional provision. You questioned it in the High Court. That was also held that it is purely a Constitutional provision and that nothing is wrong. But may I ask you as to how many Governors were sent out of office by you, how many Governors were thrown on the roads. What norms were followed? (Interruptions). What norms were followed? You should have at least set one example to be cited. (Interruptions)

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO:
The Sarkaria Commission has pointed out that out of 75 cases...

SHRI BUTA SINGH...Your record has been blank and negative...

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO...only 26 times it was justified.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: No use teaching us morals here. (Interruptions)

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: In the Sarkaria Commission Report, there is a mention about it as to how many times there was consultation and how many times it has not been followed. Therefore, instead of talking about the Sarkaria Commission, what is the point in talking about generalities?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I am touching upon the points now. The hon. Member should know that I am only responding to the various issues raised by the hon. Members (Interruptions)

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: The Sarkaria Commission has raised the point. Why don't you confine yourself to the Sarkaria Commission.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: When I was speaking only on the general terms, you raised that... (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister is replying. Let him reply.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Is it a reply?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: When I was speaking only on general terms, I was told that I am not touching upon the points raised by the hon. Members. Now, I am answering the points.....

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: We referred to specific points.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: It is one thing that it is not pleasant for you. It is one thing that the replies are not pleasant for you. But what can I do? I cannot help it.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: The Sarkaria Commission has talked about 75 cases and in how many cases it is justified. Why don't you refer to it?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Madam, as I was saying... (Interruptions) Madam, as I was saying, whatever is being followed is according to the established conventions. In the past 40 years, these are the conventions established on the appointment of a Governor. And we have followed strictly the conven-

tions. We have not introduced any new element in it. We have followed only the conventions. The conventions have been in this country and we have strictly followed the conventions.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: You have to consult the Chief Minister before you appoint a Governor. That was the convention...

SHRI BUTA SINGH: That is what we did.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: You have given it up now.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Before the appointment of. (Interruptions)

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: I have to get the record straight....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you please sit down for five minutes?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Before the appointment of the Governors, I had a talk with the Chief Ministers... (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you get up like that, how to run the House?

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: I have to keep the record straight....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. You are not there to keep the record straight. You made your own point. Let the Minister make this reply.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: It is the duty of the Members if the record goes wrong to correct it... (Interruptions)

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh): Madam, I want to seek a clarification from the hon. Minister because so much is being said about the appointment of Governors. And we all know that for political motives, a controversy is being created. Even when we talk about the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission, I would like to know whether any recommendation, even what is being referred to, can go beyond the spirit of

the Constitution and the provisions of the Constitution because as far as I understand, the Constitution provides for the post of a Governor who has not only to act as a link between the Centre and the States but also to supervise the functioning in a State so that the Government miscarried on according to the Constitutional provisions. It is a very important Article that when here is a constitutional break-down it is the Governor who has to report to the Centre, it is the Governor who has to recommend the imposition of the President's Rule. I would like to know from the hon. Home Minister that can a Governor discharge his constitutional duties if he has to be a person who is pliable by the Chief Ministers or acceptable to the Chief Ministers. And to what extent is that acceptance of the Chief Minister, what they are referring to, is required? To what extent? That is more important.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Consultation. ..

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are not to reply. Let the Minister reply.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Consultation, is a different matter. But-----

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: He has raised a very fundamental question. Therefore ____

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I would like to know whether the Government can carry his constitution duty...

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: He has raised a very fundamental question...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let the Minister reply. You are not there to reply. When you become a Minister, you reply. Now let the Minister reply to the clarification.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: When I become a Minister, that is a different matter...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You reply to the clarification.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Madam, I am on a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No Point of order now.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARTL NACHALAM: The point is that the present arrangement is not satisfactory.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am not allowing any point of order.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: You allowed a Member to raise a point.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him reply to the clarification. You please sit down.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: There is a fundamental point which has been raised.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is what he is replying to.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: It is not for the Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not *or you also.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Madam, I am on a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am not allowing the point of order. You please sit down. It is entirely up to the Chair to allow a point of order or not. I am not allowing you.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Madam, I have already made it clear; the position of the Government, I have made clear, that we have followed strictly the conventions so far adopted on the appointment of Governors. Now, after the appointment of the Governor, it is between the Chief Minister and the Governor that they should have smooth relations. They should not stand on false egos and they should not quarrel on matters of public importance. And that depends upon the confidence that one enjoys from the other. Unfortunately, in some of the States, yesterday, day before yesterday also hon. Members preferred to make reference to various, in fact all the Members wanted to make referen-

[Shri Buta Singh]

ces to the Governor in question, and I have made my position clear there also. If there is anything unconstitutional between both of them, it can be sorted out according to the constitutional provisions or any relevant Act passed by the State Legislature. Nobody is disputing the prerogative of the Chief Minister but at the same time if the Governor has been given certain powers under that Act or under any other law, naturally if a person tries to exercise those powers. Why should there be a hue and cry? SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: No powers.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: It will be your interpretation. But this is the position which I have said. I have not tried to defend anybody or apportion blame on anybody.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM: What are you doing now?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Well Professor, you know it better. Having done it, you must take it. If you have done it, it is my duty, I have to respond. If I do not respond then you will tell the press, the Government has no answer.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM: Why have you no guts to say, I am defending the action of the Governor?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Why are you forcing me? Why should I?
(Interruptions)

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: I must thank you for advising her to sign. Let her sign quickly and end the controversy.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: This is wrong, absolutely wrong. I refute it. This is mischievous, politically motivated. We have never advised any Governor on these lines. I mean this is the type of politics you want to play. (Interruptions)

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: You did not listen completely. I said

you have advised her to stick to the constitutional provisions and sign. I am complimenting you. (Interruptions) I know the advice has gone from Delhi. Let her do it quickly and end the controversy.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Upendrajji, I made it very clear that the matter has been sent to us. We will examine it, and if there is the necessity for any advice we will give it to Rashtrapati and it will go to the hon. Chief Minister and to the Governor. But have I to take orders from the Professor, intemperate Professor? He has no sense of addressing another colleague in the House. He is shouting me down. Yes, this the way? I never do it that way. Is this the way? I am prepared to take any advice from him. He is a senior Member. He can tender his advice.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Aladi Aruna, he referring to you. In future you kindly be more polite.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Generally he is very kind. But I do not know why he is annoyed with me today. Must be something wrong at home.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Is the Home Minister snooping on Mr. Aladi Aruna's household problems?
(Interruptions)

SHRI BUTA SINGH

आपके भी घर में हैं, हमारे भी घर में हैं, सबके घर में हैं। . . . (व्यवधान)

The other day speaking on the Inter-State Council, Shri Upendra did not like this idea. And Shri Advaniji wanted it very much.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: No, I said, we wanted the Council to be formed but did not want the Standing Committee. I said only the general body is enough.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I do not find any Standing Committee having been mentioned by Sarkaria Commission. The report only mentions of the Inter-State Council under article 263_

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA-
ev said of Standing Committee.

3HRI BUTA SINGH: But Advaniji d
that the opposition is unanimous this.
I thought even the present)rking of the
Zonat Council...

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Every-day
wants the Council.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: If that is your
 md, naturally we will examine it. it I
 am not here to reject or immediately
 react to it. I was only to get
 clarification. Is there
 difference in what Advaniji said :d
 what you said? I raised it also hen
 Advaniji was commenting, and said : 'I
 don't know what Upendra-
 has said' but he stood by what he id.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Andhra Pradesh Government has already made recommendation.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Our impres-on is that the present zonal Councils ave worked successfully. Unfortun-tely, in the past, meetings could not 5 held. Now I have taken one leeting of all the Councils and the ext meeting of the North Zonal Coun-il is going to be held soon after the ion. Our experience has been uite encouraging and we hope most f the disputes between various States ave been amicable settled, like in Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Punab, Haryana. We have been render-rig assistance to various States throu-;h this Council, but we are still open nd we will examine the suggestions made by the hon. Members.

The other point raised by the hon. VTembers was about the appointment of Governor and Inter-State Council, the present setup of Planning Commission or National Development Council also has helped in the progress of our country. Planning Commission itself has established itself as a great institution of national importance. All

the Chief Ministers, the State Governments, participate in the Planning Commission's deliberations. The plans are primarily prepared by the states at their level and then these are brought to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission takes an overall national view and based on that, with the agreement and consent and with the participation of the States, takes decisions in the best larger interests of the country. Similarly, the National Development Council is working well. The issue is of vital importance to the nation. Sarkaria Commission has touched upon this very important aspect of this issue and they have given exhaustive recommendations.

General Sahib raised the issue of Anandpur Sahib Resolution... (*inter, rptions*). Do you want me to reply?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM; You reply; we welcome.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Then don't laugh at me.

श्री वीरेंद्र वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : 9
स्टेट्स कौन-कौन सी है, यह बता दीजिए।

SHRI BUTA SINGH; In the Punjab Accord itself, in para 8 it is said that the Anandpur Sahib Resolution stands referred to Sarkaria Commission. Now, I find, the Commission has taken this issue not as a part of their wider re-por^ but they have taken it as a representation from a regional party and they have gone through the contents of the Resolution. Firstly, they have gone into three different resolutions which have been mentioned by Akali Party and also their government subsequently. AU the three resolutions differ in content. If I have the permission of the Chair, I can read out all the three resolutions. They substantially differ; there is different between one and the other. in a substantive manner, so far as the contents are concerned. The memorandum before the Commission was

[Shri Buta Singh]

not only by the Akali Party but also from the Government. The Commission took the original Resolution of 1973 as the Resolution before it for consideration. The Commission took the 1973 Resolution as constituting the main demands and also considered the statements made in the memorandum submitted to it by the Akali Party in 1987. Accordingly, the main demand of the Party considered by the Commission was "The interference of the Union should be restricted to defence, foreign relations, currency and general communications and that all other powers should vest in the States." Further "For the expenditure incurred by the Union in respect of the above subjects, the States should contribute in proportion to their representation in Parliament." This was the substance of the Resolution.

The Commission rejected these demands on the following grounds: Firstly, "If only the four subjects referred to above are to remain in the Union List and all other subjects including Taxation are excluded from the Union List and assigned to the States, the country cannot survive as one integrated whole. There does not exist anywhere in the world today a Union or a Federation in which the national Government has no fiscal resources of its own independent of the constituent units." The second ground; If the redistribution of powers is to be made as proposed, it will amount to drastic changes in the scheme of framework of the Constitution and as such it will, firstly, be beyond the terms of reference of the Commission and, secondly, beyond the amending power of Parliament conferred by article 368 because it affects the basic structure of the Constitution."

Alongwith these two arguments, the suggestions for wholesale changes in the entire in the three Legislative Lists of the Constitution made by the Akali Dal in its memorandum to the Commission and also by Punjab and

the other State Governments have also been rejected by the Commission: The Commission has also rejected the pernicious theory of linguistic home lands propounded by the Akali Government in Punjab in its memorandum. Therefore, this is the finding of the Sarkaria Commission on the reference made to it in respect of the Anandpur Sahib Resolution.

Hon. Members who have participated in the discussion, especially learned Members like Shri Bhandare Shri Masodkar, Shri Madan Bhatia Shri Baharul Islam and other Members from the Opposition, have made very valuable contributions to this debate by giving their considered opinion. The other House also will discuss this report. The Government will give serious thought to the suggestions made by the various parties and hon. Members. We will also take into account the responses of the State Governments. Only then the Government will make its decision on the recommendations of the Commission and we will submit it to this august House. With these words...

SHRI VIRENDRA VERMA: Kindly give the names of the nine States.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I will send you the names.

Madam, may I once again express my gratitude to hon. Members for having given their most valuable suggestions? May I also place on record our sincere appreciation of the work done by the Sarkaria Commission and its staff and, produced this wonderful document which is of national importance? Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, there is an amendment by Shri Subramanian Swamy. Are you withdrawing it, Mr. Swamy?

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I would like to say a few words.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Provided you withdraw it, I will allow you two-three minutes.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: fou are such a charming person that would never say 'no' to you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN- I appreciate.

..

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: But let me first say what I want to say.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM: Two charming personalities have made an alliance. We have made an alliance. We have been abandoned.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One compliment is more than enough for a day.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Specially before lunch.

I came here with great expectations. In spite of high fever, I came to listen to Mr. Buta Singh. I must say that under the rules, the motion should have raised a definite issue. Kindly see rule 169. I have, by my amendment, tried to give content to this Motion. And it does not mean that I am against everything that Sarkaria Commission has said. In fact, when in Parliament we move Cut Motions, say on some budget provision, it does not mean that we want to deny money to project 'A' or project 'B', we want to use the Cut Motion as a way of disapproval. Now I would like to give content to the motion that Sardar Buta Singh has brought before the House because it says, "The Report be taken into consideration." All parties have given a representation that the Commission has given a representation that the Commission has taken four years and the Government has taken one year and still they want this to be under consideration. This appears to be a prevarication, an attempt to avoid taking any decision. That is the reason why I have brought this amendment. First of all, Buta Singh Sahib did not know the rule under which the amendment was brought.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing the amendment we are discussing the Sarkaria Commission Report. *(Interruption)*

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: You first control those Tamil Nadu MPs. *(Interruptions.)* I really want to say that the Sarkaria Commission Report meets with my disapproval on two questions. The one is the media which is very important where the Sarkaria Commission should have said that a State Government is allowed to operate one channel in the television. Madam, in developed countries television have 57 channels, all going at the same time. Here we have one channel. If there is the second channel in some city, it is dominated by the Central Government. The State Government, in keeping with the diversity of India, should be allowed to operate one channel and if you want in your enthusiasm for liberalisation have one more channel for private sector, I have no objection. *(Interruptions)* I said, if you want is your enthusiasm for liberalisation which is going on since 1975 you can do it, unless you want to disown your Prime Minister's liberalisation programme, that is up to you. Madam, I am saying that at the minimum this media question should have been dealt with very seriously and the Sarkaria Commission did not do that. In fact, it sang the same tune which Mr. Buta Singh wants to sing and that is why he has given it such certificate.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do not pass comments on anybody.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I am not suggesting that Justice Sarkaria has sung the time which he gave, I am saying that it is music to the ears of Mr. Buta Singh that the media should be in the hands of the Central Government.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: If you were there in the Commission what would you have done?

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Well, you appoint one Commission. As long as you do not ask me to take any commission, I am willing to sit on any Commission.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Maharashtra): Are you willing to take any?

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Can it be a matter of public discussion? If you find me three pretty ladies in Panama, I am ready to take commission.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can dispense with the commission and come back to you, submission.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Or to the omissions. So, in conclusion,

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: He has made a very very significant remark. He has said, if you find me three pretty ladies in Panama. That means he knows who those ladies are. Whether they are pretty or ugly we are not aware but he knows.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: And he is asking me to do the job knowing so well that I have such profound respect for Mrs. Subramanian. Because of her I know what good things have come about in him.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Let that be on the record.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Of course, it is going to be on the record.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: In conclusion, Shri Buta Singh, instead of dealing with the points and saying what he was going to do by way of implementation he has given a speech which will be published in full in Tamil Nadu and that is on the Constitution and so on. Madam, let me make it clear once again that at no time the Janata Party has ever thought in terms of a multi-national State. And your interpretation of what these people said is also mischievous distortion. India is one country and if there is any body to break up India, it is the Congress Party of which you

are a member. (*Interruptions: Ni no*). Therefore, Madam, in conclusion

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are going to adjourn for lunch. Please conclude now.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY I am concluding, Madam. When pop went back to Italy, he was asked what struck you the most about India? An he said; "I am surprised how this court try has continued. It has no Pope it has no church, it has no book and still that country has continued this way."

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: We have you.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY The Swamy is all over. But they are all decentralised Swamies. They are in the districts. There is no Pope.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: But then is one Swamy.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are two Swamies. One is behind him

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: No, no, he is a gentleman.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: One is grandfather of the other.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Thanks to the Supreme Court's decision on basic structure, these people could not amend the Constitution to make it a monarchy. And, therefore, we are today safe. I therefore, would like to disapprove what the Government is doing through my amendment, but since you have a powerful person, ality and you have appealed and said that I withdraw my motion, I am withdrawing my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN-. Thank you very much the discussion concludes and the House stands adjourned for lunch till 2.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty-two minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-two minutes past two of the clock. The Vice-Chairman (Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy) in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (PUNJAB) 1988-89

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EXPENDITURE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI B. K. GADHVI): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement (in English and Hindi) showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants for Expenditure of the Government of Punjab for the year 1988-89 (November-December, 1988).

SPECIAL MENTIONS

"Yaj" Disease Affecting Tribals of Bastar District of Madhya Pradesh

श्री अजीत जोगी (मध्य प्रदेश) : महोदय बस्तर जिला न केवल मध्य प्रदेश का बल्कि पूरे भारतवर्ष का सबसे पिछड़ा हुआ जिला है। यहाँ अधिकांश आदिवासी ही निवास करते हैं। मैं आज इस सदन के माध्यम से इस जिले के आदिवासियों के स्वास्थ्य के संबंध में जो एक विशेष समस्या खड़ी हो गई है उस ओर ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। वैसे ही बस्तर जिले के आदिवासियों की गरीबी और मृफिलिसी किसी से छिपी हुई नहीं है और उनको जो चिकित्सा सुविधाएँ उपलब्ध हैं वे भी प्राथमिक स्तर की भी बिल्कुल नहीं हैं। अभी हाल ही में एक सनसनीखेज तथ्य सामने आया है कि बस्तर जिले में "याज" नामक एक रोग, जिसके बारे में ऐसा कहा जाता है कि अब विश्व में अफ्रीका को छोड़कर कहीं नहीं है, वह रोग बस्तर जिले के आदिवासियों में बहुत जोरों से फैल रहा है। विश्व स्वास्थ्य संगठन ने तो अपनी रिपोर्ट में यह कहा था कि वर्ष 50 के पहले ही पूरे विश्व से अफ्रीका और दक्षिण अमेरिका को छोड़कर अन्य भागों से यह रोग समाप्त हो गया है। किन्तु अभी यहाँ के कुछ नये और युवा चिकित्सकों ने यह तथ्य उजागर किया कि "याज" नामक रोग

से बस्तर के आदिवासी ग्रसित हैं। यह रोग बड़ा ही बीभत्स होता है, डरावना होता है और मैंने स्वतः जाकर पिछले दिनों बस्तर में "याज" से ग्रसित कुछ रोगियों को देखा। जैसे कुछ रोगी होते हैं उससे भी खराब हालत "याज" नामक रोग से ग्रसित रोगियों की होती है। दुख इस बात का है कि पहले तो केन्द्र शासन और पूरा चिकित्सा विभाग यही कहता रहा है कि यह तथ्य बिल्कुल गलत है कि "याज" नामक रोग फिर से भारतवर्ष में आ गया है और बस्तर के आदिवासी इससे ग्रसित हैं, पर जब वहाँ के कुछ-चिकित्सकों ने, वहाँ के एक युवा सहायक चिकित्सक और मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी ने जब इस रिपोर्ट को बार बार शासन को भेजा तो अब कम से कम इस बात को स्वीकार किया जाने लगा है कि "याज" नामक रोग बस्तर के आदिवासियों में फैल रहा है। तो मैं आज सदन के माध्यम से इस ओर केन्द्र शासन के स्वास्थ्य मंत्रालय का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहूँगा और यह कहना चाहूँगा कि यह एक बड़ी गम्भीर परिस्थिति है। केन्द्र सरकार को एक विशेष दल गठित करके अध्ययन के लिए बस्तर जिले में भेजना चाहिए। क्योंकि यह एक ऐसा रोग है, जिसके बारे में स्थानीय डाक्टरों को कोई जानकारी नहीं है, कोई अनुभव नहीं है, जिसका कोई निदान नहीं है और यह एक ऐसा रोग है, जिससे ग्रसित हो जाने के बाद आदिवासी की हालत ऐसी हो जाती है कि उसका अंग भंग हो जाता है, अंग गलने लगते हैं, शरीर मुड़ जाता है और ऐसी अपार तकलीफ उसको होती है, जिसका निराकरण किया जाना स्थानीय डाक्टरों, स्थानीय चिकित्सकों और स्थानीय दवाई के माध्यम से सम्भव नहीं है।

मेरा अनुरोध है कि इसकी ओर गम्भीरता से ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिए, तत्काल कोई विशेष दल गठित किया जाना चाहिए, तत्काल उसका अध्ययन किया जाना चाहिए और जो कुछ साहित्य, जो कुछ दवाइयाँ और अनुभव इस दिना में उपलब्ध है, उसका उपयोग करके इस रोग का निदान किया जाना चाहिए। धन्यवाद।