

printing of only one thousand copies of a book. I don't think that you will find a more scandalous example of corruption in the history of world than this.

Recently two festivals, one festival of U.S.S.R. in India and other festival of India in U.S.S.R were organised, which deserve all praise, but the things taking place here in India in the name of cultural activities must be stopped immediately. For example, a Russian girl, who married to an Indian here, is a very good artist, but she was not allowed to work in Garhi Colony for ten years. I wrote to the hon. Minister and the Ministry about this matter but nothing was done. Later I was told that the wife, of a highly placed official who was also an artist, was doing that job and so the official did not want that the Russian girl should get the job. Such injustice done with the talented artists, should be stopped at the earliest, because in our country cultural activities are confined only to a few capitalists, bureaucrats or their wives and families. Cultural activities of this country is required to be so shaped which may bring benefit to crores of workers and farmers and poors of the country.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Time is over.

SHRI AZIZ QURESHI : I will continue next time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : No, you cannot continue. I will not allow you futher time.

15.30 hrs.

PARLIAMENTARY PAY COMMITTEE
Second Report

[English]

SECRETARY-GENERAL : I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Second Report (Hindi and English versions) on Amenities, Facilities, Special Allowances and other general matters (along with other connected documents) of the Committee of Parliament appointed to report on the

structure of pay, allowances, leave and pensionary benefits for the officers and staff of the Rajya Sabha and Lok Sabha Secretariats.

15.31 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS'
BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Fiftieth Report

[Translation]

SHRIMATI USHA RANI TOMAR
(Aligarh) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I beg to move :

“That this House do agree with the Fiftieth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on 29th March, 1988.”

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The question is :

“That this House do agree with the Fiftieth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 29th March, 1988.”

The motien was adopted

15.32 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE : CENTRE-STATE
RELATIONS—Contd.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now we take up further discussion on the Resolution regarding Centre-State relations moved on 18th March, 1988.

The Mover of the Resolution, Shri H.M. Patel, was to continue his speech. Since he is held up some where, the House may treat his speech as finished. Shri Shantaram Naik.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK (Panaji) :
I beg to move ;

[Shri Shantaram Naik]

That in the resolution,—

after "Centre-State relations"

insert "on account of rigid attitude of certain State Governments even to the extent of considering Centre as a myth" (1)

That in the resolution,—

after "Constitution"

insert "and the approach of the State Governments towards the Centre" (2)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Which State considers Centre as myth? I think, that is a frivolous amendment.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: In this process of democracy that we are in, we have got a beautiful and ideal federalism in our country. We have got various States as also Union territories with varied powers given under various Lists of our Constitution. It is indeed a very ideal democratic structure even for other developed and democratic countries of the world to adopt. In fact, we have had several elections at the State and Central level. And in a way, we are proud that in certain States we have got Governments of political parties which are opposed to us, who have defeated us and are ruling in various States of the country. But it is very unfortunate that certain State Governments do not adhere to the provisions contained in our Constitution or they do not respect the federalism which is inherent in our structure. One of the State Government chief executives has gone even to the extent to say that he would consider the Centre as myth, which is very unfortunate. He contended at a stage that there is nothing like a Centre which exists, only the States exist and the Centre is a myth. If this is the attitude taken by a State Government or by any Chief Executive of the State Government, what will happen if others start following it? That is why I have proposed that amendment to the main Resolution.

Secondly, although people have given mandate to certain State Governments, including the one which I have referred to rule the State, because of their attitude they have not been able to fulfil the aspirations of the people given under the Constitution and given under the promises which we have made to the people. In Southern States we have now realised and the facts will come—that at least there are two States which have now virtually become bankrupt. In one State I may mention that I have read reports that they do not have even sufficient funds to pay to the employees after each month.

SHRI PIYUS TIRAKY (Alipurduar): Which is the State, Sir?

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: This is the State . . . ** This is happening because certain State Governments behave in a very irresponsible financial manner. For instance, we, as Members of Parliament, receive booklets and pamphlets issued by the . . . ** Chief Minister in very glossy paper—I do not know how much it may be costing the State exchequer—every fifteen days, to say how Centre-State relationship should be governed, why the financial powers given under the Constitution should be changed. And who tells this?—the Chief Minister who has made the State bankrupt. It was not bankrupt before and it has never been so before. They do not mind spending lakhs of rupees on glossy booklets to tell us these things. If the intention of the hon. Chief Minister was to make his views known to the hon. Members of Parliament, there is nothing wrong in that, but they could have done it in an ordinary way, in simple booklets or some other cyclostyled things or whatever it is. So, this is how the State Governments are running their administration. . . . (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You cannot criticise the Chief Minister.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: I will answer your objection, Sir. Very nicely, these two volumes discuss the Centre-State relationship and I am supposed to discuss this. If I cannot refer to the Chief Minis-

ters, then the Sarkaria Commission also cannot refer to any Chief Minister.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You cannot criticise individual Chief Ministers in particular.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK : I will avoid that, Sir.

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE : Is it a telephone directory ?

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK : It looks like that.

Another aspect which has been dealt with by the Sarkaria Commission which relates to Centre-State relationship is the Governor's role. They have been contending time and again that Governors are appointed without consultation. First of all, when they contend so, they must see whether there is any provision in the Constitution to that effect. And I do not think there is any provision to the effect that a consultation is required. It is not so. Article 155 of the Constitution simply says : "The Governor of a State shall be appointed by the President by warrant under his hand and seal." Article 157 says : "No person shall be eligible for appointment as Governor unless he is a citizen of India. . .". (Interruptions). Now come conventions. When the articles do not support them, when a plain reading of the Constitution does not support them, then they find out these conventions. And if you sometimes quote a convention, they will say this convention goes against the rule of law, or something like that. So, this is the manner in which they treat it. The question is whether the Constitution requires a certain procedure to be followed or not. It is sometimes not possible, especially when we have got certain Chief Ministers—I am not mentioning the names—with an attitude that in whatever manner you may consult them, they will never cooperate. When you have got persons like this, then it is very difficult for the Central Government to have consultations.

Then comes the question of appointment of Governors. It is true, Sir, that one of the paras quotes even Jawaharlal Nehru with respect to selection of Governors, and I do not deny that these principles

should be followed as far as possible. These principles have been reiterated by the Sarkaria Commission, and I quote :

"We recommend that a person to be appointed as Governor should satisfy the following criteria :

- (1) He should be eminent in some walk of life.
- (2) He should be a person from outside the State.
- (3) He should be a detached figure and not too intimately connected with the local politics of the State, and
- (4) He should be a person who has not taken too great a part in politics generally and particularly in the recent past."

All these conditions necessarily cannot be followed at all times and therefore, with necessary regard things can be modified. Say, for instance, there has been a Minister who has been active and he is appointed as a Governor. It does not necessarily mean that he will go or play a role which is something beyond the powers given to him by the Constitution. In fact the Constitution does not give much role to the Governors at all except in some situations, although we may say that when opportunity arises the President of India has got this much power and the Governors have got this much of role. In fact the President and the Governors, we have to admit, are titular heads. Irrespective of the fact that Leaders of Opposition approach the Governors of States sometimes, nothing happens. In certain matters the Governors do not have discretion to be used. And it is an admitted fact that Governors and the President under the Constitution have got titular or nominal powers the fact of which has been admitted by the Sarkaria Commission and they have quoted even the constitutional authorities. They have quoted certain constitutional authorities to specify the role of the Governors. In this Report of the Sarkaria Commission, one thing I would like to state is that the roles of the Administrators have not been properly scrutinised. In the Union Territories we have what are known as Administrators.

[Shri Shantaram Naik]

Here they are in fact powerful. Under the Union Territories Act, if a decision is given by the Council of Ministers, it is not binding on the Administrators in the Union Territories. An Administrator can override the decision of the Council of Ministers. I have been submitting in this case time and again that this position has to be reviewed. The powers which are vested in a Governor in a State have to be given to the Administrators, wherever at least Assemblies are there. This is because since we have got an elected Assembly—the Union Territory of Pondicherry only remains now—if the Council of Ministers in a Union Territory advises the Administrator in a particular manner, we should have a provision or we should amend the Union Territories Act to the effect that that advice should be binding. Otherwise, it means that we treat the Union Territory which has also an elected Assembly in a different manner, different from that of the State. In order to avoid this discrepancy I would submit, Sir, that our Union Territories Act should be amended to that effect to give more powers to the Council of Ministers in the Union Territories. In fact, I am of the opinion, which I reiterated before also, that the entire Union Territories Act 1963 should be scrapped and all those provisions which are there in that Act should be incorporated in the Constitution by adding a new Chapter. This is because when Parliament has passed the Union Territories Act in 1963, this Act governs the Union Territories whereas the States are governed under the Constitution. Therefore, this gave them in a way a status below that of a citizen of a State. In order to avoid this discrepancy again, I would suggest that the Union Territories Act, to the extent, may be modified and the Provision may continue to the Union Territories, with modifications, as suggested in the provisions of the Constitution.

Secondly, in the process of Centre-State relationship, always consultation with the Opposition Parties are required. In fact, our Prime Minister, Shri Rajev Gandhi in the initial stages had consultations with the leaders of the Opposition Parties But our experience in this regard was very bitter. It may be some persons like Mr. Dandavate might have been cooperating

with the Government with respect to certain aspects. But subsequently, the role of the Opposition Parties has not been to that cooperative.

Now, for instance, let us take the case of Punjab. We read in the newspapers that they are firing this rocket and at this nick of time, we had the Constitutional Amendment for emergency. But they have opposed it. They opposed the provisions to amend the Constitution for this purpose, when things had gone to the extent that actually war is waged, practically in Punjab by terrorists. This is the way, they try to oppose tooth and nail every aspect of Government decision. If they cooperate sincerely, perhaps the things would have been better.

About the electoral reforms which are part and parcel of the system, same thing is happening. Although we have got independent body to deal with electoral reforms, it is we the Central Government, in consultation with the Election Commission and various Parties, who have to achieve this process of electoral reforms. I would, in fact, urge upon the leaders of the various political parties to go into this matter. It is because everyone is interested in free and fair elections, May-be in some pockets, certain things may work. But everyone is interested in having a system which is very much free and fair and we are also interested today in reducing the role of money power which is there in the process of elections. They are also interested; the ruling Party is also interested. In fact, some of the Members have spoken about this aspect this morning. Therefore, supposing if we coordinate our thinking and put our heads together, I think, a well-documented programme or scheme of electoral reforms can come. Therefore, I would urge upon the leaders of various political parties to cooperate with the Government in this regard.

Lastly, I would come to the three lists which are also part of the relationship. The subjects are well laid down in the Union List, State List and Concurrent List. Many times what we do is, for instance, take education which being a concurrent subject, we are having national education policy.

But what happens is, in the case of education, about the education policy, if a State Government does not comply with that policy, we are handicapped. Therefore, in such matters of concurrent list, we can have some sort of guidelines rather than policy. When we say, it is a policy, it has to be effectively implemented in full and we should give no scope to anyone to violate that policy. In that matter of Union List, we can have a policy and get it implemented because the Centre is in full charge of that subject. But as far as concurrent list is concerned, this problem arises. We enact a policy on a subject falling in the concurrent list and some States do not cooperate, and then the failure comes on the Centre. In fact, the Centre is not fully responsible because the actual execution or implementation lies with the State Government. Therefore, in this list, I would like to make a suggestion that not only education but wherever concurrent subjects are there, let us have some sort of guidelines instead of policy so that we do not give any scope for the State Government, specially in the education field. Certain State Governments like West Bengal, as far as educational policy is concerned, are not willing to cooperate to any extent. They pretend that they have not been consulted. I have found out that they have been consulted. The draft policy was sent to them. But they pretend that they have not been consulted. They find fault with every point of the policy. To avoid this, I would say that we can have guidelines on this subject. As far as Union List is concerned, we can have this policy.

I would say that I mentioned only three or four points on the Centre-State relationship. In any case, we will have a thorough discussion on Sarkaria Commission report and in this discussion, let us hope that some valid points will emerge from both sides and Government will be able to fortify this relationship in future.

SHRI SATYAGOPAL MISRA (Tamluk) : I am thankful to Mr. H. M. Patel for moving this resolution which has given us another opportunity to discuss the present position of Centre-State relationship.

Through the years, we have developed some established policies, some principles and above all, there is our Constitution which can safeguard the Centre-State relationship.

I can refer to the resolutions of the Congress-I party before independence. What they have said during the freedom struggle against the British imperialists about the Centre-State relationship? In different resolutions, it was clearly said that after independence, there will be a Government at the Centre but the State Governments will be given more powers so that they can function well. But if we go through the history after independence, we see that the Government at the Centre is making a continuous effort to disown State Government and to make the State Government weak in different ways. This is their continuous effort. Both are elected Governments. Government at the Centre and the State Governments both are elected and they are elected by the people of our country. Guided by the Constitution, the Government at the Centre and the State Governments have different roles to play and different responsibilities to discharge. In practice, our experience has to be discussed elaborately.

Our Central Ministers, when they go to different States, particularly to non-Congress-I States, their only activity is to condemn the activities of the State Governments. That has become the only activity of the Central Ministers.

You know there is an Article 356 of the Constitution, All the Central Ministers when they go to non-Congress-I States, always give lectures that they will use Article 356 to dislodge the elected State Government there. That has become the practice of the Central Ministers at present. They act in a way as if this country has become their personal property.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (S. BUTA SINGH) : This is not correct, I am sorry.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK : He is making a false statement.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The hon. Minister says that your statement is not correct.

SHRI SATYAGOPAL MISRA : I am very happy if my statement is wrong. But I ask Mr. Buta Singh to go to Calcutta once again. Shri P. R. Das Munsri requested him to go Calcutta. I would also like to request him to go to Calcutta. (*Interruptions*). Please go to Calcutta and ask your own people; please go through all the daily newspapers published in Calcutta during the Panchayat elections. (*Interruptions*).

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (S. BUTA SINGH) : Will you kindly yield for a moment ? This is the problem with the opposition. I have been repeatedly saying that do not go by the rumours of press reports. You quote any Central Minister having gone to Calcutta and said what you have said just now that we would use Article 356 against the Government of West Bengal. Quote any Minister.

SHRI SATYA GOPAL MISRA : I am very thankful to Mr. Buta Singh. But our experience is otherwise. We have seen Mr. Ghani Khan Choudhary when he was the Central Minister. (*Interruptions*). We have heard Shri P. R. Das Munsri. (*Interruptions*).

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI K. C. PANT) : He talked of Bay of Bengal. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SATYAGOPAL MISRA : What has happened in Tripura ? Before elections, army was deployed without the consent of the State Government. Even without the consultation with the Election Commission at the Centre, army was deployed. In this way, our Centre-State relationship is going on.

You see the loan melas are going on. It is very good. If you give loans to the poor people, nobody will object to it. But do it in a proper manner. The RBI is there, its instructions are there, banking system is there. You give loans to the poor as much as you can. But do it in a proper way. In the non-Congress (I)

Governments, one particular party, the ruling party at the Centre will collect applications along with some money and then the banks will be asked to distribute loans. The Minister at the Centre will go and himself distribute loans in an undemocratic manner. What is happening ? Before the Panchayat elections in West Bengal, the Minister incharge of Rural Development went to West Bengal and sanctioned some money for rural reconstruction to a particular club belonging to a particular political party. Is this the way ? (*Interruptions*).

KUMARI MAMTA BANERJEE (Jadavpur) : It is not true. It is a social organisation. (*Interruptions*)

DR. PHULRENU GUHA (Contai) : ...It sanction was before the election was declared. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SATYAGOPAL MISRA : It is true. It has happened in my district. I know it. If I am wrong, you can bring a Privilege Motion against me. In this way, they are maintaining the Centre-State relationship at present.

I have heard Mr. Shantaram Naik. He has given a philosophy by which there should be no State Governments. Even, there should be no Central Government. One person should dictate and that will go on. He has given that idea. He was saying about the bankruptcy of some State Governments. I would like to ask him why has it happened so ? Why some State Governments are financially weak. Whose fault it is ? What do you do here at Centre ? Are you not financially bankrupt ? You deficit financing is rupees 700 to 800 crores which is going up year after year. (*Interruptions*) Have the State Government any machinery so that they can print notes ? You say : "you have to stop all overdrafts." Have this Central Government got any moral right to ask the State Governments to stop overdrafts when they themselves go on for deficit financing year after year and the amount of deficit financing go up every year ?

Then what happens when some natural calamities arise like some floods or some drought ?

16.00 hrs,

According to the Finance Commission, some margin money is left with the State Governments but when the margin money becomes insufficient, then one Central Team will go they will see and at their sweet will they will sanction some money to the State Government. In this way can a flood situation or a drought situation be saved—whether it is in the Congress-I rules States or in the non-Congress-I rules States? It should be done in a proper manner with the consultation of the respective State Government, so that the flood situation or the drought situation can be tackled in a proper way.

The Finance Commission is consulted from time to time and according to their recommendations some reorganisation in financial matters is done. But what happened to the last Finance Commission's recommendations? The recommendations of that Finance Commission were rejected by the Government at the centre and particularly the State Government of West Bengal was deprived of Rs. 325 crores. Why did it so happen? Usually the recommendations of the Finance Commission are taken into consideration. But in that case when the West Bengal State Government was the beneficiary, at one stage the Central Government took a decision not to accept the recommendations of that Finance Commission.

Sir, let me discuss to the question of the post of Governor, Mr. Shantaram Naik has said so much of the activities and appointments of Governors. It has become a political rehabilitation centre of the persons belonging to ruling party at the centre. Some persons lose their election and they are rehabilitated at the office of a Governor. Some Ministers lose their jobs and they are rehabilitated as Governors. They are acting in that way, in a partisan manner. This has started since 1957 when the duly elected State Government of Kerala was dislodged. In some newspapers it was published that some CIA money was floated to dislodge the Kerala Government.

Now, the ruling party at the centre is making discrimination against State Govern-

ments. Over the years two irrigation projects were taken up by the Central Government—one was Bhakra-Nangal in Punjab and the other was Tista in West Bengal. Both these States had to suffer because of the partition of our country. Bhakra-Nangal was constructed with the financial help of the Central Government. But what happened to the Tista project? Bhakra-Nangal was completed, that is good, we have no objection. But for the construction of Tista project, uptill now they have given only Rs. 5 crores out of a total cost of Rs. 450 crores. This type of discrimination is going on.

Much was said about freight equalisation. It was accepted by the Central Government that the freight equalisation Act will be withdrawn. Year after year is passing away. How much time will it take? When we ask this question they say that there are some differences among the State Governments. You ask the Chief Ministers to come and have a free discussion and take a decision. How long can we go on waiting for the freight equalisation policy to be withdrawn?

Similarly what about the consignment tax? The State Governments are deprived of the consignment tax. Year after year it is going on and the passing of the Consignment Act is still pending. I don't know when it will come.

Sir, yesterday in the House the hon. Minister of Industry said that everything has been cleared in respect of Haldia Petrochemical complex. Since 1977 we have been trying to have a petrochemical complex at Haldia in West Bengal but till now we have not got the industrial licence. Yesterday the hon. Minister of Industry gave a vague answer that everything has been cleared. What has been cleared? I would like to know whether the industrial licence has been issued or not?

In the mean time some petro-chemical complexes in other parts of the country have come up. We have no objection to that but what has happened to petro-chemical complex at Haldia. In this House Mr. P. Siv Shanker when he was incharge of this

[Shri Satyagopal Misra]

Ministry categorically assured us that Haldia petro-chemical complex will come up but so many years have passed and the fate of this project is still hanging in the air. I do not know when the industrial licence will be issued.

Sir, a lot has been said about the electronics complex at Salt Lake, Calcutta. West Bengal Government has acquired a valuable piece of land and reserved the same for the development of electronics in West Bengal. Although electronics complexes have been sanctioned in other parts of the country yet as far as West Bengal is concerned the reason given is that West Bengal is a border State and, as such, electronics complex cannot be set-up at Salt Lake whereas in some other border States like Haryana and U.P. electronics complexes have been set-up. We have no objection to that but why the State of West Bengal is deprived of it? That is the main question.

Sir, in U.P. in the current plan some fertiliser units are coming up. That is good. But what has happened to the Haldia fertiliser complex? When will that project be commissioned? Time and again we have asked the question but no categorical answer has come and in this way the Government at the Centre goes on discriminating with the non-Congress (I) States. Therefore, a situation has been created in the country where the safeguards for the upkeep of the Centre-State relationship in our Constitution have gone down and a deliberate attempt has been made by the Central Government so that State Government cannot function properly. A clear discrimination is going on so that the non-Congress (I) governments may not function. Their projects are not sanctioned. Money is not released in time. Therefore, time has come when the matter should be dealt with properly.

Sir, when the country-wide agitation was going on this subject then the Central Government constituted Sarkaria Commission. They have submitted their report recently. We have got a copy of the report but till now the Central Government has not taken any decision as to which of the recommendations they are accepting or

rejecting. So the fate of the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission is hanging in the air and I do not know how long it will remain hanging in the air. In this way, the Government have centralised their functioning. Their attitude has created a confusion among the people at large in our country. In this respect, I want to make some positive suggestions. Both the State Governments and the Central Government are elected. Both of them should be made stronger. Nobody wants that there should be a weak Government at the centre. There should be a strong government at the Centre. At the same time, I suggest that there should be the strong State Governments functioning properly.

All the financial resources should be distributed in a proper manner. The subjects like Defence, Transport, Communications, Banking, Foreign Affairs, should remain in the hands of the Centre. They will deal with these matters. Other work should go to the States. They should function and discharge the other responsibilities, which the Centre is enjoying at present.

As regards financial resources, 75 per cent of the funds from the Central exchequer should be distributed among different States. It may be West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh or any other State. With the remaining 25 per cent of the financial resources, the Central Government will discharge their duties. If we go in this manner, we can have strong India with strong Centre and strong States. I hope my suggestion will be taken up.

Even after 40 years of Independence, politics of confrontation is going on. I can repeat it again. Mr. Buta Singh is there to react on it. Every time when the Central Ministers go to the non-Congress States, they go on accusing the State Governments. That has become their routine affair. They are afraid that if they do not function in that way, they might lose their ministership. Such types of things cannot be tolerated. A time has come when we should define the Centre-State relationship in a very meaningful way. Therefore, the resolution moved by Mr. H.M. Patel can be accepted. Thank you.

PROF. N.G. RANGA (Guntur) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have heard very carefully the two speeches that have been delivered today. I would like to say, in the very beginning, that our Constitution is neither federal nor unitary. It is a unique thing by itself. It was formulated for a society as well as a country which is continental. True, we had the example of England on one side and America on the other. But we developed this structure in order to suit our conditions. There is no such thing as finality about it. It is an evolving process of approach towards our practical problems.

In the beginning, when the Constituent Assembly was convened, we were thinking of only very few limited powers for the Centre. At that time, we had to negotiate with the Indian States, their princes and their autocracy. On top of it, there was Great Britain also. Slowly, Indian States were liquidated. The princes and their autocracy were removed. India became one politically and came to be devoted to

16.15 hrs.

[SHRI SARAD DIGHE *in the Chair*]

democracy. As a result, under the able leadership of Sardar Patel we began to think, first of all, of having strong Centre. Then the whole of the Constituent Assembly agreed that there should be a very strong Centre and at the same time a number of States with certain powers which are to be exercised in an autonomous manner with the aid of their own elected machinery of Legislature and all the rest of it. But in between, we also had to think of a contact between the State Governments, the State Legislatures and the Centre. Therefore, we adopted the British system. The earlier precedent we have had, it is the system of appointing Governors. Who used to appoint Governors? Of course, the Centre through the President. But then we conceived the idea to first of all consult the State Governments before we appointed the Governors. At the time of Pandit Nehru, in all the States, there were only Congress Governments. It would be a sensible thing to consult their Chief Ministers in regard to the appointment of Governors because at that time we were all acquainted with

each other. We were brought up in our political life as a kind of a great giant family and so we knew each other. The Chief Ministers in their States, when they were consulted, they knew all available ones as to who will be appointed as Governors. But then the Chief Ministers in the respective States would know who is who in the whole of the country, to be good enough, to be fit enough, to be big enough, to be experienced enough to be chosen as Governors. Therefore, how can we carry on that kind of experiment which Jawaharlal was able to make for over a period of 15 years? Since then changes came. We think of so many people. Administrators may have a bio-data. We think of politicians and political leaders. Because of our differences in political approaches, between the States and the Centre, they may not be willing to accept anybody at all who had never been a Member or an important leader or as a ruling partner at the Centre. Today it is the Congress. Some time back, it was Janata. Therefore, we cannot very well depend upon that kind of a practice which Jawaharlal initiated, not as a well-established convention but he hoped that the condition should continue to be in the manner they faced at that time, but today it is not possible.

Secondly, there is a move on the part of some of the State Governments and leaders that we should not appoint people of administrative experience. Some others say that we should not appoint anyone who had any political career. All these are conditions which cannot be fulfilled. Some of them would be administrators, some may be politicians some of them will be spokesmen and some may be philosophers. It all depends upon circumstances. Did we imagine that we would come to have a philosopher like Dr. Radhakrishnan and an educationist like Shri Zakir Hussain as President? We did not. But it came to be that way. Therefore, I do not agree with the kind of criticism that is emanating from some of the eminent leaders in the States which are being governed by parties which will not see eye-to-eye with the central party. At the same time, we must also agree to look upon the Offices of Governors with some consideration and respect. There was a Governor in Madras, He took some objec-

[Prof. N.G. Ranga]

tion to the kind of diet that had to be provided for some dignitary and then within 24 hours he was removed. I was shocked and I could not understand it even upto this date. I cannot reconcile myself to the rationale of that act. This is one extreme on one side. On the other, recently in some Cabinet a resolution was passed against the Governor and a political party has gone on record criticising the Governor. This is not the way this high office is to be treated at all. Then, they want to judge the Governor by the amount of money he spends. What are the functions of a Governor apart from the functions that are charged on him in the Constitution? There are so many non-political functions like the Red Cross Social activities, organizations working for the welfare of the minorities, tribal people, scheduled castes and under-developed sections and areas and specially the disabled women and disabled people. To these people, it is not the Chief Minister or the Prime Minister who is really the Godfather, it is the Governor, because he represents the whole of the State there and he represents the whole of the nation in that particular part of India. Therefore, the Governor has got to be social and has to meet the organizational needs of such organizations and provide leadership also to these people but in a non-political manner, non-factious and in a statesmanlike manner. These are the conditions which should be fulfilled, which should be respected both by the Governors on the one side and the Ministers who happen to be there in power in the respective States on the other.

Having said that about the Governors, now about the division of powers. There was the Rajmanna Commission appointed by the Madras Government at one time. Recently, on the pressure from opposition as well as from regional sections and sectors, Sarkaria Commission was also appointed. They have now made a report to us. I do not think that report can be final at any time. Nor can any report be final because it is in the evolving process of political life that we are having in our country. But for whatever it is worth, it is a very important Commission. We should certainly

pay a very high regard to their recommendations. I agree, but then when it comes to separation of powers, look at the manner in which some of the States have behaved in regard to water resources. It is supposed to be a State subject. We made a mistake in the beginning. Education also we thought should be a State subject. Why did we not pay greater attention to the needs for Central responsibility also in regard to these things? At that time we did not pay sufficient attention, and we were guided by earlier experiences under the British. So, we left it at that. Agriculture, forestry, education, water resources, irrigation and so on are all State subjects. During these forty years have we not found it necessary to give more and more powers, not more than what the States are expected to exercise, because the Centre did not have any power to start with in many of these things. We have done that. Therefore, this division of responsibility as well as powers has powers has also got to be a flexible thing, made to depend on the experiences we gain. Environment now has become an all-India responsibility, Can anybody object to that? But a State Government which is so very keen for an irrigation project, or some other project, which is too impatient about it, may take objection to the environment being with the Centre and saying that the project should not be in this area. It should be in some other area, otherwise pollution there would be, environment mischief there would be. Then the State Governments go on quarrelling with each other. These are all practical problems. Water resources we have left to the States. What has happened between Maharashtra and Andhra, Maharashtra and Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and Kerala over Krishna, Godavari and Cauvery? They are notable to settle it. Therefore, the Centre has got to come again and again. One after the other—our own Members of Parliament—go on asking day after day the Central Government to have, if necessary, a special legislation in order to force the State Governments to come to some kind of an agreement or to accept the decision of the Central Government. We did go into this matter, We passed a legislation in regard to the appointment of a Tribunal. Then there was a complaint from here saying that it should not be appointed.

The Central Government comes around and then says, we must make the concerned State Governments agree to that before we can appoint a Tribunal. These are practical difficulties. How are we to get over them? We have got to get over them by trial and experiment. That means there must be harmonious relationship between the Centre and the States.

What happens when the Chief Ministers themselves indulge in walk out from the National Development Council? You just think about the enormity of it. Only this morning we were discussing educational policy. We want to see that students are taught how to be disciplined. But Professors, Lecturers, teachers, everybody, have no discipline at all. Now here, at the very top of it, the people who have got to set an example to the rest of the population in our country, they themselves indulge in indiscipline, by simply walking out from the National Development Council. How many of them participated? May be 27 or 28 and at the most 30—including every kind of administration that we have in our country. These thirty people could not very well sit together, discuss things in a patient manner with mutual respect towards each other. Now with such personnel that we have as leaders in our country, we cannot very well have cut and dry division of powers and responsibilities between the Centre and the States.

Then comes the question of languages. There is a question regarding Belgaum, I was very much worried about it, as much as the concerned Chief Ministers—the poor people. What is the use of blaming the good old Indiraji for having delayed the solution of that problem? They are highly educated, trained, experienced and aged Chief Ministers, who are not able to sit together and come to any kind of a settlement.

One side says, "we are prepared to give Rs. 100 crores in order to get one city" and the other side says what is this Rs. 100 crores? It is a matter of honour. You just see this kind of madness. What is the solution for it? Not by legislation. The solution can only lie in the hearts of the leaders from both sides.

In Sri Lanka there are two areas—Southern and Northern. In between these two areas, there lies one Buddhist area. The Southern and Northern areas are predominantly Tamilian areas. We have agreed to let those two areas be put into one province and we provide them with provincial Governments. Have we not done that? Can we not think of our own solutions on some such lines? If we do that, would we not be able to solve this problem, here in Punjab—problem regarding two taluks? But they begin to quarrel. We are having all these troubles in Punjab. There are three or four villages where some other languages prevail. What does that matter? If a solution is possible in Sri Lanka, why should not similar solution be possible here in our country also? But people must be sensible-minded, co-operative-minded. They must be statesmanlike. They must behave in a statesman-like manner, but they do not. What is the difference between an ordinary man and a statesman? Ordinary man would not have any patience until his case is settled by the Supreme Court.

He is so curious, so factions'. But a statesman is prepared to follow the policy of give and take. That is exactly where I insist that statesmanship should be allowed to prevail and that can happen only when Parliament exercises wisdom and Legislature exercises wisdom.

There was a Chief Minister who said that he must have complete freedom to draw upon the RBI. Now to call upon the RBI to place all the money that he needed for his own various schemes, nobody objects to these schemes. But there is a limit for finances, so the Centre says; his own people say and he says, look at the Centre. It goes on having welfare schemes, defence expenditure and all the rest of it, indulging in inflation, indulging in deficit financing, indulging in asking the RBI to go on printing more and more notes. "If it is possible for the Central Government, why should it not be for me?" he says. Now, who is going to tell him the A, B, C of the Constitution, A, B, C of political life. If a village panchayat rises against a mandal panchayat, mandal panchayat rises against zila parishad then zila parishad rises against the State

[Prof. N.G. Ranga]

Government ! Let him think about these issues. Not only himself as, one man, let all the Chief Ministers think about it and then they would realise the need, the wisdom for them to abide by the Constitution. But let the Centre carry on its work according to the Constitution and to make the State Governments also behave themselves properly. Oh, they do not like the word 'behave' They say, "Who are you, the Centre, to say that we should behave?" That is the trouble we had about Tripura. I do not wish to go into details. What was Tripura ? True, we give them the Statehood, but, at the same time, how many million population, what is the size of it ? In the whole of this great country, it is only a infinitesimal thing. Therefore, they must go on dictating to the government in regard to security also and they must find fault with the government because Centre finds it necessary to interfere there. With regard to movement of population between that State and a neighbouring State, if we go on in this way, we cannot make any progress in our country. My hon. friend, the author of this resolution was a great friend of mine at Oxford and here in India. During the decade, when we were carrying on our Swatantra Party, we ourselves were sitting on that side where Prof. Dandavate is now sitting. He is one of the most responsible politicians in our country and advisedly he has formulated his proposition. He says, early re-structuring so that federalism underlies. . and so on and so forth. He did not say straightway that the State Government should have so much power Already, they have so much of it. Certainly, we are all in favour of early re-structuring; it is not early; it is an eternal thing, but, then from period to period we should be re-structuring. But, as the times comes, the time, I am prepared to say, is coming; it would come provided, firstly, the Chief Ministers in the States; secondly, the Prime Minister and, thirdly, the one which was not included at that time when we were passing the Constitution, the National Planning Commission, along with it other commissions which are also cooperating in order to see that our country is held together; all these people are willing to cooperate with each other in a statesman-like manner, not in a manner in

which some of the State Chief Ministers have behaved or misbehaved in the National Development Council by indulging in that rowdy fashion or students' fashion or trade union fashion of walking out. So, the time is coming, time is there provided that atmosphere is there. As long as that atmosphere is not there I wish to swear by the Constitution that I am not prepared to depart from it.

Next thing, some chief Ministers say Oh! Inter-continental international powers also, we must have There were proposals coming from one of the State Governments that they should have power to raise loans in other countries, to invite industrial concerns of other countries to come and become partners in their own industrial concerns! Where do we go then in this direction ? I would like my hon. friends also to give a serious thought to it. If you allow a thing like that, then this country will go to dogs. It will go back to the Mughal period, when one great Peshwa was here, — was he a Peshwa, what was he ? — one great Emperor simply trounced down and another fellow, his own Sardar sat on him, pulled out his eyes one after another, that is after Aurangzed had gone away. A thing like that ought not to be allowed to happen here in our country and that was the reason why I was very glad indeed that Indiraji at that time put her foot down and then said, "Nothing doing; if you want, come and deal with our Planning Commission. If they agree that such and such an industrial concern is absolutely necessary for the development of industries in your own State, then you negotiate with the Planning Commission as to wherefrom you are going to get the money If there is an American concern, or a Russian concern, or any other foreign concern, which is willing to come into partnership with your own local concern, let them discuss it. But under our auspices, under the auspices of the Planning Commission. Then let us decide. All that foreign capital should also be treated as national resource. Then it can be divided between one State and another. One State cannot go on like that, borrowing from abroad when all other States are crying for money. The whole country is one when it comes to the question of money, investment, industrial development,

national development and educational development."

Now I am coming to Education. What is the position ? Here is Navodaya scheme. Excellent scheme ! The Prime Minister has put it very nicely the other day. I do not wish to repeat it. The backward classes were never tried. Harijans, even the minorities, Muslims and others, women—they were all neglected. You depended upon one caste for providing the national genius for our country. Therefore, the country went down. Slowly the British came and broadened the seed bed of education. Now here again is the Prime Minister. Here is the Education Minister coming forward with this revolutionary scheme of Navodaya, in order to help, give special preference to the children of all those minorities, of all those undeveloped people, suppressed people and also especially the rural people, to send their children to get the best possible type of education, better education than what you are supposed to be getting at Doon or at any public school or any of the places abroad, Cambridge or Oxford or in America. They would get that education. In that way we would be able to open up just as from borewells underground water comes up, so much of underground, where the huge social mass of people who had not been invited to make their contribution to the national well being, national thought and national wisdom ? This is the great vista for intellectual development.

What does one Government say in their own wisdom ? Wherefrom do they get it, God only knows. We are not going to use Navodaya. They have got some wisdom. Is it from the East or is it from the West ? God only knows. But they do not want to have it. In such circumstances, what is the kind of solution that you can get either from Rajamannar or Sarkaria or that Gurdwara, of Anandpur where they hatched that evil plan for Khalistan ? Therefore, it is absolutely necessary that we should certainly have re-structuring, but not now. When ? When all these people are prepared to behave towards each other in a statesmanlike manner, in a progressive manner and in a manner in which we made the Constitution last time. Thank you.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj) : Mr. Chairman Sir, at the dawn of our Constitution, Dr. Ambedkar cautioned us and said that we need gentlement to run the Constitution.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : Ladies also.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : suppose gentlemen includes ladies also.

When I was listening to the speech of our revered colleague Mr. N.G. Ranga, I really felt touched and I think that a time has indeed come when we should see where the Indian State is proceeding; the way which way we are going; whether we have lost the way and what should we do to bring us on the rails in order that we really evolve and mature into a functioning-federal, secular, democratic socialist order.

Sir, politics has always been defined as a system under which you determine who gets, what, how much and how. Politics is concerned with the distribution of assets, resources and goods and services of the society. But politics in our country has been reduced to a game of competitive acquisition and we politicians perhaps are very acquisitive animals. We are always confronting each other in order to get wealth, very hopefully, for our States, for our regions, for our communities, a bigger share of the cake. Some sort of a struggle is essential; certain degree of competition ought to be there; but when it is carried to a point where we start encroaching upon the legitimate aspirations of another region of our country, another community in our own country, then perhaps we give rise to situation a which does not augur well for harmony to which Prof. Ranga referred.

Sir, we have two ways of looking at the problems that are with us today. One is of course, to go into contemporary reality—hard solid facts. The other is to take a conceptual view and that is what I imagine Sarkaria Commission has tried to do, what is ought to be, what is the pattern that we should proceed towards. Of course, the real test will always be, how we can change from the contemporary reality to that ideal which we are harping on. But the ten-

[Shri Syed Shahabuddin]

dency that we find today, whether it is the Central Government or the State Governments, the overall tendency over the last forty years has been that every political party in our country and every political leader has been speaking in terms of decentralisation of power, keeping in view that renunciation is the ultimate test. But the actual fact, we must admit that the trend has been towards centralisation. More and more power, more and more authority, and more and more functions have flown upwards even from the level of the local bodies or municipalities. The functions that we at one time carried out by Panchayats, they have all become concentrated into the hands of, what you call, bureaucracy or the District Administration or the State Governments. In fact, if I say so, to a large extent, many of these functions have also in effect been concentrated in the hands of the Central Government.

There are ways of doing it. When you have control over the resources of the State, you have sordid processions in my view, of Chief Ministers on their annual pilgrimage of obeisance to Delhi and arguing for a crore or two crores or ten crores, getting as much as they can. Some are blessed with favours and some are looked at with disfavour. And that creates, to my mind, a situation which, I think, in the larger national interest we should avoid. So, how do we reverse this trend? This is a question, to my mind. We must start with this confession that this trend of 40 years has to be reversed. Gandhiji talked of the gram panchayat. And that is why, when I think of the Centre-State relations I am not confining myself to just the relations between the Centre and the States. I think, you have to think of the Centre-State relations in the larger perspective of decentralisation of power when it logically follows that a State Government must be prepared to share its power with the district level and whatever authority we have at the district level that power should be decentralised to the block level and right down to the gram panchayat level. And I was very happy the other day when the Prime Minister did talk about reversing the planning process. That is what we have been

arguing for so many years that economic and social planning of this country must not be carried out in the ivory towers of Delhi. It must begin from the grassroot level. A combination of village plans must give us a panchayat plan. A combination of panchayat plan must give us a district plan. A combination of district plans must give us a state plan. And similarly a combination of State plans must finally give us the national plan. Of course, I am not taking into consideration those specific areas of authority in which, for example, the Centre is supreme. There, of course, the Centre has to plan by itself. I will come to that later. But broadly that should be the pattern.

Having said this, I would like to say that from a purely functional point of view and by virtue of geography and history by virtue of the very size of our country and by virtue of the plurality which is a gift of history, efficiency in administration and accountability are just not possible without a due degree of decentralisation. If the village teacher is not working, the Education Minister at the Centre cannot control. It is impossible. Even the State Minister of Education cannot control. If a Medical Officer in the primary health centre is not paying due attention to his job, it is only at the level that his performance can be controlled and he can be made accountable. Therefore, there has to be monitoring at that level. And for that monitoring to be effective, there has to be authority vested at that level. Therefore, from a purely functional point of view, we have got to define areas of responsibility for each of these levels I have mentioned. No doubt, we have thought about these Central subjects. And I think, we have always agreed that there are certain functions and we have no disagreement on that, which can only be carried out in respect of the sovereign State only by a central authority. The maintenance of independence of the country, the protection of its territorial integrity, its defence from foreign enemies, its national network of communication, its national monetary system, even its broad economic relations, the economic system and its relations, with the outside world, because no economy in the world today operates in a vacuum; it has to

operate in the world environment, all these can only be carried out by a central authority. The trouble is something with the psyche. I think, this much is granted and conceded by everyone. But our minds are clouded by our experience of history. We have certain psyche fear and apprehensions in our minds which move our thought in that direction that decentralisation or autonomy might ultimately mean disintegration of the country. This is the fear. We have always said and I have heard many speakers say so in my very brief political life, that India has been India or India has remained India only when there was a strong centre and the moment the centre was weak, then India had disintegrated. I think a lesson should be learnt from the history. But at the same time, the Governments of the past did not perform all the functions that we expect the governments of the present hopefully to perform, and, therefore, there cannot be a comparison on all the fours. That is why I am taking a functional approach that there are certain functions granted that can be performed only by the Centre. But you must equally grant that certain functions can only be performed at the village level, certain functions can only be performed at the Panchayat level, or at the district level, or at the State level. Only those functions which cannot be performed at the lower level should be taken up at the higher level. That should be our axiom. That should be our conceptual framework, without which we cannot really come to a proper balance, in my view.

There is also this problem, again arising from geography, of a certain heartland of the country and its relationship with the periphery. Forty years after Independence I am very much concerned about it that somehow the way we have run our polity, we have not been able to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of our periphery. The people who are living in our peripheral areas somehow feel that they are not in it, they are not participating in it, they have become marginal to the scheme, they make hardly any contribution to the formulation or resolution of national policies. It is the heartland which sets the tone, that makes the rule, and they feel as if they are the objects of this system and not equally

the subjects of the system. Now, this fear may not be wholly well-merited, but this fear and apprehension does persist and it is our national duty to see to it that the people in our peripheral regions do not continue to nurse such sentiments or feelings.

I would like to make another general point. Any set of problems which persist in our country, any phenomenon of a national nature, has to have through consensus a certain national approach for dealing with it. It requires a matching national consensus a national norm, a national standard, a national way of dealing with it, because the problems do : erupt from place to place, from time to time, but they are basically the manifestations of the same phenomenon. For example, whether you are dealing with social violence, or you are dealing with the linguistic minorities or you are dealing with the problems of health care, or you are dealing with the problems of, say, primary education, you must separate these two—the authority and the norm. The norm must be uniform, the norm must be universal, the norm must be national because we regard all our people as one, we regard all parts of our country to be deserving the same treatment. Therefore, when I apply this thought to the concept of Centre-State relations, I have said in the Parliament in the past when I was speaking on Punjab, that much as I favour the quest of autonomy, and greater autonomy, by various States, I cannot agree to a separate regime for any State of India. Kashmir, yes, because of historical situations, historical conditions. In any case, you cannot reverse the history. It is there. But then all States of India must be subject to the same pattern, must be subject to the same degree more or less, of the Central monitoring, Central authority or Central control, or whatever it is. It cannot be loss in the case of one State or more in the case of the other. So, that is where I apply this principle of uniformity, not only to a specific problem but also to a larger equation like that of Centre-State relations. However, where I find something amusing is we lay down uniform standards and yet when it comes to actual situations, somehow we tend to become arbitrary in our dealings,

[Shri Syed Shahabuddin]

somehow we tend to become not very forthright. We really do not treat every situation equally. We do not react to every situation with equal concern. We do not look upon the grievances or the aspirations of different areas with the same degree of care. Somebody is ours, somebody is not. Some governments are being run by the same Party which is in the Centre and some States are not. Therefore, some are in and some are out and this game of in-laws and out-laws goes on in our polity. This is where I object. There should not be any arbitrariness because arbitrariness will always lead to rowdiness of which Prof. Ranga complained.

SHRI RAM PYAREP ANIKA (Roberts-ganj) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want one information. Mr. Shahabuddin, you are time and again, in this speech even, saying that the Centre is not giving equal opportunities to the States so far as allocation and other things are concerned. Kindly give us some examples where the Centre has done like that.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : Well, I don't think the Chairman will give me that much of time, but I am sure that those who understand will understand. Those who understand, they know.

SHRI RAM PYARE PANIKA : This point is again repeated by him. So, let us have the exact thing. (*Interruptions*). I want to know which State. Kindly give one example where the State has been neglected. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : I said, some are in and some are out.

AN HON. MEMBER : Who are out ? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RAM PYARE PANIKA : Give an example. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : When you deal with the demands of States, somehow you feel that you are at odd squib or you do not politically bear the same colour. A certain degree of differentiation creeps in. May be it is part of human nature, may be it is part of the quasi process

of a State, I don't know. But an objective observer of the Indian political scene today will concede this point that while we lay down uniform standards and uniform norms, when it comes to applying them, we don't deal with the same degree of equanimity or with the same sense of equanimity. I do not have to give out anything, here there are learned men, they understand my point.

Now, Sir, on this point I would like to make one observation. I am for small States because it helps in one way because when you have got smaller States which are comparable to each other, the degree of differentiation that will be there in the treatment of a powerful State and a weaker State, that perhaps will come down. And it is another historic and cultural reason. We know that some of these States at least in the North are really in a sense accidents in history. They combine together areas over a vast stretch of land in which there is hardly any commonality of interest, there is hardly any sense of belonging to one area and therefore, when you look back into history you will find that there were distinct units in our history which have a certain cultural relevance, which have made a unique contribution to our history, whose names echo through the corridors of time apart from the question of manageability and therefore, the people of that region have a certain understanding with each other, have a certain possibility of working and cooperating with each other for a common cause. That is why I plead for smaller States. Once you have smaller States, the possibility also of striking the right balance between the Centre and the States will be much more. That is also another aspect of the matter because sometimes the Centre which has to deal with a variety of States which vary from a population of 120 million to the population of less than a million finds it very difficult to apply those uniform standards that I talked about. That perhaps can be sorted out to some extent by taking into consideration history, geography, culture, language, and then trying to create socio-cultural units which have a homogeneity, which have an aspiration to which people respond, and that is one reason, Mr. Chairman, I feel why the development of the smaller States

has been much faster. Even a State like Haryana which in resources is much less endowed than my State of Bihar has moved faster.

AN HON. MEMBER : You are supporting Jarkhand.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : I am only making a conceptual presentation.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY (Mindapore) : Don't be a Jarkhandi, any way (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : I am a born Jarkhandi, any way.

17.00 hrs.

Now as far as the Constitution and legal provisions are concerned, of course, we will get an opportunity to go into in detail when we deal with the Sarkaria Commission report. I am hopeful that it will be presented to Parliament with the views of the Government and we shall have an occasion, as the Home Minister promised, to discuss the recommendations in detail and in depth and coming to a national consensus on that point.

One question that is in my mind and that is always a debatable question is, where should the residuary power reside. I think, that has dogged us from 1920 onwards ever since we started looking for Constitutional devolution of power. I feel, when I start from the bottom and I want a functional allocation of responsibilities and duties—starting from below—then it is obvious and logical that the residuary power must ultimately reside in the Centre. It is because, I am defining from below and functionally going up, stage by stage, step by step. Therefore, in my view the residuary power must rest with the Centre. But we must be fair to each level and we must not try to make any short cut. We may must be very fair to them and see that whatever is possible for them to do justice to them; whatever is possible for them to deal with effectively in the interest of the people, keeping the welfare of the people as our ultimate objective. We should be generous in defining those powers and then conceptually certain residuary powers will remain and that will of course come up and flow at the Centre.

PROF. N.G. RANGA : There is no atmosphere of secularism in a village. It is all casteism. Kindly remember what horrors have been committed in Bihar and Andhra Pradesh.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : It is those villagers who elect us and send us to Parliament.

I cannot say, I am a villager. But I must say, had been to the villages also. (*Interruptions*.)

I must, however, refer to one institution, the institution of Governor. There is a point of view and I think a legitimate case can be made out for abolishing this post. But perhaps an equally good case can be made out for keeping them. But unfortunately, the Governor who is a Constitutional post as defined in the Constitution; has been in practice made into an agent of the Central Government. I am not using a harsher phrase. I could call him, hand-maid of the central Government but I would not do so. You can have any number of examples of command performance and I think, this is what is eating into the institution. We have, of course the recommendation of the Sarkaria Commission that at least active politicians should not be appointed as Governors. The Sarkaria Commission says, retired Ministers should not be appointed....

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM) : Should we appoint inactive politicians ?

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : Those politicians who have renounced politics.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : I am willing to take the entire front row.

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE : That is what he says : when the candidates are defeated in the elections, they are inactive.

SHRI VIR SEN (Khurja) : Do you want bureaucrats to be appointed as Governors ?

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : It can be anybody. There are eminent people in every walk of life. We politicians think that we are very important. No. The country is really being run by the people who are not politicians.

Similarly, on the question of emergency provisions of I have a feeling that there has been not a very scare use of emergency provisions. I think, it has become far too generous and I would only point out to this House to take 40 years of independence by decades. Look at the example of first 10 years, the next 10 years, and then the next 10 years and then the latest 10 years. You will find perhaps the number of times that we have invoked the emergency provision in the last 10 years, is perhaps more than we did in the last 30 years. So, either the polity has deteriorated to an extent—that is really a matter of concern—or the power is being misused. All I am saying is emergency provisions have to be there in the Constitution but they have to be used with great care.

I would like to make two or three more points. As far as the Services are concerned, I think broadly there is a national consensus that the Services should cover more functions. There should be more All India Services. For example, there is much talk of All India Judicial Service. About judiciary, I would like to caution here. I had submitted in my last incarnation in the Rajya Sabha a Bill about the formation of a Supreme Council of Judiciary in order that the influence that the executive today exercises in the choice of judges should be reduced. It should be a purely judicial function in which the High Court concerned, the Bar Council, the Chief Justice of India play a role but, as far as possible, the President comes into the picture only for signing and sealing the document. That is there. This idea brings in politics. I am sure it is coming in and as Prof. N. G. Ranga very correctly pointed out those stalwarts which had tried to establish good conventions are no more on the scene.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : They are stalled now.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : On the question of economic and social planning, I have a point. This whole idea of a Centrally—sponsored scheme is anathema to me. I would suggest that the broad concept of the Centre should be collection agency and then the distribution of those resources, whatever formula the Finance Commission might suggest, the national consensus might prove, and then the State should be supreme in their domain. Here I find a Ministry which has no executive function. For example, the Ministry of Education. It does not build any dams, it does not have any flood control scheme. It does not operate anything. It only doles out money. It is only a money doling agency. I do not approve of the agency. If the function is to be carried out by the State Government, then that money should be made available to the State Government. If they like the Tista project or Mahanadi basis, the State Government should not come and beg for money.

SHRI PRATAP BHANU SHARMA (Vidisha) : This work is being done by the Ministry of Irrigation. That is more important.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : I have got the point. I have said on the floor of the House that technical expertise should be available. That is not so. I am talking about the financial aspect.

SHRI PRATAP BHANU SHARMA : It is to be seen whether that technical expertise is sound or feasible.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : It is where the States complain. Sometimes you can approve a project in no time. Sometimes you take decades. That is where politics come in.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK : You should settle the disputes also.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : The Ministry's Budget does not consist in paying for the technical expertise. The Ministry's Budget, the allocation that is available, 90% of it is finally used by the State. I say "Give it ab initio to the States. Don't make them beggars at your door."

This idea that the Prime Minister visits a place and generously announces a grant-in-aid or generously announces a project I think, again it is very political.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : On the eve of elections.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : He may have his other compulsions. That apart, after all, we are running a Government, an administration. A Project must be appraised, must be studied, as my friend pointed out, and the State Government must come into the picture and so on and so forth. This must be done in the normal course. But why make a political**

I have one more point about the mass media. I have spoken on this subject in the past and suggested that there should be a three-tier arrangement. Even the Parliament makes**... some times.

SHRI RAM PYARE PANIKA : Don't use the word.. **...

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : It takes two to make a **...

MR. CHAIRMAN : I will find out whether it is parliamentary. Then we will consider.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : As far as mass media is concerned, I feel that it has enormous power. We are tending towards a total control.

In fact, I have argued that a democracy does not need Ministry of Information. A democracy does not need Ministry of Information. Either the mass media should be totally free or at least it should be decentralised because from a national network, you cannot go into the grievances and the aspirations of the people at the grassroot level. I have argued, therefore, why can't we have three channels. There can be a state channel ; there can as well be a district channel. Because then only we shall be able to harness the energies of those people for the cause of development for the cause of education.

Finally, I just end by saying that once we can see that resource mobilisation is the responsibility of the Centre but the distribution must be according to certain uniform norms and the execution largely except those areas of exclusive authority of the Central Government must be in the hands of the State. Then it follows that our present system of planning, our present system of allocation leaves much to be desired and leaves a lot of bad blood in the course of this confrontation which must be avoided if we are to have a Centre-State relationship on a proper key. With these words, I stand here to support the Motion.

[Translation]

DR. G. S. RAJHANS (Jhanjharpur) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have been listening my friend Shri Shahabuddin for the last one hour very attentively but I could not make out anything from his speech.

[English]

I admit that my comprehension is poor.

SHRI SYED SHAHAUDDIN : I can take the horse to the water but I cannot make it drink.

[Translation]

DR. G. S. RAJHANS : He has said a very good thing that history is not every thing. There was a time in the history when it was said that there should be a strong Centre but now the time has changed.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : The Centre must be strong, who said it otherwise?

[English]

But on its own sphere.

[Translations]

DR. G. S. RAJHANS : But I have heard that.

[English]

Those who do not learn from history, they are condemned to repeat it.

[Dr. G.S. Rajhans]

[Translation]

It will be our bad luck if we do not learn lesson from our recent history. What was the political situation of the country before the arrival of Britishers in India and their departure from this country? Just now, hon. Shri Ranga has just explained lucidly what was in the minds of the member of the Constituent Assembly at the time of framing the Constitution. Our Constitution is neither unitary nor federal in character but it is unique in itself and this form of the Constitution must be maintained.

You please forget this petty politics for a while and search your soul and ask yourself as to whether the Centre should be weakened in view of the present happenings in this country? Would this be in your or our interests? If the Centre is allowed to be weakened then the country will be fully disintegrated and all of us will remain nowhere.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : How the Centre will become weak by giving some more powers to States?

DR. G.S. RAJHANS : I am telling you how it will become weak.

SHRI PRATAP BHANU SHARMA : The existence of the States depends on the existence of the country.

DR. G.S. RAJHANS : There is no use of making the pillars of a house strong without a strong roof. If there is no strong roof, what is the use of strong pillars? What you are advocating is to have a human body with strong feet and hands and weak head. But it is not good. To my mind, we should make efforts to strengthen not only our feet and hands but the head also. (Interruptions).

SHRI SYED MASUDAL HUSSAIN (Murshidabad) : We want that the Centre and the States both should be strong (Interruptions)

DR. G.S. RAJHANS : I beg your patience to hear me and let the Centre be

strong because this is the need of the hour. I would like to tell you a fact. The people in Bihar think that wherever the Centre has some interference there is stability but the spheres which fall under the jurisdiction of State Government, are full of weakness and the work is not being done properly in those spheres. The people of Bihar publicly say that education should not be kept in the concurrent list, it should be in the union list. The educational systems in Bihar is the worst in the country. When the boys of Bihar come in Delhi for employment after getting the education, they find themselves unable to compete with other candidates. What is the fault of these unlucky boys in it? We will have to draw a line anywhere and have to accept the interests of the country as supreme. Instead of raising the question of Centre vs. State we should see the interest of the nation.

When law and order problems assume serious proportions, it is the C.R.P.F. and B.S.F. which create fear in the minds of wrong doers. The people at that time think that the State police is partial. I will only say that you may please give an opportunity to make the Centre strong.

Our opposition colleagues have also referred to the question of over drafts. (Interruptions).

In support of it, a well reasoned argument is given that when the Centre can resort to the deficit financing and print as many currency note as it wants, why the States can not resort to over draft? It means that Central Government will continue to meet the extravagancy of the States Governments by printing more and more currency notes. It is a lesson to be learnt that those Congress ruled States which resorted to overdraft have to pay its price in the regime of Shrimati Indira Gandhi and Shri Rajiv Gandhi and the action was taken against them. The State Government utilise the facility of overdrafting to spend the money on their publicity. Thus, you tell me as to what is the use of this overdraft facility? You should keep national interest in mind. This does not give the State Governments a right to resort to overdraft in the manner they like, they should also think about the interest of the nation.

When the States take funds from the Centre, is it not their duty to furnish details of account of that fund to the Central Government? I want to tell you that there are some non-Congress ruled States which were provided more aids than Bihar at the time of floods but when they were asked to submit account of funds received they began to say that the Centre cannot ask for the accounts. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Don't record anything.

(*Interruptions*)**

[*Translation*]

DR. G.S. RAJHANS : I will go on repeating the same thing. Previously, I went to China and Russia for some days, there, I found that both the countries were of the opinion that a strong centre was must to make the States strong. Yes. I was saying that there should be no overdraft facility.

The Centre must be more strong and States should not be allowed to resort to over draft in a free manner, rather stringent measures should be taken to check it, so that the poor people of the entire nation are not put to suffer due to the spend thriftness of one State.

Now I come to the second point; My hon. friend has said that we have not taken any lesson from the Geography. In this regard, I would like to say that a strong Centre is must due to the Geo-political reasons and if a strong Centre is not created then we would be nowhere.

You referred to appointment of Governors. (*Interruptions*) The Administrative Reforms Commission and the Sarkaria Commission have also made certain recommendations in their respective reports about the office of the Governor and I also say that if you go through the post-independence history of India you will find the kinds of persons appointed as Governors or for that matter even Presidents they were either educationists or trade unionists e.g. Dr. V. Giri was a trade unionist. Then,

how can you say that a particular class of people should be appointed and a particular class of people should not. All are of the opinion that such persons should be appointed as Governors who have the experience in one or the other field and could be impartial in his dealings. In fact, only such persons are appointed Governors but you will always have the objection whoever may be appointed as Governor. These types of things should be avoided... (*Interruptions*) No doubt, the Central Government have appointed Shri Ram Lal as Governor but it has withdrawn him also. I would like to say in this regard that the office of the Governor is a very sacred one and there should be no controversy on this sacred office. Whenever, we talked about the rights and powers of the Governor, we have always tried to strengthen this institution but the opposition have always found faults with it. Now, I want to draw the attention of the House to a very funny thing which has also attracted the headlines of the newspapers It is said that the Prime Minister should have no right to convene the meeting of the District Magistrates of different States and make direct report with them. You tell me, what is harm in it. The Prime Minister belongs to the whole nation. If a person wants to work for the development of the whole nation, then why you got disturbed? When the public and the District Magistrates have no objection, then what objection the opposition can have?

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN : The time allotted for this Resolution is almost over. Is it the pleasure of the House to extend the time by another two hours?

MANY HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN : So, with the consent of the House, time for this Resolution is extended by two hours.

[*Translation*]

DR. G.S. RAJHANS : Therefore, to call the District Magistrates and have consultation with them by the Prime Minister is a step in right direction and I want that

[Dr. G.S. Rajhans]

this consultation should be held at a larger scale so that the Prime Minister may be able to know what is happening in this country. This types of consultations should be held in every State and the non-Congress ruling States should have no objection to it. The Prime Minister should call any District Magistrate of any State at random and may ask him what is happening.

I have already mentioned in this House and again I say that the money granted for development is not being spent for right purposes. I have mentioned in this House time and again that the responsibility of the Government does not end only by granting money and leaving its execution on State Government. The State Government doesn't execute it properly, whether it is a Congress ruled State or Non-Congress ruled State. Railway and Post and Telegraph which come directly under the Central Government are working very efficiently. But the Government granted money for Kosi Project and handed over it to the State Government and as a result of it their expenditure has increased and they have created a mass out of it. Therefore, my suggestion is that if the money is granted by Centre for any project either to Congress ruled States or Non-Congress ruled States, it should be executed by the Centre itself as is being done in the case of Railway and Post and Telegraph projects. The efficiency can be increased if the Centre takes the responsibility of execution of those projects in its hands.

I would also like to say some thing about the Financial Resources and Financial powers. There is a Finance Commission and if there is any problem, it can be referred to it. It will certainly take action but there will be no use of representing irrelevant things.

With regard to Mass-Media, the people demand to have two or three channels of television. But when the Government is unable to manage successfully even one channel, it would be very difficult to manage more channels. I impute motives of those people who are in favour of handing over Mass-Media into private hands. When the country is moving forward on the path of

progress, the people should make contributions to it, they should not create chaos as is prevailing in political parties. The country gets direction through Mass-Media and the people of remote areas become aware of the thinking and policies of the Government at Centre. The different channels of Mass-Media will create nothing but only confusion. We are already facing a great difficulty in those areas where the parallel system of Centre and State is working side by side. What advantages can be gained out of it except creating more complications and troubles ?

Our of our colleagues talked about Tripura. Frequent discussions have been made about Tripura in this House. In this concern there is a proverb in Hindi :

“Hath Kangan Ko Arasi Kya,
Pade Likhe Ko Farasi Kya”

which means a self truth needs no evidence. In the past, the people of Tripura were not so happy as they are at present. In this country, the three fourth of the newspapers are playing the role of opposition. Even the newspapers did not write to the effect that the people of Tripura are not happy after elections. Thus it is not reasonable to level wild allegations that Military was deployed, elections were rigged and the people of Tripura are not happy etc. It is very ironical that even the Ministers of the West Bengal Government levelled charges of Poll rigging at Panchayat Elections held in West Bengal, what to talk of others people. There cannot be more unfortunate thing than this.

I would like to conclude with these words that we will make separate discussions in details on Sarkaria Commission and will discuss and ponder over the all the varied issues like Centre-State Relations and Financial Relations, appointment of Governors, calling of district Magistrates for discussion, the issue of Mass-Media, and the issue of judges mentioned there in Sarkaria Commission. But I would like to mention only one thing that the views of opposition Members should be clear. Our country is making progress, therefore, contributions should be made towards it and you should desist from spreading

rumour that the Centre is becoming more strong at the cost of States are becoming weak day by day. The Centre is becoming strong as well as which the States are also becoming strong and with it the country is becoming strong.

[English]

SHRI KADAMBUR JANARTHANAN (Tirunelveli) : Mr. Chairman Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on the Private Member's Resolution. It is a very good Resolution brought by the ex-Finance Minister. After hearing Prof. Ranga who is a well experienced man, who lived at the time of Gandhi and is living at the time of Rajiv Gandhi, has touched at the end on the restructure which is inevitable for the present India. Basing upon that point—I am only an agriculturist, I am not a lawyer to speak on the legal side of the relations between the State Governments and the Central Government—as a common man, I would say that the relations between the States and the Centre should be like a mother and the child and not like a father and the child. Father will have likes and dislikes towards the child but mother will not have such things. Whether our attitude is right or wrong, looking to the present condition of the soil where Bhagat Singh was born, what is the problem today? Considering such things, Centre-State relations is not quite healthy. Even though we are united, the relation is not healthy. Everyone here, the lawyers and others often speak of a strong Centre. Centre is strong from 1947 uptill now. Our masters, our voters have made India, the Central Government as strong as possible, even when the Government changed in 1977. They never made the Central Government a weak and loose Government. We, the political people should say that our masters have made India strong. I will say that a strong Centre with stronger States will only lead to the strongest people of India. That should be the theory. I cannot understand what you mean by strong India. 401 MPs on the Rajivji side does not mean a strong Centre. Laws alone cannot bring strength. For example, consider the NMEP, the National Malaria Eradication Programme. The name is 'National'. They were eradicating malaria mosquitoes which lives everywhere. I say that the Centre is

over-burdened. We must let loose our burden to the youngest sons who are sitting at the high end of the country. When I come to Delhi by flight, I see a number of IAS officers flying from all States to Delhi. This shows that they are not able to take decisions of their own. Prof. Ranga was referring to Rajmanna's Commission which was from Tamil Nadu. We are proud of it and today we are having Sarkaria Commission. The number of Commissions will not bring unity but only the feeling matters.

Language spirit is inborn in any human being. Everyone's mother tongue should be given equal opportunity. When I climb Tamil Nadu Express, I must hear Tamil in Delhi. I must hear Tamil in Bombay. A man coming from Madurai to Maharashtra after visiting Meenakshi Temple, should hear his language there. A man coming from Bhubaneswar to Bangalore, must hear his language there. Only then the unity and integrity of the country will grow and the feeling of oneness will grow. You have the three-language formula. Whatever be the formula, the formulae are there only in chemicals, not for human beings.

I am a common man and I can only make an appeal to the intellectuals. As an Indian I feel proud. If India is disintegrated, we cannot live. In the present international situation, we should be united from Cape Camrin to Kashmir, otherwise we cannot survive. Only if we are united, we will be strong in culture and our existence will be fully possible.

Again, in the end, I would like to appeal to all the intellectuals that let the relations between the States and the Centre be like the children and the mother and not like children and the father as it is today.

[Translation]

SHRI HARISH RAWAT (Almora) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, keeping in view the circumstances in the country our Constitution is so framed that we can say it neither a fully federal nor a fully unitary. It strikes a balance between two and it stood the test of time in all situations so far cropped in the country. We have so far successfully thwarted all kinds of challenges posed to our political system and we have

[Shri Harish Rawat]

remained stable amidst such pressure on our system. I do not think that any new development has taken place, warranting reappraisal and detailed analysis of our political system.

Often our friends, particularly from opposition parties, raise the demand for redefining of relations between the Centre and States. I think whenever any political development takes place in a particular state or a particular party of a particular state feels any pressure on it, in that situation the only one slogan is raised that the Central Government is committing excesses on it, be it his political issue or a financial issue.

Generally, such things are raised on three counts. Firstly, it is raised on account of the institution of Governor, secondly on account of prevailing financial relations between the Centre and the States and thirdly such things are raised by different regional parties for their personal political gains under the compulsion of situations in their state. If a detailed analysis is made with regard to it, one comes to the conclusion that behind all these three factors, it is mainly the political compulsion that forces them to raise such issues.

Sir, if we take an example of the present West Bengal Government which often holds Central Government responsible for any lapse on their part so that they could hide their failures they often level charges against Central Government of not granting that much of autonomy which is required by the their State Government to undertake the job. While the fact is that our constitution is neither newly formed nor it is a creation of recent past. At present, whatever equation between the Centre and the States is prevailing, it has been prevailing under the constitution since long ago. It was formed long-long ago by our Constitution-makers. So long as the same party ruled at the Centre and the State no such problem arose but as soon as different parties came into power at the Centre and States, such problem began to arise. Of en, the states make complains against Central Government for not paying attention towards their financial needs and for not

providing them the required financial resources as a result of which development projects remain incomplete. Basically, it is the governments of states which are responsible for making developments in their States and in order to fulfil this obligation, they need money. States have been presenting their case before Finance Commission and the financial resources are distributed accordingly and this thing is clearly mentioned in Constitution also. But we see that whenever some State Governments become unable to generate required financial resources to fulfil the requirements of development works and also to function according to the aspirations of people of that particular State, then such State Governments blame the Centre for not providing them required funds.

I would like to submit to the hon'ble Minister for Home Affairs that the present Finance Commission shall devise a formula as to how the states could be provided their maximum share in the financial resources. A serious thought is required to be given to it and the formula so evolved may undergo minor changes but major changes in it creat imbalance and generally some people try to shirk their responsibility on this pretext.

Some days ago, some suggestions were given to the Hon. Prime Minister by the Chief Ministers of some States. When they called on Hon. Prime Minister, they talked on different subjects. They did not have any concrete proposals with regard to their recommendations. Even then, the Hon. Prime Minister assured them to forward it to the Finance Commission and advised them to contact directly to the Commission. But when they came out after meeting the Prime Minister what they told to the Press was totally contrary to that. They tried to emphasize that the point put forward by them was quite justified and the Prime Minister did not pay attention to it. I do not want to go into depth of it, because in politics a number of things can be said and are being said but the only thing just I want to submit that the Chief Ministers of non-Congress ruled states should understand a point as to how the congress ruled states are, after all, functioning under the same financial frame-work fixed by the

Central Government and the Planning Commission.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY (Midnapore) : They also speak against it here and there.

SHRI HARISH RAWAT : They don't speak against it but they give suggestions only. Previously the Congress Chief Ministers offered a suggestion to give states more percentage of share in the amount of small savings than what is being given to them at present. This was a concrete suggestion but such solid suggestion was never given by the Government of West Bengal or for that matter the Governments of Andhra Pradesh or Karnataka. To give such solid suggestions is quite in keeping with the spirit of federal system. The Chief Ministers of states should give such suggestions and the Central Government should consider it. If the Centre refuses to consider the reasonable suggestions given by State Chief Ministers then I think that definitely our relations should be reconsidered.

Their reasonable suggestions can be considered and accepted. I don't think that any good can be done to the State or for that matter to our policy if one instead of offering some reasonable suggestions, goes on levelling charges and casting aspersion on others. I was making submission that some of our Chief Minister of the States have totally politicized it. Be it a conclave organised by them or a meeting of head of the parties called for considering the issue of their merger or problem of discontentment brewing within the Party or for that matter they are experiencing difficulties in making adjustment between Janata Party or between the different constituents of the left front, they raise the bogey of Centre-State relations and level a varieties of charges against the Centre to hide their failures and divert the attention of the people. If the Central Government provides some funds to them and if the Centre Government ask for the details of expenditure incurred by them which have not been utilized properly ... (Interruptions)... . If a scheme is launched, the responsibility to implement the scheme lies with the State Government. If the Central Government or for that matter the head of the Central Government ask for some details about it,

how it is justified to give a political colour to it. You are recalling when our Prime Minister has said a few days ago that the state should spend the funds given to them by the Centre in a proper manner. It is his duty to see as to whether they are spending it properly or not. I don't think any wrong in it. In this statement not a particular state has been pinpointed. Our Political parties made a lot of hue and cry for it. They tried to emphasise that the Prime Minister were trying to meddle with their internal working.

Can there be a Prime Minister who will not want that his country should march forward? It is the duty of the Prime Minister to ensure the well being of the entire country and he is committed to that. If the Prime Minister calls for a meeting of the Chief Ministers and advises them to make proper utilisation of the funds as per plan programme in a bid to fulfil this commitment, it should not be construed that he has done anything wrong. If this thing is discussed with the opposition parties face to face they will also agree that there is nothing wrong in it. It is totally unbecoming on the part of some of the Chief Ministers and political parties who have tried to impute motives in it. When some States spend the funds allocated to them under N.R.E.P. and R.L.E.G.P. schemes on such work which will benefit a particular party only, it is quite but natural that the Prime Minister should express concern for that. It will be a matter of concern not only for the Prime Minister but also for the whole country. I am not referring it as an allegation. There are a number of State Government which do not abide by the approved parametre of the scheme while spending money given by the Centre. Funds are diversified to different heads. Funds are being spent on such heads, with which country is not benefited at all. There are some States which are spending the funds providing rice at subsidised rate of Rs. 2 per kilogram. This may enable them to get some votes by selling rice at the subsidised rate of Rs. 2 per kilogram and applause from people for the time being but no body tries to make an assessment as to how much the people of the country and the State concerned are being benefited by this practice. There are some State which

[Shri Harish Rawat]

spend the funds on different names such as 'Soubhagyashali' etc. In West Bengal, the funds are being spent on strengthening their cadre. It should be ensured that once the plans are approved, the funds sanctioned for a particular item should be spent on that item only. If some State Governments feel that the act of ensuring is an interference in their internal affairs, this aspect should be considered. There should be a factual evaluation of the financial position of the State. Here is also a need to make an indepth study on delegating more powers to the States for mobilising their own resources. It may be that some States may misuse the funds, but most of the States are not like that. The more the States are given funds, the more the welfare schemes will reach to the people and it will bring economic prosperity to them. If the States achieve economic prosperity, the country will also get its benefits alongwith them. Some of our colleagues have been trying to emphasise on the point that the Centre will become strong when the State are made strong. For example, our body will become strong when other limbs like hands and legs become strong. This factual system is prevalent in our country. With the development of the States, the whole country will develop. Now a days, new trend has developed with the formation of regional parties. Different regional parties are emerging in Assam, Andhra Pradesh and several other States of the country. They are being given such names which make one to feel that these are not only mere regional parties, but also spreading regional feelings. A regional party with the name of Telugu Desam has been formed. When we have already one country, Bharat, what was the need of creation of the 'Desam'. Regional parties are raising their heads at various places. There is a need to give a serious thought to this aspect.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : It is due to failure of the Centre.

SHRI HARISH RAWAT : It is not our failure. Had the Central Government failed, our federal system would have collapsed. It seems that it has not so far been able to make dent on the political

system of our country, but in due course, it will have its effect. Several regional parties are trying to boost this objective, owing to which the situation is becoming more unfavourable instead of becoming favourable. Now a days, regional feelings are gaining momentum. The image of national parties is gradually declining. Once a party comes to power, it makes all out efforts to remain in power by hook and crook. Their way of thinking and style of functioning is becoming totally regional. Whatever slogan they may give, but their internal working system has been becoming like that of the regional parties. I would like to submit the hon. Minister of Home Affairs that there is need to think it seriously as to the extent to which the regional parties are allowed to preserve their existence under the present electoral system. I do not say that the regional parties should be banned. But the way irresponsible regional parties are mushrooming in the country is a matter of great concern. These irresponsible regional parties are giving slogans of regionalism. Anyone, after becoming a rebel and revolting from a party form his own regional party. In the process, a number of regional parties come into existence. Now a time has come when we should apply a break to curb such activities. Assam which was divided into several parts and as many as 6 to 7 States were created out of that one States There are still demands to further divide it. Two to three regional parties in that State are making such demand. The same is the position with Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and several other States. Except a few smaller States, there is a demand to bifurcate all the States in the country. Mr. Chairman, Sir, such a demand is coming up from your State also. It is quite but natural that it will be a matter of concern for us. I fail to understand as to where the end of it. The Congress Party is not going to lose in any way of such activities. Nor will it be able to destory the Congress party. Rather it will cause harm to some regional parties. For example the ruling party in West Bengal has been badly involved in Gorkhaland Movement. That party is fully responsible for the movement. Whatever might be the reasons for regional parties coming into powers, but now it is time that we should give a serious thought to it in

view of the prevailing situation. Otherwise, it will put a very bad effect on our political system. The situation at the time of independence was quite different from the situation prevailing today. Before independence there was a generation which was fully devoted to national cause. They were ready to make every sacrifice for the country. But the new generation did not see the hardships of pre-independence era. They were born in independent India. They saw a developing India. They think that the India of today has not undergone any changes from what it was earlier. A number of people among us mislead them. Regionalism is being encouraged at various places. It is exercising overbearing influence everywhere. It is mainly attributed to discontentment among youths, which has been created due to many factors such as non-availability of employment etc. Discontentment has spread everywhere among the youth. All these people are joining the regional parties which raise some sort of anti national slogans. Through you, I request then hon. Minister of Home Affairs to ban all such regional parties which are fully based on regionalism. which have parochial views which have no economic policies behind them, which have no political philosophy and which spread the feelings of regionalism. Formation of all such political parties should be banned immediately.

A lot of things have been said about the institution of Governor in this House. We know that the institution of Governor has discharged its duties in a most responsible manner when any constitutional crisis arose in a State. This institution has proved very helpful in preserving democracy in our country to a great extent. It will be treated as politically motivated if any allegation is made or any aspersion is cast against this institution. It is not wise on the part of anyone who raises hue and cry on the decisions of the Governor taken for maintaining law and order in a particular State. It is not necessary that the Governor should always agree to the views of the ruling party in the State. Because, every political party takes decisions keeping in view its political interest. A tendency of making allegations and casting aspersions against this institution has been on the increase in our country. This tendency needs to be checked.

I would like to request the opposition parties to think deeply on this subject.

18.00 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

Railway Schools

[English]

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY (Midnapore) : I want to raise half-an-hour discussion in relation to the reply of the hon. Minister for Railways to my Question No. 3429 on 17.3.88. I do not want to embarrass the Government in this regard nor do I pinprick the Government. I want to bring to the notice certain obligations lying with the Government regarding the education of the sons and daughters of Indian railway men. The Minister has dodged the answer. He has stated that there are 51 High, 34 Higher Secondary Schools, 7 Intermediate Colleges and 1 Degree college run by the Railways. My question was : what is the curriculum that is followed by these railway schools and colleges ? Is it not a fact that they follow the curriculum of the Directorate of Education of various States in which the schools and colleges are located ? In the matter of appointing teachers, their standard, their numbers, do they not follow the standards set by the Board of Secondary Education and Board of Higher Secondary Education of various States ? But the Minister did not answer it properly. It has been stated that the pattern prescribed by Department of Education for Centrally Administered Schools is adopted for Railway School Teachers, with regard to qualifications and pay scales.

So my first question is : Of the schools and colleges mentioned in the reply, how many are affiliated to WBSE and how many are affiliated to Board of Secondary Education and Board of Higher Secondary Education of various States ? I am from a railway colony—Kharagpur—which is the biggest railway colony in India. I am a student from a railway school, BNR Indian Railway High School. All throughout my life I have seen that these schools have been following the curriculum of the State Government. Even the standard of education is