

[Smt. Basava Rajeswari]

Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Committee on Private Members' Bill and Resolutions.

MATTERS UNDER RULE 377

[*Translation*]

(i) Need to Shift Cantonment from Nahan district in Himachal Pradesh to some other place

SHRI K.D. SULTANPURI (Shimla): There is a military cantonment in District Nahan in Himachal Pradesh. It is called cantonment in Nahan. The entire population in this cantonment comprises of Gorkha people who are serving the defence forces of the country in the capacity of soldiers and small and big officers. The better part of the population of Distt. Nahan consists of Ex. servicemen. These people have been living here since the times of former rulers. The major part of this area has now been covered under cantonment area which is causing great hardship to the people living in civil areas. This cantonment known as Cantt. is a source of great hardship to them. On an earlier occasion also, I had reminded the Prime Minister and the former Defence Minister about the difficulties faced by these people. Thereupon the Defence Minister of India had directed the Government of Himachal Pradesh to see that these people are not put to any difficulty. They should acquire alternate land at some other place in place of the land, in question. Since a decision in this regard has not been taken by the Himachal Pradesh Government so far, people are not permitted to carry out additions and alternations and undertake repairs in their respective houses. They are not permitted to carry out new construction work as well. The Government of India is, therefore, requested to direct the state Government immediately not to put these people to any difficulty and the land which is in their possession should be allowed to be retained by them as usual.

In case the Government requires any land for cantonment, land for that purpose might be acquired at some other place. It is hoped that Government of India will immediately address itself to hammer out a solution to this complicated problem.

[*English*]

(ii) Need to clear the proposal to set up a Refinery and Petrochemicals Project at Mangalore

SHRIMATI BASAVA RAJESWARI (Bellary): Sir, the proposal to set up a Refinery and Petrochemicals Project at Mangalore in the West Coast of Karnataka State, initiated in 1980 is still pending with the Government of India.

MRPL submitted the project report in April, 1989 to the Government of India. According to the terms and conditions of the Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of India and the Project authorities, the final clearance for the implementation of this project should have been given in July, 1989.

The Project authorities have also tied up the most appropriate and the latest technologies for the various processes in the refinery and the Naptha Cracker Complex. MRPL is in a position to implement this project within a period of 42 months from the date of obtaining final clearance. I appeal to the Government of India to take decision in the matter urgently.

(iii) Need for giving financial assistance to Orissa Government for early completion of Chirolu Dam Project in Sambalpur district

SHRI BHABANI SHANKAR HOTA (Sambalpur): Sir, Padampur sub-division in Sambalpur district of Orissa is a backward as well as a perennially drought prone area neglected since the British days. The only hopes of the farmers is an irrigation project on the river Ong at Chirolu which will irrigate about 2.68 lakh acres of land.

The Government in 1979 launched the project at Chiroli as the site was selected considering the cost benefit factor. But later on, the said project was stalled and the site was changed to Pujharipali. The farmers are opposed to setting up of a project at Pujharipali and instead they want the project to come up at Chiroli.

Farmers are facing great difficulties due to lack of irrigation facilities in the whole of the area. I urge upon the Government to provide adequate financial assistance to the Orissa Government to complete the Chiroli Dam Project at the earliest.

(iv) Need for formation of Statutory Development Boards for Marathwada and Vidarbha regions of Maharashtra

DR. VENKATESH KABDE (Nanded): Marathwada and Vidarbha are backward regions of Maharashtra State. These areas have remained backward and neglected in terms of industrial, educational and overall development. The Maharashtra State Assembly and Legislative Council have unanimously recommended in 1984 formation of Statutory Development Boards for Marathwada and Vidarbha as per provisions of Article 371(2) of the Constitution of India. A similar recommendation has been made for backward region of Konkan. The Boards have not come into existence even after six years of recommendations of the Maharashtra Government to the Union Government. Recently, the hon. Prime Minister and hon. Home Minister have made public pronouncements in Nagpur and Bombay respectively that these Boards will be formed in the near future. May I request the Union Government to expedite Cabinet decision to form the Statutory Boards and fulfil the long standing demands of these regions. A suitable amendment to the Constitution may be undertaken to include provisions of Board for Konkan under Article 371(2) of the Constitution.

[Translation]

(v) Need to retain Scheduled Tribe Status of Manjhi tribe of Madhya Pradesh

SHRI BABURAO PARANJPE (Jabalpore): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, while kir community has been declared as tribal community in some districts of Madhya Pradesh, Manjhi, Majhwar and Vijhwar communities have been declared tribal communities in the entire state of Madhya Pradesh in terms of statutory orders 1956 and 76.

Through the notifications of the Madhya Pradesh Government issued during the period from 1982 to 1985 Manjhi and Kir tribes are being deprived of the material benefits available to them by virtue of their belonging to these tribes by declaring them backward classes equivalent and synonyms of those belonging to fisher men sub communities known as Dhiwar, Kewat and Kahar etc.

Indian caste system is based on birth and ones occupation. A community may be known by several names. According to the judgment of High Court, Madhya Pradesh, Jabalpore delivered on 14.2.89, the petitioners belonging to fisher men community admittedly belong to Manjhi tribe. Their certificates are valid and the order does not permit for making any distinction about them. Madhya Pradesh Government defines Manjhi as backward class while it defines Majhi as tribe. But in both the English and Hindi versions of the schedule relating to tribes both these words have been used for one and the same serial member and community.

In the article titled 'Majhwar' of the Thesis titled 'The tribals of Madhya Pradesh' published by the Madhya Pradesh administration, the communities of majhwar and majhi have been recognised as one community i.e. fisher boatman tribe. There is no difference between Manjhi and Majhi. Dictionaries of all the languages define Manjhi as a