

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Seventeenth Report

[Translation]

SHRI SHYAM BIHARI MISRA (Bihar): I beg to move:

"That this House do agree with the Seventeenth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bill and resolutions presented to the House on 17th March, 1993."

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Seventeenth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and resolutions presented to the House on the 17th March, 1993."

The Motion was adopted

RESOLUTION RE. CREATION OF NEW STATES OF UTTARANCHAL AND VANANCHAL - CONTD.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House will now take up further consideration of the Resolution moved by Shri Jagat Vir Singh Drona regarding creation of new States of Uttaranchal and Vananchal.

Shri Sriballav Panigrahi to continue his speech.

SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI (Deogarh): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, two weeks before on 5th March, we were having discussion on the Resolution moved by Shri Jagat Vir Singh Drona for creation of two new States - Uttaranchal and Vananchal. The names are not so significant. The agitationists who are demanding separate States call them either Vananchal or

Jharkhand. So, in that way the name is not significant.

The difference between the 5th and today that there is a vigorous movement going on in Bihar demanding for creation of a new State that is Jharkhand. That movement, unfortunately, has turned violent - live have been lost, of rain have been derailed, transport of mineral ore has been affected in that portion of Bihar. Admittedly violence run counter to the ethos of democracy, to the principles of democracy and violence and democracy cannot go hand in hand. But, unfortunately, violence has erupted, the movement has turned violent.

The highlight or significance of our freedom movement was non-violence. Non-violence was the moving spirit of our freedom movement led by Mahatma Gandhi. The agitationists set fire to a police station at Chowri Chure as cause of non-Cooperative. Nobody knew or in 1921 movement expected that the movement would gain of much momentum at that point of time. The people were hopefully looking forward that probably the days of freedom, achievement of independence was round the corner. At that point of time because violence interrupted Gandhiji, to the surprise of all, gave a call or made an announcement withdrawing the movement.

So, it is time that the House should also feel concerned about the growing violence particularly when the atmosphere is not congenial in our country on so many counts. I am not going to refer those things. Since December, the climate in our country is full of hatred.

The violence that we had at that time is still very much there.... (Interruptions). Yes, in Bombay also. This is very much there. The threat to our internal security is looming large today. This is not a happy situation for a country like ours. I had made it clear at that time that in principle I am for smaller States and it is time it carve out some new States looking to the genuine demands of the people. To meet the legitimate aspirations of

[Sh. Sriballav Panigrahi]

the people, some new States should be carved out. Such new States must be administratively sound and economically viable. Just for the sake of creating States, we cannot create States. The States so created should not be parasites. So, we have to carefully look at it from the economic consideration. The smaller States are administratively more manageable, better manageable and would be more participatory also. From the point of view of economic.

15.46 hrs.

[SHRI SHARAD DIGHE *in the Chair*]

policy also that becomes easier. As you know, Sir, sometimes largeness of States causes law and order problem. Crimes go on unabated. So, from that point of view also creation of smaller States would be in the interest of law and order and would contain crimes. The small States have so many advantages. While forming States social and cultural affinity of the people of the regions also, has to be taken into consideration.

Jharkhand is a very old movement. It has passed different phases. Government of India, as we understand, have taken serious note of it. They have entered into discussions. The Home Minister has had parleys with the Jharkhand leaders. He has also talked to the Chief Minister of Bihar. As you know, Sir, the free and frank observation of the hon. Union Home Minister on Jharkhand also evoked a controversy. The demand is very clear and not only the Government of India, even State Government, of whichever party they may be, and all political parties also should take cognisance of these things that whatever these demands originate, they originate mainly because of exploitation. The origin lies in exploitation of and negligence shown to particular area, community, etc. So, it should be an eye-opener. All concerned should

learn adequately from all that is happening and there should be sincere endeavour by all concerned to see that there is no exploitation of any kind at any level. All genuine and legitimate aspirations of the people should be met and as far as possible.

We have recently passed the Urban Bodies Bill and the Panchayati Raj Bill which have provisions to give more power to the power to the people. I would say that - with greater emphasis - that it is the time for greater decentralization and greater autonomy also for different areas.

There is a demand for Uttarakhand comparing of eight hill districts. The U.P. Vidhan Sabha has also passed a resolution unanimously. They feel neglected. There are very beautiful areas in this Himalayan region. There are so many places of unique tourist importance and also pilgrim centres like Badrinath, Kedarnath, Gangotri, Jammuotri etc. This is a land of beautiful places, places of natural beauty. Our age old culture is associated with it. We should also respect the feelings of that area. We have to take cognisance of their feelings. We have to consider that aspect. Everything possible should be done to assuage the feelings of the tribals of Bihar and also people of hill areas of U.P.

I was saying about this last time also. We have our grievances in different parts. In Western Orissa and in Koraput - which is in South of Orissa - there are similar situations. These tribal areas are neglected. There is Vidarbha issue in Maharashtra, Chota Nagpur in Bihar, Teelengana in Andhra Pradesh, Saurashtra in Gujarat and like that other places also. There are places where people feel neglected. There has not been much of development there in the fields of health, education, roads, in communications, economic development and also regarding location of industries, providing employment and other things. Naturally all attempt should be made to see that overall development of all regions of all areas of the States are made. That should be ensured. Also there should not be any scope for the

people of different areas to feel aggrieved. That should be an ideal situation. That way I would say that looking at the present climate it is probably not ideal the time. Considering the present position I do not see that they are without any basis or justification. But at the same time if all these are now considered at this juncture it may open up a Pandora's Box. We should see whether that in the interest of the country at this hour. This is my point.

I want to place some of these points before the august House for consideration. All the grievances should be looked into. The Sarkaria Commission has also dealt about this problem in some depth. It is time that some sort of agency should be formed to study and go into this aspect and come out with concrete suggestions.

In this connection would like to refer to the editorial in yesterday's edition of the Times of India wherein they have mentioned about the Jharkhand issue. I quote :

"The spate of FIRs, obviously, cannot go on for so long while the leaders of the nation overcome their fear of State reorganisation and are coming out for smaller, more manageable, more participatory and more democratic State - Jharkhand. It should be given adequate autonomy even constituted as a sub-State.

I underline the word 'sub-state'.

I continue to quote :

within Bihar to begin with, as a significant reassurance of these people that the issue are processed in all seriousness".

Like that sub-States within Bihar, sub-States within Uttar Pradesh - to start with it can be something like this. It can also be the solution. But I do not find any sense in some people even some people in authority or some leaders opposing this demand in toto, I think that is prompted by small consideration, selfish consideration, narrow consideration and even some do not mind calling it

a secessionist movement. It is never so. How can it be? A movement demanding the creation of a state within the Indian federation can never be called a secessionist movement. I cannot be equated with such demand and that difference we have to understand if people feel neglected and other considerations are also there. What did the SRC do in mid-Fifties? They also have not done adequate Justice to all areas of the country. We in Orissa also have our own grievances about the recommendation of the SRC which submitted its report in 1956. So, that way, Sir, it is time that without further delay at least some arrangement should be made so that greater autonomy is given to the people of all the areas.

With these words, Sir, I conclude.

SHRI MAHABENDRA SHAH (Tehri Garwal). Mr. Chairman, to recapitulate I may point out that the Resolution passed by the Lucknow Assembly was some time in May 1991 and thereafter, on the floor of this House this issue was taken up again and again and the reply that was received from the Home Minister was that he had sought clarification from the U.P. Government. This was some time in December 1991 and I understand, the reply was received some time in March 1992 and now it is March 1993. Therefore, I think the Resolution that is being considered by this House is the correct Resolution and the timing was quite correct as we have patiently waited for one year for a response from the Home Ministry. The Home Ministry had asked for certain clarifications and some of the clarifications, I think, were irrelevant and I would like to ignore them. For example, they had asked for what is the area and population of the districts. I do not know how it had become relevant. So, I am only trying to touch upon some of the relevant clarifications that they had sought. The Centre had asked for the basis for the separate State and the reply received was that Uttaranchal was a sensitive area, was prone to natural calamities, had a large number of educated unemployed

[Sh. Maabendra Shah]

ment persons and 70 per cent of the population was below the poverty line. They have also tried to educate the Home Ministry about the scenario of the Himalayan range. They pointed out that in the Himalayan Range except for the J.P. Hills there are many varied types of States and it is only Utamchal which did not have a State. And, therefore, similar aspiration existed by the Uttaranchalies.

Giving the economic clarification, the U.P. Government indicted that the benefits of funds for non-plan schemes and economic protection which have contributed to the development of other hills were denied to these area. Further more, the U.P. Government pointed out that the terai region of Uttaranchal was a natural part of the Hills and the Terai being the agricultural area was a buteress for agriculture and trade centre and hence had the potential to sustain he economy of Uttaranchal. Administrative justification was also given by the U.P. Government and they pointed out that Himachal Pradesh with less population had 68 Members Assembly while Uttaranchal with a much bigger population had 19 Member in a much bigger Assembly; and

16.00 hrs.

The people of the plains were reluctant to work in the hills and the local people were denied employment in those vacant places. They also pointed out that special problems prevailed in the hills, for example, clash of environmental development with the general development. Therefore, they recommended that the hill region had little in common with the plains and that insignificant representation in the Assembly denied them a proper voice. In fact, their voice was like a drop in the ocean.

It will be observed that the demand of Statehood is a panacean not only for the region' economic upliftment, but also for self-Government, employment and proper

representation in the Government. I have cleared the deck of the clarifications; the only thing that is left on the deck is the political consideration of the ruling party and I think, the political consideration is based on those political leaders of the party who want to project their image as leaders of a big State. Otherwise, their ego would be deflated.

Sir, the Prime Minister knows and I think, all the other parties know that during the general elections, except for the BJP, no one had in their manifesto, a separate hill State for Uttaranchal or Vananchal for that matter. Every candide in the hills had made their own such ; E k (one point) manifesto and that Ek suchi (one point) manifesto was that they also supported a separate hill State. This is not hidden from any of the parties that contested the election during that time. Therefore, it was pointed out to the Prime Minister by his own partymen after the election, and time and again to support the demand for a separate hill State. Shri Indrajit Gupta visited Tehri for his party meeting and there he supported the demand for a separate hill State. In fact, he has even introduced a Bill to that effect. The Janta Dal may have some reservations as far as Vananchal I concerned, but, I think, they have a tacit support for Uttaranchal, because I understand that in the near future, Mulayam singhji is going to have a Rath Yatra in the hills.

The Janta Party and all other parties, I hold, they have to consider the question of Vananchal.

My arguments on behalf of Utaranchal equally apply to Vananchal. In fact, I would say that Vananchal has two added advantages. One is that it is tribal area and if there can be mini, multi-tribal States in the East Jharkhand or Vananchal, deserved Statehood earlier. Similarly, their mines are potential and makes it economically viable. Therefore, on these two counts also, vananchal should have had its Statehood long ago. But now that we are considering this

Resolution, I think, both Uttaranchal and Vananchal should get their Statehood.

Uttaranchal and a separate State for Vananchal.

With these words, I support the Resolution.

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR (Barh): Mr. Chairman Sir, the House is discussing the Resolution brought by Shri Jagat Vir Singh Drona for the creation of new States of Uttaranchal are two different issues, so far a Uttaranchal is concerned all the political parties of Uttar Pradesh have supported it. Recommendation has also been made to the Union Government by the concerned State Government and the legislative Assembly has also passed a resolution supporting it. Hence there is no problem in the creation of Uttaranchal, so it should be created.

Sir, the Government of India may have certain reservations, firstly, that the creation of Uttaranchal may be the beginning of a demand for more States. But, if a demand for more there. But, if a demand genuine, if a demand legitimate, I do not see why the government should be hesitant in conceding to the demand. Secondly, they say that there can be inter-state disputes, specially regarding haring of river waters. Himachal Pradesh, has not been a source of dispute in river water distribution. But, there can be a dispute between Punjab and Haryana, but Himachal Pradesh on the one side and Haryana and Punjab on the other side, there is no dispute. So, I do not see how can Uttaranchal be a source of dispute on river waters. Therefore, that carries now eight.

Thirdly, they may be afraid of the financial liability which may increase. I would like to point out that for such region, the Government of India has provided general plan assistance in a more liberal scale both in capital loan assistance allocation and also treating a large portion of it as grants. Nevertheless I would also like to point out that the Government was prepared after special dispensation if we give up the demand of Uttaranchal. If that is the position, the financial implication has no value whatsoever.

What I have pointed out so far are infallible, if they are infallible, they should be accepted. Some people say that there could be balkanisation due to these demands. Yes, balkanisation can take place if self-government is taken forcefully. But we are demanding peacefully for a smaller State to be carved out from the bigger State. Under these circumstance, balkanisation cannot take place.

Under the circumstances, I request the whole House forget Party differences, to support us for our separate hill State of

But so far as creation of Vananchal State including Chhota Nagpur and Santhal Pargana of Bihar is concerned, it is a demand of the Bharatiya Jana Party. On the one hand there is a demand for creation of a separate state including Chhota Nagpur and Santhal Pargana of Bihar alongwith this there is also demand or creation of Jharkhand state comprising Chhota Nagpur and Santhal Pargana of Bihar, some tribal dominated areas of West Bengal, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh. Including all these 26 district there is a demand for creation of Jharkhand state, thus there are several demands for creation of Vananchal or Jharkhand. In my opinion small states should be created. Loknayak Jay Prakash Narayan and Chaudhari Charan Singh were supporters of creation of small states in the country, and several leaders of the country advocated the creation of small states for balanced development of the country. In my opinion small states should be created. But merely by dividing one or two states or creating one or two states the problem will not be resolved. The demands for creation of separate states are being raised in several part of the country, for instance, Marathwada and Laddakh. Thus there are

[Sh. Nitish Kumar]

several areas where people are demanding creation of separate states. These are such problems in many North Eastern States. In West Bengal, the problem of Darjeeling is there. They demand a separate State for themselves. There is a demand of Bodoland as well. Present, some kind of agreement has been reached, but their basic demand is of a separate State. Demand for separate States are being made in many other States also. I suggest that it will be far better to set up a States Reorganisation Commission for the formation of small States throughout the country, to settle all such issues and for the integrated development of the country, than to state all such issues separately. If a State Reorganisation Commission is set up, the structure of the State, throughout the country can be reconsidered. Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh are higher States. A demand for a separate State of Telangana has been going on in Andhra Pradesh. Likewise, Bihar is also a big State. There are many States which are geographically and population-wise very big. The demands for separate states can be considered scientifically in deference to the emotions of the people there. The decisions on this regard should not be taken under pressure because of movements in a particular State, which take a violent turn. We should try to find out solution of the problems in this regard. Many movements are led to create problems for the State and the Centre. There have been many movements which created problems.

Recently, the hon. Home Minister made a statement regarding Jharkhand movement in Bihar, which added fuel to the fire. If a responsible person like the hon. Home Minister makes an irresponsible statement on such an issue, then the statements of the people are likely to be listened definitely and it is but natural that some sort of retaliation is also there. You are talking about Vananchal. It is therein there manifesto and Jharkhand is in the manifesto of some other party. Every party in Bihar is divided on this issue. There is no such party there, which is

not divided. The intention of the Central Government is also to divide the people but not to create a new State since, if they create a new State of Jharkhand, they will have to create States like Marahwara, Bodoland and Darjeeling. That is why Uttaranchal is not created even though it fulfills all the conditions for being a state. Uttaranchal has got the support of all the four, therefore it should be made a separate State under special circumstances. We also support it. But all other issues should also be considered.

You call it Jharkhand or Vananchal, it is a separate issue. The Bihar Legislative Assembly had passed a Bill unanimously and sent it to the Central Government. All the political parties are unanimous on it. Those who are spearheading the agitation in the name of Jharkhand also supported it. This Bill was passed which their support and it has been pending with the Central Government for the last two years. However, talks were held to arrive at a decision. Once again, the economic blockade is going on. This issue is once again before the Government. Fresh talks are being held on the issue. We are unaware of the nature of the discussions on the issue. There is the Government of Janta Dal in Bihar. Taking it into consideration, the Janta Dal should have been taken into confidence. All the representatives of that area should also have been taken into confidence along with all the political parties to which these representatives belong. This question is not of creating a new State. It is an issue of reorganisation of many States. Therefore, the decision should be taken only after taking all the States into confidence.

The economic viability is also taken into consideration at the time of the formation of States. It is not like that a State is formed without considering its economic viability. The economic viability should be taken into consideration at the time of the carving out a State out of Bihar. The Government will bifurcate the area rich in minerals. I fully support that the people of that area who have been exploited should

be allowed the right to have their own Government. The existing State of Bihar has an economic viability. The Centre gives grants to it. There is a formula under which the States get the grant equivalent to the internal resources mobilization. It will not be wise to bifurcate the area which provides most of the internal resources of Bihar. The people of that area should be allowed to run their Government, I have no objection to it but the people of the remaining Bihar have not committed any crime therefore, their interests should also be safeguarded. Today the internal sources mobilization of the remaining Bihar is negligible. In the whole of North Bihar, the rivers flowing from the Himalayas via Nepal cause havoc due to floods. The floods in the Ganges and the rivers of the South cause havoc in the Central Bihar. (Interruptions) We share your sentiments. Those people have been exploited during the last forty years. The soil is very fertile in the Central as well as in North Bihar. Not only in the country but also at the international level the soil of the Northern Bihar is considered to be the best. Even though it is hit either by floods or by drought and no attention has been paid to in the last 40 years. Bihar had faced injustice on two counts during the last forty years, one is that the whole of the area was left to face floods and drought and nothing was done to remedy the situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Time for this Resolution will have to be extended as it is expiring at

16 17 hours.

Is it the sense of the House to extend the time allotted for this Resolution?

SHRI INDER JIT (Darjeeling): It is a very important subject.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Sir, it should be extended.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRONICS

AND DEPARTMENT OF OCEAN DEVELOPMENT) AND THE MINISTER OF THE STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM): I suggest that it should be extended by one and a half hours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time has been extended by one and a half hours for this Resolution.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the present it is extended by one and a half hours.

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM: Let us extend it by two hours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the sense of the House that the time be extended by two hours?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Time for this Resolution is extended by 2 hours.

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: Kumaramangalamiji, why do you speak? When the private members are asking to let it go on then why are you intervening? *(Interruptions)*

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the soil of the Northern Bihar or Central Bihar is very fertile but no attention was paid to the development of agriculture in that area. Centre has done only two things during the last forty years. One is that nothing has been done for the development of agriculture in the Northern and Central Bihar. Secondly the people of the Chhota Nagpur and Santhal Pargana areas have been exploited. There are two reasons for the pain and agony of the people there. The people who went there from Bihar or anywhere also were bereft of the feelings of services. They went there for looting and till date they have not changed. I am

[Sh. Nitish Kumar]

Member of Parliament from that area and I am in active politics there. Someone approaches me that he does not want to join medical services in that area and does not want to serve the suffering humanity but a police officer is ready, that he should be posted there. It means that, that is the place of much earning. The people, belonging to the police services want that they should be posted there, simply have a chance to lot the people. Secondly, the people, displaced there due to the setting up of factories were not given jobs and they were exploited. The poor tribals who have been living there since ages have been exploited and their lands were grabbed. They did not have the knowledge and awareness and that is why they were exploited and there are no two opinions they they should certainly get justice now. My submission to the Government through you is that it should provide them justice and if the people of that area a separate State then we have no objection to it. The Government must evolve a formula. No State should be divided all of a sudden. I do not know, but certainly there is anger in them. I would certainly like to submit to those who are in politics that we have living together for a long time, so in the proper to suddenly develop this much ill will for us. I do accept that the persons having vested interest are indulged in exploiting the people of Jharkhand areas, but the poor people living in rest of the areas whether falling in the Central Bihar or North Bihar are not responsible for their exploitations.

Economic viability is a must for creation of a State in that situation. If the Government declares Jharkhand to be a separate State then the rest part of Bihar would not be left economically viable and the centre will also not own any responsibility therefor. But if reorganisation of states are taken up and in that situation that area of Bihar is given the status of a separate State and the rest part of Bihar is given a status of yet another State by taking other parts also into it then the centre will have the responsibility to look after the welfare of that State.

So the economic viability has to be taken into consideration. And when then attention of the Central Government is drawn to the question of economic viability, the Government will then also consider as to how internal resources can be generated in that particular State. The amount of Central aid would also be increased in that situation and there will therefore be much Central assistance given to it. But if it is done now, then all the assistance will be stopped and an awful crisis will envelope the entire area all of a sudden.

In that situation, the violence and terrorism that are already causing concern for the Government, will spread in the rest of the areas unabated and that will go against the Centre. We should not invite such a situation. The two parts of Bihar that have hitherto been serving a two wheels of a chariot should not be allowed clash together. The Central Government has been making a perpetual effort to avoid solution of the problem and to keep it on as also to linger it. I feel that this is the motive of the Central Government. I would therefore like to submit that the opinion of all the concerned parties should be sought so that solution to the problem may be found.

The second point is that there should be a reorganisation of all the smaller States of the country. A States Reorganisation Commission should be set up all such issues should be referred to it for solution so that unity and integrity of the country may be strengthened and all round development of the backwards and of the people who are exploited may be ensured. With these words I conclude.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Resolution has got two parts. And, naturally, it is expected that we should deliberate on the two distinct parts which is contained in the Resolution. One part relates to the formation of new States and smaller States. And another part specifically suggests for the creation of Vananchal and Uttaranchal, as new States.

I know, Sir, that your State is also very much agitated over the same issue. I mean, the State of Maharashtra. In Maharashtra, there is a sustained movement for the creation of Vidharbha, as per the recommendations of the SRC and that was not implemented because of creation understanding arrived at between the leadership of Vidharbha region and Maharashtra, that is, Bombay region, as you may say.

There is also a demand for Marathwada within Maharashtra. There are demands in Uttar Pradesh not only for Uttaranchal but also for Bundelkhand or something else. There similar demands in other parts of the country also.

Therefore, whether it is desirable, whether it is advisable or whether it is feasible to have smaller viable states, is a matter for consideration and analysis in depth. Earlier, when the SRC was established, the main criteria was linguistic States. Language, as far as I understand, was the main factor.

There can be difference about it. Language and culture wrier the basic criteria for formation of a State; SRC considered that aspect with all seriousness. But even, after the formation of the States on the basis of language and culture, that is what we say linguistic redistribution of the States, there have been still problems lingering on. These problems are manifested in the form of the book meant for Vananchal or Jharkhand or Vidarbha or Marathwada or Bundhelkhand or somewhere else. Therefore, there is a need to have a fresh look into the matter as to whether there will be another commission to go into the remaining problems or lingering problems arising out of the linguistic redistribution of the States.

So far as Jharkhand or Vananchal is concerned, rather I am very much concerned about Jharkhand, I do not mean anything else; if you want to have a separate State, it is a different thing; what would be its name would be decided by the people of that area the concept or the precession of

it, according to me, is not based on cultural or language considerations; nor it is based on ethnicity. Ethnicity has got a strong point. All over the world, today I am finding the manifestation of agitation, manifestation of political forces, emergence of political forces, division and redivision of the State or countries, on the basis of ethnicity.

Sir, excuse me; I would also say with all humility to the advocate of Jharkhand State that there is no basic question ethnicity, language or culture for the demand of the creation of Jharkhand State. The basic issue or the basic emotion or the basic sensitivity for the demand of creation of Jharkhand State is a regional disparity of development. That means, there has been a regional disparity in development; and because of the regional disparity in development, the question of having a separate State has arisen and not on the basis of language, not on the basis of culture and not on the basis of ethnicity because even if Jharkhand State is created, it will be a multi-lingual State having more than language; even if it is a separate State, it will be a multi-ethnic State; and even if it is a separate State, it will be a multi-cultural state.

Therefore, Sir it is not so simple an issue. So far as creation of the State is concerned, I do admit that there has been exploitation, that there has been backwardness; and that backwardness has been a planned backwardness; that is not the natural backwardness; that is the backwardness arising out of the blunder and loot of a section or a segment of vested interests in Bihar and elsewhere. That is the thing.

I know that you will not give me time and I also do not want to take the time of the House on this. But here is a document which describes in vivid, how the Jharkhand area has been exploited by certain segment of the vested interests. Only for the information of some of friends, here, I would quote the figure which is available with the Bihar Government itself. The economic backwardness of the region has

[Sh. Chita Basu]

been brought home there. It says:

"This region, that means the 12 districts of Bihar which is generally known as Jharkhand area, contributes over 70 per cent of the total revenue of Bihar." (*Interruptions*)

Is it 16 or 12? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAGAT VIR SINGH DRONA (Kanpur): In Santhal Pargana there are 16 districts. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Any way, in the case of Santhal Pargana, there has been division and sub-division. I mean, Jharkhand area. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: No personal discussion please.

SHRI CHITA BASU: Jharkhand area contributes about 70 per cent of the total revenue of the united Bihar State. So far as the resource transfer to that region is concerned, it does not exceed 20 per cent. Why? (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mohan Singh, you are going to speak. Why do you now make observations by sitting only?

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Therefore, this is a glaring example of exploitation. The value of the Total agriculture production of entire Bihar comes to Rs. 1, 165.92 crore and the share of these 16 or 12 districts in the Jharkhand area comes to only Rs. 172.59 crore. that is, only 6 per cent of the total agricultural production of the State. Of the total net irrigated area, the Jharkhand region has got 1.06 lakhs hectares as irrigated area out of a total of 11.19 lakhs hectares. And dams are being created there. Many projects are also being created.

Then, there are many other things- al-

ienation and exploitation. I will give only one example and I will finish on that point. The total number of electrified villages in Bihar is 49,444 and the number of electrified villages in Jharkhand region is only 10,791, although 50 per cent of the production is from that region.

So far as land alienation cases are concerned, the tribals have been alienated from their land. So far, 90,847 cases were submitted. 44,000 have been allowed, that is, permitted to be gone into. 34,000 have been dismissed and 13,000 have been pending. Land has been restored in 2,994 cases only out of 90,000 cases of alienation of tribals from land. Only 3,000 cases have been successfully contested and land has been resorted to the original tribal owner. Therefor, these are glaring examples of regional disparity and fearless exploitation of the tribals and loot and plunder by a section of the administration-all those people who matter. Therefore, I again reiterate my conclusion by saying that it is not the question of ethnicity, culture, language but it is the question of the removal of regional backwardness and question of justice and equality. Therefor, I reiterate my view that this should be considered from that point of view. I feel that, at the present moment, for the times being, a regional autonomous council is an appropriate mechanism within the united Bihar State for rapid and satisfactory economic and social development of the region. for the of case, there should be statutorily guaranteed financial resources from the center and there should also be statutorily sanctioned, statutorily fixed resources transfer from the State. The main grievance is that there is no transfer of resources from the State Headquarters. The grievance is even if some resource is transferred to the State by the centre, the appropriate proportion does not go the Jharkhand area and therefore, there should be an autonomous council which should be guaranteed with wide powers of administration and legislatives business and also guaranteed with statutory financial resources both from the centre and State. This can be the resonable, rational and

satisfactory solution to the Jharkhand problem which is before us for the last six decades. But the centre has got a role to pay. I have got a cutting before me but I shall not quoted from it. But Mr. S.B. Chavan had told the Lok Sabha on 2nd December last that the centre was not averse to the formation of the separate Jharkhand States. Mr. Chavan had told here on 2nd December last that the Centre is not averse to the creation of Jharkhand State provided West Bengal agrees, Bihar agrees, Madhya Pradesh agrees and Orissa agrees. This is the way how they want to drive with a wedge between people of different States only to maintain their political supremacy or political reign or hegemony. So far as West Bengal is concerned West Bengal has made its position clear saying that not a single block.

is on the basis of population. In East Purulia and Midnapore districts, more than ten per cent of their population is constituted by tribal population. Orissa Government has made its position clear to the Centre. It is a compact area where the advises or the Scheduled Castes constitute at least a sizeable population. Therefore, even disturbing West Bengal, even bifurcating Bihar and even disrobing the State of Orissa is not for the idea of speedy and satisfactory economic and social development of that area. My friend is very much angry with us because of Darjeeling Gorkha Hills Council. Sir, there might be certain defects and certain shortfalls but in a country like India, where a vast population is a tribals and Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, there must be autonomous regions. They must have the widest possible administrative and legislative powers and financial resources to fulfil the hopes and aspirations because they are the people who are Indians. There are many of us who have come from outside India also and we should not forget that historic aspect. Therefore the Centre should be very clear in their ideas and programmes. They should encourage somebody in Darjeeling and they should not encourage some forces in Jharkhand area. If they do so, they would

be disturbing the stability of the country thereby. For this purpose, I would appeal to the Government that they should have a policy formulated on these issues. And I take the opportunity to appeal to the people who are engaged in Jharkhand Agitation not to indulge in such activities because in this way they are creating certain misunderstanding among the people of Bihar and West Bengal. I also warn that they are increasingly taking resort to violence. This is an issue which can be settled through dialogue, consultation, discussion and mutual understanding. Therefore, there should not be negative approach from the advocates of the Jharkhand Agitation and they should see to it that the matter is solved in a peaceful manner through dialogue, through reasoning, and through arguments for the greater interest of the people of different States and more than that, in the supreme interest of our nation.

SHRI INDER JIT (Darjeeling): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am deeply grateful to you for giving me a chance to speak on this very important Private Members' Resolution. I would like to make it clear straightway that I support this Resolution and the creation of both Uttaranchal as well as Vananchal. In fact, Mr. Chairman Sir, I would venture to go a few steps further

I think Sir, a time has come when we, on all sides of the House, must seriously consider the question of setting up a second States Reorganisation Commission. I am conscious of the fact that the first States Reorganisation Commission set up in 1956 created a lot of turbulence and many problems all over the country. For some three years, all other activity came to a stop. We were all busy fighting with each other over districts, sub-divisions, talukas and vilages.

Nevertheless, over the last 35 years, a situation has grown whereby fresh demands have cropped up in to different parts of the country for separate states. We have seen how Assam has now come to be split in as many as five to seven States. We now

[Sh. Inderjit]

call that region as the areas of the Seven Sisters. There was a time when we only spoke about the viability of Assam and firmly ruled out creation of any other State.

Sir, we have these demands and particularly the demand for a Jharkhand State for many years now. We have also had demands in the past for a separate State of Vidarbha, for a separate State of Surashtra and for a separate State of Uttarakhand which is now called as Uttaranchal. Sir, we have these demands made from almost all parts of the country. Therefore, I do think that it is time that we seriously think of a second States Reorganisation Commission. And I would strongly urge that the Government should not reject this immediate demand for these two States of Uttaranchal and Vananchal, out of hand. These are demands which deserve serious consideration.

Sir, it was my privilege to pay some role in the creation of the Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council. Initially, Sir, as you are aware, there was a demand for a separate State of Gorkhaland. Eventually, we worked out a formula whereby a separate autonomous district council was created and this district council and supposed to be something short of a full-fledged State. The Darjeeling model was at that time acclaimed on all sides and, I must confess, I too personally thought that it held out hope and answer to the problems of many parts of the Country.

In fact, as you are aware, the people of Laddakh who felt exploited by Srinagar for decades came forwards and demanded a Darjeeling model autonomous council for Laddakh. Linkewise, I thought at one state that similar councils could find and answer to the demands and requirements of Vidarbha; demands and requirements of Saurashtra and demands and requirements of many other areas. But, Sir, we must seriously consider whether this autonomous council can be a model.

I regret to say that our own experience in Darjeeling has been far from happy. My good friend Shri Chitta Basu strongly recommended an autonomous council for Jharkhand. But, Sir, my own experience of the Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council has left me with one distinct impression that this model will not work so long as it is implemented in the manner in which the West Bengal Government is implementing it. To be honest, Sir, the Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council Accord has not been implemented by the West Bengal Government and its Chief Minister, Shri Jyoti Basu either in letter or in spirit. In fact, to be honest, the implementation has been virtually a fraud on the Accord. And, so long as we cannot get this kind of a model to work efficiently and honestly, there is no point in trying to work out similar autonomous councils. I will give only three examples to show how this Accord has not worked.

It will shock you to know that as of today the Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council faces a financial blockade from the state Government in Calcutta. Sir, an amount of Rs. 37.16 crores which was sanctioned by the Centre to the Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council has been blockaded by the West Bengal Government. This amount was given to the Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council for the year 1990-91 to 1991-92. But this amount of Rs. 37.16 crores has been used up by West Bengal.

When the accord was being hammered out, the Leader of the Gorkha National Liberation Front wanted Centre assistance and Central funds to be made available directly to the autonomous council. The West Bengal Government protested and said, "If you are going to start giving funds directly it would give the Council. The status of a separate State." I then put forth a compromise formula and that formula was happily accepted. I proposed that Central funds meant for the Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council be routed through the West Bengal Government but the West Bengal Government should only function as a Post Office. Yet, Sir, what has happened?

As I just told you, Rs. 37.16 crores of our fund have been blockaded and used up by the West Bengal Government. In fact, today is the 19th of March. There are only 11 days left for this financial year to end. Yet not a single paise has been passed on to the Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council for the year 1992-93. Consequently the Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council has been virtually forced to pull down its shutters.

This was ideas and excellent model. It was a model which received compliments from the former President, Shri R. Venkataraman when he visited Darjeeling. He said at that stage that this was a model which should be accepted and applied all over the country. Alas! however, this has not worked because there is a great deal of double talk and deception by from Calcutta. Unless that ends, it cannot work. Therefore, we must seriously think as to what is the way out.

In my opinion there is only one way out and that is to go in for more States. In my humble opinion what the country needs is not 25 large States what we really need are 50 smaller States instead of these 25 larger States which should not be made on the linguistic, cultural or even ethnic basis. Jharkhand movement has been there for a large time and I think a they have a very strong claim.

Once upon a time you will recall we had united Punjab. Nobody wanted to touch united Punjab. I, as a Punjabi, was also opposed to any break-up of Punjab. So Haryana was demanded, it was said, "Haryana is not viable, Haryana is a barren area and it will be a total wasteland. It will be great difastar." About Himachal, too when Himachal people wanted to go out, we were not prepared to let them go. But once Himachal was given statehood, it has flourished Haryana has also flourished.

Therefore, experience has shown that if you go in for smaller States, the smaller States are likely to flourish a lot. The reason

why they are likely to flourish is simple. There is a tendency in almost all the States Capitals to treat certain areas as colonies and exploit them and plunder them and indulge in reckless pursuit of personal and party aggrandisement. Therefore, what we really have to do is to think in terms of smaller States, more States. Even as I recommended a second States Reorganisation Commission, I strongly suggest that we should not delay moving in the direction of a separate State for Jharkhand and a separate State for Uttaranchal.

It has been my view for a long time that U.P., for instance, needs to be cut up into four separate States. We know how Western U.P. and more so eastern U.P. have suffered. Several administrative steps were taken. At one stage, for example the Chief Secretary's secretariat, a mini secretariat was even set up in Meerut in addition to what you had in Lucknow. It did not work because these things will not work. Therefore, I strongly recommended that we must go in for smaller States.

In this context, I shall conclude after making one more point. Even as I recommended many more smaller States, I humbly make another constructive suggestion. Instead of having all of the States of one kind, we should seriously think in terms of what was done immediately after Independence. Instead of having one category States we should think in terms of two to three category States as was the the situation immediately after Independence. That is, we should have Part A States with full powers as we have, now, then part B States with certain limited powers and Part C States which could be in the nature of Union Territories.

This has to be done because there is a tremendous amount of reckless exploitation of certain areas within various states. Reckless plundering that is going on. Large areas in various States are being treated as colonies. Therefore, if we are to give our people, particularly our exploited people, a fair deal, I think, it is time to take a fresh look

[Sh. Inderjit]

at our political map and think in terms of many more States than just 25. Thank you.

[Translations]

SHRI RAMASHRAY PRASAD SINGH (Jhanabad): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the discussion on the issue of Uttaranchal-Vananchal that is going on at the moment gives me an impression that the discussion has slit into two groups. On the one hand there are people who support and making of the separate State while on the other there are people who oppose it. Not I would like to know through you that if a separate State is really made then what is the justification for it and if it is not made then again what is the justification for that.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, India is a vast country. Earlier India was divided into many parts. This House should those who are responsible for verification of India into a vast country (*Interruptions*) Mr. Chairman, Sir, now efforts are being made to divide India into many parts. Who are making such efforts? The reason for it is discontentment. A country disintegrates when discontentment develops. A family however small, many be of five members only, too is liable to disintegration. When the head of the family is dishonest, then the house is bound to be divided, otherwise it is not so. If the head of the family is honest, the family remains united for generations to come. Today I must say that the demand of separate States can be attributed to the long rule of the Congress party. The people of the country actually do not understand this fact. No political party has ever ruled anywhere in the world for so long a period as the Congress party had an opportunity to rule the country for such a long period. And its rule has been based on favouritism. It has ruled the country by dividing the people in groups like backwards, forwards and Harijans. They have never thought of the interest of the country as a whole, they have always cared more for chairs. They have ruled with the primary concern of protecting

their chair.

Such a big national party that has ruled the country and that has the credit of providing leadership during national movement, joined hands with the regional party of Tripura to jointly rule the State. So they intend to divide Tripura also? If a regional party that is formed somewhere, is given importance then raises a demand for separation. This is what has been happening.

Secondly, I would like to say that when I was a Member of the Legislative Assembly, I used to read in the newspapers that the fight in Telengana is with Mr. Chenna Reddy. There was a violence for a long time. Was Telangana given the status of a separate State? So far it has not been given the status of a separate State. We all know how that issue was dealt with. We have also witnessed the agitation in Darjeeling. Why were the Bodo agitation and Jharkhand agitation held? Agitations are held only at the places where the Government did no development. Some people of the places where development was not done by the Government, came forward, formed organisation on and started awakening the people. The example of simmering discontent is there before you. People are talking of the Jharkhand party. I wanted to know whether development can be ensured if Jharkhand is given the status of a separate State? Mr. Subodh Kanti Sahay is the leader of that party. Mothers go to work taking their children on their backs. Does this mean development? Suraj Mandal is also one of their leaders. The name Suraj Mandal is a synonym of a big plant. He does not belong to a Scheduled Tribe. I would like to ask whether he is the same Suraj Mandal who was the right hand of Laloo ji. He might have earned millions of rupees. I am stating the truth and I am saying it with honesty. But what changed in four months that Mr. Subodh Kant Sahay was made the leader of the party. Who has done all this? The Congress party is responsible for it because the Congress party allowed Chandrashekhar ji to rule the country for four months Millions of rupees

were grabbed by a handful of persons in those four months. I am in this House since 1984. The question is who is responsible for the ruining the country. What would have happened if the power rested with the Congress party? But they cannot tolerate being out of power for a longer period. The congress party has this weakness that if the stays away from power for 5-10 years then no one will remain with this party. All will go to death bed. This weakness that if it stays away from power for 5-10 years then no one will remain with this party. All will go to death bed. This is the condition of the Congress party.

What I want to say is that if the Congressmen work honestly in the villages then everything can be O.K. There is division in the villages under congress ruled states. Development is done on the basis of caste every where. If a drain has to be made in a particular village and if the M.L.A. of that area belongs to a forward caste then he would get the drain made in the area inhabited by the forward class people and if the M.L.A. belong to some backward community, then the drain would be constructed in the area inhabited by the backward class people. Now I want to ask whether this is painful to the need by people or not. Whether the need by people will suffer or not. You can honestly think that if there are double standard of development in the same village, then people will have a general feeling that their Government is not doing well and that government should go out of power.

17.00 hrs.

The facility of hand pumps is provided, Government has the require money. The system weakens when the laws are violated. Everything breaks when laws are broken. I would not mention the name of the Chief Minister who is no more. He broke the rules. It was decided by the Selection Committee as to where the hand pumps would be bored and what should be the criterion of population of an area for providing a hand pump. But this right has been given to the M.L.A. That is why things are

in a mss and the whole amount is spent. There are many other things, But who will investigate into all those matters. There is no difference between the rule of the State Government there and the rule by a Congress Government in a State. Health Centres have been opened in the villages inhabited by the upper caste people and besides, there is also the facility of additional P.H.Cs. But there are several villages inhabited by the people belonging to the backward classes who have to go seven-eight kilometers away in some different district for buying medicine....(Interruptions) Let me again come to the Jharkhand issue. The Government is bent upon dividing the villages as well. An inquiry can reveal thousands of such incidents in our constituency itself that an M.L.A. gets additional P.H.C. or its sub-centres opened in the villages where the people of his caste dwell in larger number. Roads are also constructed on the same consideration. Shri Chitta Basu asks even now with much emphasis as to how this all happened. Why is there the demand for a Separate Jharkhand State? The long rule of the Congress Party has been based on favouritism. I have said several times over that if christians were not there, we could not have even a single literate persons from the Scheduled Tribes. There are persons who have changed their religion to hold big posts. But they are not able persons. We see the persons placed on high posts who are all converts. They taken Organ or something else with their name. Ultimately why is it so. The Government is responsible or all that. The Government least bothered about the incident of religious conversion. After all that conversion is for the sake of development. After undergoing conversion of religion, they are sending their children for schooling. When they belong to the Scheduled Tribe area, they make maximum efforts to get their children admitted to schools even through they are M.L.As or M.Ps. What will be your answer to it? If Jharkhand state is formed, what will happen then. If you run the country with honesty and with the feeling of patriotism, then nobody will demand separate

[Sh. Ramashray Prasad Sing]

Jharkhand State but in the absence of equal development, you what to divide the country into pieces. Hon. Minister fo Home affairs has said that Shri Laloo has spoken about it. This is a central issue, therefore he should not have spoken. The Center said....(*Interruptions*) it should have been done there. The one who heads the Government in the state is called Chief Minister. He should have said that it had not been given the desired level of development, we are going to given the desired level of development, we are going to give it that level.....(*Interruptions*) They will have to work honesty or its development, which has not been done till date.

They have enacted a number of legislations but their land was bought by the property dealers and they auctioned the same. You even enacted a law for this purpose but did not implementit. Who had got it auctioned. The same Tikku who goes from here and charges interest, who is sitting there as well as here also.... (*Interruptions*) It is not a question of Suraj Mandal alone. The questions is why Suraj Mandal is leading this movement. You go to rancho and see for yourself that officers as well as politicians and contractors have built forts for themselves. They have grabbed the nation's assets. If we form Jharkhand, these people will make merry. Suraj Mandal and Shibu Soren may acquire how high positions but poor people are not going to benefit from it. Therefore, I want to say that if you actually what to do anything for the welfare of the poor, then you must do something for their development. It am not as leaneared as Shri Chitta Basu but the fact is that their development is not done properly. Had there been equal development, then there would not have been this movement and other problems related to it. The development there is so unequal that somebody is very rich and somebody is very poor.

They ruled the country for forty years.

Had the people removed them after five years, then it would not have happened. The people of the country committed a great mistake which is leading to the disintegration of the country.

SHRI BALRAJ PASSI (Nainital): Mr. Chairman, Sir, a proposal has been put forward that a separate Uttranchal state may be formed and Vananchal may be set up. During the last election in U.P., Uttranchal was an issue. Specially the issue of Uttaranchal reached every nook and corner of the remotest places. This demand was initially raised in 1952. Since then, this demand has been raised in some form or the other. But after 1952, the Congress ruled the State and it was the ill fortune of this Uttaranchal region that four Chief Minister hailed from region. Interestingly, three Chief Ministers hailed from holly areas and the fourth Shri Chandra Bhanu Gupta was from the plains but he contested from Ranikhet and assured the people there that all round development will be made. I would like to say that whatever development took place there was during the rule of Pt. Govind Ballabh Pant as some schemes were launched at that time. After that hon. Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna became the Chief Minister who thought himself to be a mand from hilly areas. I can still remember that he contested a bye-election of Lok Sabha from Dehradun and that time he was not in the Congress but.

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why do you discuss these personalities by taking names?

[*Translation*]

SHRI BALARAJ PASSI: It is related with that.

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do not go on taking names. You discuss the principles.

[Translation]

SHRI BALRAJ PASSI: The people there elected a leader, who made them believe that when he became the Chief Minister, this area would be developed. A persons from National district of Uttar Pradesh who became Chief Minister four times and held the portfolio of a Minister at the Centre three or four times. The people of hilly region voted in favour of the Congress for forty five years with the belief that the fate of this areas as well as the fate of the youth would change. Even the Britieshers did not develop This area in the Planned manner because they need men for their army and home Guards, Therefore, they did not want to develop this area. The Congress also adopted this policy for 45 years. They people of this region thought that this region would develop and the youth of this region would become self-reliant but nothing of this short happened. The Congress also did not let the youth awaken because in it did so, the youth would have ecome vigilant about his rights. I would like to ask the Government as to what did the Congress do for Uttaranchal during the last 45 years? It gave nothing except backwardness, poverty and destitution.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, in 1971 Himachal Pradesh was part of Punjab. No the people of Uttaranchal are jealous of Himachal Pradesh which is quite natural Because Uttaranchal has more population and more area than that of Himachal Pradesh. At the time of formation of a state 50 per cent population was below the poverty line, which has been reduced to 25 per cent at present. The people of Uttranchal saw this change taking place there. When Himachal Pradesh was part of Punjay, it did not get its due share. Schemes were planned but were limited to Punjab only. When in 1971, Himachal Pradesh came into being, the people changed their luck through hard wok. The way Himachal Pradesh has identified its Circumstances and worked to achieve progress can also be adopted in case of Uttranchal.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is ill fortune of the people of Uttaranchal that the person from plains who does not have any knowledge about hilly areas it made a Minister for the development of hilly areas. This has happen many times. What else can be more funny> I would like to ask whether the Minister whoever had held office at that time, was aware of the geographical situation of the hills? Was he aware of the conditions of roads? do not want to mention the name of the Chief Minister of the previous Government. When the matter of drinking water problem of Pithorgarh area was taken up with him, he asked his Secretary, whose name I do not want to mention, to look into the matter. He said a Grant of Rs. 5 lakhs was being released for instaling hand pumps there. What a fun? I would like to ask how schemes are chalked out as it was not a practical scheme.

There is a place by the name of Ramgarh in Nainital district. I visited that place after elections as the people of that area voted for me in elections. They had resentment which they had been having for the last forty five years because the person. against whom I was elected, had remained Chief Minister of the state four time. He had also been a Minister at the Centre for many terms and is also respectable leader of our area. But even then people elected me with a hope and belief. The only reason was that though he used to make his point strongly, nobody listened to nim. The foundation stone of a cold storage has been laid at that place known as Ramgarh. I was alkyd by the people why this could storage was being constructed, I told them that it was meant for their development, they said that it would serve the interest of those officials and bureaucrats who had submitted this scheme. I asked whether they would not keep apples and potatoes in the cold-storage? They replied, "Mr. M.P., apple grows where in the season when it does not Grow any where else, neither in Himachal not in Kashmir. If they kept their apple in cold-storage, then they would suffer loss in compassion to apple from Himachal and Kashmir as nobody will prefer their appie to

[Sh. Balraj Passi]

the one from Himachal and Kashmir." Similarly, 'pahari' potato grows there, which is much sought offer in Delhi. That too grows there in off-season. Now that plans are formulated that their produce should be kept in cold storage. Such impractical schemes are formulated by people sitting in Delhi and Lucknow. I myself met the Chief Minister in this connection. Ultimately that Rs. 1.5 crore scheme was abandoned.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I can mention not one but a number of such impractical schemes. Land in the hill areas is very fertile. We are competent enough to carry out development works in our area. In our area not only number of revolutionaries and saints were born but the poets of the prominence of Sumitranandan Pant were also born. While on a visit to Almora, the birthplace of the great poet, if you get a chance to stay in the Rest house you will find that nobody can enter the building from the main gate. You will wonder at architectural design of the building. The way leading to the main entrance of the building is closed and the brckside wall has been demolished to make way for the entrance. Architectural design was made in Lucknow on the promise that it should be East facing. However, it was not taken care of the fact that even hills are sometimes blocked by hills and the building was constructed. When hall of the construction work was over the question of the main entrance became a riddle. Entrance was constructed at the backside since the hillock faced the building. Such impractical schemes are being formulated in Uttranchal. Though we raise our voice against all these things, but it seems to be of no avail. After 45 years of independence the B.J.P. came into the power in Uttar Pradesh. People of the area whole heredity had voted in favour of the B.J.P. and out of 19 Assembly seats my party won 15 seats on the plank of Uttranchal. What else can be a better omen than the election of 4 BJP MPs from the area on the plank of Uttranchal. Only as a gesture of goodwill and to honour the sentiments of Uttranchal people.

the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly by a majority vote passed a resolution in favour of the formation of Uttranchal and forwarded it to the centre. What is the fate of this proposal? I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Home Affairs, that in the past in response to the question regarding the formation of Jharkhand State, he replied that no such proposal had been received from the State Government, but on the other hand when the Government of Uttar Pradesh forwarded to the Centre a proposal highlighting the circumstances for the formation of Uttranchal why it is not being examined? I remember the day and the year not the date, but on that day I was in Almora. The Government of Uttar Pradesh headed by Shri Kalyan Singh could not announce the formation of Uttranchal, but on that day made an announcement that a separate secretariat for Uttranchal will be set up at Almora. Foundation stone for the same was also laid that very day. The then Minister of Finance came to lay the foundation stone. Many a hon. MPs and MLAs were present on the occasion. A special stage was constructed and the people were in high spirits. People were in festive mood that the days of hardships are over. Unfortunately, that very day the statement of the hon. Minister of Home Affairs appeared in the press that Uttranchal was not being formed for the present.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to submit to the hon. Minister of Home Affairs that the people of my area are peace loving and patriotic. To take on the challenge of the enemies of the country revolutionaries came forward from this area and even the soldiers for this area go to face the enemy in the battle field so as to successfully defend the country's borders. Demand for Uttranchal is not being raised to serve our narrow parochial interests, but to successfully defend the country from foreigners, as whole of the Uttranchal region shares borders with foreign country. Our borders will not be safe if the youth of the country is in low spirits. The issue of the low spirits of the youth of the region comes up when the youth stay back in the area. All the children

after High School migrate to Delhi in search of employment because they cannot remain a mute spectator to the starving conditions at home. It is very unfortunate that even after BA and MA the youth fail to get employment there. Last to last year Government held an interview at Tanakpur in the Nainital district for the post of Bus Conductors. Unfortunately even for that post the youth of the area were not selected. We were satisfied that if our youth are not competent enough to be IAS and PCS officers, at least they can hope to become bus conductors, but now it seems even this is not destined. 85 per cent youth of the plains were selected through that interview. There could be nothing more unfortunate than this. Through that interview 60 per cent vacancies were filled up by the youth of the district of the then Chief Minister of the State.

Even now in the recruitment in Police in Pithoragarh district 60 per cent of the vacancies are filled by the youth of Etawah district. Recruitment in Police takes place in Pithoragarh but the youth of a place as far as 500 kms away, are selected while the youth of that area are not selected. So, how can the fortune smile on them? They are simply idling away their time.

The Government of Uttar Pradesh respecting the feelings and sentiments of the people of the area has conferred upon us the status of the hill cadre. The Government of my party was determined enough to implement it and had also taken a vow in this regard so as to create maximum avenues of employment for the youth of the area.

Mr. Chairmen, Sir, there can be nothing more unfortunate than the fact that though there are hospitals and schools, but the doctors and teachers are not being appointed. Even when the doctors are appointed they never join duty. Immediately one day after joining their duty they proceed on leave and through the influence of some officer or the Chief Minister try to get transfer in the areas in the plains. Even no the

hospitals and the school are without adequate staff. Immediately after appointment they get themselves transferred.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, therefore, I would like to request you and whole House that in view of the peculiar problems of the hill area this proposal should be accepted. There can be some difference of opinion regarding Jharkand. However, as Shri Paswan stated last week that there is no difference of opinion regarding Uttaranchal. Members of other parties had also said the same thing. Therefore, this proposal regarding Uttaranchal should be passed unanimously today itself. So that we can tell the innocent people of our area that better days are now again round the corner.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (KISHANGANJ): MR. Chairman, Sir, we have been debating this Resolution from many angles. I think, there is a general consensus that today we need smaller States and in fact, apart from Uttaranchal and the question of Jharkhan, we have taken cognizance of the demand for smaller States from various parts of the country. It has been suggested that the time has come now to establish a new States Re-organisation Commission with proper terms of reference which would take into account, not only the question of languages, but also various other parameters including the experience of development since we became free.

Sir, I would like to place some information before you. We have here the report of the 1991 census. We have got the basic population and area figures for every State and Union Territory. The Union consist of 24 States and 7 Union Territories. The total population of the country is of the order of 839 millions. Now, the biggest State, Uttar Pradesh accounts for 16 per cent of the population. The tow biggest States, Uttar Pradesh and Bihar account for 26.8 per cent of the population. If you take the first three, that is to say, including Maharashtra, the total comes to 36 per cent of the population. Take the next one, West Bengal, four

[Sh. Syed Shahabuddin]

States together come to 44 per cent and take the first five States including Andhra Pradesh, that is, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Maharashtra, West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh, together these five States give us 52.3 per cent of the total population of the country.

Sir, I will not give you more figures, but I have gone up to the 12th. You add one more State, it brings another 10 per cent, add another two States, it means another 15 per cent and within 12 States and among you have 90 per cent of the population of the country. Now, these are the major States, the giants are the first five States. If you take the area figures, the only exception in that pattern are, West Bengal and Kerala which have got very high density. But, otherwise again we find that the first five States, that is, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Maharashtra, West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh cover nearly 36 per cent of the area of the country and that way, these 12 States cover 85 per cent of the area and 90 per cent of the population.

Unfortunately, over this period for various reasons we have created micro States. So, we have a picture, unfortunately, in our country where we have giants, on the one side and pigmies on the other. We have got big States and then we have got not small States, but micro States.

Micro States have been created because of certain compulsions or political circumstances, because we did not have a formula before us, because we did not have a total vision before us, because we did not have a completed plan before us and therefore as and when we came across a problem and when we were pressed very hard, the only solution found was, to create a micro State. So, on the one hand, we have States like Uttar Pradesh with a population of 140 million people and here in our very country, we have got a State like Sikkim with 4 lakh people; we have got Mizoram with 7 lakh people and we have got about

half-a-dozen States with each one of them having a population below 1 million.

Therefore, Sir, we have now a federation, a federation of giants and pigmies; a federation of big States and micro States. Can this federation survive? Do we not benefit from experience, draw some lessons from the experience of the Soviet Union, from the experience of Yugoslavia? I personally feel, Mr. Chairman, that one of the distabilising factor in any federation is the vast dichotomy between the big and the small, between the giant and the pigmy. Then what happens? The federation is no longer a true federation: the federation tends to be dominated by the big ones, by the giants, by the big States. Therefore, there can never be a balance relationship; there can never be an equality of relationship; there can never be justice in inter-State relationship or in the relationship between the Centre and the States.

That is why, I think, we should draw some conclusion from the experience which is right before us. The Soviet Union in my opinion disintegrated because the biggest chunk, the Russian State was more than half in population and in area and the others were very small States. Similarly, in Yugoslavia, Serbia dominated the entire Yugoslavia and all the other States were extremely small compared to that. Therefore, I think, there is very good reason that we should try to re-organise our polity in a manner where though we cannot have absolute equality but we can have some degree of comparative equality among the various constituents of the Union.

The other aspect is, we have adopted it as a national ideal the policy of decentralisation and autonomy. Decentralisation and autonomy, if they are practised in the right spirit and with sincerity and did not merely apply to Centre-State relations but to the relations between the State and the districts, the relations between the district and the blocks, and the relations between the blocks and the various gram panchayats, then perhaps the fair rate would

work. As it was pointed out here, there is vast disparity in the level of development. Even in small matters as was pointed out, in the construction of roads, in the location of local schools, in the establishment of the local health centre, in the alignment of the local power line and in the alignment of the local drainage system, there is an in-built discrimination and injustice and that cannot be cured under the present system at all. Unless you bring democracy, unless you bring decision-making power right down to the smaller level, it cannot be cured. Therefore, I believe that there should be smaller states and there should be smaller districts. Within a smaller district, we should have manageable blocks and we should have gram panchayats with real powers transferred to them. Then only, we should be able to tackle this question of disparity in development.

I would like to make one point. We are all conscious of the existing disparities and injustice. But I would like to say one thing in favour of the decision maker. Some of it may not be deliberate. I cannot accuse the decision makers of *mala fide*. Some of it arises from the very nature of the situation. How can a man sitting in Lucknow or for that matter, a decision-maker sitting in Patna understand the agony of the people in a far corner of Bihar, in the North or South of Bihar? It is impossible. I once asked a U.P. Chief Minister: "You have got 60 districts. Can you recall the names of all the districts?" And then I asked him, one other question: "The district officer is the key man there. He is the man on whom you depend if there is any crisis. Do you have any mental picture of the capacity and capability of that man sitting out there? Can you possibly have it?" That applies not only to the Chief Minister but it applies to every Department head also. Can the Agriculture Minister analyse which agriculture officer is good; how good he is? It is impossible. But if you have got a smaller State in which you have about ten to fifteen districts and when an important programme or project is there, in the morning itself, the Minister concerned can ring up all the 15 officers of the

department and find out, check, monitor and control the progress of that project. That is what is done in Haryana. That is why, development is faster. That is why, bureaucracy is not careless. That is why, bureaucracy is always on its toe that the people's representatives and the Ministers concerned are always there to monitor them and to control them. That is why, smaller States are developing faster than the bigger States. That is one good reason.

The biggest States by not developing faster as the rest of the country are instead of being an advantage to the country—proving themselves to be a drag. If you take any parameter, the number of illiterates, the infant mortality rate, per capita income consumption of energy, the national average goes down not because of smaller State but because of the biggest State. The average per capita development level is much lower in the biggest States. Therefore, there is no doubt at all, experience has proved that if we have smaller State, our development would be faster. It will be far more under the control of the people; it shall be closer to the people; it shall reflect the aspirations of the people; it shall respond to the people and it shall be answerable to the people. The people's representatives who are there on behalf of the people would keep an eye and they would be able to exert themselves and to guide development in a more effective manner.

Therefore, I feel that there cannot be any piecemeal solution. I am not opposing Uttaranchal. I am one of the supporters of Uttaranchal. I have signed many petitions in favour of the creation of Uttaranchal. But I must also say that every major State in the country has got regions which speak to us through their sense of solidarity and through their psycho-social unity. That is not an antithesis to national unity. National unity must be based on this regional unity, on this regional solidarity. They cannot be divorced from each other and, therefore, when I hear of Avadh or Brijhoomi or Bundelkhand or Jharkhand or Magadh from where I come

[Sh. Syed Shahabuddin]

and whose history was the history of India for 500 years and when I hear of Mithila, these are all names which cannot be ignored. For that matter, in Maharashtra, Vidarbha; Marathwada, Konkan; even in small Kerala, there is the history Malabar. Even in Tamil Nadu, there is a difference between Koramandal and the rest of Tamil Nadu and Madurai, the seat of a great empire. In Andhra Pradesh, we have Telengana and we have . These regions were not artificial formations They were historical formations and they had certain cultural identity. They had a certain built in human solidarity and development depends on tapping that sense of humanity, solidarity, that consciousness of community, the consciousness that we share our agonies and our triumphs and our difficulties as one community and, therefore, unless it is a very small community, a macro community that must be fitted into this picture of decentralisation and unless these States must respond to the claims of history, human solidarity there cannot be any piecemeal solution. There has to be a National Consensus which should take into account all these factors of history, and geography, of language and culture, of the state of development and the various economic factors that are there.

When we think, for example, of Uttar Pradesh, we have Western Uttar Pradesh which it has a built in socio-economic milieu and we have Eastern Uttar Pradesh, part of which is Bhojpur. Bhojpur was not only in Uttar Pradesh but also in Bihar. Why cannot there be a Bhojpur State? Why cannot Bhojpur have a status as a language just as Rajasthan claims a status of its own? Why cannot Bhojpur have a common destiny as a constituent of this great Union of ours? Thus it may even require cutting across the present boundaries of the States, not merely reorganise a State but reorganise the map of India, cutting across the present boundary lines.

People have said about river waters

and boundaries. But the river waters have always been there. The change in the political map of India will not affect the distribution rules. It depends upon our national wisdom that we frame the rules for the exploitation of our river waters in a manner that both the upper riparian and the lower riparian gets a fair deal and that applies equally to all the States through which a particular river system passes and, therefore, that cannot possibly be cited as an argument against the idea of reorganisation.

SHRI RAJENDRA AGNIHOTRI (Jhansi): Please say something about Jharkhand.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: In the case of Jharkhand, I was listening very carefully to Shri Chitta Basu. There is a dichotomy in that situation. One aspect is the question of having a tribal State. There is no question at all that the tribal people have been exploited but it is my view that in the Jharkhand State, as is being claimed by the proponents of the Jharkhand movement, the tribal people shall continue to be dominated and continue to be exploited by the non-tribals.

I am totally in favour of having a tribal majority State. Tribal majority districts, but added to that, tribal majority blocs which are contiguous, added to that the tribal majority panchayats which are contiguous, should form a State in which the tribal will see that he has come into his own, that he is the master of his soil, that he is running the State in his own interest, that he does not depend on any outsider or any non-tribal element to come and show them the way, but it has to be a tribal unity. Therefore, as far as Jharkhand is concerned, there is no such thing as a Jharkhand nationality. But there is something called tribal consciousness and that tribal consciousness must be given expression in the form of a tribal majority State. But then comes the catch. It is not only a question of Bihar. In fact, Bihar has just two districts now which have got a tribal majority. The

real tribal districts now are in Orissa and in Madhya Pradesh and I think there has to be a meeting of mind at least among these three States, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar and Orissa in order to create a tribal majority State so that the tribal majority region which was divided by the British, some in Bihar, some in Orissa and some to Madhya Pradesh, can all be united and find a destiny of its own.

I feel that a States Reorganisation Commission is the need of the moment. It must be established before any further bitterness penetrates or permeates our polity. It should be given enough time. There is no hurry. It should be given a clear mandate. It should be given a clear set of criteria based on national consensus and then we should work out a new map of India based on equality and justice, to all our people and to all our regions and to all our cultures and to all our languages, taking into consideration the question of administrative efficiency, the question of economic viability as well as the question of geographical contiguity.

I believe that the Federation should consist of States of roughly uniform size, roughly 15 million to 25 million people, roughly 10 to 15 districts and, I am sure, if that comes about, the progress of the Union itself shall be much faster than it is so far because then it will tap the total energy of the masses which remain latent today and which has not yet flowered.

SHRI A. CHARLES (Trivandrum): The Resolution before the House is for the creation of new smaller States and, especially Uttaranchal, comprising the hilly regions of Uttar Pradesh and the Adivasi belt of Bihar and Vananchal of Jharkhand State comprising the tribal areas..

AN HON. MEMBER: Is it proper for a speaker who has just spoken to leave the House? I am on a point of order. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI A. CHARLES: Of Madhya Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa and West Bengal.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

SHRI A. CHARLES: I do feel that the demand for the creation of the above States deserves serious consideration.

17.43 hrs

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *In the Chair*]

However, it should not be forgotten that religion, caste, language, regionalism are very sensitive issues and any decisions taken on this issue shall be taken after very careful consideration and after arriving at a consensus of all the political parties and especially the affected people of the concerned area.

I was closely listening to the speakers for the last one hour. One of the hon. Members, on the other side, was accusing the Congress for not forming these States and accused the Congress that even though the Congress was in power in several States, these regions were totally neglected.

This is only to gain political advantage out of a sensitive issue. After all, we have paid much because of religious fundamentalism and the price we are paying today is that several parts of the country have been blasted. (*Interruptions*). Sir, this is the saddest thing. Even within the House, some of the political parties cannot understand what the feelings of an ordinary layman of this country are. *The Times of India*, in its issue dated 11.02.93, has a small news item: "JD supports the formation of Uttarkhand". One small paragraph reads like this:

" According to observers, the Janata Dal's announcement must be viewed in the context of its long term political strategy. The Janata Dal had no other option, as no party can survive in the region without supporting the cause of a separate hill State. Interestingly, during Mr. Singh's tenure as Prime

[Sh. A. Charles]

Minister, the Janata Dal had ignored the Uttarkhand issue."

Sir, this is the political aspect of the issue which I have been trying to highlight and not that I am against the formation of the State. My friends on the other side unnecessarily need not worry about it.

We all know that always smaller units are very easy to administer. There is a beautiful book titled "Small is beautiful", written by Hue Maker. They teach the ethos of Gandhi's rural India. So, we are all for fulfilling the hopes and aspirations of the people of the tribal area, of small groups who have the same cultural and religious background.

Sir, India is the largest democracy in the World. And our great success is that we were able to nourish and mature our unity in diversity. But now, the security and survival of the nation is being challenged. So, at this time, preserving the unity and integrity of the country is what is most needed.

Sir, immediately after the independence, the greatest challenge or the greatest problem that faced the country was; How the country could be consolidated? You know, there were more than 500 kingdoms and the real problem was how to consolidate all these kingdoms under one central rule. And thanks to the wisdom and the leadership shown by our great leaders, that the whole country was consolidated and reorganization of the States took place.

Sir, it is true that language was the main basis of the reorganisation of the States in this Country. But, there were other factors also, such as historical, cultural, social and economical

Kerala is an example. At the time, when we got independence in 1947, I come from Trivandrum. It was the capital of the Travancore State. After a few years, the next neighbouring State of Cochin, which was a sepa-

rate autonomous Kingdom was added to Travancore; and Travancore and Cochin were together for sometime. And thereafter, some parts of Madras, known as Malabar - three revenue districts - were again added to this State, forming the present Kerala State, on the basis of language. But quite unfortunately, Kanyakumari district which was culturally, emotionally, economically, tied to Kerala was separated on the basis of language and was given to Tamil Nadu. The cultural ties of Kanyakumari with Kerala is more than what it is with Tamil Nadu. So, the Keralites have been demanding that Kanyakumari should be given back to Kerala again.

1749 hrs.

[MR. SPEKAER in the Chair]

I do not think whether any Tamil Nadu M.P., is here. But quite reasonably, the people of Kanyakumari district are now demanding, saying that their ties are with Kerala and not with Tamil Nadu because in every nook and corner of the Kanyakumari district, when you go and see, people there speak in Malayalam. They still know Malayalam Language. I was there, in charge of an election work in that district.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (Mayiladuturai): Will you permit me, Shri Charles? If this is the argument, then surely Dubai will become part of Kerala.

SHRI A. CHARLES: Kindly excuse me. I am just voicing the aspirations of the people of my neighbouring State. If you have any objection, I am prepared to withdraw and I do not stand in your way and trouble you. I am just trying to convince you that there were factors other than language at the time of the reorganisation of the States. Now, we know that the Sarkaria Commission has gone into the full details of the Centre-State relations. I feel that at the time of independence, the need of the hour was a very strong Centre because our country was born as a

new nation. I think, now the time has come when we have to have a rethinking on how the administration of every region has to be strengthened.

Regional imbalance is the main cause of all the trouble of this country. Even within a State, as the previous speaker has said, there are many regions which are totally neglected. So, I request that the whole concept of the reorganisation of the State has to be re-examined and wherever possible, small States, smaller units, autonomous regions shall have to be formed; and they should be given the democratic process of administration. Their hopes and aspirations will have to be fulfilled. More autonomous, in the lowest level can only help the country to grow. That is the main policy of the present Government also in bringing forward the Panchayati Raj Bill. If the Panchayati Raj legislation is implemented every part of our country, every citizen of this country will get an opportunity to get his demand fulfilled.

Shri Inderjit has said that there can be different types of States; like Part A, Part B, Part C States, I am totally opposing that. There can be no discrimination after giving some power to the State. Every State, big or small, is equal; and I feel that there is a very strong case, as one of the front bench opposition Member was saying, for creating more states from UP and such other bigger states. On principle I am for the creation of small States and I do support the spirit of the Resolution. But I think, this is not the way, this is not the time to pass the Resolution and get two States born. On the other hand, unanimously the whole House can look into this question and can take a decision as to how many States can be newly formed, not only Uttaranchal and Vanachal. There are other smaller groups, tribal areas and certain regions which, geographically could not continue in the same States. So, a new attempt can be made for the total reorganisation with the concept of a smaller States. With that view in mind, I request the hon. Member to withdraw the Resolution for the time being and let us join together. We will

be with you for the formation of these two States; we will be supporting you. But, have a largest view of the whole nation and let us come to a common understanding. Thank you.

MAJ GEN. (RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI (Garhwal): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Resolution for creating separate Vananchal and Uttaranchal States. An extensive discussion has already taken place on the issue and almost all the hon. Members have agreed that the demand is justified. Some of the hon. Members have laid some conditions and also given several suggestions. However, all of them have agreed that development has not taken place in these areas and injustice has been done to them till this day. The foremost thing to think is why the need to make them spearhead State has arisen. Due to lack of time I would concentrate particularly on Uttaranchal though I do support the same demand with regard to 'Vananchal' equally.

The most important reason for it is the lack of development. What is the position of development in Uttaranchal region even after 45 years of independence. Some of the hon. Members have touched this point and I would like to render more information in regard to it. At the time of independence the *per capita* income in the hilly areas of this region was among the first ten districts of other regions of the country and today after 45 years of independence the people of this area are the last in the list. This is the development that has taken place after 45 years of independence. So far as the people living below the poverty line are concerned, more than 70 per cent of the total population of this area lives below poverty line even today.

As regards to industry, seven out of the eight districts are 'Zero' industry areas. A few days back I had sought information to this effect from the Planning Commission. Seven districts are extremely backward from the point of view of industrial development. No industry has been set up in these dis-

[Maj Gen. Bhuwan Chandra Khanduri]

tracts even after 45 years of independence. What type of thinking is this? This attracts our attention towards the attitude in this country regarding the development policy being adopted in the country.

So far as the problem of unemployment is concerned, the Government may not realise that how serious the problem of unemployment is there. Educated youth do not want to stay there in our hilly areas today. All of them have migrated to plains and wandering in search of job. Only the aged persons, women and children or the school going students are left. On the other side, it is an irony that more than half of the posts in schools, hospitals and other places are lying vacant. On one side there is widespread unemployment whereas on the other side a large number of posts are lying vacant. It is because of the fact that the life being tough in hilly areas people do not want to go there. People show their willingness to go there just to get the appointment but after remaining there for only three or four months they seek transfer from there on the pretext of illness or go on long leave. Today, the situation in the schools is critical. The working strength of the teachers in the colleges and schools there is less than 50 per cent. Similar situation prevails in other departments. The officers are posted to hilly areas on the basis of three P's till today i.e. promotion, punishment and probation. Recently another 'P' has been added to it and that refers to 'Paisa'. People go to hills to earn money. They misuse the money allocated for the development of those areas and become wealthy. The Government can well imagine to what extent resentment is prevailing among the people of that region.

So far, as the development is concerned, electricity, water, hospitals, schools and roads are in such a deplorable condition there that the Government cannot visualise the actual position without going to that area. The people of our constituency the place where Ganga and Yamuna flows - do not have even drinking water. The Government have

figures of the villages having facility of drinking water but all these figures are fictitious. People do not get drinking water there. Aged persons, women and children have to fetch water throughout the day.

18.00 hrs.

They have to cover a distance of 4-5 kms. in that hilly area that take the entire day. Despite this they do not get adequate drinking water. As regards to electricity, very few villages are electrified and among those also most of the villages do not get proper supply. Bills prepared by computers are dispatched to them which are wrong or exaggerated. They get the supply only for half an hour and sometimes it is cut for weeks together. The condition of hospitals is such that it takes a complete day to reach a hospital. Sometimes the ailing or pregnant women die even before reaching the hospital. As regards to roads, projects have been lying pending for which the Government has not given clearance for the last 10-12 years. But there is no one to pay attention. Due to lack of development the people have lost faith in the Government machinery. The problem of development of this region is somewhat different from that of other regions due to the different topography, climate and the socio-economic conditions and culture of this area. Therefore, the people sitting in Lucknow and Delhi who make the policies for those areas cannot realise their problems. Just now, the hon Member speaking prior to me stated that when the problem of drinking water is so acute there, then the officials should have ordered to install the hand-pumps in the hilly areas. A number of such schemes are prepared but the people of those areas feel sorry about the manner in which their problems are being dealt with and feel pity on the people who make such schemes. These things are creating feelings of discontentment among their minds and strengthening their demand for a separate State.

My next submission is that as to why there is a demand for 'Uttaranchal' as a separate State. If we look at the map of India

there are separate States through out the Himalyan range from Jammu Kashmir to eastern region. Uttaranchal is the only exception. We any being with Jammu-Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, Sikkim, Assam and Nagaland and 'Seven sisters' have been made separate States. Then why discrimination with Uttaranchal only? Why 'Uttaranchal' cannot be made a sepearate State. It is justified by every aspect. Several hon. Members of the House have opposed the idea on the plea that it would not be viable. It is a wrong propagada that it will not be viable to make it as a separate State. I would like to make two submissions. First, that which ever State have been made so far after independent no objection was raised regarding their viability. States were formed, their development took place and gradually they became viable. Uttaranchal as a separate State is very much viable and we do have our resources. But they are being misused. As it has been pointed out with regard to 'Vanchal' there resources that region are being used at other places. We have human resource and an hon. Member belonging to our area has stated that a large number of people are in the army from our area and as the hon. Members know that after getting retired at early age a large number of disciplined persons are rendered unemployed, their services are not being utilized.

We are rich in forest wealth and benefits thereof ae being engaged by the enforce country even today. Not only forest wealth, we have medicinal herbs in abundance but hash have not been utilied till today because the people at Delhi and Lucknow do not have enough time to look into such matters. As regards water I have already submitted that the Ganga and Yamuna rives which originate from our area are providing water to the whole of the country. It has the potential of setting up so many micro hydel schemes which can provide electricity not only to State but to many areas of the country but that has not been utilised upto now. Today nobody has adequate funds to invest there. There is largest potential of wind Energy in the region. If wind energy

can be tapped properly in Uttranchal, it can remove the scarcity of energy in the entire country.

But nobody has thought over it till date. We do not have time for these things. Similarly, the atmosphere is conducive for animal Lusbandry and agriculture. For other things also the surroundings provide large scopes, high attitudes and a clean environment for setting up various other centres for the development of the area.

Not only pilgrims but also tourists of various kinds visit out tourist spots. The area can be developed a lot for this purpose. We do not have resource crunch. What we lack is will power which should be utilised properly and with a good intention. Today the Congress Party does not have good intentions. Its only intention is to exploit through its power. The Government wants to exploit as easily as possible and take away the funds outside The local areas and it is not concerned for the necessities and development of local people.

I will give only three examples of how Uttaranchal is suffering due to its not being declared a separate State. The first one is that the Planning Commission has fixed certain norms as to how much funds should be provided to Uttranchal and other hill-areas. It has fixed norms to receive aids from the Planning Commission. The basis is 65 per cent population, 20 per cent performance and 10 per cent of other things. On the basis of these norms we should be given more than Rs. 400 crore, but we are given Rs. 180 crore only. When I raised this issue in the Parliament I was told that the amount of Rs.180 crores is a just amount and the balance amount should be sought from the State. The population of Himachal Pradesh is 51 lakh where as that of our State is 59 lakh. But our State is allocated an amount of Rs. 180 crores Himachal Pradesh gets Rs. 350 crore.

This kind of injustice is being meted out to us only because ours is not a separate State and we are suffering economically for

[Maj Gen. Bhuwan Chandra Khanduri]

this reason.

The second issue is related to industries. Just now the hon. Minister of Finance stated in his Budget proposal that we was providing tax-holidays for five years for setting up new industries in backward areas. This has been stated by him in his speech. He has provided tax-holidays to new industrialists and entrepreneurs for five years in the North-East, Jammu and Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, Sikkim, Goa, the Union Territories of Andaman and Nicobar, Dadra-Nagar Haveli, Daman-Diu, Lakshadweep and Pondichery but there is no mention of Uttaranchal in it. met the hon. Minister of Finance and asked him as to why he did not give concessions to us, because out of 8, 7 districts fall under zero industry area. Thereupon he said:

MR. SPEAKER: You may continue next time please.

MAJ. GEN (RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI: Thank yo Sir.

MR. SPEKAER: I have specially come to the Chair to make a special request to the hon. Members. We have seven Ordinances to be approved by the House. After that, we would like to discuss the Railway Budget and then we would like to have general discussion the general Budget. Then, before 31 March, we shall have to pass the Vote an Account. These ordinacnes are also time bound and I am told that they have to be passed before 4th April. We are not going to work from 1st April to 19th of April. We have time constraint. So, I have to request you to please cooperate in seeing that these Ordinances are passed. You can make speeches, but concise and very terse. At the same time, let us divide the time availble to all the Members together. Some Members can speak on some subjects which are nearer and dearer to their heart's desire. and some others can speak on some other subjects. If we do this, it should be possible to finish the work. Unless we pass two or

three Ordinances at least a day, when we next meet, we will not be able to complete the agenda.

AN HON. MEMBER: Today?

MR. SPEAKER: Not today of course. Today we will do something, There is is one Ordinance on Wildlife Protection. We may complete it today.

So, please bear this in mind and cooperate.

Mr. Bharagava please.

18.10 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE. DISAPPROVAL OF THE WILD LIFE (PROTECTION) AMENDMENT ORDINANCE

AND

WILD LIFE (PROTECTION) AMENDMENT BILL

[Translation]

SHRI GIRIDHARI LAL BHARGAVA (Jaipur): I beg to move, " That this House disapproves of the Wild Life (Protection) Amendment Ordinance, 1993 (Ordinance No. 7 of 1993) promulgated by the President on the 2nd January, 1993".

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FOREST (SHRI KAMAL NATH): I beg to move,

"That the Bill further to amend the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972, be taken into consideration."

Sir, the Bill has a very limited ambit and is aimed at facilitating adherence to the stipulations laid down by this august House in terms of Section 38 H of the Wild Life