

when the discussion starts.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI ARVIND NETAM): Will the discussion on the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Agriculture continue after Prime Minister's Business is over?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think.

15.31 hrs

[English]

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS'
BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Twentieth Report

SHRI P. KALIAPERUMAL (Cuddalore): I beg to move:

"That the House do agree with the Twentieth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 28th April, 1993".

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Twentieth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 28th April, 1993".

The motion was adopted

15.32 hrs

RESOLUTION *RE*: CREATION OF NEW
STATES OF UTTARANCHAL AND
VANANCHAL

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maj. Gen. (Retd). Bhuwan Chandra Khanduri was on his legs last time. Nine minutes are left out of the time allotted

to this Resolution.

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla): You extend the time by two hours more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the House that the time for this Resolution be extended by two hours more?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, the time for this Resolution has been extended by two more hours. Now you can start speaking.

[Translation]

MAJ. GEN. (RETD). BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI (Garhwal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, on 19th March, 1993, I had started discussion on the creation of separate States of Uttaranchal and Vananchal. I had spoken on a few points on that day. I am repeating them briefly. I had stated as to why creation of Uttaranchal and Vananchal is necessary and as to what are the problems of Uttaranchal. I had expressed in detail that the main problem of the region came to a standstill in the absence of a separate State. I had also stated that creation of separate State is necessary because of its topographical reason. Its climatic, cultural, economic and social conditions are different from the plains. If you go through map of India you will find that separate states have been created for all the time border areas from Kashmir to the extreme east. A separate state has not yet been created for these 8 hilly districts of Uttar Pradesh. It being a border area should also be developed as a separate State. A propaganda is often made that there will be no feasibility in Uttaranchal. In this regard I had stated in detail that there are sufficient natural resources in Uttaranchal and this new State will definitely be viable. Today, I would like to present some other points before you. The first point is as to why a separate Uttaranchal State should be created. The first reason is that the people of the region are suffering economically and politically in the absence of a separate State. I would

[Maj. Gen. Bhuwan Chandra Khanduri]

like to cite three examples in this regard. The first thing is that the Planning Commission provides grants to each State and it has set its norm to do so. The norm adopted by the Planning Commission to provide grants are 65 per cent grants on the population of the State, 20 per cent on the population of the State living below poverty line 10 per cent on the performance and 5 per cent on other things. In this way the Central Government on behalf of the Planning Commission provides grants to all the States of the country. According to these norms the Planning Commission should give more than Rs. 400 crore to Uttaranchal. Our share comes to Rs. 400-500 crore every year but we are getting Rs. 180-182 crore every year. When I asked the hon. Minister of Planning about it he told me that the Central Government provides Rs. 182 crore and the remaining amount can be had from the State Government Uttaranchal is not a separate State hence ask the Uttar Pradesh to provide more funds. Mr. Minister, Sir, I would like to tell you (*Interruptions*) The population of Himachal Pradesh is 51 lakh and of Uttaranchal is 59 lakh. As regards poverty line as well as other factors we figure below them but Himachal Pradesh gets Rs. 350 crores while we get Rs. 182 crore. When I raised this question the Union Government replies that it can't give us because Uttaranchal is not a separate State. What sort of justice is this. On the one hand the Central Government does not create Uttaranchal State and on the other hand it punishes us on the plea that it is not a separate States., So it will not get the required amount. It is a wrong policy of the Government due to which there is resentment among the people.

Secondly, it is the opinion of the Central Government that Uttaranchal is not a separate State so facilities will not be provided to it. In this regard I would like to draw your attention to the budget presented by the hon. Finance Minister In his budget speech the hon. Finance Minister said a very good thing that a tax holiday will be given to no industries area. But when he ex-

plained it in detail that this facility would be given to North-Eastern States, Jammu and Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, Sikkim, Union Territories of Andaman and Nicobar islands, Dadra-Nagar-Haveli and Lakshadweep but seven districts out of eight districts of Uttaranchal which are zero industries areas are not included under this facility. These figures are not mine; these figures are of the Planning Commission. During the discussion on the budget when I asked him about it he said that Uttaranchal is not a separate State but he thinks that the facilities should be provided to the region. In such a situation, when there is no industry in my region how the industrialists will be motivated to set up industries there unless the Government provides a tax holiday. What sort of logic and ideology is this that on the one hand the Central Government itself does not create a separate States of Uttaranchal Pradesh and on the other hand it punishes the people of the region, the hon. Minister should consider it.

The third thing I would like to say about the political set back to the people of the region. As I have stated that population of Uttaranchal is 59 lakh and population of Himachal Pradesh is 51 lakh. I am comparing the figures with Himachal Pradesh because it is our neighboring States otherwise there are more figures in our favour. The number of members in the Assembly of Himachal Pradesh is 68 while population of Uttaranchal is 8 lakh more than it but there are only 19 members of the State Assembly from this region. What sort of justice is this with the people of this region. What sort of justice is this with the people of this region. I am unable to understand as to what sort of political blow is this the people of the region that the basic principle for creating districts, blocks etc. is being ignored. For the purpose of proper development of the region small units should be formed for hilly areas. But there is no such system because it is not a separate State.

I would like to put another point before you that the major part of the population of the Uttaranchal region consists of Army personnel. There are a large number of people of Uttaranchal

region are in the army. This is not a recent phenomenon, it is going on since the beginning of this century. They are regarded as the best soldiers in bravery and other fields. Now, the position is that at least one member of each family is a soldier in army and in several families 2-3 members are serving in army and similar is the number of ex-soldiers there Besides this a large number of the people of the region are serving in a para-military forces. I would like to tell the hon. Member that a number of excellent and best soldiers are there in this region. Their development is hindered and did not take place and they are of the opinion that injustice is being done with them, therefore, I would like to draw your attention to a couple of things of this region.

The first thing is that the people of this region are great warriors. They do not hesitate to sacrifice their lives for the sake of the country. The people of this region are the most courageous. I would like to submit to the hon. Minister that if this courage or bravery turns into violence then it will not only jeopardise the interest of our region but against the whole of the country also. It will be unfortunate for us if it happens so. I, therefore, urge the Government to consider it seriously. The second aspect is that the development of the area did not take place and the poverty has increased in the region. The economic and social evils, negligence of the administration, corrupt administration run by the leaders from Lucknow and Delhi have led to turn their behaviour from good to bad. Today the quality of the very soldier has come down due to all these evils. These soldiers who were once considered as excellent and strong, now have lost their quality. You can take figures from the Ministry of Defence and if this process goes on a soldier dominant area will turn into a weak area and it is also worth considered that this area is situated on the border of our country. In view of the circumstances, I would like to State that unless the Government does not create a separate State, proper development will not take place. In this absence of a separate State the people will not be satisfied and feeling of resentment will

increase among the people which is not good for the country.

Now, I would like to tell you that oftenly, it has been said as to what are you doing through constitutional manners. I would like to tell you that several states have been created in the country but such sorts of strict conditions have never been imposed on the creation of states as has been fixed for the creation of Uttaranchal. Earlier the States were created keeping in view the political as well as the developmental aspects of the region and the constitutional process was also to be followed side by side but in the case of Uttaranchal a lot of pre conditions have been imposed in a particular way and their follow up has made obligatory. It has also been laid by the Central Government that resolution to this effect should be passed by the State. Now, I would like to give some figures to the hon. Minister. Now you will call it a repetition but under the circumstances its repetition has become necessary. The Central Government received a resolution from the State Government on 19 November, 1991 regarding creation of a separate Uttaranchal State. After 15 days on 4th December, 1991 I raised this issue in the House during the Zero Hour and asked about the action being taken by the Government in this regard. I am unable to understand as to what was fact whether the Ministry actually wanted to do so or just to avoid the issue, it had asked the Government of Uttar Pradesh to clarify its justification. Well, after that a detailed justification of 30 pages was laid on the table of House on 5th March, 1992, and after that I am asking about it time and again.

I had asked in this regard in this House itself on the the March, 23rd April, 8th July and on 26th November, 1992. But every time the reply of the Government was the same that the matter is under consideration. This inactive Government have kept the matter under its consideration for one full year and yet it did not come to any decision at all. When I asked that at least have talks with the people of that area, the reply was that there was no need of it. When I further asked

[Maj. Gen. Bhuwan Chandra Khanduri]

to talk to the Members of Parliament hailing from that part of the State, the Government did not feel the need of it either. The matter is under consideration without any progress. Anyway, I very well understand that keeping the matter under consideration is nothing but a tactic of the Government to linger on the matter. But what is shameful and turgid about it is the reply made by you on 23rd February, 1993 and which I would like to read out here. This was the reply made by you like to read out here. This was the reply made by you in response to my persistent query to know about the development in that regard. The hon. Minister may please note that the Uttar Pradesh Assembly was dismissed on 6th December, 1992 and President's rule was imposed. It is believed that unless an elected Government is formed in the state it would not be prudent to take any decision on such sensitive and important issues. The hon. Minister should ponder whether the erstwhile Government in the State was not an elected one or whether the State Government that sent its proposal to the Centre was not having the mandate of the people. Was there a dictatorship and not the rule of the people? And if at all the hon. Minister intends to convey through his reply that the Congress Party is going to make a come back in the State, then it is nothing but making a castle in the air. What to think in the next elections, your Government is going to come in Power in the State during the current century. If you keep on such a policy, there will then not be even a single supporter of your party in the State and to think of securing backing of the people is a mere falacy. Let me remind you that 15 out of 19 total assembly seats of that area were bagged by the candidates of our party all on the issue of Uttaranchal State. Earlier, there was only one M.L.A. of our party during the tenure of Government that preceded ours in Uttar Pradesh. So the number rose there from 1 to 14. And so far as seats of Members of Parliament are concerned, we had earlier no M.P. of our party from those areas whereas we have now bagged, all the four parliamentary seats. So boasting of

having the backing of the people is nothing, but a misleading statement. This is neither in your interest nor in the interest of our party. You are therefore, required to reconsider this matter.

Constraint of time does not permit me to be more expressive in my submission. I would just like to request the hon. Minister that the present Congress Government which the hon. Minister is a Member is behaving in a hypocritical manner. He should, however, make note of the fact that this is not good for his party as well. Here I would like to submit that what is required at the moment is to pay attention to development which has been obscured by the game of nasty politics. What is required is to come out of it... (*Interruptions*) The men of your party do not have the guts to say by going there that Uttaranchal State should not be created. You should try to know their views. Cent per cent people are in favour of the move I would therefore like to submit to the Government that it should accept this demand.

15.45 hrs

[SHRI RAM NAIK *in the Chair*]

Mr. Chairman, Sir, due to the paucity of time I would like to conclude after making one more submission. The promise of the Government to create a Council or a Union Territory is nothing but red herring. We however, do want that we want a separate State. This is because the development of the area cannot be ensured unless there is creation of a separate State. I would therefore, like to submit to the Government that it should drop red herring and should create a separate Uttaranchal State.

SHRI KIRSHAN DUTT SULTANPURI (Shimla): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Resolution. I hold that development of the hill region cannot be ensured unless there is creation of a separate State. I hold that the areas of Uttaranchal or the part of Bihar for which there is a demand to create separate States cannot develop unless they are made separate States. If other hill States like Himachal Pradesh, Kash-

mir, Sikkim, Nagaland, Arunachal Pradesh can be given statehood, then why can other areas like that can't get statehood. For want of separate statehood those areas will lag behind in the race of development. There is no other way to ensure development to those regions. Today a person from Garhwal goes to the capital Lucknow in connection with his work, but he does not have the idea as to where Lucknow is situated to whom he should meet. This is how the development work of those regions is neglected. I, therefore, hold that the demand for a separate State should be accepted.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, our country has many islands like Nicobar, Kar Nicobar having large areas. We know that there are single Parliamentary seats for places like Sikkim and Nicobar for which Members are elected. So, why there should not be smaller States for the smaller parts of the country so that extensive rights could be provided to the people of those areas. The Government should consider it. This House is a supreme body so it can consider how development to those regions can be ensured.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I had been to Garhwal last days in connection with electioneering. I found that all the contract works from Rishikesh to Badrinath are grabbed in Lucknow by the contractors and the people of those areas are denied the opportunity of earning money. The people of the area have to suffer loss and they lag behind in race of development I have observed that the road between Satpuri and Chamoli and like that many other roads date back to British time and they lack maintenance. The people of the area are still using the same roads, So what is required is to pay attention to all these points.

As was said by our colleagues, hill regions are largely populated by the persons who are in military Services. Moreover, there are ex-military personnel who sacrificed all their lives for the sake of the country. This is quite true. These regions therefore require special attention.

I would further like to submit one more point

that 90 per cent amount of the total expenditure of the plans made for the hilly States like Himachal Pradesh and Jammu and Kashmir has been provided by the Union Government and we have been getting the rest 10 per cent amount as loan. However, the Ninth Finance Commission that has been formed under the Chairmanship of Salve ji has reduced the limit of this amount. Here I would like to say it in strong terms that unless the development of States like Himachal Pradesh, Gharhwal, Sikkim, Meghalaya, Manipur and Pondichery is ensured, the limit of the amount should not be reduce. Those States need to be uplifted and more money is required for that. There is no agitation in those area. Garhwal, Himachal Pradesh are such areas where the people still lead a traditional life. They never harass the Government to make provision of more money for them. Industries are opened in backward areas. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have to catch train.

SHRIKRISHANDUTT SULTANPURI: You should allow me to speak. I will catch the train later. The outsiders set up industries in the hilly-regions. They avail subsidy for setting up industries and after that they go to other States without setting any industries and that why there is misuse of funds. An inquiry should be set up in this regard since our State does not get any benefit. There is no provision to purchase the items that are produced in those regions. Those who set up industries in the hilly-regions should get maximum encouragement. Moreover, I would like to add one more thing in regard to tourism. The Government should make the service of Vayudoot and 'Domier' available for Garwhal, Himachal, Pradesh, Meghalaya, Lakshdeep and Nicobar etc. so that the number of tourists going to those places may be increased. The Government should try to know the name of officers who have some dedication for the people and who can work for the people of those regions. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have already taken seven minutes. There are other members also

to speak.

SHRI KRISHAN DUTT SULTANPURI: Apple and potato are grown in our hilly area on priority basis. The Government should therefore pay attention to the farming of those things. So far as the States are concerned, facilities should also be provided in Lakshdeep and Nicobar also. The hon. Minister of Home Affairs hails from Lakshdeep. He is aware of the life-style of the people of those area. I would like to submit that since there is at least one Member from those places each, so they should be provided statehood. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are discussing about Uttaranchal and Vananchal.

SHRI KRISHAN DUTT SULTANPURI: There is a demand in Bihar about formation of separate states of Santhal Pargana and Chhota Nagpur. No assistance is provided in tribal areas for development. Injustice is being done with them. Funds meant for these areas are siphoned and swindled. An agitation is going on there. We should inquire into the reasons behind this agitation. Every party gives assurances but nobody does anything.... *(Interruptions)* They are behaving like the General who claimed that everything was well so long he was at the helm of affairs and as soon as he retired the efficiency suffered. One should trace out the drawbacks in the developmental programmes in Bihar. I got a chance to visit a tribal area, which has a cooperative dairy farm and a bio-gas plant.... *(Interruptions)* but its control is not in the hands of the local instead they are being exploited and injustice is meted out to them. I want that the Central Government or a State Government, should not allow lapses under their nose. Keeping this in view we must chalk out schemes for the development of hilly areas. We will welcome if locals participate in this process. An hon. Member told that according to its population, the Uttaranchal has less number of M.L.A.'s whereas, Himachal Pradesh which is much smaller than Uttaranchal has more M.L.A.'s I think, there are 18-19 M.L.A.'s who represent

Uttaranchal. The U.P. Legislature has 425 M.L.A.s and therefore the voice of the MLAs from Uttaranchal is not heard there.

For the development of hilly areas and its people, we must have separate States and therefore, I support this motion. Our Government will certainly do the needful in this regard therefore I request the hon. Member to withdraw his motion.

SHRI TEJNARAYAN SINGH (Buxar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I support this resolution. I felt happy that our colleague from Congress also supported it, but sorry to say that later on he withdrew it. Uttaranchal has been neglected for years together. I think that if it is given the status of a State it will develop and make progress. This is not happening in U.P. alone. A demand for a separate Jharkhand State is also being raised in Bihar. The Government should also accede to it. Madhya Pradesh is also a big State. For the sake of proper development it can also be divided into two-three separate States. Even in Andhra Pradesh a demand regarding separate Telengane is long pending. This demand has become so intense that it has become difficult for the Government officers to live there. Therefore, the Government should accede to these demands and should opt for smaller States.

This is an absolute truth that the formation of a separate State will pave way for its development and presently, the amount which is spent on beautifying Lucknow will go to hilly areas and will provide for irrigational facilities and potable water and construction of roads in such areas where there are no roads at present. You provide money to poor under Jawahar Rozgar Yojana, and Indira Awas Yojana but actually, this money does not reach them and it remain in Lucknow only but it will reach to the poor. Therefore, it requires the formation of a separate Uttaranchal State. Even after 45 years of Independence very few areas of U.P. have been developed and most of the areas have been left undeveloped. Therefore you must accede to the demand of the people for a separate

Uttarakhand. The demand regarding Jharkhand State in Bihar is also a genuine one. The State Government does not supply essential commodities in these areas. The area is reeling under drought. The people do not feel a semblance of Government there. The people from other States are ruling there but the local tribals are not getting any benefit.

16.00 hrs

Therefore, I support the formation of a Jharkhand State there. Our party colleagues have been supporting this proposals for so many years. I demand the Government to urgently take steps in this regard as further postponement of it would not be in the interest of the nation. Gone are the days when people used to remain silent against any injustice. We will wage a fight for the creation of Uttaranchal State as we have been doing for Jharkhand State. If you think, that we will not make demand for the next 2-3 years in this regard then you are mistaken. Irrespective of the party in power in centre we would raise this demand and if it does not accede to this demand then that Government cannot rule peacefully. It is quite possible that this agitation may take a violent turn, which may prove disastrous for the Government.

Mr., Chairman, Sir, therefore, I demand the Government to accept this resolution as early as possible and form Uttaranchal and Jharkhand States which may help in accelerating the pace of development there.

With these words I support this resolution and conclude.

SHRI JEEWAN SHARMA (Almora): Mr. Chairman Sir, I rise to support this resolution. The demand in respect of Uttaranchal and Vananchal should be fulfilled as it is the basic right of the people there.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, so far as the question of agitation in respect of Uttaranchal State is concerned it has been there since 1952 and there-

fore it is not a new demand. These eight hilly districts of U.P. are quite different from the districts situated in plains. The people from plains have always been at the helm of affairs and even the planning in all fields is based on the needs of plains which cannot be implemented in hills and which are not beneficial for hilly areas in any sense. Even after 45 years of Independence, women have to fetch water from 4 to 5 kilometers. Children below the age of ten year do not go to schools as they have to tread 4-5 kilometers to reach the school.

Sir, whenever we visit a village, we do not find any youth, only women, children and old persons are there out of these eight districts, four districts are on the borders of China. Now, you can will imagine, how significant it is, from strategic point of view to have a separate State? The locals will get more employment opportunities. So far as the question of the development of this area is concerned there has been no development since the Britishers left it. This can be seen in the cases of Mussorie and Nainital, which have not been developed thereafter. Although, this question was raised so many times but my friends from Congress asked about its viability? Well you can see, that they are ridiculing the idea and making fun of it. I would like to ask them whether the viability of the States which have been formed till date was questioned by anybody? For instance, you may take Jammu & Kashmir or the North-Eastern States. Was this question of viability raised at that time? I fail to understand, as to why is the issue of feasibility raised. I want to say that the state meets all the norms required for feasibility as there are a number of rivers there and if all these rivers are properly harnessed, then that may generate at least 30, 000 Mw of power. To my mind the development of tourist spots can leave behind even Jammu and Kashmir, famous in the world from tourism point of view, as there is enough potential for the development of tourism. It could become another Switzerland in India.

The economy of the area, if I say frankly is Money Order economy because the people

[Sh. Jeewan Sharma]

there survive just on the money remitted by the migrants. To remove the difficulties of the area it is absolutely essential that the State of Uttaranchal is formed.

Sir, I am associated with the movement for the creation of the separate state of Uttaranchal for the last 5-6 years. Previously the Congress was in power in the state and after that the Janata Dal came to power. Even during the rule by the Congress, we met several Ministers in connection with the demand for a separate State but unfortunately no satisfactory reply could be solicited. Even when the Janata Dal was in power, we met several Minister but to no avail and now the hon. Members of the Janata Dal like Shri Paswan and George Fernandes also favour the creation of a separate state. However, I remember clearly that when we met Shri George Fernandes, when he was a Central Minister, he stated that we favour the creation of smaller States in the country and a resolution in this connection was passed way back in 1954 by the Socialist Party.

Then Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav became the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh. Exactly 15 days after assuming office by him, a statement was issued that separate state will be allowed to be created at no cost. However, now even the hon. Members of his very party favour creation of a separate State. I would like to know the reasons for changing stance of his party from time to time and why is the public being taken for a ride. Are they just aiming at building up the vote banks alone? Why did they not favour creation of a separate state when they were in power?

Sir, last time when there was Jharkhand blockade, every political party favoured creation of Jharkhand State. At that time the hon. Members did mention that until a resolution in this connection is passed by Bihar, Jharkhand state could not be created. However, the BJP Government of Uttar Pradesh did send a resolution for the creation of a separate state to the

centre, why then no decision has been taken so far? On the demand for Vananchal, it is said that till a resolution is not received by the State Government, no separate state could be created. So, when a resolution in this connection has already been sent by the Government of Uttar Pradesh, what is the difficulty in creating the separate state. We fail to understand the double standards adopted by the centre in this regard.

During the last two years the issue of resolution sent by Uttar Pradesh was raised in the House on many occasions but every time the hon. Minister gave evasive replies. I recall, in December, 1992 an hon. Member desired to know the time by which action will be taken on the resolution sent by Uttar Pradesh? The hon. Minister replied that no time frame could be given. Therefore, when such sort of reply was given by a Minister of the Government of India, what sort of message would have been conveyed to the youth of the area. What kind of impression would have the youth of the area gathered by such sort of replies of a Union Minister, could very well be imagined. This sort of responsible statements should not be made.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Sir, since again and again you are pressing the bell, I am concluding my speech. I would only reiterate that both these states need be created immediately....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Surya Naryan Yadav.

SHRI SURYA NARAYAN YADAV (Saharsa) : Mr. Chairman, Sir.

Mr. chairman: Shri Surya Narayan Yadav, please sit down for a while. I have been informed that you had your chance. Therefore, let me check the facts. Shri Mrutyunjaya Nayak.

SHRI MRUTYUNJAYA NAYAK (Phulbani) : Mr. Chairman, Sir,

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Surya Narayan

Yadav. on this issue a long debate had already been held in the House and you took part in the debate on 5th March, 1993. you gave an impressive speech lasting 14 minutes.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): Mr. Chairman, Sir, how much more time is to be devoted to this resolution?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before you came to the House, the Chair on the advice of the House extended the discussion by 2 hours. Right now I have a list of 20 hon. Members. The House can reconsider its decision but the time which has been extended just now is two hours.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P.M. SAYEED): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to seek a clarification on it whether the hon. Members who have already had a chance to speak will not be given another opportunity?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

SHRI P.M. SAYEED: Is it so in the rules?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Time is extended to allow all the hon. Members to express their views. When all the hon. Members cannot speak even once, where does then the question of another opportunity arise. Although the hon. Ministers are often allowed this privilege.

[English]

SHRI MRUTYUNJAYA NAYAK: Mr. Chairman, Sir, undoubtedly I support the very objective of this particular Resolution for the formation of some more new States, but I am sorry to say that this is not the right time to bring such a Resolution. The reasons are manifold and I hope this august House would appreciate my arguments.

Sir, it is very imperative to note as to what are the turmoils and what are the problems before the nation. As you are aware, there is a

threat to the country's unity and integrity both from inside and outside our country like the foreign agencies which are involved in the sabotage. So also, there are agencies inside the country which are similarly indulging in such a heinous practice to destabilise our unity. Sir, since our country is under the situation of threat from both our neighbouring countries, it is necessary that there should be quite goodwill of understanding among ourselves to safeguard the unity of our country first.

Sir, the country now undergoes so many challenges from outside as well as from inside. The secular condition of our country is at stake. The country needs enough time to keep pace with the changing circumstances in the world economy. Ours is sub-continent with vast population and with our very limited resources, naturally we have to first of all strengthen our economy. At a given point of time, when super-power country like U.S.S.R. could not avoid disintegration at least we should survive to protect our national integrity despite facing so many challenges.

Everywhere in the country, there is a demand for creation of new States, demands of Jharkhand, demand of new State for Vidharbh, demands for Telengana State, demand for Bodoland etc. As my friends has said, in Tamil Nadu also, there is problem. Therefore, it is necessary that we should balance our economic conditions and the development that is needed at this hour. Even from my State, Orissa, there is such a demand. Everywhere, there is similar demand.

What are the turmoils which the country is undergoing at the moment. As you know, everywhere there is turmoil because of communal riots, agitations that are going on and the country is facing a big challenge at least to safeguard our integrity. When there is so much pressure from the foreign agency to weaken the country's unity, at this point of juncture, we should all be intact and united. This is not the right time for such a demand or movement

[Sh. Mrutyunjaya Nayak]

[Translation]

because first of all, there should be common understanding among all political parties. Secondly, the existing situation must develop towards a peaceful atmosphere. Thirdly, the country needs enough time to survive our economy and to have a lot of developments in the country so as to keep pace with the new changes that are taking place in the world arena.

We also agree that the movement for Jharkhand is no doubt justified in order to improve the economy of that particular region, and for the smooth functioning of administration there and to ensure justice to the people. The demand for the creation of Jharkhand is no doubt genuine.

But we should be above all partisan and partial resolutions and whims. There should be understanding and harmony among all the Parties. Then only initiatives like the creation of Uttaranchal can be taken up for consideration.

But now I have to say that this is not the right time to bring such a resolution in the House for the setting up of Jharkhand and Uttaranchal and I urge that it should be withdrawn in the larger interest of the unity and integrity of our country.

I, therefore, request the hon. Members who have moved this Resolution carefully to understand the pulse of the people of the country.

I am very sorry to say that I am unable to support the Bill.

I hope that first of all my BJP friends must understand that their demand for the construction of Ram Mandir is going to create chaos and crisis in the country. They must solve that problem first and then bring normalcy and congenial atmosphere in the country. After that we can sit together and hold consultations amongst ourselves. Then any such Resolution would be welcome and it can then be taken up for consideration.

SHRI LALIT ORAON (Lohardaga) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to speak in support of the resolution moved for the creation of Uttaranchal in Uttar Pradesh and Vananchal in Bihar.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I hail from Chota Nagpur-Santhal Pargana region in Bihar. I have the first hand experience of the sufferings and neglect of the area and I am still experiencing such sufferings. Therefore, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the actual position of Chota Nagpur-Santhal Pargana region. Chota Nagpur-Santhal Pargana is richly endowed with natural resources. The area is rich in costly mineral wealth. Land is quite fertile. Chota Nagpur-Santhal Pargana region meets 50 per cent demand for coal of the country, 95 per cent mica requirement, 95 per cent copper requirement and 40 per cent bauxite requirement. In addition, iron and china clay are also found in abundance. Even then 3 crore people of this neglected area migrate to tea gardens of Assam and Bengal and to rural areas in Haryana and Punjab and to brick kilns for livelihood for 6 months in a year. What are the reasons for this state of affairs in the region, richly endowed with natural resources, where the sons of the soil run helter-skelter in search of livelihood. There are some reasons for this neglect due to which the people of the region are facing great hardships.

One of the main political reasons for this is the continuous neglect by the Bihar Government of the region in the matter of political representation. Since independence 25 Governments came to power in Bihar and in no cabinet proportional representation was given to the region. Even in the present Cabinet of Shri Laloo Yadav, the advocate of social justice, there are just 5 Ministers representing three crore people of there in his cabinet of 72 Ministers. Even out of the 33 Ministers of Cabinet rank there is only one Minister of Cabinet rank from the area. This is not anything new. From the very beginning this is going on. People of the area are continuously feeling the pinch of neglect.

I would like to raise two-three issues more in this connection. In 1908, during the reign of the Britishers for Chota Nagpur a law was enacted called 'Chota Nagpur Tenancy Act', under which no outsider was allowed to purchase the land of the tribals and nor the land could be transferred. Similar legislation was enacted in 1949 for Santhal Pargana. However, despite both these legislations, land grabbing is going on in full swing and the people are very perturbed because of all this. Even today the Mafia are getting the land transferred by their muscle power and in connivance with top officials in the name of the cooperatives or in any other name. The Government is unable to check this tendency even after enacting a law. Not only the officials and the land mafia, but the State Government as well as the Central Government is also involved in this activity and are acquiring land from the tribals and the poor there in the name of industrial units, irrigation and other projects. The Government had prepared a report in 1989, according to which there were 90847 cases of eviction in Chota Nagpur and Sandthal Pargana. The land of the tribals was occupied by the others. An investigation was started in this regard. A total of 43,775 cases were filed, out of which 34,477 cases were rejected. At present 13,595 cases are lying pending and 2993 cases have been disposed of. The tribals have been given back their lands, but in several cases, the land given back on papers only and actually it was not done. The Government has made another provision also. The land owner, whose land will be acquired, will be given compensation. There is another provision also according to which the land owner or one of his family members will be provided Government job, if two acres of land is acquired from him. If the acquired land is more than 2 acres, two family members of the land owner will be provided with Government jobs. Besides these, the persons who will be displaced due to acquiring of land, will be rehabilitated and they will be provided Rs. 750 for shifting. But the Central as well as the State Government is neither interested in providing employment nor rehabilitating them. Nothing is being done to remove the resentment

prevailing among the people there. The State Government had prepared a new scheme for generating 700 megawatts of electricity. Today that scheme is hanging in balance. The people are agitated as they have lost faith in the Government and are doubtful about the provisions made by it.

I would like to make another submission. In 1976-77, 112 blocks of Vananchal area were covered under the Subplan area. A Secretariat was up at Ranchi in this regard and an official of Chief Secretary level was posted there. But he is not able to work due to the pressures from the State Government. Due to the existing discrepancies in the rules and laws, not a single work regarding subplan area can be done.

Sir, I will end by submitting only one point. The members, who rise here to speak, never conclude their speeches, until they have shed some crocodile tears for the tribals, backwards and harijans. It is the duty of the House to pass the resolution presented here in regard to providing statehood to the Chhota Nagpur-Santhal Pargana area of Bihar, which is dominated by tribals and backward classes. Today, it will become clear from the voting who are the true protectors of interests of the tribals and have real sympathy for the backward classes. This will be proved today.

With these words, I conclude.

SHRI MANJAY LAL (Samastipur) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support this resolution regarding the Utrakhand State. Sir, the concept of smaller states is not a new one. I remember that in 1955, when a movement was going on in Maharashtra to form smaller states, the world famous philosopher and socialist leader Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia was holding a conference at the time of launching socialist party at Hyderabad and had passed a resolution that the area should be developed by forming smaller states and the administration should be made effective. So, the concept of smaller states is not a new one.

[Sh. Manjay Lal]

Mr. Chairman, Sir, in view of geography, culture and systems, the demand of Uttarakhand State in Uttar Pradesh is totally justified. This separate Uttarakhand State for which demand has been raised includes 8 districts of Garhwal and Kumaon division - - Garhwal, Tehri-Garhwal, Almora Nainital, Uttar Kashi, Chamoli, Pithouragrah and Haridwar. According to the census of 1981, these areas except Haridwar have a population of 48,36,912 and they have been exploited a lot. According to the present data, 46 per cent population of our country lives below the poverty line. In Uttar Pradesh, 50 per cent population lives below the poverty line, whereas in Uttarakhand, more than 70 per cent of the population is living below the poverty line. They have been exploited and there is no industry in 7 districts. I therefore, would like to submit that the BJP Government there had passed a resolution in the State assembly and had sent it to the Centre that a new Uttarakhand State should be formed. While replying to the demands of the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Home Minister had said yesterday that whenever there will be an issue of forming any new State, the views of both the state Government as well as the people agitating there, will be considered. (*Interruptions*) So, when the Uttar Pradesh Government had sent a resolution after passing it in the State Assembly and the people there are agitating for Uttarakhand State for years, the Central Government should not neglect this issue any more and should form an Uttarakhand State at the earliest.

Sir, our hon. Member Shri Oraon was speaking about Jharkhand State also. (*Interruptions*) He had stated about Vananchal. It should be formed. Not only Bihar, but Orissa, Bengal and Madhya Pradesh are also covered under Vananchal. So, the issue of Vananchal is not concerned with one state only. (*Interruptions*) A State Re Organisation Commission had to be set up in this regard and very aspect will have to be considered. Recently, the Bihar Government

had sent a resolution regarding Chhota-Nagpur, Santhal Pargana autonomous development Council and the Central Government should implement it at the earliest. The demands made by the residents of those areas should be considered an accepted. I would like to submit that smaller states should be formed, so that they can develop, prosper and progress and can have an efficient administration. So I support this resolution.

[*English*]

SHRI INDERJIT (Darjeeling): Mr. Chairman Sir, Not recorded

SHRI JAGAT VIRSINGH DRONA (Kanpur): He has already spoken and supported my Resolution Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, I have checked up the records. The hon. Member has already spoken on this Resolution. Therefore his remarks may be removed from the records because he also may not like to have his remarks on the same Resolution for a second time come on record.

SHRI INDERJIT: I accept it Sir.

[*Translation*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to request all the hon. Members to recall their memory as it has already been discussed on 5th and 19th March. Nineteen hon. Members have already spoken on the subject. It will take time if I mention their names.

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV (Jhanjharpur): You may kindly mention the remaining names.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The number of remaining names is large

Shri Kirip Chaliha.

SHRI KIRIP CHALIHA (Guwahati): Mr. Chairman Sir, I think Shri Jagat Vir Singh Drone for moving this Resolution for the creation of the States of Uttaranchal and Vananchal, carving out of different States for U. P., Chotanagpur, Sandthal Paraganas regions of Bihar. I must say that in principle it has been the desire of the majority population of the entire India that specially these two or three States have become unwieldy and big for correct governance. That has been the general impression. In principle nobody can object to the creation of new States for better administration.

I think that when we consider this Resolution we have to look into the entire gamut of reorganisation of States, the very basis on which States in India was created. There are many aspects to be given due consideration and one should not go in for a hapazard conclusion in this regard. Sir I come from a State which has been reorganised time and again. One of the reasons of anger for many of our younger generation is, they feel that the rulers sitting in Delhi, including we the Members of parliament, have been little over enthusiastic in granting favours and concessions to the tribals of the North-Eastern regions whereas we have not been equally impartial in our approach towards the tribal population in the Hindi heart land. There have been numerous complaints about under-development, about regional exploitation and about discrimination in resource distribution in different areas in those States. The point to ponder is whether creation of State is the ultimate answer, the ultimate panacea for all these problems. Under-development, regional discrimination and disparity cannot be the phenomenon which can be solved only by creation of States. This is one aspect which must be given due consideration. Moreover, a feeling has grown that under the present Parliamentary system of Democracy, under the present system of Union and State Governments, creation of States means immediate development. This is wrong feeling. It does not mean that there can be development only by

creation of States, otherwise you cannot develop.

It is also debatable whether giving autonomy to a particular section alone will lead to prosperity of that particular group. Sir, as you know our States were reorganised on the basis of language. But in many cases like Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh Bihar and Haryana the language spoken was Hindi. So, when you say that the reorganisation was done only on the basis of language, that becomes the point to be debated. In the North-east we have Assam as a State which has a number of languages. I understand that even in States like Andhra Pradesh in South and in Maharashtra and Karnataka on the linguistic basis people are still demanding separate States. We hear about the Telengana agitation and about the Konkan agitation. There is also an agitation for a separate Vidharbha State There are numerous examples of this type. The point is that we have to come to a particular, definite and an indian conclusion with regard to what should be the basis of reorganisation of States.

Our experience in the North-East has been that we have gone for reorganisation not merely on the basis of language alone but we have even given concessions on ethnic basis. For example a State like Nagaland has been reorganised on what basis, I am yet to understand. Earlier it was a district of Assam. Was it reorganised because of ethnicity or because of caste, I do not know. Nagas themselves are divided into many tribes and sub-tribes. They speak different dialects and they have different languages. Then difference between a dialect and language is just a matter of degree. Similarly, we have created Meghalaya, which is comprising of the districts of Khasi hill, Jayantia hill and Garo hill. There languages, that is Khasi, Jayantia and Garo, are spoken there, and in addition they have other sub-dialects also.

The point I am trying to make is that there was something wrong in the process of reorganisation of States right from the begin-

[Sh. Kirip Chaliha]

ning. That is why I say that under the present circumstances, the whole principle of reorganisation of States should be reviewed. Is it proper to reorganise the States on the basis of language alone? Is it pertinent to talk about the reorganisation of States only on the basis of ethnicity? Above all, whether the States are administrative units meant for collective and proper administration or the

State is a group of people enjoying either common culture, a common religion or caste. So, first the basis of reorganisation has to be determined before reaching to certain conclusion. I have a feeling that we made a mistake right from the beginning when we considered language as the basis of reorganisation of States. Both in Madhya Pradesh as well as in Uttar Pradesh Hindi is spoken and considering language as the basis, both of them should have been one State rather than two different States. So, we have to take into consideration all these things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI KIRIP CHALIHA: Sir, I have just started and you are ringing the bell. I am raising certain basic issues. I am not making political speeches like BJP Members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you will appreciate that such remarks should not be made to the Chair.

SHRI KIRIP CHALIHA: I entirely apologise for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have already taken 8 minutes and there are so many other persons who want to speak.

SHRI KIRIP CHALIHA: Sir, we hardly get time to speak. I am coming from Assam and I should be given a chance to speak,

MR. CHAIRMAN: You try to be brief.

SHRI KIRIP CHALIHA: Sir, the point that has to be considered is on what basis we are going to reorganise the States. Should we reorganise the States as an administrative unit; as a linguistic unit, as an ethnic unit or as a religious unit? We have to come to a certain conclusion with regard to that.

If it has to be an administrative unit, I understand that there are some States like for example Uttar Pradesh which is so big that I have been told that in one turn the Chief Minister of that State cannot cover all the districts of the State. It is almost as big as India. There is also a feeling that Uttar Pradesh is kept big because of certain Political consideration and not because of any other consideration. So, you cannot straightaway denounce the claim for a different State like Uttaranchal specially because the tribals living in the hills have their legitimate aspirations.

Day before yesterday, when a Member was mentioning about the plight of the Jharkhand people he literally broke'down. Unfortunately, our Janata Dal friends who have achieved so much of brilliance without any conscience, have been very unfair to their demand. I do not understand why Bihar Chief Minister has taken such rigid stand on this issue. He does not want to give any autonomy whatsoever. I have all respect for the Chief Minister of Bihar. As a leader he has shown certain remarkable qualities in fighting the communal forces. Why cannot he show some consideration for the poor tribal people who are demanding certain amount of autonomy? They are not asking for a State straightaway; they want to negotiate. My points is if we do not give a certain amount of autonomy to the tribal people living in Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa but give autonomy only to the tribals living in the North-East part of the country and then say that we are the lovers of tribal people, how can we accept this proposition? That is why I congratulate Shri Drona, although he belongs to a party with which it is very difficult to agree many times. I must say that he has brought out certain basic principles

in this resolution.

The resolution raises some fundamental questions and you will agree with me that we must rise above party considerations. We must have an outlook; some amount of patriotism on certain matters; a national outlook on certain matters on. It is lacking very badly because of Mandir-Masjid and similar other issues. We see even in the case of bomb blasts, party lines are taken. The incident of bomb blast which is afflicting the country and killing of innocent lives, it is also being attempted to be politicised. Sir, we must rise above party considerations on certain matters.

I feel that in principle, we must concede to the demand of Uttaranchal. We must give them a State. You cannot silence the genuine claims of the Jharkhandis. Today, the Janata Party Chief Minister of the BJP Chief Minister or for that matter the Congress Chief Minister can silence a particular agitation for some time, but genuine aspirations of the people cannot be silenced. When they weep; when they are exploited; then they rise and then wake up and when they woke up you will have to concede to their demands. People have to listen to them. But the point is that when you politicise it or if you raise the demand for a separate State only to embarrass somebody, only to create more difficulties for somebody, how can anyone tolerate it? If you want to support the cause for a separate State only to create a law and order problem, only to get some electoral benefits, how can anyone support it? You must be able to convince people also for the demand that you are making that it does not have political connotation, it does not have any political aspiration. You must be unbiased. In that case, there must be full unanimity. This is a very vital matter. It is concerning re-organisation of the States. I would like to suggest one thing here. Why are you leaving out konkan region? Why are you leaving out Telengana region? Why are you leaving out the claims of Vidharbs region? My honest request is this. I must say Mr. Drona has got considerable foresightedness for raising this very vital matter. Why does he not change

this Resolution and ask for a total re-organisation of States, for administrative efficiency, for greater autonomy to the ethnic groups and linguistic groups? If that can be done, then, there will be total unanimity. Even Mr. Hari Kishoreji who is here, will also agree with me. He will be able to convince his Chief Minister-although, I doubt very much in this case.

So, Sir, my only humble request is that we are all for creation of a separate State-let there be a unanimity. I must say a few words about Assam. Assam had been separated so many times. We, younger generation of Assam, are being accused that we are in the Congress Party.

[*Translation*]

You congress people also do nothing. what have you done for the last so many years? Nobody what even touch the UP.

[*English*]

Such kinds of talks are taking place. When we try to explain it, they become secessionists and they attack us. You will be surprised to know this. I am not joking it is a genuine sentiment. These are spoken in private. Hence, we must have a comprehensive view. I must say, even the bigger States of bigger administrative units must be made smaller in order to make them more efficient and all parties are unanimous on this. But the only point is that we should not take a biased stand. We should not raise the demand of Jharkhand only to embarrass Laloo Yadav because it suits the BJP.

Similar is the case regarding Uttaranchal. We should not raise it only during elections just to embarrass some one. That is why my honest appeal to Mr. Drona is, let him kindly change his Resolution and Seek unanimity. Let him not go in for a voting on this Resolution. Let us complete it. Let us all sit together. Then, we have a full-fledged Resolution. Then, there need not be any Resolution because, we will all go out for it.

SHRI OSCAR FERNANDES (Udipi): Sir, I have a point. This is a major issue. A large number of Members may like to take opportunity in this. So, we may kindly extend the time.

DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA (Mandsaur): Sir, we are not ready for it.

SHRI OSCAR FERNANDES: Let us take the sense of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The sense of the House was already taken and time has been extended upto 4.40 p.m.

DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA: We are not in favour of extending the time further.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By 4.40 p.m. we will complete the debate.

[Translation]

17.00 hrs

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Private Member's Resolution presented by Dronad saheb. I had myself presented a Private Member's Bill of this nature in U.P. Legislative Assembly in 1986. I had also pleaded for the bifurcation of U.P. in five parts in 1986. When a Commission on Reorganisation of States was set up in 1956, Shri Fazal Ail, Dr. Hridaya Nath Kunzaru and Shri K.M. Panikar were the Members of this Commission. Registering their dissents the Member of the Commission had opined that U.p. should be divided into two parts. It is a very big state from administration point of view. There should not be one administrative unit for it. At that time they had suggested that one State should be formed by margining some districts of Western Uttar Pradesh, some districts of Rajasthan and one or two districts of M.P. Since it was minority opening the Commission refused to accept their suggestion.

With the passage of time, after this Com-

mission only linguistic base was considered for the reorganisation of States. But, afterwards, the country had to face many problems. The Government of India had to accept the proposal of reorganisation of new States one after another under the pressure of different areas. Particularly after Chinese aggression in 1962, the Government of India had to reorganise new States in the areas which were adjoining to China's border from administrative point of view and from the point of view of the security of our borders with China. In the process many states had to be formed in Assam only. As far as the question of the security of the borders is concerned the areas of Uttar Pradesh which touches the borders of China after the annexation of Tibet by China is more than that of North India. The route to Kailash and Mansarwar passes through Uttarakhand. The people of both the countries had good commercial relations and they used to do business in each other's areas. But when the relations between two countries became strained, it was felt very much necessary to recognise that area as a separate state for the security of our borders.

Secondly, I would like to mention that U.P. is such a big State from administrative point of view that it takes three days for a person who wants to visit its capital from Badrinath or Kedarnath. To facilitate him, that area should be given a status of a separate state. There should not be any objection in acceding to this proposal.

The High Court of U.P. is in Allahabad. The people of Western U.P. have been fighting to have a separate Bench of High Court in Western U.P. for a long time. When this movement became intensive in 1982, the Jaswant Singh Commission was set up. That commission had also recommended that a separate Bench of High Court should be set up for the areas of Western U.P. and Uttarakhand keeping in view the inconvenience that is being experienced by these people. But the persons who are ruling the State and running the Administration do not agree to it. The Government of U.P. has been evasive on one to other pretext to accept this

recommendation.

Have been fighting to have a separate Bench of High Court in Western U.P. for a long time. When this movement became intensive in 1982, the Jaswa, and Uttrakhand keeping in view the inconvenience that is being experienced by these people. But the persons who are ruling the State and running the Administration do not agree to it. The Government of U.P. has been evasive on one of other pretext to accept this recommendation

I feel happy as there is no dispute among the major political parties of U.P. in reorganizing at least Uttrakhand as a separate State.

The political parties whom I know best are in favour of reorganising Uttrakhand as a separate State. In the last Legislative Assembly elections of U.P. almost all the political parties had supported the cause of reorganisation of Uttrakhand as a separate State in their manifestoes issued in U.P. With this object, the legislative Assembly of U.P. has recommended unanimously to the Central Government to give Uttrakhand status of separate State.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to ask whether the Central Government understands the language of Feruman. Has the Central Government become habitual of it. The Central Government does not pay any heed until and unless a man like Ramble sacrifices his life after having 60-70 days fast unto death and inspires the people of the State the intimate struggle for the purpose. It is an unfortunate situation. That is why I would like to request the Central Government to modify its policy keeping in view the unanimous demand of all the political parties and sentiments of the people of Uttrakhand and present a proposal in the House in regard to reorganise it. The Government should give right to the people of that area before they resort to methods of violence. In brief, Mr. Chairman, Sir, I support and conclude keeping in view the sentiments of the people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please keep it in mind that this debate will be over at 5.40 p.m. But some hon. Members are sending the slips of their names. If you cooperate, I would like to give chance to those Member first whose names appear in the list. It is a big list. It would be difficult to include new names at this stage. Normally, the members belonging to different parties have already spoken. Only one hon. Member belonging to Kerala Congress remains to speak. Even though, I will try to accommodate others.

[English]

SHRI OSCAR FERNANDES: The convention of Private Members' Bill is not according to party basis, it is entirely individual members' business. So at least you should accommodate all the members who desire to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is why if you send chats now then that is not possible. There has to be some scheduling.

SHRI OSCAR FERNANDES: It has always happened. Even at the last minute when a Minister rises to speak, it is allowed.

(Interruptions)

(SHRI P. M. SAYEED): When I was presiding, once on Ayodhya Bill, my esteemed friend Shri Dikshit spoke almost for 15-20 minutes on this very issue and a discussion was there on the same. The ruling was given that the Chair cannot restrict the Private Member's time. Therefore, the hon. Member is perfectly right in raising that convention. I just want to remind you that the House has already established such convention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am very much thankful for the information given by the hon. Minister but the Private Member's right is limited to other Private Members right to speak. So he cannot have unlimited time. Time has to be regulated.

(Interruptions)

[*Translation*]

DR: LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the time of 7 hours allotted to this Bill for the discussion will be over at 5.40 in the evening today. It has been discussed for a sufficient time and a mumber of hon. Members have expressed their view on it. I understand that the hon. Minister should reply to it at appropriate time and the introduce of this Resolution should be given opportunity to speak on it at 5.39 p.m.

SHRI P.M. SAYEED: Mr. Chairman, Sir, how can it be preconceived. We will do as per the opening of this august House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time has been extended to 5.40 p.m. and in view of the time factor we should proceed further.

SHRIVISHWANATHSHASTRI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, let me speak first. If you want to extend the time thereafter you can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes all right, please do speak.

SHRIVISHWANATHSHASTRI: Mr. chairman, Sir, I support the Resolution introduced by Shri Jagat Vir Singh Drona because Kumaun and Garhwal regions in Uttar Pradesh have made significant contribution in our freedom struggle and after the Independence the region did a lot in the nation building.

But I am distressed to state that no proper attention has been paid to this region after the Independence. The region went on growing more and more backward. I can very well understand the Britishers policy because of their vested interest in keeping them backward. Due to the backwardness of the region they found good and brave soldiers from this region. The rulers of the princely state also kept these areas backward and neglected in respect of education and other points of view. This too was understandable. But after the Independence these areas could not be developed upto the expectation. Barring Kash-

mir it is the greatest State in the entire Himalayan region. If we could have created a State like Himachal Pradesh, why we cannot create the Uttrakhand State. Despite having 4 Chief Ministers and several other Ministers and more than Five Hill-development Ministers, there the region is still backward. We find that more than 75 per cent citizens of the region are dependent on agriculture. The per capita land is 0.56 hectare there. Only 13 per cent land all over the region is fit for cultivation. Out of it only 3 per cent land is irrigated. Thus the region remain neglected.

Not only this, 46 per cent people live outside the region due to unemployment there. At least one person of about 59 per cent families, lives outside the region. Only Money order economy runs there. The citizens of the region depend only on the amount received through the money-orders to meet their demands.

The forest estate of the area has been handed over to industrialists and traders. They are exploiting it for their own benefit. manyese is found in abundance in Uttarakhand. That too has been transferred to states. That area was exploited from every point of view. The land worthy of cultivation in the Tehri region belongs to the administrative officers and the high rank officers of army.

Owing to these very circumstances the citizens of the area have been demanding peacefully for Uttrakhand State for a long time. There is so much awakening in this regard among the people that even the major opposition parties in Utter Pradesh are unanimously supporting it. The C.P.I. is not only supporting it, but it has constituted a separate Uttarakhand State Council also in its organisational pattern. Last year the general Secretary of the C.P.I. Comrade Indrajit Gupta has inaugurated that State Council. The result is that every one supports it in Uttar Pradesh without having any reservation. Nobody thinks in that them that the B.J.P. Government has sent this proposal, so we do not agree to it. Taking into account the specific condition

of Uttarakhand, all the people in Uttar Pradesh are unanimous that the region cannot be properly developed unless there a separate "State is created. Therefore, the unanimous proposal was sent to the Central Government. I would like to demand the Government not to turn this area into a turbulent one and the peaceful agitation should not be allowed to take a violent shape due to the delaying policy of the Government as it has already done in several places. I, therefore, would like to urge the Government to create a new State of Uttarakhand by acceptance the desire of the people of Uttar Pradesh. The eight districts should be given the status of an independent State; the autonomous Council won't serve the purpose. It should be provided the status of an Independent

State as has been given to Himachal Pradesh and other States. It has a larger area and has its own language also. There are two universities and many other things. It fulfills all the criteria and no section of society is opposing this demand. I, therefore, would like that Uttarakhand State should be set up as the earliest. I strongly support this demand of theirs. If it is delayed by the Government, I apprehend the agitation may turn hot. The people will cultivate this impression that unless they expedite their movement resort to violence and sabotage, their voice would not be heard. Therefore, it would be for better if the Government accepts their demand during the course of their peaceful agitation.

Similarly, the Jharkhand agitation is going on in Bihar. All of you know it very well as to waste extent the agitation has gone. I support the Jharkhand agitation too. First it was proposed to create the Jharkhand region encompassing the parts of Orissa, West Bengal, Madhya Pradesh. Latter on, it was demanded to create a Jharkhand State consisting of Chhota nagpur and Santhal Pargana. A Separate State should be created there. Similarly, the Andaman & Nicobar Islands also should be given the same status. For the sake of their development, the Government should give a free hand to the

people.

With these words I support this Resolution.

SHRI KARIYA MUNDA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Resolution introduced by Shri Drona. Uttarakhand and Vananchal are being discussed for several days. It is my firm opinion that the Uttarakhand region should be given a status of a separate State.....

Many things have talked on Uttarakhand I would like to confine my speech to Vananchal only. We have been demanding to create separate state comprising of 16 district in Bihar of the last several years. Bihar has been divided into two parts. the one is plain area and the other is hill-area. There are lot of rivers in the plain area of Bihar and plenty of water is also there. The area covered by mountains is full of forests and minerals. The composition of the land of both the areas is such as the identical scheme cannot be launched in both the areas. The soil on the one side is hard, and the soil on the other side is soft. So, it is not possible to launch similar kind of schemes on both the sides.

So far as population is concerned, the population of Vananchal is nearly 3 crore. It has sufficient population for giving it the status of state.

For economic point of view this area is prosperous as it contributes 42 per cent of the total mineral production of the country. Gold, Silver, Iron, mica, granite, uranium, bauxite manganese, copper and many other minerals are found here. Country and the State get a big share of royalty from the minerals of this area, but not even 25 per cent of the royalty is spent on this Vananchal Pradesh. Similarly this area has been neglected by the Government in respect of economic and industrial development. It is a great injustice to its people.

So far as the political scenario is concerned, approximately 81 M.L.As and 14 M.Ps are elected from this area. But in regard to the

[Sh. Kariya Munda]

representation in the Bihar Government, there is only one cannot Minister from this area and others are just State Minister of Deputy Ministers. On the basis of the proportional representation for every ten MLAs there should be at least one cabinet Minister from this area. In this way at least 8 MLAs from this area should get cabinet level has been totally neglected for the last 42 years. Whatsoever party has come to power in the State. Similarly on the basis of population, there should be 100 MLAs and 15-16 MPs to represent this area instead of 82 and 14 respectively. thus politically also this region has been ignored and exploited.

In regard to the development all the irrigation projects of the area lying incomplete whether it is lift irrigation, check dam, boring of wells for irrigation. Billions of rupees have been spent there and in Government's official record these projects have been completed but actually not even an acre of land is being irrigated through these schemes. You can find the all the concerned officers have constructed big bungalows in Raanchi. It shows that the money meant for development has been swallowed by the officials. In such a situation anyone can be agitated but people of this area are so submissive that they had not launched any agitation in this connection. Anyone can get annoyed if you have money in your pocket an someone extorts that money from you. If you donot fire at him, it is certain that you would at least give him a now. Now the Government says that it will not provide anything. why? This agitation has been peaceful till date.

So far as the education is concerned, even after fifty years of getting independence. Your will find that of there are schools, these do not have any building. You will find children studying in some cottage or under the tree. Bihar gets the whole earning of the region but its children donot have any place to study. In primary schools where the requirement is for five teachers only two are available and those are also not working.

In middle schools is place of nine, only five teachers are working and in high schools teachers of few subjects are not available for the last several years. How long this trend can be tolerated. Therefore we decided that we ourselves will develop our area an demanded a separate State. The government is saying that Jharkhand will be made an autonomous territory, but what it will do actually, God knows, what privilege this region get. The main objective of demanding a separate State is increase the administrative efficiency and to expedite the development of the region. It is for this Chhota Nagpur and Santhal pargana should be give the status of a separate State. It is my submission to the Government that this matter should be decided at the earliest, The genuine demand of the people should be accepted. I would like to tell one more thing that Jharkhand movement is not as tribal' movement. The demand for a separate State is the demand of all the 3 crore people living in the area. For the last fifty years this area has not been developed in any sphere whether it is field of employment, economic development, planning or education. Therefore the demand for a separate State is not from only triballs but from every section of the society. So, I urge upon the government to respect the feelings of the people and accord it the status of separate State so that this area can be developed. With these words I conclude.

[English]

SHRI P. C. THOMAS (Muvattupuzha): Mr, Chairman, Sir, the Resolution moved by hon. Member Shri jagt Veer Singh Drona is a commendable one in the sence that the has - by this Resolution- brought to light a very important need of starting some consultations with regard to formation of States and the demarcation of the present States. Though the Resolution is with regard to the formation of two particular states, I would think that the idea which has been put forth has given an opportunity for discussion of the real formation and re-organisation of States and the issues connected thereto.

I think that there are demands of this nature, not only from these particular areas, but also from other areas including the East, the West and the South of India. I would think that the Centre should take immediate measures to call conference of all concerned to have a discussion with regard to the reorganisation and the changes to be made with regard to the boundaries of the States.

When this Resolution has come, I would think that there is also a more important aspect which is involved in this resolution. The basis of this demand the Resolution as such is that the areas which are under-developed should be given more developmental facilities so that the formation of new States, according to the geographical conditions, will be helpful.

I think at this stage we have to think of the very important principle of making the Centre stronger and stronger and also to give more satisfaction to the States. The Principle of strong Centre and satisfied states is not given due weight at least in practice. I think that this principle, which has been formulated and which has been discussed for long and which has been accepted and approved by everybody, is yet to be given more practical impetus.

I feel that the present States are not given adequate economic powers and adequate satisfaction with regard to the economic and financial powers which have been given to them. I think that the Centre should also start a discussion with regard to the States and the inter-state relationship and also the relationship between the Centre and the states. Though the Constitution provides for a Council and though it has been provided that the Council should discuss disputes between the States and between the States and the Centre, I do not think that effective steps have come forth even now.

I think that this is a Resolution which has come at a time when we can even think of formulating some very important aspects with

regard to the relationships between the Centre and the States. I think that the Centre should take immediate steps and the Home Ministry—the hon. Minister steps is here—will take very serious note of this Resolution and the purpose of this Resolution.

I do not think that the demand for more States should be considered and granted in piecemeal. If that is done, then the demand which are going to come will be numerous and the Centre as well as the authorities will find it very difficult to come to a conclusion with regard to the demands. I am also sure that with regard to the geographical boundaries and also with regard to the ways in which the States are to be divided, there will be very many difficulties and there will be very many divisions. Though it may not be political, of course, politics will also will come into it. There will be so many objections as to how and in which manner the division should be made. So, it is not possible and it may not be viable also to grant more states in piecemeal. I feel that the demands of this nature must be put together and it must be taken together when the whole re-organisation of states and the re-organisation or the changes in the boundaries of States are considered.

As far as the language is concerned, though we are told that the division was once made on the basis of languages, we find that there are so many anomalies and so many difficulties are there with regard to the division which was based on the languages. Now, the linguistic minorities are facing every serious problems in so many respects. I can quote an example where the linguistic minorities face difficulties in a country like India, When our hon. Minister for Public Distribution is here, I may point out a very difficult problem faced by the linguistic minorities in Delhi. The linguistic minorities from all over India who have come to Delhi, they find it very difficult to get a very basic document, that is, the ration card. This kind of problem cannot be solved by the formation of more States; some important steps have to be taken to solve this kind of problem.

Sir, I would commend the principle on which this Resolution has been brought, but I would think that this must not be a basis on which the House should be divided. As has been mentioned by some of the friends, we must keep it pending. I think this should be taken as a wider aspect on which further discussions should ensue. We should all sit together, all parties from all regions should sit together and start a dialogue on this and we should also take it to the extent of a dialogue with regard to the re-organisation of States and for consideration of all the demands which have come from various parts of the country. (Interruption)

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): Mr. Chairman, Sir, time of the House was extended for two hours when this discussion started. Extended time is about to end, you please direct the Minister to give a reply on this discussion. This issue had been discussed for seven hours. (Interruptions)

SHRI MANORANJAN BHAKTA (Andaman and Nicobar Islands): We also want to participate in this discussion. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him complete first.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, the committee on Private Members Bills and Resolutions had allotted two hours for it, later on, three hours time was extended for discussion and keeping in view that more Member are interested to participate in the discussion time was again extended for two hours. I think the issue has been discussed at length. What is the use of repetition. Now please direct the hon. Minister to reply and have the opinion of the House. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: let us take the opinion of the House.

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH (Sheohar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to say that it is a very important and basic issue connected with country's administrative system. Therefore more time should be allocated for it. I am very much surprised that being an experienced and generous member, why Vajpayeeji is persisting on this issue. He even did not allow discussion on the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. If he had shown such activeness in the matter pertaining to Delhi, our joint candidate Shri Khurana had become the Chief Minister of Delhi.

SHRI BUTA SINGH (Jalore): Mr. Chairman, Sir this question is not related to one party only but it is related to the whole country. Although this Resolution has been presented by one Member but now this proposal belongs to the whole House. This is a serious matter and several member want to speak on it. This is not an ordinary question but the future of the country is connected with it. So it should be discussed at length. More time should be allotted for it as House is capable of doing so. I would like to suggest to allot more time for this issue.

DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA (Manadsaur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, my submission is that this issue has been discussed in detail, so there is no need to extend the time. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please let me have to opinion of the eminent persons of the party.

SHRI SURYA NARAYAN YADAV (Sahasra): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is an important issue and all the members wish to participate in discussion as the issue is related to all the States. So I would like to request Mr. Vajpayeeji and you that all the hon. Members should be allowed to speak. So time should be extended.

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to submit that Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly has sent a proposal in this regard and this matter is pending with the Government since long. Today people are agitated on this issue and thousands of people has organised demonstration on outside Lok Sabha demanding for a separate Uttaranchal Pradesh. I would say that the Government should tell its views in this regard as public want to know whether the Government intend to give statehood to Uttaranchal region.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please tell your opinion whether the discussion on this issue should continue or not.

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: My opinion is that discussion on this issue should be discontinued and the Minister should reply.

SHRI MANORANJAN BHAKTA (Andaman and Nicobar Islands): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I hold Shri Vajpayeeji in high esteem. He is a senior member. He know that this matter is not related only to Uttar Pradesh but to the whole country. So it should be discussed seriously and maximum number of Members should be allowed to express their views on it so I urge to extend the time. (*Interruptions*)

I am not saying this to instigate anyone, there is nothing to be agitated on this issue. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRONICS AND DEPARTMENT OF OCEAN DEVELOPMENT) AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI S. NGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM): Many members have voiced their views on this. There are quite a number of Members on all sides who want to speak. It is an extremely important resolution. It is not one of the normal

type of resolutions. There is no question of cutting short this discussion because it would look as if we are trying to shut out the views of some hon. Members on such an important matter.

I would, therefore, request you to consider this. You have list before you. I do not have to mention the number. We may extend the time at least by an hour so that those who want to speak get a chance to voice their views of such an important matter.

It is unfair and unfortunate and it would be out against normal democratic principles, if we try to stop them. I think, each Member may be given at least five to ten minutes to express his views.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Mover of the Resolution, Mr. Jagat Vir Singh Drona, do you want to say anything?

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly sit down. he is speaking. He is on his legs.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is the mover of the Resolution. So, I am asking for his opinion.

SHRI YAIMA SINGH YAMNAM (Inner Manipur): When Sharimati Malini Bhattacharya was presiding the House was extended by two hours. Why is it taken again? why should it be extended now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is why, it was decided to extend it up to 5.40 PM. Now we are reaching 5.40 PM. That is why the issue has come up whether the time is to be extended or not. Important Members of the House have already given their opinions. I am asking for the opinion of the mover of the Resolution. What does he want to say?

SHRI OSCAR FERNANDES: I am on a point of order. There is nothing like referring it to the mover of the resolution for taking a decision. This Resolution is the property of the House. The mover of the Resolution has no say on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your point of order is ruled out because that Member has a right to say about his resolution. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI OSCAR FERNANDES: I agree with you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As the mover of the Resolution, he has total responsibility. There is no question of agreeing or disagreeing.

[Translation]

SHRI JAGAT VIR SINGH DRONA (Kanpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is my Resolution. It was put before the House on the 5th March and since then discussion on it has started. It was also discussed on 19th March. Originally the Government has allocated two hours time which was extended for three hours and again for two hours. The main purpose of extending time was to allow maximum members to express their views on it. Thirty hon. Members have expressed their views which include eminent leaders of various political parties. In my speech I had requested the Minister of State of Home Affairs. *(Interruptions)*

That several members had participated in this discussion and expressed their views rising above the party lines. My apprehension was right that the treasury benches would try to delay it. It has been discussed for seven hours and thirty hon. Members have participated in the discussions held on this issue. Now the Minister should make a statement on it and then accept the opinion of the House. *(Interruptions)*

[English]

DE. KRUPASINDHU BHOI (Sambalpur): Do you agree for extension or not?

[Translation]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Several hon. Members have expressed their views. There should be consensus for extension of time. There is no consensus in the House on this issue. So time will not be extended. Therefore Minister would give a reply.

(Interruptions)

[English]

MANY HON. MEMBERS: No, Sir.

SHRI BUTA SINGH (Jalore): You have to take the opinion of the House. How can you take that decision?

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM: I am sorry.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: It is the property of the House, The House has to decide it. You cannot give a ruling on this. Your ruling is not relevant to this. The House has to decide it. You put it to the House.

you have to put it to the vote of the House. Kindly put it to the vote of the House.

[Translation]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I had expressed my opinion that the consent of the House is necessary to extend any discussion, but I think that is not there.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: It is for the House to decide, not the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not imposing any decision. Generally these matters are not decided by vote.

SHRI BTU SING: It is the responsibility of either the House or the BAC to decide it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: You can

put it to the vote of the House; but I would like to submit that your attitude is totally wrong.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: This is totally wrong, his issue concerns with the nation and not with the party.

[English]

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMAR MANGALAM: Let them go down on record that the main Opposition Party do not want the views of every Member to be heard and they want a Division on that. If they want it, let them go on record on that. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am on my legs. Please sit down. The consent of the House is not there to extend the debate.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the issue is this whether there should be a division or not. If Shri Buta Singh, Shri Kumaramanglam and Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee wants, we can go for a division.

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH: If you want to extend the debate, a division should be held.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, we are going for it.

SHRI P.M.SAYEED: Mr. Chairman, Sir I think this august House has established conventions that the Private Member's Business has never taken such a voting pattern That is according to my knowledge.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are right.

SHRI P.M.SAYEED. There are Members who want to participate in this important measure. The Member who has moved the Resolution and almost every section of the House are supporting this Resolution. (Interruptions) In

order to uphold the dignity conventions established in this House, it would be proper if you extend the time and then continue the discussion. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA(South Delhi): Your intention is to avoid it.

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV(Jhanjharpur): Whatever has been said here, I do not want to challenge it but the consent of the House should be sought in order to avoid such a precedence in the democratic system of our country. If the will of the majority is there. (Interruptions) The resolution is before the House that the House may consider it whether the time should be extended or not. A division should be held to find out the factual position.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH AFFAIRS AND SPORTS) AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI MUKUL WASNIK): Sir, it is going to be very unfortunate if we are going to divide the House only on the issue whether the discussion should be extended or or it should be curtailed. It is really unfortunate that when an important resolution like this is before the House, when all sections of the House and several Members want to participate and express their views on such a Resolution, there are efforts to prevent Members from getting an opportunity to speak on this Resolution.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr., Chairman, Sir, I have no intention of making any allegation against any body but the way the discussion period has been extended and an emphasis is being laid to extend it further shows that you want to prolong the matter.

[Sh. Atal Bihari]

Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is Parliament. The whole country known that the Railway budget is passed after having one day discussion, a five hour long debate is enough for the Ministry of Defence, and four hour for the Ministry of External affairs. Now seven hours have passed with the House. (*Interruptions*)

[English]

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM: It is a question of reorganisation of States. Is it just a casual matter? Is it an every body matter? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MUKUL WASNIK: Sir, the former Home Minister of the country wants to participate in the dissuasion. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Why the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs should interrupt a Member, an ordinary Member like me?

[Translation]

Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is not correct if the hon. Minister says with sincerity that the Government has not yet formed its opinion and it wants some more time to form its opinion then the matter can be considered. (*Interruptions*) I am not being allowed to complete my expression. These who have already spoken want to speak again. The representatives of all the parties have kept their views. If would not be of any use of repeat the same. In spite of all this if the Government says that the matter is very important and requires more time then the opposition being responsible is prepared to consider it. But if you are bent upon for evading the important issue, we are equally bent upon finalise it today itself.

SHRI P. M. SAYEED: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have a deep regard for Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. The stand of the Government on this issue is

very clear. While replying to it, I would enumerate the policy of the Government. But this is not an issue. But this is that senior leaders like Shri Buta Singh and others want to participate in the discussion. Since he has been a former Home Minister he knows fully the areas from where the demands for new States are arising the knows each and every thing about the facts as to what has been happening in various areas. That is why all the Members want to put their views in the connection and it is the intention of the government. To have a doubt on the intention of the Government is not proper on the part of a very dignified member like Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: I suggest that this House should sit upto 7 p.m. this evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not necessary. I have heard just now as to what is the intention of the House and the House has the capacity to decide it because now I feel that you are not in favor of extending the time for discussion on this resolution. You do not want to extend the time while the treasury benches want to extend it. So we have to take a decision on basis of voting whether the time should be extended or not. (*Interruptions*)

[English]

SHRI MUKUL WASNIK: Sir I would once again like to make an appeal that on this issue whether to extend the time or not to extend the time please do not set as precedent like this and divide the House on an issue like this. It is going to be an unfortunate precedent in this House.

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: Would you like to waste the time like this till 6 p.m. You want that as soon as it is 6 O'clock in the evening and the time may be over. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I move the motion that

discussion on this resolution should finished by extending the time till 7 p.m. I move the motion that the House should sit by 7 p.m. it should sit by one hour late and the debate on the motion be concluded by then the House should sit by 7 p.m. (Interruptions)

SHRIBUTA SINGH (Jallora): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I feel very anguished thwa the leader of BJP, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has called this question a very simple question. It is a question of reorganisation of the country. (Interruptions) This is not an ordinary question. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee knows that if this question is said to be the question of reorganisation of the country than this question can not be resolved under the constitution. Even Lok Sabha cannot decide it because it is for the people of the country to decide.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order.

SHRIBUTA SINGH: I would like to submit that it is not proper form him to compare this question to the railway budget and the defense budget. These are the day-today activities of the Government; this is the normal procedure of the Parliament of passing the budgets but this question is connected eight the lives of the people.

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: I propose that the debate of the House could be extended upto 7 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not point of order., what would you like to submit?

SHRIBUTA SINGH: I would like to submit the this is going to affect the lives of the whole of the nation such questions are posing difficult situation to the country . It is not a question pertaing to some villages in Harayana and Punjab.

Thousands of people have lost their lives but you want to put up this serious matter in such a manner as if it is an ordinary. Just now

the issue so Nelgam in Karnatka has been raised here....(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have understood your point as to what you want to say.

SHRIBUTA SINGH: Mr Chairman, Sir you could also not decide that you can not intake any decision on such an explosive issue of Belagaum in a few minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order. there is no point of order in it.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Just now Shri Vajpayee ji has said that his party is bent upon it. The BJP has to give up this rigid policy of its. No issue can be resolved by following this type of rigid policy.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. Kindly sit down.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please . Now, kindly sit down. There is no point of order, kindly sit down.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF STEEL (SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV) : Sir , the time is over.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am putting this issue as to whether to extend the time or not to extend the time may say 'Ayes'

MANY HON. MEMBER: Ayes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those who do not want to extend the time may say 'Noes'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Noes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 'Ayes' have it. The time is being extended.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you want a Division you can ask for it.

*(Interruptions)***18.00 hrs**

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Shri Ram Naik) Nothing that is spoken by Members without my permission is going on record.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know my responsibility. This is not the way Do not challenge the Chair like this.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing of those Members who speak without my permission goes on record.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM: There cannot be a vague Resolution with no specific extension of time. A vague Resolution cannot be put to the vote of the House. *(Interruptions)*

MOHANDEV: Sir, I will make a last appeal to you not to take a decision whereby the message will go that we are doing something unconventional. Kindly be reasonable and be a good Chairman. You are in the judgment seat of Vikramaditya and nothing less. You will understand this Please decide like that. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, there is as little vagueness in the motion which was given for voting. That little vagueness is about the timer by which it is to be extended. Since that is not done, I would like to know from the Treasury Benches first as to by what time the

time of the debate is to be extended. This discussion or taking consensus will complete and then we will adjourn the House.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SONTOSH MOHANDEV: We would like to get a ruling from you. After 6 O'clock when the time of the House is not extended, first the Chair has to ask and task the sense of the House. Kindly give a ruling on that. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House is not adjourned.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SONTOSH MOAN DEV: But, you have not extended the time of the House. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: But, the House is not adjourned.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SONTOSH MOHANDEV: First you have to know the sense of the House whether you can extend it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is what I am doing now.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHANDEV: First you have to ask the question, whether we can extend the time of the house. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARA MANGALAM: Mr. Chairman, Sir may I make a request, I think, in the best interest of the House? As rightly pointed out earlier normally on matters of extension of time, that too. on Private members Business, we do not really divide the House and have a difference of opinion because Private Members Resolutions are Resolutions Which it is always felt that every individual- it is not a party affair - must have a right to speak on. You also must have noticed, Mr. Chairman, Sir,

that views cut across party lines for and against. There is no real party borders on this matter. We have really reached a stage where we are confronting with each other on a matter which I think, is quite serious.

It has implications of real reorganisation of States in many ways. Strong view are there; not necessarily on political lines. Many of the view are on other considerations. Many people represent various views of their respective areas.

Normally, the House should have risen at 6.00 o'clock. If the Chair could consider, we can take it up next time when the private Members' Business comes up and at that time if the feeling is still so strong on both sides, then it can be decided. But today at this stage to press it for a division on extension of time, I feel would not be fair. Moreover, this would also give an opportunity to some people to voice their views I repeat again, curtting across party lines there have been views and since it is a private members Business, I would plead with the Chair that let us not create a precedent which would be unfair in this regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How such extension do you want?

SHRI MRUTYUNJAYA NAYAK (Phulbani): Sir, I have a submission to make.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let the Minister complete first.

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARA MANGALAM: Sir, considering the list of the speakers is over if really one has to do justice to the subject, then I think minimum three hours time would be required.

[Translation]

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH: Atal ji may speak. I have no objection on it. I would like to listen the ideas of the Leader of Opposition of this issue... (Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Budget Session is going on and several times we have set late here after 6 O' clock. Today also we can sit beyond 6 O' clock. But now 6 O' clock is being made a time limit (Laxman Rekha). This time limit (Laxman Rekha) was appropriate in Surajkund..... (Interruptions)—Mr., Chairman, Sir, if there is a proposal to sit one hour or half an hour more, then I could agree that a number of Member are interested in the dissuasion. Now, the proposal presented—pardon me—somebody may object that I have doubts about their intentions, We have no doubts in this regard. Your intentions is clear and we can see it clearly. If it requires 3-4 hours for discussion it means discussion will take place continuously on it on Friday and voting will not be allowed on it and then the session will be progame and as a result this resolution will be lapsed. You have the right to form your opinion in this regard and to accept or reject this resolution. You have strength of number but we have only strength of logic and argument. Though it is being said that the they do not like to divide the House. We are also not in favor of dividing the House. But the resolution presented by us is in the interest of the nation and your please accept it without dividing the House and if you can't do so, reject it. This issue is not being extended for the discussion but for nullifying the discussion. Mr., Chairman, Sir, now you have to decide it.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Sir, I submit to you that shri Vajpayee ji is presenting his patry's stand time and again in the House. He has the right to do so but this house is much above any party and the matter presented before the House is a comprehensive one. This is a matter os reorganising the country.... (Interruptions) This matter is not concerned only with the reorganisation of states but of the country, also, so I am fully confident that.... (Interruptions) Why you talk of U.P. only. It is not a matter of U.P. only, we would like to raise other things, how can you stop us Along with it we would talk to the whole country. This House is competent to examine the reorganisation of the country done earlier

[Sh. Buta Singh]

and whether it is right or not. Has it created the feeling of unity in the country or not. (Interruptions) Who else will be concerned about it except this House? The reorganisation done earlier has benefited the country or not, has it increased the feeling of unity or not? These all issues are related to this matter. It is a comprehensive matter.

We know the view point of the Bharatiya Janata party. This House and the Country know it very well. It is not a new thing, so to say that.....(Interruptions)....we don't want to interrupt this discussion and it should not be confined to this house only. It will also be discussed outside the House and the people of country should also participate in it. It is a comprehensive matter so the House can decide on it only after getting full time to discuss it. It will not be resolved merely through the policy the Government.

It is a decision of the House related to the constitution. This decision is not related only to the government but also to the very foundation of the Constitution to my little knowledge, I think that even this House is not competent enough to change that decision, because of the reorganisation of the country creates danger to its unity and integrity, we can't take such decisions. therefore, I humbly request to Shri Vajpayee ji not to take this matter from the point of view if his party but take it keeping in view the

interests of the country. It is believed that there is only on leader in the BJP who regards country above his party. I would like to appeal to Vajpayee ji to give a chance to this House to discuss this issue keeping the interest of the country above the party's interests. It should be discussed in detail, it does not matter if it may take time of 10 sessions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Several hon. Members have expressed their views about this matter. I also heard views of Shri Kumaramangalm, Shri Vajpayee ji and Shri Buta Singh and can guess their mood from their faces that the discussion should be completed to day itself. I think that this matter will be given 2 hours time when it comes for discussion net time. Now two and half hours allotted for the private Member's Business is over.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Therefore, with the consent of the House two more hours are allotted for the discussion on this matter. This discussion will take place next time .

Now the House is adjourned till eleven of the clock on Monday, 3rd May 1993.

18.20 hrs

*The lok sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday. May 3, 1993/
Vaisakha 13, 1915 (Saka)*