

Mompa--and any other Naga tribe. For the information of the Government, let me mention that there is no Naga tribe in Arunachal. This is the reason why talk of Greater Nagaland by some vested interest political leaders in the North East is going on. This is a serious issue which the Government of India must take notice of because in the Statehood Bill, there is a mention, '....any Naga tribe'.

In the Statehood Act, there is a mention of Naga tribes, whereas there is no Naga tribe in Arunachal Pradesh.

Therefore, I would request the Government, through you, Madam, that in the next session of Parliament a suitable amendment in this Act should be brought into and all the lacunae, loopholes and defects should be removed.

Finally, I would like to quote what Pandit Nehru had said. While talking of Panchsheel, Pandit Nehru laid down five principles for administration of tribal areas. The first principle was that the people should develop along the line of their genus and we should avoid imposing anything on them. We should try to encourage in every way their own tribal lives and culture. The second principle was, that tribe territory—land and forests—should be respected. The third principle was that we should try to train them and build up a team of their people in the work of administration and development. Some technical personnel from outside will be needed, specially in the beginning, but we should avoid introducing too many outsiders into the tribal territory. The fourth principle was that we should not administer those areas and overwhelm them with multiplicity of schemes. We should rather work through and not as rivals to their own social and cultural institutions. The fifth was that we should judge not by statistics or by the amount of money spent but by the quality of human character that is evolved. I would request that these principles should be kept in mind while formulating any

policy or programme for the tribal people. Once again, I call upon the Government of India, through you, Madam, to bring suitable legislation for removing the lacunae in the Statehood Act. With these words, I conclude. This is my maiden speech, of course. Thank you.

ABOLITION OF CHILD LABOUR

SHRI SOLIPETA RAMACHANDRA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, I would like to draw the attention of this House and the Government to the problem of child labour.

The recent Calcutta High Court directing the State administration to look into the aspect of compensation to families of children who were killed last year in an explosion in a fire-works factory in Howrah District reminds us of the magnitude and seriousness of child labour menace in our country, even after the historic decision of the Supreme Court on abolition of child labour.

Madam, Article 24 of the Constitution provides that, "No child below the age of 14 years shall be employed to work in any factory or mine or engaged in any hazardous employment". But there are about 20 to 25 million child labour in the country working in deplorable conditions in a variety of business--factories, hotels, restaurants, garages, construction sites, beedy industry--including around three million children who are working in hazardous occupations and processes, such as, fire-works, stone quarries, mines, etc. As per the 43rd round of the National Sample Survey which was conducted in 1987-88, the bulk of child labour is in Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh.

Although efforts are being made at the Central and State levels to bring down the growing child labour menace, yet the incidence of child labour is still large. The Governments have so far been able to pull out about 1.5 million children and put them into schools. We cannot achieve our goal with this speed.

Therefore Madam, I urge upon the Government to take note of the recent annual report of the UNICEF on the "State of the world's Children" and take necessary steps for immediate elimination of child labour. Free and compulsory education for every child and stringent action for violation of anti-child labour laws should be ensured. Thank you, Madam.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMAL SINHA): Mr. Reddy, you have been very brief. Now, Shri R. Margabandu.

SHRI R. MARGABANDU (Tamil Nadu): Madam, at last my name has been called.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SMT. KAMLA SINHA): I wish I could have called it half-an-hour ago.

Setting up of a Supreme Court Bench in a Southern states preferably in Madras or Bangalore

SHRI R. MARGABANDU (Tamil Nadu): Madam, the slogan of the Judiciary nowadays is speedy justice, justice to be taken to the doorsteps of litigants by decentralisation of courts. Madam, on 14.12.1996, the Law Minister presided over a function of the Southern State Bar Councils Conference at Bangalore. In that conference he said that there are about three crore cases pending in the whole of India. Madam, there are different types of courts, namely, trial courts, appellate courts, second-appeal courts, Supreme court. Nearly a decade is taken for trial and appeal, nearly 15 years are taken in second appeal and several decades are taken for disposal of appeals in the

Supreme Court. So, this is the actual state of affairs in which we are living.

There is a slogan of decentralisation of courts by setting up courts in different parts of the country. as a matter of fact, for the last one decade, advocates from southern States, namely, Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh have been demanding for setting up of a Supreme Court Bench either at Madras or at Bangalore. But, all the cry has not reached the ears of the Supreme Court and the Central Government. I say this with anguish that several conferences have been held, resolutions have been passed, representations have been sent to the Supreme Court and to the Government, but there is no effect at all. Then, what? The Supreme Court is situated in Delhi and Kanyakumari is about 2,500 kilometres away from Delhi. A poor litigant cannot afford to go over to Delhi and plead his case in the Supreme Court. It has economic constraint also. A poor litigant cannot travel all the way for Kanyakumari to Delhi for pleading his case in the Supreme Court. In fact, he faces so many difficulties. Only rich people can manage to go over to Delhi and approach the Supreme Court. So, in this situation, lawyers and the public at large in the southern States have been demanding for setting up of a Supreme Court Bench in one of these places. But, it has not considered so far.

Madam, the reason given by the Supreme Court for not setting up its Bench at places other than Delhi is that if the Supreme Court Bench is set up outside Delhi, then the quality and standard of justice will go down. There are several eminent lawyers in the High Courts of these four States and many of them are even coming for practice to the Supreme Court. If this is the argument of the Supreme Court, then what about