

Government has not given an explanation, yet a disclosure has been made about his connections and other things. All I say before I sit down is : Could not Mr. Morarji Desai find anyone else in the country and make him Private Secretary to the Finance Minister and Deputy Prime Minister?

#### THE BUDGET (BIHAR), 1968-69

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. C. PANT) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the State of Bihar for the year 1968-69

#### SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR EXPENDITURE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF UTTAR PRADESH FOR THE YEAR 1968-69

SHRI K. C. PANT : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants for Expenditure of the Government of Uttar Pradesh for the year 1968-69.

#### RESOLUTION RE ACCORDING FULL STATEHOOD TO THE UNION TERRITORY OF HIMACHAL PRADESH — continued.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : माननीय वाइस चेअरमैन महोदय, मैं उस रोज हिमाचल प्रदेश को राज्य बनाने के प्रस्ताव पर बोलते हुए यह कह रहा था कि वहां की असेम्बली ने यह प्रस्ताव एकमत से पास किया कि इसको राज्य बनाया जाय। उस सिलसिले में कुछ सदस्यों ने दूसरी इंडियन टेरिटरीज का जिक्र करते हुये कहा कि यह छोटा है या बड़ा है लेकिन मेरी तो राय यही है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश की असेम्बली ने जब प्रस्ताव पास किया कि हिमाचल प्रदेश को राज्य के रूप में परिणत किया जाय तो जो इंडियन टेरिटरी है वह छोटी है या बड़ी है यह देखने की आवश्यकता नहीं है, वहां के अवाम और अवाम के जो प्रतिनिधि हैं, जो नुमाइंदे हैं वह पास करें और खास कर के सर्वसम्मति से प्रस्ताव पास करें तो मेरी गुजारिश यह है कि सरकार को उसको मंजूर करना चाहिये, उसमें

उसका कुछ बिगड़ता नहीं है। हमारी सरकार कभी डंडे के सामने, कभी प्रचार के सामने, झुक कर के राज्य बना देती है। राज्य बना, नागालैंड में बना। वहां कोई एक भाषा नहीं, 19 तरह के नागा लोग हैं, उनकी कई डाइलेक्ट्स हैं; उनकी भाषा नागामीज हैं, आसामी बोलते हैं अंग्रेजी बोलते हैं, लेकिन आपने प्रांत का निर्माण किया चूंकि वहां लोगों ने डंडे से अपनी मांग को आपके सामने रखा और आप झुके। तो मेरी गुजारिश है कि आप यह डंडा दूसरे राज्य में चलने न दें। हम मनीपुर जाते हैं, त्रिपुरा जाते हैं। यहां हिमाचल प्रदेश में हम देखते हैं कि चार जिले थे अब दस जिले हो गये। वहां के एम० एल० एज० को, वहां के मिनिस्टर्स को क्या सुविधा मिलती है। मिनिस्टर्स को सम-चुअरी एलाउंस नहीं मिलता। और जब वह देखते हैं कि दूसरी जगह के जो एम० एल० एज० हैं, जो मिनिस्टर्स हैं उनको क्या सुविधा मिलती है तो वह महसूस करते हैं। उनका कहना सही है कि जब पंजाब से, हरियाणा से, केरल से, नागालैंड से उनका रकबा बढ़ गया, क्षेत्रफल बढ़ गया, 22 हजार वर्ग मील हो गया, आबादी 30 लाख को हो गई और वहां की असेम्बली ने एक स्वर से यह प्रस्ताव पास कर के केन्द्रीय सरकार के पास भेजा है कि जल्दी से इसको मंजूर कर के संविधान में तस्मीम की जाय और जल्दी से जल्दी इसको लागू किया जाय तो कोई न कोई बहाना ले कर के इसको आप पास नहीं होने देते हैं तो यह मुल्क के लिये और खासकर के डेमोक्रेसी के लिये, जम्हूरियत के लिये, अच्छी चीज नहीं है। मुझको तो अंदेशा है क्योंकि अभी मणिपुर की असेम्बली ने भी पास किया है, उनकी भी अपनी एक मणिपुरी भाषा है हालांकि वह संविधान में लिखी हुई नहीं है जैसे हम हिंदी बोलते हैं वैसे ही उनकी भी एक बहुत पुरानी भाषा है और वहां जो हास्टाइल नागाज हैं वह प्रचार करते हैं कि देखो नागालैंड है लेकिन तुम्हारा क्या है, तुम क्यों इंडियन टेरिटरी में मिले हुये हो, देखो वहां के लोगों को इतना मिलता है और तुम्हें क्या मिलता है और इस तरह से वहां तीन डिविजनों में उपद्रव कर

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

रहे हैं। त्रिपुरा में भी य कम्युनिस्ट भाई हैं जो कि जेल में बन्द हैं, इनको जेल में ही बन्द रखना चाहिए, भूपेश गुप्ता की पार्टी है और वह राइट नहीं है रांग कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी है, तो जिनको लेफ्ट कहते हैं वह वहाँ खुराफात मचा रहे हैं, वह तमाम तरह का विद्रोह कर रहे हैं वहाँ की असेम्बली ने भी पास किया है। वहाँ भाषा के आधार पर होना चाहिये। वहाँ एक भाषा बंगाली है और यहाँ हिमाचल प्रदेश में हिंदी है। अब, चूंकि हिमाचल प्रदेश बड़ा है, उसकी तीस लाख आबादी हो गई है, जब कि पहले नौ, साढ़े नौ या दस लाख की आबादी थी, तीन गुनी आबादी हो गई है, क्षेत्रफल भी तीन गुने से ज्यादा बढ़ गया है और वहाँ की जनता चाहती है तो हर एक तरह से देखने पर उसको राज्य बनना चाहिए।

अब एक सवाल उठता है कि राज्य बनने के बाद किस तरह से उस प्रान्त का कार्यसंचालन होगा, कहां से बित्त आयेगा, कहां से फाइनेंस आयेगा। उसकी आमदनी भी है लेकिन जब आप दूसरे राज्यों को प्लानिंग के लिये, योजना के लिये रुपया देते हैं तो यह सवाल हिमाचल प्रदेश के लिये क्यों उठ सकता है। नागालैंड को 20 करोड़ रुपया देते हैं और उसकी रेवेन्यू क्या है! कुछ नहीं है। और राज्यों को भी देते हैं, यू० पी० को देते हैं, बिहार को देते हैं, सब को देते हैं। इसलिये यह सवाल उठ ही नहीं सकता है। उसको जल्दी से जल्दी राज्य बनाया जाय।

उस रोज हमने कहा था कि यदि आप इस तरह की चीज को वहाँ की जनता की मांग को टुकराते हैं तो मुल्क के बाहर के लोग हैं ये जो प्रो-चाइनीज एलिमेंट यहाँ हैं चीनी भी हैं, पाकिस्तानी भी हैं, पाकिस्तानी एलिमेंट हैं, ये सब फायदा उठावेंगे। मुल्क में ये जितने जो विद्रोही हैं चाहे वह नागा हों, कूकी हों या मीजो हों, ये तरह तरह के लोग हैं सब जगह हैं, यह द्रोह कर रहे हैं, ये एक आबोहवा बना रहे हैं और उनका साथ देने की कोशिश करते हैं। ये जो इंडियन टेरिस्ट्रीज हैं वह पहले सी क्लास स्टेट थीं और मनीपुर भी एक स्टेट

था और इसके बाद यह इस स्थिति में आई।

पहले इन सब लोगों का अलग अलग एगजिस्टेंस था। तो इसलिये आप पर शक करते हैं कि यह होम मिनिस्ट्री कोई उसूल क्यों नहीं रखना चाहती है, क्यों भाषावार राज्य जल्दी से जल्दी नहीं बनाते हैं। कोई एक राज्य बनाइये तो भाषा के आधार पर बनाइये। नागालैंड के हमारे साथी बंटे हुए हैं, मैं नागालैंड के लिये नहीं कहता क्योंकि जितने ये शिङ्ग्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स वाले हैं सब जगह आवाज उठाते हैं। संथाल परगना में इनकी 22 या 23 लाख की तादाद है, बंगाल में 15 लाख है। तो ये जो शिङ्ग्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स के और नागाज जहाँ जहाँ हैं वह चाहते हैं कि सबको इकट्ठा कर लें और इस तरह शिङ्ग्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स के नाम पर प्रान्तों का निर्माण हो रहा है आसाम के टुकड़े करने के लिए इनके बारे में जो कभी कभी होम मिनिस्ट्री सोचती रही या सरकार सोचती रही यह बड़ी खतरनाक चीज है क्योंकि पहले तो नागालैंड के लोग कहते थे नागालैंड बना दो अब, जब वह बन गया तो वह हिन्दुस्तान से बाहर होने की बात करते हैं क्योंकि भाषा उनकी नहीं है, भाषा के आधार पर हमने प्रान्त का निर्माण किया है और भाषा के आधार पर आज इतने बड़े बड़े हिन्दी भाषी प्रान्त हैं और वैसे ही हिमाचल प्रदेश भी जो हिन्दी भाषा भाषी है उसका राज्य बनना चाहिये। आपने पंजाब के टुकड़े करके दो राज्य बना दिये, पंजाब का टुकड़ा करके और हरियाणा का टुकड़ा करके हिमाचल को दिया। सब लोगों ने चाहा, पंजाबियों ने भी कराया, हरियाणा वालों ने भी कराया। हम मुखालिफत करते थे कि पंजाब का टुकड़ा नहीं होना चाहिये लेकिन हो गया, भाषा के आधार पर टुकड़ा हो गया तो फिर उसका अलग राज्य क्यों नहीं बनाते हैं जब कि वह पंजाब से बड़ा हो गया, हरियाणा से बड़ा हो गया। पंजाब और हरियाणा के लोगों को एम० एल० ए० दिये लेकिन हिमाचल प्रदेश में न उनको कोई सुविधा, न उनकी पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन है, वह दिल्ली में दरबार करने के लिये आते हैं। यू० पी० एस० सी० में बैठने के लिये वह हजारों मील से लोग त्रिपुरा से, मणिपुर से आयेगे ऐसी बात जंचती नहीं। इन बातों से बगावत की भावना फैलती है, देश को नुकसान

होता है। इसलिये सरकार से हमारी गुजारिश है कि यह जो उसकी नीति है कि डंडा उठओ और आंदोलन चलाओ तभी झुके यह ठीक नहीं है। जो वहाँ की अवाम है, जनता है, जनता के चुने नुमाइंदे हैं यदि वह सर्वसम्मति से प्रस्ताव पास करके भेजते हैं तो फौरन संप्रदेश संविधान में तरमीम लाकर हिमाचल प्रदेश का राज्य बनाना चाहिये उसके बाद मणिपुर को भी, त्रिपुरा को भी बनाना चाहिये। ठीक है कामरेड भूपेश गुप्त उसमें एक तरमीम लाना चाहते थे, मणिपुर और त्रिपुरा को जोड़ना चाहते थे लेकिन हमारी मांग है कि भाषा के आधार पर हिमाचल प्रदेश का राज्य बने। गारो खासी जयन्तिया हिल्स की बात छोड़िये शिङ्गूड ट्राइब्स का राज्य बनाने की बात न करें और संविधान में तरमीम लाकर भाषा के आधार पर हिमाचल प्रदेश को अलग राज्य बनाएं उसी तरह स मणिपुर को भी बनाएं, त्रिपुरा को भी बनायें। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं तहेदिल से प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I stand to support the resolution placed by Mr. Varma for granting proper Statehood to Himachal Pradesh within the Indian Union. I do not think it is very much of a debatable issue. From the discussion that has been going on in the House I see that all sections of the House are in support of this demand, which is a just and democratic demand. Therefore, I feel that the Government should not hesitate in accepting this demand. But from the complete indifference that is being displayed by the Government to this issue, because there is no one even to listen to our debate, no Minister is present to listen to our debate. . .

AN HON. MEMBER: The Deputy Minister is here.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: He is there. I should have thought that on an issue like this the Cabinet Minister or the Minister of State should have been in the House. Anyway from the meagre attention that is being paid by the Government to this issue I think the

Government is not going to accept it. If it does not accept it, would be nothing but the cussedness of a Government that is not prepared to accept anything through persuasion but would perhaps eventually accept something if a big stick were to be waved at it, and that is our experience. There have been so many demands, reasonable and unreasonable, sometimes under the pressure of a mass movement or under the threat of a mass movement. The Government has even gone to the extent of accepting unreasonable demands, but in this case just because there is no threat of a big mass movement in Himachal Pradesh and just because the sponsors of the resolution want to persuade the Government into accepting it, I do not think the Government would be prepared to accept it. Therefore, my one advice to Mr. Varma and his friends on the opposite side, who are very keen on getting this demand accepted, would be to develop a big mass movement in that State which would compel the Government to accept it. That has been our experience. Right from the days when the movement for linguistic States was started—first it was Andhra, so many things happened in Andhra; then in Maharashtra, so many people died in Maharashtra; then Gujarat; then it came to Punjab—the Government went on refusing it until it became impossible for the Government to refuse it. That represents not only the cussedness of the Government but an extremely undemocratic outlook. I would like to know from the Home Minister why the Government are refusing to accept this. I am sure the Government would be hard put to it to explain why they are not accepting it.

The basis on which our States had been constituted and the conditions that are generally laid down for the constitution of a State within the Indian Union are satisfied by Himachal Pradesh. It is a contiguous territory, big enough. It is a territory with a common historical background. It is a territory the people of which have common traditions, have a common language. They have the feeling of oneness. They want to tackle their

[Shri Z. A. Ahmad]

own affairs themselves. They do not want unnecessary bureaucratic intervention from the top. All these factors which would justify to make Himachal Pradesh an autonomous State within the Indian Union are there. I do not know how you can explain away your refusal to accept these facts. I am looking forward to the day when the Minister will reply to it. I do not think he has any arguments which can hold water.

Right from the very inception of our Constitution and the formation of States, Himachal area was treated, as many friends have said, as a unit that ultimately would get proper Statehood within the Indian Union. It was treated as such when it was formed into a Class C State. Later on the leaders of the Government made announcement to that effect and everyone expected that in due course of time Himachal Pradesh would come of age and would get proper Statehood. But then again the wheels have turned in the reverse direction. Now there is an Assembly, there are legislators, there are Ministers, but all are puppets. Everything is done by the bureaucratic machinery at the Centre. The I.A.S. and I.C.S. people rule the State. Ordinary demands in the interests of the people against which there can be no objection are just turned down. I was told by some friends from Himachal Pradesh that last year the Government there wanted that there should be a provision of Rs. 32 lakhs for providing clean drinking water to the villages. But that was turned down by some bureaucrat sitting in office here, in the Finance Ministry or somewhere. It was just turned down, "No, clean water will not be supplied. Rs. 32 lakhs will not be spent. Let the people drink dirty, contaminated water." That was just turned down. Now, in a State where there are elected representatives of the people, where there is a properly constituted Assembly which has powers, it would be absolutely fantastic if money is not allowed to be spent to provide good, clean drinking water to the people, and some ICS or IAS officer sitting in his room, air-conditioned room, says, no

water to these people, let them die like rats and flies. And he turns it down. It has come to that. In the administration, you have cadres from Delhi or Punjab or from somewhere else going and administering Himachal Pradesh. Is Himachal Pradesh a desert? Are there no decent, educated people there to look after the affairs of their own State? Why should these people be sent from Delhi and Punjab and elsewhere to carry on the administration in Himachal Pradesh? It is fantastic. Therefore, for the life of me, I cannot understand how the Home Ministry can justify the non-acceptance of this demand.

Now, the traditional argument is that the territory is not big enough. But there are smaller territories to which you have granted Statehood. Haryana is there, Nagaland is there. And I think the territory of Punjab is much smaller than Himachal Pradesh. Then the argument of economic viability is brought in. That is nonsensical in the sense that in a modern State there will be areas where you have to establish an autonomous or a democratic set-up and which may not be economically viable, but then you have to make it economically viable. After all, what is the purpose of a Central Government. It is there to help those areas which are relatively economically backward to come up and become viable. Therefore, the argument of economic viability is absolutely absurd and nonsensical. Mr. Varma has repeated it again and again, he goes on repeating them, without the strength of a moss movement. He says, we have increased our revenues. From a few lakhs, we have gone up to a crore and a quarter or something like that. Himachal Pradesh is to be properly helped. You have mineral wealth, you have timber wealth, you have forest wealth. All sorts of things are there which can be developed and you can make it more economically viable.

Thirdly, there are some people who put forward the argument and say that this territory cannot be given a proper democratic set-up because it is a border area. When the entire border area, from Kashmir to UP to Bihar, Bengal

and all that and Manipur, has got a democratic set-up, why should the poor Himachal Pradesh be denied that? Even that argument cannot possibly hold water. And in fact, it is proper and good and necessary that the people in the border areas should be made to stand on their own feet. They should not be made dumb-driven cattle. They should feel strong enough to defend themselves and the people of Himachal Pradesh have to be given enough proof of their loyalty to the nation and their devotion to the nation. Therefore, that also cannot hold water.

In the end, I would submit that in view of the fact that the Government does not have a single argument that can be effectively put forward against Himachal Pradesh's case for a properly elected democratic Statehood, it should concede it. Let the Government—and let the Deputy Minister listen—do things with grace. You always do things in a graceless manner. When you are compelled when the big danda is waved at your head, you say, all right, we concede this much. We give two annas, four annas, six annas. And ultimately you concede sixteen annas in the rupee. Do it with grace. The demand is from all sides of the House. Take democratic consensus. It is a question which cuts across party differences. When all people are saying this, do not become cussed, do not become obstinate. And if you continue to be obstinate, a day will come when under the pressure of a huge mass movement, under the pressure of firing and shooting down of people by the police, you will have to say, now we have reconsidered the matter and we are prepared to concede a democratic set-up to Himachal Pradesh. Therefore, do things in time; do things with grace. And never miss the bus. You are in the habit of missing the bus. Do not miss the bus this time. That is my submission.

Again, I would lend my voice of support to the Resolution moved by Mr. Varma that the territory of Himachal Pradesh be given a proper, democratic Statehood within the Indian Union.

Thank you.

SHBI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA (Bihar) : Mr. Vice-Chairman. Sir, I am one of those people who feel that India should have only five States, the Eastern Zone, the Western Zone, the Southern Zone, the Northern Zone and the Central Zone. In my own State of Bihar, we have the Urdu-speaking minority, we have the Bengali-speaking minority, we have the tribal languages-speaking minority. We have all that there. Suppose three or four States unite and if they have different languages, the same problem will be there. The integration of the different language-speaking people will be much better. But the language emphasis is so much that we are today thinking more of our own States than of the country itself. But I know that mine is a lone voice. So, we have to consider this aspect from the realities of the situation as they obtain today.

Sir, I am very much struck and impressed by the marvellous development which this tiny State has made since 1948. I have figures before me. We had roads in this State in 1948 extending over 200 miles only. Now, there are 5,000 miles of roads. We had one college; now there are 18 colleges. We had hospitals and dispensaries numbering 88; now there are 411. A marvellous stride has been made. Then about agricultural research stations, there was nil; now there are 37. Seed multiplication farms they had nil; now there are 40 of them. Progeny orchards were nil then; now there are 67 of them. Then the area under food production has increased double-fold. The area under horticulture has increased by almost 80 per cent. And there are other such very impressive developmental activities. The income of the State was Rs. 85 lakhs. Now it is Rs. 13 crores. All these show that there is a very rapid, very wholesome and very impressive development in that State.

The other day I was listening to the speech of Mr. Varma. He said certain things about these Centrally-administered areas. I wish the Home Minister were here; I am glad that the

[Shri Awadeshwar Prasad Sinha.]

Deputy Home Minister is here. I hope that he will convey my feeble voice to his chief. Sir, I find that Simla is a very lovely place and it is no good for people, particularly in the summer months, to come down to the valley. But they go on coming down and going up because without this files here do not move. Whether Himachal Pradesh is given Statehood or not, this sort of red-tapism, this sort of delay in administrative matters, delay which is avoidable, is not good. The Central Government, particularly the Home Ministry along with the other sister Ministries should see to it that not only Himachal Pradesh but other Union territories do not suffer and thin?? are so managed that any letter coming from the Chief Minister or the departmental Secretaries is properly attended to and the people do not have to rush from Manipur, Tripura or other places to Delhi.

I would like to tell you that very nearer home, in the Union territory of Delhi, they have also to bother a great deal because of this red-tapism. I would beg of the Home Minister to look into this matter before Statehood is granted either to Himachal Pradesh or to any other Union territory. As my friend, Mr. Sheel Bhadra Yajee has said, this sort of arrangement can be made at once so that the Ministers or the officers need not waste their time in coming over to Delhi like this.

Secondly, I would like to urge that this demand for Statehood should not be compared to Nagaland. On this point, Sir, I differ from the previous colleagues who spoke fourteen days back and who are speaking today because Nagaland has its own problems. After all, this Upper House is a very enlightened House and I need not waste my time over explaining the very fundamental, basic difference between Nagaland and other States including Himachal Pradesh. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Nagaland has all tribals. Many of them have become Christians under the Baptist Church and have taken to English in language as well as dress and of late so many problems have cropped up

there. In Himachal Pradesh the tribals are only 2 per cent.; 98 per cent, are non-tribals. So this comparison with Nagaland is no good for Himachal Pradesh or for any other Centrally-administered area, be it Delhi, Manipur or Tripura or any other area. This sort of comparison is invidious. This is not admissible in my humble opinion.

Now, Sir, the question comes of Statehood. I feel the question should not be based on sentiment; it should be based on the realities of life, financial and otherwise. I do not agree that because this is a border State so it should be a Centrally-administered area. This argument has no value for me because U.P. is a border State, Bihar is a border State, West Bengal is a border State, Punjab is a border State, Jammu and Kashmir is a border State and Assam is a border State. Will all these areas then become Centrally-administered areas? If not, why should Himachal Pradesh be made an exception? But I would not like to be carried away by sentiments. I would like this matter to be examined from the financial point of view.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, whether it is viable or not I do not know but its income has increased manifold. I have given you the figures of development works. Mr. Vice-Chairman, if I happen to be a citizen of India I am a citizen of Himachal Pradesh too. Had I been a political worker or a social worker of Himachal Pradesh, my first attempt would have been to see that these development activities went on increasing so that the State became viable and the demand for making it a full State would become irresistible. We should always try to put the horse before the cart and not the cart before the horse, say so with all humility. Sir, I have been to this State and I have seen how the people are trying to improve their State day and night. There were opportunities for other States to grow but in spite of their full Statehood they have not cared to grow adequately.

The other day I was very much shocked. I shall narrate a small incident. It was the voting day for the election of the President and the Vice-President and I saw Dr. Parmar, who is the Chief Minister of Himachal Pradesh, standing in the Parliament House. I asked him how on that day, when he should be voting in his Assembly for the election, he was here. He said that he was a Member of the Himachal Pradesh Assembly but he could not vote. This anomaly should go. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, red-tap-ism should go lock, stock and barrel at once. And M.L.A.s anywhere should have the same right so far as the voting for the President and Vice-President is concerned. This has distressed and pained me very much. I hope this occasion will not arise in future.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You kept it so long within yourself.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: Because there was no occasion and being a hard task master you will not allow if I say anything which is not relevant. There are Members who may say anything which is not applicable but I cannot say what is not much applicable, admissible and very much relevant. I have not yet specialised in irrelevance, Sir!

With these words, Sir, I have made my observations. Once again I send my greetings to the political workers of Himachal Pradesh for all that they are doing. I wish them all well. I wish them godspeed, and the way they are progressing I am sure the day is not far when it will be a full-fledged State.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have the greatest pleasure to associate myself with the aspirations of the people of Himachal Pradesh who last January passed a resolution in their Legislative Assembly unanimously demanding Statehood for the State of Himachal Pradesh.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I will not traverse the ground which has been already covered by my friends of both the sides. I would have been very happy if there would have been a single dissenting voice in this House who could have advanced any plausible argument against the Statehood of Himachal Pradesh. It would then have been easy for me to reply to those arguments and I would have been very happy to associate myself with the aspirations of the people. But it seems the debate is going to be a one-sided affair. Sir, I know that all the hon'ble Members who will be participating from the different sections and parties of this House will support this proposal so that when the Minister will ultimately come here to reply to the debate he will accept the Resolution with good grace and not talk in the vague terms of "considering the matter" or "referring the matter to the Cabinet". I would very much like that the Cabinet within this period should have met and decided about this so that the aspirations of the people would have been fulfilled before long.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, one of the arguments that is being whispered outside against the maturity of the State to achieve Statehood is that it is a border State. Another aspect that is being whispered outside—those persons have no courage to come here and talk to us—is that the State is not viable to achieve the Statehood so soon. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I want to confine myself to these two 3 P.M. arguments. I will remind those friends who whisper like this that like Punjab, Himachal Pradesh has always contributed greatly to the cause of the defence of this country, and it will be very much annoying to them, to those loyal and patriotic sons and daughters of this part if such ideas are aired in any quarter. And I think next to Punjab, Himachal Pradesh which is a Centrally-administered territory, has contributed the largest number of contingents to the armed forces of this country. And if I am permitted to quote some figures, the number of

[Shri Banka Behary Das.]

ex-servicemen now in Himachal Pradesh runs to 50,872, and the number of serving soldiers is 49,487, which means a total of 1,00,359. It is not a question of soldiers only because all those old men and women who have sent their children to the army have all associated themselves with the security of the country. So, if I may be permitted to say so, more than one lakh of families of Himachal Pradesh are now behind the security of this country against the Chinese and the Pakistani forces. The number of families of deceased soldiers runs to 6,260. The number of servicemen who were killed during the wars with China and Pakistan comes to 542. Not only have they contributed in numbers to the Indian Army, but as regards the quality of the soldiers also, they have won 165 gallantry awards. So if any person who comes forward to advance the argument that if that Centrally-administered area which is a border area is converted into a State, then the security of this country will be in danger, should come forward to challenge these figures that I have given here. So, Sir, out of the 30 lakhs of people who live in the Centrally-administered territory of Himachal Pradesh, more than one lakh of people have been in the Defence Services in the past, or are there at present; that means one among every thirty has a direct stake in the security of the country.

Next I want to speak about financial viability. Again I am astounded to hear here and outside that Himachal Pradesh should be financially viable to achieve Statehood. I ask the Ministers here: Has India up till now achieved that stage? Is India in a position to manage without any aid from any quarter and without the huge loans that they float every year? If the entire Union has not been able to fulfil the aspirations of the people, what to speak of this small territory? And is it not a fact that most of the States, from U. P. to Maharashtra and West Bengal which are industrially very much developed, run to the Centre

every now and then asking for assistance either for their Five-Year Plans-or for paying dearness allowance to the teachers? Then why is this fantastic argument advanced against Himachal Pradesh? Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I want to quote a few figures to show that in regard to domestic receipts and disbursements also, Himachal Pradesh stands on a better footing. For example, for Assam in 1965-66 the percentage of Central assistance was 72.8, and in 1966-67, it went up to 76.8. For Jammu and Kashmir, the percentage of Central assistance was 50.6 rising to 77.6 during the same period. For Himachal Pradesh, it was 58.6 and it rose to 66.8—comparatively less. And if you go to the question of receipts and establishment expenditure, then also you will find that in 1963-64, there was a surplus to the tune of Rs. 1.47 crores. In 1964-65, the surplus was Rs. 1.07 crores. In 1965-66, it was surplus to the extent of Rs. 28 lakhs. Only after the integration of a portion of the former Punjab with Himachal Pradesh, the deficit started. And if you take the question of increasing expenditure on the administrative head, many of the States are also facing the same position. I need not go into all those figures. The mover of the Resolution, Mr. Varma, had mentioned about some projects which could earn a lot but which have been neglected. After this integration, more than 6,000 people, Government servants, had to be accommodated in Himachal Pradesh, though most of those people are still applying to the Government of Himachal Pradesh that they do not want to serve there and that they want to go back to Punjab. This is a peculiar position which Himachal Pradesh is facing now, because most of those Government servants have their houses in Punjab and naturally they do not want to serve there and want to go back. So even if all these calculations are taken into consideration, I am sure the domestic receipts and disbursements of Himachal Pradesh will be "plus" and not "minus".

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, before I conclude, I want to highlight one aspect of the matter, that is the regional



aspirations of the people in different parts of this country. Sometimes we talk of integration and in that background, we say that this tendency of regionalism, this tendency of aspirations of certain regions to achieve some better standard of living, goes counter to the aspirations of the entire nation. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I want to plead that it is just the opposite. If the regional aspirations are not fulfilled within the democratic set-up, then, I will plead here, it will create a problem against the very forces of integration. Only when nationalism and regional aspirations are grouped together, can the country achieve maturity and political stability. In this connection, I want to refer to the latest nationalist movement in Scotland. You may have seen in the papers that the Scottish people, who have always been a part of the U. K. have now regional aspirations, with all the political maturity and highest standard of democratic traditions in that country, and are carrying on a movement to have a separate legislature of their own; and to that extent, they have to separate themselves from the U. K. Only two months back I had the occasion to study the problem in Scotland and I had the opportunity to discuss it with all those Scottish Nationalist leaders who have thrown overboard the Labour Party and the Conservative Party; the Scottish Nationalists during the last local bodies elections completely swept the polls and are in power almost in all the municipalities there. Mr. Vice-Chairman, you can imagine the position there: in this twentieth century, when the Mother of Parliaments is there in the U. K., when they have political maturity of such a high standard, the Scottish people there demand a legislature of their own, and not only a legislature, but a separate State. Only two days back I read in the columns of the Guardians that the pressure had been so much that the Conservative Party has set up a committee to go into the question of how the aspirations of the Scottish people can be satisfied, and one of the sitting judges of England is a member of that committee. It is not a committee of the Government but a committee of

the Conservative Party which is the Opposition Party there. I referred to this just to show that the regional aspirations that are developing in the different parts of India are not forces that can be regarded as inimical forces to the forces of integration. They also want that this country should be great. If you want this democracy that is taking root here to prosper, then the only way is to respect the regional aspirations of the people whether they are in Himachal Pradesh, or in Nagaland or in Tamilnad . . .

SHRI A. T>. MANI '(Madhya Pradesh) ... or in Orissa also.

SHRI BANK A BEHARY DAS: Or in Madhya Pradesh, or wherever they may be. Then only integration of sentiments and aspirations can be achieved. Then only the cause of India can be served. The cause of India and the security of India cannot be served only by our armed personnel at the borders of the country, but can only be served when the legitimate demands of the people and the aspirations of the people are satisfied. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am not going to say anything more though I have a lot of material to speak. But I want to know how long this second class statehood will continue. I entirely agree with my friend Mr. Sinha when he referred to the question of the Presidential elections. I think this socialist democracy which the Constitution has conceived, must at least see that not only there is equality between the different States, but there is equality among different citizens also. I want to know how long are you going to treat this Himachal Pradesh, the only class 'C' State in this country which is still remaining as a Centrally-administered territory if historical facts are taken into consideration. When will you include it with other States so that ultimately you can satisfy them without further trouble and discontent. I want to plead here in this House that the Home Minister when he replies will act with grace and will fulfil the wishes of the people of Himachal Pradesh. I hope the hopes

LShri Banka Behary Das.1

and aspirations of the people of Himachal Pradesh as embodied in the unanimous resolution of the Legislative Assembly which has been supported and buttressed by the Members of the Rajya Sabha on both the sides will materialise soon. Thank you. Sir.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Sir, before you call the next speaker I would like to submit to you a matter of grave national importance. Sir, the point is, I am told that the Government is now taking a decision regarding the appointment of the Attorney-General after Mr. Daphtary. This is a matter of real national importance.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA : But how can you bring that matter here now?

SHRI A. D. MANI : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Mani, let him speak.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Sir, Mr. Sinha does not understand the implications. Sir, in this connection. Mr. Ku-maramangalam's name is being heard and the attempt of the Government is to appoint him. If it is a question of seniority, if it is a question of experience. Sir, there are many more senior Advocates-General in the country who could be considered. Sir, as a matter of convenience Mr. Kumaramangalam, who was a card-holding communist member, resigned three or four months prior to his appointment as the Advocate-General of Madras. He continued only for four months as the Advocate General of Madras and since his services were found unsuitable, the next Government did not continue him as the Advocate-General. Now, Sir, when the communists were infiltrating into any other party I had nothing to say. But now there are infiltrating into the Government. You cannot get any communists who are card-holders into the services of the country. It is a statutory post. Sir, the Attorney-General's post is a very important post for the

country. The President has to refer to him many important matters and if a communist comes and gives legal advice to the entire country, God only knows where we are going. Therefore, I would further like to know, Sir, whether in this connection it is not very desirable that the comments of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court should be taken into consideration. I am told and I have my own sources of information that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of India has given adverse comments . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Don't bring in the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court here.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I want to know whether he has given adverse comments or not. The Chief Justice of India has given adverse comments about him. I think it would be very undesirable for the Government to appoint him (Mr. Kumaramangalam). He does not have a national reputation or status so far as law is concerned. Therefore, somebody who enjoys the confidence of the entire country so far as law is concerned, may be posted in that particular position.

SHRI A. D. MANI : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am glad that my honourable friend Mr. Misra has mentioned the possibility of Mr. Kumaramangalam being appointed as the Attorney-General. I happen to know Mr. Kumaramangalam's reputation as a lawyer, as one of the young lawyers of this country. But, Sir, the office of the Attorney-General of the Government of India, since the inauguration of the Republic has been held by lawyers of great repute and not by politicians. Mr. Setalvad was the first Attorney-General and he continued to be the Attorney-General till the other day and when Mr. Ashok Sen put forward the proposal of a party-man as Attorney-General there was a sharp reaction all over the country. The office of the Attorney-General should be held by a professional man who is not committed to any particular point of view. We all know that Mr. Kumaramangalam was a card-holding

member of the communist party and even today he is associated with the communist party. As the Attorney-General he will have access to the secrets of the Government of India and we cannot allow a person having different political views to be appointed as the Attorney-General.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I do not understand the reference to Mr. Kumaramangalam in this manner. The Government is quite right in taking the decision. Whether he was a card-holder or whether a rightist communist or . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Kulkarni, this is not a debate. Please take your seat.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : But Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : There is an end of it, please. Will you please take your seat? (Interruptions) Order, order please.

SHRI S. K. SINGH (Maniour): Sir, I give my wholehearted support to the resolution requesting the Central Government to grant Statehood to Himachal Pradesh. The Central Government will be well advised to appreciate that Himachal is now in such a position as would entitle her to claim full-fledged Statehood for herself as of right. It is, therefore, time for the Central Government to take necessary steps to make Himachal a full-fledged State without further delay.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) in the Chair]

While considering the case of Himachal, I would also like to request the Central Government to consider the cases of other Union Territories, specially the case of Manipur. Manipur has been seething with discontent for not being given Statehood. The emergence of Nagaland as a State, which was merely a district of Assam

only the other day and subsequent inclusion of three sub-divisions of Manipur in the cease fire covered area, have created several problems for Manipur, which can only be solved if Manipur is made a full-fledged State. To cite a few instances of these problems, exercise of administrative functions in the afore-said three sub-divisions by the so-called Federal Government of the Underground Nagas, collection of taxes and levies, oppression and killings of the loyal Nagas by the hostiles are going on unabated since the inclusion of the above areas in the cease fire covered area. On the top of these now comes the threat of dismemberment of Manipur. This is a very crucial problem which compels the urgency of the question of Statehood for Manipur. Not that the so-called Naga delegation from Manipur who recently visited Delhi to meet the Central leaders, has become a great disintegrating force in Manipur. Their move for integration of three Naga-inhabited sub-divisions of Manipur to Nagaland has got no sanction of the Naga people of Manipur. The members of the above delegation are some disgruntled elements; they are not the representatives of the Nagas of Manipur. The real representatives of the Nagas of Manipur are the Naga M.L.A.s of the Manipur Legislative Assembly, who have been elected by the Naga people themselves. These M.L.A.s have not supported this move; on the contrary, they have strongly supported the demand for the Statehood of Manipur in the form of a unanimous resolution of the Manipur Assembly. So one fails to understand at whose instigation and on whose behalf the above mentioned delegation were speaking to the Central leaders.

Even so, I apprehend that this move will gather momentum and the number of the Nagas willing to join Nagaland will increase if the Central Government delays granting of Statehood to Manipur, because the Centre is giving more money and higher political status to Nagaland which is smaller than Manipur in area and population. These are tantalising enough attractions making the Nagas of Manipur itching to get these advantages and facilities by

[Shri S. K. Singh.] joining Nagaland. Moreover the armed persuasion of the Naga hostiles is telling much upon the otherwise unwilling Nagas. This is not to say that the above advantages should not have been given to Nagaland; my only submission is just to depict its repercussions in Manipur in proper perspective. The unrealistic solicitude of the Central leaders to placate the Nagas of Nagaland may also encourage undue ambition on the part of the Nagaland Government.

Apart from the above, this move for integration of the Naga areas of Manipur with Nagaland raises a very important pertinent question to which the attention of the whole country and the Central leaders is respectfully invited. Let us examine how far this move is logical and justifiable though apparently it may seem so. To make the whole situation clear I seek first to explode a myth which may be obsessing the minds of the Central leaders and many other persons. The myth is that many people wrongly think that the Manipuris are quite a different people from the Nagas of Manipur. But that is not so. The Manipuris are as much Nagas as any other Nagas of either Nagaland or Manipur. This is an unchallengeable ethnological and historical fact. The similarities in their physical features and roots of their languages are too obvious to require any further proof. The only difference between the Nagas and the Manipuris is that the Manipuris are Hindus while the Nagas are mostly Christians and that the Manipuris did not claim to be included among the Scheduled Tribes. Otherwise there is no ethnical difference between them. The Manipuris are called the 'Meities' which literally means a mixed people. According to the extant old Puranas of Manipur in some olden days a few kukies, the Nagas and a handful of Aryan elements mostly Brahmins got mixed up to form the mixed community called the Meities, of whom the overwhelming bulk being the Nagas. Those who remained outside this merger continued to be called by their respective tribal clan names. When the Meities were converted into Hinduism, there deve-

loped a sort of social aloofness between the Meities and those who remained outside the above merger. Even now any Naga converted to Hinduism is called a Meitie from the very moment of his conversion. Not less than 70 per cent. Manipuris are Nagas in their origin. Such being the case there can be no question of integration of the Nagas of Manipur with the Nagas of Nagaland by separating them from their closer Naga brothers of Manipur on ethnical grounds. Do they seek the integration on religious ground euphemistically termed as cultural ground to form a sizable Christian State as was contemplated by some missionaries? This, if conceded, I am afraid, will be the first shot on the arm of India's secularism. Some responsible persons in the Government of Nagaland are reported as being behind this move. If the report is found correct, the Central Government should advise the persons concerned to desist from such activities. If the people of Nagaland desire integration, I submit that the whole of Manipur be integrated with Nagaland and that the Meities be declared Scheduled Tribe as they actually are, so that Manipur and Nagaland may form one single State to the great relief of the Central leaders and the whole country. This proposal, if acted upon, will greatly strengthen the cause of peace in Nagaland. Nay it will even lead to the solution of all the outstanding problems of Nagaland and Manipur and there will be no more necessity of continuing the fruitless unending dialogues between the Government of India and the underground Nagas. If this proposal is not feasible, any move from any quarters for integration of the Naga areas of Manipur to Nagaland should be sternly and categorically turned down. I may here remind that it is the responsibility of the Central Government to preserve intact the territorial integrity of Manipur because the inclusion of the aforesaid three subdivisions in the ceasefire-covered area was done without the knowledge and consent of the Manipur Government though there was the popular Ministry in Manipur.

In matters of granting Statehood some people say Nagaland's is a special

case. Well, I contend, if Nagaland deserves special consideration, Manipur deserves it no less but more, because Manipur has a brilliant record of sacrifice for and service to the country proved by historical facts. It is due to the sacrifices and constant fightings of the Manipuris with the foreign invaders that a great sector in the northeastern border of India, could be protected and kept intact. Otherwise a big chunk of the Indian territory in the north-eastern corner up to the district of Cachar would have been taken away by the Burmese in the early part of the British rule. The Manipuris by their constant fightings, sometimes suffering heavy defeats themselves and sometimes inflicting crushing defeats upon the Burmese, could drive away the latter from the Indian soil. Not only that, they could even hold a part of Burma known as Kabau Valley as tribute-paying land. The Manipur Government used to receive an annual tribute of rupees five thousand every year up to the time of the independence. It was only after the independence that our Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru, gave away the above land to the newly independent Burma Government as an earnest of our friendship with that country. The old records in the External Affairs Ministry will be an eloquent testimony to this fact. As such may not the people of Manipur claim a little bit of sympathy from the Government and the people of India to their cause of Statehood? It will be too much to expect that such a virile people as the Manipuris, who have got a long history of glorious achievements of their forefathers and who have got an advanced Vaishnavite culture as is now well known all over India, will remain content with their present status of a second-class citizenship. From time immemorial Manipur has been remaining as a separate State, sometimes a sovereign independent State at that. So it will be doing a simple justice if Statehood is restored to Manipur.

Regarding finance, in these days of planning and developmental works the question of finance has become irrelevant. Moreover the Centre has not yet

done anything for the economic development of Manipur though she is Centre's charge since the integration of the State with the Indian Union in 1949. If the Central Government can give Rs. 20 crores to Nagaland, they need not grouch to give the same amount to Manipur.

Lastly I would like to say a few words about the other Union Territories. According to the ancient Indian polity, India was a land of many States big and small. In the present-day independent Indian Union it may be necessary to revive that pattern with some circumspection in order to preserve unity in diversity. I am confident our national leaders will have the genius and wisdom of tolerating and sustaining some small States in the Indian Union, small States to be born out of the Union Territories. Though initially it may be a burden to the bigger States, it will be worth bearing for the sake of unity and willing co-operation among the diverse elements of Indian humanity.

Thank you.

SHRIMATI SATYAVATI DANG (Himachal Pradesh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to support the Resolution moved by my friend, Shri C. L. Verma, and I am grateful to you for the honour and opportunity given to me for speaking on it. Since this is my first speech in this hon. House, I may be excused for my failings and utilisation of my recorded notes.

This Resolution, Sir, concerns 30 lakh people of the Himalayan territory of Himachal Pradesh who stoutly guard our Indian borders against the Chinese on the one hand and the Pakistanis, our close neighbours, on the other. With all the patronage and interest the Parliament and the Union Government took in the past and the generous manner they provided funds for its development, when it was young and small, for all of which we have always been and still are grateful, I cannot help telling this House how things have changed and how we feel not only lack

[Shrimati Satyavati Dang.]

of sympathy but even lack of understanding by the Government which has special responsibility to look after us and safeguard our interests. My concern, however, is to see that 4 P.M. these borders which are already disturbed, need better and more sympathetic handling and understanding and they should for ever remain attached and loyal to this country. The people there are still loyal and devoted, and have faith in the leadership and this Parliament.

A very genuine and deep feeling in Himachal Pradesh is, that after reorganisation of the Punjab and the inclusion of most of the hill areas of the erstwhile State of Punjab with Himachal Pradesh, increasing its population and area to more than double the original, as has already been mentioned, Himachal Pradesh should have automatically been admitted as a full-fledged State like the States of Punjab and Haryana after reorganisation. If Haryana could be admitted as a State, why not Himachal Pradesh, the people naturally ask.

There are two aspects of this matter which need special attention. One is the moral and the other constitutional. Even though moral considerations appear to recede into the background to-

day, I do not know if our hon. Members of Parliament and Government of India have completely lost faith in them. If they have, I can hardly say anything in the matter. However, my assumption and that of the country is that they have not. Without tracing the whole history of Himachal Pradesh and its formation it may be sufficient to point out that at the time of integration the late Sardar Patel, who brought about this wonderful consolidation of the Indian States, had made a firm commitment that "in the final stage, after this area is sufficiently developed in its resources and administration, it is proposed that its constitution should be similar to that of any other province". I repeat it: 'in the final stage, after this area is sufficiently developed in its resources and administration, it is proposed that its constitution should be similar to that of any other province.' Our very humble submission is that in terms of the late Sardar Patel's letter, dated 18th March 1948 referred to above, we have justified for admission as a full-fledged State and no doubt is left in the matter. It will be a bold person indeed who could say today that Himachal Pradesh had not sufficiently developed in its resources and administration. The following figures will remove any doubts which any person may have :

	H. P. in 1948	H. P. in 1968
Revenue . . . . .	Rs. 8.6 million	Rs. 137.9 million
Area . . . . .	10,600 sq. miles	22,000 sq. miles
Population . . . . .	9,35,000	30 lakhs
Motorable roads . . . . .	200 miles	5000 miles
Schools . . . . .	512	4680
Colleges . . . . .	1	18
Hospitals and Dispensaries . . . . .	88	411
<b>Agricultural Institutions :</b>		
Agricultural Research Sections . . . . .	Nil	37
Seed Multiplication Farms . . . . .	Nil	40
Progeny orchards . . . . .	Nil	67
Area under food production . . . . .	947,000 acres	18,15,000 acres
Area under horticulture . . . . .	539 hectares	8611 hectares
Quantity of fruits grown . . . . .	15,000 quintals	810,000 quintals
No. of districts . . . . .	4	10
No. of tehsils . . . . .	23	38
No. of Govt. employees . . . . .	14,942	96,000
No. of IAS officers . . . . .	2	27
No. of IPS officers . . . . .	Nil	18
Hydel generation . . . . .	200 KW	500 KW

I might particularly mention that in the matter of hydel generation, with the power potential of 65 lakh K.W. we already have the following Projects in hand which when completed within ten years, will generate 11,50,000 K.W. which in terms of money will mean 30,50,00,000 gross per year or 17,25,00,000 nett per year :

To be commissioned at Bassi in December 1968 . . .	45,000 KW
To be commissioned at Giri Bata in 1971 . . .	60,000 ,,
Project report for Suel . . .	2,00,000 ,,
Under investigation Kol Dam . . .	3,20,000 ,,
Under investigation Parvati . . .	5,00,000 ,,

This House will realise, that the Government must stand by its commitments and must honour them. If it does not intend to implement them, let it not make them. But once made, they have to be honoured. There can be no greater damage to Government, if people feel it can go back on its words and that its word is not to be trusted. That will lose people's complete faith in it and lead to extremely bad results.

Speaking on the Constitution (13th Amendment) Bill and State of Nagaland Bill, dated 28-8-62, on granting them Statehood, the late Prime Minister Nehru had said:

"I would submit that even this Parliament is committed to it, apart from the minor points of it, and any hesitation in giving effect to it, will not have good results. It will show that we give our word and cannot keep it, which is not a good thing for a Government, and certainly not for Parliament."

It is worth remembering that no other Union Territory or Centrally-administered area anywhere, had planned its future, before launching a movement for integration with the Centre and obtained such a clear commitment from the Government of India. That is why Himachal Pradesh's claim or request for Statehood should not be mixed up or confused with the demand

for a hill State for Assam or for any other State. As arrangements for Assam, Jammu and Kashmir and Nagaland were all arrived at according to the peculiar conditions of each area and no uniform pattern or set can now be allowed to come in the way of the grant of Statehood for Himachal Pradesh, which is its due.

The other aspect is the constitutional one. Is Himachal Pradesh entitled to become a State as a constituent unit of the great Indian Union and meet its financial responsibilities accordingly. It may surprise you all that till the time of integration Himachal Pradesh was fully financially viable and its establishment charges were more than met by its domestic receipts. The following figures will make that clear:

Domestic receipts	Establishment charges	(In lakh rupees)
		Surplus (+) or deficit (—) after meeting establishment charges
	<b>1963-64</b>	
561.01	413.45	+147.66
	<b>1964-65</b>	
764.38	657.26	+107.12
	<b>1965-66</b>	
839.27	811.14	+28.13

It was a result of integration that a gap has developed between domestic receipts and establishment charges. This was the result of the fact that liabilities of the coming in of merged area were transferred to Himachal Pradesh while her assets were withheld. When the whole area of the Bakra Dam, the whole area of Pong Dam, the whole area of Beas-Sutlej link project, the whole area of Joginder Nagar Power House are completely in Himachal Pradesh, why and how has Himachal Pradesh been denied their ownership, control and management. Even the benefits/revenues that legitimately should have been secured for her, have been denied. By charging a royalty on generation of electricity alone, on the analogy of other States, Himachal Pradesh is entitled to Rs. 2.9 crores yearly. Similarly, out of the water rate at Rs. 12 per acre, which the States of Haryana, Punjab and Rajasthan charge from the growers, out of the water stored by us, on our lands

[Shrimati Satyavati Dang.]

for them, after ousting our people and sinking our most fertile lands, we are entitled to at least Rs. 6 per acre and that would give us a revenue of roughly Rs. 7 crores.

Thus, when the Union Government wants us to meet the establishment charges, let the Rs. 10 crores, which are our due, be credited to us, and this talk of financial viability will come to an end for ever. Let this House not forget that, in spite of all this, Himachal Pradesh is not getting any substantial amount, more than what Jammu and Kashmir and Assam are getting. The following table will make that clear:—

Percentage of Cental Assistance to Expenditure			
	1965-66 (Actuals)	1966-67 (Revised Estimate)	
Assam . . . .	72.8%	76.8%	
Jammu and Kashmir	50.6%	77.6%	
Himachal Pradesh .	58.6%	66.8%	

I hope this hon. House realises that there is no substance in this objection, about financial viability.

I hope it is clear that Himachal Pradesh is in no worse condition than the States of Assam and Jammu and Kashmir and Nagaland even at present, when it gets no share of Central revenue, and in future, while there is hardly much hope of those States improving their financial position, Himachal Pradesh is well set on a course of prosperity and abundance, both for its people and its State.

It is at times said that for purposes of security of the border it may not be a very wise step to grant Statehood to Himachal Pradesh. It is not realised that such a statement is nothing short of an insult to anyone, and more so to a people who have guarded their borders better than most States. When other States were sleeping over it, the Himachal Pradesh Government had taken proper steps to safeguard its borders. You can trust Punjab, you can trust Rajasthan, you can trust West Bengal, you can trust Jammu and

Kashmir and you can trust Nagaland and make them into full-fledged States. But the only Government you are shy to trust is Himachal Pradesh, which is the unkindest thing you can do. I hope no one intends to annoy these border people in this manner. Himachal Pradesh is proud of its services in regard to the defence of her and the country's borders. Out of a total population of 30 lakhs, she has 50,872 ex-Servicemen and 49,487 serving soldiers today, that is, a total of 1,00,359. 6216 families of deceased soldiers and 542 Servicemen from this Pradesh were killed during the Pakistan and China wars. There were 165 winners of Gallantry Awards from this small Pradesh. That shows our contribution in the field of battle.

An hon. Member has brought in the matter of integration of Jammu alone. I wish he had avoided a mention of this subject. The matter of Jammu and Kashmir has international implications and had best be left to the Government of India. However, if it is to be discussed, let it be clear that, as far as Himachal Pradesh is concerned, it would welcome the integration of the whole State of Jammu and Kashmir and not Jammu alone as that will lead to the handing over of Kashmir to Pakistan, which no one in this House or outside can permit.

In the end, I would again appeal to the hon. Members to give their united support to this Resolution and also request the Government to accept it.

With these words, Sir, I close my remarks and thank you.

**श्री रतन लाल (पंजाब) :** उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, वर्मा जी का जो प्रस्ताव हमारे सामने है वह उचित ही है। उसका जो उद्देश्य है वह न्यायसंगत है और संविधान की आकांक्षाओं के अनुसार है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि इस प्रस्ताव पर सदन के जितने सदस्य अभी तक बोल चुके हैं, उन सभी ने इस प्रस्ताव का जोरदार समर्थन किया है। हैरानी



तो इस बात की होती है कि सरकार अभी तक इस मांग को स्वीकार करने से क्यों इन्कार कर रही है। जब स्वर्गीय सरदार वल्लभभाई पटेल 1948 में भारत के गृह मंत्री थे जिनकी बदौलत हमको हिमाचल प्रदेश के अस्तित्व को देखने का अवसर मिला, उन्होंने भी यही सपना देखा था कि हिमाचल प्रदेश की जो छोटी रियासत बनी है, जिसकी आय करीब 80 और 85 लाख के है और जिसकी आबादी करीब 9½ लाख के है और जिसका क्षेत्रफल करीब 10 या 11 हजार वर्गमील है, भविष्य में एक परा स्टेट के रूप में सामने आ जायेगा। इस तरह का उनका विचार था और उन्होंने एक जगह यह बात लिखी है कि जब हिमाचल प्रदेश ठीक प्रकार से डेवलप कर लगा, तो वह भी अन्य राज्यों की तरह एक फुल फ्लैज्ड राज्य बन जायेगा। तो उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती है कि जब पंजाब का पुनर्गठन हुआ था जिसमें सारे का सारा शिमला जिला, गुरदासपुर का सारा जिला, कांगड़ा और होशियारपुर का सारा जिला इसमें शामिल कर दिया गया जिससे इसका क्षेत्रफल 11 हजार वर्ग मील से बढ़कर 22 हजार वर्ग मील हो गया है। जिसकी आबादी 9½ लाख से बढ़ कर 32 लाख हो गई, तो उसको पूरे राज्य का दर्जा क्यों नहीं दिया जाता है जबकि हरियाणा को पूरे राज्य का दर्जा दिया जा चुका है। उचित तो यह था कि जिस समय रियासतों का इन्तर्ग्रहण हुआ था, हरियाणा को पूरे राज्य का दर्जा दिया गया था, उसी समय हिमाचल प्रदेश को भी पूरे राज्य का दर्जा दे दिया जाता। उस समय हिमाचल प्रदेश को पूरे राज्य का दर्जा न दिये जान की बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है।

हिमाचल प्रदेश को पूरे राज्य का दर्जा न देने के बार में कई प्रकार के तर्क दिये जाते हैं। एक तर्क यह दिया गया है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश में इकॉनॉमिक वाइबिलिटी नहीं है, हिमाचल प्रदेश का एरिया बहुत छोटा है, हिमाचल प्रदेश की जनसंख्या थोड़ी है और हिमाचल प्रदेश की आय बहुत थोड़ी है। इसके साथ ही साथ यह भी

कहा जाता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश चूँकि एक बाउंडर एरिया वाला क्षेत्र है, इसलिए वहाँ के लोगों को पूरे राज्य का दर्जा देना खतरे से खाली नहीं है। इस तरह के तर्क हाउस में दिये गये हैं और मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि सरकार की ओर से भी यही तर्क दिये जा रहे हैं या नहीं। अगर यही तर्क सरकार की ओर से दिये जा रहे हैं, तो जो आंकड़े हाउस में प्रस्तुत किये गये हैं वक्ताओं की ओर, वह इन बातों को अच्छी तरह से मीट कर सकते हैं। इन सब आंकड़ों को देखने से फिर सरकार के लिए कोई रास्ता नहीं रह जाता है कि उस क्षेत्र को स्टेटहुड न दे। मैं इस बात की लम्बाई में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ और न उन बातों को दोहराना चाहता हूँ क्यों कि उससे रिपीटिशन होगा लेकिन मैं माननीय सदस्यों का ध्यान इस बात की ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि वे संविधान की धारा एक की ओर देखें। संविधान की पहली धारा के पहले सब में यह लिखा हुआ है :

"India, that is Bharat, shall be a Union of States."

इस धारा का मतलब यह है कि भारत के जो कम्पोनेन्ट्स युनिट्स होंगे, वे स्टेट्स का दर्जा रखेंगे। स्टेट का दर्जा रखने के साथ उसमें रहने वाले सभी लोगों को वही पोलिटिकल और दूसरे अधिकार होंगे जो बाकी फुल फ्लैज्ड स्टेट के लोग इस्तेमाल करते हैं। तो फिर मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश के लोगों को यह अधिकार देने से सरकार क्यों इन्कार कर रही है।

संविधान के प्रिम्बल में भी यह लिखा हुआ है :

"WE, THE PEOPLE OF INDIA, having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a SOVEREIGN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC and to secure to all its citizens EQUALITY of status and of opportunity;"

तो क्या हम हिमाचल प्रदेश के लोगों को इक्वेल आपरच्युनिटी दे रहे हैं। उनको हम स्टेटहुड का दर्जा देने से इन्कार कर रहे हैं, यह

[श्री रतन लाल]

बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है। मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि हम लोग हिमाचल प्रदेश के लोगों को स्टेटहुड का दर्जा न देकर अपने संविधान की अवहेलना कर रहे हैं।

मैं दो तीन बात सदन के सामने विशेषकर रखना चाहता हूँ। पहली बात यह है कि पंजाब के रिआर्गनाइजेशन के फलस्वरूप उसके कुछ भाग हिमाचल प्रदेश के साथ जोड़ दिये गये हैं। कांगड़ा, शिमला, गुरदासपुर और होशियारपुर जिले के कुछ भाग हिमाचल प्रदेश के साथ जोड़ दिये गये हैं। जब ये क्षेत्र पंजाब के साथ मिले हुए थे तो काफी जागरूक थे और वहाँ के लोगों को पोलिटिकल और दूसरे सब अधिकार जो एक एक फुल फ्लेज्ड राज्य के लोगों को मिलते हैं, वे मिले हुए थे। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि जब वे क्षेत्र हिमाचल प्रदेश में मिल गये हैं तो उन लोगों को जो अधिकार पहले मिले हुए थे, वे हिमाचल प्रदेश में मिलने के बाद क्यों खत्म हो गये हैं। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि हिमाचल प्रदेश के लोगों को पूरे स्टेट का दर्जा मिलना चाहिये।

कोई बजह नहीं है, कोई कारण नहीं है, कोई तर्क नहीं है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश को पूरे स्टेट का दर्जा न मिले। इसी प्रकार एक और रेडीकुलस सेचुएशन है जिस की ओर मैं सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। आप को पता है कि पंजाब के जो क्षेत्र उधर गये हैं वहाँ पर काम करने वाले सरकारी कर्मचारी, स्कूलों में या दीगर संस्थाओं में काम करने वाले, मर्ज हुए हैं। उन का भी वहाँ पर ट्रांसफर हुआ है। उन लोगों के बतन जो हैं और हिमाचल प्रदेश जो पहले का था उस के कर्मचारियों के बतन में बहुत फर्क है। एक ही संस्था में काम करने वाले, एक ही स्तर रखने वाले, एक ही जगह काम करने वाले लोगों के ग्रेड जो हैं, पे जो है, डिफरेंट है। यह कैसी एक रेडीकुलस सेचुएशन है जो इस तरह वहाँ पैदा की जा रही है। सवाल यह पैदा होता है कि क्यों ऐसी व्यवस्था नहीं की जा रही है कि इस समस्या का हल

निकले। अगर हम हिमाचल प्रदेश को स्टेट का पूरा दर्जा दे दें तो वह अपनी सारी समस्याएँ मनेज कर सकता है, अपने सारे इम्प्लाइज को एक ही पे-ग्रेड दे सकता है, अपने सारे टीचर्स को और दूसरे लोगों को, जिन की कि प में इस-लिये फर्क है कि कुछ लोग पंजाब से स्थानान्तरित हो गये हैं और कुछ वहाँ के रहने वाले हैं, उन के साथ अन्याय हो रहा है। तो मैं पूरे जोरदार शब्दों में कहना चाहूँगा कि यह फर्क नहीं रहना चाहिये और यह तभी नहीं रह सकेगा कि जब हम हिमाचल को पूरे स्टेट का दर्जा दे देंगे। आप पूछेंगे कि ऐसा क्यों किया जाय। सवाल यह है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश में लेजिस्लेचर है लेकिन उस लेजिस्लेचर के पास वह ताकत नहीं है जो होनी चाहिये। उस को लेजिस्लेशन करने की हिम्मत नहीं है। उस को वह पावर्स नहीं हैं जो कि पूरे स्टेट की होती हैं। वहाँ पर काउंसिल आफ मिनिस्टर्स है, लेकिन उस काउंसिल आफ मिनिस्टर्स के पास वह पावर्स नहीं हैं जो एक पूरे स्टेट की मिनिस्ट्री के पास होती हैं। इसी प्रकार वहाँ पर गवर्नर है, उस के पास वह पावर्स नहीं हैं जो दूसरे गवर्नर्स के पास हैं। कोई भी बात करनी हो, कोई भी ऐक्शन लेना हो, कोई लेजिस्लेशन करना हो, कोई भी अधिक खर्च बर्गैर करना हो, जब तक हरी झंडी केन्द्र से नहीं मिलती वह नहीं कर सकते, एक इच्छा रखते हुए भी वहाँ गवर्नमेंट इम्प्लाइज का ग्रेड एक जैसा होना चाहिये, बाकी दूसरे लोगों का केंडर एक जैसा होना चाहिये, पंजाब के जो लोग उधर गये हैं उनके कारण उन का पोलिटिकल स्टेटस घटना नहीं चाहिये, इस सब के लिये उन की मांग है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश को पूरे राज्य का दर्जा दिया जाय। धन्यवाद।

SHRI G. R. PATIL (Maharashtra) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to participate in this debate. I wholeheartedly and with great pleasure support the Resolution that has been moved by my hon. friend, Mr. C. L. Varna. As you know the only Union territory in the country today which is without Statehood is

Himachal Pradesh. Taking into consideration the historical background of the birth of Himachal Pradesh and the rapid progress that it has made during the last twenty years it will be quite clear that on all counts Himachal Pradesh deserves to be made into a full-fledged State. Here Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether the Government has laid down any criteria for converting a Union Territory into a State. In fact there have absolutely been no such criteria as far as other States that are in existence today are concerned. Even if we apply the so-called criteria—generally referred to by all—namely, area, population and economic viability, I am quite confident that Himachal Pradesh does deserve to be converted into a full-fledged State. As far as area is concerned, it is quite clear that the area of Himachal Pradesh is 22,000 sq. miles and when you compare other States which are full-fledged States in the Indian Union, like Punjab, Haryana, Kerala, Nagaland and also Jammu and Kashmir, it stands to reason that Himachal Pradesh also must be made a full State. As far as population is concerned, I am sorry I will not advocate that Himachal Pradesh should be asked to increase its population because Kerala might be having 30 lakhs of people in one district while the entire Himachal Pradesh might be having only 29 or 30 lakhs. Now, much has been made of economic viability here and I may point out that the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel wrote a letter to the late Pattabhi Seetharamayya Vice-President of the All-India States Peoples Conference on 18th March 1948 and there it is clearly stated:

"The ultimate objective is to enable this area to attain the position of an autonomous province of India. This objective would be attained in two stages. The area will in the first instance be administered by an Administrator, probably an officer of the Chief Commissioner's status, assisted by an advisory council..."

Then it goes on to say :

"Subsequently subject to the decision of the Constituent Assembly it

is proposed that the administration should be put in charge of a Lieut. Governor assisted by an advisory council representing the Princes and a legislature in the province. In the final stage after this area is sufficiently developed in its resources and administration it is proposed that its constitution should be similar to that of any other province."

So applying these criteria given by the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, as far as administration is concerned I cannot say that there is anything wrong with the Himachal Pradesh administration. If the legitimate aspirations, desires, ambitions and sentiments of the people are ignored we know what consequences take place in our country. There are many instances. In fact, by passing a unanimous Resolution in their Assembly they only want to see by constitutional means their legitimate aspirations are fulfilled. We know very well that Himachal Pradesh is a border State or a border Pradesh and therefore it requires special consideration from the Centre from the defence point of view. It is clear that during the last conflict between India and Pakistan the people of this area played a great part. It was the Dogras and Rajputs of Himachal Pradesh who contributed valiantly for the defence of the country. They sacrificed their lives for the sake of the country. Are we not going to take into consideration the sacrifices made by these brave soldiers, this fighting race, for the cause of the country, for the independence and sovereignty of this country ? It is they who are now coming before the Government and demanding, not in any illegitimate manner, not by means of agitation, but by constitutional means that they should be given Statehood. Are we not going to concede their demand ? That is why I say all these aspects should be taken into consideration. Even the late Gopalaswami Ay-yangar, who was Minister of States, had also assured that this area would be brought on par with other States. Are we not going to keep those assurances that were given by the great national leaders of our country ? If the assurances are not heeded, then

[Shri G. L. Patil.] disturbances are created and certain situations arise.

My hon. friend, Mr. Parthasarathy, had made a suggestion that Jammu should be included in all Himachal Pradesh is to be made into a full-fledged State. I for one feel that this suggestion made by Mr. Parthasarathy is not at all relevant as far as conferment of Statehood to Himachal Pradesh is concerned, because today if the question of Jammu and Kashmir is to be taken into consideration then it may perhaps be inferred that India is not laying any claim on Kashmir and so many complications are likely to arise by bringing in the question of Jammu here. I personally feel that the question of integration of Jammu with Himachal Pradesh should not be considered when the question of converting Himachal Pradesh into a full State is being decided. I am quite confident that as facts stand today Himachal Pradesh deserves to be constituted into a full-fledged State. I do not wish to repeat what other hon. Members have said but I would only like to warn the Government that if the legitimate aspirations, ambitions, sentiments and desires of the people are trampled upon, if they are not heeded to, perhaps it might lead to some complications and disturbances in the border areas and my personal request is that we should not do anything whereby such situations may develop. Once again I sincerely and wholeheartedly support this Resolution moved by my friend, Mr. C. L. Varma.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, this question has been raised in this House on earlier occasions and we have had the opportunity of putting forward the Government's viewpoint on this matter. Nobody would be happier than the Government of India, if they could soon abolish all the Union territories and either give them Statehood, wherever possible, or merge them with the adjoining States, so that normal conditions could prevail in those areas. As

he hon. House knows, these Union territories were created because of the special circumstances obtaining in those areas like Goa, Pondicherry, Manipur, Tripura, NEFA, Himachal Pradesh, Nagar Haveli, Dadra, etc. Wherever we find that conditions do not exist which justify continuance of the Union territory, we shall not hesitate, even for a moment, either to merge it with the adjoining State or give it Statehood.

Himachal Pradesh is the biggest Union territory in our country from the point of view of size and there is some kind of public support to the demand that Himachal Pradesh should become a full State. We have full sympathy for this demand. We do not want to hold back Statehood from Himachal Pradesh a day longer than necessary. As a matter of fact it is our firm policy to help Himachal Pradesh gain financial resources as quickly as possible and once their financial resources become equal to their requirements and they obtain the condition of financial viability, we would not hesitate to give it Statehood. The only thing that hinders the consideration or conceding of the request is that today as the figures are before us, there is a large gap between their revenue and expenditure, between their resources and requirements. That is why. . .

**श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव (बिहार) :** मैं एक क्लैरिफिकेशन चाहता हूँ। नागालैंड के फाइनेंशियल रिसोर्सेज में और हिमाचल प्रदेश के फाइनेंशियल रिसोर्सेज में क्या फर्क है ?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: The hon. Member is a new Member in this House. This matter has been raised and replied to several times, but I will again state what it is. The hon. House knows what is the background to the creation of Nagaland. It is not as if there was a war or there was disquiet or there was violence in Nagaland and so Nagaland was created, or because these things are absent in

Himachal Pradesh, it is not getting Statehood. That is not the point.

**श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव :** अब मेरा एक दूसरा कन्फ्रिकेशन होगा। आप मुझे नया सदस्य कह कर के इस बात को टाल नहीं सकते हैं।

**श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल :** टाल नहीं रहा हूँ।

**श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव :** मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जिस प्रकार आंध्र प्रदेश का निर्माण हुआ किसी के शहीद होने पर या नागालैंड का निर्माण हुआ इस लिए कि वह बायलेंस हो गया, क्या उसी प्रकार जब तक बायलेंस नेचर हिमाचल प्रदेश स्वीकार नहीं करे तब तक भारत सरकार उसको स्टेट का स्टेटस देने के लिये तैयार नहीं है?

**श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल :** ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है। इस बात से कुछ तय नहीं होता है। बायलेंस करें या न करें उससे कुछ नहीं होता है। मेरिट्स पर हर चीज देखी जाती है। और फिर उस पर कुछ निर्णय लिया जाता है। नागालैंड में कुछ विशेष परिस्थितियाँ हैं। काश्मीर में कुछ विशेष परिस्थितियाँ हैं और उन के कारण कुछ विशेष ढंग का वहाँ काम किया जा रहा है। बायलेंस हो या बायलेंस न हो उस से कोई खास फर्क नहीं होता है।

जहाँ तक आन्ध्र प्रदेश की बात है, मैं माननीय सदस्य को याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के पहले ही इस बात का निश्चय अखिल भारतीय कांग्रेस कमेटी के द्वारा कर लिया गया था कि स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के बाद भारतवर्ष में भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना होगी। यह बात ठीक है कि स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के एक दम बाद भाषावार प्रान्त नहीं बनाये गये, कुछ उस में बायलेंस हुआ, कुछ उस में इस तरह की बातें हुई, उस के बाद यह हुआ। पर यह जो सिद्धांत था यह पहले से मान लिया गया था कि ऐसा करना है और करने की बात भी थी। इस लिये इस तरह से अब कहना कि वहाँ पर चूँकि आन्दोलन नहीं

हुआ या खून-खराबी नहीं हुई इस लिये कुछ नहीं किया जा रहा है, ऐसी बात नहीं है। नागालैंड और काश्मीर दो ऐसे स्थान हैं जहाँ पर बड़ी विशेष परिस्थितियाँ हैं। और इस कारण वहाँ पर इस तरह का इंतजाम किया गया। वैसी ही दूसरे ढंग की विशेष परिस्थितियाँ हमारी दूसरी नियत यूनिटेरिटेरीज में हैं जैसे गोआ में हैं या पांडुचरी में हैं और वहाँ पर दूसरी तरह का इंतजाम किया गया। जहाँ सामान्य रूप की परिस्थितियाँ हैं वहाँ पर हम ने साधारण सामान्य रूप से राज्य शासन दिया हुआ है और जहाँ तक हिमाचल प्रदेश का सवाल है हम यह कहते हैं कि हम वहाँ पर सामान्य रूप से राज्य शासन देने के लिये तैयार हैं और इस में हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं है, पर हमें इसकी आर्थिक अवस्था देखनी है कि कहीं यह केन्द्रीय सरकार पर एक बोझ न बढ़ जाय। इस को इस तरह से बनाया जाय, जिस से वहाँ की जो आर्थिक अवस्था है, जो वहाँ के आर्थिक साधन हैं वे इतने बढ़ा दिये जाय कि वे खुद अपना पूरा खर्चा सम्हाल सकें। और हर तरह से अपना काम चला सकें। इस के बाद हमको किसी तरह से इस में आपत्ति नहीं होगी कि इस को स्टेटहुड दिया जाय। जैसा मैंने कहा, हमारी सद्भावना भी इस के साथ है और हमारे प्रयत्न भी यह हैं कि हम इन को इस बात में सहायता करें कि धीरे धीरे या जल्दी से जल्दी ये ऐसी स्थिति में पहुँच जायें जहाँ ये स्टेटहुड ले सकें। इस को हम किसी तरह से रोकना नहीं चाहते हैं। जहाँ तक गृह मंत्रालय का सवाल है या भारत सरकार का सवाल है, हम को कोई यूनियन टेरिटरी रखने में खुशी नहीं होती है। उस से हम लोगों की तकलीफें ही बढ़ती हैं, मुश्किलें ही बढ़ती हैं और किसी तरह से हम लोगों को कोई फायदा नहीं होता। इस लिये माननीय सदन को मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी इस में कोई रुचि नहीं है कि हम यूनियन टेरिटरीज रखें। दिल्ली की एक विशेष अवस्था है और वहाँ की बात छोड़ दीजिये। दिल्ली छोड़ कर के बाकी दूसरी जगहें जो यूनियन टेरिटरीज हैं उन का यह स्टेटस आगे या पीछे या भविष्य में समाप्त ही होना है।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाव यादव : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ . . .

श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल : मैं आपसे निवेदन करूंगा कि आप मुझे बोलने की इजाजत दीजिये ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : You have made your point.

श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल : तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि जहाँ तक हिमाचल प्रदेश की इस माँग का सवाल है उसमें हम लोगों को किसी प्रकार की कोई आपत्ति नहीं है । हम आशा करते हैं कि धीरे धीरे या शिघ्रातिशीघ्र ऐसा मौका आयेगा जब हम इन की इस माँग को पूरा कर सकेंगे ।

मैं इस बात को भी दोहराना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरफ जो इन के प्रयत्न हो रहे हैं उन प्रयत्नों में हम पूरी तरह से सहायता कर रहे हैं । मैं हिमाचल प्रदेश के शासन को इस बात के लिए बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले दस पंद्रह सालों में उन्होंने इस दिशा में बहुत अच्छा काम किया है और हिमाचल प्रदेश में अच्छी प्रगति हुई है । उन्होंने अपने साधन बढ़ाए हैं और इसी तरह से यदि वे अपना काम करते जायेंगे और अपने साधनों को बढ़ाते जायेंगे तो वह दिन दूर नहीं है जब कि उन्हें स्टेटहुड मिल सकेगा ।

इस लिए मैं आशा करता हूँ कि जो मैंने बातें कही हैं उन पर ध्यान दे कर के हम इस प्रस्ताव पर विचार करेंगे । हम लोगों को चाहिये कि हम इस तरह से रुचि ले कि हिमाचल प्रदेश को जल्दी से जल्दी स्टेटहुड मिल सके ।

MISS M. L. MARY NAIDU (Andhra Pradesh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I support the Resolution moved by my hon. friend, Mr. Varma. I heard the Minister of State giving his explanation for not giving Statehood to Himachal Pradesh immediately, although he promised

that it will be given as soon as possible, sooner than we expect it. Still I would like to bring to the notice of the Minister of State, who, I am sure, is a father, a little example. All the Members of this House also are responsible, loving parents. As such, you all know that when a grown-up daughter is there before you, you soon look around and see that she is settled down in marriage and has a home of her own. If the parents do not do that, everybody knows what follows. She will have to demand that she be given a partner to settle down. Still if you do not yield to her pleadings, she will pretty soon run away with somebody or seek her own way.

So, the Central Government which is in the place of a mother must think that Himachal Pradesh is ready. According to the statements given by all the Members of Himachal Pradesh, they have fully grown up now. They have explained point by point that they are ready to take the management of their own State if Statehood is given to them. The only point the Minister of State, Mr. Shukla, said is that according to the finances there is still some difficulty. Even on that my friend, Mrs. Satyavati Dang, has explained and said that there is a lot due to them from Bhakra Dam and from all other projects that are in Himachal Pradesh, the benefits of which are going to other States. If those are given to them, then they do not need to depend on the Centre at all. So, if you go through their speeches, you will realise how much they are wanting to stand on their own legs. If you do not give it to them, you will pretty soon find that they will be like the girl who is fully grown up and who is ready to run away from home. Let us not have that situation created in the present times when we have enough of troubles. We cannot run after a grown-up daughter who is discontented.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: The House is unanimous about its Statehood. Let us pass it and strengthen his hands.

MISS M. L. MARY NAIDU : Unlike many other resolutions this resolution

is supported by all the Members of the House, by all parties. When everybody is in favour of it, when every Member of Himachal Pradesh is demanding it, it is very very unusual for a parent, to sit down and say the time has yet to come. The time has come, and I hope that the Government will pretty soon see that it is given before any irresponsible people take undue advantage of the situation and start agitations. (Interruption.) Government has got so much work, it has got to do so many other things, that it does not find time. In this case I entreat the Government really to see that the Government finds time because the Himachal Pradesh people, from the accounts given, far from being uneducated have become very well educated, far from being uncultured—not uncultured, I do not mean to say it from the cultural point of view; I mean from the point of view of not wanting things—they have built themselves up so quietly and so efficiently. Now they say their difficulty, if I may bring it to the notice of the hon. Minister, is this, which every State finds also, which they find in a little more intensive way. For everything they have to come to the Centre. Coming to the Centre they have to stand at the door of the Secretary begging for things. If the Central Government as a mother really had the interests of Himachal Pradesh at heart, why is there no university in Himachal Pradesh?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Step mother.

MISS M. L. MARY NAIDU: Not step mother. It is its own child which is rather a dumb child, it does not shout loud. (Interruption.) Like a quiet child poor Himachal Pradesh did not demand it loudly. So they are taking it easy giving it to those who cry loud. Because they did not cry loud, they did not get it. Like this there are many other projects which are demanding their attention but which are not finding a place in the eyes of the Central Government. So, they have come. I need not repeat all that they have demanded all this time. They have said that they are ready for Statehood.

I entreat the Minister once again, before it is too late, before they begin to agitate, to please see that they are given their full Statehood.

Thank you.

SHRI A. D. MANI : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to support the resolution moved by my friend, Mr. Varma, which has received the enthusiastic support of all sections of this House. I do not think that in the recent history of our House there has been any resolution or any proposition which has received such unanimous support as this resolution of Mr. Varma has done. I do not want to go over the entire ground which has already been traversed by previous speakers about the history of this agitation for making Himachal Pradesh a full-fledged State of the Union. We have set to redeem the pledge given by Sardar Patel in 1955 to the people of Himachal Pradesh, and they have shown by their performance that they have fulfilled the criteria which have been set before them by Sardar Patel.

I would like to draw the attention of my hon. friend, Mr. Shukla, who comes from Madhya Pradesh as I do to some of the remarkable figures which have been placed before this House. Motorable roads in 1948—200. They are now 5,000.

I do not think in Madhya Pradesh we have got a comparable performance in a very well-organised State of the Union. Hospitals and dispensaries in 1948—88. They are now—411.

My hon. friend, Mr. Shukla knows that there are areas in Madhya Pradesh where there are dispensaries without doctors. If Himachal Pradesh could have made such remarkable strides, it certainly deserves the warmest support of Parliament and the Government.

Nagaland occupies an area of 4,000 square miles; Haryana 17,000 square miles; Punjab 19,000 square miles; Kerala, the torch-bearer of Communism in this country, 21,000 square miles; Himachal Pradesh 22,000 square miles. If we can permit the people of Kerala

[Shri A. D. Mani] to experiment in Communism in that part of our sub-continent, why cannot we allow the people of Himachal Pradesh to experiment in freedom and autonomy ?

SHRI KESAVAN (THAZHAVA) : (Madras) : No State as Kerala State was given to us by the Union of India. Before integration Kerala formed three States. Travancore State and Cochin State were independent States before the independence of British India. Malabar was part of Madras State.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I accept the correction. If in Kerala . . .

SHRI KESAVAN (THAZHAVA) : If the population of Himachal Pradesh is very thin, we from Kerala will go there and settle down.

SHRI A. D. MANI: If we can have an experiment in Communism in Kerala, why cannot we have an experiment in self-respect and autonomy in an area of 22,000 square miles ? In square mile area, as my hon. friend, Mr. Shukla, pointed out, it is the biggest Union Territory in India. They have shown by their own performance and their record of work that they are entitled to Statehood.

I would like to mention here that fourteen long years ago Dr. Zakir Husain, Mr. T. N. Singh, myself and Mr. Jaipal Singh as members of the Press Commission visited Himachal Pradesh. We met at that time a very young man, who has become older in years, Dr. Parmar. We were greatly struck by the vitality of the new State and by the leadership of the new State. If my friend would not mind my saying so, one of the drawbacks we noticed at that time and which we point out now is that there is no press in Himachal Pradesh excepting two newspapers published irregularly in Simla. He knows it very well. In fact if there is no press, it is not possible to maintain a fully developed public life. When they are thinking of Statehood, they should also think of newspapers and journalists who can make public opinion. There are no newspapers in Himachal Pradesh. (Interruption.) Unless we

have a well-developed Press, it is not possible to develop Himachal Pradesh.

5 P.M.

I would like to deal with one argument of my hon. friend, Mr. Shukla, regarding the viability of this area. If the viability of an area is to be the test of a Statehood, Assam should cease to be a State because it gets as much as 72.4 per cent in the way of assistance from the Centre. Jammu and Kashmir should also cease to be a State because it gets 58.6 per cent from the Centre. Himachal Pradesh gets 58.6 per cent also. Now, if it is a question of viability, we should not allow these two States to exist. And I feel that financial argument should not "be trotted out by the Home Ministry to stand in the way of Himachal Pradesh becoming a full-fledged State of the Union.

I would like to make one observation regarding the set-up in some of these border States. I hope my friend, Mr. Varma, and Mrs. Dang will accept the suggestion that I want to make that in regard to these border States where our internal security is involved, they should have some kind of a Central assistance in regard to the maintenance of surveillance, equipment and arrangement. I would like to suggest that in a very sensitive area like Himachal Pradesh there should be an adviser of the Central Government to advise in regard to intelligence matters so that the advice of the Central Government may also be available to the State Government, with the slight modification of the State's autonomy.

I support very cordially the Resolution which has been moved by Mr. Varma and I hope that this Resolution will be voted upon by this House and carried with acclamation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I wish to move that the question be now put, because sufficient discussion has taken place. Nobody has opposed it. We can pass it by voting. The point is for you to decide now. You see, here practically every Member is supporting it. We do not debate for the luxury of a



debate. When there are controversies between the two sides, we discuss matters in order to find arguments for and against. Then, he is not even a Member of this House. He has stated the position of the Government. Mr. Shukla certainly has intervened on behalf of the Government, not being a Member of the House. But it is all right, he has done it. But the Members of our House have sufficiently discussed it. All of us have spoken in favour of the Resolution. The simple thing I would ask Mr. Varma is not to reply. Closure you accept. Put it to vote and have it passed. You have got a chance to have it passed. It is for the Government to accept the Resolution or not to accept it. That we will discuss. It is another matter.

SHRI A. D. MANI : When you have moved the closure motion, you cannot speak now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I know it.

SHRI A. D. MANI : I know much more than that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Important views are to be expressed. Mr. Pande.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, I am gratified that there is widespread support to this Resolution in this House. If I stand to speak, this is of one reason . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What has happened to my closure motion?

SHRI C. D. PANDE : The closure motion is lost.

SHRI A. D. MANI : On a point of order. When a Member under the Rules moves for closure, it has got to be put without a word of speech. And since he is going to speak, it should be put.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Mr. Vice-Chairman, after my speech . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I have moved the closure motion. You have to put it. It is under the Rule.

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated) : If a motion for closure is formally moved, as I presume the hon. Member intends to do, then in the first instance it is for the Chair to give his consent. The Chair must first determine whether such a motion should be placed before the House or not. It should use its own discretion. When the Chair has exercised its discretion in favour of the Member, then alone can the closure motion be put. You should, Sir, decide one way or the other.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : The very fact that he has called me means that I should speak.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Kaul is quite right. Do not take time like this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : The Chair is of the view that since some of the important views are yet to be expressed, this will not be given consent.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : How do you know ? No, no. Why do you say so? (Interruptions.) Now, on a point of order. Kindly give me the Rules.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : On a point of order. Sir, you have given the ruling. After that there is no question.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I will ask him to reconsider his ruling.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : No, no, it is not the way.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Which, rule you are acting under?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Rule No. 244.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Rule No. 244?

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Find out.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It says :

"At any time after a motion has been made, any Member may move, "That the question be now put"

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta] which I did and I sought your permission for it—

and, unless it appears to the Chairman that the motion is an abuse of these rules or an infringement of the right of reasonable debate, the Chairman shall then put the motion : "That the question be now put".

Let me develop my argument. You are guided by three considerations. First of all, about 'abuse of these rules', I do not think after the debate the previous day and today. . . {Interruption by Shri Pande.) Please, Mr. Pande, let me finish my argument. This motion is being debated for the last two non-official days and therefore you cannot say that I have invoked this rule which amounts to an abuse of the rules. Normally in the other House and in this House. . . (interruptions.) Please for goodness sake, let me develop my argument. You see, it is not an abuse of the rule, whatever view you may hold. In fact, the Business Advisory Committee gives time. I should like to know how much time the Advisory Committee has given.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Any amount.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Secondly, ""an infringement of the right of reasonable debate".

SHRI M. N. KAUL : That is for the Chair to determine.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am coming to that. Mr. Vice-Chairman, are you so impatient. Now, I precisely say that a reasonable debate has taken place and the debate is so abundantly in favour of the Resolution that, well, except for the Home Minister, the Government, nobody spoke against it.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : That is for the Chair to decide.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : He says that it is for the Chair to decide. He said that some other viewpoints are to be expressed. Nowhere is it said that the Chair can make a suggestion or a

provocation that other viewpoints should be expressed. The only thing for the Chair to consider is—you, Sir, are from this side—whether a reasonable debate has taken place, reasonable from the point of view of time, reasonable from the point of view of freedom of expression and privilege of the Members of the House. The debate has travelled from this corner to that corner and back to this corner again. And it has been abundantly shown that we are all as if in a symphony of support in regard to this matter. Therefore, a reasonable debate has also taken place. So, you would be justified in at least putting it to vote. Let them defeat it and have a debate. If anybody thinks that a reasonable debate has not taken place, Mr. Vice-Chairman, he can vote against it and defeat my motion. Discussion goes on. I am not binding your hand. It will be most uncharitable if even after such . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : You kindly take your seat. You have made your point.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab) : I agree with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta only to the extent that there has been no abuse. But the point still holds that you have already given your ruling. After that, nobody has any right to question it and thereby make a speech as the hon. Member has done. Secondly, as for the question whether a sufficient debate has taken place, you alone are the judge. I walked up to you to know whether I could get one or two minutes. It is not that I had new things to say. But it is also my privilege to speak. You said, we are closing this at five, that the discussion will go on till next time and that I will get an opportunity.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : On a point of order. Mr. Vice-Chairman, if you have said this thing, with all respect to you, you have prejudged this House, prejudged the Rules of Procedure of this House. How can you say these things?

SHRI C. D. PANDE : These words are derogatory to the Chair,

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI): Mr. Gupta, you have had your say. Let others say.

DR. ANUP SINGH : Mr. Vice-Chairman. . . (Interruption by Shri Bhupesh Gupta)—I listened to you. I did not interrupt you. Please have patience. There are at least 15 or 20 other names. (Interruption by Shri Bhupesh Gupta.) Nobody has the right, even the great, great Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, has no right to anticipate what these Members are going to say. Let somebody oppose introduction of this closure at this stage. You are depriving others of their right.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : At 5 o'clock there is a discussion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is 5 o'clock and the Private Member's Bill is over. Sir, you cannot carry on beyond 5 o'clock.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : A reasonable debate is subject to criterion. The Chairman has the discretion and I think that from this point of view it should continue.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Reasonable or not, it is 5 o'clock and it is over for the time being.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI): Mr. Bhargava.

**HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION ON  
POINTS ARISING OUT OF ANSWER  
TO STARRED QUESTION NO. 298  
ANSWERED ON THE 5TH AUGUST,  
1968**

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I wish to raise a discussion on the points arising out of the answer to starred question No. 298 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 5th August, 1968, regarding vigilance work by Senior Deputy General Managers of Railways. Now, to refresh the memory of the House I will read out the question and the answers given by the hon. Minister. The question was : —

(a) whether it is a fact that in the Zonal Railways, Senior Deputy

General Managers also look after the vigilance work;

(b) whether it is a fact that some of the Senior Deputy General Managers have been detected to have indulged in corrupt practices themselves ;

(c) if so, the number of such Senior Deputy Genral Managers, zone-wise who indulged in corrupt practices during last 5 years; and

(d) the nature of corrupt practices indulged in by each of them and the action taken against each of them?"

The reply of the Minister was :

"(a) Yes, Sir. The Senior Deputy General Managers on the seven major Zonal Railways and Deputy General Managers on the remaining two Railways (North Eastern and Northeast Frontier) have been designated as Chief Vigilance Officers who look after the Vigilance work.

(b) to (d) Complaints were received against two Chief Vigilance Officers of the Zonal Railways, one in the year 1966 and the other in 1967. On investigation, the allegations against one of them were not substantiated and the case was closed in consultation with the Central Vigilance Commission. As regards the other officer, the allegations refer to irregular promotion/appointmjnt of two employees. The allegations have been investigated by the Vigilance Directorate of the Railway Board and the question of initiating action against the officer in the light of the report and the Central Vigilance Commission's advice thereon is under consideration".

Now, as far as the one officer, against whom the allegations have not been substantiated, is concerned we need not go into that question here. We have, therefore, to see the allegations against the other officer.

I understand that the whole investigation against this particular officer started on the alleged complaint by a Member of the other House which was sent to the Central Vigilance Commis-