

Oil Corporation Limited., (Marketing Division).

(f) Forty-seventh Report on Public Relations and Publicity in Public Undertakings.

(g) Fifty-first Report on State Trading Corporation of India Limited.

—

MINUTES OF THE SITTINGS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS

MISS M. L. M. NAIDU (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, on behalf of Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the Minutes of the sittings of the Committee on Public Undertakings relating to the following Reports:—

(a) Twenty-fifth Report on Praga Tools Ltd., (Paras in Section IV of Audit Report (Commercial), 1968).

(b) Twenty-sixth Report on Trombay Unit of Fertilizer Corporation of India (Paras in Section II of Audit Report (Commercial), 1968).

(c) Twenty-seventh Report on Hindustan Cables Ltd., (Paras in Section II of Audit Report (Commercial), 1968).

(d) Forty-second Report on Magaon Dock Ltd., Bombay.

(e) Forty-third Report on Sindri Unit of Fertilizer Corporation of India (Paras in Section II of Audit Report (Commercial), 1968).

(f) Forty-fourth Report on Fertilizers and Chemicals, Travancore, Ltd.

(g) Forty-sixth Report on Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Ltd.

(h) Forty Seventh Report on Public Relations and Publicity in Public Undertakings.

(i) Forty-ninth Report on Industrial Finance Corporation of India.

(j) Fifty-first Report on State Trading Corporation of India

(k) Action taken on Reports Nos Twenty-second-Twenty-third Twenty-fourth, Twenty-eighth to Forty-first, Forty-fifth, Forty-eighth and Fiftieth; and

(l) Procedural and Miscellaneous Matters.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): The House stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at two minutes past one of the clock.

—

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the Clock—THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

THE CONSTITUTION (TWENTY-SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL, 1968—*contd.*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
Mr. Purkayastha.

SHRI M. PURKAYASTHA (Assam): Madam Deputy Chairman though belated, I welcome the introduction of this Bill. This Bill is evidently based on the statement made by the Government of India on the 11th September, 1968. I am sorry to say that this Bill does not offer a permanent and lasting solution to the problem of Assam. It only envisages piecemeal solution of the problem of Assam. It does not mention about Cachar and Mizo districts, and without solving the problems of Cachar and Mizo districts, the problems of Assam cannot be solved.

The special position of the hill areas in Assam was recognised by the Constitution-framers and so in the

Bill, 1968

Constitution there was the Sixth Schedule which created district councils for six hill districts of Assam. But the district councils could not function properly because of lack of co-operation from the Assam Government. They did not place adequate funds at the disposal of the district councils. The Planning Commission enquired into this allegation made by the hill leaders and found truth in it and recommended separate allocation of funds for the hill areas of Assam. The whole trouble in Assam is because the rulers of Assam, majority of whom come from the Assamese-speaking people, regard only those who speak Assamese as Assamese and not those who live in Assam. If the connotation of the term "Assamese" meant all people living in Assam and if the Assam Government recognised it, then there would be no problem of the hill areas, there would be no problem of Nagaland and there would be no problem of NEFA. Nagaland would not have been created, NEFA would not have separated and now we would not have to consider the creation of a Sub-State for the hill areas of Assam.

Madam Deputy Chairman, during the last few years what we have seen is that the Assam Government had been paying attention only to the development of the Assamese-speaking regions. Three universities were started and they are in the Assamese-speaking region. Two medical colleges are there in Assam and they are in the Assamese-speaking region. Two engineering colleges, one agricultural college and one veterinary college are there, but all of them are in the Assamese-speaking region, though out of 11 districts, as many as five are non-Assamese-speaking regions. So there was the demand by the APHLC for the creation of a separate Hill State.

Madam Deputy Chairman, the States Reorganisation Commission examined the demand for the creation of a separate Hill State and recommended against it. They recommended the maintenance of the multi-lingual character of Assam. But that

multi-lingual character was disturbed by the introduction of the Assam Official Language Act in 1960. The Act was passed in 1960 and the All Party Hill Leaders Conference was born after the passing of that Act, in October 1960. Since then the All Party Hill Leaders Conference is agitating for the creation of a separate Hill State. I must pay a tribute to the leadership of the All Party Hill Leaders Conference because though they have complete hold over the hill people, they have shown enough patience and prudence, and they have shown a high sense of patriotism by responding to the Government of India's call whenever they asked for patience.

Madam Deputy Chairman, this Bill envisages the creation of a Sub-State comprising, whether wholly or in part, all or any of the tribal areas of Assam. I would urge the Home Minister when he brings forward the Assam Reorganisation Bill—because this is only an enabling legislation—to bring all the hill areas of Assam under one Sub-State. What is envisaged in the statement of the Government of India is that North Cachar and Mikir hills will be given the option to join the Sub-State or not to join it. I think this option should not be there. The Assam Government is taking advantage of the backwardness and comparative illiteracy there and they have demanded that this option should be given to the Mikir Hills and the North Cachar Hills. What I say is that all the hill areas should be brought under one administration, one Sub-State comprising the Khasi Hills, Garo Hills, Mikir Hills, North Cachar Hills and Mizo Hills. In North Cachar and Mizo Hills, they have got 4 MLAs and the Assam Government, in their policy of divide and rule, have made three of them Ministers and the other has been made Chief Executive Councillor of the Mikir Hills District Council. And in order that the Chief Executive Councillor can stay in office, they have postponed the election of the Mikir District Council twice. It was due in 1967, but it was postponed. Again in 1968 it was postponed. And it may again be postponed in 1969.

[Shri M. Purkayastha]

Madam Deputy Chairman, this Mizo National Front which is leading the revolt in the Mizo Hills is the creation of the Assam Government. To weaken the Mizo Union which was supporting the Hill State, they gave all sorts of support to this Mizo National Front and placed huge funds at their disposal with which they built up their organisation and militia, and ultimately they revolted against the Assam Government and the Union Government. I have said that the All Party Hill Leaders Conference have a hold over the people of Mizo Hills and if the Mizo Hills are brought under the Sub-State, I am sure they would be able to restore peace and order in the Mizo Hills. Now what is the situation in the Mizo Hills today? There is no peace, no tranquillity, though for the time being there is no disturbance because the whole district has been brought under military control all these three years. Curfew is continuing for more than three years. The people cannot go out of their houses between sunset and sunrise. What does it mean to the people of the district? You can well imagine that. Therefore, I would urge upon the Government of India to bring the whole of the hill area under one administration. In this connection, I would also urge upon the Home Minister to consider the case of Cachar which is a Bengali-speaking area and which is agitating for its legal and legitimate status in Assam or in the North-East Frontier.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I may also mention about the Assam Official Languages Act. When that Assam Official Languages Act was passed—it was an obnoxious measure—which would enable the Assam Government to impose Assamese on the people of Cachar, we sent a representation to the Government of India, we sent a deputation to the Prime Minister, the Home Minister and others, but with no result. Then there was a movement by the people of Cachar and in that movement as many as 11 people, including one girl, died. And then the Home Minister Shri Shastri intervened and got that clause deleted from

the Assam Official Languages Act. In the present case also a deputation has gone to the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister and the Home Minister. Meetings, processions, conventions, have been held..

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI (Assam): Madam, on a point of clarification

SHRI M. PURKAYASTHA: Meetings, processions, conventions, have been held..

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI: Madam, on a point of clarification

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Unless he yields how can you ask?

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI: How does the Official Languages Act come in this?

SHRI M. PURKAYASTHA: Meetings and conventions have been held and we have urged the Home Minister to consider the case of Cachar. But nothing has been done. It seems the Government is not giving due attention to it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must wind up.

SHRI M. PURKAYASTHA: Just two minutes, Madam. Let me tell the Home Minister that if the demand of the people of Cachar is not considered, then there will be a movement, I am not holding any threat. But I am only giving expression to the feeling of the people of Cachar. Madam Deputy Chairman, a provocation to the people of Cachar has been created when the Gauhati University declared the introduction of the regional language at all stages of university education. The Vice-Chancellor declared that by the "regional language" they meant "Assamese". If Assamese is attempted to be imposed on Cachar through the back door, through the university I am sure, the people of Cachar will not tolerate it. They can

only impose Assamese on the dead bodies of the people of Cachar. Assamese will not be allowed to be introduced either through the Official Languages Act or through the university. Therefore, I would urge upon the Government and the Home Minister to consider the case of Cachar which is a Bengali-speaking area and for which the States Reorganisation Commission recommended that Tripura, which is contiguous to Cachar and which also speaks Bengali, and Cachar should be merged together and formed into a Commissioner's Division in Assam. But this was not done. And now if a Sub-State is created and Cachar is left with Assam, there will be discontent, there will be constant agitation . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must wind up now. There are so many speakers.

SHRI M. PURKAYASTHA: It is a vital problem for our district. I shall take only two minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. You were finishing and now you want two minutes more.

SHRI M. PURKAYASTHA: I was the first to speak.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Even if you were the first to speak, you will not get more.

SHRI M. PURKAYASTHA: I may just remind the Home Minister that at the time of partition, the District Congress Committees of Cachar, Manipur and Tripura, were under the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee and immediately after partition there was a joint move by all these Committees for the formation of a State Congress Committee with Tripura, Manipur and Cachar. Actually in September 1948 a Congress Province was created by a resolution of the Congress Working Committee but due to opposition from the Assam Government and the Chief Minister of Assam, that resolution was rescinded in December 1968. Instead of

what could be one State in that place we now find that there is one Union Territory for Tripura, one for Manipur and Cachar is under Assam. Mizo is practically under military administration. The Home Minister stands for the unification of linguistic areas. He also arranged for the unification of the Marathi-speaking areas of Maharashtra and Mysore. He arranged it in Goa also. I would urge upon the Home Minister on that basis, on that principle, that Cachar and Tripura should also be merged together and formed into one administrative unit.

श्री जी० बरबोरा (आसाम) : उप-सभापति महोदया, इस बिल के पीछे आसाम के पहाड़ी भाइयों को कुछ ज्यादा क्षमता देने और आगे बढ़ने की सुविधा देने की जो प्रेरणा है उसकी मैं सराहना करता हूँ। मैं इसकी कुछ खास कम-जोरियों के बारे में इस मदन की दृष्टि आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ।

यह बिल आसाम के पहाड़ी इलाकों की जो खाम समस्या है उस कुल समस्या का हल नहीं कर पायेगा; क्योंकि इस बिल में सिर्फ आसाम के अंदर खासी हिल्स और गारो हिल्स को लेकर और जयन्तिया हिल्स को लेकर एक सब-स्टेट बनाने की बात है, लेकिन आसाम के अंदर गारो हिल्स भी हैं, मीजो हिल्स भी हैं, नार्थ कछार और मिकिर हिल्स भी हैं। इनके बारे में कहा गया है कि वह चाहें तो आसाम में रहें या इस सब-स्टेट में आयें, लेकिन वहां के लोग अगर चाहें कि हम न आसाम में रहें और न इस नये सब-स्टेट में रहें, अलग रहें तो उसके लिये कोई प्रबंध इसमें नहीं है। खासी हिल्स के बारे में इसमें कोई बात नहीं कही गयी है। आसाम की जो समस्या है वह वहां जो विभिन्न प्रकार के लोग रहते हैं मैदान में और पहाड़ों में, जो विभिन्न भाषा-भाषी लोग हैं,

(श्री ० जी ० बरबोरा)

उन सबकी समस्या है। आज जो आटोनामी की मांग है वह आटोनामी की मांग, सेपरेट स्टेट की मांग न सिर्फ खासी और गारो हिल्स में है, बल्कि मैदान में भी काफी लोगों की यह मांग है। मैदान के लोगों की तरफ से भी आटोनामी की मांग की गयी है। ग्वाल-पाड़ा के अंदर तीन सब-डिविजनल कांग्रेस कमेटियां, जिनको डिस्ट्रिक्ट कांग्रेस कमेटी कहा जाता है—कुकरा आर, ठोकरी और ग्वालपाड़ा इन तीनों कांग्रेस कमेटियों की ज्वायंट मीटिंग की ओर से भी ग्वालपाड़ा डिस्ट्रिक्ट के लिये आटोनामी की मांग की गयी है। तार्ई मंगोलिया परिषद् की ओर से भी अपर आसाम के लखीम-पुर और शिवसागर जिले के लिये आटोनामी की मांग की गयी है। इसलिये इन सारी समस्याओं की ओर नजर रखते हुए हमें इसका हल ढूँढना चाहिये था, लेकिन जो खासी, जयन्तिया और गारो हिल्स को सब-स्टेट देते हुए इस समस्या का हल निकालने की कोशिश की गयी है, यह गलत है। खासी, जयन्तिया और गारो हिल्स के अंदर भी हम देखते हैं कि वहां आल पार्टीज हिल लीडर्स कांफरेंस की तरफ से जो आन्दोलन चलाया गया था, उस आन्दोलन के साथ जो लोग रहे उनमें से कुछ लोग बाहर निकल गये। वहां एक अलग पार्टी भी कायम की गयी है और इस बिल के बाद एक आन्दोलन भी चलाया जा रहा है कि हमको सब-स्टेट नहीं, बल्कि एक अलग स्टेट चाहिये। गारो हिल्स में भी ऐसे एलीमेंट्स हैं जिनका कहना है कि खासी, जयन्तिया हिल्स और गारो हिल्स को मिला कर एक सब-स्टेट नहीं, बल्कि हमको अलग से पूरी आटोनामी दो। इस परिस्थिति में हम सोचते हैं कि यह जो बिल है यह बहुत सीमित है। हिन्दुस्तान के उत्तर पूर्वी इलाकों

की समस्या इससे हल नहीं हो पायेगी, इसलिये इससे किसी समस्या का समाधान नहीं होगा और देश भर में जो आज जगह-जगह पर आन्दोलन उठ खड़े हुए हैं कि हम पिछड़े हैं, हमको सुविधा दो, हमको आगे बढ़ने का मौका दो, हमको अलग राज्य बनाने का मौका हो, इस मेजर से उस समस्या का समाधान नहीं हो सकेगा। इसीलिये इस सदन का ध्यान उस दृष्टि से इस पर दिलाना चाहता हूं कि आज जो समस्या है वह विकेन्द्रीकरण की है। ज्यादातर क्षमता केन्द्रीय सरकार के हाथ में है और प्रान्तों के हाथ में कुछ है नहीं और प्रान्तों के हाथ में जब ज्यादा क्षमता है नहीं और ज्यादा पूंजी है नहीं तो उस परिस्थिति में हर एक पिछड़े इलाके के लिये ज्यादा काम नहीं किया जा सकता है। नागालैंड की मिसाल ही हम लें तो देखा जाता है कि नागालैंड एक सेपरेट स्टेट बन गया है 4 लाख नागाओं के लिये और केन्द्रीय सरकार की ओर से 25 करोड़ रुपया सालाना उस पर खर्च किया जाता है और जो आसाम के पहाड़ी इलाके हैं, जहां कि 13 लाख लोग हैं, वहां के 13 लाख लोगों के लिये 3 करोड़ रुपये से ज्यादा नहीं मिलता है। अगर उसी हिसाब से सभी पहाड़ी इलाकों के लिये केन्द्रीय सरकार की ओर से समान रूप से धन दिया जाता और सभी की तरक्की के लिये रुपये पैसे का प्रबन्ध किया जाता, तो जो यह बिखराव की भावना आज हर एक पहाड़ी इलाके में है, जगह-जगह अलग-अलग स्टेट की मांग हो रही है, यह न होती।

इसमें एक और भी जिम्मेवारी है जो कि आसाम की सरकार की है। सिर्फ पहाड़ी इलाकों की ही बात नहीं है या जैसा कि श्री महितोष पुरकायस्थ साहब बोले कि कछार में बंगाली भाषा

की बात है वह ही बात नहीं, बल्कि जो आसाम के दूसरे भाग के लोग हैं, जो कोई ट्राइबल्स हैं, जो कोई अहोम हैं, जो कोई चाय बागान के मजदूर हैं, किसी की भी समस्या का समाधान आसाम की सरकार नहीं कर पाई। यह जो आसाम की सरकार है उस आसाम की सरकार की कमी है और इसके साथ ही साथ केन्द्रीय सरकार की भी कमजोरी है, दोनों ओर से कमजोरी है और दोनों ओर की कमजोरी की वजह से आज सारे आसाम में और उत्तर-पूर्व आसाम में एक परिस्थिति आई है।

केन्द्रीय सरकार की जो नीति रही वह हर एक इलाके के लिये अलग-अलग है। आप मणिपुर को लीजिये। 4 लाख नागाओं का फुल-प्लेज्ड स्टेट है और 4 लाख नागाओं के लिये 25 करोड़ रुपया केन्द्र से उसको मिलता है, लेकिन 8 लाख मणिपुरी लोगों के लिये यूनियन टेरिटरी है और 8 लाख मणिपुरी लोगों की तरफ से मांग है कि हमको भी फुल-प्लेज्ड स्टेट का स्टेटस दिया जाय और हमको भी कुछ और सुविधायें दी जायें, लेकिन उनको वह नहीं दिया जाता। नेफा जो है वहां के लोगों की नेफा की तरक्की के लिये मांग है कि वहां डेमोक्रेटिक सेट-अप होना चाहिये, लेकिन वहां अभी तक डेमोक्रेटिक सेट-अप हो नहीं पाया और अभी खासी और गारो हिल के लिये तो सब-स्टेट का प्रोपोजल है और नार्थ कछार और मिकिर हिल के लिये भी वह व्यवस्था है, लेकिन मीजो हिल के बारे में कम्प्लीट साइलेंस है। इसलिये जो सरकार की नीति है, उस नीति से सारे उत्तर-पूर्वी हिन्दुस्तान की जो समस्या है, उसका समाधान नहीं कर पायेंगे। यह मेरा निश्चित मत है कि सारे उत्तर-पूर्वी हिन्दुस्तान की जो समस्या है, पहाड़ी इलाकों और मैदानी इलाकों सभी को

एक साथ मिला कर उसकी तरक्की के लिये जो व्यवस्था हो वह करने के लिये केन्द्रीय सरकार अगर तैयार होती है, तभी जा कर इस समस्या का समाधान हम कर पायेंगे।

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI: Before I come to the subject proper, Madam, I must protest against the speech made by Mr. Purkayastha who has been in this House by virtue of being elected by all the Members of the Assam Assembly. I would be failing in my duty if I do not protest against his speech which is not at all in conformity with the Bill now before us. He has mentioned about the Language Act; he mentioned certain facts which are completely false and I feel he should not have used this august House for such parochial propaganda when the whole of Assam needs unity and emotional integration. We all know that Assam is a border State surrounded by hostile countries and in such a situation we should do everything possible to preserve the unity and integrity of Assam. Mr. Purkayastha said that in the Language Act for Cachar Bengali was not provided. But he will find that in the Language Act we have provided Bengali for the Cachar district because it was predominantly dominated by Bengalees. I assert that the Assam Language Act is the only scientific and best Act up till now produced in the whole of India. If any Member of this House is interested, he can read it. No doubt before we introduced this Bill, the late Lal Bahadur Shastri went to Assam and had discussions with all the parties and under his leadership and guidance we evolved a formula with regard to the Assam Language Act. In every hill district they have been given freedom to choose their own language at the district level and at the Secretariat level Assamese and English is to continue till it is replaced by Hindi. So there is no question of imposing Assamese in all the districts. Therefore Shri Purkayastha has completely distorted the facts.

[Shri Sriman Prafulla Goswami]

About language riots Mr. Purkayastha has mentioned something. He should know that we the Congressmen risking our lives combated them and stopped those disturbances; we visited all the disturbed areas. The then President of the Assam Pradesh Congress Committee went to visit Cachar during those disturbances and he was about to be killed by the fanatic rioters of Cachar but somehow he saved his life. At that time what was Mr. Purkayastha doing? Did he stop those disturbances? Was it not his duty to do so? The true position is that at that time there was no Language Act at all. When a Bill is passed by the Legislature, then only it becomes an Act.

Now I am a member of the Gauhati University's Executive Council. So I know the university affairs better than Mr. Purkayastha knows. In the university stage also we have not yet introduced Assamese as the medium of instruction in the colleges; English is continuing; we are going slow in the process of introducing regional languages in the universities. For this we have been accused by some sections of the people. Otherwise you see U.P. and some other States where they have introduced Hindi and other regional languages. But in Assam we are still continuing English. There is a proposal for a hill university and until and unless that university is established, we are considering the inconvenience of all the non-Assamese people, particularly the hill people. Last time also Mr. Purkayastha made propaganda in this House from the point of view of Bengali alone. As an Indian I stand for all the languages; that should be our stand.

Now as for the Bill, I wholeheartedly support this Bill. I do not say that this is the best solution but under the present circumstances there is no other alternative; there is maximum agreement and this is therefore a better solution. I congratulate the Home Minister for bringing about this sort of consensus among our people. I will

be failing in my duty if I do not record my opinion because it is a historical decision which affects the future generation. I have been closely associated with the history of Assam for the last 40 years or so. I must say that this problem has been made more complicated by delaying some decision for about a decade or so by our leaders, both the State leaders as well as the Central leaders. Lokpriya Gopinath Bardolai was the symbol of unity; he was going to unify the whole of Assam but unfortunately he died in 1950 and could not continue with the process of unification. He enjoyed the confidence of all the people including minorities both in the matter of religion and language and particularly of the tribal people. Therefore their language, their customs and their land were guaranteed and they were finally provided for in the Constitution in the Sixth Schedule. And you will find that the Sixth Schedule does not deal with and provide for the other hills people or tribal people although Bihar and Madhya Pradesh are dominated by more hills people or tribal people when compared to those in Assam. But that was necessary at that time—this Sixth Schedule. And if we had not provided the Sixth Schedule, probably, with British encouragement, with the conspiracy of British Imperialism and other imperialists, this whole State of Assam would have been created as another buffer State by the colonial Emperor. But such a design at that time was thwarted, and the State of Assam was saved. And by saving Assam we saved India from disintegration in that manner. There is no doubt that much credit is due to the then Chief Minister, the late Shri Bishnuram Medhi. He was a so-called iron man. But I am sorry to say that he had a suspicious mind and he had a conservative outlook. Therefore he could not carry the minorities and the hill people with him; he was not liberal towards them. Somehow it happened like that. It was his mistake that he even did not entrust the Portfolio for Tribal Affairs to the care of the Reverend Nicholsroy, who was then a Minister in his Congress Cabinet. Then came all these happenings one after

another, and they had a long history. Then after him came the present Chief Minister, Shri Chaliha. No doubt he is a very good man, but I must say he also committed many mistakes because he has an obstinate mind and a feudalistic strategy, by which he is ruling Assam. With all that, the minorities and the hill people were putting up and they were carrying on smoothly. But it was a wrong and tactless statement that he made that led to the riot on the issue of language. He uttered one sentence in the matter of Assamese language being made the Official language and it led to the language riot. Somehow this happened. As I said, all these happenings have a long history. I do not blame anybody. Another contributing factor was the indecision of the Union Government in the matter of satisfying the reasonable demands of the tribal people. Our beloved Prime Minister, the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, seriously felt for the tribal people and he wanted to introduce the Scottish pattern. We agreed to the Scottish pattern of administration with certain modifications on certain minor points like appointing Ministers, and others. But, unfortunately, at that time the decision to introduce the Scottish pattern of administration was not taken. Had the Scottish pattern of administration been introduced and implemented then, probably the All Party Hill Leaders Conference would also have accepted it, and the subsequent complicated situation would not have arisen. I am narrating all this because at every stage I was closely connected with the developments as an office-bearer of the Pradesh Congress Committee, and also I am a public worker there taking interest in all movements, of course not in language riots, and other communal movements. I have combated the communal and other reactionary movements risking my life many times. Now, as I said, the Scottish pattern of administration did not see the light of the day. Then, after the late Prime Minister Nehru Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri became the Prime Minister and he appointed the Commission headed by Shri Pataskar. And the Pataskar Commission went round the place and

gave a very commendable report amply supported by facts stating therein that the hills people were not exploited and that the Assam Government had given weightage to the development of the hills people and also stating that the development was generally very slow in Assam and more slow in the hills, which was a fact. But that Pataskar Commission Report also was not considered and agreed to by the parties concerned. Then came our present Prime Minister and our Home Minister made a statement on the 13th of January suggesting a federation. Well, that created a tremendous movement in Assam. For that I do not blame the Home Minister; we have to be also blamed because, when the scheme of a federation was put to our Chief Minister Chaliha, he neither rejected it nor accepted it; he kept mum. Then the Home Minister thought "Let us go ahead with the scheme." At this Chief Minister Chaliha was very jubilant. The Home Minister thought that the solution of a federation would be a very successful one for this complicated problem. As I said, he announced it on the 13th of January. Unfortunately, he could not consult our esteemed leader, Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed—who is now here in the Central Cabinet—who was very ill then. It was just an announcement of the scheme of a federation. Nobody bothered to know about the details of the federation. The scheme of the federation was just mentioned and it was said that one or more States might be associated in that federation. The sort of the federation envisaged agitated the concerned people and we rejected it. Our leaders in Assam fell out over this scheme of federation. With his obstinate mind and feudalistic strategy our Chief Minister could not lead the people and carry them with him in this scheme of federation. Thus the scheme of federation also fell through. Then another committee was appointed, the Asoka Mehta Committee, and I was also there. That Committee was boycotted by the All Party Hill Leaders Conference. So the formula evolved by the Asoka Mehta Committee also fell through. Then somehow this formula now embodied in this

[Shri Sriman Prafulla Goswami]

Constitution (Amendment) Bill was evolved, to which the APHLC agreed. We also agreed. And I know that, in Assam, among the people in the plains and among the people in the hills there are extremist sections who are opposed even to the present scheme. They are small sections of the people and they are against this scheme. They say that instead of this scheme it is better that the hill State is a completely separate State having nothing to do with the State of Assam. Among the APHLC people—they are called moderates now—there is an extremist section who want a separate hill State. They do not like even the present scheme. So between two extremes why we have supported this scheme? It is because, today, under the circumstances, I feel we should avert the vivisection and division of Assam, and we have stopped it at least for the time being. Well, it is very easy to break something and to divide something. But once you divide it, once you break it, it cannot be united again. That is why I support this scheme and this Bill, and at least for the time being we have kept Assam integrated by creating for the purpose a sub-State with all the paraphernalia attached to it. It is a scheme where all have been accommodated and we have kept Assam integrated and safe for the future generation. It is for the future generation, it is for posterity to continue to keep it integrated and safe. I believe that the future generation will be completely free from chauvanistic tendencies and free from all language or communal feelings. The new leadership, which will care not only for the unity of Assam, not only for the unity of India but also care for the whole unity of the human world, will devolve and depend on the future generation. I also believe that Assam needs a new leadership. It cannot be one man's leadership, because we all belong to the average class of leaders. In India also, now our leaders are as we are in Assam. We are not super-men like the late lamented Jawaharlal Nehru whom India gave birth to. So what we want now is collective leadership and it should grow on the basis of scienti-

fic socialism. Unless and until you can educate the masses in socialism and start the socialistic movement in right earnest, all these fissiparous tendencies, the communal feelings and all the rest of it, and the vested interests in all walks of life will not end. I believe it is in the historical process and it is coming. And when socialism will be entering into the minds of the people, and when they—the hills people and the plains people—will be feeling the benefits of socialism, they will all feel as one and all the banes afflicting the people today will all vanish. They will forget to think in terms of Assamese or Bengalis or tribal people. Then they will all join in throwing the remnants of imperialism or feudal exploitation or bourgeoisie exploitation, and all this will be overthrown. Of course I believe in democratic socialism. My method may be different but the ideal is the same. I am not afraid of communism, I must say here. Some of my friends may be, but I am not afraid of communism although I disagree with the methods adopted by the Communist Party. I am afraid of their method of violence. This is a class struggle and I am not a supporter of the class struggle, killing people. Through the democratic process we can have socialism. This is the problem. And in Assam, I must say to the Home Minister that he should see that an efficient leadership is created there and an efficient Ministry is made to work this scheme. It will require a very good and efficient Ministry, not the present Ministry in which there are some without any progressive ideas, and they cannot continue. Therefore a new leadership which will command the respect of both the hills and the plains needs to be created there, more so because this new sub-State for the hills is going to be formed. That is why I support this Bill. Once we have stopped the division among the hills people and the plains people, as is the case now, it is for the future generation to continue to maintain the integrity of Assam and the unity of Assam comprising the hills people and the plains people. If they do not want to maintain this and they want to divide, it is very easy. Even now it is

very easy to encourage separatist tendencies and divisive forces. It is equally easy for the future generation also if the people do not like unity and integrity of the State. But if we divide now, posterity will blame us; the social forces will blame us. That is why I support this Bill.

Madam, with these few words I support the Bill wholeheartedly, and I hope that the Prime Minister and the Home Minister will give greater attention to Assam's problems. The frustration must be removed from the minds of the people, and because of this frustration the vested interests are creating communal problems and language problems, and what not. Therefore, I also request Shri Mahitosh Purkayastha to be a more progressive man.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
That will do.

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI: Thank you, Madam.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN (Kerala): Madam, this is an ill-drafted and misconceived legislation. It appears to be a measure of political expediency. I do not think, Madam, that Parliament had considered previously the various Constitution (Amendment) Bills with such an amount of reservation in the minds of Members as it is considering this Bill today. Even the supporters of this legislation have not thought, Madam, that this Bill and the provisions thereof would be able to solve the problem in any way. A demand has been made rightly or wrongly—and that has been there for a long time now—by the hill peoples and their organisations that there should be a separate State. I do not think, Madam, that there is a third way out as it is proposed in this legislation. Either the hill peoples will have to contain themselves within the State of Assam or their demand for a full-fledged State would have to be conceded. In this state of affairs it is stated that this measure has received an element of agreement as between the various parties and that is the reason why it is being pursued. Even the Government of India in its first

public statement as early as 1967 issued in the form of a press statement to the public stated that the hill areas of Assam would be constituted into a Sub-State within the State of Assam but in 1968 after the matter had been reviewed the position became otherwise and today the demand of the Assam hill peoples is not being met by the provisions contained in this Bill firstly because, Madam, the hill areas of Assam are not proposed to be brought into the so-called Sub-State. It is only the Garo Hills and the United Khasi and Jaintia Hills that are proposed to be brought in. It is stated that so far as the United Mikir and North Cachar hills are concerned it is left to them to join the autonomous State at any future point of time. Regarding the Mizo Hills it is not at all brought into the ambit of this Sub-State. Under such circumstances how can this Bill be thought to achieve a Sub-State for the hill areas and the hill peoples of Assam? And this Sub-State that is conceived within the State of Assam under the provisions of this Bill is neither going to be a State nor going to be something like a local administration. It is against the very scheme of the Constitution. The Constitution never thought of a Sub-State within a State. The proposed Sub-State is going to have a Legislative Assembly; it is going to have a Council of Ministers headed by a Chief Minister but in working practice I would warn this hon. House with all respect that the very persons who have accepted the Sub-State will themselves certainly come and state with greater voice that what they wanted to achieve has not been achieved at all because the Sub-State Assembly in working practice would be found to be no better than a glorified Panchayat and the Chief Minister of the Sub-State would be found to be no better than a glorified President of a Village Panchayat because only such powers are proposed to be transferred to the Legislative Assembly and the Executive headed by the Council of Ministers and the Chief Minister.

[Shri K Chandrasekharan]

It will be seen, Madam, that in working practice again a lot of administrative difficulties is bound to arise. The State of Assam and this Sub-State will have a common Governor. There are a number of constitutional functions which have got to be discharged by the Chief Minister of a particular State. And so far as the State Governor is concerned there are areas of discretion within which he himself can act on his own. Take for example, Madam, the appointment of Chairman and Members of the Public Service Commission, the appointment of the Advocate General, the preparation of the annual financial statement which has to be laid before the Assembly, the appointment of the Judges of the High Court and the Chief Justice of the High Court. In all these matters the Governor has to act on the advice of his Council of Ministers. Take for example, Madam, a position in which the Chief Minister of Assam and the Chief Minister of the Sub-State give varying advices to the Governor in regard to these matters, the Governor will have to act in his discretion, an area of discretion which the Constitution does not give him otherwise in the articles of the Constitution. I submit, Madam, therefore, that this is going to create a lot of hitches, complications, difficulties and resultant confusion in the administration of Assam and in the administration of the proposed Sub-State.

In regard to the services, Madam, it is stated that a large section of the services will be under the control of the Chief Minister of Assam but in regard to subordinate services it is stated in the note, which constituted the background paper for this legislation on the basis of which I hope that the statute to be legislated upon by Parliament in pursuance of this Constitution (Amendment) Bill would come, that so far as subordinate services are concerned a section will be made over to the Sub-State Chief Minister and the other will be under the control of the Chief Minister of

Assam. An officer posted within the Sub-State particularly at the higher level would be under the total control of the Chief Minister of Assam and it may be, Madam, that he may belong to a different political party. Such complications which we did not think of at the time the Constitution was enacted are now causing difficulties in regard to Centre-State relations because the Centre is controlled by a particular political party and in many States there are Governments of parties other than the party at the Centre in control of those States' affairs. It need not be on account of the dual party functioning within the Sub-State and at the State level in regard to administration. It may even be that where the same party is functioning and is in control of the administration there are genuine and bona fide differences of opinion which would lead to an administrative blockade so far as areas within the Sub-State are concerned.

Then, this Bill, when implemented would again cause, so far as the geographical aspect is concerned, confusion. The Mizo hills are kept separate and are not to be included within the autonomous State at all. The United Khasi and Jaintia hills are a Sub-State and the United Mikir and North Cachar hills areas also. There will be an enclave of the State of Assam within the Mizo hills, and this enclave again is going to cause administrative difficulties so far as the State of Assam and the hill Sub-State are concerned.

Then, it is stated in the provisions of the Bill that, although the statute that has to be enacted in pursuance of clauses 2 and 3 of this Constitution (Amendment) Bill, may contain provisions which amend or have the effect of amending the Constitution, such law would not be treated as an amendment under article 368 of the Constitution. I am aware of the fact that there are certain specific articles in the Constitution, as enacted originally, which state that certain laws can be enacted in pursuance of that constitutional provision which may

contain apparently or seemingly an amendment to a provision of the Constitution but would not be treated as an amendment of the Constitution under article 368. The articles of the Constitution in such matters give guide-lines so far as that amendment is concerned. Here in clauses 2 and 3 of this Bill there are absolutely no guide-lines at all. In the working of the Sub-State of Assam and for the purpose of providing administrative facilities for the Sub-State of Assam, various provisions of the Constitution will have to be amended by virtue of the statute that has to be enacted in pursuance of this Constitution (Amendment) Bill. I put it to you, Madam, that courts are likely to say that legislation of this type is a fraud on article 368 of the Constitution.

Then, again, the statute that is proposed to be passed by Parliament can be passed by a simple majority of Parliament, but an amendment of the statute subsequently would require a two-thirds majority as enjoined by article 368. The hon. Home Minister stated during the Select Committee stage that this was so in view of the fact that the statute that is going to be enacted is as a result of consensus and, therefore a simple majority of Parliament would suffice. I respectfully submit that this distinction is absolutely misplaced in view of the fact that article 368 requires a two-thirds majority in respect of a legislation which is in fact a constitutional amendment and should be treated as a constitutional amendment. I submit that the provisions of this Bill would lead by and by to greater fissiparous tendencies. The hon. Home Minister stated that he too thinks that there is a likelihood of such demands being made, but he is of the view that such demands may not have any basis in view of the fact that Assam has a special status, because of the Sixth Schedule and particular provisions of the Constitution itself. May I submit that the Sub-State that is being formed today in Assam would by and by lead to such demands being made in

Andhra Pradesh with regard to Telangana and Rayalaseema and various other States in this country? It is tragic that the disintegration of the country is taking place and fissiparous tendencies are growing, not in the non-Congress administered States, but in the Congress-administered States. What happened in Madras during Congress rule and what is happening today in Madras when a non-Congress Government is in power there? What is happening in Assam? What is happening in Maharashtra? What is happening in Andhra Pradesh and in some of the so-called Congress States? What is happening in West Bengal? What is happening in Punjab? What is happening in Kerala? At least in the States administered by non-Congress Governments, there are no fissiparous tendencies, but the happenings in Maharashtra, the happenings in Andhra Pradesh and the happenings in Assam have culminated in a measure of this kind. I am certain that it would ultimately lead to the break-up of this country and I warn this House that, if at all this measure has got to be passed, it has to be passed with an element of the greatest reservation as a measure of nothing else but political expediency.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Yajee. Everyone up till now has kept to fifteen minutes. So, please be brief.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : मैडम डिप्टी चैयर-मैन महोदया, मैं इस विधेयक की तारीफ तो करता हूँ लेकिन खुशी से नहीं।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारि : तो विरोध करिये हिम्मत से।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : हिम्मत से बोल रहा हूँ और आप को भी कुछ नसीहत दूंगा क्योंकि आप लोग ही ज्यादा गड़बड़ करने हैं और हमारी सरकार को ऐसा करने के लिये मजबूर करते हैं। इस लिये मैं आप को ही सुनाऊंगा।

मैं इस लिये बोल रहा हूँ कि अभी तक जो राज्यों का निर्माण हुआ वह

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

भाषा के आधार पर हुआ। हमारे हिन्दुस्तान में करीब तीन करोड़ आदिवासी, शैड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स हैं और केवल आसाम में ही नहीं हैं, बंगाल में हैं, बिहार में हैं, मध्य प्रदेश में हैं, गुजरात में हैं, और महाराष्ट्र में भी हैं। आज एक विचारधारा, एक तरह की भावना फैल रही है कि प्लेन की एरियाज़ के लोगों से जो हिलम पर रहते हैं और जो शैड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स लोग हैं उनमें किसी तरह का सम्बन्ध न हो। यही अंग्रेजों की पुरानी नीति थी। लेकिन जो सरकार अपने को समाजवादी कहती है और समाजवाद स्थापित करने की बात कहती है, उसके सामने यदि यह सवाल आये और वह हिल स्टेट्स बनाने की बात कहे तो यह उसके लिये उचित नहीं होगा। आज जो हमारे देश में तीन करोड़ शैड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स के लोग हैं उनकी माली हालत खराब है, उनकी इकोनामिक कंडीशन खराब है और उनकी दशा को सुधारने का प्रयत्न न कर के एक-एक स्टेट में छः-छः हिल स्टेट्स बना दी जायें तो हमारे बिहार में सब से ज्यादा हिल स्टेट्स बनेंगी। आसाम में 22, 23 लाख शैड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स के लोग हैं और होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने फरमाया कि वहां छः हिल स्टेट्स बन सकती हैं। यदि ऐसा है तो हमारे यहां भी कई ऐसी स्टेट्स बन सकती हैं और उनसे ज्यादा मध्य प्रदेश में बन सकती हैं और उड़ीसा में भी बन सकती हैं। यह जो हम बीज रोपने जा रहे हैं इसमें हमारी सरकार ज़रा सोच-समझ से काम ले, यही मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूं। देखना यह है कि जो पूर्वी सीमांत क्षेत्र है उसके लिये क्या करना उचित था। अभी हमने आसाम के दो लीडरों को इस सम्बन्ध में लड़ते देखा। वारपेटा पोलिटिकल कॉर्पोरेशन का जो प्रस्ताव था कि आसाम,

नागालैंड, मनीपुर, त्रिपुरा और नेफा को मिला कर एक पूर्वोत्तर सीमांत प्रदेश बनाया जाय वह आज हमारे सामने क्यों नहीं आया, दूसरी बात क्यों आई। गलती सब तरफ से होती है। लेकिन केन्द्र में जो हमारी सरकार है उसको कोई गलत कदम उठाना नहीं चाहिये क्योंकि होल जो पूर्वी जोन है वह ज्वाला-मुखी पर्वत पर बैठा हुआ है, उसपर पाकिस्तान की निगाह है, चीन की निगाह है और सब के एजेंट वहां पर बैठे हुये हैं। मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि जो अंग्रेजों की नीति थी कि ये जो शैड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स के लोग हैं ये दूसरों से मिलें नहीं क्योंकि इनका कल्चर अलग है, इनकी सभ्यता अलग है और नहीं मालूम उनकी क्या क्या बकवास थी, उस बकवास को हम मानते हैं और हमारे महान लीडर्स और नेहरू जी भी मानते

3 PM थे। तो यह चीज बड़ी खतरनाक हो रही है। लेकिन मैं क्यों इसका समर्थन करता हूं, क्योंकि हिल पीपुल जो हमारे हैं वह कहते हैं कि हम इस को मानते हैं। देश की सारी पार्टियां, सिवाय जनसंघ को छोड़ कर इस को मानती है। इस लिये मैं भी इस को मानता हूं, लेकिन इस से क्या प्राबलम मालव होने जा रहा है। नहीं होने जा रहा है। इस लिये कोशिश यह होनी चाहिये, जैसा कि हमारे श्री प्रफुल्ल गोस्वामी जी ने कहा कि यह सरकार की जो आर्थिक नीति है, इस की जो समाजवाद की नीति है जब तक उस की रफ्तार को तीव्र गति से नहीं ले जाया जायगा तब तक काम नहीं बनेगा। क्योंकि सब से ज्यादा गरीब और भुक्तभोगी लोग हमारे शैड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स और शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट के लोग हैं, उन में समाजवाद पहले जाना चाहिये और ऐसा होने पर जो यह अलग-अलग मांगने की बात हो रही है वह रुकेगी। यह अलग-अलग चीज मांगने की बात

इसीलिये है कि उन का डेवलपमेंट नहीं हुआ है, उन का विकास नहीं हुआ है। हमारे नागालैंड के रेप्रेजेंटेटिव ने कुछ कहा और कहते कहते कहा कि पूरी पावर मिलनी चाहिये और साथ ही कुछ और बात भी कहने लगे। तो नागालैंड के लोगों ने कहा कि हमारा नागालैंड अलग बना दो। उस के बाद कहा गया कि हिन्दुस्तान से बाहर चलो और नहीं तो अपनी फौज बनाओ। हमारी फौज यह ठीक है कि सब कुछ देखती है, हमारे ब्रिज टूटने हैं तो उन को भी देखती है, वहाँ के हालात को कंट्रोल में रखती है, लेकिन वह कहते हैं कि यह चीज नहीं होगी। इस के साथ ही वह पावर की मांग करते हैं। नेहरूजी ने कहा था कि पावर दो नागालैंड को, लेकिन अगर आज हमारी सेना वहाँ बैठ कर चुपचाप देखती रही है तो यह नागालैंड की सरकार क्या करेगी? वहाँ पर विदेशी और चीनी अपना काम कर रहे हैं और उन के एजेंट सब जगह बैठे हुए हैं। अभी वहाँ आप सेपरेट स्टेट दे दे और बाद में वह भाग करेगा कि हम हिन्दुस्तान से बाहर जायेंगे। इस लिये ही यह बड़ी खतरनाक चीज हो रही है। यह ठीक है कि सब ने इस को स्वीकार किया है और जब लोक सभा में किसी माननीय सदस्य ने पूछा तो हमारे होम मिनिस्टर ने यह भी कहा, किसी ने पूछा था कि इस तरह की स्टेट और सब जगह होगी या यही हो रही है तो उन्होंने कहा था कि हम गारन्टी नहीं दे सकते। तो केन्द्रीय सरकार की मजबूती के साथ जवाब देने की पालिसी नहीं है। जब इस तरह की सिचुएशन कहीं पैदा हो जायगी तो उसके बारे में वह अभी से कुछ नहीं कह सकते हैं। तो इस लिये मेरे विचार में यह काम तो निहायत गलत ही है, निहायत गलत कदम उठ रहा है, यह कदम न

सिर्फ आसाम के लिये, बल्कि बिहार, बंगाल, मध्य प्रदेश, गुजरात, सभी के लिये गलत है। शेड्यूलड ट्राइब्स के लिये जो स्टेट बना रहे हैं, वह स्टेट विद्वान स्टेट बनेगा, लेकिन खतरा हम को यह है कि हम समझते हैं कि अगर नागालैंड का 4 लाख लोगों का स्टेट बन गया तो उस में समस्या का समाधान हो गया, लेकिन इस में समस्या का समाधान नहीं हुआ। मनीपुर की 10 लाख की आबादी है। एरिया में वह नागालैंड से डबल है। नागालैंड की कोई भाषा नहीं है, लेकिन जिन की भाषा है, जो एरिया में डबल है, उन को आप स्टेट नहीं बनायेंगे तो होगा क्या? जैसे नागालैंड में लोग हथियार उठाने हैं वैसे ही वहाँ भी लोग हथियार उठावेंगे। आप लोगों को मजबूर कर रहे हैं अपनी गलत नीति की वजह से और इस से देश में खतरा बढ़ेगा और उस एरिया में, उस क्षेत्र में जहाँ कि बंगाल में पाकिस्तान भी बैठा है और दूसरी तरफ चीन बैठा है हमारी कोई ऐसी गलत नीति नहीं होनी चाहिये। जिस तरह से यहाँ पर उसी प्रदेश के दो सदस्य लड़ गये, यह ठीक बात नहीं थी। आज यह लिम्बोज़ कम्प्युनलिज्म से बढ़ कर है। अगर वहाँ आसाम सरकार चाहती तो इस तरह की परिस्थिति पैदा नहीं होती। अभी भी कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि जो हिल एरिया के गरीब लोग हैं उन के बीच कैसे हम समाजवाद की गाड़ी तीव्रता से चलावे। अगर उन की आर्थिक स्थिति में सुधार हो जाय तो यह सब ठीक हो जायगा। हम कहते हैं कि सारे ससार की सोशलिस्ट गवर्नमेंट बनेगी, लेकिन तैलगाना का विकास आज क्यों नहीं हो रहा है। कहा जाता है कि जितना रुपया वहाँ लगना चाहिये था वह नहीं लगा। बिहार में भी इस तरह की आवाज उठती है और वहाँ भी तीर धनुष से

[क्षी शीलभद्र याजी]

आवाज उठती है। तो मसला इस तरह से हल होने वाला नहीं है। इस लिये यदि आप इस चीज को करते हैं तो ठीक है, करिये, लेकिन जैसे कछार के लोगो ने डिमांड की है कि यदि भाषा के आधार पर आप यह कर रहे हैं तो कोई बजह नहीं है कि कछार को त्रिपुरा के साथ आप अलग स्टेट न बनाइये। मनीपुर को आप को स्टेट बनाना पड़ेगा। आप के सामने कोई लाजिक नहीं है, कोई तर्क नहीं है। अगर आप उसे नहीं मानेंगे तो इसी तरह के तत्व उठेंगे। इसलिये इस विधेयक की तार्ईद करते हुए मैं अपनी सरकार को चेतावनी भी देता हूँ कि समाज में जो तत्व इस तरह की आवाज उठाते हैं, सरकार का जो इंटेलीजेंस डिपार्टमेंट है—खुफिया विभाग—वह देखे कि उन इलाको में क्या हो रहा है। अभी आसाम की यूनिटी नहीं हो रही है। जरूरत यह थी कि वरपेटा रेजोल्यूशन के मुताबिक यूनिटी होती। वैसा होने पर हमें खुशी होती, लेकिन आप ने जो कुछ उन लोगो को खुश करने के लिये किया है उस की तार्ईद करते हुए भी मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह नीति गलत है। भाषा के आधार पर जो प्रान्तों का निर्माण हुआ उस के लिये भी हम मोचने हैं कि वह नहीं होना चाहिये था। आप को सही हल के लिये उन की माली हालत को ज्यादा से ज्यादा सुधारना पड़ेगा, समाजवाद की गाडी को तीव्र करना पड़ेगा, तभी इन समस्याओं का समाधान होगा। इस लिये यदि आप आसाम में हिल स्टेट बनाते हैं, एक सब-स्टेट बनाते हैं तो आप के लिये लाजमी है कि कछार को त्रिपुरा के साथ तथा मनीपुर को राज्य का दर्जा दिया जाय और यदि आप ऐसा नहीं करते हैं तो मजबूर हो कर फिर आप को यहां आना पड़ेगा, इस तरह की परिस्थिति पैदा हो सकती है। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आधे दिल से इस विधेयक की तार्ईद करना हूँ।

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) Madam Deputy Chairman, I am supporting this Bill because it is a step forward, and only in that way I am rendering my support to the Bill. But then the Bill has got many defects and many deficiencies, and those defects and deficiencies also have to be pointed out in order that the Government, if it so chooses, may look at those deficiencies and weaknesses and may find a way to removing them by bringing forward a Bill or a legislation or even an amendment of the Constitution with a greater purposiveness and a better perspective. Madam Deputy Chairman, I do not understand, for example, why this State within a State concept, which is a new concept in any constitutional law, is being introduced by this particular Constitution (Amendment) Bill. As far as the Constitution of India is concerned, the Constitution has said that India is a Union of States. I do not understand, if the Constitution says that India is a Union of States, how can within this Union an autonomous State be created.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) in the Chair.]

It is rather an anomaly, and I only hope that that anomaly will not render this particular piece of legislation constitutionally invalid or constitutionally void. I think the better term that could have been used to describe these autonomous areas consisting of the various hills districts is autonomous region. But in any case a constitutional impropriety if I may say so, has been committed by calling these hills districts, which are being given certain wider powers, as an autonomous State within the State of Assam. I know that this kind of jugglery with the Constitution—I am again using a strong word but I cannot but use a strong word—has been made in order to arrive at a kind of compromise. This compromise, in spirit, has landed the Government in this peculiar position that this Government is now trying to create a State within a State. If the hill people's demand for greater rights of self-government were really acceded to as a legitimate demand by the Government of India—and I think

that has been the feeling in this House also expressed by certain hon Members there—it is not understood why the aspirations of the hill people should not have been granted by creating a State with all its panoply of powers as are given to other States within the Indian Union. Instead, we find that by virtue of an amendment of the Constitution, what is being sought to be created is a kind of sub-State, and again that sub-State will not have all the powers, certain powers may be given to the Assam Legislative Assembly and certain other powers will be given only to a limited extent to the sub-State within the State of Assam. That is not the way of doing things. I am constrained to say that this triumvirate Government of Mr. Morari Desai, Shrimati Indira Gandhi and Mr. Chavan cannot do anything except by stopping half way. Well, half-way stoppage is always fraught with grave consequences and great difficulties. Serious complications may arise if the Government, even after granting the legitimate aspirations of the people of the hill areas in this way, stops half way. That is why I would suggest and recommend to the Government that it sees its way in days to come—and I hope that there will not be many and long days—to granting full State powers and full State sovereignty, if I may use the word 'sovereignty'—because no State is sovereign within the Indian Union—to these hill people who are being combined together to form, at the present moment, what is nothing but an autonomous region.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I must also express another opinion of mine, and that opinion, that sentiment, has also been expressed by another hon. Member of this House, Mr Purkayastha, coming from Assam. Well, I am apprehensive that after this hill region—this autonomous region which is now called an autonomous State—is created, there will be trouble in regard to the Bengali-speaking areas of Cachar. It is true that we do not want the Indian Union to be divided and subdivided. But then the position in which Cachar is at the present moment situ-

ated, that position will be rectified and remedied if only Cachar is tacked either to Tripura and made a Union territory—because then the two Bengali-speaking regions will be one and united—or some other status is given to Cachar so that the people of Cachar may carry on their own internal development, their own culture, their own linguistic independence and autonomy in their own way, without being trammelled and impeded in its development by the imposition of the Assamese language upon it. And I am expressing the apprehension that the situation in Cachar may head for trouble. I am expressing this apprehension because of this reason that in the Gauhati University, we find that the Assamese language is being made the regional language as far as the State of Assam is concerned. That will be taking with one hand what was given to the people of Cachar some years ago by the other hand, namely, in the District of Cachar, Bengali was recognised as a co-ordinate language—a language co-ordinated with Assamese. But if the Bengali-speaking people in Cachar are compelled to read Assamese or to study the various humanities and sciences in Assamese language at the University of Gauhati, then that will be imposition of the Assamese language upon the people of Cachar, an imposition against which the people of Cachar fought and 11 persons were killed, and only after that in Cachar the Bengali language was given a status. So, that status will be taken away if this regional language business in the University of Gauhati is given its free play—and it will be given its free play. Therefore, I am impressing upon the Government of India that as far as the problem of Cachar is concerned, that problem has also to be solved in a statesmanlike spirit.

Cachar is near Tripura. It is almost on the border of Tripura which is a Union territory. Tripura is a Bengali-speaking territory. Cachar is a Bengali-speaking district. If, for example, the Mikir Hill region and the Cachar Hills decide to unite with this autonomous State which is being created within the State of Assam, then it should be

[Shri A. P. Chatterjee]

clear to everybody that the link between Cachar and the rest of Assam will be thinned and will not be so obvious and so clear as it is now. In that view of the matter also, it is better that Cachar is united with Tripura and made a Union territory or that in some other way Cachar is given such a status that the people of Cachar may feel that their language will not be interfered with, that their cultural development will be free and uninterrupted.

Lastly, so far as this Constitution (Amendment) Bill is concerned, as far as my party is concerned, I give support to it because it is a step forward. It is a significant step; certainly we have to support it. But these opinions, these sentiments, which I have expressed, I hope, will be given proper weight.

Another thing which I cannot but comment on—and that has been commented upon by the hon. Member who spoke a little while ago, Mr. Chandrasekharan—is that we do not understand this kind of thing that this Constitution (Amendment) Bill is being accepted in this House with a simple majority. But then if an Act is passed by Parliament in accordance with this Constitution (Amendment) Bill, an amendment to that Act, if it is to be passed, will have to be passed by a two-thirds majority. Absurdity cannot go further. As far as the Constitution (Amendment) Bill is concerned, you pass it with a simple majority. But if you have to pass any amendment to the Act which is the creation of this Bill, that amendment has to be passed by a two-thirds majority. I think that this also has to be looked into. Because this bill is a significant step forward, we do not want to cause obstruction to the passing of the Bill; otherwise, perhaps I would have come forward with an amendment to this particular provision of the Bill wherein it is said that the Act which will be passed pursuant to this Bill can be amended only by a two-thirds majority. But I will ask the Government to

see whether they can accept this amendment which I am proposing. Of course, I have not got the amendment in so many words. But the Government can look into it and see whether this part of it can be deleted and instead of a two-thirds majority, if the words 'simple majority' can be put in there. If they can be put in there, this Bill will still be a better step forward.

I support this Bill.

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM (Assam): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I thank you very much for giving me a few minutes. I had no mind to speak but a few speeches made by some of my hon. friends, I am afraid, have created a wrong impression in the House and I will try my utmost to dispel some of it, if I can.

The point before us was whether we should support the measure brought forward by the Home Ministry, namely, the Constitution (Twentysecond Amendment) Bill for the reorganisation of Assam. Under the present Constitution, Parliament has no power to create a State within a State, and to give that power, the Home Minister has brought this Bill forward. Now, what is the reason why this legislation has been brought forward? The reason is that some of the hill people of Assam were crying for a long time that they should have a separate State and their alleged grievances were that some injustices were done to them by the Assam Government. Therefore, unless and until they have their own State they could not develop their districts and, therefore, they wanted a separate hill State. Naturally, amongst themselves some of them were not in favour of it. For example, Shri E. M. Sangma, an hon. Member of this House and a member of the Select Committee is not in favour of a separate State for the hill people. But some of our hon. friends were also saying that this is not the best solution possible. I admit that this is not the best possible solution. But in the absence of a better solution available, this is the best solution in the present circumstances. And, therefore, some of the Assam people,

e.g., the extremist sections, do not accept this solution.

Similarly, all the hill people, though the majority of them accept this solution, do not accept this solution. Taking an overall picture of the State, however, most of the people in Assam, including the Government of Assam, accept this solution. Therefore, I say that in the absence of a better solution this is the best solution. And therefore, the Home Minister was pleased to make an announcement that on the basis of this consensus of opinion the Reorganisation of Assam Bill will be introduced in Parliament.

One of my hon. friends, Mr. Purkayastha, said that the Assam Languages Act was responsible for the 1960 riots. These are unpleasant things and I think these matters are irrelevant also in the present context. Whether Mr. Purkayastha was correct or not, I invite the attention of the hon. Members to the Assam Languages Act itself. The Assam Languages Act provides for three languages. Although there could have been one regional language, namely, the language of the maximum number of people in the State of Assam, Assamese—Assam is a peculiar problem State, because Assam has as many languages as India has, because Assam has as many races as India has, because Assam has as many religions as India has—Assam had to have a peculiar Languages Act. And, therefore, this Act provides for three languages, namely, English, because the Hill people cannot do with any other language, Bengali, because the people of Cachar and some others cannot accept any other language than Bengali and, naturally, it also provides for Assamese.

It was made out by some that because the Assam Government was responsible for this situation the hill people could not pull on with this Government of Assam. Therefore, they came out with the demand for a separate hill State. This is not correct.

I will draw the attention of the hon. Members to the Pataskar Commission

itself. It has given a categorical answer to this. It said that the Government of Assam spent more money for the hill people than for the plains people themselves, that the *per capita* expenditure for the hill people was higher than the expenditure for the plains people. It is a complete lie that any government, whether it was Mehdi Government or the Chaliha Government or anybody, was discriminating against the hill people. On the contrary, it can be said that if they discriminated at all they discriminated more in favour of the hill people themselves. But that was not the point was that these hill people have political aspirations. They think that unless they have their own Government, unless they themselves bring forward measures they cannot develop themselves. That is the thing. It is more psychological than otherwise. And, therefore, unless this aspect of their aspiration was satisfied, they said, they could not pull on.

Mr. Sangma in his note of dissent says that all the hill people are also not of the same standard. For example, the Garos are more backward educationally and economically than the Khasis and, therefore, they could not pull on with the Khasis who are more advanced. He has given his reasons and he is correct also. Therefore, he suggested, instead of having only one hill State, let there be as many hill States as there are hill districts. Then there would not be so much bitterness. But this is not feasible. For the two major hill districts, namely Garo and Khasi, the Home Ministry at the beginning wanted to have a hill State. Option was given to two other States, namely Mikir and North Cachar Hills. It was also said that to a large extent the ex-Chief Minister, Mr. Mehdi, who is not a Member of this House, and Mr. Chaliha were responsible for the present state of affairs. But may I submit to this hon. House that it is not an easy job to become the Chief Minister of the State of Assam. Possibly it may be said that it is easier to be the Prime Minister of India than to be the Chief Minister of Assam because Assam is more problematic than India.

[Shri Baharul Islam]

As I have already said, it has more races, languages and religions and so many other heterogeneous elements than India has. Therefore, A, B or C, whosoever becomes the Chief Minister of Assam, cannot claim that he will be more successful. It is difficult. What I say is that every Chief Minister of Assam, every Government of Assam, was trying its level best to do full justice to the hill people. And, therefore, I submit, Sir, that neither the Government of Assam nor the people of Assam are responsible for these so-called grievances of the people of the hills. It is the British Government which was responsible because during the British times they did not allow the plains people to enter the hill districts. They did not allow the Nagas to meet others, they were kept separate.

Sir, as the Nagas had a separate State from Assam, we are not even now allowed to go to N.E.F.A. and though the *lingua franca* of the N.E.F.A. people is Assamese they do not know us and we do not know them till this day. They were separated from the people of Assam by the British. The hill people were kept completely aloof from the plains people. Therefore, mutual suspicions grow. We do not know each other as fully as a U.P. man knows an Assamese man or a Bihari man knows a Gujarati. But crying over the past will not help us much. Now it is our duty to see how best we can maintain friendship and goodwill with the hill people, and until and unless we have friendship and goodwill with these people we cannot remain united. Assam is a frontier State and two enemy countries are beside us, namely, China and Pakistan. Therefore, unless and until the hill people of Assam are emotionally with us we cannot have a very strong frontier. With these words I conclude.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to generally extend my support to this Constitution (Amendment) Bill. But much remains to be seen when the legislation envi-

saged by this Bill is brought before the House. However, we have got the outlines of the proposed legislation to give effect to the decisions of this Constitution (Amendment) Bill.

Only last week-end the Congress President, Mr. Nijalingappa, was assailing the formation of linguistic States in the country. In fact, he went to the length of demanding the break-up of the linguistic States and formation of new States on, what he called, certain administrative basis . . .

SHRI A. P. JAIN (Uttar Pradesh): Economic basis.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Anyhow, I agree it is difficult to make what Mr. Nijalingappa means when he says something and it is difficult to make out what he says. However, when the Congress President was airing such views, the party of which he is the president, rather the party Government was sponsoring this Constitution amendment measure in the other House which we are discussing here today. Not only must we stand by the linguistic reorganisation of the States but we are faced with the situation when we have to extend our ideas of democracy and democratic reorganisation of the States to the point of creation of autonomous regions or States, whatever you call it, within a State. That only shows how isolated the Congress President is from the mainstream of our political life. Anyhow the Government has not taken it very seriously. That is the only redeeming feature of the entire situation.

Now, let me come to the substance of the Bill. The Bill is welcome in the sense that it empowers Parliament to create an autonomous State within a State, a new concept that we are introducing into our constitutional and political set-up. This development is undoubtedly a welcome one in the sense that it conforms to a certain extent to the urges and aspirations of the people who want to make their future according to their own likes without having to face either suppression or interference from outside

agencies or outside authorities. Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is a fact of history that the hill regions or the hill areas of the State of Assam have been subjected to all kinds of denials and have been treated unfairly and unjustly in many ways by the Congress Government in Assam. Even the monies that were allocated to be spent for the well-being of the people there or for the improvement of those areas, had not been properly spent and, in fact, had been squandered away or otherwise misused. These people had been treated as a kind of second-class citizens, subjected to plunder by certain exploiters from outside and bureaucratic tyranny from the side of the administration. Naturally, the hills people felt highly aggrieved and there was growing resentment all over the hill areas of the State of Assam. The Government, instead of taking note of the signs on the wall, instead of paying heed to the urges and aspirations of those people, sought to silence them by political fraud and by repression. Even to-day we have the spectacle of what is happening in the Mizo Hills. There is open defiance and revolt on the part of the people there on the one hand and repression let loose by the authorities on the other. If the Central Government had acted in time and proceeded to reorganise or re-shape the State of Assam having regard to the realities of the changing mood of the masses and the changing political situation, we would not have perhaps now been faced with a situation where the Mizo Hills people have to be kept outside the ambit of this measure. Now that does not speak well of the Government and certainly brings no credit to its comprehension of problems or to its handling of our public affairs.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Assam Congress Government initially took the line of resistance to any suggestion that came from various political parties in the country for reconsidering the question of the status of Assam or for reviewing the relation of the hills people or the hill areas with the rest of Assam, particularly in relation to the Assam Government. In fact,

they thought that nothing should be done to disturb the *status quo* which undoubtedly was very helpful to certain exploiters to go to Assam and exploit not only the hill areas but also the valley; and that is a well-known fact. All kinds of slogans were raised by the extremes on both sides and solution became difficult or seemed difficult for the time being. It is a notorious fact of our public life that the Assam State Government instigated initially certain agitations against the hill people's demand, and it was to be seen that when certain steps were taken by the Centre in order to bring about an understanding between the hills people and the plains people, the Assam Congress and its Government were not in the least helpful initially. Later on, I am glad, reason asserted itself and sense dawned upon them, and to-day we have come to some kind of an understanding between the hills people and the Assam Congress and other parties which function in the plains area. I welcome this understanding because problems such as these have to be solved as far as possible through mutual discussions, through consultations and in a peaceful way, always trying to find out a common voice, a common approach in the interest of national integration and in the interest of the wellbeing of the people. Therefore, I have no hesitation in extending my support to this measure because it has received the support of both the hills people and the plains people and it represents, broadly speaking, a national consensus in so far as that region is concerned. And we to-day, by supporting this measure, are giving it a solemn national sanction. I hope the measure will be passed unanimously. I cannot understand the position taken by our friends of the Swatantra Party or by our friends of the Jan Sangh.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS (Uttar Pradesh): Do not bracket them together.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I won't bracket them, but Mr. Balraj Madhok is trying not only to bracket them together, but to enter into a regular

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

wedlock between the two. Now these two parties, I am surprised, are advocating the status of Union territories for the hill areas. It seems that they have developed great faith in Mr. Yeshwantrao Chavan and the zamin-dari he runs under the style of Union territories. Well, Mr. Chavan would certainly feel flattered by the indirect tribute paid to him by the Swatantra Party and the Jan Singh when they advocate that the hill areas should be constituted as appendages of the Union Government, euphemistically called Union territories. But they should realise that this proposal runs counter to all elementary principles of democracy and certainly it goes against the very basis on which an agreement has been arrived at between the hills people and the plains people, the basis on which the hills people in particular have been persuaded to give up their demand for complete separation from the State of Assam and to accept this present arrangement, or what we may call a sub-State within a State. Now this line of the Jan Sangh and the Swatantra Party, I venture to say, fits in with their general stand for what they call strengthening the Centre. But the very idea of strengthening the Centre is conceived in a spirit of suppression of the autonomy of the States, suppression of the expressions of the people who are living in conditions of neglect and backwardness as in the case of the hill people in Assam. Naturally this can never be acceptable to democratic thinking—I mean the suggestions made by the Swatantra Party and the Jan Sangh. I need not go into their stand now. It is utterly reactionary, retrograde, authoritarian, and certainly pleasing to Mr. Chavan who must have been feeling very flattered by the confidence reposed in the Union Government by the two parties in the Opposition. However, we know that Mr. Chavan, though a realist...

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Sir, he does not know what he is talking. The Swatantra Party has never advocated making union territories within Assam.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know that. My friend thinks that I do not know what I am talking about. But I can say Mr. Misra did not listen to what his colleague, Prof. Ruthnaswamy, was saying. Prof. Ruthnaswamy was pleading, was supporting actually the proposition of union territories. And I thought that my friend would at least listen to his colleague's speech, who sits to his right. Now I am not going into that again. Mr. Vice-Chairman, it should be given a fair trial. I would not say it should be given a fair trial only. We must make it a success and it is the common obligation of all of us to see that when a Sub-State or whatever you call it, is created, it becomes acceptable and becomes a living reality to the people for whom it is meant. What does it imply? It implies in the first instance that the ruling classes in Assam must reconcile to the position when the hills people should be allowed to carve their future as they think best uninhibited by interference from outside or pressures from outside. This is very very important because it is quite possible if the Assam Government does not behave in a proper manner, if it becomes tardy in matters and also if the Assam Government tries to create difficulties, the entire scheme of things will fall through and extremist demands will come forward. Therefore, it is our common duty to ensure and we should give a solemn pledge to that effect that this rearrangement is being made primarily with a view to extending justice and the right of self-expression to the hills people who had been hitherto denied all these because of certain wrong policies on the part of the Government of India and the Government of Assam. I think it will be necessary for the Government of Assam, especially the Chief Minister of Assam, whoever he might be, to understand that under this measure or under the new arrangement, they will have to put in a special effort to rehabilitate the confidence of the hills people in the new set-up that is being created because it is their task to attract the hills people towards them; otherwise, I am afraid, things will not work out in the best possible way.

The second point I should like to know in this connection is this that the Central Government must render all financial assistance for the development of the hill areas. There may be tendencies on the part of the Centre to deny the needed funds in the belief that now that they have been given a Sub-State it might not be necessary for the Centre to meet all the financial demands coming from those quarters. That would be a wrong approach. No State in India, not to speak of a Sub-State which is being created, is today viable in the true sense of the term. It is our moral obligation and our special duty to help in every possible way generously, ungrudgingly, the backward areas which are brought to the light of modern civilisation and to which new avenues of modern life must be thrown open, generously and with every assistance from the Centre. That should be done. So, I would urge upon the Centre to cultivate a new mentality while creating a Sub-State within the State.

As far as the Governor is concerned, he might get certain special responsibilities of which we are not quite clear. But there must not be any tendency on the part of the Governor of Assam or the Chief Minister of Assam to exercise what may be called a veto power or certain restraints on the development of the hill areas. That again is a very very important point which I should like the Government to bear in mind.

As far as Cachar is concerned, I do not know why this question has been brought in by my friends of the Congress Party coming from Cachar. They made a suggestion that Tripura and Cachar should be formed into one State or that Cachar should be merged with Tripura. But have they consulted the people of Tripura? Besides, have they consulted the people of the Assam valley? Cachar is a district of the State of Assam. It is undoubtedly a problem. But this can be solved by fighting the Congress policies and I would ask my friend, Mr. Purkayastha, to come out of the Congress, if he

will, and join with the Opposition in the Assam State Assembly so that we can together fight for the legitimate demands of the people of the district of Cachar, whether in respect of services or in respect of industries or whatever it is. My friend, Mr. Purkayastha, is well aware that the Assam Congress supported this measure and that they did not make their support conditional upon the acceptance of Cachar as a separate entity or any such thing. I do not know why he is becoming suddenly a dissident in this matter. I think he may be well-advised to become a dissident Congressman at Faridabad instead of exhibiting his dissidence in this House this afternoon. Therefore, I have full sympathy with whatever demands or grievances the people have there if these grievances are legitimate and just and they should certainly be looked into by the authorities. But simply because there are certain grievances one should not go out with certain unrealistic slogans in order to spoil the whole thing. Well, that is all that I have to say with regard to Cachar. I hope my friends in Cachar will not misunderstand. I have already extended my offer to them that they can easily join with us coming out of the Congress in the Assam Assembly and we can together fight for Cachar district or for that matter any other district. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I do not wish to take any more time except to say...

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): You want to fish in troubled waters.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My friend, Mr. Akbar Ali Khan, says I believe in fishing in troubled waters.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: Not only that. You trouble waters, just to fish in.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: First of all let me deal with my friend. May I say that it is difficult to fish in troubled waters because all the Congressmen are jellyfish? Now, as far as

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

the suggestion that we create troubles goes, may I say that we are not creating troubles in Assam at all? The trouble is their own creation. The entire situation has been created by years of neglect, cynicism and indifference on the part of the Congress rulers in Assam who did not pay attention to even the very elementary urges of the people who inhabit the hill areas of the State. I am not responsible for it. As far as my Jan Sangh friends are concerned, they are advocating the theory now of unitary India; they do not like federation at all; they think they have captured the Metropolitan Council in Delhi and it will be only a few steps more to capture power at the Centre. But I may tell them that geographically they may be sitting very near the Centre but politically they are very far away from it and we are there to bar their way to capture power at the Centre. I can make that clear to them. Therefore, I think my friends of the Jan Sangh should not suffer from any illusions that they can get into power here. As far as their line is concerned, it is absolutely reactionary from A to Z.

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated): They are divided in their ranks.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In the name of unity of India every time they open their mouth whether through the RSS organ or through loudspeakers, but disintegration is what we have achieved by way of unity.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: Now you are really original.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Not original; he said 'regional'.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: No, aboriginal.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Anyway, what I want to say is that these

viewpoints are generally rejected by the people of this country and I hope they will never come to be accepted by all those who broadly stand for democracy and secularism.

Finally, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I pay my tributes to the Assamese people and the hill people for the manner in which even at this late stage they have come to some agreement over this matter. Again and again I would like to stress that in a matter like this we should always seek a democratic solution through discussions, negotiations, mutual consultations and that is how we can solve this problem. Fissiparous movements and agitations are no good. Although the Congress Party very often provokes such things, I think we should avoid these things. It goes to the credit of the hill leaders themselves and also the people of the Assam Valley that despite their certain reservations with regard to the arrangement that is being proposed they have come together in the larger interests of the country as also in their own interests to accept this arrangement. I hope their expectations will not be belied and their aspirations and urges will be fulfilled. I do urge upon the Central Government not only to have this measure passed and legislations brought before the House but also to ensure that the purposes and principles of these measures are fully carried out by extending all possible help, sustenance and encouragement to the hill people whom we must integrate properly and wholly with the rest of the country by our generosity, fellowship, kindness, assistance and friendship all along the line. Thank you.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to give my very reluctant support to this Bill. But for the fact that the Home Minister and the Government of India have committed themselves to a national consensus on the subject, I would have voted against the Bill. My hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, referred to the understanding that is necessary between the hill areas and the plain

areas of Assam. We are not opposed to any such understanding. But the manner in which we have sought to introduce alarming constitutional innovations in this Bill is something which is to be regretted.

Under clause 2 of the Bill it is provided that an autonomous State should be created in the State of Assam consisting of certain specified areas. I do not want to refer to what was said in the Select Committee but some of us feel very unhappy about the word 'autonomous'. I feel 'sub-State' would have been a more appropriate description of what is sought to be done under this Bill. Then under clause 2 of the Bill we are also trying to make it possible to carry out the amendment of the Constitution by a simple majority of the House but the amendment has got to be passed by a two-thirds majority of both the Houses of Parliament. Now I would like to ask the Home Minister whether he would recommend this solution to other parts of India. For example, I come from two areas, Nagpur in Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh. I was concerned with a separate Vidarbha State agitation many years back when the hon. Home Minister was the Chief Minister of Bombay. At that time he took the line that he would not have a separate State of Vidarbha and in 1957 I accepted his suggestion that the agitation should be dropped. Now many people in Vidarbha are asking for the creation of a separate State. Now Mr. Chavan would stand up and say that he would not accept the solution of a separate or a sub-State or an autonomous State for Vidarbha. Similarly in the case of Telengana there is a good deal of feeling that Telengana should be an autonomous region. Would the hon. Home Minister accept this solution, which is proposed for the State of Assam, in the case of Vidarbha and Telengana? (*Interruption*) Sir, I feel that this experiment is not going to work satisfactorily. I do not want to be a prophet of doom and I do not like that any dismal situation should emerge in Assam, but I would like to draw your attention to Mr. Gopal

Barbora's Minute of Dissent, where he says:

"The proposed reorganisation as outlined in the 11 September declaration has satisfied nobody in Assam, neither the hills people nor the people of the plains; both of the Brahmaputra and the Surama Valley. Even in Khasi-Jaintia and Garo Hills, for which the sub-State has been proposed, many people, whatever be their number now, feel let down by the APHLC leadership and have formed the Hill State People's Democratic Party to further carry on their struggle for a separate Hill State."

Now Mr. Barbora comes from that area and he knows what is happening there. So I am afraid that, as soon as this Bill is passed by Parliament and a new law is brought forward to reorganise the State of Assam, there will be a good deal of agitation. We have received a good deal of memoranda from many concerned parties including the Gorkhas objecting to the provisions of this Bill. Therefore, Sir, what I feel is that this Bill is seeking to create more problems that it solves. The moment an autonomous State is created, the powers cannot be restricted only to certain subjects. Now law and order is supposed to be kept away from the hands of this autonomous State. But the moment this autonomous State comes into being, they will naturally like to ask for powers to carry on law and order. (*Interruptions*) They would naturally ask for the administration of law and order. And if law and order is going to be given to a small area, what is going to happen to the unity of this country? This is a matter that the Home Minister and the Government of India should very carefully consider—the consequences of this Bill on the fabric of Indian unity. I feel, Sir, the moment the autonomous State is created, that region will ask for full Statehood. Now, when the Government of India has given full Statehood to the State of Nagaland, how can they deny it to the people of the Assam hill areas?

[Shri A. D. Mani]

There is a good deal of feeling on the subject. They want separate Statehood for the whole regions which are going to be constituted into these autonomous States. Sir, I would like to also mention that the Governor of these regions will be the Governor of Assam. Now, even in Nagaland, as the Home Minister is aware, the Government of Nagaland wants the appointment of a separate Governor. How can he object to a separate Governor being demanded by the people of this autonomous region? I am afraid, the moment we agree to create this autonomous State, they will ask for a separate Governor, a separate High Court and a separate Public Service Commission, and if we agree, we will be multiplying fissiparous tendencies in the State of Assam.

Sir, I would like to say here that even in regard to these autonomous regions there has been no scientific basis for the constitution of these autonomous areas. Garo Hills are going to be a part of this autonomous region. The population of Garo Hills is only 3,07,228, whereas that of United Khasi and Jaintia Hills is 4,62,152 according to the 1961 Census figures. This Garo Hills is much smaller in population as well as in area than the United Khasi and Jaintia Hills. Garo Hills are different from United Khasi and Jaintia Hills in their ethnic origin as they differ from Assamese or Bengalis or other communities in all other States in the country. So, what the Home Minister is trying to do is that he is trying to bring Garos along with Khasis and Jaintias, but Garos do not like this arrangement. And there has been no reference even to the creation of an autonomous region for the Mizos, and I feel, Sir, that this experiment will promote a good deal of bad feeling and controversy in the State of Assam the moment Garo Hills are brought together with United Khasi and Jaintia Hills.

Sir, I do not want to say more except to say that we view this Bill with grave misgivings. If this Bill is

passed, we will be seeing that first attempt to dismantle the fabric of Indian unity. I do not want to throw cold water on the enthusiasm of the Home Minister, who thinks that this will produce an immediate solution in Assam. Unfortunately, Mizo Hills, which constitute a very big problem in Assam, do not come within the ambit of this Bill at all; the Mizo problem is going to be dealt with separately and this Bill is concerned only with Garo Hills and United Khasi and Jaintia Hills at the present time. Now, Sir, this Assam experiment is being conducted in a vulnerable border area bordering with Pakistan and Burma. I do not think that this is a move we should welcome with enthusiasm, as my hon. friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has done. But, Sir, we do not want to dishonour the word of Mr. Chavan. Since he has agreed to the national consensus, we vote most reluctantly for this Bill.

श्री जगत नारायण (हरियाणा) :

वाइस चेयरमैन महोदय, जब हिन्दुस्तान का बटवारा हुआ तब मैं लाहौर कांग्रेस का प्रधान था और हमने उसकी सख्त मुखालिफत की। खैर, उसका बटवारा हुआ। फिर यहां आने पर मद्रास का बटवारा हुआ।

श्री ओम् मेहता (जम्मू और काश्मीर) :

लेकिन यह बटवारा नहीं है।

श्री जगत नारायण : मैं उसी बात पर आ रहा हूं।

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

जब आंध्र प्रदेश और मद्रास अलग किया गया तब मैं पंजाब प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी का जनरल सेक्रेटरी था और तब हमने उसकी मुखालिफत की। और जब महाराष्ट्र गुजरात बना तब भी उसकी मुखालिफत की। और जब पंजाब का हाल में बटवारा हुआ तब मैं अपोजीशन में था, तब मुझे जेल में भी जाना पड़ा मगर उस वक्त भी मैंने उसकी

मुखालिफत की। और मैं यह समझता हूँ कि इस वक्त जो यह हिल स्टेट बनाई जा रही है, यह जो आसाम का बटवारा किया जा रहा है, यह गलत कदम है और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जो बिल पेश किया जा रहा है इसको वापस ले लेना चाहिये। मैं इसलिये यह कहता हूँ कि आज श्री चव्हाण साहब ने कहा कि आगे कोई इस किस्म की बात नहीं होगी कि अगर हमने यह सब-स्टेट बना दिया तो तेलंगाना भी बनाना पड़ेगा या कोई और विदर्भ भी बनाना पड़ेगा। उन्होंने यह कहा अपनी स्पीच में, मगर मैं यह समझता हूँ कि जिस वक्त पंजाब के बटवारे की बात आई थी उस वक्त पहले सच्चर फारमूला बना, उसके बाद रीजनल कमेटोज़ बनीं और फिर उसके बाद पंजाब का बटवारा हुआ और पंजाब को हिस्सों में बांट दिया गया, तो यह जो कह रहे हैं कि इसको रोक लेंगे और तेलंगाना का अलग सब-स्टेट नहीं बनायेंगे या और कोई सब-स्टेट नहीं बनायेंगे ऐसा नहीं कर सकते। और जो कुछ आज कांग्रेस के प्रधान ने कहा है उसके बारे में हमें सोचना होगा कि लिग्विस्टिक बेसिस पर स्टेट्स को बनाना है या नहीं बनाना है। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि जो कुछ उन्होंने मशविरा दिया है उस पर सोचना चाहिये और मैं श्री चव्हाण साहब की तवज्जह इस बात की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब कांस्टीट्यूट असेम्बली में यह मामला पेश हुआ कि लिग्विस्टिक स्टेट्स हों, लिग्विस्टिक स्टेट्स का प्रस्ताव पेश हुआ, तो उस वक्त पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने क्या तकरीर की थी? उनकी जो तकरीर थी वह मैं जरा उनके गोशे-गुजार करना चाहता हूँ। वह यह है :—

“... Speaking for myself, I have been overwhelmed with the thought that we must give the topmost priority to the development of a sense of unity in India, because these are

critical days. Any decision that might come in the way of that unity should be delayed till we have laid a strong foundation for it. Because of that, I for my own part have frankly—and I should be quite frank with this House—not taken any aggressive or positive step in regard to the formation of linguistic provinces.”

यह उस वक्त कांस्टीट्यूट असेम्बली में उनकी तकरीर थी और वहाँ पर लिग्विस्टिक प्रोविसेज बनाने का रेजोल्यूशन वापस हुआ। उसके बाद आंध्र प्रदेश बना, महाराष्ट्र बना, गुजरात बना, यह सारा कुछ बना, तो उस वक्त भी इसी लोक सभा में पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू की यह तकरीर थी, जो उन्होंने तकरीर की थी, जो उन्होंने इस बारे में अपना ऐंगविश पेश किया था वह, मैडम यह थी :—

“The more I have thought about it, the more I have been attracted to something which I used to reject previously and which, I suppose, is not at all practicable now. That is the division of India into four, five or six major groups regardless of language, but always, I will repeat, giving the greatest importance to the language in those areas. I do not want this to be a step to suppress a language, but rather to give it encouragement. That, I fear, is a little difficult. We have gone too far in the contrary direction. But I would suggest for the consideration of this House a rather feeble imitation of that. That is, whatever final decisions Parliament arrives at in regard to these States, we may still have what I would call zonal councils, that is, a group of three, four or five States, as the case may be, having a common council...”

यह थी उनकी तकरीर जिसमें उन्होंने अपना ऐंगविश जाहिर किया। तो हिन्दुस्तान में स्टेट्स का बटवारा होता चला गया। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि श्री

[श्री जगत नारायण]

निजलिगप्पा ने जो बात कही है वह नई बात नहीं कही है। उन्होंने बिल्कुल ठीक ही कहा है। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने जो यह कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान में सिर्फ चार, पांच बड़ी स्टेट्स होनी चाहियें वह ठीक था। उन्होंने कहा कि अगर सब-स्टेट्स बनानी हैं तो चार, पांच स्टेट्स बनानी चाहियें। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि बहुत सी सब-स्टेट्स बन रही हैं। सारी तो सब-स्टेट्स बन नहीं सकती लेकिन अगर बनती है तो साल दो साल बाद मालूम होगा कि स्टेट्स की सब-स्टेट्स बन जायेंगी। फिर आप विदर्भ स्टेट भी बनाइये जैसा अभी हमारे एक भाई ने कहा। फिर गवर्नर मांगेंगे, असेम्बली मांगेंगे। आज यह जो जंग लड़ी जा रही है यह इस वास्ते नहीं है कि बैकवर्ड एरिया है, हिन्दी एरिया है, बल्कि लिगुइस्टिक जंग है। अगर आपने इस तरीके से स्टेट्स को बांटना शुरू किया तो जैसा हमारे भाई मणि साहब ने तेलंगाना की बात कही, उसका अलग स्टेट बनाइये, उसी तरह से विदर्भ की बात आयेगी।

Mr. Jagat Narayan

मणिपुर के हिल रीजन्स कहते हैं हमारा स्टेट अलाहिदा बनाइये। अभी-अभी एक भाई ने कहा कछार का एक सब-स्टेट बनाना चाहिये। स्टेट्स के सब स्टेट्स यह कितने आप करते चले जायेंगे। तो मैडम, मैं बड़ी अदब के साथ श्री चव्हाण की खिदमत में अर्ज करता हूँ कि अगर ईमानदारी से वह महसूस करते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान की एकजुती होनी चाहिये तो एकजुती इसी तरह से हो सकती है कि हिन्दुस्तान को चार, पांच स्टेट्स में बांटें। दोबारा, एक कमिशन मुकर्रर कीजिए स्टेट्स को रिअर्गनाइज करने के लिये और सबको इकट्ठा करके हिन्दुस्तान की एकजुती को पूरा होने देने की कोशिश कीजिए। अगर आपका

यही मौजूदा सिलसिला जारी रहा तो यकीन जानिये कि कम से कम पच्चीस, तीस स्टेट्स हमारे यहां बन जायेंगी और इस तरह से देश को बांट कर कभी एकजुती नहीं आ सकेगी। इसलिये मैं चव्हाण साहब से रिक्वेस्ट करूंगा कि इस रिजोल्यूशन को वापस ले लें और हिन्दुस्तान को चार, पांच फ्रेश जोन्स में बांटें ताकि हिन्दुस्तान की एकजुती कायम रहे।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I still have the name of Mr. Pitamber Das and of Mr. Rajnarain. I was to have called the Minister at 4.15 but now I shall call him at 4.30. Both of them can accommodate within the time limit. Mr. Pitamber Das.

श्री पीताम्बर दास : मैडम डिपुटी चेरमैन, इस बिल को लाकर हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहब यह समझते हैं कि उन्होंने बहुत दिनों से उठी हुई समस्या को हल कर लिया है।

“वह समझे हैं हमारा काफिला मंजिल पे आ पहुंचा

मगर इस काफिले की दास्तां कुछ और कहती है।”

होम मिनिस्टर साहब का यह कहना है कि यह एग्रीड सोल्यूशन है। अगर हम ज़रा ध्यान से देखें तो पता चलेगा कि इस योजना से किसी की भी तसल्ली नहीं हुई है। जो खासी और जयंतिया के लोग हैं वे अभी भी फुलफ्लेज्ड स्टेटहुड मांग रहे हैं। समय-समय पर इस क्षेत्र से जो तार आए हैं या मेमोरेन्डम आये हैं उनसे पता चलता है कि गारो इलाके के रहने वाले लोग यथास्थिति, यानी ‘स्टेट्स को’, चाहते हैं। और भी बहुत से ऐसे तत्व हैं कि जो सभी हिल डिसट्रिक्ट्स के लिये पूरी आटानोमी चाहते हैं नगालैन्ड के पैटर्न के ऊपर जो

नान ट्राइबल माइनारिटीज है, गुरखा है या प्लेन्स के लोग है या और लोग है, उन्हें अपनी सुरक्षा के लिये, अपने बहुत से अधिकारों को बचाने के लिये, प्राविधानों की यानी सेफगार्ड्स की आवश्यकता है, ऐसी उन्होंने माग की है। जो यह आमाम हिल पीपुल्स लीडर्स कान्फरेन्स है उसके नेताओं ने भी इस योजना को पूरे तरीके से स्वीकार नहीं किया। लॉ एण्ड आर्डर आसाम सरकार को जो दिया गया है उसके सबध में वह अपना समाधान नहीं कर पाये हैं अभी। ऐसा दिखायी देना है कि इस योजना से सरकार ने तो यह समझा है कि हमारी जान बच गई और हिल लीडर्स कान्फरेन्स के लोगों ने यह समझा है कि जितना मिल गया उसे ले लो और आगे के लिये अपनी माग जारी रखो और झगड़ते रहो। नतीजा इसका यह होगा कि जो दिक्कत आज गई दिखायी देती है वह कल फिर सामने आयेगी। इस तरीके की जो मागे उठती हैं उन मागों का उठना इतना खतरनाक नहीं है जितना खतरनाक सरकार का उन मागों को सुलझाने का तरीका है।

जिस समय नगालैन्ड की माग को सरकार ने स्वीकार किया था, हमने उस समय भी कहा था कि इन सारी चीजों के ऊपर एक साथ बैठ कर विचार कर लिया जाय, टुकड़ो-टुकड़ो में विचार किया जायेगा तो उससे समस्या हल नहीं होगी। और तो और, इस हाउस में भी इस बहस के दौरान उन सदस्यों ने भी जिन्होंने समर्थन किया है इस बिल का, इसके प्राविधानों की डट कर आलोचना की है। मुझे बड़ा ताज्जुब आता है सदस्यों के इस रवैय्ये के ऊपर, कि बिल की तो आलोचना करते हैं और कहते हैं हम इसका समर्थन करते हैं।

“इन बातों का मतलब क्या समझे आसान भी है, दुश्वार भी है।

होठों पे हसी, माथे पे शिकन
इकरार भी है, इनकार भी है।”

वदकिस्मती तो यह है कि मैं उर्दू के शेर पढ़ता हूँ और लोग कहते हैं कि मैं उर्दू के खिलाफ हूँ।

श्री अकबर अली खान (आंध्र प्रदेश) :
आपको नहीं कहते हैं।

श्री पीताम्बर दास मेरा कहना यह है कि इस क्षेत्र के जो लोग हैं उनकी क्षेत्रीय आकांक्षाएँ समझ में आने योग्य हैं। कुछ उनकी अपनी सामाजिक आवश्यकताएँ होंगी, कुछ उनकी आर्थिक विपमताएँ होंगी, वह उनका संरक्षण करना चाहेंगे। परन्तु साथ ही साथ देश की एकता और सुरक्षा के प्रश्न को भी नजरअंदाज नहीं किया जा सकता। ऐसी हालत में हमने जो नोट आफ डिसेन्ट में सुझाव दिया है उसको मैं पढ़े देता हूँ और फिर मैं अपनी बात समाप्त कर दूंगा।

“It is, therefore, imperative that instead of giving full statehood to small areas like Nagaland or huddling different Tribal areas together as is envisaged in this bill for Khasi, Jaintia and Garo hills, the autonomous status of each hill district should be further strengthened by treating each of them as a Union Territory. All these Union territories together with the State of Assam should have a common Governor assisted by a number of Commissioners for different territories, a common High Court, a common Civil Service, and a common Police Cadre. A pattern on these lines can surely be evolved after a thorough examination of the whole problem by the commission suggested above. Such a pattern can fully satisfy the aspirations of each tribal area and people and at the same time safeguard the wider interests of the country as a whole.

[श्री पीताम्बर दास]

In view of what is stated above we are unable to agree with the report of the Joint Select Committee on the Constitution (Twenty-Second Amendment) Bill."

Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rajnarain, just 10 minutes. Mr. Das has taken less than ten minutes.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: I have deliberately not taken more than 10 minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, you have not taken 10 minutes.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश)
मैं पहले ही निवेदन कर दू कि अगर मैं रिपोर्ट करू तो मुझे रोकियेगा।

उपसभापति यह बात नहीं है. . .

श्री राजनारायण : 15 मिनट मेरी पार्टी का बाकी है पहले का। 25 मिनट का समय तो हमारा है ही।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not think there is partywise arrangement. Everyone was given 15 minutes each.

श्री राजनारायण : मैं आपसे अदब के साथ अर्ज करता हू कि आप मुझे शुरू में टोकना शुरू न करें। मैंने बोलना भी आरम्भ नहीं किया कि आपने टोकना शुरू कर दिया। It has become your habit. जब भी मैं खड़ा होता हूँ आप टोका करती है। क्यों आप कहती है शुरू में . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I want to appeal to the House. I said you can have 20 minutes between you and Mr. Das. You may speak now. At 4.30 I will call the Home Minister.

श्री राजनारायण : आप होम मिनिस्टर को ऐसे काल करेगी तो मैं बोलने नहीं दूंगा।

I have also got my right and duty. I also represent a party.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
Your Party member has spoken.

श्री राजनारायण : हा, 8 मिनट। हमने आपस में समय बांट लिया था। हमारा 10 मिनट पहले का बाकी है और 10 मिनट और है। (Interruption.) अजीब बात है। मैं जब बोलता हूँ पता नहीं शुरू में ही क्यों टोक देती है। 3 मिनट तक हमसे ज्यादा वह खुद बोली है। देखिये मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस सरकार ने किस मकसद को हासिल करने के लिये इस विधेयक को प्रस्तुत किया है।

सरकार का जो मकसद है क्या उसकी पूर्ति इस विधेयक से हो रही है या नहीं हो रही है। माननीया, मैं बहुत ही परेशान हूँ कि इस देश की समस्याओं को यह सरकार एक राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण से, एक राष्ट्रीय नुवतेनज़र में समाधान करेगी या नहीं करेगी। माननीया, देखा जाय। मैं इसके पहले ही कह दूँ कि अभी-अभी यह टाइम्स आफ इंडिया में दिया हुआ है "PM keen on Telengana safeguards. The Prime Minister is reported to be in consultation with the Home Minister on the question of providing constitutional guarantee to the Telengana safeguards" अगर कास्टीट्यूशनल गारन्टी देने की बात है तो फिर तेलंगाना में इतना कत्ल क्यों, इतनी हत्या क्यों, इतनी आगजनी क्यों और इतनी बरबादी क्यों। क्योंकि यह सरकार समयक दृष्टि से और पूर्ण दृष्टि से कोई भी काम करना नहीं चाहती है। यह तो तब ही कोई काम करेगी जब उसके सिर पर लोग सवार हो जायेंगे, काफी बरबादी हो जायेगी,

तब ही सरकार कुछ करना चाहती है। इसलिए मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मैं इस विधेयक का समर्थक हूँ और प्रसन्नता के साथ इसका समर्थन करता बशर्ते कि हमारी ये सब चीजे हो जाती।

मैं सीधी-सी बात कहना चाहता हूँ और इसमें कोई हर्ज नहीं है कि हमारे मित्र श्री भडारी जी ने और हमारे मित्र श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने अपना-अपना प्वाइन्ट रखा है और दोनों अपनी-अपनी जगह पर हैं और वे दूसरों की बात को नहीं समझते हैं। हमारे मित्र श्री सुन्दर सिंह भडारी यूनिथन टैरीटरी के मातहत यह चीज आ जाय। वे इस हिस्से को यूनिथन टैरीटरी को देने के लिए तैयार हैं। मगर वे वहाँ की जनता को स्वेच्छा से अपने प्रतिनिधियों द्वारा राजकाज चलाने को देने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं और इस पर उन्हें बुरा लगता है। श्री भूपेश गुप्त अपनी जगह पर हैं क्योंकि उनका कहना है कि जब तक सेन्टर दूसरों के साथ में रहेगा तब तक राज्यों के पास अधिकार नहीं रहेंगे। वे एक कदम आगे जाने के लिए तैयार हैं। वे राज्यों को “पावर टु सिसीड” का अधिकार देने के लिए तैयार हैं। वे यह चाहते हैं कि राज्यों को यह हक हो जाय कि वे जब चाहे केन्द्र से अलग हो जाय। श्री भूपेश गुप्त अपनी जगह पर ठीक हैं, लेकिन हम इस दृष्टिकोण का समर्थन नहीं करते हैं। आत्म-निर्भरता में इक्लूड करते हैं पावर टु सिसीड। आत्म-निर्भरता सच्ची तब ही होगी जब उसको यह हक होगा कि वह केन्द्र से अलग रहे। श्री भूपेश गुप्त अपनी जगह पर ठीक हैं, मगर हम इस दृष्टिकोण का समर्थन नहीं करते हैं। हमारा दृष्टिकोण श्री भूपेश गुप्त के और श्री भडारी जी के दृष्टिकोण से अलग है। हमारा दृष्टिकोण क्या है।

आजकल समाचार-पत्रों में एक विवाद खड़ा कर दिया गया है, सेन्टर कमजोर और राज्य मजबूत या फिर सेन्टर मजबूत और राज्य कमजोर। इस तरह का निरर्थक और थोथा विवाद खड़ा कर दिया गया है। मैं एक प्रश्न उपस्थित करना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि चाहे बंगाल हो, चाहे उत्तर प्रदेश हो। बंगाल में कुछ जिले ऐसे हैं जिन जिलों की बराबर यह शिकायत रहती है कि हमारे लोगों की दयनीय स्थिति है और जो पिछड़ा हुआ हमारा इलाका है उसके पिछड़ेपन को दूर करने के लिए राज्य सरकार ध्यान नहीं दे रही है। तो हर राज्य के अन्दर जितने जिले हैं, तो फिर वे जिले मजबूत क्यों न हों और राज्य ही क्यों मजबूत हो। जितने जिले हैं उनका अनईवन डेवलपमेंट हुआ है और सभी जिलों का इक्वल डेवलपमेंट नहीं हुआ है। जैसे आप उत्तर प्रदेश को देख लीजिये। उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी इलाके—बनारस और गोरखपुर कमिशनरिया जो हैं उनमें एक वर्ग मील इलाके में 800 आदमी रहते हैं जब कि सारे देश की औसत करीब 380 के हैं। इस तरह से पूर्वी इलाकों में एक वर्ग मील में 800 व्यक्ति रहते हैं। इस तरह से वहाँ पर कितनी थिक पापुलेशन है। वहाँ पर लोगों की आमदनी 3 आना रोज है। वहाँ पर 80 प्रतिशत लोगो की आमदनी इतनी है और इस तरह से वह कितना पिछड़ा हुआ इलाका है। अगर हमें इस समस्या का समाधान करना है तो इसके लिए हमें एक राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण बनाना होगा।

जैसे मैंने पहले कहा कि अगर हमें राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण बनाना है तो हमें शुद्धतः और पूर्णरूपेण आज जो सरकार दो पायों पर टिकी हुई है, दो पिलरों पर टिकी हुई है, दिल्ली और लखनऊ या

[श्री राजनारायण]

दिल्ली और बम्बई, उसको कम से कम चार पिलर आफ दी स्टेट बनाये। एक दिल्ली का, एक राज्यो का, एक जिलो का और एक ग्रामो का। इस तरह से गाव पचायत, राज्य पचायत, जिला पचायत और केन्द्र पचायत। केन्द्र के पास सीमा की सुरक्षा रहे, सिवयोगिटी फोर्स रहे, विदेशो मामले, अन्तर्प्रान्तीय मामले, हमारे देश का यातायात और मुद्रा रहे। राज्यो के अन्तर्गत जो राज्यो से संबंधित समस्याएँ हैं वे राज्यो के पास रहे। गाव पचायत के पास शिक्षा, दवा, रोगनी, सफाई, पानी और जो इसान की जिन्दगी के लिए बुनियादी चीजे हैं, वे सब गाव पचायत को दे देनी चाहिये। जिले स्तर पर जो विकास के सवाल हैं वे जिले के अन्दर छोड़ दिये जाने चाहिये। आमदनी का भी उचित ढंग से बटवारा कर दिया जाना चाहिये। अगर इस तरह की व्यवस्था हो जायगी तो श्री चव्हाण साहब के लिए भी आसानी हो जायगी और दूसरे लोगो को भी आसानी हो जायेगी।

इस समय जो हर जगह पर हलचल मची हुई है कि हर आदमी दिल्ली ही आना चाहता है और हर आदमी मंत्री बना रहना चाहता है। अगर आपने ऊपर की तरह व्यवस्था कर दी तो गाव पचायत का जो प्रधान होगा वह गाव की एरिया में वहाँ की शिक्षा को देखेगा, वहाँ की सफाई को देखेगा, वहाँ की रोगनी को देखेगा, वहाँ की सड़को को देखेगा और इस तरह से जो छोटे-छोटे आदमी हैं, वे चाहेंगे कि हम गाव पचायत में रहकर गाव का प्रशासन ठीक तरह से चलायें और इस तरह से कास्टीट्यूशनल ढंग से सत्ता का बटवारा हो तथा डिस्ट्री-व्यूशन हो। डेलीगेशन आफ पावर की बात मैं मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन आफ पावर

हो। डेलीगेशन और डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन आफ पावर में बड़ा अन्तर है। डेलीगेट करने के पूर्व हमको सत्ता चाहिये और जब हम सत्ता ले ले तब उसमें से कुछ हिस्सा डेलीगेट करेंगे। इसलिए हम दूरतम, अधिकतम और दूरी तक जाकर किसी को पूर्ण अधिकार देने के लिए तैयार हैं। इसी तरह से विश्व की सरकार बनें और राष्ट्र उसके अन्तर्गत आ जाय। इस तरह से एक विश्व पचायत बन जाय और उस विश्व पचायत में हर राष्ट्र अपनी प्रभुसत्ता का एक अंश दे दे। अगर इस तरह की बात की गई तो इन समस्याओं का सामाधान हो सकता है।

मैं एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। मैं ने पूरे आसाम का दौरा किया था और स्वर्गीय जवाहरलाल नेहरू को उसकी रपट दी थी। हमारे साथ गुलाब बरबोरा थे और हम लोग सब जगह पर गये। इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो विधेयक हमारे सामने प्रस्तुत है इससे समस्या का समाधान नहीं हो सकता है। यह तो बिल्कुल खड है, पीसमील है। मैं श्री चव्हाण साहब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो ये तीन हिस्से हैं—खासी, जयन्तिया और गारो, ये कहते हैं कि हमें आटोनमस स्टेट का दर्जा दिया जाना चाहिये। मेरा कहना है कि आटोनमस स्टेट शब्द यहाँ पर उपयुक्त है या नहीं, इस चीज को अच्छी तरह से देखना चाहिये। हमारी समझ में आटोनमस स्टेट शब्द उपयुक्त नहीं है और इसके लिए कोई दूसरा नाम होना चाहिये।

एक माननीय सदस्य : सब-स्टेट।

श्री राजनारायण. सब-स्टेट कहिये या रीजनल आटोनमी कहिये। जहाँ तक रीजनल आटोनमी का सवाल है, इसको

तो हम समझ सकते हैं, लेकिन आटोमस स्टेट कौन होंगे, इसके बारे में जो पोलिटिकल साइन्स के विद्यार्थी हैं उनको और श्री चव्हाण साहब को भी इस पर विचार करना चाहिये।

एक माननीय सदस्य : आटोमस के माने इंडिपेंडेंट के हुए।

श्री राजनारायण : हम को शक है। इसके साथ ही हमारे मित्र ने जितने प्रश्न उठाये हैं, उनको मैं दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूँ। मगर मैं इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि कछार और मिकिर लोगों की जो यह माग है कि हमको भी इसमें शामिल किया जाय, ऐसा हमसे क्यों कहा जाता है क्योंकि हम तो एक सेपरेट स्टेट के रूप में रहना चाहते हैं और रहेगे। इसलिए उनकी भी अलग स्टेट की माग उठ रही है।

इसके साथ ही जो मैदानी इलाके के ट्राइबल्स हैं, अहोमस हैं, उन्होंने भी सेपरेट स्टेट की माग की है और इस सरकार के पास उनके लिए क्या गारन्टी है? क्या सरकार उनकी माग पर झुक जायेगी? इसीलिए हमने एक साधु सशोधन दिया था। हम चाहते थे कि जहाँ यह लिखा हुआ है कि “इस सविधान में किसी बात के होते हुए भी सशोधन विधेयक द्वारा आसाम राज्य के भीतर” वहाँ उसको आसाम राज्य में नहीं जोड़ा जाना चाहिये था। चाहिये यह था कि सरकार एक अधिकार लेती कि ऐसे सवाल अब जहाँ कहीं भी उठेंगे उसके सबध में सरकार आवश्यकता के अनुसार एक सब-स्टेट या रीजनल आटोममी देने की व्यवस्था कर सकती है। इस तरह से एक साथ सब काम हो जाता। अगर सरकार इस चीज को मान लेती तो तेलगाना का सवाल भी हल हो जाता और जहाँ

कहीं भी इस तरह के सवाल उठते वे भी हल हो जाते। (*Time bell rings.*)

माननीया मुझे बहुत ही दुःख है कि उर्वशीयम का जो मामला है वह कोई समझता है या नहीं। आज कांग्रेस पार्टी के लोग उर्वशीयम को नेफा से ममझते हैं। वहाँ के लोगों की भी माग हो रही है। अगर हमारे सशोधन को मान लिया जाय तो उनकी माग का समाधान भी सरकार निकाल सकती है।

उसी के साथ-साथ मनीपुर का आन्दोलन भी चल रहा है। (*Interruption*) मनीपुर की जनता की आवाज़ को मैं बुलन्द करना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि मनीपुर के लोग स्टेटहुड की माग कर रहे हैं और वे चाहते हैं कि जैसा दूसरे राज्यों को अधिकार है उसी तरह से पूर्णरूपेण उनको भी अधिकार मिलना चाहिये। इस लिये जो सशोधन हम दे रहे हैं उसको अगर मान लिया जाय तो मनीपुर को समस्या का भी समाधान सरकार समय पर निकाल लेगी और जो विभिन्न जगहों पर समय-समय पर आन्दोलनकारी प्रवृत्तियाँ चल रही हैं उनसे भी सरकार को छुट्टी मिल जायेगी। मगर आज सरकार सकुचित दृष्टिकोण से पता नहीं क्यों पीसमिल मेजर एडाप्ट कर के सारे देश की समस्याओं को मुँह बांधे रख के खड़ा रखना चाहती है। लेकिन जैसा कि मैंने पहले ही कह दिया कि एक कहावत है कि अगर कुछ नहीं है तो जितना है उतना ही अच्छा है और इस माने में मैं इसका समर्थन कर रहा हूँ क्योंकि जनता को कुछ अधिकार तो मिल रहा है। मगर इसका पूर्ण रूप से और दिल खोल कर समर्थन तभी होता जब सारे राष्ट्र को दृष्टि के सामने रख कर इस समस्या का कोई समाधान निकलता।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Madam Deputy Chairman, except I think the

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

speakers on behalf of the Jan Sangh, most of the other speakers have supported the Bill, though incidentally they have expressed doubts about the possibility of working it. No political problem, and particularly a problem of these complications can have an ideal solution, because ideal solutions can be only thought of as a result of wishful thinking. Here is a problem between two sets of people. Some people say that the problem is essentially economic and instead of politically reorganising the State it is much better to solve the economic problems of the State. Economic problems by themselves can be solved by merely developmental activities, but there is always a complication of political aspect which is basically psychological. Here the people in the hill area have a desire to have a recognition of their political personality, and in order to meet this aspiration a commitment was made on behalf of the Government of India by the late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, that maximum autonomy would be given, and the principle of autonomy for even districts was conceded in this particular case. So now we have proceeded on the same line. I never said that it is with full agreement of all the persons concerned. Mr. Bhandari tried to tag me on to this particular idea. We know that in the process of consensus there is never a hundred per cent agreement.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: Only the APHLC agreed.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: The Assam Government agreed. The Assam Government represents the people of Assam. This is the basic thing and the hon. Member, Mr. Bhandari, forgets about it.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: If the Congress Party agrees, why take a consensus of this House also?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: It is not only the Congress Party, the Communist Party has also supported this consensus. Unfortunately, the Jan Sangh

is not a party to be reckoned with in Assam. What can I do about it?

So, Madam, the point is that, as I said, it was because the leaders of the APHLC wanted and wanted very strongly a separate State for hill areas, and I must say that it is a measure of their sense of patriotism and statesmanship that they agreed to give a trial to this new scheme. The scheme is certainly very delicately balanced. It will have to be worked in an attitude of understanding, but for that matter any political system or any political scheme is always difficult to work. Even if we take the present distribution of powers between the Centre and the States, some people are making it difficult. It depends upon goodwill, understanding, patriotism, etc. That is very necessary even to work the present constitution. When we want to work out any political solution, it will have to be presumed that there is minimum understanding to work the propositions. I presume it when both the sides have generally agreed to work it. I have no hesitation in recommending this Bill.

Some Members have asked whether this idea of sub-State is acceptable to the Constitution. Madam, that is exactly why we are introducing the Constitution (Amendment) Bill. There was no such thing accepted by the Constitution so far. That is exactly the purpose why we are amending the Constitution. . .

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: I support the Bill, but according to article 1 India is a Union of States. How can you really reconcile it with the creation of a sub-State?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: It is a very interesting question you have raised. The relationship of the State and the Union will remain. For that matter the Assam State remains. The personality of the Assam State is there. It is not a bit compromised. Whatever functions the State had, they have been distributed between the autonomous State and the State. There will be a complete representative Assembly for the

entire State of Assam. Therefore, the basic structure of the Constitution is not eroded in any way.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: The State is there.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: The State is there. I am rather surprised, I was trying to understand the logic of the criticism of the Jan Sangh. Their general line of argument is this that the eastern sector is very important from the point of view of a security and therefore this area should be kept together by any means. For that purpose they are suggesting that there should be more than five or six Union Territories. What is the structure of a Union Territory? When a certain area is carved out of a State and is given the status of a Union Territory, the first result, good or bad, is that that area becomes administratively, politically, constitutionally, separate from that State. Is that exactly what they want?

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: It is already there.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: It is not there. This is my plea that this is the essence of the thing that has not been understood. Some Members tried to remind me of the partition of India. Where is the question of partition? It is exactly with a view to avoiding partition of the State, breaking of the State, that this idea has been accepted. I do not want to take more time of the House. As a result of long deliberations and exchange of views this consensus was arrived at, and I think it is necessary that this House blesses the Bill. What is the intention or purpose of this Bill? As I just now said, this is the purpose of the Bill that because people were aspiring to have some recognition of their political personality, we have tried to find a solution for that demand and at the same time we have tried to see that the integrity of the State of Assam is not broken. There are other people who are afraid about what happens to other demands for other States. I do not

think these two propositions are comparable in any way. The Assam situation is different. The Telengana situation is different. Any other situation that would be thought of is different. Therefore, to mix up these two propositions is to unnecessarily confuse ourselves. I do not want to confuse the House. I would make an appeal to them that this is a very important Bill. Let us pass it unanimously because by accepting unanimously this decision we will give our full moral support to the people who are going to work this arrangement.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Under article 368 of the Constitution, the motion will have to be adopted by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members of the House present and voting.

The House divided.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:

Ayes	173
Noes	7

AYES — 173

Abdul Samad, Shri A. K. A.
Abid Ali, Shri
Abraham, Shri P.
Ahmad, Shri Z. A.
Alva, Shri Joachim.
Amla, Shri Tirath Ram.
Anandam, Shri M.
Anandam, Shri T. V.
Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy,
Shrimati.
Ansari, Shri Hayatullah.
Arora, Shri Arjun
Bachchan, Dr. H. R.

Baharul Islam, Shri.
 Barbora, Shri G.
 Basu, Shri Chitta.
 Bhadram, Shri M. V.
 Bhargava, Shri M. P.
 Bhatt, Shri Nand Kishore.
 Bobdey, Shri S. B.
 Brar, Sardar Narindar Singh.
 Chandra Shekhar, Shri.
 Chandrasekhar, Dr. S.
 Chatterjee, Shri A. P.
 Chaudhary, Shri Ganeshi Lal.
 Chaudhri, Shri N. P.
 Chetia, Shri P.
 Chinai, Shri Babubhai M.
 Damodaran, Shri K.
 Dass, Shri Mahabir.
 Desai, Shri Suresh J.
 Deshmukh, Shri T. G.
 Dharia, Shri M. M.
 Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
 Doogar, Shri R. S.
 Dugal, Sardar Harcharan Singh.
 Gilbert, Shri A. C.
 Goswami, Shri Sriman Prafulla.
 Gujral, Shri I. K.
 Gupta, Shri Balkrishna.
 Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
 Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.
 Hasan, Prof. Saiyid Nurul.
 Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.
 Hussain, Shri Syed.
 Iyer, Shri N. Ramakrishna.
 Jadhav, Sardar D. K.
 Jagarlamudi, Shri Chandramouli.
 Jahanara Jaipal Singh, Shrimati.
 Jain, Shri A. P.
 Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri.
 Kaul, Shri B. K.
 Kaul, Shri M. N.
 Kemparaj, Shri B. T.
 Kesavan (Thazhava), Shri.
 Khaitan, Shri R. P.
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.

Khan, Shri M. Ajmal.
 Khobaragade, Shri B. D.
 Kollur, Shri M. L.
 Kothari, Prof. Shantilal.
 Krishan Kant, Shri.
 Kulkarni, Shri A. G.
 Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
 Kurup, Shri G. Sankara.
 Lalitha (Rajagopalan), Shrimati.
 Mahanti, Shri B. K.
 Mahida, Shri U. N.
 Mallikarjunudu, Shri K. P.
 Mandal, Shri B. N.
 Mangladevi Talwar, Dr. (Mrs.).
 Mani, Shri A. D.
 Maniben Vallabhbbhai Patel, Kumari
 Mariswamy, Shri S. S.
 Mehta, Shri Om.
 Menon, Shri K. P. Subramania.
 Mirdha, Shri Ram Niwas.
 Mishra, Shri L. N.
 Mishra, Shri S. N.
 Misra, Shri Lokanath.
 Misra, Shri S. D.
 Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Mohammad, Chaudhary A.
 Mohta, Shri M. K.
 Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja.
 Momin, Shri G. H. Valimohmed.
 Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.
 Muniswamy, Shri N. R.
 Murahari, Shri Godey.
 Musafir, Shri Gurmukh Singh.
 Nagpure, Shri V. T.
 Naidu, Miss M. L. M.
 Nair, Shri G. Gopinathan.
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
 Narayanappa, Shri Sanda.
 Neki Ram, Shri.
 Panda, Shri Brahmananda.
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Panjhazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh.
 Parthasarathy, Shri R. T.
 Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.

Patel, Shri Sundar Mani.
 Patel, Shri T. K.
 Patil, Shri G. R.
 Patil, Shri P. S.
 Patra, Shri N.
 Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
 Phulrenu Guha, Dr. Shrimati.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
 Purkayastha, Shri M.
 Pushpaben Janardanrai Mehta, Shri-
 mati.
 Rajnarain, Shri.
 Ram Singh, Sardar.
 Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
 Ray, Shri S. P.
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
 Reddy, Shri M. Srinivasa.
 Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda,
 Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
 Reddy, Shri Nagi.
 Reddy, Shri Y. Adinarayana.
 Reddy, Shri Yella.
 Roy, Shri Biren.
 Ruthnaswamy, Shri M.
 Sadiq Ali, Shri.
 Sahai, Shri Ram.
 Salig Ram, Dr.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Sangma, Shri E. M.
 Sanjivayya, Shri D.
 Satyavati Dang, Shrimati.
 Savnekar, Shri B. S.
 Seeta Yudhvair, Shrimati.
 Sen, Dr. Triguna.
 Sen Gupta, Shri Dwijendralal.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shanta Vasisht, Kumari.
 Sharma, Shri Anant Prasad.
 Sherkhan, Shri.
 Shervani, Shri M. R.
 Shukla, Shri Chakrapani.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati.
 Siddalingaya, Shri T.

Singh, Shri Bhupinder.
 Singh, Shri Dalpat.
 Singh, Shri Devi.
 Singh, Shri Gurcharan.
 Singh, Shri Jogendra.
 Singh, Shri S. K.
 Singh, Shri T. N.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap.
 Sinha, Shri Rewati Kant.
 Sisodia, Shri Sawai Singh.
 Somasundaram, Shri G. P.
 Sukhdev Prasad, Shri.
 Sur, Shri M. M.
 Suraj Prasad, Shri.
 Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.
 Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad.
 Tripathi, Shri H. V.
 Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.
 Usha Barthakur, Shrimati.
 Vaishampayan, Shri S. K.
 Varma, Shri C. L.
 Vasavada, Shri S. R.
 Venkateswara Rao, Shri N.
 Vero, Shri M.
 Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati.
 Vimal Punjab Deshmukh, Shrimati.
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.
 Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati.
 Zaidi, Col. B. H.

NOES — 7

Bhandari, Shri Sundar Singh.
 Jagat Narain, Shri
 Mahavir, Dr. Bhai.
 Pitamber Das, Shri.
 Shejwalkar, Shri N. K.
 Varma, Shri Man Singh.
 Varma, Shri Niranjan.

The motion was carried by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less

than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The House divided.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:

Ayes 173

Noes 7

AYES — 173

Abdul Samad, Shri A. K. A.
 Abid Ali, Shri
 Abraham, Shri P.
 Ahmad, Shri Z. A.
 Alva, Shri Joachim.
 Amla, Shri Tirath Ram.
 Anandam, Shri M.
 Anandan, Shri T. V.
 Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy, Shrimati.
 Ansari, Shri Hayatullah.
 Arora, Shri Arjun.
 Bachchan, Dr. H. R.
 Baharul Islam, Shri.
 Barbora, Shri G.
 Basu, Shri Chitta.
 Bhadram, Shri M. V.
 Bhargava, Shri M. P.
 Bhatt, Shri Nand Kishore.
 Bobdey, Shri S. B.
 Brar, Sardar Narindar Singh.
 Chandra Shekhar, Shri.
 Chandrasekhar, Dr. S.
 Chatterjee, Shri A. P.
 Chaudhary, Shri Ganeshi Lal.
 Chaudhri, Shri N. P.
 Chetia, Shri P.
 Chinai, Shri Babubhai M.
 Damodaran, Shri K.

Dass, Shri Mahabir.
 Desai, Shri Suresh J.
 Deshmukh, Shri T. G.
 Dharia, Shri M. M.
 Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
 Doogar, Shri R. S.
 Dugal, Sardar Harcharan Singh.
 Gilbert, Shri A. C.
 Goswami, Shri Sriman Prafulla.
 Gujral, Shri I. K.
 Gupta, Shri Balkrishna.
 Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
 Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.
 Hasan, Prof. Saiyid Nurul.
 Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.
 Hussain, Shri Syed.
 Iyer, Shri N. Ramakrishna.
 Jadhav, Sardar D. K.
 Jagarlamudi Shri Chandramouli.
 Jahanara Jaipal Singh, Shrimati.
 Jain, Shri A. P.
 Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri.
 Kaul, Shri B. K.
 Kaul, Shri M. N.
 Kemparaj, Shri B. T.
 Kesavan (Thazhava), Shri.
 Khaitan, Shri R. P.
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
 Khan, Shri M. Ajmal.
 Khobaragade, Shri B. D.
 Kollur, Shri M. L.
 Kothari, Prof. Shantilal.
 Krishan Kant, Shri.
 Kulkarni, Shri A. G.
 Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
 Kurup, Shri G. Sankara.
 Lalitha (Rajagopalan), Shrimati.
 Mahanti, Shri B. K.
 Mahida, Shri U. N.
 Mallikarjunudu, Shri K. P.
 Mandal, Shri B. N.
 Mangladevi Talwar, Dr. (Mrs.).
 Mani, Shri A. D.
 Maniben Vallabhbhai Patel, Kumari.

Bill, 1968

Mariswamy, Shri S. S.
 Mehta, Shri Om.
 Menon, Shri K. P. Subramania.
 Mirdha, Shri Ram Niwas.
 Mishra, Shri L. N.
 Mishra, Shri S. N.
 Misra, Shri Lokanath
 Misra, Shri S. D.
 Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Mohammad, Chaudhury A.
 Mohta, Shri M. K.
 Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja.
 Momin, Shri G. H. Valimohmed.
 Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.
 Muniswamy, Shri N. R.
 Murahari, Shri Godey.
 Musafiri, Shri Gurmukh Singh.
 Nagpure, Shri V. T.
 Naidu, Miss M. L. M.
 Nair, Shri G. Gopinathan.
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
 Narayanappa, Shri Sanda.
 Neki Ram, Shri
 Panda, Shri Brahmananda.
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Panjharai, Sardar Raghbir Singh.
 Parthasarathy, Shri R. T.
 Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.
 Patel, Shri Sundar Mani.
 Patel, Shri T. K.
 Patil, Shri G. R.
 Patil, Shri P. S.
 Patra, Shri N.
 Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
 Phulrenu Guha, Dr. Shrimati.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
 Purkayastha, Shri M.
 Pushpaben Janardanrai Mehta, Shri-
 mati.
 Rajnarain, Shri.
 Ram Singh, Sardar
 Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
 Ray, Shri S. P.
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha

Reddy, Shri M. Srinivasa.
 Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda.
 Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
 Reddy, Shri Nagi.
 Reddy, Shri Y. Adinarayana.
 Reddy, Shri Yella.
 Roy, Shri Biren.
 Ruthnaswamy, Shri M.
 Sadiq Ali, Shri.
 Sahai, Shri Ram.
 Salig Ram, Dr.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Sangma, Shri E. M.
 Sanjivayya, Shri D.
 Satyavati Dang, Shrimati
 Savnekar, Shri B. S.
 Seeta Yudhvair, Shrimati.
 Sen, Dr Triguna.
 Sen Gupta, Shri Dwijendralal.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shanta Vasisht, Kumari.
 Sharma, Shri Anant Prasad.
 Sherkhan, Shri.
 Shervani, Shri M. R.
 Shukla, Shri Chakrapani.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati.
 Siddalingaya, Shri T.
 Singh, Shri Bhupinder.
 Singh, Shri Dalpat.
 Singh, Shri Devi.
 Singh, Shri Gurcharan.
 Singh, Shri Jogendra.
 Singh, Shri S. K.
 Singh, Shri T. N.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap.
 Sinha, Shri Rewati Kant.
 Sisodia, Shri Sawai Singh.
 Somasundaram, Shri G. P.
 Sukhdev Prasad, Shri.
 Sur, Shri M. M.
 Suraj Prasad, Shri.
 Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.

Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad.
 Tripathi, Shri H. V.
 Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.
 Usha Barthakur, Shrimati.
 Vaishampayan, Shri S. K.
 Varma, Shri C. L.
 Vasavada, Shri S. R.
 Venkateswara Rao, Shri N.
 Vero, Shri M.
 Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati.
 Vimal Punjab Deshmukh, Shrimati.
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.
 Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati.
 Zaidi, Col. B. H.

NOES — 7

Bhandari, Shri Sundar Singh.
 Jagat Narain, Shri
 Mahavir, Dr. Bhai.
 Pitamber Das, Shri.
 Shejwalkar, Shri N. K.
 Varma, Shri Man Singh.
 Varma, Shri Niranjan.

The motion was carried by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That clause 3 stand part of the Bill.”

The House divided.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:

Ayes	.	.	.	172
Noes	.	.		7

AYES—172

Abdul Samad, Shri A. K. A.
 Abid Ali, Shri
 Abraham, Shri P.

Ahmad, Shri Z. A.
 Alva, Shri Joachim.
 Amla, Shri Tirath Ram.
 Anandam, Shri M.
 Anandan, Shri T. V.
 Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy, Shrimati.
 Ansari, Shri Hayatullah.
 Arora, Shri Arjun
 Bachchan, Dr. H. R.
 Baharul Islam, Shri.
 Barbora, Shri G.
 Basu, Shri Chitta
 Bhadram, Shri M. V.
 Bhargava, Shri M. P.
 Bhatt, Shri Nand Kishore.
 Bobdey, Shri S. B.
 Brar, Sardar Narindar Singh.
 Chandra Shekhar, Shri.
 Chandrasekhar, Dr. S.
 Chatterjee, Shri A. P.
 Chaudhary, Shri Ganesh Lal.
 Chaudhri, Shri N. P.
 Chetia, Shri P.
 Chinai, Shri Babubhai M.
 Damodaran, Shri K.
 Dass, Shri Mahabir.
 Desai, Shri Suresh J.
 Deshmukh, Shri T. G.
 Dharia, Shri M. M.
 Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
 Doogar, Shri R. S.
 Dugal, Sardar Harcharan Singh.
 Gilbert, Shri A. C.
 Goswami, Shri Sriman Prafulla.
 Gujral, Shri I. K.
 Gupta, Shri Balkrishna.
 Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
 Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.
 Hasan, Prof. Saiyid Nurul.
 Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.
 Hussain, Shri Syed.
 Iyer, Shri N. Ramakrishna.
 Jadhav, Sardar D. K.

Jagarlamudi, Shri Chandramouli.
 Jahanara Jaipal Singh, Shrimati.
 Jain, Shri A. P.
 Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri.
 Kaul, Shri B. K.
 Kaul, Shri M. N.
 Kemparaj, Shri B. T.
 Kesavan (Thazhava), Shri.
 Khaitan, Shri R. P.
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
 Khan, Shri M. Ajmal.
 Khobaragade, Shri B. D.
 Kollur, Shri M. L.
 Krishan Kant, Shri.
 Kulkarni, Shri A. G.
 Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
 Kurup, Shri G. Sankara.
 Lalitha (Rajagopalan), Shrimati.
 Mahanti, Shri B. K.
 Mahida, Shri U. N.
 Mallikarjunudu, Shri K. P.
 Mandal, Shri B. N.
 Mangladevi Talwar, Dr. (Mrs.).
 Mani, Shri A. D.
 Maniben Vallabhbbhai Patel, Kumari.
 Mariswamy, Shri S. S.
 Mehta, Shri Om.
 Menon, Shri K. P. Subramania.
 Mirdha, Shri Ram Niwas.
 Mishra, Shri L. N.
 Mishra, Shri S. N.
 Misra, Shri Lokanath.
 Misra, Shri S. D.
 Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Mohammad, Chaudhury A.
 Mohta, Shri M. K.
 Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja.
 Momin, Shri G. H. Valimohmed.
 Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.
 Muniswamy, Shri N. R.
 Murahari, Shri Godey.
 Musafir, Shri Gurmukh Singh.
 Nagpure, Shri V. T.
 Naidu, Miss M. L. M.

Nair, Shri G. Gopinathan.
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
 Narayanappa, Shri Sanda.
 Neki Ram, Shri.
 Panda, Shri Brahmananda.
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Panjhazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh.
 Parthasarathy, Shri R. T.
 Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.
 Patel, Shri Sundar Mani.
 Patel, Shri T. K.
 Patil, Shri G. R.
 Patil, Shri P. S.
 Patra, Shri N.
 Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
 Phulrenu Guha, Dr. Shrimati.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
 Purkayastha, Shri M.
 Pushpaben Janardanrai Mehta, Shrimati.
 Rajnarain, Shri.
 Ram Singh, Sardar.
 Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
 Ray, Shri S. P.
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
 Reddy, Shri M. Srinivasa.
 Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda,
 Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
 Reddy, Shri Nagi.
 Reddy Shri Y. Adinarayana.
 Reddy, Shri Yella.
 Roy, Shri Biren.
 Ruthnaswamy, Shri M.
 Sadiq Ali, Shri.
 Sahai, Shri Ram.
 Salig Ram, Dr.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Sangma, Shri E. M.
 Sanjivayya, Shri D.
 Satyavati Dang, Shrimati
 Savnekar, Shri B. S.
 Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.
 Sen, Dr. Triguna.
 Sen Gupta, Shri Dwijendralal.
 Shah, Shri K. K.

Shanta Vasisht, Kumari.
 Sharma, Shri Anant Prasad.
 Sher Khan, Shri.
 Shervani, Shri M. R.
 Shukla, Shri Chakrapani.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati.
 Siddalingaya, Shri T.
 Singh, Shri Bhupinder.
 Singh, Shri Dalpat.
 Singh, Shri Devi.
 Singh, Shri Gurcharan.
 Singh, Shri Jogendra.
 Singh, Shri S. K.
 Singh, Shri T. N.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap.
 Sinha, Shri Rewati Kant.
 Sisodia, Shri Sawai Singh.
 Somasundaram, Shri G. P.
 Sukhdev Prasad, Shri.
 Sur, Shri M. M.
 Suraj Prasad, Shri.
 Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.
 Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad.
 Tripathi, Shri H. V.
 Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.
 Usha Barthakur, Shrimati.
 Vaishampayan, Shri S. K.
 Varma, Shri C. L.
 Vasavada, Shri S. R.
 Venkateswara Rao, Shri N.
 Vero, Shri M.
 Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati.
 Vimal Punjab Deshmukh, Shrimati.
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.
 Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati.
 Zaidi, Col. B. H.

NOES — 7

Bhandari, Shri Sundar Singh.
 Jagat Narain, Shri
 Mahavir, Dr. Bhai.
 Pitamber Das, Shri.

Shejwalkar, Shri N. K.
 Varma, Shri Man Singh.
 Varma, Shri Niranjana.

The motion was carried by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That clause 4 stand part of the Bill.”

The House divided.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:

Ayes	.	.	.	173
Noes	.	.	.	7

AYES—173

Abdul Samad, Shri A. K. A.
 Abid Ali, Shri
 Abraham, Shri P.
 Ahmad, Shri Z. A.
 Alva, Shri Joachim.
 Amla, Shri Tirath Ram.
 Anandam, Shri M.
 Anandan, Shri T. V.
 Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy, Shrimati.
 Ansari, Shri Hayatullah.
 Arora, Shri Arjun
 Bachchan, Dr. H. R.
 Baharul Islam, Shri.
 Barbora, Shri G.
 Basu, Shri Chitta.
 Bhadram, Shri M. V.
 Bhargava, Shri M. P.
 Bhatt, Shri Nand Kishore.
 Bobdey, Shri S. B.
 Brar, Sardar Narindar Singh.
 Chandra Shekhar, Shri.
 Chandrasekhar, Dr. S.

Chatterjee, Shri A. P.
 Chaudhary, Shri Ganeshi Lal.
 Chaudhri, Shri N. P.
 Chetia, Shri P.
 Chinai, Shri Babubhai M.
 Damodaran, Shri K.
 Dass, Shri Mahabir.
 Desai, Shri Suresh J.
 Deshmukh, Shri T. G.
 Dharia, Shri M. M.
 Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
 Doogar, Shri R. S.
 Dugal, Sardar Harcharan Singh.
 Gilbert, Shri A. C.
 Goswami, Shri Sriman Prafulla.
 Gujral, Shri I. K.
 Gupta, Shri Balkrishna.
 Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
 Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.
 Hasan, Prof. Saiyid Nurul.
 Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.
 Hussain, Shri Syed.
 Iyer, Shri N. Ramakrishna.
 Jadhav, Sardar D. K.
 Jagarlamudi, Shri Chandramouli.
 Jahanara Jaipal Singh, Shrimati.
 Jain, Shri A. P.
 Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri.
 Kaul, Shri B. K.
 Kaul, Shri M. N.
 Kemparaj, Shri B. T.
 Kesavan (Thazhava), Shri.
 Khaitan, Shri R. P.
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
 Khan, Shri M. Ajmal.
 Khobaragade, Shri B. D.
 Kollur, Shri M. L.
 Kothari, Prof. Shantilal.
 Krishan Kant, Shri.
 Kulkarni, Shri A. G.
 Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
 Kurup, Shri G. Sankara.
 Lalitha (Rajagopalan), Shrimati.
 Mahanti, Shri B. K.

Mahida, Shri U. N.
 Mallikarjunudu, Shri K. P.
 Mandal, Shri B. N.
 Mangladevi Talwar, Dr. (Mrs.).
 Mani, Shri A. D.
 Maniben Vallabhbbhai Patel, Kumari.
 Mariswamy, Shri S. S.
 Mehta, Shri Om.
 Menon, Shri K. P. Subramania.
 Mirdha, Shri Ram Niwas.
 Mishra, Shri L. N.
 Mishra, Shri S. N.
 Misra, Shri Lokanath.
 Misra, Shri S. D.
 Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Mohammad, Chaudhury A.
 Mohta, Shri M. K.
 Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja.
 Momin, Shri G. H. Valimohmed.
 Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.
 Muniswamy, Shri N. R.
 Murahari, Shri Godey.
 Musafir, Shri Gurmukh Singh.
 Nagpure, Shri V. T.
 Naidu, Miss M. L. M.
 Nair, Shri G. Gopinathan.
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
 Narayanappa, Shri Sanda.
 Neki Ram, Shri.
 Panda, Shri Brahmananda.
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Panjhazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh.
 Parthasarathy, Shri R. T.
 Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.
 Patel, Shri Sundar Mani.
 Patel, Shri T. K.
 Patil, Shri G. R.
 Patil, Shri P. S.
 Patra, Shri N.
 Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
 Phulrenu Guha, Dr. Shrimati.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
 Purkayastha, Shri M.
 Pushpaben Janardannai Mehta, Shrimati.

Rajnarain, Shri.
 Ram Singh, Sardar.
 Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
 Ray, Shri S. P.
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
 Reddy, Shri M. Srinivasa.
 Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda.
 Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
 Reddy, Shri Nagi.
 Reddy, Shri Y. Adinarayana.
 Reddy, Shri Yella.
 Roy, Shri Biren.
 Ruthnaswamy, Shri M.
 Sadiq Ali, Shri.
 Sahai, Shri Ram.
 Salig Ram, Dr.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Sangma, Shri E. M.
 Sanjivayya, Shri D.
 Satyavati Dang, Shrimati.
 Savnekar, Shri B. S.
 Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.
 Sen, Dr. Triguna.
 Sen Gupta, Shri Dwijendralal.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shanta Vasisht, Kumari.
 Sharma, Shri Anant Prasad.
 Sherkhan, Shri.
 Shervani, Shri M. R.
 Shukla, Shri Chakrapani.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati.
 Siddalingaya, Shri T.
 Singh, Shri Bhupinder.
 Singh, Shri Dalpat.
 Singh, Shri Devi.
 Singh, Shri Gurcharan.
 Singh, Shri Jogendra.
 Singh, Shri S. K.
 Singh, Shri T. N.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap.
 Sinha, Shri Rewati Kant.
 Sisodia, Shri Sawai Singh.

Somasundaram, Shri G. P.
 Sukhdev Prasad, Shri.
 Sur, Shri M. M.
 Suraj Prasad, Shri.
 Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.
 Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad.
 Tripathi, Shri H. V.
 Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.
 Usha Barthakur, Shrimati.
 Vaishampayen, Shri S. K.
 Varma, Shri C. L.
 Vasavada, Shri S. R.
 Venkateswara Rao, Shri N.
 Vero, Shri M.
 Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati.
 Vimal Punjab Deshmukh, Shrimati.
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.
 Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati.
 Zaidi, Col. B. H.

NOES — 7

Bhandari, Shri Sundar Singh.
 Jagat Narain, Shri
 Mahavir, Dr. Bhai.
 Pitamber Das, Shri.
 Shejwalkar, Shri N. K.
 Varma, Shri Man Singh.
 Varma, Shri Niranjan.

The motion was carried by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill.”

The House divided.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:

Ayes	.	.	.	173
Noes	.	.	.	7

AYES—173

Abdul Samad, Shri A. K. A.
 Abid Ali, Shri
 Abraham, Shri P.
 Ahmad, Shri Z. A.
 Alva, Shri Joachim.
 Amla, Shri Tirath Ram.
 Anandam, Shri M.
 Anandan, Shri T. V.
 Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy.
 Shrimati.
 Ansari, Shri Hayatullah.
 Arora, Shri Arjun
 Bachchan, Dr. H. R.
 Baharul Islam, Shri.
 Barbora, Shri G.
 Basu, Shri Chitta.
 Bhadram, Shri M. V.
 Bhargava, Shri M. P.
 Bhatt, Shri Nand Kishore.
 Bobdey, Shri S. B.
 Brar, Sardar Narindar Singh.
 Chandra Shekhar, Shri.
 Chandrasekhar, Dr. S.
 Chatterjee, Shri A. P.
 Chaudhary, Shri Ganeshi Lal.
 Chaudhri, Shri N. P.
 Chetia, Shri P.
 Chinai, Shri Babubhai M.
 Damodaran, Shri K.
 Dass, Shri Mahabir.
 Desai, Shri Suresh J.
 Deshmukh, Shri T. G.
 Dharia, Shri M. M.
 Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
 Doogar, Shri R. S.
 Dugal, Sardar Harcharan Singh.
 Gilbert, Shri A. C.
 Goswami, Shri Sriman Prafulla.
 Gujral, Shri I. K.
 Gupta, Shri Balkrishna.
 Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
 Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.
 Hasan, Prof. Saiyid Nurul.

Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.
 Hussain, Shri Syed.
 Iyer, Shri N. Ramakrishna.
 Jadhav, Sardar D. K.
 Jagarlamudi, Shri Chandramouli.
 Jahanara Jaipal Singh, Shrimati.
 Jain, Shri A. P.
 Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri.
 Kaul, Shri B. K.
 Kaul, Shri M. N.
 Kemparaj, Shri B. T.
 Kesavan (Thazhava), Shri.
 Khaitan, Shri R. P.
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
 Khan, Shri M. Ajmal.
 Khobaragade, Shri B. D.
 Kollur, Shri M. L.
 Kothari, Prof. Shantilal.
 Krishan Kant, Shri.
 Kulkarni, Shri A. G.
 Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
 Kurup, Shri G. Sankara.
 Lalitha (Rajagopalan), Shrimati.
 Mahanti, Shri B. K.
 Mahida, Shri U. N.
 Mallikarjunudu, Shri K. P.
 Mandal, Shri B. N.
 Mangladevi Talwar, Dr. (Mrs.).
 Mani, Shri A. D.
 Maniben Vallabhbhai Patel, Kumari.
 Mariswamy, Shri S. S.
 Mehta, Shri Om.
 Menon, Shri K. P. Subramania.
 Mirdha, Shri Ram Niwas.
 Mishra, Shri L. N.
 Mishra, Shri S. N.
 Misra, Shri Lokanath.
 Misra, Shri S. D.
 Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Mohammad, Chaudhury A.
 Mohta, Shri M. K.
 Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja.
 Momin, Shri G. H. Valimohmed.
 Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.

Muniswamy, Shri N. R.
Murahari, Shri Godey.
Musafir, Shri Gurmukh Singh.
Nagpure, Shri V. T.
Naidu, Miss M. L. M.
Nair, Shri G. Gopinathan.
Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
Narayanappa, Shri Sanda.
Neki Ram, Shri.
Panda, Shri Brahmananda.
Pande, Shri C. D.
Panjhzari, Sardar Raghbir Singh.
Parthasarathy, Shri R. T.
Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.
Patel, Shri Sundar Mani.
Patel, Shri T. K.
Patil, Shri G. R.
Patil, Shri P. S.
Patra, Shri N.
Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
Phulrenu Guha, Dr. Shrimati.
Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
Purkayastha, Shri M.
Pushpaben Janardanrai Mehta, Shri-
mati.
Rajnarain, Shri.
Ram Singh, Sardar.
Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
Ray, Shri S. P.
Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
Reddy, Shri M. Srinivasa.
Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda.
Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
Reddy, Shri Nagi.
Reddy, Shri Y. Adinarayana.
Reddy, Shri Yella.
Roy, Shri Biren.
Ruthnaswamy, Shri M.
Sadiq Ali, Shri.
Sahai, Shri Ram.
Salig Ram, Dr.
Samuel, Shri M. H.
Sangma, Shri E. M.
Sanjivayya, Shri D.
Satyavati Dang, Shrimati

Savnekar, Shri B. S.
Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.
Sen, Dr. Triguna.
Sen Gupta, Shri Dwijendralal.
Setalvad, Shri M. C.
Shah, Shri K. K.
Shanta Vasisht, Kumari.
Sharma, Shri Anant Prasad.
Sherkhan, Shri.
Shervani, Shri M. R.
Shukla, Shri Chakrapani.
Shukla, Shri M. P.
Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati.
Siddalingaya, Shri T.
Singh, Shri Bhupinder.
Singh, Shri Dalpat.
Singh, Shri Devi.
Singh, Shri Gurcharan.
Singh, Shri Jogendra.
Singh, Shri S. K.
Singh, Shri T. N.
Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap.
Sinha, Shri Rewati Kant.
Sisodia, Shri Sawai Singh.
Somasundaram, Shri G. P.
Sukhdev Prasad, Shri.
Sur, Shri M. M.
Suraj Prasad, Shri.
Tarkha, Pandit S. S. N.
Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad.
Tripathi, Shri H. V.
Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.
Usha Barthakur, Shrimati.
Vaishampayan, Shri S. K.
Varma, Shri C. L.
Vasavada, Shri S. R.
Verkateswara Rao, Shri N.
Vero, Shri M.
Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati.
Vimal Punjab Deshmukh, Shrimati.
Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.
Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati.
Zaidi, Col. B. H.

NOES—7

Bhandari, Shri Sundar Singh.

Jagat Narain, Shri

Mahavir, Dr. Bhai.

Pitamber Das, Shri.

Shejwalkar, Shri N. K.

Varma, Shri Man Singh.

Varma, Shri Niranjan.

The motion was carried by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the title were added to the Bill.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Madam, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was proposed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Be brief.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I will be very brief. I have not much to say. I thought that in the Third reading of the Bill something should be said. My first submission is that it is a happy occasion that on a Bill of this importance the House has given its consent in such a large measure. Sometimes, I feel, it is good to take the consensus of the people's opinion in view which, on many occasions, elicits such large consensus. So it is a happy event and a good and correct move on the part of the Government to have got such a large support even on the part of the Opposition.

Madam, it is necessary to bear in mind certain fundamentals. In the short discussion that we had here certain fundamental questions were raised. By the passing of this measure, or by giving this measure to our hill brethren are we disintegrating the country? In fact, it was strange to hear an hon'ble Member on this side of the

House who said that India was partitioned once and it is being partitioned again. It is fantastic to hear such views. Do you partition your country if you offer certain concessions to them? If you concede the democratic urges of the people recognising that this country has distinct social groups with distinct cultural background, with distinct languages, if you recognise this reality how far is it correct to raise the cry that India is disintegrated?

Madam, we have to lay down certain fundamentals. What is disintegration and what is national integration? I submit, Madam, that there are two lines of thought on this question. One is that which is represented by our Jan Sangh friends who want a unitary system of Government, with four or five big areas constituted into States and a very strong Centre . . .

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: Not necessarily.

SHRI Z. A. AHMED: . . . Madam, this is a step in the right direction. I personally feel that for the first time the Indian people got really united as a nation in our struggle against British imperialism. After the advent of freedom certain realities of life began to assert themselves. What were those realities?

Firstly, there was uneven development of the country. The second major reality was that there are distinct social, cultural and linguistic groups, and if democracy means anything it should mean that every group should have full opportunity for the flowering of each specific way of life, for its specific language, for its culture, for its traditions. These two big realities cannot be ignored. I think at that time the Congress leadership and the Government at the Centre and the States did not recognise these realities as clearly as they should have. Take, for example, the whole question of formation of linguistic States.

Now some people suggest that there should be no linguistic States and that the Bombay Presidency or the Madras

[Shri Z. A. Ahmad]

Presidency which were formed by the British Government should continue to exist. It took time for many honest people to realise the reality that India is a multi-national State, that it is one State which has developed into one nation but it is constituted by nationalities which have their specific cultures and languages and religions.

Now, Madam, after a lot of agitations this principle of linguistic States was conceded; the last one to be formed was Punjab. The matter does not end here. It must be realised that the flowering out of democracy is a process. Within one State there may be certain areas which would be comparatively backward and would need more attention and, therefore, sentiments will come up within those areas. Take, for example, the question of Telengana.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE (Maharashtra): What about U.P.?

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: May be. I do not know. If the people of Eastern U.P. want separation...

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): We do not want any separation.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: ... You may not want it for the time being. But if there is an urge on the part of the backward people of Eastern U.P. that they should be constituted into some sort of an autonomous region, I think there will be nothing fundamentally wrong with the demand. Similarly, take the question of Telengana. I do not want to be very dogmatic about Telengana. Some people from that side of the House started saying, "No more autonomous regions". I say, do not be so categorical about it. Life will unfold itself. There will be problems and you should always have an open mind and flexible policies so that you integrate those people more and more. Let there be diversity in unity. You have to recognise that there is a tremendous beauty in the great national unity that exists today in India. I consider the Jan

Sangh attitude not only reactionary, it will ultimately lead to a dictatorial State. And, therefore, I consider it totally wrong. Their whole conception of democracy is rather undemocratic and I am glad that the people have started thinking on correct lines and they stand together against reactionary, undemocratic attitudes and principles represented by the Jan Sangh.

Madam, whenever any such democratic concession is made, I regret to say, these people raise the cry that India is going to disintegrate. It is all because they have no confidence in the essential oneness of the Indian people...

SHRI MAN SINGH VARMA (Uttar Pradesh): You have selected the wrong occasion for your sermon.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: One of the biggest realities of life is the feeling of oneness, the feeling of unity. I, therefore, say we should not be afraid in conceding these concessions. People who have no confidence in the people and no confidence in the greatness of the Indian people, they alone are afraid of conceding any concessions. Therefore, Madam, I welcome this Bill and I am sure, after adopting this Bill, we shall not create situations where important people will come out and talk of disintegration.

I think this talk of disintegration should stop. This talk of reversal of democratic processes that we have chosen for ourselves should stop. I am sorry when I find such important people as the President of the Indian National Congress saying, "let us go back to the unitary system or let us abolish these linguistic States". This is wrong... (*Interruption*) ... If you have a policy, stand firmly by that policy. The process of linguistic States having been completed, stand firmly by it. If there are any adjustments to be made within those linguistic States, let those adjustments be made in a flexible, proper manner so that the democratic fabric is strengthened and the unit of the great people of India

is further advanced That is my submission With these words I support the Bill.

5 P.M.

डा० भाई महावीर (दिल्ली)

महोदया, इस बिल के बारे में मतदान हो चुका है, परन्तु मुझे सौभाग्य मिला है कि अपने माननीय दोस्त डा० जड० ए० अहमद की कृपा से मैं उनकी एक दो गलतफहमियों को दूर करने के लिये खड़ा हो सका हूँ। वह डेमोक्रेसी के पैगम्बर बन रहे हैं, देश की एकता के ठेकेदार बन रहे हैं। वही लोग जिन्होंने इस देश को कभी एक समझा नहीं, इस राष्ट्र को कभी एक माना नहीं, जिनकी डेमोक्रेसी का तमाशा चेकोस्लोवाकिया में हो रहा है, यह डेमोक्रेसी के पैगम्बर इस तरह का जन सभ के ऊपर आरोप लगाये, एकता के विघटन की, डेमोक्रेसी के खिलाफ जाने की, या लोकतंत्र को पीछे हटाने की, जिनकी राह हो और लोकतंत्र के अक्षरों का जिनको ज्ञान नहीं, जिनको एकता खूबी सूखी भी नहीं सुहाती, जो देश को एक मल्टी नेशनल स्टेट मानकर चलते हैं, उनको एकता की बात कहा देखकर हसी भी आती है और वह कहावत याद आती है—डेविल कोटिंग द स्क्रिपचर्स।

परन्तु महोदया, मुझे हैरानी इन बातों की है कि गृह मंत्री महोदय ने भी कम्युनिस्टों की बात को बड़ी प्रसन्नता से स्वीकार किया और कहा कि आसाम के अदर जिन दलों ने या जिन लोगों ने समर्थन दिया है इस योजना को उनमें कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी है। बंगाल की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का रोल उन्हें थोड़ी देर के लिये भूल गया नहीं तो शायद वह इस प्लिजेंट कम्पनी में इतने खुश नहीं होते जितने खुश वह दिखायी देते थे।

जन सभ ने देश को एक समझा है। इसके मानी यह नहीं है कि देश के अदर

एक तानाशाही शासन की कभी हमने कल्पना की है। हमने देश को समझा है एक सांस्कृतिक एकता के आधार पर बना हुआ देश और यहाँ पर राजनैतिक इकाइयाँ कई बार बनती रही, बदलती रही, लेकिन राजनैतिक इकाइयों के कारण यह देश एक नहीं रहा। इस देश की एकता, इस देश के सिद्धान्त इस देश की जो भौगोलिक इकाई है, जिस भौगोलिक इकाई को प्रकृति ने एक बनाकर हमको दिया है, वहाँ में इस देश की एकता प्रारम्भ होती है। जब हम एकात्मक शासन की बात करते हैं तो उस एकता का आधार लेकर कहते हैं कि उन सारे क्षेत्रों को, सभी स्थानों को जो सत्ता प्राप्त हो वह इस देश की एकता से निकल कर आए और उसमें जो विघटनवादी प्रवृत्तियाँ हैं उनको दूर हटाया जाय। अभी हमारे दोस्त अहमद साहब को डेमोक्रेसी की बात याद आई और वह कहते हैं डेमोक्रेसी आगे बढ़ रही है। यह डेमोक्रेसी बढ़ाते-बढ़ाते, जिस वक्त पाकिस्तान की मांग चली तब यह सबसे अधिक उसमें उनको डेमोक्रेसी नज़र आती थी और आज यह कहते हैं यहाँ पर विभाजन की बात क्यों कही गई, आप जब आसाम के रिआर्गनाइजेशन के बिल के साथ अलग-अलग बातों को खींच कर जोड़ते हैं तो अगर किसी ने कहा देश के विभाजन के लिये इसी तरह की मनोवृत्तियाँ जिम्मेदार थी तो आपको बुरा क्यों लगता है। मेरा निवेदन है, महोदया, अपने इन दोस्तों से और हमारे गृह मंत्री को भी थोड़ा ध्यान रहे कि किन लोगों का सपोर्ट उनको मिल रहा है। वह सपोर्ट किस कारण से मिल रहा है? जहाँ देश के विघटन की ज़रा भी आशा होती है वहाँ यह घी के चिराग जगमगाने लगते हैं और खुशी की गहनाइयाँ बजाने लगते हैं क्योंकि देश की एकता

[डा० भाई महावीर]

जब तक कायम है तब तक न रूस के मंसूबे पूरे होते हैं, न चीन की आकांक्षाएं पूरी होती हैं। हम समझते हैं, इस देश को अपने पैरों पर खड़े होना है तो दुनिया के दूसरे देशों की तरफ, उनसे स्पर्ति लेकर, उन देशों से जिनकी जड़ें दूर हैं, जिनकी आशाएं दूर हैं और जो मास्को में बारिश है तो यहां पर छाता लेकर चलते हैं, सिरदर्द वहां हो तो बाम यहां मलते हैं, ऐसे लोगों पर देश की एकता के मीनार को हम कायम नहीं रख सकते हैं। फिर भी हम समझते हैं यह जो कुछ भी हो रहा है यह एक प्रयोग किया जा रहा है परन्तु उस प्रयोग में चव्हाण साहब अगर यह देखें कि उनका कदम सही है और अगर हमारे विचार केवल दुष्कल्पनाएं हैं, एप्रीहेन्सन्स हैं, गलत साबित हों, तो हम समझते हैं कि हमसे ज्यादा प्रसन्न कोई नहीं होगा। हमें डर यह है कि जब एक बार कांसीड करने लगते हैं, झुकने लगते हैं, तो एक बार पहाड़ी के ऊपर पड़ा हुआ पत्थर जब थोड़ा सा लुढ़कता है तो नीचे खड़्डे में जाने से पहले उसको रोका नहीं जा सकता है। आज आप स्वार्थ के आगे, छोटे-छोटे लोगों की महत्वाकांक्षाओं को एक बार में रोक नहीं सकते। कितनी भी आशाएं लगायें, आप उसको रोकते रोकते खुद उसके पीछे लुढ़कते हुए चले जायेंगे, इसकी संभावना ज्यादा है। हम केवल देश प्रेम की, देश की एकता की भावना से, और देश के प्रति निष्ठा की भावना से खड़े हुए हैं, किसी चुनौती की भावना से नहीं खड़े हुए। जब हमें कम्युनिस्ट मित्रों से प्रशंसा मिलेगी तो हम सोचेंगे कि ऐसी कौन सी गड़बड़ हो गई जो हमारी तारीफ हो रही है क्योंकि उनके द्वारा हमारी तारीफ करना एक विचित्र बात होगी। चव्हाण

साहब भी सोच लें क्योंकि उनकी तारीफ कम्युनिस्टों द्वारा हो रही है। गवर्नर बंगाल का जो इतिहास है वह हमारी आंखों के सामने अभी-अभी बीता है। उसके बाद भी उनकी तारीफ से चव्हाण साहब प्रसन्न होते हैं तो मैं समझता हूं उनको बड़ी शांति के साथ विचार करना होगा कि न जाने इसमें क्या गड़बड़ वह करेंगे।

इन शब्दों के साथ महोदया, मैं इस बिल के बारे में इस स्टेज पर भी अपना विरोध प्रकट करता हूं।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sinha. Five minutes.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Madam Deputy Chairman, I will be brief. I would not have intervened in this debate but for the speech by the hon. Member representing the Communist Party. I do not speak for my party; I speak for myself now. Now, I can understand a plea being made for giving autonomy to people who have a distinct racial, linguistic and cultural complex. But then he has advanced the argument to such an extent that if that argument is accepted, India will break up into pieces. He says if Eastern U.P. wants to separate from Western U.P., then it must separate, and if in Telengana there is a demand for separation from Andhra, it is democratic and progressive to allow that demand. But Andhra Pradesh is one cultural and linguistic unit and, therefore, one should not be guided by these passing demands which are really manipulated by some interested people for their own selfish interests, and yield to them, because these demands are of a passing nature and will vanish in no time. I am afraid the hon. Member has tried to project the philosophy that obtains in the U.S.S.R. to this country without realising that the political, economic and social systems of the two countries are entirely different.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: You are opposed to linguistic States?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: The hon. Member forgets that while in Soviet Russia there are republics which are the counterparts of our States in India, there is one party behind the whole State apparatus in the U.S.S.R., and that is the Communist Party. While the States have a formal existence, they are really enmeshed in the iron grip of the Communist Party and, therefore, the arrangement and conception of nationalities that prevails there cannot be transferred to a different environment. I know how you have solved the problems of nationalities and minorities. I know that when the German armies began to advance, there was a long-established colony of Germans known as Volga Germans and you solved that problem of nationality by transporting them in trucks to the far distant Siberia. That is how the democratic urges of the people are met there. And recently reports appeared that the Tartars were uprooted from a certain region of Soviet Russia because somebody higher up in the Kremlin thought that their loyalty could not be relied upon, and so in trucks they were transported to Uzbekistan. Now it has been disclosed that in that process of transport, 25 per cent died. And even now when they have been rehabilitated, when their loyalty has been affirmed by a regular session of the Congress of the Communist Party, they are not being allowed to come back and settle in their old territories. Therefore, you have a different way of dealing with these democratic urges of the people. You have a different political, economic and social set-up. Do not try to project it in a different environment. If you project it in a different environment, this country will break up. And yet we accept that people with a distinct cultural, linguistic and racial complex must have autonomy, must have freedom to develop in their own way, to advance further. But if in the name of democracy, to suit your passing interests, you make a plea for the division of a State like U.P. or Bihar or Andhra Pradesh which are single cultural, linguistic units, we shall consider that a disruptive demand and we shall resist that demand to the last.

श्री राजनारायण: महोदय, मैं आपको इसके लिये धन्यवाद दूँ कि आपने तीन वक्ताओं के भाषण को सुनने का मुझे मौका दिया और मुझे अखीर में बुलाया। मैं आपका आभार प्रकट करता हूँ। यदि इन लोगों को बिना सुने हुए मैं बोलता तो मैं केवल घर मंत्री महोदय के बारे में कहता। अब हमको थोड़ा सा जन संघ, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी और कांग्रेस पार्टी तीनों को सामने रखकर और देश के सामने रखकर बोलने का मौका हुआ है। मैं पहले यह बता दूँ, मैं छिपाना नहीं चाहता कि श्री यशवन्त राव चव्हाण से हमारा मन मिलता है। मगर मैं चाहता हूँ कि मन का मिलाव साकार स्वरूप तब तक ग्रहण नहीं कर सकता जब तक मस्तिष्क का मिलाव न हो। मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि मन तो मिलता है मगर मस्तिष्क भी मिले तब मामला बन सकता है वरना नहीं। मैं इस चीज़ को छिपाना नहीं चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस के अन्दर बहुत से ऐसे लोग हैं जो राष्ट्रीय स्वतंत्रता संग्राम में हमारे साथ थे। हम सब लोग साथ-साथ जेल में रहे, साथ-साथ खाया, पीया और तसले बजाये तथा फाटक तोड़े। तो हमारा मन उनसे मिलता है जो लोग हमारी तरह बातें करते हैं। इसीलिए मैं कभी-कभी यह चाहता हूँ कि उनके साथ दिमाग भी हमारा मिल सकता है। आज जो कांग्रेस का स्वरूप है वे उससे होकर अलग हमारे साथ आ सकते हैं।

अब मैं श्री भूपेश गुप्त और श्री भंडारी की बात पर आता हूँ और कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे आज हमारे विश्लेषण को समझें।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी: चौखम्बा राज्य हो गया।

श्री राजनारायण: कैसे? मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि नेशनलिटी और नेशन में फर्क है या नहीं? अगर नेशनलिटी नेशन हो जाय तो आप 1941, 42, 43 की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को देखे। उस समय कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने कहा था कि राइट आफ सेल्फ-डिटरमिनेशन मिलना चाहिये। हिन्दू और मुसलमान दो नेशन है और इसी आइडियलोजी को लेकर उन्होंने मुल्क के बंटवारे की ताईद की थी। जनसंघ क्या कहता है। हिन्दू राष्ट्र।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी: जनसंघ नहीं कहता है।

श्री राजनारायण: मैं चाहता हूं कि जब सीरियस और गम्भीर विषय पर बातचीत चल रही हो, तो उसको समझा जाना चाहिये। मैं फिर यह कहना चाहता हूं और श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी जी को किसी तरह का इस बारे में मुगलता नहीं रहना चाहिये और न स्वयं ही मुगलते में रहना चाहता हूं। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि कम्युनिस्ट बहुत अधिक पैदा नहीं हुए हैं और उनकी जो कुछ भी फिलासफी है वे रूस नहीं जायेंगे और न ही चीन जायेंगे। एक, दो, चार चले जायें, वह दूसरी बात हुई, मगर रहेंगे सब यही।

मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि 1957 में जनसंघ ने जो अपना घोषणापत्र जारी किया था उसका पहले वाक्य में लिखा हुआ है "हिन्दू के अतिरिक्त अन्य जनों को भारतीय संस्कृति मुक्त करके उनको राष्ट्रभावनापन्न करना"। जिस पार्टी के राजनीतिक घोषणा पत्र

में यह लिखा हुआ हो कि जो हिन्दू नहीं है वह राष्ट्रीय नहीं है, बल्कि उनको भारतीय संस्कृति से अभिमुखित करके तब जाकर राष्ट्रीय भावना उत्पन्न की जा सकती है। इस तरह से उनके नुकतेनज़र में आज मुसलमान राष्ट्रीय नहीं है।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी: भारतीय नहीं है।

श्री राजनारायण: एक सभा में मैंने जनसंघ वालों से पूछा था कि एक राष्ट्रपति डा० जाकिर हुसैन है और एक राष्ट्रपति यादूया खां हैं। दोनों मुसलमान हैं। एक तो देशी है और दूसरा विदेशी है। तो इस देशी और विदेशी के फर्क को भारतीय जनसंघ नहीं समझता है।

Interruptions

मैं फिर उस घोषणापत्र के वाक्य को दोहरा देना चाहता हूं। "हिन्दू के अतिरिक्त अन्य जनों को भारतीय संस्कृति मुक्त करके उनको राष्ट्रभावनापन्न करना"। यह वाक्य बिल्कुल साफ है। जो हिन्दू नहीं है वह राष्ट्रीय नहीं है।

अब मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी अननोइंग में जानती है, समाजवाद के सिद्धान्त में यकीन करती है और समझती है कि समाजवाद का सिद्धान्त यह कहता है कि सोशलिज्म इज दी सम टोटल आफ ह्यूमन नालेज, तो स्थिर नहीं है, ज्ञान विकासमान है, बढ़ते रहता है और इसीलिए मैं चाहता हूं कि वे इस ज्ञान को लें। जिस दिन कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी यह कंसीड करती है कि मुसलमान एक सैपरेट राष्ट्र हो, हिन्दू एक सैपरेट राष्ट्र हो, उस दिन वह जन संघ के साथ हो जायेगी। आज भारतवर्ष का वह हिन्दू जो यह कहता है कि मुसलमान की जगह भारत में नहीं

है, वह मुसलमान होगा और वह जिन्ना का अनुयायी होगा चाहे वह यह बात कहे या न कहे। अगर सिद्धान्त निरूपण किया जायेगा तो जो भी हिन्दू है अगर वह यह कहता है कि मुसलमान भारत में न रहे तो वह जिन्ना का सेवक और अनुयायी है। इसलिए मैं बहुत ही अदब के साथ यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN You must wind up. Please wind up.

श्री राजनारायण मैं दो मिनट में समाप्त कर दूंगा। मैं श्री भूपेश गुप्त से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हम इस बात के लिए क्यों नहीं लड़ें कि जो छोटे छोटे पिछड़े हुए इलाके देश में हैं उन्हें उन्नत इलाकों के मुकाबले क्यों नहीं लाया जाय? अगर एक सब-स्टेट हो जायेगा तो उसमें पूजापति जो हैं अपने पाव जमाने शुरू करेंगे और फिर वहाँ पर मिल मालिकों और मजदूरों के झगड़े शुरू हो जायेंगे। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जितने छोटे राज्य बन रहे हैं उतना ही हमको नुकसान हो रहा है। क्या आप यह बात नहीं सोचते हैं कि मध्यम वर्ग के खानदानों के लड़के जो विश्वविद्यालयों में पढ़ते हैं, वे ही राज्यों के अलग-अलग की मांग ज्यादा करते हैं?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Your two minutes are over. Please wind up now.

श्री राजनारायण मान लीजिये अगर तेलगाना अलग हो जाता है तो वहाँ के गरीब किसानों तथा गरीब मजदूरों की हालत खुशहाल हो जायेगी। मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती है। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक दृष्टि अख्तियार करनी चाहिये कि अपने देश के अन्दर जो इलाके जितने पिछड़े हुए हैं, उतनी ही

उनकी आर्थिक सहायता की जानी चाहिये, सामाजिक सहायता की जानी चाहिये और उनको हर तरह से आगे बढ़ाया जाना चाहिये।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN That will do.

श्री राजनारायण एक बात मैं श्री चव्हाण साहब से कहना चाहता हूँ और कांग्रेस पार्टी से भी कहना चाहता हूँ। देखो भाई, सरकार और विरोधी दल, दोनों को बनाने की कोशिश मत करो। चार, पांच दिनों से हमारे दिमाग में यह बात बहुत जोरो से उठ रही है प्राइम मिनिस्टर इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी सरकारी पक्ष को भी अपनी तरफ बनाना चाहती हैं और विरोधी पक्ष को भी अपनी तरफ बनाना चाहती हैं। सरकारी पक्ष में उन्होंने कहा कि तेलगाना के लिए कुछ नहीं। जितना है उतना ही। लेकिन अखबारों में कह दिया कि तेलगाना के लिए हम कास्टीट्यूशन राइट देने की बात सोच रहे हैं। इस तरह से दो तरह की बातें कही गई हैं। सदन में एक परिपत्र निकाल दिया गया कि अगर विरोधी दल का कोई भी सशोधन बिडला के सम्बन्ध में हो, तो उसका समर्थन न करें। इसी को लेकर हमारे मित्र श्री चन्द्र शेखर और श्री धारिया इस सदन में चले गये, बाहर जाकर कह दिया कि देश में भावना है कि बिडला के विरुद्ध कार्यवाही की जाय। (*Interruptions.*) इस तरह से वे सरकारी पक्ष और विरोधी दल दोनों को अपने साथ रखना चाहती हैं। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस चीज का पदफाश हो और ठीक दृष्टिकोण से देश को चलाया जाय।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Mr. Brar, you have got only two minutes.

شری نریندر سنگھ برار (پنجاب):

مہدمآ دیٹی چہرمین صاحبہ - میں اس بات کی مبارکباد پیش کرتا ہوں کہ بہ جو آسام کے لوگوں کی آواز سنی گئی ہے - دیگر کئی ضروری وجوہات کی وجہ سے یہ جو صوبہ بنا رہا ہے میں اس کے لئے چوہان صاحب کو مبارکباد دیتا ہوں - میری پارٹی نے اس بات کے لئے ان کا ساتھ دیا ہے اور ہم اس اصول کو مانتے ہیں لیکن ساتھ ہی میں ایک التجا بھی کروں گا کہ جب آپ یہ صوبہ بنائیں تو اس صوبہ کو اچھی طرح سے بنایا جانا چاہئے - اس کے لئے کوئی چھکڑا نہیں چھوڑا جانا چاہئے جیسے ننڈا جی ہمارے لئے چھوڑ گئے ہیں - ننڈا جی پنجاب کے لئے اور ہمارے لئے وہ سپایا، چھوڑ گئے ہیں اور ہریانہ کے لوگ ہمارا سر پھونے کے لئے تیار ہوتے ہیں - اس لئے میں آپ سے التجا کروں گا کہ جب آپ اس صوبہ کو بنائیں تو اس میں کسی قسم

کی خامی نہ چھوڑ دے اور جو بھی خامیاں ہیں ان کو آپ ابھی دور کر دیں - چاہے کوئی بھی حکومت آئے ہم سب لوگوں کا یہ نظریہ ہونا چاہئے کہ ہم اس صوبہ کو ترقی دیں، روزیہ دیں اور ہر طرح سے طاقت دیں اور ان کو یکساں سمجھیں - اگر ہم اس طرح کی بات سوچیں گے تو اس دیہ کی ترقی ہوگی، یہ دیہ طاقتور ہوگا - ہم یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ چاہے کسی خیال کا کوئی آدمی ہو، چاہے اگلی کی حکومت آئے، چاہے کمیونسٹ کی حکومت آئے اور وہ بھارت میں وشراس رکھے والا ہے، اس دیہ کو مضبوط کرنا چاہتا ہے تو وہ ہر اسٹیٹ کو مدد دینے کی بات سوچیں گے اس لئے میں آپ کا زیادہ تائم نہ لیتے ہوئے آپ سے التجا کروں گا کہ اگر کسی قسم کی کوئی خامی ہے تو اس کو آپ دور کریں گے اور انصاف کریں گے - اتنا کہہ رہا ہوں کہ مبارکباد پیش کرنا چاہتا ہوں -

†[सरदार नरेन्द्र सिंह ब्राह्मण (पंजाब) : मैडम डिप्युटी चैयरमैन साहिबा, मैं इस बात की मुबारकबाद पेश करता हूँ कि ये जो आसाम के लोगों की आवाज सुनी गई है। दीगर कई जरूरी बजहात की वजह से ये जो सूबा बना है मैं इसके लिये चव्हाण साहब को मुबारकबाद देता हूँ। मेरी पार्टी ने इस बात के लिये उनका साथ दिया और हम इस उसूल को मानते हैं। लेकिन साथ ही मैं एक इल्लिजा भी करूंगा कि जब आप यह सूबा बनायें तो इस सूबे को अच्छी तरह से बनाया जाना चाहिये। इसके लिये कोई झगड़ा नहीं छोड़ा जाना चाहिये जैसे नंदा जी हमारे लिये छोड़ गये हैं। नंदा जी पंजाब के लिये और हमारे लिये "स्यापा" छोड़ गये हैं और हरियाणा के लोग हमारा सिर फोड़ने के लिये तैयार बैठे हैं। इसलिये मैं आपसे इल्लिजा करूंगा कि जब आप इस सूबे को बनायें तो इसमें किसी किस्म की खामी न छोड़िये और जो भी खामियां हैं उनको आप अभी दूर कर दें। चाहे कोई भी हुकूमत आये हम सब लोगों का यह नजरिया होना चाहिये कि हम इस सूबे को तरक्की दें, रुपया दें और हर तरह से ताकत दें और इनको एकसां समझें। अगर हम इस तरह की बात सोचेंगे तो इस देश की तरक्की होगी, ये देश ताकतवर होगा। हम यह चाहते हैं कि चाहे किसी ख्याल का कोई आदमी हो, चाहे अकाली की हुकूमत आये, चाहे कम्युनिस्ट की हुकूमत आये, अगर वह भारत में विश्वास रखने वाला है, इस देश को मजबूत करना चाहता है तो वह स्टेट को मदद देने की बात सोचेंगा। इसलिये मैं आपका ज्यादा टाइम न लेते हुए आपसे इल्लिजा करूंगा कि अगर किसी किस्म की कोई खामी हो तो उसको आप दूर करेंगे और इन्साफ करेंगे। इतना कहकर मैं आपको मुबारकबाद पेश करना चाहता हूँ।]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Home Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. Madam, I rise on a point of order. (*Interruptions*). The point of order is to be allowed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, I was a little surprised that when I rose on a point of order, a chorus developed from that side and you did not ask the Leader of the House to stop that chorus. Therefore I say that brute majority is at work and even the Chair is rendered helpless in this matter. I am very sorry for it. These gentlemen cannot go without passing it. (*Interruptions*) Therefore I say that there should not be two rules, one for them and another for us. (*Interruptions*) Madam Deputy Chairman, why did you not name all of them for shouting? You should have named them all. (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, are you presiding over the Rajya Sabha Session or are you occupying the chair at Faridabad? That is what I would like to know. (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, please take your seat.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I rise on a point of order, Madam.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया, मैं भी प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर पर खड़ा हूँ . . . (*Interruptions*) मैं पहले से प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर पर खड़ा हूँ . . .

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, I am not casting any reflection.

श्री राजनारायण माननीया, यह चेयर पर कोई रिफ्लेक्शन नहीं कर रहे हैं . . .

(*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lokanath Misra.

(*Interruptions*)

I do not like this way of doing things. Please sit down. I do not want this sort of pandemonium in the House. After having gone through all the stages, on the third reading you should not go about in this fashion. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, the words that you have used you must withdraw.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA. Madam, I have used nothing objectionable. They are treating you as if you are presiding over the Faridabad Session. As a matter of fact you are our esteemed Deputy Chairman.

(*Interruptions*)

श्री राजनारायण माननीया, अब हमारा प्वाइट आफ आर्डर सुना जाय . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Secretary tells me that there is nothing to withdraw, whatever Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said. So that is all right.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat). Madam, you must use your own discretion, not your Secretary's discretion.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Secretary has brought to my notice what was actually said and I find nothing wrong in it.

(*Interruptions*)

श्री राजनारायण . हमारा प्वाइट आफ आर्डर यह है कि ससदीय प्रथा के मुताबिक . . . (*Interruptions*)

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश). सवाल यह है कि माननीय सदस्य ने विद्वद्ग करने की कौन सी बात कही है . . . (*Interruptions*)

श्री राजनारायण ससदीय प्रथा के मुताबिक क्या मैं यह कहने का हक नहीं रखता कि आप सदन के सदस्यों से कहे कि वे अपनी पार्टी का सम्मेलन इसको न समझे। भूपेश जी ने जो कहा वह यही कहा कि यह फरीदाबाद का अधिवेशन नहीं है, हम वहां नहीं बैठे हैं और आप इस सदन की चेयर पर बैठी हैं। इसलिये आप सदस्यों से कहे कि वे फरीदाबाद के अधिवेशन के डेलीगेट की तरह बिहेव न करें। तो भूपेश जी ने कोई गलत बात नहीं की है।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA. Madam, I am on my original point of order. The Business Advisory Committee decided that we should sit up to 6 O' clock. If Mr. Chavan says that he would require half an hour for making his reply, I entirely concede that point; let him speak for half an hour. If he, however, thinks that he would not consume the entire time left, i.e., half an hour, I suggest that others who desire to participate in the third reading on that side as well as on this side, they might be given an opportunity to speak. This is according to the Business Advisory Committee.

(*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, please take your seat. The Business Advisory Committee has said that we may sit up to 6 p.m. but if we finish our business earlier, we can do so. Therefore I am calling the Home Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That interpretation you cannot give, Ma dam. I was in the Business Advisory Committee. I was in the Business Advisory Committee meeting. Now you are putting a different interpretation on it. I am not quarrelling with Mr. Chavan. Mr. Chavan can speak as long as he likes. But that should not be done.

(Interruptions)

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Madam, the House has very carefully considered the Bill and practically completed its voting except on this third reading. Now, even at the third reading stage some Members raised those issues which possibly could have received consideration at the first reading stage, and I would certainly like to meet some of those points. Let me refer to the first point made by Mr. Ahmad. I am very grateful to him that he has supported this Bill. The reasons that he gave for his support are possibly good as far as this Bill goes, but I do not agree with his general philosophy about the reorganisation of the problems—he says about the reorganisation of the problems and breaking up of the States.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: I did not say about breaking up of the States.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Wherever necessary.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: I said, "Keep your mind open."

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I am coming to that. My mind is open. That is the point I am coming to. You said, "Keep your mind open." What is this idea of keeping the mind open at both the ends so that nothing remains in the mind?

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: You will have to keep your mind open.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I can understand when one says his mind

is open, that he is prepared to consider everything that comes. But at the same time there must be certain basic considerations which will influence your thinking. We have first of all accepted the principle of linguistic States, and I think that is a wide enough thing and a good enough thing.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: I want to explain what I said. I said that within the linguistic States some arrangements of this type may be possible and some such arrangements should be made.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Mr. Ahmad, I am glad if this is your idea. But you see, when we express these views in the context of what is happening now in the country, and particularly when some Members even opposed this Bill on the consideration that it was going to create more repercussions and more reactions then, possibly, they may amount to supporting the disintegrating process which has of late been visible in the country. This is exactly why I said that we are supporting this particular proposition in the case of Assam. It is not with a view to dividing the State or breaking up the State. We are taking this step to keep the State integrated. And this is, really speaking, where you are missing the point.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: "Keep your mind open" is all that I said.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Well, I am very glad. If it is so, if you mean what I say, I have no objection to it. As long as you think as I think, I have no objection. Why should I do that?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Your mind has declared a lock-out.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: No, no, my mind is not that open as yours that nothing remains in that mind.

Then the other Member who spoke, I mean Mr. B. K. P. Sinha, really speaking he made the same point as I am making and therefore I support his thinking in this particular matter.

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

Now, Madam, the other Member, Rajnarainji, he made a very intelligent speech today. I hope he, somehow or other, sometimes reverts to this sort of thing, which is very welcome.

I am very grateful to this hon. House that they have considered this Bill, and for the splendid support that they have given to this Bill and I am sure the people of Assam and the people of this new autonomous State will see the spirit with which this Bill has been supported, and work it out in the same spirit.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The House divided.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:

Ayes 175

Noes 8

AYES — 175

Abdul Samad, Shri A. K. A.

Abid Ali, Shri

Abraham, Shri P.

Ahmad, Shri Syed.

Ahmad, Shri Z. A.

Alva, Shri Joachim.

Amla, Shri Tirath Ram.

Anand Chand, Shri.

Anandam, Shri M.

Anandan, Shri T. V.

Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy,
Shrimati.

Ansari, Shri Hayatullah.

Arora, Shri Arjun

Bachchan, Dr. H. R.

Baharul Islam, Shri.

Barbora, Shri G.

Basu, Shri Chitta.

Bhadram, Shri M. V.

Bhargava, Shri M. P.

Bhatt, Shri Nand Kishore.

Bobdey, Shri S. B.

Brar, Sardar Narindar Singh.

Chandra Shekhar, Shri.

Chandrasekhar, Dr. S.

Chaudhary, Shri Ganeshi Lal.

Chaudhri, Shri N. P.

Chetia, Shri P.

Chinai, Shri Babubhai M.

Damodaran, Shri K.

Dass, Shri Mahabir.

Desai, Shri Suresh J.

Deshmukh, Shri T. G.

Dharia, Shri M. M.

Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.

Doogar, Shri R. S.

Dugal, Sardar Harcharan Singh.

Gilbert, Shri A. C.

Goswami, Shri Sriman Prafulla.

Gujral, Shri I. K.

Gupta, Shri Balkrishna.

Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.

Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.

Hasan, Prof. Saiyid Nurul.

Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.

Hussain, Shri Syed.

Iyer, Shri N. Ramakrishna.

Jadhav, Sardar D. K.

Jagarlamudi, Shri Chandramouli.

Jahanara Jaipal Singh, Shrimati.

Jain, Shri A. P.

Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri.

Kaul, Shri B. K.

Kaul, Shri M. N.

Kemparaj, Shri B. T.

Kesavan (Thazhava), Shri.

Khaitan, Shri R. P.

Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.

Khan, Shri M. Ajmal.

Khobaragade, Shri B. D.

Kollur, Shri M. L.

Kothari, Prof. Shantilal.

Krishan Kant, Shri.

Kulkarni, Shri A. G.

- Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
Kurup, Shri G. Sankara.
Lalitha (Rajagopalan), Shrimati.
Mahanti, Shri B. K.
Mahida, Shri U. N.
Mallikarjunudu, Shri K. P.
Mandal, Shri B. N.
Mangladevi Talwar, Dr. (Mrs.).
Mani, Shri A. D.
Maniben Vallabhbhai Patel, Kumari.
Mariswamy, Shri S. S.
Mehta, Shri Om.
Menon, Shri K. P. Subramania.
Mirdha, Shri Ram Niwas.
Mishra, Shri L. N.
Mishra, Shri S. N.
Misra, Shri Lokanath.
Misra, Shri S. D.
Mitra, Shri P. C.
Mohammad, Chaudhury A.
Mohta, Shri M. K.
Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja.
Momin, Shri G. H. Valimohmed.
Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.
Muniswamy, Shri N. R.
Murahari, Shri Godey.
Musafir, Shri Gurmukh Singh.
Nagpure, Shri V. T.
Naidu, Miss M. L. M.
Nair, Shri G. Gopinathan.
Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
Narayanappa, Shri Sanda.
Neki Ram, Shri.
Panda, Shri Brahmananda.
Pande, Shri C. D.
Panjhazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh.
Parthasarathy, Shri R. T.
Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.
Patel, Shri Sundar Mani.
Patel, Shri T. K.
Patil, Shri G. R.
Patil, Shri P. S.
Patra, Shri N.
Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
Phulrenu Guha, Dr. Shrimati.
Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
Purkayastha, Shri M.
Pushpaben Janardanrai Mehta, Shrimati.
Rajnarain, Shri.
Ram Singh, Sardar.
Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
Ray, Shri S. P.
Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
Reddy, Shri M. Srinivasa.
Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda.
Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
Reddy, Shri Nagi.
Reddy, Shri Y. Adinarayana.
Reddy, Shri Yella.
Roy, Shri Biren.
Ruthnaswamy, Shri M.
Sadiq Ali, Shri.
Sahai, Shri Ram.
Salig Ram, Dr.
Samuel, Shri M. H.
Sangma, Shri E. M.
Sanjivayya, Shri D.
Satyavati Dang, Shrimati.
Savnekar, Shri B. S.
Seeta Yudhvair, Shrimati.
Sen, Dr. Triguna.
Sen Gupta, Shri Dwijendralal.
Shah, Shri K. K.
Shanta Vasisht, Kumari.
Sharma, Shri Anant Prasad.
Sherkhan, Shri.
Shervani, Shri M. R.
Shukla, Shri Chakrapani.
Shukla, Shri M. P.
Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati.
Siddalingaya, Shri T.
Singh, Shri Bhupinder.
Singh, Shri Dalpat.
Singh, Shri Devi.
Singh, Shri Gurcharan.
Singh, Shri Jogendra.
Singh, Shri S. K.

Singh, Shri T. N.
Sinha, Shri Awadheshwar Prasad
Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap.
Sinha, Shri Rewati Kant.
Sisodia, Shri Sawai Singh.
Somasundaram, Shri G. P.
Sukhdev Prasad, Shri. .
Sur, Shri M. M.
Suraj Prasad, Shri.
Tankha, Pandit S. S. N..
Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad.
Tripathi, Shri H. V.
Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.
Usha Barthakur, Shrimati.
Vaishampayan, Shri S. K.
Varma, Shri C. L.
Vasavada, Shri S. R.
Venkateswara Rao, Shri N.
Vero, Shri M.
Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati. .
Vimal Punjab Deshmukh, Shrimati.
Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.
Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati.
Zaidi, Col. B. H.

NOES—8

Bhandari, Shri Sundar Singh.
Jagat Narain, Shri

**Mahavir, Dr. Bhai.
Pitamber Das, Shri.
Shejwalkar, Shri N. K.
Thengari, Shri D.
Vārma, Shri Man Singh.
Varma, Shri Niranjan.**

The motion was carried by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we have less than twenty minutes. Does the House propose to continue or adjourn for the day?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let us take up the next item.

MANY HON. MEMBERS: Let us adjourn now.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I find that the sense of the House is that we adjourn now.

The House stands adjourned till
11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at forty-two minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 1st May, 1969.