

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN): Sir, the Government have learnt with deep regret of the reported intention of Sant Fateh Singh Ji to go on fast on December 17 and to commit self-immolation on December 27, 1966. We had thought that after the reorganisation of Punjab on linguistic basis, according to the wishes of the people of Punjab, co-operation and goodwill of Sant Ji would be available towards a smooth change-over and the stabilisation of the new States.

In the statements made by him in the Press from time to time and in the communications received by the Government from him, Sant Ji has pressed two demands, namely, (a) inclusion of certain areas, which according to him, are Punjabi-speaking, and Chandigarh in the new State of Punjab and (b) discontinuance of common links between the new States.

As the House is aware, allocation of the territories to the new units emerging as a result of reorganisation of Punjab has been made in accordance with the recommendations made by a high-powered Commission presided over by an eminent judge of the Supreme Court, except in respect of Kharar tehsil. The majority of the members of the Commission had recommended that the entire Kharar tehsil should go to Haryana and one member had suggested the allocation of a part of it, including Chandigarh, to Punjab and part to Himachal Pradesh. The constitution of Chandigarh into a Union Territory to serve as a joint Capital of the new States was decided upon against this background of conflicting claims. In the circumstances this decision can hardly be regarded as unfavourable or unfair to Punjab.

The demand for discontinuance of common links seems to be based on the misunderstanding that something had been done which is peculiar to Punjab or detracts from its position

as a full-fledged State of the Indian Union. A common Governor and a common High Court for Punjab, Haryana and Chandigarh, with headquarters at Chandigarh which serves as the common capital of the first two, were provided for the sake of convenience to the reorganised States. In his letter dated the 1st November to the Prime Minister, Sant Fateh Singhji had raised the question about these common links. In her reply of 9th November, the Prime Minister has already made it clear, that if at a future date, the States concerned express the desire to have separate Governors and High Courts, the matter can be considered without much difficulty.

The arrangement to have a common Governor for Punjab and Haryana does not flow from the Punjab Reorganisation Act itself. The Constitution permits the President to appoint the same person as the Governor of more than one State and this arrangement exists in two other States. This, however, need not be regarded as a permanent feature of the reorganised States in Punjab.

Continuance of Corporations which becomes inter-State in character as a result of reorganisation and certain other common institutions, as also provision of facilities by one State to another during a transitional period are a feature common to all State reorganisation schemes to avoid a vacuum developing as a result of reorganisation. Such common facilities are continued only to the extent and for the period necessary. Similarly legal cover for bifurcation of other Corporations, etc., is provided by the Inter-State Corporations Act and other laws. As I have already indicated, these provisions are on the lines of the previous reorganisation laws.

So far as the Bhakra and Beas Projects are concerned joint arrangements for important inter-State projects of national importance have

been made elsewhere. The Damodar Valley Corporation is an instance of this kind. These projects will remain the joint property of the participating States; the States concerned will have their representatives on the Boards for maintenance and construction of the projects and it is proposed to man the services of the Boards from engineers on deputation from the successor States.

The position was explained in the Prime Minister's letter of the 9th November to which I have referred earlier. A further letter dated the 15th November 1966 was received by the Prime Minister from Sant Fateh Singhji reiterating his earlier demands. A reply has been sent to this letter explaining the position.

As the House is aware, in matters of this kind, decisions have to be taken on merits and in the light of competing and sometimes conflicting claims and demands, and it is always difficult to find solutions which are acceptable in their entirety to all the parties and interests. The Government are unable to accept any claim for readjustment of the reorganised territories which, as I have already stated, have been determined on the basis of recommendations of a high-powered and impartial Commission, unless at any time in future, all the parties concerned evolve a mutually agreed solution. As for common links, I have explained the position fully and there seems to be hardly any problem concerning them. The two links which have been regarded as special to the States of Punjab and Haryana are the common High Court and the common Governor. If either of the two State Governments recommend the establishment of separate High Courts or appointment of separate Governors for the two States, we would be prepared to initiate the necessary action.

I would appeal to Sant Fateh Singhji to reconsider the issues in the perspective in which I have placed them. His life is too valuable

to be sacrificed and it is our sincere hope that he would abandon his contemplated fast and save his life for the service of the great Sikh community, the State and the country as a whole.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, संत फतह सिंह जी ने जो सबसे आखिरी कदम है, उस कदम को उठाने का फैसला ले लिया है। मैं भी मंत्री जी की इस राय में उनके साथ हूँ और तार्किक ढंग में अपने जज़्बात को जोड़ना चाहता हूँ कि संत फतह सिंह जी ऐसा काम न करें। यह तो बहुत आखिरी कदम है। अगर वे अपनी इच्छा की पूर्ति ही करना चाहते हैं, तो उनको ऐसा कदम उठाने के पूर्व और रास्ता है, जैसा कि मंत्री जी ने सुझाया है। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि संत फतह सिंह जी ने जो अपने ब्यान में यह बात कही कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने, सरकार के लोगों ने, उनको धोका दिया है। उन्होंने कहा है कि उन्हें जो आश्वासन दिये गये थे, उन आश्वासनों की पूर्ति नहीं की गई। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने संत फतह सिंह जी को क्या क्या आश्वासन दिये थे और अगर आश्वासन दिये गये हैं, तो उन आश्वासनों की पूर्ति क्यों नहीं की गई ?

दूसरी बात मैं मंत्री जी से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार भविष्य के लिए भी और अब के लिए भी, जो अनावश्यक, बेमतलब का, हल्के टाइप का घमण्ड दिखलाया जाता है, उसको दिखलाने से भविष्य में बाज आयेगी ? सरकार घमकी के सामने नहीं दबना चाहती है, सरकार इस तरह की धमकियों को कुचल देगी, ऐसी बातों से फायदा क्या है ? यही बात आन्ध्र के मौके पर कही गई थी, यही बात पंजाब के बटवारे के मौके पर कही गई थी, यही बात गोवध आन्दोलन के बारे में कही गई थी और इस तरह से घमण्ड और दम्भपूर्ण भाव प्रकट करने के बाद फिर सरकार इस

[श्री राजनारायण]

तरह से मुलायम ढंग से झुक जाती है कि जिसे एक बड़ा अनर्थ होता है।

आज जैसा बयान मंत्री जी ने दिया है, इमी ढंग का बयान बिना इस दंभ के दिखाये हुये कि कुचल दंगे, फतेह सिंह के आंदोलन को दबा दंगे. . . . . ( Interruption ) में इस लिये कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार से हमारा अिनम्र निवेदन है कि सरकार दंभपूर्ण तरीके से किसी बात का इजहार न किया करे। इससे वातावरण दूषित होता है, बिगड़ता है। क्या सरकार इस पर भी ध्यान देगी कि जा पत्र व्यवहार प्रधान मंत्री और संन फतेह सिंह जी के बीच से हुआ है वह सभा के पटल पर रखा जाये।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I must make one point clear. The suggestion that Rajnarainji made in his question was that the Prime Minister has given some assurance to Fateh Singhji which has not been kept up. It is a very incorrect suggestion. No promise was given and there is no question of breaking any promise.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): May I ask the Minister whether apart from the question of the common High Court and the common Governor the main point of contention is the location of Chandigarh as a Union territory? Why does not Government apply the same principles which lie behind the recent Bill passed for conducting an opinion poll in Goa? Because the impression has been left on the minds of people that because the Government of Maharashtra has influential representation in the Cabinet and is able to exercise pressure it is able to secure an opinion poll. But because the States of Punjab and Haryana are not so powerful and do not have influential representatives in the Cabinet, they are not able to prevail upon the Centre . . . (Interruption.) The second point I want to ask is whether the State of Punjab and the State of

Haryana can be economically and financially viable if a separate Governor or a separate High Court is set up in either State. It is we, the citizens of India, who have to pay in the form of higher excise duties for these people. Can the Minister assure us that he would call upon both the parties to make the States economically viable before they think of the luxury of a separate Governor or a separate High Court?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: As far as the first part of the question is concerned, there is no question of ascertaining the wishes of the people on this particular matter at the present moment because the decision was taken by appointment of a certain impartial, high-powered Commission, and there is no comparison to the problem that he referred to possibly, may I say, in a friendly, mischievous suggestion for me. As far as the second part is concerned the Parliament has accepted the premise that both the States are viable States. There is no question of proving that they are going to be viable. When we have accepted them as States by an Act of Parliament, there is no question of their being viable or not. The question of expenditure involved in the Governorship is certainly a matter that even more viable States can re-examine and consider. That is a different matter, but I have explained the position of the Government. If either State wants it, we will consider it.

SHRI D. THENGARI (Uttar Pradesh): So far as the statement of Minister goes, I think it is merely a reiteration of the stand taken earlier—by earlier I mean after Sant Fateh Singh has made his declaration. I agree with the Minister that the life of Sant Fateh Singh is very valuable for the country. I also must point out that in not following the majority recommendation regarding the status of Chandigarh Government has already gone out of its way. Under the circumstances I want to know—because there is an imminent

danger of some tragedy so far as self-immolation is concerned—what concrete steps the Government proposes to take to avoid the tragedy of self-immolation.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: The step is the statement that I have made before Parliament.

شری نریندر سنگھ بوار (پنجاب) :

عالی جاہ ... میں چند سوالات آپ کے سامنے رکھنا چاہتا ہوں۔ جہاں تک سنٹ جی کے اعلان کا تعلق ہے انہوں نے واضح الفاظ میں کہا تھا کہ یہ ہمارا پہلا اور آخری جتھا ہے جو چلنی گذہ جائے گا اور پر امن طریقے پر جائے گا۔ پہلے بھی جب پنجابی صوبہ نہیں بنا تھا ہمارا یہی نعرہ ہوتا تھا کہ ہندو سکھ زندہ بان پنجابی صوبہ زندہ بان۔ ہماری ہستری میں کبھی ایک ایسا موقعہ نہیں آیا ہے جب ہم نے لا اینڈ آرڈر کو وائلوٹ کیا ہو۔ تو یہ جتھا چپ منگٹلف مقامات پر پر امن طریقے پر گزر رہا تھا کوئی پرووکیشن نہیں ہوا تھا کوئی غبر ذمہ دارانہ قدم نہیں اٹھایا گیا تھا تب بھی اس جتھے کو گرفتار کر لیا گیا بغیر کسی وجہ کے۔ جب کہ دوسری پارٹیوں کو پارلیمنٹ کے دروازوں تک آ کر شور مچانے کی اجازت دی جاتی ہے۔ چلنی گڑھ تو ایک چھوٹی سی ٹیوریٹری ہے اور وہاں پر ہمارا جتھا جانے دیئے میں کیا ہرج تھا جب

کہ آج سے پہلے بھی کبھی ہماری طرف سے کوئی بات نہیں ہوئی ہے۔

دوسرا سوال میرا یہ ہے کہ کیا اس کی یہ وجہ تو نہیں تھی کہ رولنگ پارٹی نے جان بوجہ کر سنٹ جی کو ایجیٹیشن میں پھنسا دیا اور اشتغال دلا کر ان کو اس قدم پر مجبور کیا تاکہ وہ آسانی سے الیکشن جیت سکیں۔

ہمارے بھائی ابھی کہہ رہے تھے کہ کیا یہ صوبے گورنر اور ہائی کورٹ کے خرچے برداشت کر لیتے۔ اگر گورنمنٹ یہاں کے منسٹروں کے ایک بڑے بھاری جھنڈ کو تلفواہ دے سکتی ہے؟ ان کو بہتہ دے سکتی ہے تو ہماری سمجھ میں نہیں آتا کہ وہ گورنر اور ہائی کورٹ کے لئے کھوں نہیں خرچ کر سکتی۔ جہاں تک چوہان صاحب کا تعلق ہے ان پر ہم کو پورا اعتماد ہے چاہے وہ کوئی قدم ہمارے خلاف اٹھائیں یا کسی کے خلاف اٹھائیں میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ حکومت کو اپنی حکومت قائم رکھنے کے لئے لا اینڈ آرڈر کو درست رکھنا چاہئے اور اس معاملہ میں ہم ان کے ساتھ ہوں۔ جہانگ کہ جائز طریقہ سے طاقت کا استعمال کیا جائے گا۔

اس کے علاوہ میں یہ جاننا چاہتا ہوں کہ جو سنٹ جی کی مانگ

[شری نریندر سنگھ براو ]

ہے اور جو پنجاب کی رولنگ پارٹی نے پردیس کانگریس کمیٹی نے مانگ کی تھی اس میں ان کو کیا فرق دکھائی دیا۔ پردیس کانگریس کمیٹی نے بھی یہی مانگ کی تھی کہ کامن لنکس دور کر دیئے جائیں اور یہی ڈیمانڈ سلامت جی کی ہے۔

یہ جو جوڈیشیل انکوائری ہوئی تھی یا جو ہائی پاور انکوائری ہوئی تھی اس کے خلاف بے اعتمادی کا خیال نہ ہے اور نہ تھا۔ اس کے بارے میں یہ میں ضرور کہوں گا اور پہلے جب ری آرگنائزیشن ایکٹ آیا تھا تو اس وقت بھی میں نے یہ عرض کیا تھا کہ پنجابی سمجھنے والے جو نہیں تھے ان کی باتوں کو سنا گیا اور جو مالک مکان تھے ان کی باتوں کو نظر انداز کیا گیا وہاں پر جو عارضی طور پر ملازم تھے جو عارضی طور پر لہبر تھے یا جو عارضی طور پر تھپرنے والے اسٹوڈنٹ تھے یا جو دوسری عارضی چیزیں تھیں ان کو لے کر کے ایک سرجائری بنا دی گئی۔ میں نے اس وقت بھی نندہ جی سے کہا تھا کہ وہاں مکان بنانے

والے جو ہیں ان میں پنجابی بولنے والوں کی تعداد زیادہ ہے اور اس لئے چندى گدھ پنجاب کو دیا جائے۔ ویسے کوئی جگہ ہریانہ کو دی جائے یا پنجاب کو دی جائے اس میں کوئی فرق نہیں ہے لیکن میں نے اس وقت بھی صاف کہا تھا کہ یہ جو قانون ہے یہ جھگڑا کرانے والا اور لوانے والا خطرات کا قانون ہے اور چندى گدھ وغیرہ کی کچھ ایسی باتیں اس میں ڈال دی گئی ہیں جن سے دو بھائیوں میں آپس میں لڑائی ہو سکتی ہے۔ ہم ہریانہ اور پنجاب میں کوئی فرق نہیں سمجھتے ہیں۔ ہریانہ والے ہمارے بھائی ہیں اور ہم ان کے خلاف نہ کچھ بولیں گے اور نہ لڑیں گے اور نہ وہ ہمارے خلاف کچھ کہیں گے لیکن یہ ایک شوشہ چھوڑ دیا گیا ہے۔ میں نے نندہ جی سے بھی کہا تھا وہ آئی ایم سوری تو مینشن ہز نیم۔ میرا یہ خیال ہے کہ لوانے کے خیال سے ہی نندہ جی کو سمٹ دینے کے لئے کہا گیا تھا۔ میں معافی چاہتا ہوں کہ میں سوال پوچھنے کے بجائے تھوڑا بول رہا ہوں۔ میں سیکرٹری

صاحب کی انگیزائی کو محسوس  
کر رہا ہوں -

श्री सभापति : आप सवाल कर लीजिए ।

شری نریلندر سنگھ بوار : جہاں تک  
سوال کا تعلق ہے جناب میں یہ  
عرض کروں گا کہ جو حالت پیدا  
ہو گئی ہے اس وقت اس میں سنت  
جی کی جائز مانگوں کو مانگنے کے  
لئے سرکار اپنی غیر ضروری ہمت دھرمی  
کو چھوڑ کر کیا اس کے لئے دروازہ  
کھلا رکھنا چاہتی ہے کہ کوئی حل  
نکل آئے؟ جب کہ یہ کہہ رہے ہیں  
کہ سنت جی سب کے لئے اور ملک  
کے لئے نہایت وفادار ہیں جو  
انہوں نے باہر بھی اپنی اسپیشلیٹی  
میں کہا۔۔۔۔۔ جب پاکستان کا  
حملہ ہوا اس وقت بھی انہوں نے  
ایسا ہی ثبوت دیا جو انہوں نے  
سنت جی کی جان کی اتنی تعریف  
کی ہے تو کیا اس کے لئے دروازہ  
کھلا رکھنا چاہتے ہیں؟ ان باتوں  
کے علاوہ کچھ سوال اور ہیں ان کا  
جواب آنے کے بعد ایک آدھ سوال  
کی اجازت آپ دیں -

†[श्री नरेन्द्र सिंह बार (पंजाब) :  
आली जाह, मैं चन्द सवालात आप के सामने

† [ ] Hindi transliteration.

रखना चाहता हूँ। जहाँ तक संत जी के एलान  
का ताल्लुक है उन्होंने वाज्य अल्फाज में  
कहा था कि यह हमारा पहला और आखरी  
जत्था है जो चंडीगढ़ जाएगा और पुरअमन  
तरीके पर जाएगा। पहले भी जब पंजाबी  
सूबा नहीं बना था हमारा यही नारा होता था  
कि हिन्दू सिख जिन्दाबाद, पंजाबी सूबा  
जिन्दाबाद। हमारी हिस्ट्री में कभी ऐसा  
मौका नहीं आया है जब हमने ला एण्ड आर्डर  
को वाइलट किया हो। तो यह जत्था जब  
मुख्तलिफ मुकामात पर पुरअमन तरीके पर  
गुजर रहा था, कोई प्रोवोकेशन नहीं हुआ था,  
कोई गैर-जिम्मेदाराना कदम नहीं उठाया गया  
था तब भी इस जत्थे को गिरफ्तार कर लिया  
गया बगैर किसी वजह के, जब कि दूसरी  
पार्टियों को पार्लियामेंट के दरवाजों तक  
आकर शोर मचाने की इजाजत दी जाती है।  
चंडीगढ़ तो एक छोटी सी टैरिटरी है और वहाँ  
पर हमारा जत्था जाने देने में क्या हर्ज था  
जब कि आज से पहले भी कभी हमारी तरफ  
से कोई बात नहीं हुई है?

दूसरा सवाल मेरा यह है कि क्या इसकी  
यह वजह तो नहीं थी कि रूलिंग पार्टी ने जान  
बूझ कर संत जी को एजिटेशन में फंसाया  
और इशतमाल दिला कर उनको इस कदम  
पर मजबूर किया ताकि वह आसानी से  
इन्वेकशन जीत सकें।

हमारे भाई अभी कह रहे थे कि क्या  
ये सूबे गवर्नर और हाई कोर्ट के खर्च बरदास्त  
कर लेंगे। गवर्नमेंट यहां के मिनिस्ट्रों के एक  
बड़े भारी झुंड को तनख्वाह दे सकती है,  
उनको भत्ता दे सकती है तो मेरी समझ में  
नहीं आता कि वह गवर्नर और हाई कोर्ट  
के लिए क्यों नहीं खर्च कर सकती। जहाँ तक  
चह्दान साहब का ताल्लुक है उन पर हमको  
पूरा एतमाद है चाहे वह कोई कदम  
हमारे खिलाफ उठाएँ या किसी के खिलाफ

[श्री नरेन्द्र सिंह बरार]

उठाएं मैं समझता हूँ कि हुकूमत को अपनी हुकूमत कायम रखने के लिए ला एण्ड आर्डर को दुरुस्त रखना चाहिए और इस मामले में हम उनके साथ हैं जहाँ तक कि जाइज़ तरीके से ताकत का इस्तेमाल किया जाएगा।

इसके अलावा मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो संत जी की मांग है और जो पंजाब की रूलिंग पार्टी ने, प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी ने मांग की थी उसमें उनको क्या फर्क दिखाई दिया। प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी ने भी यही मांग की थी कि कामन लिंक दूर कर दिए जाएँ और यही डिमांड संत जी की है।

यह जो ज्युडिशियल इन्क्वायरी हुई थी या जो हाई पावर इन्क्वायरी हुई थी उसके खिलाफ बेंतमादी का ख्याल न है और न था। उसके बारे में यह मैं जरूर कहूँगा और पहले जब रिओर्गेनाइजेशन ऐक्ट आया था तो उस वक्त भी मैं ने यह अर्ज किया था कि पंजाबी समझने वाले जो नहीं थे उनकी बातों को सुना गया और जो मालिक मकान थे उन की बातों को नज़र अन्दाज़ किया गया। वहाँ पर जो आर्जी तौर पर मुलाजिम थे, जो आर्जी तौर पर लेबरर थे या जो आर्जी तौर पर ठहरने वाले स्टूडेंट थे या जो दूसरी आर्जी चीज़ें थीं उनको ले कर के एक मेजारिटी बना दी गई। मैं ने उस वक्त भी नन्दा जी से कहा था कि वहाँ मकान बनाने वाले जो हैं उनमें पंजाबी बोलने वालों की तादाद ज्यादा है और इस लिए चण्डीगढ़ पंजाब को दिया जाए। वैसे कोई जगह हरियाना को दी जाए या पंजाब को दी जाए इसमें कोई फर्क नहीं है लेकिन मैं ने उस वक्त साफ कहा था कि यह जो कानून है यह झगड़ा कराने वाला और लड़ाने वाला खतरनाक कानून है। और चण्डीगढ़ वगैरह की कुछ ऐसी बातें इसमें डाल दी गई हैं जिन से दो भाइयों में आपस में लड़ाई हो सकती है। हम हरियाना और पंजाब में कोई फर्क नहीं समझते हैं। हरियाना वाले हमारे भाई हैं और हम उनके खिलाफ न कुछ बोलेंगे और न लड़ेंगे

और न वह हमारे खिलाफ कुछ कहेंगे लेकिन यह एक शोशा छोड़ दिया गया है। मैंने नन्दा जी से भी कहा था "आई एम सौरी टू मेन्शन हिज़ नेम" मेरा यह ख्याल है कि लड़ाने के ख्याल से ही नन्दा जी को सीट देने के लिए कहा गया था। मैं माफी चाहता हूँ कि मैं सवाल पूछने के बजाए थोड़ा बोल रहा हूँ। मैं सेक्रेट्री साहब की एंगज़ाइट्री को महसूस कर रहा हूँ।

श्री सभापति : आप सवाल कर लीजिये ;

श्री नरेन्द्र सिंह बरार : जहाँ तक सवाल का ताल्लुक है, जनाब, मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि जो हालत पैदा हो गई हैं इस वक्त उसमें संत जी की जाइज़ मांगों को मानने के लिए सरकार अपनी गैर जरूरी हठधर्मी को छोड़ कर क्या इसके लिए दरवाज़ा खुला रखना चाहती है कि कोई हल निकल आए ? जब कि यह कह रहे हैं कि संत जी सबके लिए और मुल्क के लिए निहायत वफादार हैं जैसा उन्होंने बाहर भी अपनी स्पीच में कहा कि जब पाकिस्तान का हमला हुआ उस वक्त भी उन्होंने ने ऐंसा ही सबूत दिया था। जब उन्होंने संत जी की जान की इतनी तारीफ की है तो क्या इसके लिए दरवाज़ा खुला रखना चाहते हैं ? इन बातों के इलावा कुछ सवाल और हैं उनका जवाब आने के बाद एक आध सवाल की इजाज़त आप दें। ]

श्री सभापति : आप बहुत कुछ कह चुके हैं, काफी लम्बी तकरीर आपने की।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I do not know how many questions the hon. Member has put. He really made a statement. As far as arresting the *jathas* is concerned, this was the decision of the Punjab Government and, naturally, they had to take that decision because of the law and order question involved in that. They allowed the *jatha* to proceed for some time. But when they reached the conclusion at some stage that it might be a threat to the peace in the

State, they had to take that decision. It is their decision.

As far as the status of Chandigarh is concerned, in my statement I have made it very clear—the Government's position in this matter. Sir, about the suggestion that it was done because certain allegations have been made against my predecessor, I must refute them with all the emphasis at my command. As a matter of fact, the Commission has recommended by a majority decision to hand over Chandigarh to Haryana. If at all he is interested in its transfer, he should have supported it. And this is not the decision of a single or an individual Minister; it was the decision of the Government, as a whole. It was a Cabinet decision.

Then, Sir, I would request that Mr. Brar who is an hon. Member of this House who, I am sure, equally values the life of Sant Fateh Singh, would persuade him not to resort to this very drastic step in this matter. And as I have said, it is a question of territories, which can be reopened only if there is some sort of agreement between the States concerned. And as far as the common links are concerned, as I have said, if either of the States is prepared to reconsider this question, certainly it can be done. Our attitude has always been sympathetic. Our attitude has always been friendly and it would remain friendly.

شری نریندر سنگھ بھار : میرے ایک

سوال کا جواب نہیں آیا کہ سرکار اس

کو دی آپن کرنے کے لئے . . .

! [श्री नरनंदर सिंह बरार : मेरे एक सवाल का जवाब नहीं आका कि सरकार इसको रीअपन करने के लिये . . . ]

श्री सभ पति : बस । बहुत से नाम हैं, बहुत तंग पूछना चाहते हैं ।

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): The Home Minister has described that attitude as sympathetic but the statement which he has made accords with the news that has appeared in the newspapers today even, that the Government has taken a firm attitude of not yielding to anything. So, the words may not be harsh. But the attitude is like that. May I point out to the Minister and ask for clarification; if both the States agree then only can the question be taken up? But as has been stated by the Minister, even in the Commission itself at no stage has there been complete unanimity. You cannot expect unanimity on this question. For example, the Government wanted to turn Bombay into a Union territory under the Central administration and deny it to Maharashtra. There was no unanimity between the Gujaratis and the Mahrattis. But obviously, Bombay, belongs to Maharashtra. May I know from him whether they would adopt the same thing, a half-way house at least, to meet the desire of Sant Fateh Singh? Secondly, if you do not accept all the questions that have been raised by Sant Fateh Singh, at least the dissolution of common links need not wait till the General Elections take place because there is a strong objection. Every State has common links with the other States since they all belong to the Indian Union. Why should these particular States have common links and create lots of friction between them? Is it not better that these common links are severed at least so far as the Governor and the High Court are concerned? Please do that—leave aside the other questions—and settle that Chandigarh falls within the territory of Punjab State. Whatever the majority might have said, Chandigarh belongs to Punjab as far as can be seen by anybody. Why make it a bone of contention? Make Parliament pay some money to Haryana to build another quite good capital and solve this issue and do not keep it as a



[Shri Niren Ghosh.]

bone of friction between these two States, two language groups. All these create troubles.

And lastly, I would also request the Government—do not embark on the path of provocation. It seems that the arresting of the peaceful *jathas* has created this situation. Please avoid that and see that some solution is arrived at and that this is averted. That is what I want to know and get clarified.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Sir, I think he has made many suggestions. I have nothing to say about those suggestions. But I would like to make the Government's position very clear as far as the common links are concerned. The hon. Member has not understood the statement that I have made. I have said that we are certainly prepared to consider the suggestions that either of the States makes about it and initiate also action, as I said, in this matter. But as far as the territories are concerned, the question can be considered only after the States concerned have certain agreed solutions to suggest.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Sant Fateh Singh's life is very precious. Government should make every effort to see that he does not resort to this. I want to know whether it is possible for the Prime Minister to have frank talks with Sant Fateh Singh with regard to the questions that he has raised. We all know that tehsil was a unit for considering the demarcation of these two States. I want to know whether it is not possible for the Government to have a fresh look and on the basis of the Pataskar formula make the village as the unit? The disputed areas might be referred to arbitration. Secondly, I want to know whether it is not possible for the Government to give an assurance that within five years a new capital will be built for Haryana and

for that period, Chandigarh will be a common capital for both the States and afterwards Chandigarh will be the capital of Punjab.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I think my statement is very clear on this issue, I do not think I need reiterate the same thing, again and again.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): We all share the sentiments that there should not be any development leading to the self-immolation in this matter. But at the same time the issue remains with us. As far as Chandigarh is concerned; I do not see the reason why the Government should not make a declaration *suo motu* that it will revise its decision so that Chandigarh becomes, rightly, the capital of the newly formed Punjab State.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): Why do you say 'rightly'?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I say 'rightly'. All the same it should become the capital of Punjab. Now, this is the thing. Here in this matter we have travelled far enough after the reorganisation issue came up. Only we find that at every step the Government falters, delays the decision to be taken later after a certain crisis has been created. That has been our experience over the decade and more than a decade, in regard to the reorganisation. Why, in this case the Government cannot make, in principle, an announcement that they accept the proposition that Chandigarh should be the capital of Punjab and that expeditiously this principle will be acted upon and Chandigarh will become the exclusive capital of the Punjab State? This is a very, very essential. I cannot understand why now they should suddenly suggest that either of the State should make a request. Well, it is not necessary; it is not at all necessary that either of the States

should make a request. The States have been formed and the declaration of Chandigarh as the capital of Punjab should follow the paramount fact, namely, the reorganisation of the Punjab; Chandigarh goes with the linguistic part of it and becomes, on merits, the capital of the Punjab State. That is now the Government should make it clear. I think it will help the atmosphere. I appeal to Mr. Chavan—he was appealing to Sant Fateh Singh—now that he is the new Minister for Home Affairs—the previous one bungled quite a lot; the new one need not get into bungling—that he should make a categorical statement. It will improve the matter. Secondly, with regard to this Governor and the High Court, well, as far as the Governors are concerned, I want them to go lock, stock and barrel. It is absolutely a useless institution. People may look at the Governor's car but not at the Governor, as you know, when they travel nowadays. It has come to that. It is an expensive institution. But then, I think you can spend a little more even on this waste. You can reduce their salary and so on, amend the Constitution. But these points of irritation need not be there. This is not economy. But if a certain incident takes place, the cost will be much more than what you will have paid to the Governor for ten years.

Then with regard to the High Court, why should there not be two High Courts; why one High Court? I can understand the question of language of the High Court. But a High Court is a very important institution in the political set-up.

With regard to the other matter, I think the Government should accept the principle of village as the unit. Having accepted that, they can ask the people to discuss among themselves and come to a settlement. The trouble has arisen, Sir, because the Government has been faltering on the question of principles. I appeal to the Government that the Govern-

ment should rise up to the principles involved in this matter and clearly and unequivocally accept the two demands and say that they would be expeditiously implemented, before the appeal of Sant Fateh Singh gathers more force, I am sure the matter will be solved peacefully and to the satisfaction of all, and also in a democratic way.

**SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN:** Instead of asking for clarifications on policy he has enunciated his policy. I have nothing to say except to add one point. Some Members want to know whether the Prime Minister would be willing to see Sant Fateh Singhji. In her latest reply to Sant Fateh Singh Ji, she has already indicated that if Sant Fateh Singh Ji wants any clarifications of the Government's policy and decision, she would always be willing to meet him.

**श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :** सभापति जी, मुझे अफसोस है कि जब गृह मंत्री महोदय ने वक्तव्य दिया तब मैं यहां नहीं था, लेकिन पंजाब की घटनाओं से मैं पूरी तरह से जुड़ा हुआ रहा हूं और जिन परिस्थितियों में कामन लिक्स के बचन दिये गये हैं वे परिस्थितियां मुझे भी मालूम हैं और गृह मंत्री महोदय को भी मालूम होनी चाहियें।

अभी जो वक्तव्य दिया गया है उससे ऐसी ध्वनि निकलती है कि जैसे कामन लिक्स के बारे में सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट का कोई कमिटमेंट नहीं है। यह बात गलत है। नंदा जी और प्रधान मंत्री महोदय द्वारा भी जो आश्वासन पंजाब के पुनर्गठन के समय हमको दिया गया था, यह वक्तव्य उन आश्वासनों के प्रतिकूल है। मेरी स्वयं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से बात हुई थी जब वीर यज्ञदत्त शर्मा भूख हड़ताल कर रहे थे और यह प्रश्न था कि वह अपनी भूख हड़ताल वापस लें, तो केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यह वचन दिया था कि हरियाणा और पंजाब के बीच में अधिक से अधिक कामन लिक्स बनाये जायेंगे अब कहा जा रहा है

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपयी ]

कि अगर हरियाणा नहीं चाहता, पंजाब नहीं चाहता तो कोई कामन लिंक नहीं रहेगा। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि कामन लिंक के बारे में केन्द्रीय सरकार का दृष्टिकोण क्या है प्रश्न केवल पंजाब और हरियाणा का नहीं है भाखड़ा नंगल हिमाचल में है, उसकी नहरें हरियाणा को सींचती हैं, बिजली तीनों क्षेत्रों को जाती है . . .

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I would request you to read the statement first. पहले स्टेटमेंट पढ़ लें।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपयी : सभापति जी, अभी आपने जवाब दिया है कि कामन लिक्स के बारे में अगर हरियाणा पंजाब कुछ फैसला कर लेंगे . . .

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Will Mr. Vajpayee listen to me first? We have said about the two common links, namely the Governor and the High Court. But about Beas and Bhakra-Nangal, I have made my position very clear in the statement, that it will remain a joint project. But about the two common links, we really said that the common links of a common Governor and a common High Court . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What link is your Governor?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: You do not like Governors and, therefore, you have no right to talk about Governors.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What a wonderful link?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: About this common link, Mr. Vajpayee wants to know the Government's policy. I have got some extracts of the statement that my predecessor, Nandaji, made on the floor of the Houses of Parliament on the 21st March, 1966. May I read the relevant part of it so that it will be very clear?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Please.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: It says:

"Before announcing these decisions, Government took into full and careful consideration the representations made to them by various interests including those who were opposed to the reorganisation of the Punjab on the lines proposed. In the course of the long meetings held with some of them, misunderstanding and misgivings regarding the reorganisation that was under consideration were largely removed. The Government have made it clear to them:

(i) that the proposed reorganisation of Punjab will follow the linguistic basis, without any communal or religious factors being allowed to come into consideration;

(ii) such common links between the units resulting from the proposed reorganisation as are found feasible will be provided in consultation with the concerned interests;"

The most important point there is "as are found feasible" and "in consultation with the concerned interests", that means the two States here. These are the relevant factors in this matter and the legitimate rights and interests of the whole of India and linguistic minorities will be taken into consideration. Naturally, these two links, i.e. the High Court and the Governor, have been provided on this basis. But if they are not found feasible and if the parties concerned want to revise them . . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir. . . .

(Some hon'ble Members stood up in their seats.)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, I have not finished my question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Eight Members from this side have spoken. I want to come to this side also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This side is have nots while they are haves.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : सभापति जी, अभी जो गृह मंत्री महोदय ने कहा उसमें क्रमलटेशन की बात कही गई है, सारी च जें उन पर छोड़ने की बात नहीं की की गई है। खैर मैं उममें नहीं जाना चाहता। मैं दूसरी बात कह रहा हू।

श्री वाई० बी० चव्हाण : फीजिबिलिटी की बात है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : फीजिबिलिटी है या नहीं। फीजिबिलिटी है तभी तो आपने माना है और इसीलिए पंजाब रिआर्गनाइजेशन बिल में यह लाये।

श्री वाई० बी० चव्हाण : पहले।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : जो चीजें तीन महीने पहले फीजिबिल थीं वे संत संत फतह मिह जी की धमकी आते ही फीजिबिल नहीं रही।

श्री वाई० बी० चव्हाण : हमने यह नहीं कहा कि फीजिबिल नहीं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : क्या है।

श्री वाई० बी० चव्हाण : दोनों पार्टी में किसी ने कहा कि फीजिबिल नहीं तो वह अनफीजिबिल बन जाता है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं चव्हाण साहब से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि बात इतनी सरल न बनायें, कमिटमेंट केवल प्राइममिनिस्टर का नहीं है, कमिटमेंट एक कांग्रेस लीडर शिप का है और वह कांग्रेस पार्टी पंजाब में हरियाना में मेजरिटी में है।

श्री सभापति : आप दूसरी बात कहना चाह रहे थे।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Ignore that leadership.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAEYEE: No, no. We are not going to ignore it. That leadership is there, and we are not going to ignore that leadership.

सभापति जी, मैं दूसरी बात कह रहा हूँ। क्या यह ममझा जाय कि जहाँ तक चंडीगढ़ को यूनियन टेरिटरी बनाये रखने का सवाल है इस सवाल पर सरकार का दिमाग साफ है कि चंडीगढ़ यूनियन टेरिटरी रहनी चाहिये, कितना भी दबाव पड़े, धमकी आये, सरकार इससे टस से मस नहीं होगी और अगर टस से मस होगी तो चंडीगढ़ हरियाना में जायगा पंजाब में नहीं। आपने एक रिआर्गनाइजेशन कमिशन बनाया, उस कमिशन की मेजरिटी की रिपीट है कि चंडीगढ़ हरियाना में जाना चाहिये, चंडीगढ़ हरियाना को न देने के बाद एक अन्याय किया गया हरियाना के साथ कि चंडीगढ़ निकाल दिया गया। मगर यह अन्याय करने में भी संत जी को संतोष नहीं। संत जी ने कहा था कि पंजाब बन जायगा तो मैं राजनीति से सांस ले लूंगा, हिन्दू-सिख एकता के लिये काम करूंगा। बड़ा दुख है, संत फनेह मिह जी के लिये मुझे बड़ा आदर है, अगर वह इस तरह की धमकिया दें तो यह सरकार उन धमकियों के सामने झुक जाय। तो यह सरकार नहीं चलेगी, शासन नहीं चला पायेगी। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि चंडीगढ़ को जाना चाहिये हरियाना में, इस पर सरकार का दिमाग साफ है या परिस्थिति बिगड़ने के बाद यह सरकार फिर झुकेगी और उमकी प्रतिक्रिया फिर होगी।

श्री सभापति : उसका भी आपने स्टैंटमेंट में कह दिया है।

DR. GOPAL SINGH (Nominated): Sir, I rise to welcome the statement of the hon'ble Home Minister. It is a very sagacious statement, full of meaning and very conciliatory. I hope and I respectfully submit to Sant Fateh Singh that he should agree with the suggestion of the hon'ble Home Minister, namely, that in respect of the common links and in respect of disputed areas, if the two parties, namely, Haryana and the Punjab Governments whenever they choose, they can get together, whether before the elections or after the elections and come to a mutually agreed settlement, the Central Government will not stand in the way. I think more than this the Government of India cannot and should not do, unless it wants to rake up the controversy once again and create conditions in the State of Punjab which will not merely affect the Punjab State but will have wider repercussions. It is an irony of fate that the same gentleman who brought about the division of the Punjab is now fighting against its consequence. I saw through this and protested and suggested that a *via media* should be found out for this but unfortunately the passions of the communities were roused like the passions that are being roused by Mr. Vajpayee over Chandigarh. Neither I nor he has any business in the matter of Chandigarh unless the two parties, that is, the Haryana Government and the Punjab Government get together and agree on a mutual settlement in which case, either it goes to one State or the other but we should not appeal to the communal passions as Mr. Vajpayee has done.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I take strong objection to this. I have not appealed to any passion.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: That is your motive.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: You do not know what you are talking about. This was the gentleman who supported Punjabi Suba and now he is . . .

DR. GOPAL SINGH: You are saying . . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Non-sense . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Vajpayee has not aroused any communal passions. He was just speaking passionately.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: I submit that he always takes the side of Haryana because he thinks it is a Hindu State and therefore it should go to Jan Sangh . . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Absolutely wrong.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: Why do you not . . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Because the Commission recommended that Chandigarh should go to Haryana. This is a serious matter. I would not have taken any objection if the Commission had recommended that Chandigarh should go to the Punjab State. Punjabi Suba and Haryana are equal to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Gopal Singh please do not say that he has raised communal passions. He talks with passion.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: We all know what the decision taken was and how it was taken. We also know that the minority report in respect of Himachal Pradesh was accepted in 1956. That is how Himachal Pradesh was formed but I am not discussing it. I am discussing that a political decision . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not the time for discussion.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: I am seeking some clarifications. I support the statement of the hon. Home Minister that in respect of the common links and in respect of Chandigarh and the other disputed territory whatever decision is mutually arrived at between the Governments of Haryana and Punjab, would be acceptable to the Government of India. The Government should also make it clear that the places of worship will not be misused by anyone howsoever high-placed he may be, for political purposes.

This is a thing about which I am very clear.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): Hear, hear.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order. Mr. Arora is saying 'Hear hear'. We are not in a public meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am very happy that you are pointing this out.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am happy that I have pointed this out and you have taken note of it.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: Secondly, the Government is determined to maintain law and order and if anybody wants to provoke a conflict between the Hindus and Sikhs at this critical juncture, he would be dealt with according to law.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, एक सवाल मेरा भ. हो जाय ।

श्री सभापति : कुछ तो इन्साफ कीजिए । आप तो न्याय और सद्मेव के हामी हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : मैंने एक ही सवाल किया था शुरू में ।

श्री सभापति : आठ आदमी उधर से बोल चुके हैं । इधर से भी कहना चाहते हैं । उनको भी तब समय दूँ या न दूँ ?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Two issues have arisen. One is about the continuing of the common links. May I know if it is the attitude of the Government to-day that if a demand for severance is made by any one of the two states even to-morrow or the day after, that demand will be conceded because some Members tried to create an impression as if that demand will not be conceded till the elections are over? I do not know why the Minister thought that the suggestion of Mr. Mani for an Opinion Poll was a friendly suggestion but a mischievous suggestion.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): It was purely a mischievous one.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: It is not only Chandigarh that is in dispute. There are some other areas both in Punjab and in Haryana and in Himachal Pradesh also which are in dispute. Some areas are claimed by Himachal Pradesh, some by the Punjab and some by Haryana. May I know what are the difficulties or dangers that the Minister envisages if he accepts the suggestion for an Opinion Poll because that could be a very democratic solution of the whole thing? My fear is that if some such suggestion is not accepted in good time, the suggestion will have to be accepted after a lot of trouble is created. I remember when C. Rajagopalachari came out in favour of the suggestion for Pakistan people called him anti-national and disloyal to the country but he had the wisdom to foresee earlier than others that that was the only proper solution. I would therefore like to know from the Minister what are the exact dangers that he perceives if the suggestion for an Opinion Poll in all the disputed areas is accepted.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Fasts seem to be the order of the day. It is also true that there is some amount of coercive force in the fasts involved. I would like to know how far the Government is prepared to be coerced or how for its judgment is going to be based on fasts.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Cabinet should go on a fast.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: What attitude the Government is going to take to these fasts because fasts have become unfortunately the order of the day in this country?

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR (Madras): While I welcome the statement of the Minister as one of great statesmanship in expressing great concern about the unhappy events that may follow in the case of the self-immola-

[Dr. S. Chandrasekhar.]

tion of Sant Singh, may I know whether he has found out if the Haryana Government has also expressed their desire for a separate High Court and a separate Governor? May I know if the Haryana Government has been approached to find out what their attitude is and if they also say that they would like to sever the links on these two matters, may I know if the Government will initiate measures to see that these are accomplished before things set worse? I would like to know whether the Haryana Government has made any statement on this question and if not, whether the Centre has approached them to find out their attitude? Secondly, I would ask the Home Minister or the Government of India as a whole, whether they would not contemplate reaching a firm decision as a policy matter that in any future political discussion and agitation, if any party or individual wants to threaten or demand on the basis of a fast or self-immolation, whether the Government will not even talk about the matter or enter into any negotiation but on the other hand would be standing firm, no matter who starts it, despite the fact that this particular means as a means for redressal of grievances has been bequeathed to us by Mahatma Gandhi and into our body politics? The Government of India, as a body, should not enter into any discussion with anyone unless he immediately starts eating, unless he wants to contribute to the food problem and unless he wants to contribute to solving the food problem of Mr. C. Subramaniam. I would like the Minister to make a categorical statement on these.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): I have a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I am afraid I will not give you a chance.

Mr. Ghosh has already put a question.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: You said that you would call me . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, Mr. Chatterjee. The new Member.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana): Will the hon. Home Minister categorically state that there will be no change in the position of Chandigarh or any other boundary under any threat? Haryana has already suffered and it will not be prepared to suffer any more.

SHRI NARINDAR SINGH BRAR: Just one clarification I want. Only one . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. I am extremely sorry. I pass on to the next item.

SHRI NARINDAR SINGH BRAR: Just one clarification . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, please. Papers to be laid on the Table of the House.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

##### NOTIFICATION UNDER THE INDUSTRIES (DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION) ACT, 1951

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI BIBUDHENDRA MISRA): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (2) of section 18-A of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951, a copy of the Ministry of Industry Notification S.O. No. 2001, dated the 30th June, 1966. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-7489/66].

##### ANNUAL REPORT (1965-66) OF THE MINERALS AND METALS TRADING CORPORATION OF INDIA LIMITED, NEW DELHI, AND RELATED PAPERS

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI M. SHAFI QURESHI): Sir, on behalf of Shri Manubhai Shah, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (1) of section 619-A of the Companies Act, 1956, a copy each of the following papers:—

(i) Third Annual Report and Accounts of the Minerals and Metals Trading Corporation of India

Limited, New Delhi, for the year 1965-66, together with the Auditors' Report on the Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India thereon.

(ii) Review by Government on the working of the Corporation.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-7490/66 for (i) and (ii).]

ALLOTMENT OF TIME FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE MONOPOLIES INQUIRY COMMISSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that under rule 172 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I have allotted three hours for the consideration of the motion regarding the Report of the Monopolies Inquiry Commission, 1965.

ALLOTMENT OF TIME FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE INDIAN TARIFF (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have also to inform Members that under rule 186(2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I have allotted one hour for the completion of all stages involved in the consideration and return of the Indian Tariff (Second Amendment) Bill, 1966, by the Rajya Sabha, including the consideration and passing of amendments, if any, to the Bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO DR. ANUP SINGH

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that the following letter dated the 29th November, 1966, has been received from Dr. Anup Singh written from New York:—

"I came to the United States in September, 1966, for a lecture tour and I had expected to return in time to attend at least part of the current session of the Rajya Sabha.

Under the instructions of our Government I have joined the Indian Delegation for the Twenty-first Session of the United Nations General Assembly.

I shall be grateful if you would kindly grant me leave of absence from this session of the Rajya Sabha."

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Dr. Anup Singh for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the current session?

*No hon. Member dissented.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA  
THE SEEDS BILL, 1966

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House that I have received a message from the Lok Sabha informing the Rajya Sabha that the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 5th December, 1966, passed the Seeds Bill, 1966, with the following Amendments.

I am directed to inform Rajya Sabha that the Seeds Bill, 1964, which was passed by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 18th November, 1964, has been passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 5th December, 1966, with the following amendments:—

*Enacting Formula*

1. Page 1, line 1, for "Fifteenth" substitute "Seventeenth".

*Clause 1*

2. Page 1, line 3, for "1964" substitute "1966".

3. Page 1, lines 4 and 5, omit "except the State of Jammu and Kashmir".

*Clause 2*

4. Page 1, omit lines 12 and 13.

5. Page 1, line 15, after "established" insert "or declared as such".

6. Page 1, line 17, after "section 8" add "or recognised under section 18".