

**Proceedings of the Twelfth Session of the Assam Legislative
Assembly assembled after the Second General Election
under the Sovereign Democratic Republican
Constitution of India**

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber, Shillong at 10 a.m. on Thursday, the 28th September, 1961.

PRESENT

Shri MAHENDRA MOHAN CHOUiDHURY, B. L., Speaker in the
Chair. Seven Ministers, Three Deputy Minsters and Eighty Members.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

STARRED QUESTIONS

(To which oral Answers were given)

Re: Introduction of Revenue circles in the acquired Estates

Shri BHUBAN CHANDRA PRADHANI (Golakganj) asked :

*5. Will the Minister, Revenue be pleased to state—

- (a) Whether Government are introducing revenue circle system in place of Managerial system still in vogue in the acquired estates ?
- (b) If so, what measures Government are contemplating for absorption of those employees of the acquired estates ?
- (c) What is the number of employees in all the acquired estates from the rank of Assistant Manager to Barkandas and Peons ?
- (d) Whether it is a fact that on introduction of the revenue circle system many of the above employees, especially the Assistant Managers, Tahsildars and Mohorers and Barkandas would be thrown out of employment ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue) replied :

5. (a)—The matter is under examination of Government.
- (b)—The revenue circle system had not yet been introduced, the question of absorption of the acquired estates employees will arise, when that system is introduced. Those who are suitable and necessary may be absorbed.

(c)—Seven hundred and fifty-three.

(d)—It cannot be predicted now. Some of them may be thrown out of employment.

Shri BHUBAN CHANDRA PRADHANI (Golakganj): When the acquired Estates and their offices, have been treated by Governments as Government offices and why the employees of the Estates have not been considered as Government servants till now ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue): The employees are also Government servants but separate cadre has been created for them and they belong to that cadre.

Shri BHUBAN CHANDRA PRADHANI : Is it a fact that the employees are approaching Government repeatedly to redress their grievances ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: Yes.

Maulavi JAHANUDDIN AHMED (Bilasipara): Whether the circle system will be better or the Mauza system will be better ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: That has not been finally decided as yet, but my personal view is that Mauza system will not work there.

Shri BHUBAN CHANDRA PRADHANI: How long these officers will remain in this stage ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: They are in a better position than that they were under the Zamindars.

Re: National Extension Service Community Development Blocks

Shri PRABHAT NARAYAN CHAUDHURY (Nalbari-East) asked—

*6. Will the Minister-in-charge of Community Development be pleased to state—

- (a) The total number of National Extension Service and Community Development Blocks up till now showing the total number of Anchalik Panchayats to be covered in the State ?
- (b) Whether the entire State is to be covered up by National Extension Service and Community Development Blocks by 1962 ?
- (c) If so, why out of 17 Anchalik Panchayats in Gauhati Subdivision only nine Development Blocks have so far been constituted ?

- (d) How it is proposed to cover up the remaining eight Shadow Blocks in Gauhati Subdivision including Nalbari within a short space of time ?
- (e) Why Nalbari comprising more than two Shadow Blocks and population justifying four Blocks has altogether been ignored in spite of conditions favouring creation of Development Blocks ?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED (Minister, Community Development, etc.) replied :

6. (a)—Ninety-six Blocks have been opened up till now of which 70 are functioning in the Plains districts. The total number of Anchalik Panchayats yet to be covered is 50.

(b)—No.

(c)—Does not arise in view of reply to (b) above.

(d)—The remaining Shadow Blocks in the Gauhati Subdivision including Nalbari will be covered along with other Shadow Blocks in the State in due course.

(e)—The question of opening Blocks at Nalbari was considered. But on scrutiny, other Blocks in that Subdivision satisfied the necessary conditions better and hence got preference over these Shadow Blocks.

Shri PRABHAT NARAYAN CHAUDHURY (Nalbari-East) : If not by 1962, when is it proposed to cover the entire State by the development blocks ?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED (Minister, Community Development etc.) : The proposal is to cover the entire State by the Development blocks as early as possible.

Shri PRABHAT NARAYAN CHAUDHRY : Is there any time-limit fixed for the completion of this work ?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED : Provisionally 1963 has been fixed as the time limit but our sticking to that date will depend upon the availability of technical personnel necessary for these blocks.

Shrimati LILY SEN GUPTA (Lahowal) : অনুন্নত অঞ্চল বিলাকত বিবিলাক Shadow Block আছে সেই বিলাক প্ৰথমে লবলৈ হলে চৰকাৰে কি ব্যৱস্থা গ্ৰহণ কৰে ?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED : অনুন্নত অঞ্চলবিলাকৰ বুকবিলাক প্ৰথমে লোৱা হ'ব।

Shri PRABHAT NARAYAN CHAUDHURY : What are the conditions that could not be satisfied by Nalbari for the creation of a development block there ? The Minister has replied that Nalbari could not satisfy the conditions for the creation of shadow blocks. What are those conditions ?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED (Minister, Community Development etc.): In my reply I have never said that Nalbari could not satisfy the conditions for the conversion of shadow blocks. What I said is that conditions were better satisfied by other blocks than those of Nalbari.

Shri MOHANANDA BORA (North Lakhimpur): May I know from Government whether after the tagging of the blocks with Panchayats the results are encouraging or discouraging?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED: It is too early to say but signs are hopeful.

Shri MOHI KANTA DAS (Barchalla): What are the criteria for creation of blocks?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED: Backwardness of the area, contiguity of other existing blocks, proximity of central institution, Gramdan tendency and many other such things.

***Shri PRABHAT NARAYAN CHAUDHURY (Nalbari-East):** What are those conditions that were more satisfactory for opening of blocks elsewhere?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED: It is a question of comparison on the basis of the facts available.

Shrimati LILY SEN GUPTA (Lahowal): লাহোৱালত যিটো shadow block আছে, সেইটো সকলোফালৰ পৰা backward, এই ব্লকটো চৰকাৰে এই বছৰতেই লবনে?

Mr. SPEAKER: That question does not arise.

Shri MOHANANDA BORA: In considering the suitability of the area for the creation of blocks whether the neglected backward areas should be taken first by Government than the advanced areas?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED: Yes, that is generally done.

Shri BHUBAN CHANDRA PRADHANI (Golakganj): What is the standard population of a block?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED: It varies from place to place between 60,000 to 90,000. In some blocks the population is even 1,00,000.

Shri DEVENDRA NATH HAZARIKA (Saikhowa): What is the percentage covered by Development Blocks in the State?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED: I have already stated that 70 are functioning in the plains districts and 50 more remains to be completed. So, the percentage comes to over 60 per cent.

Shri DEVNEDARA NATH HAZARIKA (Saikhowa): What about the hills ?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED (Minister, Community Development etc.): In hills also the percentage will be 50 per cent and in fact in North Cachar Hills all the area has been covered with Constitution of N. E. S. Block.

***Shri PRABHAT NARAYAN CHAUDHURY (Nalbari-East):** The Minister has replied that it is proposed to cover the entire State by the shadow blocks by 1963. Is it proposed to cover the remaining blocks in Gauhati subdivision also ?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED : They will also received the same consideration.

Shri BHUBAN CHANDRA PRADHANI (Golakganj): Is it a fact that three are blocks where population is less than 36,000 ?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED : I am not aware of it. There may be some in the hills.

Shri BHUBAN CHANDRA PRADHANI : Not in the hills, in the plains.

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED : I am not aware of it.

Re : Taxes on Gate-fees collected during Football matches

U. JOR MANIK SIEM [Nongpoh (Reserved for Scheduled Tribes)]: asked :

*7. Will the Minister-in-charge of Finance, be pleased to state—

- (a) Whether it is a fact that of late, the Government has decided to impose taxes on the gate-fees collected during football matches ?
- (b) If the reply is in the affirmative, whether Government consider that Sports organisations are commercial concerns ?
- (c) Whether Government are aware that taxes on Sports activities will hamper development of Sports in the State ?
- (d) Whether in the interest of Sports Government will be pleased to revise their decision and exempt taxes on gate-fees collection during football matches ?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED (Minister, Finance) replied :

7. (a)—No. Payments for admission to football matches are taxed under provisions of the Assam Amusement and Betting Tax Act, 1939. No recent imposition has been levied in this regard.

(b)—Does not arise.

(c)—Since the tax is on a graded scale and is paid by the spectators, Government do not consider that the levy will hamper development of Sports in the State.

(d)—No. In order to qualify for general exemption, Sports exhibitions must satisfy the conditions set forth in the Act itself.

U. JOR MANIK SIEM [Nongpoh (Reserved for Scheduled Tribes)]: Is it not a fact that of late amusement tax is being demanded from the State Sports Council?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED (Minister, Finance): I have already made it clear that no new tax is being imposed. What the Government have decided is that in future exemption will not be allowed until and unless warranted under conditions specified under the provision of the Act because Government for the last few years have been providing about Rs.2,00,000 from the State funds for development of sports. We want to have an idea what collection is realised from amusement tax on football matches and other sports. Government will then be in a position to know income from this source and if necessary to consider whether grants to these bodies may be increased through the Sports Council.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS

(To which answers were laid on the table)

Regarding the proposed Veterinary Dispensary at Abhayapuri

Dr. GHANASHYAM DAS [North Salmara (Reserved for Scheduled Castes)] asked :

37. Will the Minister, Veterinary be pleased to state—
- Why the proposed Veterinary Dispensary at Abhayapuri has not yet been constructed?
 - When it is expected to be constructed?
 - Whether Government is aware that the old dispensary house has been totally damaged?

Shri KAMAKHYA PRASAD TRIPATHI (Minister, Veterinary) replied :

37. (a)—The Construction of the Veterinary Dispensary at Abhayapuri could not be started last year as the land was available in August, 1960 and the preparation of plan and estimate for the said work could be taken up thereafter.

(b)—The construction will be started this year.

(c)—Yes.

Regarding the proposed Veterinary Dispensary at Kakapathar in Saikhowa Mauza

Shri DEVENDRA NATH HAZARIKA (Saikhowa) asked

38. Will the Minister of Veterinary be pleased to state—

- Whether there was a proposal for a Veterinary Dispensary at Kakapathar in Saikhowa Mauza from local Officers?

- (b) Whether the construction of this Veterinary Dispensary would be taken up during this financial year ?

Shri KAMAKHYA PRASAD TRIPATHI (Minister, Veterinary) replied :

38. (a) - No.

(b)—Does not arise.

Shri DEVENRA NATH HAZARIKA (Saikhowa): May I know wheather veterinary facilities will be provided for this vast area ?

Shri KAMAKHYA PRASAD TRIPATHI: There is no proposal now, but that does not mean that there should not be one.

Regarding construction of roads in Barpeta Subdivision during Third Plan

Shri GHANASHYAM TALUKDER (Sorbhog) asked :

39. Will the Minister-in-charge of P. W. D. (R. and B.) be pleased to state —

(a) How much money has been allotted for construction of new roads during the Third Plan within Barpeta Subdivision both General and Tribal separately ?

(b) Whether roads have been selected ?

(c) How much money has been allotted for each of the Assembly constituencies of Barpeta Subdivision ?

(d) How many Tribal Mouzas are there in Barpeta Subdivision ?

Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI [(Deputy Minister, P. W. D. (R. & B.))] replied :

39. (a)—Rs.28.620 lakhs from General Plan and Rs.4.30 lakhs from Article 275 Plan.

(b)—Being selected.

(c)—Does not arise in view of (b) above.

(d)—There is no Mouza in Barpeta Subdivision inhabited exclusively by Tribal people. However, there are three Mouzas, namely—Chapaguri, Koklabari and Bijni which are inhabited predominantly by Tribal (Kachari) people,

Shri GHANASHYAM TALUKDER (Sorbhog) : With regard to (b), may I know on what principle the roads will be selected ?

Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI [Deputy Minister, P. W. D. (R. & B)] : The principles in selecting the roads are (1) It is considered necessary to take up schemes to connect important places on existing P. W. D. roads instead of abruptly closing at a point where full benefits are not likely to be derived.

(2) It is considered essential that the road schemes proposed are not to be taken in part with uncertainty as to future provision of funds for the incomplete portion, as has been the case in respect of many road schemes taken up under the 2nd Five Year Plan.

(3) Preference is given to completion of incomplete roads taken up during 2nd Five Year Plan.

(4) The schemes are considered priority-wise for each constituency.

(5) The road schemes are proposed to be completed in all respects according to specification adopted under all India pattern of road development as described in paragraph 7—Page 14 of the report of Chief Engineers on Road Development Plan for India.

(6) Public Works Department considers that gravelling is an essential item to stabilise the carriage way and thus put to commission a road for all weather traffic. This item of work cannot, therefore, be deferred to a future date to be done out of repair funds, which is very limited.

(7) The selection is made subject to plan ceiling for road works being raised to Rs.13 crores.

These are the principles, Sir.

Shri GHANASHYAM TALUKDER : Whether the M. L. As. will be consulted before selecting the roads ?

Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI : It is not in the principles.

Dr. SRIHARI DAS (Barpeta) : May I know whether money will be allotted constituency-wise and in equal amounts ?

Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI : It is not done constituency-wise.

Shri RAMNATH SARMA (Lumding) : এই কাম বিলাক ১৯৬১ চনৰ ভিতৰত আৰম্ভ হবনে নহয় ?

Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI : It will take time. Till now the schemes have not been finalised. They will have to go through many channels before being finalised.

Mr. SPEAKER : The question was whether these roads would be taken up during the next winter.

Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI : We will try our level best.

Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA (Chief Minister) : I think, Sir, some of the roads will be taken up during the next winter though I am not certain about all the roads.

Shri RAMNATH SARMA (Lumding) যিটো আগৰ plan ৰ
টকা phase by phase দিয়া হয়—

Can we expect that the amount allotted this year will be utilised during the next cold season ?

Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA : I think so.

Shri GHANASHYAM TALUKDER (Sorbhog) : When will the list be finally published ?

Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI [Deputy Minister, P. W. D. (R. & B.)] : It will take some time.

Shri GHANASHYAM TALUKDER : Who will select the roads ?

Mr. SPEAKER : The Road Communications Board.

Re: The office of the Deputy Inspector of Schools at Tinsukia

Shri DEVENDRA NATH HAZARIKA (Saikhowa) asked :

40. Will the Minister-in-charge of Education be pleased to state—

- (a) Whether it is a fact that there are over 520 schools under the Deputy Inspector of Schools of Tinsukia ?
- (b) What is the number of Sub-Inspectors of Schools under him ?
- (c) What is the number of clerical staff sanctioned for his office ?
- (d) Whether this Deputy Inspector of Schools has any other staff to deal with the schools under School Board ?
- (e) What is the number of clerical staff sanctioned for one Deputy Inspector of Schools with 522 schools excluding the staff is available ?
- (f) Why there is delay in appreciating the heavy burden of clerical work of over 520 schools with only 2 office Assistants ?
- (g) Whether it is a fact that a post of Chowkidar has not yet been sanctioned under the Deputy Inspector of Schools, Tinsukia?
- (h) When adequate staff would be appointed under the Deputy Inspector of Schools, Tinsukia ?

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS (Deputy Minister, Education) replied :

40. (a)—Yes, there are 564 schools (Lower Primary 501 and Middle 63 under the Deputy Inspector of Schools, Tinsukia.

(b)—Two.

(c)—Two.

(d)—No.

(e)—According to the Yard-stick laid down by Government there should be a minimum of 2 (two) Assistants in Deputy Inspector's Office, and that additional Assistants should be calculated on the basis of every second and subsequent 500 schools.

(f)—A proposal received from the Deputy Inspector, Tinsukia in this connection is under consideration.

(g)—A casual employee has been sanctioned till the creation of a post of Chowkidar in the regular establishment. The casual employee was appointed on 15th June 1960.

(h)—As at (f) above.

Shri DEVENDRA NATH HAZARIKA (Saikhowa): With regard to (e), may I know what is the maximum number of clerical staff allowed in the office of a Deputy Inspector of Schools?

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS (Deputy Minister, Education): The maximum is according to the number of schools. The minimum is two up-to 500 schools.

Shri DEVENDRA NATH HAZARIKA: May I know how this yardstick has been fixed?

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS: It has been fixed by rules.

Shri RADHAKISHAN KHEMKA (Tinsukia): তিনচ কীয়াত এই ৬০০ খন স্কুল আছে অথচ অজিও তাত স্কুলবোর্ড কিয় হোৱা নাই?

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS: এই কথাটো আগতে explain কৰি দিয়া হৈছে। এই স্কুল বোর্ডৰ কিমান function পৰ্যায়তৰ হাতত দিয়া হব আৰু সেই মৰ্মে এখন বিল অনা হব।

Shri PRABHAT NARAYAN CHAUDHURY (Nalbari-East): সেই বিলখন আনোতে কিমান দিন লাগিব? এই অধিবেশনতে অনা নহল কিয়?

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS: সেই বিলখন পাচ কৰাৰ সময় নহব বুলিয়েই এইবাৰ অনা নহল।

Shri DEVENDRA NATH HAZARIKA: এই ৬০০ খন স্কুলৰ সুপৰিচালনাৰ কাৰণে আইন সংশোধনী কৰিবলৈ আৰু কিমান দিন বাট চাব লাগিব? How long will these schools, whose number is about 600, will have to wait to get the benefit from the School Board?

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS (Deputy Minister, Education): The question was not about the schools, it was about the staff in the D. I.'s office.

Shri DEVENDRA NATH HAZARIKA (Saikhowa): As the D. I. of Tinsukia is not a member of the School Board how will the case of the Tinsukia region be represented before the School Board?

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS: He is a Member of the School Board.

Shri KHAGENDRA NATH NATH (Goalpara): এই school board বিলাক subdivision-wise কৰা হয় নে region-wise কৰা হয়?

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS: সেইটো region wise কৰা হয়। পাঁচটা region ত এখন school board কৰা হৈছে। আৰু ৪ জন Deputy Inspector appoint কৰা হৈছে।

Mr. SPEAKER: Why Kokrajhar subdivision is excluded from the operation of an independent School Board for Kokrajhar?

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS (Deputy Minister): সেই আইনৰ জৰিয়তে আনি কিছুমান কাম পঞ্চায়তৰ হাতত দিয়াৰ ব্যৱস্থা কৰিছে। ডিব্ৰুগড়, তিনচুকীয়া, নলবাৰী আদি ঠাইত তেতিয়া সুবিধা হব।

Mr. SPEAKER: These are in a different category. Kokrajhar is a subdivision whereas Nalbari, Tinsukia and Majuli are only regions.

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS: Subdivision মানে School Board ৰ Subdivision.

Shri RAMNATH SARMA (Lumding): Civil Subdivision বেলেগ আৰু School Board ৰ Subdivision বেলেগ নেকি?

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS: School Board ৰ Subdivision বেলেগ।

Swami KRISNANANDA BRAHMACHARI (Kakrajhar): উপমন্ত্রী মহোদয়ক মই কও যে কোকৰাঝাৰ ডেপুটি ইন্স্পেক্টৰ জনৰ কোনো ক্ষমতা নাই; তেওঁ চাকৰী দিব নোৱাৰে, কাকো বদলি কৰিব নোৱাৰে, তেনে ডেপুটি ইন্স্পেক্টৰৰ কাম কি?

Shri PRABHAT NARAYAN CHOUDHURY (Nalbari-East): আমাৰ উপমন্ত্রী মহোদয়ে কোকৰাঝাৰত স্কুলবোর্ড কৰাৰ কোনো সংকল্প লোৱা নাই নেকি?

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS : কোনো সংকল্প নাই।

Swami KRISNANANDA BRAHMACHARI: মই আশা কৰে সেই বিষয়টোৰ সোনকালে এটা বিবেচনা কৰিব।

Shri PRABHAT NARAYAN CHOUDHURY (Nalbari-East) : শ্রী মহোদয়ে কৈচে যে বা'ত স্কুলবোর্ড আছে তা'ত D. I. এ কিছুমান কমতা পায় কিন্তু স্কুলবোর্ড নথকা ঠাইত D. I. ব' কি কমতা আছে ?

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS (Deputy Minister, Education) : আইনখন কবিব নোৱাৰাব কাৰণে তেওঁৰ কমতাৰ বিষয়ে এতিয়া একো কৰ নোৱাৰি। কিন্তু আইন মতে তেওঁ ভালেখিনি কমতা পাব।

Shri MOTI RAM BORA (Laharighat) : পঞ্চায়তক স্কুল বৰ্ডৰ দায়িত্ব দিয়াৰ সিদ্ধান্ত লোৱা হৈছে নে নাই, নই সেইটো জানিব খোজো ?

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS : নাই।

Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA (Chief Minister) : I submit, Sir, that the Government is of the view that greater responsibility to the Panchayat will have to be given in respect of management of the Primary Schools. That decision we have taken and this will be of the pattern of the Madras system because it has been found that that system is working very well.

Shrimati KOMOL KUMARI BARUA (Katanigaon) : সিদ্ধান্ত কবিবলৈ কিমান দিন লাগিব ?

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS : বিলখন Select Committee লৈ যাব লাগিব কিন্তু সেইবোৰ কবোতে নতুন Election অহি পাবহি—গতিকে বিলখন lapse হৈ যাব।

***Shri SARBESWAR BORDOLOI (Titabar)** : In respect of answer 'F', may I know from the Hon. Deputy Minister when this proposal was received by the Government ?

***Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS (Deputy Minister, Education)** : About 2 or 3 months ago.

***Shri DANDESWAR HAZARIKA (Morongi)** : Whether the Deputy Minister is aware of the fact that the difficulties of the schools and responsibility have not been reduced due to non-creation of staff by D. I. at Tinsukia for the School Board ?

***Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS** : The main function of the Deputy Inspector of Schools at Tinsukia is to inspect the schools.

***Shri DANDESWAR HAZARIKA (Morongi)** : And whether the Deputy Minister is aware that the teachers are to go to the School Board for payment ?

***Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS** : We are taking steps to make payment through the Panchayats as well as from Tinsukia School Board.

***Shri RAM NATH DAS [Dergaon (Reserved for Schedule I castes)] :** How long will the Government take to materialise or to give effect to the proposal ?

***Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS (Deputy Minister, Education) :** I hope we will be in a position to finalise the matter in a few months.

Mr. SPEAKER : Whether the Secretary, School Board has jurisdiction to inspect the schools falling under the jurisdiction of the Deputy Inspector of Schools, Tinsukia ?

***Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS :** Yes, he has also got power to inspect the schools which are under the school board.

***Shri HARINARAYAN BARUA (Teok) :** One school is inspected by two D. Is. and certain schools by one D. I., why this discrepancy ?

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS : That has not been done. When Deputy inspector is appointed, he inspects all schools within his jurisdiction.

Shri HARINARAYAN BARUA : It is a fact that the teachers have to submit their pay bills etc. to their particular D. I. who again have to forward them to the Secretary, School Board and thereby causes delay ?

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS : It is not causing inconvenience, it is working very well.

Shri MODY K. MARAK [Tura (Reserved for Scheduled Tribes)] : When primary schools were transferred to the District Council, there were 3 A. S. Is. and 4 S. Is. Now they are going to appoint 3 more S. Is. and thus make the total 7. S. Is. I do not know why so many S. Is. are required in Garo Hills whereas these schools are being inspected by 3 A. S. Is. only ?

***Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA (Chief Minister) :** I think the hon. Member is referring to the primary education in Garo Hills. If he tables a separate question it will be convenient for us to reply, because that particular information is not given to us.

Mr. SPEAKER : If the hon. Member puts a new question, he will reply.

Re: Removal of Untouchability in the Barpeta Sub-division

Maulavi TAJUDDIN AHMED (Tarabari) asked :

41. Will the Minister, Tribal Areas and Welfare of other Backward Classes be pleased to state—

- (a) What is the amount of money Government have given to Barpeta Subdivision for building houses in the scheme of Removal of Untouchability during the last five years ?

- (b) Through whom the payment is made to the Scheduled Caste people who are entitled to the benefit under this scheme ?
- (d) How many persons have got grants according to this scheme within Barpeta Subdivision during the last five years and how many have actually constructed the houses ?
- (e) Why the sanctioned money has not been utilised through the house building department of the Subdivision ?
- (f) Who examines the execution of the scheme and who examines the utilisation certificates ?
- (g) Whether Government has received any complaint of corruption going on this scheme ?

Shri MAHAM SINGH (Minister, Tribal Affairs) replied:

41. (a)—The amount allotted to the Barpeta Subdivision for housing subsidies under Removal of Untouchability Programme during the 2nd Plan period is as follows:—

						Rs.
1956-57	11,500
1957-58	14,451
1958-59	13,027
1959-60	15,729
1960-61	26,500
					Total	81,207

(b)—The payment was made through the Subdivisional Officer, Barpeta for the grants-in-aid to individual Scheduled Caste families.

(d)—1956-57—Nil (the grant was sanctioned to the Barpeta Municipal Board for sweepers housing scheme but the latter refunded the amount to Government subsequently as it could not implement the approved scheme).

1957-58	10 families
					1 Student Home.
1958-59	16 families
1959-60	32 families
1960-61	53 families
				Total	111 families
					1 Student Home.

Construction of the students Home has been completed. Out of 111 Scheduled Castes persons who received the grants, 86 have since built their houses and the remaining 25 persons have not yet completed their houses which are under construction.

The delay in completion of the houses is due to short supply of C. I. Sheets.

(e)—The grant as a whole is controlled by the Director of Housing and as such he exercises control over the utilisation of the subsidies sanctioned to the individual families through the respective Deputy Commissioners and Subdivisional Officers.

(f)—The Subdivisional Officer, Barpeta submits the utilisation certificates to the Accountant General, Assam and the Director of Housing after having necessary inspection carried out by the Subdivisional Welfare Officer for Scheduled Castes and the Development Officer, Barpeta.

(g)—No.

Maulavi TAJUDDIN AHMED (Tarabari): Are Government aware that all amounts of the scheme have not been utilised properly ?

Shri MAHAM SINGH (Minister, Tribal Affairs): The amount has been utilised properly.

Maulavi TAJUDDIN AHMED: Will Government enquire into some of the cases at least in Barpeta Subdivision. Why this scheme is not executed through the Housing Department.

Shri MAHAM SINGH: The scheme is under the Housing Department but it is implemented through the Deputy Commissioner and the Subdivisional Officer for convenience.

Maulavi TAJUDDIN AHMED: Why the scheme is not executed through the Housing Department at the bottom ?

Shri MAHAM SINGH: That is not the procedure because the Subdivisional Officer and the Deputy Commissioner also consult the Committee which is formed by the M. L. As. and other members of Scheduled Caste organisations.

Maulavi TAJUDDIN AHMED: Is it a fact that the works are not properly examined by the Development Officer or the S. D. Os.

Shri MAHAM SINGH: We have no information.

Maulavi TAJUDDIN AHMED: Will Government enquire into it ?

Shri MAHAM SINGH: Yes if therein is complaint.

Re: Fire victims of Nalbari**Shri TARUN SEN DEKA (Nalbari-West)** asked :

42. Will the Minister in-charge of Revenue be pleased to state—
- What is the relief rendered to the fire-victims of mouza Khetridharmapur, Dharmapur, Uttar Barkhetri, Pakowa and Bahjani under P. S. Nalbari in the District of Kamrup in 1961 ?
 - How many bundles of C. I. Sheets have been given to them ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue) replied :

42. (a)—No report of suffering caused by fire accidents in Khetridharmapur and Uttar Barkhetri Mauzas has been received. So the question of rendering relief in these mauzas does not arise.

The information in respect of the other Mauzas are furnished below :—

- Four Families, 1 of Dharmapur, 1 of Bahjani and 2 of Pakowa Mouzas were given gratuitous relief at Rs.25 per family.
 - Four families of Pakowa Mauza were given gratuitous relief at Rs.20 per family.
 - Eight families, 1 of Pakowa, 2 of Dharmapur and 5 of Bahjani Mauzas were given gratuitous relief at Rs.15 per family.
- (b)—Twenty-seven bundles of C. I. Sheets have been allotted to these affected people.

Re: Rhinos caught and sold or gifted away**Shri SARBESWAR BORDOLOI (Titabar)** asked :

43. Will the Minister-in-charge of Forest be pleased to state—
- How many rhinos have been caught and sold or gifted to different parts of the country and outside the country during the last 14 years after independence ?
 - Of these how many were given as gift and how many were sold ?
 - The price fetched by each rhino, the country where they were sold and the year of sale ?
 - The total amount of money obtained in selling the rhinos ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister-in-charge, Forests) replied :

43. (a)—Twenty-eight rhinos have been caught of which twenty-five have sold or gifted to different parts of the country as well as outside the country. The other three rhinos could not be despatched due to defects of two rhinos and the other gave birth to a calf.

(b)—Of these fifteen were sold, four were given as free gifts, five on payment of cost of capture and one on exchange basis.

(c)—A statement is laid on the Library Table.

Statement showing the number of Rhinos caught and sold or gifted to different parts of the Country and outside the country during the 14 years after Independence

(Laid on the table in reply to Unstarred Question No.43(c))

Year	Place to which sold or gifted	Price realised		Remarks
		Rs.	nP.	
1. 1847	.. London Zoo (one)	..	9,965-00
2. 1947-58	.. Chicago Zoo (one)	10,000-00
3. Do.	.. Do.	10,000-00
4. 1948-49	.. Cairo Zoo..	10,000-00
5. Do.	.. Do.	10,000-00
6. 1950-51	.. Basel Zoo (one)	15,000-00
7. Do.	.. Italy Zoo (one)	15,000-00
8. 1951-52	.. Alipur Zoo (one)	15,000-00
9. Do.	.. London Zoo (one)	..	10,000-00	...
10. Do.	.. Bombay Zoo (one)	Free gift.
11. Do.	.. Basel Zoo (one)	15,000-00
12. 1952-53	.. Madras Zoo (one)	Free gift.
13. Do.	.. Philadelphia (one)	15,000-00
14. 1955	.. Do.	20,000-00
15. 1956	.. Hamburg Zoo (one)	..	13,600-00
16. 1957	.. Mysore Zoo (one)	4,200-00	At actual cost of capture.
17. Do.	.. Trivandrum Zoo (one)	..	4,200-00	Do.
18. 1958	.. Bombay Zoo (one)	..	5,000-00	Do.
19. Do.	.. Tokyo Zoo (one)	On exchange basis with a dealer who sold it to the Tokyo Zoo.
20. Do.	.. Lucknow Zoo (one)	..	4,200-00	At actual cost minus the cost of animal and birds supplied to State Zoo by the Lucknow Zoo.
21. 1959	.. West Berlin Zoo (one)	..	30,000-00
22. Do.	.. Delhi Zoo (one)	Free of cost on exchange basis.
23. 1960	.. Hamburg Zoo (one)	..	30,000-00
24. Do.	.. Washington Zoo (one)	..	7,049-00	At actual cost of capture.
25. 1961	.. Tokyo Zoo (one)	As free gift.
Total		..	2,53,114-00	

(d)—Rupees 2,53,114.

Shri SARBESWAR BORDOLOI (Titabar): Sir, what is the price fetched by each rhino and the countries where they were sold.

Shri HARESWAR DAS: (Minister-in-charge of Forest): Fifteen rhinos were sold and 4 were given as free gift.

The price payable per rhino delivered at Kohora inclusive of cost of capture and feed and upkeep for one month from the date of capture has been progressively increased from Rs.10,000.00 in 1947 to Rs.15,000.00 in 1950-51, then to Rs.30,000.00 and subsequently in 1959 it has been fixed at Rs.50,000.00 for sale out of India. For Indian Zoos the rate has been fixed at present at Rs.25,000.00. But it has been further decided that when animals are to be given in the national interest no price except the cost of capture and upkeep for one month only is to be charged.

Altogether fifteen rhinos were sold by giving a pair each to London Zoo, Chicago Zoo, Cairo Zoo, Basel Zoo, Hamburg Zoo and Philadelphia Zoo and one each to Italy Zoo, Alipur Zoo and West Berlin Zoo. Four rhinos were given as free gifts, one each to Bombay Zoo, Madras Zoo, Delhi and Tokyo Zoo. Five rhinos were sold at actual cost of capture—one each to Mysore Zoo, Trivanpuzha Zoo, Bombay Zoo, Lucknow Zoo and Washington Zoo and one rhino was given on exchange basis to a dealer who sold it to the Tokyo Zoo.

Re: Construction of R. C. C. Bridge over Nakhanda River

Dr. SHRIHARI DAS (Barpeta) asked :

44. Will the Minister, P. W. D. (R. & B.) be pleased to state—

- (a) Whether Government is aware that the Priority List regarding construction of R. C. C. Bridge over Nakhanda River at Barpeta Patbausi Keotkuchi Road at Patbausi Ghat to be taken up under Third Five Year Plan was submitted by Local M. L. As. during the last Budget Session to the Convenor, Mr. F. A. Ahmed, Minister, Finance so far as Barpeta Subdivision is concerned?
- (b) Whether by now plans and estimates were prepared?
- (c) If so, what is the amount involved?
- (d) Whether works are going to be started immediately?

Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI [Deputy Minister, P. W. D. (R. & B.)] replied :

44. (a)—Government have received copies of some lists of proposals submitted by the local M. L. As. from the Convenor, Shri F. A. Ahmed, Minister, Finance along with his list of proposals (New Roads) for Barpeta Subdivision for inclusion in the Third Five Year Plan (Road Sector). It is however not known whether these lists were submitted by the M. L. As. to Shri F. A. Ahmed during last Budget Session. The Convenor recommended the construction of a R. C. C. Bridge over Nakhanda River at Barpeta Patbausi, Keotkuchi Road at a cost of Rs.6 lakhs. Since it is a major bridge, this could not be considered for inclusion under the Major Bridge Scheme due to limited fund allocated for the scheme.

(b), (c), & (d)—Does not arise.

Dr SHRIHARI DAS (Barpeta): The Convenor has recommended the construction of a R. C. C. Bridge over Nakhanda River at Barpeta Patbausi, Keotkuchi Road at a cost of Rs.6 lakhs. Since it is a major bridge, this could not be considered for inclusion under the Major Bridge Scheme due to limited fund allocated for the scheme. Whether any measure has been taken about that in the Barpeta Subdivision.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is your point exactly ?

Dr. SHRIHARI DAS: Whether any other bridge other than the construction of R. C. C. Bridge over Nakhanda River at Patbausi ghat has been taken up in the Barpeta Subdivision in the 3rd 5 years plan.

Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI [Deputy Minister, P.W.D. (R.&B.)] So far not a single has been taken.

Re: Mandals Barrack at Kamalpur

Shri SARAT CHANDRA GOSWAMI (Kamalpur) asked :

45. Will the Minister-in-charge of P. W. D. (R. & B.) be pleased to state—

- (a) Whether the Mandal's barrack of Kamalpur has been completed ?
- (b) What progress has been made of the construction of the Circle office of Kamalpur ?
- (c) What progress has been made of the construction of quarters of S. D. C. of Kamalpur ?
- (d) When these buildings are expected to be completed ?

(e) Whether it is a fact that the progress of work is very slow as regards the construction of these buildings ?

(f) When the works were begun?

(g) When the administrative approvals were accorded for these works ?

Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI (Deputy Minister, P. W. D.) replied :

45. (a)—The main building and the kitchen have already been completed excepting the approach road and the fencing of the buildings, which are being taken up and expected to be completed very soon.

(b)—About 70 per cent of the work of the Circle office at Kamalpur has been completed.

(c)—Reconstruction of S. D. C's quarters could not be taken up, as the existing building has not yet been vacated by the S. D. C. The D. C., Kamrup has been requested by E. E. to direct the S. D. C. to vacate the building. The reconstruction work will be taken up as soon as the building is vacated.

(d)—All the buildings are expected to be completed during this financial year.

(e)—The overall progress of some of the works has been hampered due to shortage of building materials such as cement, iron rod and C. I. sheets, etc., and also due to absence of alternative accommodation.

(f)—The construction of Mandal's barrack was started in May, 1960 and the reconstruction of Circle office in December, 1960. The work for reconstruction of S. D. C's quarter is expected to be taken up during the latter part of September, 1961.

(g)—Administrative approvals to the works were accorded as follows:—(1) Construction of Mandal's barrack on 17th February, 1960, (2) Reconstruction of Circle office on 1st June, 1960 and (3) Reconstruction on S. D. C's quarters on 17th August, 1960.

Re: Removal of Assam Rifles from Silchar

Shri TARUN SEN DEKA (Nalbari-West) asked :

46. Will the Minister, L.S.-G. be pleased to state—

(a) Whether it is a fact that Shri Puspa Ranjan Gupta, Secretary, West Silchar Development and Welfare Committee (Vivekananda Road, Silchar, Cachar) has given representation to the Chief Minister and the Chief Secretary, Government of Assam for removal of Assam Rifles from Silchar town area since a period of one year ?

(b) Whether it is a fact that a letter, dated 14th of August 1961 has been written by the said Shri Puspa Ranjan Gupta to the Chief Minister and the Chief Secretary ?

(c) If so, what has been decided by the Government of Assam ?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED (Minister, L. S.-G.) replied :

46. (a)—Yes.

(b)—Yes.

(c)—The matter is under correspondence with the authorities concerned.

Re.: The Barpeta "Jiranighar" within the Court compound

Maulavi TAJUDDIN AHMED (Tarabari) asked :

47. Will the Minister, Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) When the Barpeta "Jiranighar" within Court compound of S. D. O. was constructed and who initiated this ?

(b) Who is to maintain it now ?

(c) Whether Government is aware that this "Jiranighar" has become unsafe for use ?

(d) Whether Government propose to reconstruct it ?

(e) If so, when ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue) replied:

47. (a)—In 1949 the "Jiranighar" was constructed at the initiative of the then S. D. O., Barpeta.

(b)—Government.

(c)—The "Jiranighar" require improvement and thorough repairs.

(d) & (e)—The Plans and Estimates for improvement and thorough repairs have been received from the Executive Engineer, P. W. D. and is under examination for administrative approval and sanction of fund. The work will be taken up as soon as possible.

Maulavi TAJUDDIN AHMED (Tarabari): When the plans and estimates for improvement of the Barpeta "Jiranighar" has been received?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue): I cannot give the exact time.

Maulavi TAJUDDIN AHMED: Are Government aware that this "Jiranighar" has become dangerous to the public?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: For information of the hon. Member. I may inform him that the estimate has already been prepared. The cost will be Rs.12,400. So possibly the reconstruction will be done during this financial year.

Re: Mahmora Farming Co-operative Society

Shri KHOGENDRA NATH BARBARUAH (Amguri) asked:

48. Will the Revenue Minister be pleased to state—

- (a) Whether it is a fact that on 2nd October, 1960 the S. D. C., Nazira Circle, Sibsagar Subdivision with about 150 persons most of whom belonging to Kamargaon of Salaguri Mauza, went to Mahmora Farming Society Land of Salaguri Mauza, to evict the Society (duly registered) from the land allotted to it at Mahmora P. G. R.?
- (b) Whether Government are aware that the people of Kamargaon are all against the Farming Society since its inception and many of them are encroachers?
- (c) Whether it is a fact that the mob pulled out and cut the pulses of the Society land and that the S. D. C. also did not object to it?
- (d) Whether it is a fact that the S. D. C. arrested the Secretary of the Farming Society and got him locked up at Amguri Police Station?
- (e) Whether it is a fact that the said S. D. C. misused his official power and tried to crush the Farming Co-operative Society?
- (f) Why no action is taken against this S. D. C.?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue) replied:

48. (a)—It is not a fact. On 2nd December, 1960 the S. D. C., Nazira Circle was conducting eviction of encroachers from the Mahmora grazing ground with the help of Armed Police when some local people also gathered there at their own accord.

(b)—No. Such report has been received.

(c)—Some local people who accompanied the S. D. C. at their own accord plucked and ate some peas from the standing pulses grown by the encroachers; but the S. D. C. had nothing to do with it.

(d)—The Secretary of the alleged Society was arrested and taken to custody by the police only to maintain law and order.

(e)—It is not a fact.

(f)—Does not arise.

Shri KHOGENDRA NATH BARBARUAH (Amguri): Why the S. D. C., Nazira did not prohibit the people from accompanying him? Why the S. D. C. arrested the Secretary of the Farming Society.

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue): S. D. C. was accompanied by some people for eviction. There was no arrest.

Shri MOHANANDA BORA North (Lakhimpur): Sir, may I know whether this society was formed for the purpose of encroaching upon the land of the P. G. R.?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: Mr. Barbaruah will be able to give a suitable reply to this question.

Shri KHOGENDRA NATH BARBARUAH: Sir, this is a Government registered society and Government has been given land for cultivation on Co-operative basis. I can challenge the Government in this respect.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order.

Re: Court building and office building of the Deputy Commissioner, United K. and J. Hills

U JOR MANIK SIEM [Nongpoh (Reserved for Scheduled Tribes)]
asked:

49. Will the Minister-in-charge of Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) What is an approximate date of construction of the present buildings in which the Courts and office of the Deputy Commissioner, United Khasi-Jaintia Hills were constructed?

(b) Whether Government is aware of the difficulties experienced by the Officers and staff of the said Courts and office and also of the members of the public due to the old nature of construction and shortage of accommodation?

(c) Whether it is a fact that the lavatories are in such a filthy state that it is almost impossible to use them?

(d) Whether it is also a fact that the Bar Library is housed in a building meant for a tea-room?

(e) Whether Government propose to renovate and extend the existing buildings in the immediate future?

(f) If so, whether Government will be pleased to consider the case for better accommodation for the Bar Association?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue) replied :

49. (a)—In the year 1898.

(b)—Yes.

(c)—It is not a fact. The lavatories are cleaned and treated with phenyle daily and they are in use. However, a plan and estimate for construction of a sanitary latrine and urinal in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, K. and J. Hills is under preparation by the P. W. D.

(d)—It is not a fact. The building where the Bar Library is located was originally a witness-shed. A part of the building is now used as a tea-room.

(e)—Yes. The plan and estimate for reconstruction of the Court buildings for the Deputy Commissioner, K. and J. Hills is under examination.

(f)—In the site plan, provision for accommodation of a Bar Library has been made.

U JORMANIK SIEM [Nongpoh (Reserved for Scheduled Tribes)]: Sir, it has been stated in reply that the Plan and estimate for reconstruction of the Court buildings for the Deputy Commissioner, K. & J. Hills is under examination. May I know the date when was the plan and estimate sent to the Deputy Commissioner?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue): Sir, the exact date is not with me. However, I can inform the hon. Member that this matter is almost complete. The building will be constructed at a cost of Rs 6,41,000 and the building will be partly three storied and partly two storied. Now only some preliminaries are to be done such as giving administrative approval, etc.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member wants the exact date on which the plan and estimates were sent by the Deputy Commissioner?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: Sir, as I said already, I cannot say the exact date.

Shri RAM NATH DAS [Dergaon (Reserved for Scheduled Castes)]: Whether the fund has been allotted?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister): Yes, Sir.

Maulavi TAJUDDIN AHMED (Tarabari): Whether it is a fact that more than two magistrates are sitting in a small room in this court building?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: That is the reason for constructing these three storied building.

Shri HIRALAL PATWARY (Panery): Whether this will be taken up within this financial year ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: So far the starting of the work is concerned, this will be taken up within this financial year but when it will be finished, I cannot say that.

Re: Appointment of unqualified and unregistered Doctors

Dr. GHANASHYAM DAS [North Salmara (Reserved for Scheduled Caste)] asked :

50. Will the Minister of Medical be pleased to state—

- (a) How many unregistered and unqualified doctors have been appointed by the Government in the State, *i.e.*, the number of such doctors who are in service now ?
- (b) Why the unregistered doctors are being employed ?
- (c) How many Health Units are in charge of (i) Registered Medical Graduates, (ii) Registered Medical Licentiates, (iii) Registered Medical Practitioners who are not Licentiates, (iv) Unregistered doctors ?

Shri RUPNATH BRAHMA (Minister-in-charge of Medical) replied :

50. (a)—No unqualified or unregistered doctor has been appointed in this Department.

(b)—Does not arise.

(c)—Out of 54 posts of Medical Officers for Primary Health Units, 49 are held by Registered Medical Graduates, 4 by Registered Medical Licentiates. One Registered Medical Graduate is under order of posting to the remaining post. No such Unit has been held by unregistered doctors.

Dr. GHANASYAM DAS [North Salmara (Reserved for Scheduled Caste)]: Are the Government aware that some unregistered doctors are still maintained by the Local Board and they are still continuing ?

Shri RUPNATH BRAHMA (Minister, Medical): Yes, there are some unregistered doctors in the dispensaries taken over from the Local Boards. As these doctors have rendered services for many years in this line, it was considered desirable to allow them to continue till they can qualify themselves to be registered by the Assam Medical Council.

Shri MOHI KANTA DAS (Barchalla): Are the Government aware that there are some unregistered Dacca National Passed doctors in the rural dispensaries in Assam ?

Shri RUPNATH BRAHMA (Minister, Medical): Without being registered nobody is eligible for government appointment. If there be any he will have to be registered by the Assam Medical Council.

***Shri MOHIKANTA DAS:** Are Government aware that some of the doctors have been appointed because there was immediate necessity though they were not registered ?

Shri RUPNATH BRAHMA: I have no information Sir, if instances are brought to my notice, I may look into it.

***Shri RAMNATH DAS [Dergaon (Reserved for Scheduled Caste)]:** What about the doctor of Ahatguri dispensary ?

Shri RUPNATH BRAHMA: It is a new question, Sir.

***Shri HIRALAL PATWARY (Panery):** যিবিলাক কবিবাজ অন্যান্য বাজ্যত registered হৈছে সেই বিলাকক অসম চৰকাৰে recognised কৰেনে নকৰে ?

Mr. SPEAKER: এই উপ প্ৰশ্নটো কোন প্ৰশ্নৰ ওপৰত কৰিছে ?

***Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA (Chief Minister):** ডাক্তৰ আৰু কবিবাজ বেলেগ কথা।

Shri MOHI KANTA DAS (Barchalla): Will the Government be pleased to state if there be any dispensary without qualified doctors ?

Shri RUPNATH BRAHMA: Sir, the hon. members are aware that we are in dearth of qualified doctors. So it is just possible that there may be one or two dispensaries without qualified doctors.

Shri DENDESWAR HAZARIKA (Morangi): Sir, in reply to (c) it is said that no Primary Health Union has been held by registered doctors. Sir, may I know whether these doctors are in class I or II of Assam medical service ?

Shri RUPNATH BRAHMA: These doctors belong to medical are service class II.

Shri MOHI KANTA DAS (Barchalla): Are the Government aware that there are some M. B. B. S. passed doctors who are unemployed ?

Shri RUPNATH BRAHMA: This a new question Sir.

Shri DENDESWAR HRZARIKR (Morangi): Whether these units will be placed under the charge of class I officers ?

Shri RUPNATH BRAHMA: Sir, we are trying to do that.

Shri MOHI KANTA DAS: Sir, whether there are some unemployed M. B. B. S. doctors ?

Shri RUPNATH BRAHMA: Sir I require notice of it.

Re: Sal trees of Salbari**Shri GHANASHYAM TALUKDER (Sorbhog)** asked :

51. Will the Minister-in-charge of Forests be pleased to state—

- (a) Whether Sal trees from Government Forest can be sold without advertisement ?
- (b) How many Sal trees were sold at Salbari during 1960-61 and upto July in 1961-62 ?
- (c) Whether any advertisement was issued for selling them ?
- (d) If so, by whom the trees were sold ?
- (e) If not, why not ?
- (f) Whether any action was taken for irregular selling of these trees ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Forests) replied:

51. (a)—Yes, provided Government permits such sale.

(b)—127 Sal trees in Salbari U. S. F. were sold during 1960-61. There was no sale of sal trees in Salbari U. S. F. during 1961-62.

(c)—Yes.

(d)—The Divisional Forest Officer, North Kamrup Division.

(e)—Does not arise.

(f)—Does not arise.

Shri GHANASHYAM TALUKDAR (Sorbhog): Sir to whom the 127 sal trees has been sold ?**Shri HARESWAR DAS**: To one Shri Grish Ch. Das.**Re: Settlement of waste land at village Makaldoba of Bahjani Mauza****Shri TARUN SEN DEKA (Nalbari West)** asked:

52. Will the Minister-in-charge of Revenue be pleased to state—

- (a) Whether it is a fact that there are about 696 b'ghas of cultivable land at village Makaldoba of Bahjani mauza under Nalbari Police Station in the District of Kamrup ?

- (b) Whether it is a fact that a good number of local landless people have raised objection against settlement of some lands there ?
- (c) Whether Government is aware that a resolution was passed in an well attended public meeting at village Charia on 7th July, 1961 under the Presidency of Chairman, West Nalbari Anchalik Panchayat urging upon the Government to make all lands sarkari for a planned settlement ?
- (d) Whether it is a fact that in the month of July, 1961 the Deputy Minister, Revenue went for a personal enquiry ?
- (e) What decision has been undertaken by the Government for planned settlement there ?
- (f) Whether Government is aware that there is a good number of landless Scheduled Caste (Hira) and Backward (Kumar) people near Makaldoba, who have been demanding lands ?

Shri RADHIKA RAM DAS (Deputy Minister, Revenue) replied :

52. (a)—Yes, there are about 696 bighas of cultivable land in Makaldoba village of which 165 bighas are Government waste.

(b)—A representation from Shri Praneswar Das and others has been received which is under enquiry.

(c)—It is reported that a public meeting was held at village Charia on 7th July, 1961 under the Presidents ip of Shri P. C. Goswami, Chairman, West Nalbari Anchalik Panchayat, but what resolution the meeting adopted is not known.

(d) Yes.

(e)—These are all agricultural lands and settlement is given accord- ing to the Government policy published under Notification No. RSS.205/58, dated 25th September, 1958. There is no other proposal for planned settle- ment in the area.

(f)—Some Scheduled Caste people and people belonging to other Backward Community living near about Makaldoba village, have applied for settlement of land in the area.

Re : Realisation of exorbitant prices from tillers by the landlord in cash or kind

Shri DEVENDRA NATH HAZARIKA (Saikhowa) asked :

53. Will the Minister-in-charge of Revenue be pleased to refer to Unstarred Question No.492 asked on 8th April, 1959, in the Budget Session and state—

- (a) Whether any action was taken by the Government to prevent the land-lords from charging Rs.80 to Rs.100 per "pura" (4 bighas) of land or realising 8 to 10 maunds of paddy per pura of lands from tillers in Bogdung, Mauza Chabua, Pulunga Mouza, and Gharbondi Mouza of Dibrugarh Eastern circle

- (b) Whether Government is aware that similar higher rates are also charged in Moderkhat, Lahoal and Rahmoria Mauzas in Dibrugarh Eastern circle by land-owners ?
- (c) Whether Government propose to take such informations from Gaonburas and Lot Mandals of their respective jurisdictions ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue) replied :

53. (a)—The hon. Member is referred to replies to the Starred Question No.151 (a) and (b) of the Winter Session of the Assembly, 1959.

(b)—No.

(c)—From the informations available from the Gaonburas and Lot Mondals concerned, no such instances could be found.

Re : Saikhowa-Dirakmukh Road

Shri DEVENDRA NATH HAZARIKA (Saikhowa) asked :

54. Will the Minister of P.W.D. (R&B) be pleased to refer to Unstarred Question No.650 asked by the Questioner on 8th April, 1959 in the Budget Session of the Assembly, 1959 and state—

(a) Whether the existing alignment of the Saikhowa-Dirakmukh Road which is outside the Embankment has since been abandoned and the diversion through Lafankala inside the Embankment has been taken up ?

(b) Whether it is a fact that the portion of this fair weather road outside the bund could not serve the purpose and local public had been complaining that this expenditure has been mis-spent ?

Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI [Deputy Minister, P. W. D., (R&B)] replied :

54. (a)—Yes. This road was previously maintained by the N. E. F. Agency but now abandoned and the diversions inside the embankment have since been taken up.

(b)—No expenditure for the fair weather road outside the bund was incurred, which has since been abandoned. New diversions inside the bund from mile 331/5F unmetalled A. T. Road upto 3/4F connecting the old S.D. Road at 3/4F and from 11/2F to 13/4F towards Namsai have since been taken up.

Shri DEVENDRA NATH HAZARIKA : Sir, when can we expect that the diversion through Lafankala will be taken up ?

Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI : As a matter of fact it has already been taken up. Estimates are already prepared.

Calling attention to matter of urgent Public Importance
under Assembly Rule 54 re: strike by workers of Nowgong
Jute Bailing Labour Union

Shri KHOGENDRA NATH BARBARUAH (Amguri):

মাননীয় অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, বিধান সভাৰ নিয়মাবলীৰ ৫৪ নং ধাৰামতে, আজিৰ সদনত এটি কথা উপস্থাপিত কৰিব খুজিছো যে, যোৱা পহিলা চেপ্তেম্বৰৰ পৰা নগাঁও জুট বেলিং লেবাৰ ইউনিয়নৰ প্ৰায় ১৬০০ শ্ৰমিকে, ধৰ্মঘট কৰিছে আৰু চৰকাৰক এই বিষয়ে আবেদন কৰা সত্ত্বেও, কোনো ব্যৱস্থা লোৱা নাই। অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, এই ধৰ্মঘট নগাঁৱত প্ৰথমেই আৰম্ভ হয় আৰু লাহে লাহে, গোটেই জিলা জুৰি প্ৰসাৰতা লাভ কৰিছে আৰু এটা সময়্যৰ সৃষ্টি কৰিছে। এই ধৰ্মঘটৰ কাৰণ হল, শ্ৰমিক সকলে jute bailing কৰা, জোখকৰা, উঠোৱা নমোৱা কৰাৰ কাৰণে যিটো বেট বিচাৰিছে, মালিক সকলে দিয়া নাই। শ্ৰমিকসকলক এই বাবদ, ৭৫ নয়া পইচা দি, তাৰে এক নয়া পয়চা কাটি, মূল ৭৪ নয়া পইচা দিছে আৰু এই বাবদ শ্ৰমিক সকলে বিচাৰিছে, ১০০ নয়া পয়চা আৰু ট্ৰাকত উঠোৱা ক্ষেত্ৰত প্ৰত্যেক বেলত শ্ৰমিক সকলে ১৯ নয়া পইচা দাবী কৰিছে। প্ৰতিবেলৰ ওজন ৪ মৌন হব। শ্ৰমিক সকলে সৰ্ব মূঠ ৮ টা দাবী কৰি যোৱা এবছৰ ধৰি, মালিক সকলক জনাই আহিছে। যোৱা ২৮/১০/৫৯ তাৰিখে মালিকসকলক এই দাবী মানি লবলৈ নটিচ দিয়া হৈছিল। এতিয়া তাৰে মাত্ৰ দুটা দাবীৰ ওপৰত হে এই ধৰ্মঘট চলিছে। সেই দুটা হৈছে বেলিং বাবদ ১০০ নয়া পইচা আৰু প্ৰত্যেক বেল ট্ৰাকত তুলি দিয়াৰ বাবদ ১৯ নয়া পইচা বিচাৰিছে। মালিক সকলক এই দাবী সময় মতে জনোৱা হৈছে আৰু বহুবাৰ জনোৱা হৈছে। ১৭ আগষ্টৰ দিনা মালিকক চিঠি দি জনোৱা হৈছে, ২৫ আগষ্টত মালিকসকলক ধৰ্মঘটৰ নটিচ দিয়া হৈছিল আৰু মালিকসকলে সেই দাবী মানি নোলোৱাৰ ফলত এই ধৰ্মঘট যোৱা পহিলা চেপ্তেম্বৰৰ পৰা আৰম্ভ হৈছে।

অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, যোৱা ৭ চেপ্তেম্বৰৰ, 'লেবাৰ ইন্সপেক্টৰ, মালিকসকল আৰু শ্ৰমিক সকলৰ আলোচনাত শেষ সিদ্ধান্ত নোলোৱাকৈ মালিক সকলৰ ইচ্ছানুযায়ী ১৬ চেপ্তেম্বৰলৈ আলোচনাৰ দিন পুনৰ ঠিক কৰি মালিক মজদুৰৰ ওপৰত মিনাংসাৰ দায়িত্ব পেলোৱা হৈছে। ১৬ চেপ্তেম্বৰত পুনৰ বৈঠক হয়। একো সিদ্ধান্তলৈ মালিক সকল নাছিল বাবে ১৭ তাৰিখে মীমাংসা হব বুলি আশা কৰি ইন্সপেক্টৰ গুচি যায়। শ্ৰমিক সকলৰ অভাৱ অভিযোগ আৰু দাবী ১৭ চেপ্তেম্বৰতো মানি লোৱা নাই। তাৰ পিচত 'লেবাৰ কমিশনাৰো' সেই ঠাইলৈ নিশা গৈ মালিক সকলৰ লগত কিবা আলোচনা কৰি কোনো সিদ্ধান্ত নোহোৱাকৈ গুচি আহিছে। লেবাৰ কমিচনাৰ গৈছিল যেতিয়া তেখেতে মালিক আৰু শ্ৰমিক ইউনিয়ন উভয়কে লগধৰা উচিত আছিল। কিয় নিশা গৈছিল আৰু কেৱল মালিক-সকলকহে লগ কৰি আহিল মই বুজি নাপাওঁ।

Mr. SPEAKER: শ্ৰমিক সকলৰ ইউনিয়ন আছে নেকি ?

Shri KHOGENDRA NATH BARBARUAH (Amguri):

হয় বেজিষ্টাৰ্ড ইউনিয়ন আছে নং ৪৯২। এনে অৱস্থাত শ্ৰমিক ইউনিয়ন আৰু শ্ৰমিক সকলৰ দাবী অবমাননা কৰি, মালিক শ্ৰীলালচান্দ তোদীয়ে বে-আইনী ভাবে ১৯ চেপ্তেম্বৰৰ দিনা জুট বেলিং মিলৰ শ্ৰমিক সকল থকা ঘৰত তলা বন্ধ কৰে আৰু শ্ৰমিক সকলক কামৰ পৰা বৰখাস্ত কৰে। Lockup বেআইনী কাম। এই খবৰ জিলাৰ উপায়ুক্ত, পুলিচ চুপাৰিণ্টেণ্ডেণ্ট আদিক জনোৱা সত্ত্বেও কোনো ফল ধৰা নাই; বৰং পুলিচ বাহিনীয়ে মালিকৰ সপক্ষে ঠিয় দিছে আৰু শ্ৰমিক সকলক ব্যতিবন্ধ কৰি তুলিছে। মই ২৪ চেপ্তেম্বৰ ৰবিবাৰে উপায়ুক্তৰ ওচৰত 'ফোন' কৰি আপত্তি দিয়াত উপায়ুক্তই কৈছে কিবা action লোৱা

হৰ। তাৰ পিচত ২০ তাৰিখে, মালিক শ্ৰীভোদীয়ে গোগিনি চৰদাৰৰ অধীনত কামকৰা ৫৫ জন শ্ৰমিকক পুলিচ থকা সত্বেও ঘৰৰ পৰা বাতি ৯ বজাৰ পৰা ২ বজাৰ ভিতৰত বাহিৰ কৰি নিৰাশ্ৰয় কৰিছে। পুলিচে নিজেই বাহিৰ কৰি দিয়ে। আকৌ ২২ তাৰিখে ৫ জন শ্ৰমিক দেচাই দাস, দেৱানি দাস, ভূপি দাস, দুৰ্গা ৰায়, গোগিনি ৰায়ক পুনৰ বিনা কাৰণত গ্ৰেপ্তাৰ কৰিছে। ইউনিয়নৰ তৰফৰ পৰা পুলিচে কি কাৰণত শ্ৰমিকক গ্ৰেপ্তাৰ কৰিছে বুলি সোধাত ১৫১ ধাৰাত বুলি কয়। তাৰ পিচত, ২২ চেপ্তেম্বৰৰ সন্ধ্যা S. P. এ নিজে মালিক সকলক আগত ৰখি শ্ৰমিকক বন্দুক দেখুৱাই ভোঁৱ কৰি গন্যাতি পত্ৰ (undertaking) লেখাই লৈছে। বামৰাজ্য প্ৰতিস্থা কৰিব খোজা কংগ্ৰেছ শাসনত শ্ৰমিকৰ বুকৰ আগত বন্দুকৰ গুলীৰ ভয়, শিক কংগ্ৰেছ শাসন। এই দৰেই চৰকাৰৰ পৰা মালিকসকলে সকলো অসুবিধা আদায় কৰিছে আৰু শ্ৰীয়া শ্ৰমিকসকলে সকলো অসুবিধা মূৰ পাতি ৰহন কৰিব লাগিছে। এচনীয়া চালিৰ যি ঘৰ শ্ৰমিক সকলক মালিক সকলে দিছে তাত কোনো সভা লোক বাস কৰিব নোৱাৰে। শ্ৰমিকৰ শ্ৰমৰ মূল্য নাই, ঘৰ নাই। হৈস হেতু সদনত চৰকাৰৰ দৃষ্টি আকৰ্ষণ কৰো আৰু মন্ত্ৰীমহোদয়ৰ পৰা এটা সমাধান বিচাৰো।

***Shri KAMAKHYA PRASAD TRIPATHI (Minister, Labour):** Sir, the notice, after it was given, was enquired into. Many of the graphic grounds which have been given now about the functioning of the Police while trying to arrest were not given in the notice. Therefore, it has not been possible for us to enquire into them. From the facts disclosed, it appears, that the charge of the hon. Member that the Labour Department did not intervene in time is not correct. I find that the notice to the employers with regard to the demand of the Labour was given on 15th, but the copy thereof was given to the Labour Officers there on the 28th. The strike notice was given on the 25th and as soon as the strike notice was given and as soon as the Labour Inspector came to know, he immediately intervened and there was a discussion with both the employers and the workers. As a result thereof the Labour Inspector came to the conclusion that the strike was illegal.

Therefore he requested the Union to postpone the strike which was scheduled on the 1st September for a few days so that his intermediation might occur. The workers and the Union discussed this matter on the 31st and after considering they came to the conclusion that it would not be wise for them to postpone the strike. They thought that the jute season was in its height and this was the right time to strike so they did not want to postpone the strike and also because the bargaining power was on their side. Accordingly our Labour Officer held another conciliation proceedings on the 7th. On this the employers said that the Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce said that he could not give his opinion alone. They have fixed the discussion on the 15th; after the discussion on the 15th it was indicated that another conciliation be fixed on the 16th. On the 16th it transpired that no agreement took place. And so there was another conciliation on the 17th. In this way three conciliations seem to have failed. Then, I think on the 19th the employers asked the workers to vacate the quarters. The workers, of course, could not vacate the quarters. On this a question arose whether it was legal for the employers to ask the workers to vacate the quarters. It appears that the Deputy Commissioner consulted the Labour Department and the Labour Department opined that it was not legal because conciliation proceedings were pending and in the course of pendency of conciliation proceedings no change in service condition could be made.

*Speech not corrected.

In the meantime there was an allegation that the workers became restive and in order to prevent any untoward incident, namely violence, some preventive action was taken by the police and as a result of this preventive action under relevant sections of the law four persons were arrested. But they were immediately released on bail and were not taken under custody. In the meantime the D.C. intervened on the 26th at reconciliation and a reconciliation was brought about as a result of which the strike was called off on the 27th. The employers have agreed to increase the bale rate of jute from 75 to 85 [naya] [paise] and since the strike had been called off the workers accepted this rate. Now another consideration seems pending. In the course of the strike the workers took the view that the strike was illegal. They did not agree to the view that the workers were the direct responsibility of the employers. They contend that the whole management was through the Sirdars and since the Sirdars employed the workers, the workers belonged to the Sirdars. The workers' complaint was that the Sirdars were merely intermediaries and they could not directly employ the workers. The employers refused to take the workers' argument but they contend that they only recognise the Sirdars. Now, the legal position with regard to this is also not clear. The workers also have not been able to state their rights and therefore, this whole matter has not been clear. However, the position has been considerably eased by the latest settlement wherein the strike was called off.

Another complaint of the workers is about the treatment accorded them by the employers in the matter of housing, namely, that one long shed was provided to house the workers. In this connection the employers contend that they have no liability to give houses to the workers: this is the liability of the Sirdars. But even then they provided this shed. Their second argument in this respect is these workers were seasonal workers and not formal workers and therefore, since they are seasonal workers no permanent housing arrangements can be made for them. Now, in this matter of housing the Government is also not satisfied. It was the Government's desire that proper housing conditions should be provided to the workers whatever their status. But in this matter the employers have not yet conceded and there has not been a possibility to bring about an agreement between the two sides. But, as I have said before, the situation is eased now, I would request the hon. Member to withdraw his motion.

***Shri KHOGENDRA NATH BARBARUAH (Amguri):** Whether the cases arising out of this question will be withdrawn?

***Shri KAMAKHYA PRASAD TRIPATHI:** Sir, the cases in question will be dealt with according to their merits but I do not think any victimisation will occur.

The Assam Official Language (Amendment) Bill, 1961

By Shri Hareswar Goswami.

Shri HARESWAR GOSWAMI (Rampur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg leave to introduce the Assam Official Language (Amendment) Bill, 1961.

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED (Minister, Law): On a point of order, Sir, I would like to draw your attention to a new Assembly rule 65 a) which has been approved by this House. Sir, under this new rule, 'When a Bill is pending before the House, notice of an identical Bill, whether

received before or after the introduction of the pending Bill, shall be removed from, or not entered in the list of pending notices, as the case may be, unless the Speaker otherwise directs'. In this connection I would also like to draw your attention to the fact that this very Rule was also cited by my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, the other day when Government introduced the Assam Official Language (Amendment) Bill. In the course of meeting the arguments advanced by the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon'ble Chief Minister placed before this House and the Deputy Speaker, who was then in the Chair, three or four grounds in support of the contention that the Government Bill was perfectly in order and could not under this rule 65(a) be ruled out. His main contention was that, as there was no Bill on the language issue, pending before this House, Government Bill could not be ruled out. As far as I could than understand from observations made by the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition, he tried to argue that because his non-official Bill had been published in the official Gazette, it should be deemed to be pending before this House. My submission is that unless and until either a motion, resolution or Bill has been moved or introduced before the House and the House has accepted the motion, that motion, resolution or bill cannot pend before the House. Sir, I am quoting an authority where in addition to the literal meaning of the word 'pend', my contention finds support. If you will please look at page 220 of More's practice and Procedure of Indian Parliament you will find Sir, as follows: 'As stated earlier, in the United Kingdom all bills which have failed to obtain the Royal Assent lapse after prorogation and they are required to be reintroduced in the new session. The Government of India Act, 1935, specifically laid down that a bill pending in the Legislature shall not lapse by reason of the prorogation of the Chamber. This provision has been adopted by the Indian Constitution. Hence bills which have already been introduced are carried over to the list of pending business of the next session'.

This definitely classifies what is a pending bill and resolution, etc. My submission is that unless and until the bill has been introduced and motion for introduction has been accepted, it can not be said to be pending. This cannot be restricted too much that as the private bill has been published in the official gazette it should be deemed to be pending. Sir, if you will look...

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not the point at issue. The point at issue is that the present official bill is pending at the House. During pending of this bill whether another bill as that of Shri Goswami's can be brought here or not.

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED (Minister, Law): I am just trying to develop my point. My submission is that the Government official bill is pending. Now question is whether the bill which my hon. friend wants to introduce is in order and can be correct.

The hon. Member.....

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA (Gauhati):** On point of order or on this point of order, Sir. The Minister is now challenging the rulings of the Chair. On this particular point the Minister is challenging the ruling of the House. There was the ruling from the Chair that the two bills are not identical.

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED: There have been occasions where if any ruling has been given by the Chair that also has been subjected to further consideration. The Chair is entitled to consider whether a previous ruling requires reconsideration. There is perhaps a precedence in our Assembly a so.

***Shri DEBESWAR SHARMA (Jorhat):** Would the Hon. Minister cite an instance for the benefit of the House?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED: And secondly before.....

***Maulavi JAHANUDDIN AHMED (Bilasipara):** May I suggest Sir, that the second point of order should be discussed first?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let him finish first. There is a precedence discussed in the Presiding Officer's Conference I do not remember exactly whether it was in Hyderabad or in Bangalore. In that conference the Presiding Officers discussed and decided that in the absence of the Speaker if some ruling is given by the Chairman or by the Deputy Speaker and if subsequently that ruling is changed then the Speaker has the right to revive the decision if he so desires. That is the decision of the Conference. I am looking for that decision. I propose to give that decision to you. I think on that ground he may be allowed to speak.

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYA (Gauhati):** May we know, Sir, whether the Minister is making his submission with regard to the justifiability or otherwise of the previous ruling or he is talking extraneous to that point?

Mr. SPEAKER: He is talking for both.

***Shri HARESWAR GOSWAMI (Rampur):** I raised an objection at the time of introduction of the bill by the Chief Minister and the Deputy Speaker, in your absence, held that my bill is the dissimilar one. Therefore powers of 65(a) cannot be exercised. Now, Sir, as you said that the Speaker can set aside the ruling of the Deputy Speaker, I bow to that. Then my objection to that is that the previous bill will apply. Because my objection was in disposing the case in accordance with the procedure. Therefore, that point will have to be dealt with again.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think if I open the whole thing, the ruling given by the Deputy Speaker, in our case, may come out.

***Shri DEBESWAR SARMA (Jorhat):** May I submit one thing, Sir. There is no question about the Speaker's right. I am not acquainted with the decision of the Speaker's Conference. I think, it is an accepted principle in our democracy in the whole of India that the Speaker has the unperturbed right within the House. Therefore, he has right in proper cases to reserve his ruling. If the Hon. Finance Minister requests the Speaker, he may consider his own ruling. Therefore, the question does not arise. I am surprised to find a point of order on a point of order. The Hon. Finance Minister only develops this. Therefore I beseech the Hon. Minister to be a bit patient.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. That is right.

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED (Minister, Law): Even if a ruling has been given by the Chair previously in any matter, a member has the right to bring fresh materials and fresh points before the Chair and it will be for the Chair to consider whether any decision taken in the similar matter calls for revision. I am not challenging the ruling given by the Deputy Speaker. What I am pointing out before you is that this matter is attracted by rule 65(a). On identical matters another Bill cannot be permitted. My Hon. friend the Chief Minister, was perfectly right when he said that the official bill and the Bill which is now proposed to be introduced by the Hon. Member is not identical. That is from the point of facts as may emerge after reading the provision contained in the Bill. We have to consider what are their legal implications. I find that so far as the Bill, which the hon. Member wants to move, seeks to amend, under clause 2, Sec. 4 of the original act. He also seeks, under Clause 3, Sec. 5 of the Principal Act. So far as the Government Bill is concerned, it only seeks to amend Sec. 5 of the Principal Act. Except for few different words, the purpose of amendment, as now contained in the clause 3 of the hon. Member's Bill, which is intended to amend Sec. 5 of Principal Act is more or less similar, at least, to the extent.

Mr. SPEAKER: No amendment is proposed to Section 4 of the Official Language Bill.

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED: No amendment is proposed in Section 4 of the Principal Act under the Official Language Amendment Bill. It is confined to amendment of Section 5 only. Therefore, so far as purpose of amendment to Section 5 is concerned, it is identical, in both the bills.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is sufficient for me to understand from you whether this Bill is identical or not. That is the only point before the House. If you say that these two Bills are identical, then Mr. Goswami's Bill cannot come.

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED: The Clause 3 of Shri Goswami's Bill which seeks to amend Section 5 of the principal Act, is identical with the proposed amendment Section 5 of the Principal Act under this Government bill, I will read it for your convenience:—

3. In Section 5 of the Principal Act.—

“for the words “Notwithstanding anything contained in Section 5”, appearing in the first line, the word without prejudice to the status and scope of the Official Language as contained in Article 345 and in conformity with Article 347 of the Constitution of India”, shall be substituted.”

Now more or less the same thing has been provided in clause 3 of the Official (amendment) Bill. “Without prejudice to the provision contained in section 3, Bengali language shall be used for administrative and other purposes”. So the purpose of both the Bills is that Section 5 of the Principal Act should be amended not to drive away Assamese from the District of Cachar.

In addition to what the Government wants, my hon. Friend, under clause 2 of his Bill wants to amend Section 4 also of the Principal Act. But my submission before you is that if clause 3 of both the (amendment). Bills as will appear from both the Bills is identical clause 3 of Shri Goswami's cannot be permitted as similar amendment under clause 3 of Government bill is pending. If a portion cannot be permitted the whole also cannot be permitted unless and until it is open to Shri Goswami to amend his Bill at this stage. He should come forward with another Bill. Once the Bill is admitted to be introduced neither you Sir, nor the hon. Member has a right to take away clause 3 of his Bill. So my submission is that because at least a portion of the Bill is identical with the Bill which has already been introduced and is pending before the House, the whole of it is bad and should not be allowed to be moved here.

Mr. SPEAKER : I want to make a distinction between an original Bill and an amending Bill. In an original Bill the mover of the Bill gets opportunity of dealing with the matter in its entirety, but in an amending Bill the scope is limited because the members can only bring amendments to the section for which the amendment is sought. Suppose in section 4, no amendment has been proposed in the Official Bill, but in Mr. Goswami's Bill amendment of section 4 has been proposed, then what opportunity he will get if he wants to amend section 4 of the original Bill if he is not given the opportunity to move his Bill ?

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED : The hon. Member has the opportunity of amending the Bill and bringing it in due course. Any amendment can be brought at any time. But so far as the present Bill is concerned, once it is found that any portion of the proposed Bill deals with the same subject which is pending contained in a Bill, that cannot be allowed. So far as amendment to Section 4 of the principal Act is concerned the hon. Member will be entitled to suggest this amendment through another Bill ; but so far as the present Bill is concerned, it cannot be in order, because the moment it is allowed we will be discussing the matter which would have been discussed under the Government Bill.

***Shri DEVESWAR SARMA (Jorhat) :** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have some difficulty and so I seek clarification. Let me please make it clear that I am talking purely on point of law as I understand it. I do not claim to be infallible ; I may be wrong. So I want to understand the legal implication and not the merit of the Bill.

Sir, the relevant rule which was quoted by the Hon'ble Finance Minister was Rule 65A, i.e., an amendment of the pertinent word which is of importance, as the Hon'ble Speaker rightly pointed out, whether Mr. Goswami's Bill is identical or not identical. What are the implication of a Bill being identical or not ? I would invite your attention to rule 78 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business. Rule 78 reads like this :—

“The following conditions shall govern the admissibility of amendments to clauses or schedules of the Bill :—

- (i) All amendment shall be within the scope of the Bill and relevant to the subject matter of the clause to which it relates.”

Now in Goswami's Bill which is before the House to-day, we find that in clause 2, for the words "Notwithstanding anything contained in Section 3" to be substituted by "without prejudice etc.", and so his Bill has a wider scope, because in addition to amending Section 5 of the original Bill, Goswami's Bill seeks to amend Section 4 also, whereas the Government Bill seeks to amend only section 5 of the original Bill. Therefore, in my humble view it cannot be said that the two Bills are identical. The scope of Goswami's Bill is much wider because it embraces two Sections of the original Bill but the Government Bill embraces only one Section viz., Section 5.

Now our Rules will certainly prevent if Goswami's Bill is disallowed. Rule 78 (1) will be attracted if he seeks to bring an amendment in respect of section 4 of the Original Bill, because if he seeks to amend Section 4 of the original Bill then this will stand on the way and amendment shall be within the scope of the Bill. Section 4 of the Original Bill is not within the amending Bill and then it would not be relevant to the subject matter of clause 2 to which it relates.

Therefore, I find it difficult to understand how the two Bills can be said to be identical. The Hon'ble Finance Minister was pleased to use the words "nearly similar". It may be nearly similar but not identical. On merits also perhaps there will be sharp division of opinion whether Goswami's Bill containing the additional amendment would be to the best interest or not. But when we speak of the law, and at the moment we are speaking of the law itself, we have to remember that the Legislative Bodies make Rules and these should be the first Body to honour the Rules. We cannot invoke expediency to dishonour the Rules which we make here. Therefore, under the Rules I have not been able to see how the two Bills could be identical, and if these are not identical how can we shut out Goswami's amending Bill. It may be out-voted on merits, but so far as the question of law is concerned, I am feeling a little difficulty about this.

***Shri HARESWAR GOSWAMI (Rampur):** Sir, I am surprised to see Mr. Ahmed raising a point of order in connection with the introduction of my Bill. Sir, there is a popular feeling outside this House that this Government speaks with two voices—voice of Mr. Ahmed and the voice of Mr. Chaliha—and I find to-day that two voices are really there. I have also heard that this Government believe in indulging in tweedledum and tweedledee. I am confirmed to-day that is the practice of the Government; otherwise how could Mr. Ahmed say that although the facts are dissimilar, the law point is similar.

Sir, we are not lawyers here to argue a case. We are parliamentarians to place facts before you and to follow the rules so far as the rules are applicable to those facts. Now Sir, the other day when the Chief Minister moved for leave to introduce his Bill I raised an objection that already my Bill had been published in the Gazette and therefore that Bill had automatically got the leave of the house and therefore, one stage that was necessary for fulfilment in this House had been fulfilled and we are to go to the second stage. So, it is in the agenda of the House. That was the whole logic of argument. The Chief Minister, to my objection,

raised three points, namely, (1) my Bill is not in the agenda of the House, (2) his Bill is dis-similar from my Bill, and (3) he has received the consent of the Speaker so far as his Bill is concerned. The Deputy Speaker who was on the Chair accepted all these contentions and allowed the Bill to be moved for taking leave of the House and I was shut out. To-day my Friend, Shri Ahmed, has raised that point again. He wanted to speak on that day but as the Deputy Speaker already ruled he could not get an opportunity and so he is availing of the opportunity to-day. I will say it is a bad practice if not bad faith.

However, I now come to the Bill itself. The first point my Friend raised is about Rule 65(a). As you will remember Sir, during the October Session last year when the official language Bill was introduced there were two pending Bills—one I believe of Shri Prabhat Narayan Choudhury and another of Shri Kamala Prasad Agarwalla and Mohade Das and you were pleased to say that although we have no Rules in our House, we have to follow the Lok Sabha Rules and you ruled out that as there is Government Bill pending these Bills could not be taken into consideration. In that session you also said that our Rule Committee should be convened to frame Rules to suit our purpose and the Rule Committee went into this matter and framed Rules which have been accepted by this House and that new Rule is Rule 65(a). Therefore, whatever may be in move or May, we have our Rules here and we have got to give effect to the same. So far as this Rule is concerned it says "when a Bill is pending before the House, notice of an identical Bill, whether received before or after the introduction of the pending Bill, shall be removed from, or not entered in, the list of pending notices....." Sir, these are crucial points—"whether received before or after introduction"—and the word "introduction" has a specific meaning in the Rules of this House. Therefore, if there is a Bill pending and if there is notice before or after the introduction of the Bill then the second Bill cannot be taken into consideration. Sir, if you kindly look to Rule 64 you will see that it states "the Speaker on a request made to him may order the publication of any Bill in the Gazette, although no motion has been made for leave to introduce the Bill. In that case it shall not be necessary to move for leave to introduce the Bill, and if the Bill is afterwards introduced, it shall not be necessary to publish it again." As you know Sir, every Bill has to receive the leave of this House for introduction unless it is published in the Gazette, in which case it is not necessary to obtain leave or in the Case Rule 65(a) no leave is necessary. Therefore, my Bill automatically obtained the leave of the House and so my Bill has gone one step further. For introduction of a Bill leave of the House has to be obtained and that leave can be obtained in two ways—either by moving a motion in this House or by publication. Therefore, I come to Rule 72 which is the second stage, and not Rule 70 which is the first stage. So, Sir my Bill is in the agenda, but my friend says that it is not in the agenda because it has not been printed in the agenda. What is there in the agenda of this House? So far as the Government business are concerned these are mentioned and afterwards. Therefore, my Bill has automatically secured the first place in to-day's agenda of the House because no leave is necessary.

Now, so far as my Bill and Shri Sarat Goswami's Bill are concerned there is a difference between the two. So far as my Bill is concerned it is written in the agenda "Shri Hareswar Goswami to introduce the Assam

Official (Amendment) Bill, 1961". So I come to Rule 72 and not Rule 70. Therefore, Sir, it is a pending Bill. The second point raised by my friend is that it is not identical Bill and there is a conflict between the Chief and his Deputy. One says that it is identical and the another say that in facts it is not. My friend wants to say that in facts it is not identical but in law it is identical. If you hold Sir, that it is identical then I come to the original position of Tuesday. Why it is not identical is that my Bill goes a step further. Government Bill remains content with introducing the Assam official language in Cachar but so far as the hills are concerned, it will remain as it is. So far as Cachar is concerned, it is said "without prejudice to the provisions contained in Section 3 the Bengali Language shall be used for administrative and other official purposes....." Here Sir, Rule 78 is very relevant and you have also pointed out to Mr. Ahmed what is the scope of amendments in an amending Bill. The scope is very much restricted. If I have to do anything, I have to confine myself to the amendments proposed. I cannot say, will in so and so clause you amend so and so things. I cannot do that because Rule 78(i) is very specific about it. In this House also we have been reminded several times that in the case of amendment to an amending Bill the scope is very limited. Therefore, Sir, if I want to amend the Bill I cannot do so. And, therefore, if it is a vital amendment, then, Sir, I do not understand how can it be similar. This amendment is necessary also for Article 14. we do not want to discriminate with any area or any people. As Prime Minister said, if there is a minority with sufficient strength, their language might be recognised for that region but this cannot drive out the official language from any region. You cannot prevent this official language, you cannot do so and that is very important for the purpose of Articles 345 and 347. Under Article 345 you have to legislate for the whole State. Under Article 347 the President can declare a regional language in addition to the official language. Therefore, this is very important.

Mr. SPEAKER : Do you want to say that Section 4 of the Official Language Act offends Articles 345 of the Constitution ?

***Shri HARESWAR GOSWAMI (Rampur) :** Yes that is one thing and secondly, I will challenge on the ground of discrimination also. Whereas you have allowed the official language to go to Cachar, you have discriminated by preventing the official language from entrance into the Hill Districts. Therefore, Sir, from all this, this Bill is necessary. The point raised that you directed, with all respect to you, Sir, I must say that because a Bill is in the agenda of the House, because that item was on the agenda of the House did not mean that you directed and point of order could be raised. That was not so. If you want to direct under Rule 65(a) you can direct, Sir, but that direction will be not supposed to have been given because it is on the agenda but because you give it on the floor of the House. That direction has to be given here. On all these 3 points the Chief Minister made a statement, I also tried to convince the Deputy Speaker as much as possible but I could not. Those points were not accepted. It was said that the Speaker had already given direction that the Bills were similar.

Mr. SPEAKER : Day before yesterday you said that this Bill is similar.

Shri HARESWAR GOSWAMI (Rampur): No, did not say.

Mr. SPEAKER: What was your contention? Because your Bill was similar to the official Bill this could not be brought up for discussion?

Shri HARESWAR GOSWAMI: That was my contention but it was not accepted.

Mr. SPEAKER: You want to accept the argument advanced by the Chief Minister?

Shri HARESWAR GOSWAMI: I have accepted that as Chair has so ruled.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shri Ahmed said that section 5 of the Official Language Act can be amended by an amendment. An amendment, therefore, proposes under section 5 of the Official Language Bill you can do it by amendment. Regarding amendment to section 4 of the Official Language Act, Mr. Ahmed has raised one point, that point is that you are debarred from bringing in any amendment to section 5 in your Bill. He says that when one part is bad the whole Bill is bad. Therefore, on that ground the amendment to section 4 in your Bill should not be allowed.

Shri HARESWAR GOSWAMI (Rampur): This is very peculiar. If a finger is bad then the whole man is not bad. I have heard the other way, when a particular part of the body is bad, the whole body cannot be bad. Rule is if the whole is bad, part is bad but not *vice versa*.

Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA (Gauhati): We want to get a clarification. Mr. Ahmed has said that so far as amendment to section 5 of the Act is concerned, even without Mr. Goswami's Bill that can be discussed by the House in the form of bringing in an amendment to the amending Bill. This is accepted. Now he says that according to the rules of procedures of the House we cannot, however, bring in an amendment to section 4 because that will be going beyond the scope of the Official Amendment Bill. What is his suggestion, is that the member may take a chance of giving notice to a Bill to amend that particular section and then try their luck in future. Now, the Government was sitting tight so long as the Bill, whether it is good or bad or different it does not matter so long as the hon. Member, Mr. Goswami, did not bring in the Bill and so long as the Bill was not published in the Gazette. The Government was sitting tight and now that they have brought the Bill proposing to amend only one section. Now they say because we have brought a Bill under one section, Bills with wider scope also should be scrapped! What is this argument? If the Government actually wanted to take precedence they ought to have moved earlier. They have highly paid officials for drafting the Bills. The public are paying a lot, but they sleep and sleep to the last moment and then they come to debar other members from taking their right of moving Bills.

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue): I speak only on the law point. I also agree with Shri Debeswar Sarma that I may be entirely mistaken. I shall not go into the merits of the Bill. Now Rule 67 of the Lok Sabha, is our Rule 65(a), it reads "When a Bill is pending before the House notice of identical Bill, whether received before or after the introduction of the pending Bill, shall be removed from, etc." So interpretation on this "identical Bill" is necessary. My interpretation is that, "identical Bill" here means identical subject. If this interpretation is not accepted then an anomalous situation will arise, which I shall show. Shri Goswami relied on Rule 64. My point is that, Rule 64 merely empowers the Speaker to publish the Bill and if it is done, then leave is not to be sought. Why it is so? Because if the Bill is not published then the hon. Members will be taken by surprise, and so leave has to be sought.

Mr. SPEAKER: You should speak in the context of day before yesterday's discussion.

Shri HARESWAR DAS: If my interpretation is not accepted an anomalous position will arise. This Rule 64 was cited by Shri Goswami and by citing this Rule 64 he wanted to prove that his Bill was pending before the House. I do not agree with that. Therefore, I am giving my interpretation on Rule 64. Rule 64 merely means that the Members have got an opportunity to read the Bill before introduction. If the Bill is published, they have got an opportunity to read the Bill, leave is then not to be sought. Publication only means information to the hon. Members before the Bill is introduced. That being so, mere publication does not carry the Bill beyond the notice stage. It does not make the Bill hand before the House. It is still in the notice stage. My point is that identical Bill in Rule 65(a) means Bills on identical subject. Otherwise there may be large number of Bills on the same subject in the same Session. With slight alteration a non-identical Bill may be made. According to our Rule 131, a matter which is once discussed and decision taken cannot again be discussed. If my interpretation is not accepted, the same matter will have to be discussed in different Bills in the same Session in violation of this rule. So Sir, in my opinion "identical Bill in Rule 65(a) means identical subject".

***Shri DEBESWAR SARMA (Jorhat)**: He has defined the Bill that is to come. Item 61 says reviving discussion of a matter which has been discussed in the same Session. Here this Bill to amend Section 5 of the original Act. If the Private Members' Bill again comes then the amendment of the Section 5 will be discussed here.

Mr. SPEAKER: In this Bill the House will discuss amendment of Section 5. A decision has been taken that in the other Bill that very same point will be discussed.

***Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue)**: It seeks to amend Section 4 and 5 and then the Speaker can stop discussion. The Bill cannot be separated.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to know whether Section 4 and 5 can be separated.

***Shri HARESWAR DAS:** It cannot be separated, the entire Bill comes. The Bill stands as Section 4 and 5. My point is when the House wants to discuss the amendment of Section 5 in this Session this House will again discuss every amendment. That is quite contrary to Rule 131(6) of our Rules. So I propose, Sir, that interpretation—identical Bill means identity on the same. So this Bill should not be separated. If separated many anomalies will happen. Legislation never intended such innumerable amendments. So my submission, Sir, that in view of Rule 131(6) and 65A this Bill is to be considered as identical Bill.

Shri DANDESWAR HAZARIKA (Morongi): Mr. Speaker Sir, I want to make a few observations in connection with the point whether both Bills the are identical or not. Sir, while I bow down to the decision of the Deputy Speaker given day before yesterday I like respectfully to submit, Sir, that the two Bills are not identical.

Sir, the word 'identical' has not been defined in the Rules of Procedure for Conduct of Business in the Assembly. Now to be 'identical' let us see whether the 'objects and reasons' of the two Bills are same or not. It appears after going through the 'objects and reasons' that in both the Bills the objects are the same, *viz.*, both the Bills want that clause 5 of the Official Language Act, *i.e.*, the Mohkuma Parishad clause should be deleted. Both the Bills also want that there should be no bar of entry of the official language in Cachar. Therefore, Sir, in my humble opinion both the Bills are identical.

Now, Mr. Goswami, the Leader of the Opposition, holds that as his Bill has been published in the official Gazette his Bill is introduced in the House; hence the Government Bill cannot come. Sir, even if his contention is taken as correct I beg to point out that under Assembly Rule 65A the Speaker has already given precedence to the Government Bill by putting in the list of Business of the House. Hence in my opinion when the two Bills are identical and when the Speaker has decided that the Government Bill should be put first in the agenda Mr. Goswami's Bill must be dropped.

***Shri MOHI KANTA DAS (Barchalla):** Mr. Speaker Sir, Sri Hazarika has explained about the similarity of the two Bills, *viz.*, the Government Official Bill and the Bill moved by Shri Goswami. Sir, when one identical bill is pending before the House, how another Bill can come up before the House unless the amendment to section 5 of the original Bill is approved by this House. This will certainly clash with the other Bill. Here the Minister has said that when an identical Bill is pending, I mean identical in all force, the second Bill cannot come up.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have brought before me the Oxford Dictionary. It defines 'identical' as "it is same in every details". Do you think the second Bill is same in every details?

***Shri MOHI KANTA DAS (Barchalla):** Sir, my contention is that when a Bill identical with a contemplated Bill is pending before the House, the other bill cannot come up and that is my submission.

Shri HARESWAR GOSWAMI (Rampur) : Sir, my Friend Shri Hazarika and Shri Chaliha have overlooked certain portion of the statement and object of the Bill. I shall read the statements of objects of both the bills.

“As there is a demand for removing the Mohkuma Parishads from Section 5 of the Principal Act and as this serves no purpose it has become necessary to amend the Principal Act. Further the Official Language of the State can not be ousted from any area of the State and under Article 347 any other language if desired by a substantial proportion of the population can be recognised throughout the State or any part of the State for such purposes as may be specified. It has become necessary in conformity with the provisions of Articles 345 and 347 to clarify the position that recognition of one or more languages as the official language for any part of the State does not oust the operation of the official language from any part and language recognised for a particular part is only addition to the Official Language”.

Sir, the statement of objects and reasons of Sri Chaliha's Bill is as follows :

“There has been a feeling in the minds of the people of Cachar against the provision for exercising option in the matter of deciding the language to be used for administrative and other official purposes in the district of Cachar by the Mohkuma Parishads and Municipal Boards in the manner specified in Section 5 of the Assam Official Language Act, 1960. To meet this wish and yet not to bar the official language from being used in Cachar the amendment of the Act is considered necessary. Hence this Bill.

Sir, therefore, his Bill is for a part of the State and my Bill is for the whole State. This is the difference.

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED (Minister, Law) : Mr. Speaker Sir, I have listened with attention to all the points which have been advanced by the hon. Members in support of the contention that this Bill is in order. Sir, I may be permitted to say just a few words not connected with the discussion of the points under discussion because, unfortunately, some extraneous and provoking observations have been made by my Friend Shri Goswami, the Leader of the Opposition. It is his custom to utilise every opportunity in a political harangue and propaganda by shouting at the top of his voice. He has accused the Government of speaking in two voices one of the Chief Minister and the other of mine. Sir, I may tell the House that this is not true. It will be most unfortunate and sign of stagnation if reasons cannot be allowed to express on difference of views they may have on any point. Chief Minister and myself may have on some matters different views which we express frankly but after decision on any matter is taken there are no two voices because the decision is of the Government. Even if Mr. Goswami is justified in saying that what the Chief Minister said the other is being contradicted by me though there is no contradiction in the stand taken by the Chief Minister and myself, there is none whatsoever for Shri Goswami to speak with one mouth but with two tongues. What he said yesterday he is not doing the same to-day. He does not mind speaking differently.

Coming to the matter under discussion, I have made it clear that in so far as purpose of amendment to Section 5 is concerned and there is no dispute about this it is more or less identical. The only difference is that Shri Goswami has in his amendment included reference to some Article of the Constitution. The purpose is that Section 5 of the main Act should be amended. Now, if for the same purpose, the amendment as proposed to be placed before the House under Shri Goswami's Bill, is allowed it will be open not only to Mr. Goswami but to all Members to discuss what they would have had opportunity to do so under the Government Bill pending before the House. If my hon. Friend is not satisfied with the phraseology of our present Amendment under clause 3 of the Bill and if it is his opinion that our proposed amendment is *ultra vires* of the Constitution because it has no reference to Article 345 and Article 347, he is entitled to move amendment at the time of consideration stage of clause by clause which will be examined on merit. The only question is whether it would be proper to shut out the amendment section sought to be made to section 4 of the principal Act, if on the ground of clause 3 being identical in both the Bills, Shri Goswami's Bill is not allowed to be moved. Sir, I have submitted before you that notwithstanding two different amendments to the principal Act but having regard to similarity of amendment to Section 5 of the Act, the purpose is the same and therefore, it is barred. Once a portion is barred, how can my friend be allowed to be moved the Bill under the barred portion is taken out from the Bill. That is the difficulty which my Friend has not indicated how it can be overcome. The bad portion will remain once the Bill is allowed to be moved by you, Sir? The Bill has to come as a whole, it should therefore not be allowed. That is my submission when any part of the body is bad it affects the whole body unless that part is cured, the whole body will remain affected. Therefore, my submission is that so far as this Bill is concerned at least clause 3 dealing with amendment of section 5 of the Principal Act cannot be allowed. We cannot separate it from the Bill. Unless and until the hon. Member withdraws the Bill and comes forward with a new Bill to seek amendment to Section 4 of the Act as I said before, because of some bad portion, the whole Bill cannot be allowed to-day, there is no other remedy. *Interrelia* what I have submitted before the House that so far as amendment to Section 5 is concerned, the purpose is identical.

Now, coming to the other conclusion of my hon. friend, he has tried to argue that simply because you were pleased to allow the publication of the Bill in the Gazette, the Bill should be deemed to be pending before this House. Sir, I would just like to bring one fact to your notice. Supposing the hon. Member was not present today in the House. Under the rules in his absence if this Bill is on the agenda, it would be dropped and simply because the Bill has been published in the Gazette it would not save it because it is not a pending matter which can only be considered even in the absence of mover. Publication in Gazette of the Bill only dispenses with the necessity of moving for leave to introduce the Bill. There is a difference between motion for leave to introduce and motion for introduction. Leave for introduction is sought when the Bill is not published in the Gazette, and this is necessary because no Bill should be placed before the House before Hon. Members can have the opportunity of knowing what the Bill contains. Therefore, the discretion has been left not only to the Chair but also to the House whether leave to introduce a Bill should be allowed or not when the Bill has not been published in the Gazette. After leave to

introduce is allowed the motion for introduction can be made, when this is accepted this Bill becomes pending. My friend objected to my citing move and outside authority. I shall now place what our Commentator in India says about it, in 'Constitution of India' by Basu. "The Introduction and Prorogation of pending of Bills." "Our Constitution seeks to improve upon the position in England and saves the pending Bills from being lapsed on prorogation." A motion or a resolution or an amendment which has been moved and is pending in this House by reasons of prorogation is carried over to the next session by notices other than notice of intention to move for leave to introduce the Bill and fresh notice is given.

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA (Gauhati):** We are not here concerned with prorogation.

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED (Minister, Law): What I am pointing out is that a publication in the Gazette cannot be treated as pending. I am sorry that my friend, Shri Bhattacharyya.....

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA (Gauhati):** This is only wasting the time of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I have allowed him to speak.

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED: Sir, I strongly object to the word 'waste' used by the Hon Member. It is not parliamentary. Sir, I seek your protection and through you ask the Hon. Member to withdraw it.

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA (Gauhati):** Sir, I am placing it to you that we are not at all concerned with prorogation now.

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED: He should have at least the courtesy to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: His objection is to the word 'waste' of time of the House. Instead of the hon. Member using the words 'wasting the time of the House,' it should be 'unnecessarily taking away the time of the House.'

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA (Gauhati):** Yes, Sir. Then he is unnecessarily taking away the valuable time of the House.

Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED: Thank you very much, Sir. I was submitting before the House that actually no Bill was pending before this House when our motion for introduction of the Government Bill was placed before the House. That is what I wanted to bring before the House.

Here publication of Bill in the Gazette is not enough and does not result into the stage of pending until motion for introduction of the Bill is made and accepted by the House. That is what is generally meant and connected by a "Pending Bill". So far as the other point is concerned, I have already submitted that, admittedly, proposed amendments to Section 5, are the same. If any Hon. Member wants to suggest any change in clause 3 of Government Bill, which seeks to amend Section 5 of the Act, this can be done by moving an amendment before this House. So at least this

matter will be open for discussion at the time Government Bill is placed on the list of business. How can you allow that very matter to come before the House in this very session after the Bill has been permitted to be discussed in the Government Bill. Therefore, my submission is that if one portion of the whole Bill is admittedly bad even though it seeks to amend other provisions of this Act ; such Bill cannot be allowed. The hon. Member will be at free to modify his Bill and can come forward with other amendments in some other time to the provisions of the Act.

***Shri HARESWAR GOSWAMI (Rampur)** : I would like to draw your attention to only one point, Sir. In the last portion of Basu's Commentary in that place, so far as notice of Bills, it makes a distinction between resolution and Bills "that will remain pending....."

***Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA (Chief Minister)** : Now, Sir, because some reference has been made about me, I would only like to speak a few words but not so much as to the legal side of the matter. The Hon. Members by this time, I am certain, have appreciated the very important questions which have been raised the other day and also today on this subject. Sir, when my colleague raised this question I am quite certain that it is not his intention of meaning any disrespect to the Deputy Speaker who was in the Chair on that day. But as is clear to this House from the deliberations from both sides of the House, certain very important questions have arisen. For example, whether publication in the official Gazette itself is sufficient to say that the House is in possession of a particular matter ? The other question which has been raised is what this word 'identical' means. Is it literal in every detail, or whether the sense only is identical and so on and so forth ? That is why Sir, I think very important questions have been raised and so it should be helpful for all of us here if we get your considered ruling and clarification in this matter and on the issues that have been raised on this subject. My speech which I made on that day will be found in the proceedings of this House so I need not go into them here again. You will find there what were my submission and what was the ruling of the Deputy Speaker and what were the submissions of the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition. Therefore, I need not go into these things now. Sir, I have not been able to help you in clarifying the various questions that have been raised. As a matter of fact, we all expect that after you have heard the deliberations and arguments on this subject, we will very much be profited not only today but for future also if you give your considered opinion on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER : I am sorry. I want to take some time of the House in giving my ruling in this matter. I do not propose to give my ruling offhand. I want some time to give it because so many legal points and arguments at times conflicting, have been raised in the course of this point of order. Therefore, with your permission I want to adjourn the House till 2 p. m. today and I reserve my ruling till then.

Adjournment

The Assembly was then adjourned for lunch till 2 p. m.

*Speech not corrected.

After Lunch

Mr. SPEAKER: In the morning the House had the opportunity of hearing the arguments and discussions on the point of order raised by Shri F. A. Ahmed on the Motion to introduce the Assam Official Language (Amendment) Bill, 1961, by Shri Hareswar Goswami. The same point of order was also raised by Shri Hareswar Goswami substantially on the same ground while leave of the House to introduce the Assam Official Language (Bill,) 1961, was sought by Shri Chaliha, Leader of the House. That day also some Hon. Members took part in the course of the discussion of the point of order. The points that were discussed in the course of the discussion of the point of order were that these two Bills, namely, that of Hareswar Goswami and that of Shri Chaliha, were identical and simply the publication of a Bill in the *Assam Gazette* cannot be treated as a matter pending before the House.

Unfortunately I was not in the House at that time and the Deputy Speaker, after hearing all the points on the point of order, ruled that these two Bills are not identical and at the same time it did not rule out the scope for discussion on Shri Goswami's Bill on the Assam Official Language Act. Today, while moving the Motion for introduction of the Bill of Shri Goswami, Shri F. A. Ahmed on his point of order raised the following issues:—

1. That the Bills of Shri Chaliha and Shri Goswami are identical and as such Shri Goswami's Bill, in view of the official Bill pending before the House, is out of order.

2. That mere publication in the Gazette can not be treated as a pending matter before the House.

3. That when a part of the Bill is bad the whole Bill is bad. Let us discuss them one by one.

Issue No. 1. In Goswami's Bill Section 4 of Principal Act has been proposed to be amended along with Section 5 of the same Act which the official Bill does not propose. There is no definition of the word identical in the Act. The General Clauses Act also is silent on this point. In view of these we must go by the dictionary meaning of the word 'identical'. The Oxford Dictionary meaning of the word 'identical' is 'Agreeing in every detail'. From a physical scrutiny of the Bill it is obvious that the Bills do not agree in all details.

Issue No. 2. On a similar point like this I gave my ruling on the 13th October 1960. In that ruling I made out that no matter by mere publication in the *Assam Gazette* does form part of the Assembly proceedings, and nothing which is not in the proceedings of the Assembly can be treated as a matter being in the possession of the House. Shri Goswami cannot, therefore, claim that because his Bill has been published in the *Assam Gazette* and that the leave to introduce the Bill has been waived by Rule his Bill should be treated as a pending matter before the House.

Issue No. 3. Suppose a clause in a Bill after introduction of the Bill or at the time of taking into consideration clause by clause the Mover of the Bill wants to withdraw, whether in that case his whole Bill falls through? Or whether in the course of discussion of a Bill some of its clauses are found to be *ultra vires*, redundant or not in conformity with the provisions of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of the House, the whole Bill falls through. I searched for a precedent but nowhere I found any. But my own view in both these matters is in the negative. Because a certain clause of a Bill is redundant with some pending Bill only for this reason, the whole Bill cannot fall through.

Shri Hareswar Das raised one vital point in this connection. Whether several amending Bills proposing amendments of different sections of one and the same Act can be brought in the course of one and the same Session of a Legislature. On this point also there is no precedent. My own view is that if the Bills are not identical, there cannot be any bar in bringing different Bills by different members for amending different of the Sections Principal Act.

On very pertinent question was raised by Shri G. S. Bhattacharyya that whether a ruling given by the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker or Chairman whoever he might be could be challenged subsequently. This matter was discussed in the Presiding Officers' Conference on more than one occasion and it was decided that when the Presiding Officer of a Legislature is convinced on the unreasonableness of his ruling he may revise it at any time. Next, whether the Speaker is competent to revise any ruling given in his absence in the House by the Deputy Speaker or the Chairman. This matter also came up for discussion year before last in Presiding Officers' Conference at Hyderabad. The consensus of opinion was, 'The Speaker may depart from the ruling of a predecessor or his Deputy or a Chairman, but will do so only with the greatest reluctance and in special circumstance.'

Fortunately I am not faced with such a situation today. I have substantially no point for disagreement with the Deputy Speaker. He has correctly ruled that Shri Goswami's Bill is not identical with the official Bill.

Shri Goswami in course of the debate raised that the provision of Section 4 of the Principal Act offends Article 345 of the Constitution. I donot want to make any observation on that point. It is the High Court which is competent to discuss this question as Shri F. A. Ahmed has rightly stated.

In view of all these I allow Shri Goswami to make his Motion to introduce the Bill. I thank the hon. Members for taking part in the point of order Motion and giving me the benefit of their valuable advice in coming to a conclusion. I am also grateful to the Leader of the House for his valuable advice in this behalf.

***Shri HARESWAR GOSWAMI (Rampur):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Assam Official Language (Amendment) Bill, 1961 be introduced.

*Speech not corrected.

Sir, it has been the practice of this House not to oppose a Bill at the introduction stage and in that view of the matter I do not want to speak anything regarding the Bill at this stage.

Mr SPEAKER: Motion moved is that the Assam Official Language (Amendment) Bill, 1961 be introduced.

***Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA (Chief Minister):** We for various reasons found ourselves unable to support this Motion. The House has before it the Amending Bill which was introduced by me the other day and so far that particular Section of the Bill is concerned, there is hardly any disagreement between the hon. Member and us. But his present Bill intends to touch Section 4 of the Assam Official Language Act also which we feel, that it will not be proper for us to go into now. Therefore, Sir, I am very sorry to say that from our side of the House we are unable to lend support to this motion.

***Shri HARESWAR GOSWAMI (Rampur):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thought that no objection would be taken at this stage, viz., the introduction stage. We have been following a convention in this House and that is a Bill is not opposed at the introduction stage. However, as the Chief Minister, as the Leader of the House, has departed from that convention I want to speak a few words.

Sir, I fully appreciate his sentiments. It is not my desire to disrespect in any way the sentiment of any group of people. If the tribal brethren in the Hills do not want the Assamese language to be used for official purposes in their areas, I do not want to force it on them. As a matter of fact, in the original Act under Section 3 there is a provision for what purposes the official language can be used. Then also under section 8 the State Government has power to make rules. Therefore, Sir, I am at one with the Chief Minister or anybody in this House that we should not impose any language on anybody. With that end in view when we passed the Official Language Bill I hailed it as a very liberal piece of legislation. If you look to the Bengal Official Language Bill, which has been passed into an Act the other day, you will find that such liberal provisions are not there. There it is said that Nepali will be an additional language for the three subdivisions of the Darjeeling district. The official language will be Bengali but for those three subdivisions Nepali will be an additional language as contemplated in Article 347 of the Constitution. We have not said all those things in our Act. You will remember, Sir, that Dr. B. C. Roy during those troubled days said that the Assam Official Language Act was *ultra vires* of the Constitution. He took that point very seriously and I can understand that his main point was that in a State you cannot legislate, under Article 345, for a part of the State. It must be for the entire State.

***Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA:** May I submit, for the information of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that if he looks at the Punjab Official Language Act he will find that it provides for two official languages for two regions of that State? Similarly, my information is that there are other Official Language Acts where there are similar provisions.

Shri HARESWAR GOSWAMI (Rampur): In Punjab what has been done is this: two languages have been made official languages for the entire State, but it has been stated that for administrative purposes one language will be used in one region and the other will be used for the other region. But to keep in conformity with Article 345 both the languages have been made official languages for the whole of the State. But even supposing that Punjab has done something which is *ultra vires* of the Constitution, is that an excuse for us to do what is against the Constitution? So I am only appealing to the good sense of this House that here as legislators we have to look to that aspect of the matter also. Moreover I do not want to be accused of making any discrimination. In Cachar a group of people did not want the Assamese language, but another group wanted it. Therefore, we are making a compromise provision that so far as the Cachar district is concerned, Bengali will be used at the district level without prejudice to what we have provided in Section 3. But in the Hills we do not do so. Sir, I have no desire to wound anybody's sentiment but I want to take up a policy which is uniform, non-discriminating when we want to legislate regarding official language under Article 345. The wording of the Article is very clear:

“Subject to the provisions of Article 346 and 347, the Legislature of a State may by law adopt any one or more of the languages in use in the State or Hindi as the language or languages to be used for all or any of the official purposes of that State”.

Article 347 says that the President, on being represented, can make any language a regional language or an additional language. We do not want that anybody should go to the President when we want to do it ourselves. Therefore, we have said that so far as the autonomous districts are concerned, they will choose their language for official purposes. Similarly, for Cachar we have said Bengali. Therefore, Sir, my submission is that let us have a uniform policy for the whole State so that nobody can accuse us that because there was pressure from some quarters we have done this and because there was no pressure from other quarters we have not done this. Sir, I am not a language fanatic. As a matter of fact I have felt pained when on the Gauhati-Shilong Road I have seen signboards written in Assamese and English languages only. Couldn't we accommodate the Khasi language there? When we find “*কোম্বা*” or “narrow road”, couldn't it be written in Khasi language also? That would have created a better atmosphere. As I have said, Sir, I am not a language fanatic. All that I want is that in a State the official language should be one that is understood mostly by the people. On that consideration we accepted Assamese as the official language. Having once accepted it on principle do not bar its entry from any region. Allow it to go to any region. Whether we use it or not is a different matter, but my submission is that legally we should not put any bar if somebody wants to use it. From that point of view, I submit, Sir, that the Bill we have enacted is not in conformity with Article 345 of the Constitution. Therefore, my request is that the House should consider this aspect of the matter and should take into consideration my Bill which has a wider scope, without at the same time wounding anybody's sentiment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that the Assam Official Language (Amendment) Bill, 1961, by Shri Hareswar Goswami, be introduced.

(A division was challenged and the division bell was rung).

(After the division Bell stopped)

Mr. SPEAKER: I put the question.

***Shri HARESWAR GOSWAMI (Rampur):** Before putting up the question, I want to say a few words. It appears that the ruling party is determined not to allow us to introduce the Bill. We have been following a convention and we want to follow that. As they are not doing so, we do not like to participate.

(The Opposition members walked out).

Mr. SPEAKER: I put the question. The question is that the Assam Official Language (Amendment) Bill, 1961 by Shri Hareswar Goswami, be introduced.

(The Motion was lost).

The Assam Panchayat (Amendment) Bill, 1961.

Shri SARAT CHANDRA GOSWAMI (Kamalpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I submitted a Bill to amend the Assam Panchayat Act. But as the Government is going to bring a comprehensive legislation in the matter, so I withdraw the same.

Further discussion on the motion by Shri Hiralal Patwary re: working of the Panchayat in Assam moved on the April, 1961.

Shri DEVENDRA NATH HAZARIKA (Saikhowa): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was speaking during the last session about the necessity of training of Gaon Panchayat members. Sir, I find that there is a training programme introduced for the Presidents of Gaon Panchayats as well as Secretaries. I do not like to deal with the training of Secretary; but about the training of Presidents I am to discuss a few words. Sir, according to the recommendations of the Mehta Committee the Gaon Panchayat Presidents were to be members of Block Panchayats, i.e., the Anchalik Panchayats in our State. There is a slight departure and the Anchalik Panchayat members are elected directly from the Gaon Sabha members, and the training which are now introduced in the State and conducted by non-official trainers covers the Anchalik Panchayat members and from that syllabus the Gaon Panchayat Presidents are not benefited. The new programme of training for the Gaon Panchayat Presidents which is conducted generally by a team of officials, i.e., Block Development Officers and Extension Officers. In those training Sir, I feel that the policy matters regarding the decentralisation discussions should be made by trained non-officials. About the routine nature, training might be given by these officials; but about the discussion of decentralisation and policy matters, if the Gaon Panchayat Presidents also are trained or some talks given by trained non-officials, perhaps the mental strength and initiative of

the Gaon Panchayat Presidents will be more. It is an accepted fact that the non-official members, I mean those who are not officials, are not generally inclined to train them with those official formalities. The intention of these Gaon Panchayats were to build self-governing units of larger Indian Democracy. So, I feel that some talks may be included in the syllabus of the Gaon Panchayat Presidents' training by some trained non-officials so that they will feel, they will acquire the self-reliance and initiative in their leadership.

I do not like to take long time because on the last occasion, *i.e.*, on the 7th April, I had enough time to discuss. I hope the suggestions made by me on that day also will be taken into consideration by the Government so that our experiment of the Democratic decentralisation, *i.e.* the Panchayat system will be a success in the larger Indian Democracy.

With these few words, Sir, I like to conclude my speech.

***Shri MOHI KANTA DAS (Barchalla):** মাননীয় অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, বর্তমান আমাৰ দেশত, আমাৰ ৰাজ্যত পঞ্চায়ত আইনৰ জৰিয়তে যি আঁচনি প্ৰবৰ্ত্তন কৰা হৈছে, তাৰ দ্বাৰাই আমাৰ দেশৰ চুকে কোনে থকা সকলো গাঁও, সকলো অঞ্চল উন্নয়ন মুখী হ'বৰ নিমিত্তে যি হাবিয়াস ৰাইজৰ মনত উদ্ৰেক হৈছে, উন্নতিৰ প্ৰতি যি ইচ্ছা আকাঙ্ক্ষা বৰ্দ্ধিত হৈছে তাৰ বৰঙণী যোগাবলৈ সুবিধা হৈছে। পাৰ্বৰ্ত্ত্য অঞ্চলৰ ৰাইজৰ সুবিধাৰ কাৰণে, ডিষ্ট্ৰিক্ট কাউন্সিল'ৰ ব্যৱস্থা হৈছে আৰু সেইদৰে তৈয়াম অঞ্চলৰ ৰাইজৰ সুবিধাৰ কাৰণে পঞ্চায়ত আইন তৈয়াৰ কৰি গাঁও সভাৰ জৰিয়তে আঁচনি বিলাক কাৰ্য্যকৰী আৰু কৃতকাৰ্য্য কৰাৰ সুবিধা দিয়া হৈছে। এই আঁচনি বিলাকত গ্ৰাম্য অঞ্চলৰ উন্নতিৰ দিহা আছে আৰু জাতিৰ পিতা মহাত্মা গান্ধীয়েও দেশৰ অৰহেলিত দৰিদ্ৰ জনসাধাৰণৰ মুক্তিৰ কল্পেই ইয়াৰ সপোন দেখিছিল আৰু বাণী প্ৰচাৰ কৰিছিল। তেখেতৰ বাণীকেই শিৰোধাৰ্য্য কৰি সমগ্ৰ ভাৰতবৰ্ষতেই পঞ্চায়ত আঁচনি প্ৰবৰ্ত্তন কৰাৰ পৰিকল্পনা কৰা হৈছিল আৰু আজিৰ পঞ্চায়ত তাৰেই প্ৰকাশ। আজি আমাৰ দেশত, আমাৰ ৰাজ্যত এনে এখন গাঁও নাই, এনে এটা অঞ্চল নাই, যিটো এই আঁচনিৰ অন্তৰ্ভুক্ত নহয় বা হোৱা নাই। যোৱা পঞ্চায়ত নিৰ্বাচনত গাঁও সভাৰ প্ৰতিনিধিৰ কাৰণে, যি ৰাইজৰ উৎসাহ আৰু মনোভাৱ তাৰ পৰা এইটো স্পষ্ট বুলি কব পাৰি যে ৰাইজৰ পঞ্চায়তী আঁচনিৰ প্ৰতি অতুতপূৰ্ব্ব মনোভাৱ আৰু ভাত তেওঁলোকৰ সৰ্ব্বপ্ৰকাৰৰ সহানুভূতি আছে।

আমি দেখিছো যে ৰাইজৰ মাজত এতিয়া পঞ্চায়তী মনোভাৱ গঢ়ি উঠিছে। এতিয়া এই পঞ্চায়ত ব্যৱস্থা কি দৰে মুকললে সমাধা কৰিব পাৰি তাৰে ব্যৱস্থাৰ বিষয়ে সদনত দাঙি ধৰা হৈছে। ইয়াৰ কৃতকাৰ্য্যতা সম্পৰ্কে বিভিন্ন সদস্যই বিভিন্ন ভাবে পৰ্যালোচনা কৰিছে। এইটো সকলোৱে স্বীকাৰ কৰিব যে গাঁও সভা বিলাকেই হল পঞ্চায়তৰ ঘাই খটা। এই গাঁও সভা কেনে হ'ব লাগে সেই সম্পৰ্কে সদস্য সকলে প্ৰথমৰ্থ আগ বঢ়াইছে। এতিয়া পঞ্চায়তী ব্যৱস্থাত প্ৰথমে মন কৰিব লগায়া স্তৰটো হৈছে গাঁও সভা। এতিয়া মোৰ কথা হৈছে পঞ্চায়তী ব্যৱস্থাৰ যি কেইটা স্তৰ আছে সেই কেইটা স্তৰৰ মাজত একতা থকা উচিত। সৰহ শস্য উৎপাদনৰ কাৰণে পথাৰ পৰিচালনা কমিটি গঠন কৰা হৈছে। এই স্তৰৰ দ্বাৰা সেই অঞ্চলৰ খেতিয়ক সকলক লগ ধৰি সেই সেই অঞ্চলৰ সমস্যাবোৰ সমাধান কৰিব পাৰিব। গতিকে গাঁও সভাই এই কাম সমাধা কৰিবলৈ হলে পথাৰ কমিটিৰ লগত যোগাযোগ স্থাপন কৰি খাদ্য সামগ্ৰী বঢ়োৱাৰ পথত আগবাঢ়িব লাগিব। সৰহ শস্য উৎপাদন কৰি যদি খেতিয়কে উচিত দাম নাপায় তেন্তে সৰহ শস্য উৎপাদন কৰিবলৈ উৎসাহ পাব

কৰ পৰা ? সেই কাৰণে Service Co-operative অৰ জৰিয়তে Marketing Societyৰ জৰিয়তে আৰু State Trading ৰ জৰিয়তে উৎপন্ন বস্তুৰ উচিত দান পোৱাৰ ব্যৱস্থা কৰিছে। এতেকে এই কেইটা স্তৰৰ মাজত সমন্বয় ৰখাটো একান্ত উচিত আৰু থাকিবলৈকো বাধ্য। এই কেইটা স্তৰৰ মাজত সমন্বয় থাকিলেহে আমি পঞ্চায়তী ব্যৱস্থাৰ যি সৌধ স্থাপন কৰিবলৈ ওলাইছো সেই সৌধ স্থাপন কৰিব পাৰিম। আৰু এটা চাব লগীয়া কথা যে আমাৰ মানুহে বাধ্যত পৰি মহাজনৰ পৰা টকা ধৰ লয়। তাৰ সুবিধা লৈ তেওঁলোকে ৪।৫ টকাত ধান কিনি ধাব মাৰি লয়। গতিকে Rural Credit Society তৈয়াৰ কৰি গাঁৱলীয়া মানুহক ধাবৰ পৰা অব্যাহতি দিবলৈ আৰু মহাজনৰ শোষণৰ পৰা ৰক্ষা কৰাৰ উদ্দেশ্যে rural credit society স্থাপন কৰা হৈছে।

(At this stage the Speaker left the Chamber and the Deputy Speaker presided).

এই ৪টা অনুষ্ঠান অকল গাঁও পঞ্চায়তৰ হাততে এৰি দিলে নহব। অকল অফিচটো থাকিলেই নহব। গাঁও পঞ্চায়তে Service Co-operative আৰু পঞ্চায়ত পৰিচালনা সমিতি আদিক লৈ সমূহীয়া ভাবে উন্নতি কৰিবলৈ চেষ্টা কৰিব লাগে। ইয়াৰ বাবে অকল কৰ্মচাৰীসকল বা স্থানীয় সদস্যসকলকে দায়ী কৰিলে নহব। অন্যান্য অনুষ্ঠান বিলাকেও সহযোগ কৰি কেনেকৈ গাঁও সভা আৰু Rural Credit Society বিলাকে ভালকৈ কাম কৰিব পাৰে তাৰ নিমিত্তে চেষ্টা কৰিব লাগে। এই অনুষ্ঠান চৰকাৰী সাহায্যৰ ওপৰত চলি আছে আৰু বাইজৰ কিছু কাম হৈছে। অকল তাকে আলোচনা কৰিলে নহব। আমি চাব লাগে এই গাঁও সভাৰ কিবা অসুবিধা আছেনে নাই। কি কি উপায়ে ইয়াৰ আয় বৃদ্ধি কৰিব পাৰি তাকো চাব লাগে। খাজানা বা কৰ বেচি কৰিও যাতে সেই অঞ্চলৰ উন্নয়ন মূলক কাম কৰিব পাৰি তাকো চাব লাগে। ইয়াৰ বাহিৰে চেক্ৰেটাৰীসকলৰ পাৰিতোষিক বৃদ্ধি কৰিবৰ বাবে যি আবেদন কৰিছো তাক চৰকাৰে বিবেচনা কৰিব বুলি আশা কৰিছো।

চৰকাৰে চেমিনাৰ খোলা আঁচনি লৈছে। এইটো বৰ ভাল ব্যৱস্থা। আগেয়ে এই দৰে প্ৰশিক্ষণ দিয়াৰ ব্যৱস্থা নাছিল। চৰকাৰে চেমিনাৰ পাতি বিভিন্ন ঠাইৰ কৰ্মচাৰী সকলক প্ৰশিক্ষণ দিয়াৰ যি ব্যৱস্থা কৰিছে তেওঁলোকৰ কৰ্তব্যৰ ব্যৱস্থা কৰাটো বৰ ভাল হৈছে। মই বহুত ঠাইত দেখিছো যে গাঁৱৰ কিছুমান মানুহে এনে কিছুমান প্ৰশ্ন কৰে যিবোৰ সচাঁটকৈ বৰ আৱশ্যকীয়। চেমিনাৰত আলোচনাৰ জৰিয়তে অনুষ্ঠান বোৰৰ কেৰোণ গুচাই আৰু উন্নতীয়া সমস্যাৰো সন্ধান কৰাত বৰ সহায় হয়।

পঞ্চায়ত আইনত ক্ৰটি নাই বুলি ক'ব নোৱাৰি। কাম কৰাৰ লগে লগেহে সেইবোৰ বৰা পৰিব। এই আইনৰ জৰিয়তে খেতিয়ক বাইজৰ কল্যাণ তথা সৰ্বোদয় হোৱাৰ পথত সহায় কৰিবৰ বাবে এই সদস্য সকলৰ উপৰিও বিভিন্ন অনুষ্ঠান সমূহে সহযোগ কৰিব বুলি কামনা কৰিছো।

Shri MAHANANDA BORA (North Lakhimpur): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to take part in the motion regarding the working of Panchayats in our State. It is a very short time since during the months of January/February 1961 when elections of Panchayats were held. Till now, 6 or 7 months, only has passed, so the work of these Panchayats cannot be assessed properly. In the elections, Sir, what we have seen? We have seen that the people of our State have joined in the elections in such an enthusiastic manner that it is far more than those general elections held in this country till now. I have seen in some places about 90 per cent of the voters turned up to elect or register their votes in these Panchayat elections. Many of our friends thought before this Act came into operation, that there would be quarrel, there would be disturbances in the elections, as the voting system is new, but, Sir, from the experience what we

have seen? There were practically no such disturbance during the elections. Only in one or two places there were nominal disturbances but in about 99 per cent pollings there was no disturbance. Sir, as we know the whole of our country (India) is formed of villages in which about 80 per cent of people are living in villages. And so, development of India means development of India's 5½ lakhs villages. To develop these villages, Sir, we must give them something. We must arouse initiative in them so that spirit of development of these villages comes from within the villages. With this aim our Government has introduced Panchayat scheme and along with it the other constructive schemes such as co-operative scheme which is for the economic development of villages. Sir, according to our Prime Minister, in every village there should be three institutions. These 3 institutions are (1) Village Panchayat, (2) Village Co-operative and (3) Village School. Now Sir, co-operative scheme is the stand point of the village to work on economic lines but the service co-operatives are yet to come in its proper form. Though there are some Service Co-operatives now in our State these are not working in its proper form. Sir, if we cannot create a co-ordination between the Service Co-operative, the Village Panchayat and the Village Schools, these three basic institutions cannot succeed. So, Sir, our main work now is to form Service Co-operatives in every village Panchayat and if we can make these co-operatives active and prosperous than only the economic condition of Panchayats will improve. Many of our friends are speaking regarding amendment of the Act someone is saying let us divide the income from the markets, someone is thinking on other lines also for augmenting the resources of the Panchayat. But, Sir, we are not taking up the important points. Sir, we are not taking on the main points. We have seen no Panchayat upto now in the State of Assam tapping for its own resources in any way. Every Panchayat is now dependent on Government grant and whether it is Gaon or Anchalik Panchayat it is always looking to the Government for grants. Generally what we have seen is that all these Panchayats are dependent on the land revenue and the share of local rate and the small amount earned from the sale of markets, hats, pounds, ferries, etc. Sir, if we can co-ordinate the Service Co-operative with Village Panchayat in an effective way then Sir, I think these Village Panchayats will be able to get their resources from the business carried out by the Service Co-operatives and upto now what we have seen is that in villages the people have not understood the real meaning of the Service Co-operatives and upto now people are thinking that Service Co-operatives are meant for only paddy business. We have seen not a single Service Co-operative in the State which is actually rendering service as it should have given to the rural people. So Sir, I think, to make the Panchayat effective, we must first establish in every Gaon Panchayat at least one Service Co-operative as early as possible. Otherwise, I see no other way to augment the resources of the Gaon Panchayat according to their needs. Now Sir, in our State this House has passed the Panchayat Act which provides for a three Tier System of Panchayats, one Panchayat at the village level, the second at the Block level and the third at the Mahakuma or Subdivisional level. Now what we have seen in the actual working is that the Mahakuma Parishad has practically no work of its own, but it is only an Advisory Body to Advise the different departmental heads on the work of the schemes. The execution of the work mainly depends upon the Anchalik Panchayat and the Gaon Panchayat. According to our Panchayat Act our Gaon Sabha is the most powerful and the most active organisation. Now Sir, what we have seen in the organisation of this Gaon Sabha is that in majority of them work upto now is not at all satisfactory. This is due to the fact that new

people are coming to these Panchayats and new people are elected and these people without any experience of work in Local Bodies before are now unable to cope with the work they have in hand. Moreover, what we have seen where the President is weak, the Secretary is practically the Panchayat and where the President is strong there the President is the Panchayat. These things are happening in the Gaon Sabha level. To correct all these things, I think, Government will go on intensive training work of these Panchayat Members and Panchayat Presidents, because some of the Presidents, we have seen, do not understand what the work of a President is. So Sir, I stress mainly upon the intensive training of the Gaon Panchayat Members and Presidents. Because in our Panchayat administration Gaon Panchayat is the most important working unit. The Anchalik Panchayat has its technical personnel and there are some educated people also in the Anchalik Panchayat. So, the Anchalik Panchayat has less difficulties than the Gaon Panchayat, because every problem comes to them and they are to face it squarely. So I think, Sir, Government will intensify the training programme of Gaon Panchayat and the existing Members. On the other hand, Sir, what we have seen regarding the co-ordination between the Co-operatives and the Gaon Panchayats is that in some places, we have seen that these co-operatives are not mainly engaged in paddy business. There are several co-operatives in one Gaon Panchayat where there are more paddy growing areas. There is no Service Co-operative virtually where there is no paddy. This is the position. There may be also Service Co-operative where there is no paddy. So I think this co-ordination between the Service Co-operatives and the Gaon Panchayat should be taken earnestly and should be made early.

Now Sir, regarding the Village Schools in our State the position is in every Gaon Panchayat there is at least one school. In some Gaon Panchayat there are two or three Lower Primary Schools also. Once we thought that the Lower Primary School belonging to the Gaon Panchayat area will serve as an office and on the holidays the Panchayat meetings will be held in the School, but in practice we have seen there is no co-ordination between the school authority and the Panchayat.

Sir, we are trying in several places to bring co-ordination between them but what we have seen is that the School Board is above the School authority and Panchayat has above it the Panchayat authority. As there is little or no co-ordination at the top, Sir, co-ordination could not be brought at the lower level also. So my humble suggestion is that there should be close co-ordination amongst these 3 basic institutions namely, the Panchayat, co-operative and L. P. School. Sir, I feel that some administrative works should be divided between the Panchayat and the School Board for the purpose of bringing co-ordination between the School authority and the Panchayat authority. I am happy to learn that the Government is thinking on this line and some administrative work is going to be given to the Anchalik Panchayat with a view to bring some sort of co-ordination.

Regarding Anchalik Panchayat, Sir, generally where there is a N. E. S. block in intensive or normal stage it is some what working. Where there is Anchalik Panchayat and block there are some technical personnel and therefore the block can do good work. But where there is no block what happens? The Panchayat cannot maintain technical personnel like Overseer, etc., for their technical guidance and help in technical matters and in many other things. In some Anchalik Panchayat which have less income, the staff which has been given to them has now become a regular burden to the

Panchayat because the Panchayat cannot pay the staff which has been given to them. Sir, the working of the Panchayat differ from place to place and it is bound to differ because all places cannot be same. Some Panchayats have revenue amounting only to 3 or 4 thousand rupees annually. With this small amount of income these Panchayat can hardly maintain technical persons like Overseers, etc. These Panchayats cannot regularly make payment to their staff whose emolument on the other hand is not much. So Sir, the question of Anchalik Panchayat should be taken up separately because in different areas positions of Panchayats are different. In some advanced areas the Panchayats are financially sound and has more income. In my own subdivision, I have seen that some Panchayats have earned their incomes to the tune of rupees 40/50 thousand and in some cases I have seen that income of some Panchayats hardly comes upto Rs.2,800 or 2,600 for the whole year. So Sir, the question of grant and other things to the Panchayats should be viewed from the statement of income of the Panchayats otherwise some Panchayats cannot work. It has now come to my notice that some Panchayats are spending money from some specific Government grants in payment of their staff. I think the Government should take some steps in this direction.

Sir, there is another anomaly regarding Gaon Panchayat Secretary. In some places what I have seen is that where the Gaon Panchayat Secretary is a strong man he can pull on with the President, but where the Secretary is a weak man he is to carry out the orders of the President like a Peon. He cannot but carry out the orders of the President. There is none to save him. He is entirely at the mercy of the President. Therefore Sir, I think there should be some service rules regarding Gaon Panchayat Secretary. I hope the Government will take steps in this direction at least to save the poor Secretary from the whims of the President. I have seen in many places that the Secretary cannot be saved by anyone when the president rightly or wrongly wants to discharge him. Many secretaries are discharged and many are to face loss of pay. So some measures for protection of these Officers may be taken.

Then Sir, I come to another point. The Panchayat is an elected body and within the Panchayat there are some working groups or functional sub-committees. But in Panchayat area there may be some people who are very efficient in some works such as in agriculture, arts, etc., but they may not be elected to the Gaon Panchayat. In such a case of agriculturists, inclusion of these people in the field management committee will be desirable, because the field management committee is an important wing of agriculture. If such other people are included in other functional sub-committees for reasons of their experience if it is not done on efficiency basis but done on party basis then there may be some 'Khelimeli' between these committees. Because there are also other functional sub-committees like Jubak Mondal, Mahila mondal etc. They are to be treated as branches of the Panchayat. These groups are the real working groups and I think some more attention should be given to these working committees.

Sir, as regards Mehkuma Parishad there is another parallel parishad namely the Development Board under the presidentship of the D. C. or S. D. O. as the case may be. And this Committee is also to review the work of different Departments and they are to formulate plans also which are to

be submitted to the Mohkuma Parishad. Generally what happens? The departmental head in each Subdivision or District cares not to submit their working reports to the Mohkuma Parishad, and what I have seen as the President of a Mohkuma Parishad that no report for review is available with the Mohkuma Parishad. Such report is generally submitted to the Subdivisional Officer or Deputy Commissioner who is the Chairman or the President of the Development Committee of the Subdivision or District. Sir, these are two parallel bodies, one is the Development Committee which is under the presidentship or chairmanship of the Subdivisional Officer or Deputy Commissioner as the case may be and the other is the Mohkuma Parishad which is under the presidentship of non-Official members where M. L. As. and M. Ps. are along with them, there are *ex-officio* members such as the Executive Engineer or some other departmental heads who are also members of the Development Committee and all the departmental head and member of these two bodies are working like a parallel Committee. So in such a condition my humble suggestion is that these Mohkuma Parishad should be abolished and that official Committee should be given full powers whatever they want to do regarding developmental activities in the Subdivision or districts.

Again, Sir, if these Mohkuma Parishads are to work, some sort of power should be given, otherwise they have no work and it is better to do away with the Mohkuma Parishad. Then, Sir, my suggestion regarding all these things, and I centre my suggestions on three or four points which are as follows. (1) we must establish some sort of co-ordination between the village panchayat, and other development committees in the villages, otherwise the Panchayat cannot function efficiently; (2) my suggestion is that there should be certain set of rules and service condition with some appellate authorities for the Gaon Panchayat Secretaries which can save them from the whims of the President; (3) Thirdly, if we want these Subdivisional organisations like the Mohkuma Parishad to grow, some powers should be vested in them for their existence, otherwise, we cannot expect them to go ahead; (4) fourthly, I suggest that the matter of settlement of land which is now under the Revenue Department should also be given to the panchayat at least in an advisory capacity. Settlement and reservation of land should be brought to the Panchayats because, as I have seen in certain case, what cannot be done by the Land Record staff or Settlement Staff can be done by the Panchayat amicably. So, Sir, I think this land settlement work should be brought to the Panchayats at least in some advisory capacity. The land settlement advisory Board is now in the subdivisional level which cannot execute anything by itself, it can only advise the Subdivisional Officer regarding settlement of land. So, Sir, Government can give some power in the advisory capacity to these Panchayats in the matter of land settlement in the Subdivisions and districts.

***Shri HIRALAL PATWARY (Panery) :** On a point of clarification, Sir, whether the hon. Member wants to give power to the Gaon Panchayat or the Anchalik Panchayat in an advisory capacity or whether he wants that the Anchalik Panchayat or the Mohkuma Parishad should be made Advisory bodies?

Shri MOHANANDA BORA (North-Lakhimpur) : I want that the Anchalik Panchayat should be given the land settlement advisory capacity because the Anchalik Panchayats are the representative bodies of the

Gaon Panchayats. There is the L. S. A. Board at the subdivisional level which advises the Subdivisional Officers or Deputy Commissioners regarding settlement of land. My fifth suggestion is that from the Government side we should give some stress on the working of the functional Sub-committees in the Panchayat level. The sixth suggestion is that we should give intensive thought to the training programmes at different levels. Intensive training programme should be undertaken by Government to make these Panchayats working in villages. I am happy that the Government has already taken up the training programme in different levels but it should be more intensive because the present meele is created specially in the village level, due to the ignorance of the members of the Gaon Panchayats and Secretaries. On the other hand, I have another suggestion regarding the officials. I have seen that there are various training centres in India where the officers of these Development Departments and Panchayats are trained. Sir, I think there should be one training institution in our State also for the officials especially those officers who are to work in collaboration with the people such as the Block Officers and the Extension Officers of the Block who are to work always with the people. The training should be their special qualification ; they should be taught to work with the people, not as their masters but as servants of the people. I think our Government will try to establish one training institution for the officials at least for the Block and the Extension Officers of the Block in our State in a suitable place. Sir, these are my suggestions regarding improvement of the Panchayats. As I have said at the beginning that it is not possible within a short time to assess what has been done by the Panchayats during those six or seven months. We cannot visualise how the Panchayats will grow but we nourish the hope that these Panchayats which are the dreams of the Father of the Nation will make their achievements so that our villages in the countryside may prosper. With these words, Sir, I resume my seat.

***Shri SARAT CHANDRA GOSWAMI (Kamalpur) :**

উপাধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, পঞ্চায়ত বিল সম্পর্কে যি সকল সভাই যিবোৰ কথা আলোচনা কৰি গৈছে মই সেইবোৰৰ পুনৰুক্তি নকৰো। ঠিক এটা কথা মই বিশেষ ভাবে কওঁ যে এতিয়াও পঞ্চায়ত সমূহে কল্যাণমূলক কামখিনি যেনে, বাস্তা পদূলী বনোৱা, পানীৰ যোগাৰ দিয়া ইত্যাদি কাম খিনি কৰি অটাব পাৰিলে তেওঁলোকৰ কাম শেষ হ'ল বুলি ভাবে। কিন্তু এই মনোভাৱটো যেতিয়ালৈকে দূৰ নহয় তেতিয়ালৈকে পঞ্চায়তৰ প্ৰকৃত উদ্দেশ্য সাধন নহ'ব।

বৰ্তমান পঞ্চায়ত ব্যৱস্থা প্ৰবৰ্তন হৈছে পঞ্চায়ত আইনমতে। এই ব্যৱস্থাটো এই প্ৰাথমিক গোট মত্ৰ। ইয়াক কাৰ্য্যকৰী কৰিবলৈ আৱশ্যকীয় পৰিবেশ সৃষ্টি কৰিব নোৱাৰিলে ভাল কাম নহ'ব। আমাৰ ভিতৰতে এনে এটা মনোভাৱ হৈছে যে পঞ্চায়ত কৰ্মচাৰী সকলে একো নেজানে, বেয়া মানুহ। এনে মনোভাৱ হলে কাম কৰা টান। আমি চাব লাগে পঞ্চায়তৰ কাৰণে যি সামাজিক পৰিবেশ দৰকাৰ সেইটো পৰিবেশ হৈছেনে নাই। সেই পৰিবেশ সৃষ্টি কৰাৰ পৰিবৰ্তে যদি কৰ্মচাৰী সকলক দোষাৰোপ কৰো তেন্তে সভাপতি বা সভ্য সকলৰো কামত আস্থা নোথাকিব বৰং বাৰাগ ভাৰহে জন্মিব। সেইবাবে আমাৰ চৰকাৰী বিষয়া গৈ পৰামৰ্শ দি বা কাৰ্য্যকৰী আচনি দি কেনেকৈ আয় বঢ়াই আৰ্থিক অৱস্থাৰ উন্নতি কৰিব পাৰিব বা কামবোৰ সুচাৰু কপে সমাধা কৰিব পাৰি দেখুৱাব লাগে।

পঞ্চায়তৰ প্ৰধান কথা হৈছে টকা নেপায়। চৰকাৰৰ পৰা যি টকা পায় সেইয়া কৰ্মচাৰীৰ বেতন আৰু অফিচৰ যাবতীয় খৰছতে যায়। পঞ্চায়তে গড়ে ১২০০ বা ১৫০০ টকা পায়। চেক্ৰেটাৰীৰ বেতনত যায় ৭০০। তাৰোপৰি কেবাটাও আৰু পিয়নৰ টকা, ঘৰ ভাৰা ইত্যাদি আছেই। সেইবাবে বাইজৰ কামৰ বাবে টকা নেথাকেই। আগেয়ে উনুয়ন বিভাগৰ টকা গাঁৱৰ কামত খটাইছিল, কিন্তু এতিয়া তাৰ বৃজন অংশ এটা কৰ্মচাৰীক দিওঁতেই যায়। আনফালে আনকোনো উপাৰ্জনৰ পথ নাই। সেইবাবে পঞ্চায়তৰ লগত যদি একোজন সংগঠক বাপি কেনেকৈ কাম কৰিব লাগে, আয় বঢ়াব লাগে আদি দেখুৱাব লাগে (এটা মাত-দৰমহা কোনে দিব?) তাৰ ব্যৱস্থা থাকিব লাগে। এইদৰে হলে কৰ্মচাৰীকো কামত উৎসাহ দিয়া হব। বৰ্তমান ব্যৱস্থাত পঞ্চায়ত কাৰ্য্যকৰী নহব। এই পঞ্চায়ত ব্যৱস্থাৰ পৰা আমি বিপ্লৱ আশা কৰিছিলো। তাৰ পৰিবৰ্ত্তে এতিয়া অন্য এটা বিপ্লৱ হোৱাহে অনুমান হয়।

আগতে লোকলবোৰ্ডৰ এলেকাৰ হাট-বজাৰ বিলাকৰ আয় লোকলবোৰ্ডৰ আছিল আৰু তাৰ পৰাই বাজহুৱা কাম কৰিছিল। কিন্তু এতিয়া সৰু সৰু হাটহে গাওঁ সভাই পায়; ডাঙৰ হাটবোৰ আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়তৰ। এই হাট-বজাৰ লৈ বহুত ঠাইত মৰামৰি পৰ্য্যন্ত হৈছে। সেইদৰে আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়তৰ মাজতো কাজিয়া। কামৰূপৰ হাটলী বজাৰ খনৰ বাৰ্ষিক আয় ৮০/৯০ হেজাৰ টকা। এই বজাৰ খন প্ৰায় সীমাত পৰিছে গতিকে হাটখন তুলি নি গোবৰ্দ্ধনাত পাতিছে যাতে গোটেই আয় একেখন পঞ্চায়তে পায়। এনে মনোভাবৰ পৰা পঞ্চায়তত ভাঙোনে ধৰিছে।

এনেকৈ কিছুমান হাত বজাৰ হয়তো দুখন পঞ্চায়তৰ সীমাত পৰিছে তাৰ আয় কোনে পায় এইটো লৈ বহুত অৱিয়ান্বি হৈছে। আকৌ মোটা আয় বিলাক আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়তলৈ যায় ইও এটা আসোৱাহ। তেওঁলোকে কয় যে গাওঁ পঞ্চায়তৰ কোনো আয় নাই।

আৰু এটা নতুন অৱিয়া অৰিব সৃষ্টি হৈছে সেইটো হল এই যে তেওঁলোকে পঞ্চায়তৰ চেক্ৰেটাৰী সম্বন্ধে বহুত কথাই কৈছে। আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়তৰ নিৰ্দেশ মতে গাওঁ সভাই সভাপতি নিয়োগ কৰিব। বহুত গাওঁ সভাই আপত্তি কৰিছিল যে তেওঁলোকে চেক্ৰেটাৰী নহলেও চলিব পাৰে। এনে আপত্তি পঞ্চায়তৰ চেক্ৰেটাৰী আৰু ডাইৰেক্টৰৰ ওচৰলৈকো পঠাইছিল যে এজন চেক্ৰেটাৰী নিছাটিক আছে কোনো কাম দিব পৰা নাই।

গতিকে গাওঁসভা বিলাকক ওপৰৰ পৰা চাপ নিদি গাওঁসভাৰ সকলো কামৰ বোজা তেওঁলোকৰ ওপৰত দিব লাগে। সেই দায়িত্ব বিলাক গাওঁসভাৰ সভাপতিয়ে কৰিবলৈ দায়িত্ব লৈছে।

আৰু এটা কথা আগৰ যিবিলাক লোকলবোৰ্ডৰ **Overseer, Lower Division Assistant; Muharar** আছিল সেইবিলাকক আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়তক জাপি দিছে আৰু তেওঁলোকে দৰকাৰ নহলেও ৰাখিব লগীয়া হৈছে। মোৰ এলাকাৰ আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়তৰ এলাকাত ২।। ৰাস্তাও হোৱা নাই কিন্তু ওপৰৰ পৰা হেচা দিয়া কাৰণে দুটা মহৰী এনেয়ে ৰাখিব লগা হৈছে। গতিকে যদি এনে এটা ব্যৱস্থা চলি থাকে, তেতিয়া তেওঁলোকে যিখিনি অনুদান পায় সেইটো দৰমহা দিওঁতেই শেষ হব আৰু ঠিকমতে কাম কৰিব নোৱাৰে।

সেইকাৰণে আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়তক কিছু এইবিলাক বিষয়ত স্বাধীনতা দিব লাগে, যাতে তেওঁলোকৰ যিমান চাকৰীয়াৰ দৰকাৰ সেইমতে তেওঁলোকে নিয়োগ কৰিব পাৰে। সেই বিষয়ে যাতে ওপৰৰ পৰা কোনো হেচা তেওঁলোকৰ ওপৰত নপৰে, তেনে নিয়ম কৰিব লাগে।

তাৰ পিচত, আগতে যেতিয়া Rural Panchayat ৰ আনোল আছিল তেতিয়া এটা বিস্তীৰ্ণ এলেকাৰ লোকে একগোট হৈ এটা wider out look লৈ কাম কৰিছিল কিন্তু এতিয়াৰ ব্যবস্থা মতে সেই wider out look টো লোপ পাইছে আৰু স্থানীয় কাম কাজৰ দায়িত্বৰ কথাতো বাধা পাইছে। এতিয়া গাঁও পঞ্চায়ত আৰু আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়ত দুয়োটাৰে কিছু আসোৱাহ পৰিলক্ষিত হৈছে। তেওঁলোকে ন্যায্যভাৱে যিটো পাব লাগে সেইটো পোৱা নাই বুলি ভাবে আৰু নিজৰ এলেকাত কাম কৰাৰ সুবিধা নাই বুলি ভাবে। গতিকে আঞ্চলিক আৰু গাঁও পঞ্চায়তৰ মাজত এটা অসহযোগৰ ভাব জাগি উঠিছে। এই ভাবটো দূৰ কৰাৰ নিতান্ত প্ৰয়োজন হৈছে।

এতিয়াৰ আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়ত আইনৰ Section 162 মতে আগৰ যিবিলাক Rural Panchayat President আছিল সেই বিলাক এতিয়া full fledged মেম্বাৰ। সেইটো নাকাচ কৰা নহল। সেই বিষয়ে এটা কেচ্ হাইকোর্ট পালে।

এই মেম্বাৰ খিনিৰ ভালোখিনি মেম্বাৰে আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়তৰ সভাপতি হৈছে; এই বিষয়ে এটা সংশোধনীও আনিছিল যাতে 1st term ত তেওঁলোকক full fledged member হিচাবে treat কৰা হয় কিন্তু এতিয়াও সেইটোৰ একো হোৱা নাই।

পঞ্চায়তৰ যিবিলাক কথা হৈছে তাত panchayat ৰ তিনিটা pillar এই তিনিটা সবল কৰি গঢ়িলেহে গোটেই structure টো বহন কৰিব পাৰিব। গতিকে এই বিলাক পৰিচালনাত যাতে ওপৰৰ পৰা নিৰ্দেশ নাহে সেইটো তলৰ পৰা আহিব লাগে।

আমাৰ যি বিলাক সমবায় সমিতি আৰু service co-operative হব লাগে সেই বিলাক ঠিকমতে এতিয়াও ব্যবস্থা হোৱা নাই। এইফালে service co-operative নহলে টকা ধাৰ নাপায় আগৰ যিবিলাক গাঁৱলীয়া বেঙ্ক আছিল বা অন্যান্য টকা ধাৰ দিয়া অনুষ্ঠান আছিল সেই বিলাক এতিয়া নাই।

মোৰ নিজৰ অভিজ্ঞতাৰ পৰা মই ক'ব পাৰো যে বিশেষকৈ co-operative credit society য়ে কোনো ক্ষেত্ৰত কিছুমান মানুহক ধাৰ মুক্ত কৰিছে আৰু কিছুমানক ধাৰ গ্ৰস্ত কৰিছে। খেতিয়কে সময়মতে যি টকা পাব লাগে, সেই টকা যথা সময়ত নাপায়। উদাহৰণ স্বৰূপে ধৰক, মৰাপাটৰ খেতিৰ সময়ত টকা পাব লাগে কিন্তু সেই টকা খেতিৰ সময়ত নাপাই কাটিবৰ সময়ত পায়। তাৰ ফলত এই টকাৰ প্ৰকৃত উদ্দেশ্যত বাধা পৰে আৰু সেই টকা আন কামত খৰচ হয়।

এই টকা অনাহকত খৰচ হোৱা কাৰণে খেতিয়ক সকলৰ আৰ্থিক অবস্থা ভাল হওক চাৰি শোচণীয় হৈছে।

গতিকে সেই ফালে যদি মনোনিবেশ কৰা হয় তেন্তে service co-operative বিলাকক পঞ্চায়তৰ লগত ভালকৈ খাপ খুৱাই পঞ্চায়তৰ মেম্বাৰ সকলৰ ওপৰত যাতে সম্পূৰ্ণ দায়িত্ব পৰে তেনে কৰিব লাগে।

বৰ্ত্তমান ব্যবস্থাত দেখা যায় যে তাত যি বিলাক সভাপতি, চেৰেক্টাৰী বা Managing Member আছে, তেওঁলোকৰ ভিতৰতে ধাৰৰ টকা ভাগ বাতি নিয়ে; বেলেগ মানুহে সেই টকা নাপায়।

আমি আজি দেখা পাওঁ যে, ঋণ সম্বায় যি বিলাক সমিতি আছে, সেই বিলাকৰ বেচি ভাগতেই, তাৰ চেফ্ৰেটৰী সভাপতি আৰু মেনেজিং কমিটিৰ সদস্য সকলেই বেচি ঋণ পায়; বাহিৰা মানুহে নাপায়হে। সেই কাৰণে এই বিলাক বে-আইনী কাৰ্য্যৰ অবসান ঘটাব লাগে। তাৰ পিচত, পঞ্চায়তৰ অন্তৰ্গত যি বিলাক গাঁও সভা আছে, তেওঁলোকৰ মাজত বাধ্যতা মূলক ভাবে, আৱশ্যকীয় সংখ্যক Co-operatives store থাকিব লাগে আৰু সেই store ৰ জৰিয়তে, গাঁৱৰ বাইজৰ আৱশ্যকীয় মাল পত্ৰ সম্ভাৱিত আৰু উচিত দামত যোগান ধৰাৰ ব্যৱস্থা থাকিব লাগে আৰু তাৰ পৰা বছৰি লাভৰ অংশৰ দিভিডেণ্ট অংশিদাৰ সকলক দিয়াৰ ব্যৱস্থা থাকিব লাগে আৰু তাৰ লগে লগে, store বিলাকৰ কাৰণে একোটা Reserve fund বা পুঞ্জি ৰাখিব লাগে। এনে ব্যৱস্থা লাগে কোনো যাতে ঠোৱ অথবা অংশীদাৰ সকলৰ লোকচান হ'ব নোৱাৰে। এই বিলাক provision নথকাৰ কাৰণে আজি বহুতো সম্বায় অনুষ্ঠান ভাঙি যাব লগা হৈছে আৰু ইয়াৰ পৰা গাঁৱৰ মানুহ বিলাকৰ আস্থা নোহোৱা হৈছে। এই আচনিৰ কৃতকাৰ্য্যতা নিৰ্ভৰ কৰে, জনসাধাৰণৰ আস্থা আৰু সহানুভূতিৰ ওপৰত। কাজেই জনসাধাৰণৰ আস্থা আৰু সহানুভূতি পাবই লাগিব। ইয়াৰ কাৰণে চৰকাৰে আৱশ্যকীয় ব্যৱস্থা হাতত ল'ব লাগে এই মৰ্মে মই কেইটামান পৰামৰ্শ আগ বঢ়াব খুজিছোঁ :

(১) পঞ্চায়ত বিলাকৰ গাঁও সভা বিলাকৰ জনসাধাৰণ হতাশা গুচাব লাগিব আৰু মানুহ বিলাকক বুজাই বঢ়াই আস্থাৰ পথলৈ ঘূৰাই আনিব লাগিব। নহলে এই অনুষ্ঠান বিলাকেৰে সৰল গাঁৱলীয়া সমাজত আভুৱা ভবা হ'ব।

(২) গাঁও পঞ্চায়ত বিলাকে যাতে বাইজৰ সামাজিক আৰু অৰ্থনৈতিক অৱস্থা টনকীয়া কৰিব পাৰে তাৰ কাৰণে বিভিন্ন আচনি যেনে, সম্বায় পালটী, ফাৰ্ম, খেতি বাতি আদি ব্যৱস্থা হাতত ল'ব পাৰে তাৰ ব্যৱস্থা কৰিব লাগে।

(৩) আঞ্চলিক আৰু গাঁও সভাৰ মাজত মিচো আনাবী ভাব হৈছে, সেইটো গুচাব লাগিব আৰু আইনৰ যিবিলাক দোষ পৰিলক্ষিত হৈছে সেইবিলাক আতৰ কৰিব লাগিব। এনে ব্যৱস্থা ললেহে, পঞ্চায়তৰ কৰ্মচাৰী আৰু বাইজৰ আত্মবিশ্বাসৰ ভাব আহিব আৰু আত্মবিশ্বাস বাঢ়িব।

ইয়াৰ ভিতৰতে এটা প্ৰধান কথা যে যিবিলাক কৰ্মচাৰীয়ে প্ৰশিক্ষণ লাভ কৰি আহিছে, তেওঁলোকৰ অভিজ্ঞতা বিলাক Practical field ত খটাব লাগে নহলে প্ৰশিক্ষণৰ কোনো অৰ্থ নাই। গতিকে, এই বিষয়ত চৰকাৰে বিশেষ মনোযোগ দিব লাগে। নহলে সমাজৰ নতুন দৃষ্টি ভঙ্গিত কোনো প্ৰকাৰৰ পৰিবৰ্তন হোৱা টান সমাজৰ কল্যাণৰ হকে সকলো প্ৰকাৰৰ সুযোগ সুবিধা চৰকাৰে দিয়াৰ ব্যৱস্থা কৰিব লাগে, ইয়াকে কৈ মোৰ বক্তব্য সামৰিলোঁ।

Shri KHOGENDRA NATH BARBARUAH (Amguri):

মাননীয় উপাধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, আমাৰ দেশত বৃটিচ শাসনৰ অবসানৰ লগে লগে, আমাৰ বাইজে ভাৰিছিল, দেশৰ স্বাধীনতা আহিল। তাৰ লগে লগে দেশৰ সামাজিক অৰ্থনৈতিক আৰু ৰাজনৈতিক ক্ষেত্ৰত স্বাধীন জাতিৰ মৰ্য্যদা সহকাৰে উন্নতিৰ অভিমুখে ধাৰিত হ'ব। শাসন ক্ষেত্ৰত, বিকেন্দ্ৰীকৰণ হ'ব, দুখৰ বাতিৰ অবসান হ'ব, নতুন সমাজ ৰচনা হ'ব।

কিন্তু এতিয়া দেখা গৈছে চৰকাৰৰ পঞ্চায়ত আইনৰ বলত সেই বিলাক আশা আকাঙ্ক্ষাৰ সৰ্বনাশ হৈছে। পঞ্চায়ত আইন আৰু পঞ্চায়ত ভাবে, বাইজক ব্যতিব্যস্ত কৰি তুলিছে। সকলো পথতে হতাশাৰ সৃষ্টি কৰিছে আৰু অনুপ্ৰেৰণা কমাই দিছে। আজি, কিয় এনে হৈছে? বাছনি কমিটিৰ সদস্য ময়ো আছিলো আৰু তাত মই অমত প্ৰকাশ কৰোঁতে

অৰ্থাৎ Note of dissent দিওঁতে বিশেষ দুটা কথা কৈছিলো যে, (১) ভাৰতবৰ্ষৰ ধনী পুঞ্জিপতি বিলাকে দৰিদ্ৰৰ ওপৰত শোষণ চলাই আছে আৰু ইয়াৰ ওৰ নপৰিলে সমাজৰ কল্যাণ নাই। পুঞ্জিপতিৰ সম্পত্তি সমাজীকৰণ কৰাৰ ক্ষমতা পঞ্চায়তত নাই। দ্বিতীয়তে মই এই কথা কৈছিলো যে, গাওঁ সভাৰ কাৰণে যি ১৫% পুঞ্জি ধৰা হৈছে সি কম হৈছে আৰু আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়তৰ কাৰণে যিটো ১০ পাৰ চেণ্ট ধৰা হৈছে সিও কম হৈছে। এনেহলে আচনি কৃতকাৰ্য্য কৰাত বাধা পৰিব। এইটো স্বীকাৰ কৰিব লাগিব যে প্ৰত্যেক বছৰে খাবলৈ মানুহৰ সংখ্যা বাঢ়িছে। চৰকাৰৰ নিজৰ হিচাবতেই পাৰ এইবিলাক ; ডুমিহীন মানুহ কিমান ? খাবলৈ নোহোৱাৰ সংখ্যা কিমান ? কাজেই অকল পঞ্চায়ত গঠন কৰিলেই এইবিলাকৰ সমাধান নহয়। ইয়াৰ কাৰণে চৰকাৰে ব্যৱস্থা হাতত লব লাগিব ডুমিহীনক মাটি দিব লাগিব আৰু এই মাটি পুঞ্জিপতি সকলৰ হাতৰ পৰা চৰকাৰে কাঢ়ি লব লাগিব। এইদৰে মাটি বিতৰণ কৰি কৃষি সমবায় গঠন কৰি তাৰ আবশ্যকীয় আহিলা পাতিব যোগান ধৰিব লাগিব।

সমবায়ৰ যোগেদি বস্ত্ৰ উৎপাদন কৰিব লাগিব। তাকে কৰিবলৈ হলে অন্ততঃ উৎপাদন ক্ষেত্ৰত মাটি কাৰো একচেতীয়া হৈ থাকিব নালাগে। শস্য উৎপাদনৰ অৰ্থ-বৈজ্ঞানিক পদ্ধতিৰে খেতি কৰাৰ কাৰণে মাটি উন্নতীয়া হব লাগিব। আৰু সকলো শিল্প শিল্প পতিৰ হাতৰ পৰা চৰকাৰৰ হাতলৈ আহিব লাগিব অৰ্থাৎ শিল্প সমূহ সমাজীকৰণ হব লাগিব। তাকে নকৰিলে উৎপাদন, বিতৰণ বস্ত্ৰৰ বা দ্ৰব্যৰ মূল্য নিৰ্দ্ধাৰণ কৰা সম্ভৱ নহয়। এতিয়া বস্ত্ৰৰ দাম অতিৰিক্তবাঢ়িছে। কোনে কৰিছে ? পুঞ্জিপতি ধনী লোক সকলে কৰিছে লাভৰ অৰ্থে। চৰকাৰে চাই আছে। বস্ত্ৰ কিনা বেচা ক্ষেত্ৰত পুঞ্জিপতিৰ কোনো হাত থাকিব নালাগিব। তাকে নকৰি state trading কৰিলে কি লাভ হব ? আগতে মহাজনে গাড়ী লৈ গাঁৱে গাঁৱে ধান চাউল যোগাব কৰি ফুৰিব লাগিছিল এতিয়া state trading হোৱাৰ পৰা মহাজনে ঘৰৰ মুখতে চৰকাৰে ধানৰ যোগান ধৰিছে এইদৰে পুঞ্জিপতিক সহায় কৰিছে। কিন্তু আকৌ চাওঁক কাপোৰ সূতা; তেল-নিমখৰ কণ্ট্ৰল কৰা নাই। চৰকাৰে কতনো টেক্স লগাইছে চাইকেলৰ ওপৰতো টেক্স হল। চাইকেলে নো বাস্তাৰ কিমান মাটি খহায় ? বাৰিষা চাইকেলতকৈ ভৰিয়ে বেচি মাটি খহায় চৰকাৰে ভৰিতো টেক্স লগাবনে কি ? এতিয়া টেক্স প্ৰত্যেক কথাতে লগা হল। একালে পুঞ্জিপতিৰ শোষণ, অন্যফালে চৰকাৰৰ কৰ, পঞ্চায়তৰ ভিতৰৰ মানুহৰ সূৰু ক'ত ? আলি-পুখুৰী আদি যাতায়ত আৰু যোগানৰ কাৰণে পঞ্চায়তক টকা দিছে কিমান ? পঞ্চায়ত উচিত ৰূপে কাৰ্য্যকৰী কৰিবলৈ হলে গাঁও পঞ্চায়তক অন্ততঃ খাজনাৰ ৫০ ভাগ আৰু আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়তক অন্ততঃ ২৫ ভাগ দিব লাগিব। তাকে নকৰিলে পঞ্চায়তে টকা পাৰ কৰ পৰা।

২য় কথা হল পঞ্চায়তৰ নিবৰ্বাচন সম্পৰ্কে। মোৰ মনেৰে open voting হোৱা উচিত নহয়—এনে হলে নানা গোলমাল হোৱাটো স্বাভাৱিক আৰু তেনে হোৱা দেখাও গৈছে কাৰণ open voting ত জোৰ যাব মলুক তাৰ হয়। মই ডাঙি কব পাৰো যে পঞ্চায়তৰ ১ম নিবৰ্বাচনৰ শতকৰা এশভাগেই দৈৱ্য আৰু শান্তিপূৰ্ণ ভাৱে হোৱা নাই। নিবৰ্বাচন কেন্দ্ৰৰ বেচা ভাঙ্গি বছি ছিঙ্গি কৰবাৰ ভোটাৰ কৰবাত থিয় হলগৈ বাইজৰ মনোভাৱ প্ৰকাশ কৰিবৰ একমাত্ৰ উপায় হল secret voting (গোপন ভোট)। এতিয়া পঞ্চায়ত কাৰ, কেজন মান মানুহৰ, যি দুই চাৰি পয়চা পঞ্চায়তৰ পৰা পাইছে। সবহ সংখ্যক মানুহৰ পঞ্চায়তৰ প্ৰতি শ্ৰদ্ধা নাই।

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: এতিয়া কি কৰিলে পঞ্চায়ত ভাল ৰকমে চলিব তাকে কওক।

Shri KHOGENDRA NATH BARBARUA (Amguri):

প্রথম কথা হল নিবৰ্বাচন গোপন হব লাগে। তাৰ পিচত সমবায় ভিত্তিত কৃষিজাত বস্তুৰ উৎপাদনৰ কাৰণে মাটি উন্নৈহতীয়া হব লাগে। ট্ৰেক্টৰ-যন্ত্ৰপাতি পাৰ্শ্ব, সাৰ, ঔষধ আদিৰ যোগান চৰকাৰে পঞ্চায়তক দিব লাগে। কৃষিজাত দ্ৰব্য আৰু শিল্পজাত দ্ৰব্যৰ মূল্যৰ সমন্বয় বন্ধাৰ ক্ষমতা পঞ্চায়তক দিব লাগে। Co-operative Farming বা সমবায় ভিত্তিত খেতি কৰিবলৈ উৎসাহ প্ৰথমে শাসনৰ গাৰ্হীত থকা সকলে দিব লাগে। তেখেত সকলৰ মাটি সমবায়ত দিব লাগে। দুখৰ বিষয় আমগুৰি সমষ্টিৰ এম্ এল্ এৰ বাহিৰে কোনো এম্ এল্ এ বা কংগ্ৰেছী লোকে সমবায়ত মাটি দিয়া নাই-সমবায় খেতি কৰা নাই। পঞ্চায়তক যথেষ্ট টকা দিব লাগিব। পঞ্চায়তী শাসনত মানুহে self help basis ত কাম কৰিব লাগে। মানুহে P. W. D. ত কাম নকৰি য'ত পৰিশ্ৰমৰ পূৰ্ণ মূল্য পায়, self help basis ত কিয় কাম কৰিবলৈ আহিব? এইবোৰকে নকৰিলে আপোনালোকে যি বাস ৰাজ্যৰ সপোন দেখিছে সেই সপোন কেতিয়াও কাৰ্য্যত গঢ়ি নুঠে। শান্তি আনিবলৈ যাওঁতে অশান্তি বৃদ্ধি পাইছে।

Shri PRABHAT NARAYAN CHAUDHURY (Nalbari-East): উপাধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, সমবায় পদ্ধতিৰ ওপৰতে পঞ্চায়ত গঢ়ি উঠিব লাগিব। কাৰণ ইয়াৰ যোগেদি দেশৰ প্ৰশাসন চলিব লাগিব। এতিয়াও আমি ভালকৈ চালে দেখিম এই পদ্ধতিৰ ওপৰতে চৰকাৰ চলি আছে। কেন্দ্ৰীয় গবৰ্ণমেণ্টে টকা পায় Reserve Bank ৰ পৰা। আৰু কেন্দ্ৰীয় চৰকাৰৰ অধীনত থকা ৰাজ্যবোৰে টকা পায় State Bank ৰ যোগেদি।

কেন্দ্ৰীয় চৰকাৰৰ Community Development and Co-operative এজেন্সী শ্ৰী এচ, কে, দেব অধীনত আৰু চেৰ্কেটৰীয়েটো এটা। সেই কাৰণে তেওঁলোকৰ কামৰ সমন্বয় আছে আৰু কাম বেচি হয়। আমাৰ কিন্তু দুটা বেলেগ বিভাগ হোৱাত কামৰ সমন্বয় নাই আৰু কামো স্কলসে হোৱা নাই। সমবায় আৰু পঞ্চায়তৰ মাজত সংযোগ নথকা হেতুকে কামত অসুবিধা আৰু বেমেজালি হৈছে। এই বিষয়ে সিদিনা গুৱাহাটী সমবায় সমিতিৰ সভাপতিয়ে আপত্তি কৰিছে। সেই কাৰণে সমবায়ত পঞ্চায়তৰ প্ৰতিনিধি ৰখা দৰ্কাৰ আৰু পঞ্চায়তত সমবায় প্ৰতিনিধি ৰখা দৰ্কাৰ। পথাৰ পৰিচালনা কমিটিও এটা স্কলীয়া অনুষ্ঠান। কাৰ্য্যত হব নেলাগে কাৰণ সমবায় আৰু পঞ্চায়তৰ যুটীয়া বস্তুটোৱেই পথাৰ পৰিচালনা কমিটি। গতিকে এই এটাৰ কাৰণে বেলেগে আলোচনা চক্ৰ হব নেলাগে। মই সদায় কৈ আহিছো যে সমবায় এটা, পঞ্চায়তৰ এটা আৰু পথাৰ পৰিচালনাৰ এটা— এই তিনিটা আলোচনা চক্ৰ হব নেলাগে। আলোচনা চক্ৰ মাত্ৰ এটা হব লাগে। তেতিয়া বিভিন্ন সমস্যা বোৰ একেলগে আলোচনা কৰিব পৰা হব আৰু সমাধান কৰিব পৰা হব।

Service Co-operative বোৰ হৈছে ধান কিনা-বেচা কৰা অনুষ্ঠান অৰ্থাৎ বহুমুখী সমবায় সমিতি। এইটো বৰ সুস্থ পৰিকল্পনা। কিন্তু ই পঞ্চায়ত এলেকা মতে গঠন হব লাগে। কাৰণ গুদাম সাজিবৰ বাবে যি টকা এতিয়া দিছে তাৰে সমবায় কিম্বা পঞ্চায়ত কোনেও গুদাম সাজিব খোজা নাই। এইটো হৈছে কেৱল বুজাপৰাৰ অভাৱত। Service Co-operative ক Consumer goods deal কৰিবলৈ দিলে খেতিয়কৰ উৎপাদন বিক্ৰি কৰাত অসুবিধা হয়। কাৰণ Service Co-operative ৰ কৰ্তব্য বন্ধা আছে যে খেতিয়কক বিধান, সাৰ আদিৰ যোগান ধৰিব লাগে। তাকে কৰিব নোৱাৰাৰ বাবেই Service Co-operative এ function কৰিব পৰা নাই।

পঞ্চায়ত একোখনে ১২ শ বা ডেব হেজাব টকা পায়। তাৰে কৰ্মচাৰীৰ বেতন আদিৰ খৰছ জোৰে। ইফালে আৰু টকাও দিব নোৱাৰি কাৰণ বাজহ বিভাগে যি কৃষি ঋণ, বিধান ঋণ, হালোৱা গৰু ঋণ আদি দিছিল তাৰ টকা আদায় হোৱা নাই বাবে বিজাৰ্ড বেকে টকা নিদিয়া হল। বিভিন্ন অনুষ্ঠান বোৰৰ মাজত সম্বন্ধ নথকাৰ বাবেই পঞ্চায়ত, সমবায় আদিও কাৰ্য্যকৰী হোৱা নাই।

কোঅপাৰেটিভ আৰু পঞ্চায়তৰ যোগাযোগ অপৰিহাৰ্য্য। ঠিক তেনেকৈ পঞ্চায়ত বিলাকৰ এটা শিল্প মনোবৃত্তিও নিতান্ত দৰ্কাৰ। বৰ্ত্তমান পঞ্চায়তবিলাকে কি বাজেট তৈয়াৰ কৰে? তেওঁলোকৰ তালৈ যিখিনি ওপৰৰ পৰা টকা আহিব সেই খিনিকে মাত্ৰ কেনেকৈ খৰচ কৰিব লাগিব সেই খিনিতে সীমাবদ্ধ।

মোৰ কথা হল, এই ভুলটো কেনেকৈ শুচাব পাৰি তাৰ চিন্তা সদনৰ সদস্য সকলে কৰা দৰ্কাৰ। বৰ্ত্তমানে গাঁৱে গাঁৱে গাওঁ পঞ্চায়ত আছে। কিন্তু তেওঁলোকে গবৰ্ণমেণ্টৰ পৰা টকা নেপালে হাত সাৱতি বহি থাকে। অন্যান্য যিবিলাক মাছ পোহা, গছ বোৱা আদি ব্যবসায় শিল্প আদিৰ আচনি আছে যাৰ দ্বাৰা তেওঁলোকে বাহিৰা আয়ৰ পথ মকলি কৰিব পাৰে, সেই বিলাকত তেওঁলোকে হাত নিদিয়ে। কেবল গবৰ্ণমেণ্টৰ পৰা যি টকা পায় তাৰে কাম কৰিব নহলে বহি থাকিব। গতিকে এনেধৰণৰ উপায়েৰে আয় বৃদ্ধি কৰিবলৈ প্ৰচাৰ কৰিব লাগে।

ইয়াৰ কাৰণে পঞ্চায়তৰ বেচৰকাৰী লোক সকলে জগবীয়া পঞ্চায়তৰ যিবিলাক সভা হয় তাত এই ভুল বিলাক আলোচনা কৰাৰ সুযোগ পোৱা নাযায়।

মই উত্তৰ লক্ষীমপুৰৰ সদস্য ডাঙৰীয়াৰ লগত একমত যে Development Board এ চলি থকাৰে সন্নিবিধা আছিল। এতিয়া আমাৰ মনত ক্ষমতাৰ ভাৱ সোমাল। ইয়াৰ কাৰণে আমাৰ মুখীয়া মানুহ সকলেই দায়ী হব।

গুৱাহাটীৰ সদস্য গোস্বামী ডাঙৰীয়াই কৈছে আনকি High Court এ এটা Ruling দিছে। দেখা যায় নানা ঠাইত ভিন ভিন ক্ষমতা লৈ Ex-officio মেম্বৰ কিছুমান বহি আছে, ক্ষমতা লৈছে। কিছুমানক লবলৈ সেই পঞ্চায়তক জোৰ কৰা হৈছে আৰু হয়তো এটা পঞ্চায়তক বাধা দিছে যে মৌজাদাৰ সভাপতি হব নোৱাৰে। কিন্তু Rural Panchayat ৰ যিবিলাক সভাপতি আছিল তেওঁলোক স্কুল কলেজৰ শিক্ষকো, আনফালে পঞ্চায়ততো ক্ষমতা লৈ আছে।

বৰিগোগ আমাৰ ভিতৰত ভাল পঞ্চায়ত। কিন্তু আমাৰ মহাকুমাৰ পঞ্চায়তৰ এজন লোকেই এতিয়া আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়তৰ সভাপতি হৈ আছে।

Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA (Chief Minister) :
সভাপতি হৈ আছিল নে সভাপতি হৈ আছে ?

Shri PRABHAT NARAYAN CHOUDHURY (Nalbari) :
সভাপতি হৈ আছে। শ্ৰীপ্ৰভাত গোস্বামী নলবাৰী কলেজৰ Vice Principal কিন্তু তেখেত সভাপতি হৈ আছে। গতিকে কোনোবা আছে কোনোবা নাই। এই বিষয়ে এটা uniform rule হব লাগে। Rural Panchayat ৰ যি সভাপতি আছিল High Court ৰ যি এটা Ruling হৈছে, সেইটো চৰকাৰে মানি লব লাগে। তাৰ পিচত কেন্দ্ৰৰ নিচিনাকৈ আমাবো পঞ্চায়ত আৰু সমবায় বিলাক এজন মন্ত্ৰীৰ তলত থাকিলে ভাল যোগাযোগ হব আৰু কামো সূচাৰুৰূপে চলিব—এই বিষয়ে গবৰ্ণমেণ্টে মনোনিবেশ কৰিব।

Maulavi RAHIMUDDIN AHMED (Jamunamukh):

মাননীয় উপাধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, পঞ্চায়ত গঠনত দৃষ্টিকোণৰ পৰা আমাৰ বহুতো সদস্যই বহুতো যুক্তি দেখুৱাইছে অবশ্যে মই কিছুমান যুক্তিত যে একমত হব পাৰিছো সেইটো ঠিক; কিন্তু ভালকৈ পৰ্যালোচনা কৰি চালে কোনো কোনো বিষয়ত একমত হব পৰা নাই।

গোৰ কথা হল, আমাৰ পঞ্চায়ত তৈয়াৰ কৰাৰ উদ্দেশ্য কি? তাৰ দ্বাৰা যদি আমাৰ উদ্দেশ্যই সফল নহয় তেন্তে পঞ্চায়ত গঠন কৰাৰ দৰ্কাৰ নাই।

ইয়াৰ প্ৰধান উদ্দেশ্য হল আমাৰ জনসাধাৰণক আৰ্থিক সামাজিক, নৈতিক আৰু স্বায়ত্তশাসনৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত সম্পূৰ্ণ ভাবে সাকল্য মণ্ডিত কৰি স্বাৰলম্বী কৰিব লাগে।

সেইদেখি গাঁও সভাৰ উদ্দেশ্য হল প্ৰথমতে আমাৰ গাঁৱলীয়া জনসাধাৰণক ভিতৰত এটা দায়িত্বজ্ঞান আনি দিয়া। কিন্তু কোনো কোনো বিজ্ঞ সদস্যৰ মতে গাঁওসভাৰ কিছুমান দায়িত্ব আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়তক দিব লাগে এই বিষয়ত মই তেখেত সকলৰ লগত একমত হব পৰা নাই।

তাৰ পিচত আমাৰ গোস্বামী ডাঙৰীয়াই কৈছে দুখন গাঁওসভাৰ মাজতে যিখন বজাৰ আছে তাৰ আয়ৰ ভাগ বটোৱাৰা গৈ সেই গাঁওসভা দুখনৰ মাজত অৰিয়া অৰি হয় গতিকে তেনে বজাৰ আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়তক দিব লাগে। ঠিক তেনেকৈ ৭১ হাজাৰ টকাৰ ওপৰত যি বজাৰত বিক্ৰি হয়, সেইবিলাক মহকুমা পৰিষদলৈ যাব লাগে। অবশ্যে এই কথাৰ এটা যুক্তি আছে।

কিয়নো, সেই বজাৰত বহুতো অঞ্চলৰ পৰা হাজাৰ হাজাৰ মানুহে আহি বেচা কিনা কৰিছে কিন্তু এখন আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়তৰ তলত থকাত আৰু আয়মাত্ৰ এটা অঞ্চলৰ উন্নতিৰ কাৰণে ব্যয় কৰাত বাকী অঞ্চলৰ অন্যাৰ হৈছে আৰু বঞ্চিত হৈছে। মহকুমা পৰিষদ তহাবধানত থাকিলে সেই আয় অনুপাতিক হিচাবে বিভিন্ন অঞ্চলত ব্যয় কৰাত সুবিধা হয়।

লক্ষ্যত অনেকুৱা এখন বজাৰ আছে, যত লোকল বৰ্ডৰ দিনত ৬২ হাজাৰ টকাৰ ঠাইত মাত্ৰ ৩১ হাজাৰ টকাত সেই বজাৰ Settlement হৈছে, এইবাৰ মই আগতে কৈছো যে, এইবিলাকত ৰাজনৈতিক স্বার্থ আছে। কাৰণ সেইখন বজাৰ যেতিয়া private বিক্ৰি হয়, তেতিয়া বজাৰৰ বেলেগ বেলেগ 'আইটেম' যেনে শাক পাচলি, মাচ, চাউল, দাইল, গৰমহ আদি বিভিন্ন শিতাণত, তাৰ মূল্য এক লাখ চাৰি হাজাৰ উঠিছে আৰু সেইদৰে বিক্ৰি হল। মই তাৰ প্ৰমাণ প্ৰয়োজন হলে দিব পাৰিম। এই কথা একেবাৰে সত্য। লোকল বৰ্ডৰ দিনত সেই ডাকৰ টকাৰে ৰাইজৰ উন্নতিৰ হকে কাম কৰিছিল। সেই কাৰণে মোৰ এয়ে নিবেদন আৰু পৰামশ যে, এনে ধৰণৰ ডাঙৰ ডাঙৰ বজাৰ বিলাক মহকুমা পৰিষদক হস্তান্তৰ কৰিব লাগে, আৰু যিবিলাক বজাৰ ৭১ হাজাৰ টকাৰ তলত settlement হয়, সেইবিলাক গাঁও সভাক দিব লাগে। কাৰণ আমি, সমাজতান্ত্ৰিক সমাজ ব্যৱস্থাৰ আদৰ্শত আমাৰ অৱহেলিত গাঁও বিলাকৰ প্ৰত্যেক খনকে আদৰ্শ গাঁৱলৈ ৰূপান্তৰিত কৰিব লাগিব। এই দৃষ্টি ভঙ্গিৰে কাম কৰিবলৈ হলে, আমাৰ গ্ৰাম্য অঞ্চলৰ খেতিয়ক সকলক শস্য উৎপাদন কৰাত সহায় কৰিব লাগিব আৰু উৎপাদিত শস্যৰ যাতে উচিত মূল্য তেওঁলোকে পায় তালৈ চকু দিব লাগিব। কৃষক সকলে যদি তেওঁলোকৰ উৎপাদিত বস্তুৰ বজাৰৰ কাৰণে অনা-নিয়া খৰচৰ পৰিমাণ বেচি ভৰিব লগা হয় তেনেহলে তেওঁলোকৰ লোকচান হল আৰু উচিত মূল্য নাপালে। এই কাৰণে গাঁও সভা বিলাকে যোগাযোগৰ সুবিধা কৰি দিব লাগে আৰু আৱশ্যকীয় ব্যৱস্থা কৰিব লাগে। তেতিয়াহে গাঁৱৰ আৰু গাঁৱলীয়া

বাইজৰ প্ৰকৃত উন্নতি হ'ব। গাঁও সভাৰ অধীণত যিবিলাক হাট বজাৰ আছে, সেই বিলাকৰ বিক্ৰিৰ দায়িত্ব গাঁও সভাই পাব লাগে। তাৰোপৰি গাঁও সভাৰ এলেকাৰ **Sanitary condition** বিলাকৰ প্ৰতি গাঁও সভাই দায়িত্ব বহন কৰিব লাগে আৰু সেই এলাকাৰ মীন মহল আদি গাঁও সভাই বিক্ৰি কৰাৰ ভাৰ আৰু দায়িত্ব পাব লাগে। আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়তলৈ এইবিলাক গুচি গলে গাঁও সভা বিলাকে উন্নতি কৰিব নোৱাৰিব। তাৰ পিচত **Service co-operative** বিলাক গাঁও সভাৰ জৰিয়তে নিয়ন্ত্ৰণ কৰিব লাগে আৰু কৃষক সকলক তেওঁলোকৰ শস্যৰ উচিত মূল্য দিব লাগে আৰু এই ক্ষেত্ৰত টকা পইচাৰ অথাত পুজিৰ কাৰণে **Apex Bank** ৰ জৰিয়তে চৰকাৰে সহায় আগবঢ়াব পাৰে। তাৰ পিচত সস্তীয়া ধান চাউলৰ দোকান থকা প্ৰয়োজন, য'ৰ পৰা কৃষক সকলে সময় মতে কঠীয়া আদিৰ যোগান পাব পাৰে। এই দোকানৰ পৰিচালনা আৰু নিয়ন্ত্ৰণৰ ভাৰ থাকিব লাগিব গাঁও সভাৰ ওপৰত। কাৰণ এতিয়াৰ যিবিলাক গাঁৱলীয়া চচাইটিয়ে ঋণ দিয়ে, সেই বিলাকত গাঁৱলীয়া দুখীয়া খেতিয়ক সকলে ঋণ সময়মতেটো ক'থাই নাই, ঋণ নাপায়েই, যিবিলাকে পায় তাৰ ভিতৰত সবহ ভাগেই ধনী। তাৰোপৰি সময় পাব হৈ যোৱাৰ কাৰণে আচল কাৰণত খৰচ কৰিব নোৱাৰে আৰু ফলত অন্যফালে খৰচ হৈ যায়। তাৰোপৰি এই ঋণ দিয়া বেঙ্ক বিলাকৰ পৰিচালনা ঠিক নোহোৱাত অনেক সময়ত **failure** হৈ যাব।

Adjournment

The Assembly was then adjourned till 9 A. M. on Friday, the 29th September, 1961.

R. N. BARUA,

Secretary, Legislative Assembly, Assam.