Assam Legislative Assembly Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

TWELFTH SESSION OF THE ASSAM LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
ASSEMBLED AFTER THE FOURTH GENERAL ELECTIONS
UNDER THE SOVEREIGN DEMOCRATIC
REPUBLICAN CONSTITUTION OF
INDIA

OCTOBER-NOVEMBER SESSION

VOLUME II

No. 2

The 8th November, 1971

1990
PRINTED AT THE PAPLOO PRINTERS
JORHAT

DEBATES OF THE ASSAM LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1971

(OCTOBER-NOVEMBER SESSION)

Vol. II

No. 2

The 8th November, 1971

CONTENTS

		Pages
1.	Starred Questions and Answers	6—44
2.	Question on Legislators' Property	44—45
3.	Motion on the Report of the Enquiry Committee on Land Settlement	45—46
4.	Strike by P. W. D. contractors for non-payment of Bills	46—47
5.	Famine Condition at Mankachar	47—53
6.	Kaligaon Krishipam	53
7.	Complaint of breach of privilege againest a Minister of State	54—70
8.	Calling Attention To A Matter of Urgent Public Importance—The Assam Small Industries Development Corporation	70—75
9.	Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Report of the Public Accounts Committee	75
10.	Report of the Commission on Secondary Education in Assam	75
11.	The Assam Contingency fund (Augumentation of Corpus) Bill, 1971	76—79

12. The Assam Appropriation (No. V) Bill, 1971 ... 79—80

13. The Assam non-Government School and College Employees Centralised Provident fund Scheme (Amendment) Bill, 1971 ... ... 80—86

14. The Gauhati Municipal Corporation Bill, 1969 ... 86—87

15. Statement by the Chief Minister —Allegation against a Minister of State ... ... 87—99

16. Result of Election to the Dibrugarh University Court 99

17. Motion—Anomalies in the Settlement af land is and around Gauhati .... 100—128

10. Adjournment 129

Assam
Legislative Assembly Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

OCTOBER–NOVEMBER SESSION

Vol—II

No.—2

The 8th November, 1971.

Proceedings of The Twelfth Session of the Assam Legislative Assembly assembled after the Fourth General Elections under the Sovereign Democratic Republican Constitution of India

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber, Shillong, at 10 A.M. on Monday, the 8th November, 1971

PRESENT

Shri Mohi Kanta Das, M. A., B.L., Speaker, in the Chair, 12 (Twelve) Ministers, 8 (Eight) Ministers of State, 2 (Two) Deputy Minister and 51 (Fiftyone) members.

STARRED

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(To which oral replies were given)

Re : Representation in Central Secretariat

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua asked :

*78. Will the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) Whether it is a fact that the people of Assam have no representation in the Central Secretariat in almost all the cadres ?

(b) If so, what steps have been taken by the Government with the Government of India to make such provision in different cadres in the Central Secretariat ?

(c) If not, the reasons there of ?

(d) Whether Government is aware that such negligence is detrimental to the interest of Assam ?

Shri Mahendra Mohan Choudhury (Chief Minister) replied :

78. (a)—There is no quota for different States for representation in different cadres of Central Secretariat.

(b), (c) & (d)—In view of (a) above does not arise.

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : As the other State Governments are representing their people in the Central Secretariat from their State Secretariat for getting the benefit in all the Central Services, for instance, at the planning and other things, do not our Government consider it proper to take up this matter with the Govt. of India for representation of our people in the Central Secretariat ?

Shri Mahendra Mohan Choudhury : In some cadres, there

are some representations from Assam cadre. For example, in the cadre of IAS, from Assam cadre, there are some Deputy Secretaries, Joint Secretaries and Under Secretaries in some other departments like Law and Education departments, there also some representations are there. Therefore, the point is that in the matter of direct recruitment to the lower cadres, our people are generally not interested and so they do not try to get entry into the Central Secretariat in the lower cadre. That is the difficulty.

Shri Gaurisankar Bhattacharyya : Is it not that our people are not interested in entering into the Central Secretariat not for any other reason but because of the difficulties and impediments on their way of being represented there; that they have not been getting any scope. In the Secretariat, is the Chief Minister has said, there are different grades or different sets of personnel. So, far as the IAS personnal are concerned, some from the Assam cadre now doubt go there; but most of them who go or almost all of them who are, though belonging formerly to Assam Cadre hailing from outside the State of Assam. But so far as the lower level service is concerned, Assam is totally unrepresented and if the Government does not reprasent it strongly that there should be some arrangements for bringing people from those areas also which are almost completely unrepresented there, in the usual course, the youngmen of Assam will not get any service in the Central Secretariat. Secondly, the Chief Minister has said that we have got some people in the law and educa-

tion Department but their number is almost insignificant. For example, in the Law department, there are one or two and they are only Translators who are in the lower rang, and the Education department, probably, except Shri P. Barma, there is done worth the name. Inview of this, the Government of Assam should make out a strong case to the Govt, of India in the matter of representation from the people of Assam in the Central secretariat so that there shouid be adequate and proper representation of Assam in the Ceneral Secratariat as Assam uptill now is not getting and representation.

Shri Mahendra Mohan Choudhury: In some departments, of course, we can push some of our men when opportuity arises. But in the matter of direcruitment there is no State-wise reserved quota. Generally these people are recruited in the lower cadre by competition. There is competitive examination and from the result of this compotitive examination, the incumbants are selected.

Shri Gaurisanker Bhattaceryya : These competilive examinations are held in Delhi ?

Shri Mohendra Mohan Choudhury : Yes. I had a talk this time with the Controler of Examinations of the U. P. S. C. He made this complaint to me your people do not come for the Central Secretariat appointments'. From the list. He has scrutinised, he found that Assm and Jommu & Kashmir are almost not represented there. He has advised that we should make them interested in giving Central Secretariat examination, and he said, if necessary, they

would introduce some posts for pushing people from Assam so that they can get chance here, and that would be one of our terms of reference in the proposed Education Commission. Then, Sir, regarding the deputation of IAS cadre people to the Central Secretariat, it must be admitted that if we try to send our qualified people, there must be some length of service in there record to be eligible to go to the Centre, and these people who are eligible in point of qualification and length of service, generally, they are reluctant to go there. This is the difficulty. But we are taking up this matter and we shall try to persuode some of our people to go there and represent the Govt. of Assam in the Central Secretariat so that we can take advantage from them regrading matters which have been said by Shri Barua.

Shri Gaurisanker Bhattacheryya : Apart from that, is the Govt. contemplating to represent to the appropriate authorities, that there should be Examination Centres in Assam, because Delhi is far off and our boys and girls do not get any scope not because they are not competent but they cannot afford to go there and they do not get any information whatsoever about this.

Shri Mohendra Mohen Choudhury : That can be tried.

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : Apart from the direct recruitment, in some other States, like Tamilnadu, Maharastra, Punjab and others, they are taking their people from their State Secretariat to the Central Secretariat. Therefore, do our Government not consider it proper to depute

our people from all cadres ranging from L. D. Assistant upto the rahk of IAS officers from our State Secretariat to the Central Secretariat.

Shri Mohendra Mohan Choudhury : We have not get any information about this but I shall look into this.

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : Sir, those who have been sent from our State Secretariat to the Central Secretariat, the feeling is that those who were not wanted here, they were sent to the Central Secretariat. Their feeling is such. 6/7 Mizo officers were sent to the Central Secretariat and they thought that because they were not wanted in the Assam Administration, that was why they were deputed. But we want such kind of representation there which can render benefit to us to some extent and so will the government keep this point in view at the time of sending officers to the Central Secrethriat ?

Shri Mohendra Mohan Choudhury : We shall keep it in mind while making consideration in the matter.

Re : Unutilised materials for closing the Desangmukh breach in Sibsagar

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi asked :

*79. Will the Minister-in-charge of P. W. D. (F. C. & I.) be pleased to state—

(a) Whether it is a fact that the unutilized materials for closing the Desangmukh breach in Sibsagar were not found on the spot at the time of inspection by the Chairman of the Brahmaputra Flood Control during 1970-71 ?

(b) If so, who ordered the removal of those materials from the spot ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali [Minister, Public Works (Flood Control & Irrigation) Department] replied :

79, (a)—Chairman went for general in spection and not for checking of unutilized materials and hence his not finding the same does not arise ;

(b)—Does not arise.

Shri Promede Chandra Gogoi : The reply to question (a) is evasive. May I know from the Hon'ble Minister how many timber posts were purchased by the Commission for the breach closure work at Desangmukh ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : In all there were 380 metres of Nahar piles for this breach clasure work.

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi : How many of them were utilised in that work ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : None of these Nahar piles were utilised now of these unutilised as these were scattered in the area. Subsequently they were kept in charge of the Sectional Officer. Some of the pallisading bamboo stacks were utilised but these were taken by some Miri people by threatening the Khalasis who were on duty.

Shri Promod Chandra Gogoi : My question was how many timber posts were utilised for the breach closure work ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : I have already said that piles were not utilised for the breach closure work.

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi : Secondly, Sir, the information given by the Minister is not correct. Actually, these unutilised materials were not taken away by the Miri people of the locality. These were taken away by the then Executive Engineer, E&D, and were used by that officer for his personal or family purpose.

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : No, Sir, the unutilized materials were 380 metres of Nahar piles. These were subsequently removed from the area and kept in charge of the Sectional Officer, Mechanical, vide : Order No. 1924-45 dated 2.12.70. The utilised materials were bamboo sticks for pallisading, but these were removed by some Miri people by threatening the khalasis, as I have already said.

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi : What about the unutilised materials ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : These are in charge of the S.O.

Shri Promod Chan Gogoi : Whether these materials are available and if not whether these were sold in public auction ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : We have no information that these are not available, We may enquire about it.

Shri Sailen Medhi : The hon. member has alleged that unutilised materials had been used up by the then Executive Engineer for his own personal purpose. Whether the Hon'ble Minister can say whether this is a fact ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : As I have already said, these Nahar piles were received on transfer from the Sectional

Officer, Mechanical, and so the question of utilising them at that time by some other officer does not arise.

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi : These unutilised Nahar piles were handed over to the S.O. belonging to the Mechanical Division by the Brahmaputra Commission. I want to know whether these unutilised materials are available and if they are not availlable, whether these were sold in public auction. The Hon'ble Minister has said that this information is not available at present. If this is the position will the Hon'ble Minister enquire into the matter in detail whether these materials are available or not ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : From the records I find that these materials are in charge of the S.O. But I shall enquire into the allegation made by the hon. member.

Re : Relief to the Drought-affected People

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua asked :

*80 Will the Minister-in-charge of Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) Whether it is a fact that a sum of Rs. 50 lakhs has been sanctioned by the Government of India for the relief of the drought-affected people in the State ?

(b) If so, whether the said amount has been properly utilised for the purpose for which it has been sanctioned ?

(c) Whether the Government have proposed to take up permanent scheme to meet such emergency in future ?

(d) If so, what is the financial implication for such a scheme ?

(e) Whether the Government will move the Government of India for financial assistance to meet such natural calamities ?

Shri Biswadev Sarma (Minister Revenue) replied :

80. (a)—For the purpose of Central assistance, the Government of India have fixed the following ceiling of expenditure under relief item for relief of the drought-affected people of the State during the year 1971-72—

	Rs. in lakhs.
1. Gratuitous relief	1·26
2. Transport subsidy towards the movement of rice and atta.	6·00
3. Test Relief works	50·00
Total Rs.	57·26 lakhs.

(b)—Up-till now, Rs. 31,35,128 has been expended and the balance will be spent during the remaining period of the current financial year,

(c) & (d)—Such Schemes are under consideration by Agriculture and Irrigation Departments as part of their Five-Year Plan programmes.

(e)—The Central Government was moved for providing financial assistance to meet this expenditure, and the Central Government fixed the ceiling of Central assistance as indicated in reply to Question (a) bove.

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : May I know whether the money has been fully utilised ? If so, in what way this has been utilised and in which places ?

Shri Biswadev Sarma : It will be a long list and will take a long time of the House. However, I am giving the broad items. The expenditure incurred on issue of foodstuff, etc. Rs. 2,30,000. House building and repairing grant—nil. Seeds—Rs. 2.60.500. Shifting grant—Rs. 750. Drinking water—Rs. 4,600. Cattle loan—Rs. 5,000. Rehabilitation loan—Nil ; Seed Loan—Rs, 20,00,000 (for Rabi crops). Test Relief Schemes—Rs. 10,00,000. Expenditure incurred for drought—Rs. 19,69,700. Test Relief Scheme—Rs. 14,05,801. This is the breakup of the expenditure under broad heads.

Shri Kamini Mohon Sarma : মন্ত্রী মহোদয়ৰ পৰা জানিব খোজো যে Test Relief ৰ আঁচনিত যি টকা দিছে সেই টকা ৰডিয়া সমষ্টিত কিমান ধৰিছে । আৰু কোন কোন সমষ্টিত কিমান দিছে আমাক স্পষ্ট ভাবে জনাব লাগে ।

Shri Biswadev Sarma : সমষ্টি হিচাবে দিব পৰাটো টান হব...

Shri Moneswar Boro : সমষ্টি হিচাবে দিব পৰাটো টান হয় যদি Sub-Division হিচাবেই দিয়ক ।

Shri Biswadev Sarma :

Gratuitous Relief in kind : Barpeta—Rs. 5,000 ; Nalbari-Rs. 23,000 ; Gauhati—Rs. 5,000 and Mangaldai—Rs. 68,000. Total—Rs. 91,000.

Yarn in kind to widows and indigent women : Barpeta-Rs. 27,000 ; Nalbari—Rs. 27,000 ; Gauhati—Rs. 19,000 and Mangaldai—Rs. 27,000,

Seed/Seedling grant : Barpeta—Rs. 20,000 ; Gauhati—Rs. 9,000.

Transport subsidy on issue of rice : Barpeta—Rs. 30,000 ; Nalbari—Rs. 25,000 ; Gauhati—Rs. 10,000 and Mangaldai Rs. 20,000.

25% subsidy on issue of atta : Barpeta—Rs. 1,00,000 ; Nalbari 1,00,000 Gauhati—Rs. 1,00,000 and Mangaldai—Rs. 1,00,000 Charges of power pumps for irrigation : Barpeta—Rs. 25,650 ; Nalbari—Rs. 41,950 ; Gauhati—Rs. 15,150 ; Mangaldai—Rs. 29,150 ; Tezpur—Rs. 14,000.

Cost of Instal'ation of Tubewells, Barpeta—5,00000/, Nalbari—1,56,000/-, Gauhati—1,21,800/-, Mangaldai—1,69,000/- Total 9,46 800/-.

Paddy husking scheme on Test Relief basis, Barpata—57,000/-, Gauhati- 57,000/-, Mangaldai - 57,000/-, Total - 2,28.000/-. Cost of bund etc. on Test Relief basis, Barpeta - 1,05,300/-, Nalbari—2,49,885/-, Gauhati—69,350/-, Mangaldai—6,04,893/- Total—10,29,428/-. These are the figures I have with me.

Shri Prabhat Narayan Choudhury : Sir, for relief of the drought affected areas irrigation is most essential. Do the Govt. know that the Government of India has a provision of Rs. 1400 crores of rupees for tapping up of underground water resources for which the Govt of India wanted the States to form ground water Boards. If so, why the Govt. of Assam inspite of reminders from the Govt. of India, Ministry of Agriculture in their letter No. 18-30/70 TW dated 21st August reminded the state Govt. so that technical schemes can be prepared. In absence no such technical schemes have been submitted to Govt of India, and case of Assam went by default.

Shri Biswadev Sharma : Sir, the Hon'ble Member is not correct. Under the direction of the Department of Geology and Mining we already have constituted an underground water cell and the Govt. of India has provided us with money and rigs. Therefore, this information of the Hon'ble Member is not correct.

Shri Prabhat Narayan Choudhury : Will the Govt. take early steps to constitute a Board so that the technical schemes can be submitted to the Government of India and Assam also can come into the picture and money can be available to the land mortgaged bank, as almost all the states have been covered by that scheme except Assam ? Will the Govt. enquire into the matter and take early steps ?

Shri Biswadev Sharma : Sir, I have no information with regard to the Agriculture Department's schemes but so far as my department is concerned, i. e., Geology and Mining, we have already constituted an underground cell and the Govt. of India provided us money and rigs for this and we are making surveys.

Shri M. A. Musawwir Choudhury : Sir, certain areas of Nowgong district have been very badly affected by drought a continuous and even after continuous pressure by the local M. L. As the Deputy Commissioner did not declare these areas as drought affected areas and now famine condtion is prevailing in those areas. Will the Hon'ble Minister be pleased to send some relief in the shape of Test Relief and Gratuitous Relief to those areas ? If necessary

I can place the names of those areas, these are Rupohi, Laokhowa Dhing, Morigaon and Jorabari.

Shri Biswadev Shaama: Sir, I have alreado said the other day in the House that as and when the Deputy Commissioners send schemes to us we will give necessary relief to those areas.

Shri Giasuddin Ahmed: Sir, we have been told that Rs. 50 lakhs have been sanctioned. May I know which are those drought affected areas ?

Shri Biswadev Sarma: Sir, I have already mentioned the list.

Shrimati Lily Sen Gupta : মাননীয় মন্ত্রী মহোদয়ে কৈছে যে ক্ষতি গ্রস্ত বিধবা সকলৰ কাৰণে ২৫ হাজাৰ টকাৰ আচনি ধাৰ্য্য কৰা হৈছে। এই মহিলা সকলক বিশেষকৈ তাত শিল্পৰ কাৰণে বিশেষ ব্যৱস্থা আৰু বেচি টকা ধাৰ্য্য কৰিবনে ?

Shri Biswadev Sarma : Yarn in kind to widows indigent women for Barpeta 27,000/-, Nalbari—27,000/-, Gauhati—19,000 Mangaldai 27,000/- totalling Rs. 1,000,00/- have been given.

এইখিনি পইচা কম হোৱা নাই।

Shrimati Lily Sen Gupta : কি scheme ৰ ওপৰত ধাৰ্য্য কৰা হৈছে ?

Shri Biswadev Sarma : তেওঁলোকক কাপোৰ ৰবলৈ দিয়া হৈছে।

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : May I know from the Minister in Charge of Revenue whether it is a fact that the amount which has been sanctioned by the Govt. of India is on loan. Though the Minister has given us a statement that

this amount has been spent in different heads. What are these heads on which these amounts are going to be spent ?

Shri Biswadev Sarma : I have already given the break up in what heads the money is going to be spent.

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : My question is that these amounts have not been spent in water supply, irrigation. If so, when and how the Govt. is going to spend the money now ?

Shri Biswadev Sarma : I have already said that in the remaining period the balance amount will be spent as and when we received schemes from different departments.

Shri Prabhat Narayan Choudhury : Sir, the entire sub-division of Nalbari was affected by drought as known to the Govt. but in sinking shallow tubewell points 4 blocks Pub Nalbari Borigog Barbhogi Tamulpur had been excluded and Pacchim Nalbari also has not been adequately corverd. May I know the reason why four Blocks were excluded from sinking shallow tubewell points for irrigation purposes ?

Shri Biswadev Sharma (Minister, Revenue, etc.) Sir, I shall have to find about it. তেওঁলোকক কাপোৰ ববলৈ দিয়া হৈছে।

Shri Sarat Chandra Rabha : মন্ত্রী মহোদয়ে যে কৈছে বিলাসীপাৰাৰ পৰা খবৰ পোৱা বুলি দুর্ভীক্ষৰ সম্পর্কে। যোৱা ৬ তাৰিখে কোকৰাজাৰৰ পৰা এই অঞ্চলটোক দুর্ভীক্ষ পীড়িত অঞ্চল বুলি ঘোষনা কৰিবলৈ প্রতিনিধি দল আহিছিল সেই সম্পর্কে চৰকাৰে কি ব্যৱস্থা কৰিছে জানিব পাৰোনে ?

Shri Biswadev Sarma : স্থানীয় বিষয়াৰ পৰা Report call কৰিছো।

Shri Kabir Chandra Ray Pradhani : গোৱালপাৰা জিলা খন দুৰ্ভীক্ষৰ কৱলত পৰিছে। এই বিষয়ে মন্ত্ৰী মহোদয়ে কিবা জানেনে ?

Shri Biswadev Sarma : এই বিষয়ে খবৰ পোৱা নাই। মাননীয় সদস্যই যদি কৈছে খবৰ লম।

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : ইমান দিনে সদস্য গৰাকীয়ে বিধবাৰ কথাকেহে কৈছিল সিটো দললৈ যোৱাৰ পাচত বিধবা নাইকীয়া হল নেকি ?

Mr. Speaker : সেইটো সদস্য গৰাকীহে জানে।

Shri Kamini Mohan Sarma : খৰাংপিড়িত অঞ্চলৰ আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়তৰ যোগেদি সুতা দিয়া ব্যৱস্থা হৈছিল। এই সুতা বোৰ যথা-যথ বিতৰনৰ ব্যৱস্থা জানো। কোনো area ত কম সুতা গৈছে উদাহৰণ স্বৰূপে ৰঙিয়াত দুই বেগহে এই দুই বেগ সুতাৰে তাত নোজোৰে। আঞ্চলিক পঞ্চায়তে গাফিলটি কৰাৰ কাৰণে এনে হৈছে। ইয়াৰ এটা তদন্ত কৰি মন্ত্ৰী মহোদয়ে এটা বিহিত ব্যৱস্থা লবনে ?

Shri Biswadev Sarma : এতিয়াহে খবৰ পালো ইয়াৰ ব্যৱস্থা লম।

Re : Promotion of Executive Engineer of Flood Control and Irrigation Department

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi asked :

*81. Will the Minister-in-charge of Public Works Department (Flood Control Irrigation) be pleased to state—

(a) Whether it is a fact that some Executive Engineers of the Flood Control Department were promoted to the rank of S. Es during the current year ?

(b) Whether it is also a fact that the C. R. and other records of the present Director of River Research, Burnihat are missing from the office or were not available at the time of his promotion ?

(c) Whether it is a fact that the Government disregarded all adverse official records against this particular officer at the time of his promotion ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali (Minister, Flood Control and Irrigation) replied :

81. (a)—Yes, provisionally.

(b)—No, the C. Rs and other records were available except one file which was misplaced but the facts of the case were made available.

(c)—Selection was made after due perusal of the C. Rs and other records, even then the appointment was made under regulation 4 (d) of the A.P.S.C. (Limitation of Functions). Regulations and approval of A. P. S. C. is still awaited for regularisation of the appointment.

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi : Sir, may I know from the Minister whether it is a fact that this particular officer when he was the Executive Engineer, in the Cachar Division was placed under suspension by the then Minister Shri Moinul Haque Chaudhury on charges of corruption and moral turpitude.

Shri Syed Ahmad Ali, (Minister, F. C. & I.) : This concerns his personal life. There was case against him, procedgings were drawn up and he was put under suspension. The case went to High Court and to the Supreme Court, and he was acquitted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi : Whether it is also a fact as

a result of the proceedings increment of this particular officer was stopped from the time of suspension ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : It is is not a fact.

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : Sir, at the time promoting such officer generally character roll and previous antedents are considered. Is Government aware of that fact that not only in this case, this particular officer was involved in other cases on Cachar and he was punished with severe warning ? If it is so, under what circumstances and in what consideration this officer, who was heavily punished, was promoted from the post of Executive Engineer to the post of Superintending Engineer ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : Sir, there were two departmental cases against this office. One was, while he was S.D.O., Nowgong in 1958-59. That case was enquired into and after enquiry he was absolved of the charges. Another case was regarding the Ganigram Dyke and necessary departmental enquiry was made. The Enquiring Officer recommended censure and he was censured.

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi : Whether it is also a fact the then Chief Engineer, P.W.D. passed a order that this officer should not be placed in any working division.

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : After the enquiry of the case in Cachar in 1964 he was not subsequently placed in any Division. He was put in the Gauhati Office.

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi : Sir, in reply to (b) the

Minister has admitted that one particular file was not available at the time of his promotion. May I know from the Minister whether that particular file containing very serious records about the Executive Engineer was missing from the Office of the Chief Engineer at that time ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : I have replied that the file has been misplaced. The facts of the case and other records of the case.....

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi : The file was mis placed. Whether that particular file is available now ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : We are in search of that file.

Shri Gaurisankar Bhattacharyya : It is one thing to say the file is mis placed or not found. Another thing is to say that the facts have been ascertained. The questioner has said that in that file there were reports and remarks about the character of the particular officer, who was on several occasion, charged of moral turpitude. Even if the facts are ascertained so far as the remarks and reports of the enquiries are concerned, they may not be available. This file may be missing or stolen. So without getting the file, wherein there are so many things, why he has been promoted ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : The particular files refers to allegations against three officers including him. One Shri J. Ahmed (this officers), Shri S. L. Mukherjee, Executive Engineer and Shri H.N. Deka, S.D.O. , Barpeta.

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : The Minister himself stated

that this officer, about when the question has been put, while he was S.D.O., Nowgong there was a case against him for misappropriation and while he was posted as Executive Engineer at Cachar he committeed something rather more. Whether the Minister is aware of the fact that while he was posted at Shillong, he also did the same thing. So without going into the facts and merit of the case how this officer has been promoted ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : I have already replied that there are two cases against him. One case regarding Nowgong affairs of which he was absolved. Regarding the other case in Cachar he was recommended censure and he was censured. All these facts were considered at the time of selection and the selection was made in the Month of August, 1970 and for the information of the hon'ble members I would like to say that I was not the Minister with this potfolio.

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : Whether he was the Minister or not that is not our concern. The office of Minister is a continuous process. Now our question is that generally promotion is given to a particular officer by considering the merit cum seniority and at the time of giving promotion, his character roll and other past records are verified. I want to know under what circumstances or in what consideration Government has shown such undue favour to this corrupt officer ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : I have already said that all these

facts and findings were considered during selection for his promotion and all the character rolls are here and these character rolls wers considered.

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi : Sir, the question is very serious. One particular file was missing and it was not available. Though the Minister does not know, I know that this particular file was destroyed and the officer who destroyed the file was paid Rs. 50,000/- (noises from the opposition). So, in view of this may, I request the Chief Minister to enquire into the matter and review this case afresh ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : Sir, this file was last endorsed in the year 1966 to the Under Secretary, Establishment.....

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : We do not want these things. We simply want to know whether the file is destroyed or not ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : Sir, this was last endorsed to the Under Secretary..... .....

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : No, no we do not want this kind of reply.

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : We have got no such information. I am giving the facts how this file was endorsed to.....

shri Dulal Chandra Barua : If the file is not destroyed then whether the Minister will be pleased the file before the House.

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : That file is not traceable Sir.

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua: If the file was not destroyed whether the Minister will be pleased to place before the House. We want that answer.

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : I have already said that the file untraceable. Our office was once shifted from Shillong to Burnihat and again from Burnihat to Gauhati and during this shifting the file was misplaced and the file is yet untraceable.

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : Sir, a Point of order. We wanted to that from the hon. Minister incharge of flood control and irrigation about the concerning files. So far our knowledge goes the file was destroyed and now the Minister wants to give some other information in which we are not interested, We want a categorical reply whether the file was destroyed. This is not the convention of the House. The convention of the House is to give a reply either in negative or in affirmative.

Shri Mahendra Mohan Choudhury: (Chief Minister): Sir, the reply given by the Minister concerned is that the file has been misplaced which could not be traced out and allegation is that the file has been destroyed. These are the two contradictory points put side by side, The matter will be enquired into.

ব্রহ্মপুত্র বান-নিয়ন্ত্রণ আয়োগৰ সভাপতিৰ নিযুক্তি

শ্রীমতিলাল নায়কে সুধিছে :

*৮২। মাননীয় জলসিঞ্চন বিভাগৰ মন্ত্রী মহোদয়ে অনুগ্রহ কৰি জনাব নে—

(ক) ব্রহ্মপুত্র বান-নিয়ন্ত্রণ আয়োগৰ সভাপতি শ্রীকুমৰা অসম চৰকাৰৰ তলত কিমান তাৰিখৰ পৰা নিযুক্তি পালে, কিমান তাৰিখে কৰিলে, তেখেতৰ মাহিলি দৰমহা কিমান, তেখেত জইন কৰাৰ দিনাৰি পৰা ৩১।১০।৭১ তাৰিখলৈ কিমান টকা দৰমহা আৰু টি, এ হিচাবে পালে জনাব নে ?

(খ) তেখেত কত অফিচ কৰে আৰু কত ঘৰভাৰা কৰি আছে ?

(গ) যদি ভাৰাঘৰত আছে তেনেহলে তেখেতে সেই ঘৰৰ ভাৰা দি আছে নে ?

(ঘ) যদি এতিয়াও কোনো ভাৰা দিয়া হোৱা নাই তেনেহলে চৰকাৰে অইন চৰকাৰী ঘৰৰ ভাৰা অনুপাতে তেখেতবো ভাৰা কাটি ৰাখিব নে ?

(ঙ) তেখেতৰ বৰ্ত্তমান বয়স কিমান আৰু অফিচ আৰু থকাঘৰৰ বাবে যিবিলাক ফানিচাৰ কিনা হৈছিল সেইবিলাক অফিচ আৰু থকাঘৰত ব্যৱহাৰ কৰা হৈছে নে আৰু এই ফার্নিচাৰৰ দামনো কিমান আছিল ?

(চ) আমাৰ গৱৰ্ণমেণ্টৰ এই বাবৰ দায়িত্ব লৱপৰা আৰু তেনে কৰ্ম্মচাৰী আছে নেকি, আৰু যদি আছে ৫ জনমানৰ নাম জনাব নে ?

জলসিঞ্চন বিভাগৰ মন্ত্রী শ্রীচৈয়দ আহমদ আলিয়ে উত্তৰ দিছে ঃ

৮২। (ক)—ব্রহ্মপুত্র বান-নিয়ন্ত্রণ আয়োগৰ সভাপতি শ্রীকুমৰাৰ নিযুক্তিৰ তাৰিখ ১১ জুলাই ১৯৭০। তেখেতৰ মাহিলি দৰমহা ২,০০০ টকা (সীমাবদ্ধ)। ৩১।১০।৭১ লৈকে মুঠ দৰমহাৰ হিচাব ২৯,০৯৬·৭৫ পইচা ৩১।১০।৭১ লৈকে পোৱা ভ্রমণ-বানচ ২০,১৩২·৪১ পইচা।

(খ)— গুৱাহাটী চান্দমাৰী বান-নিয়ন্ত্রণ ভৱনত তেখেতৰ কার্য্যালয়। এই ভৱনটো অসমৰ বান-নিয়ন্ত্রণ আৰু জলসিঞ্চন বিভাগৰ অধিনস্থ।

তেখেতক কোনো বিভাগীয় বাসভৱন দিয়া হোৱা নাই। তেখেতে ৮।৩।৭১ লৈকে থকা ব্যৱস্থা নিজে কৰি লৈছিল। ৮।৩।৭১ ৰ পৰা আজিলৈকে তেখেতে ভৱলুমুখত থকা ই এণ্ড ডি ৰেষ্ট হাউচত থাকিবলৈ লৈছে; আৰু ৰেষ্ট হাউচত থকা যি ভাৰা সেই ভাৰা তেখেতে আদায় কৰি আছে।

(গ)—হয়।

(ঘ)—ওপৰত দিয়া (খ)- প্রশ্নৰ উত্তৰৰ পিছত এই প্রশ্ন নুঠে।

(ঙ)—৩১।১০।৭১ তাৰিখে তেখেতৰ বয়স হয় ৬০ বছৰ ২ মাহ ৩ দিন।

সভাপতিয়ে তেখেতৰ কাৰ্য্যালয়ৰ কাৰণে যি আচবাব পত্ৰ কিনিছিল সেইবোৰ কাৰ্য্যালয়ত ব্যৱহাৰ হৈ আছে। তেখেতৰ বাসভৱনৰ কাৰণে আচবাব-পত্ৰ কিনাৰ কোনো প্ৰশ্ন নুঠে। কাৰণ তেখেত বিভাগীয় বেষ্ট হাউচত থাকে। তেখেতৰ কাৰ্য্যালয় ব্যৱহাৰ কৰা আচবাব-পত্ৰৰ মূল্য ২৮৪৩·৬০ পইচা।

(চ)—সভাপতি হোৱাৰ যোগ্যতাৰ বিচাৰ ব্ৰহ্মপুত্ৰ বান নিয়ন্ত্ৰণৰ ওপৰত ন্যস্ত হোৱাৰ কাৰণে তেনে কৰ্ম্মচাৰীৰ সন্ধান লোৱাৰ সুযোগ হোৱা নাই।

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua ; মই মহোদয়ৰ পৰা জানিব বিচাৰিছো যে এই ঘিজন মানুহক ৬০ বছৰ পাৰ হোৱাৰ পিছতো এই কামত নিয়োগ কৰিছে, আমাৰ ইয়াত স্থানীয় উপযুক্ত মানুহ নাই নেকি ? ৬০ বছৰ পাৰ হোৱাত কাম কৰাৰ শক্তি নাথাকে গতিকে তেওঁৰ পৰা ভাল কাম পোৱাৰ আশা নাই। গতিকে উপযুক্ত মানুহ লৈ তেওঁক বিদায় দিয়াৰ ব্যৱস্থা কৰিবনে ?

Shri Syed Ahmed Ali : Commissioner ৰ চেয়াৰমেনে এইটো বিশেষ কামৰ কাৰণে দিছে। হয়ত 'চ' প্ৰশ্নৰ উত্তৰতে কোৱা হৈছে। সভাপতি নিযুক্তিৰ ভাৰ ব্ৰহ্মপুত্ৰ বাননিয়ন্ত্ৰণ বোৰ্ডৰ ওপৰত ন্যস্ত আছে।

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : এই মানুহজন নিয়োগৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত আমাৰ চৰকাৰৰ লগত আলোচনা হোৱা নাছিল নেকি ?

Shri Mohendra Mohan Choudhury : ব্ৰহ্মপুত্ৰ বান নিয়ন্ত্ৰণ বোৰ্ডে প্ৰস্তাৱ লৈছে যে এই বোৰ্ডৰ চেয়াৰম্যান আৰু অন্যান্য member বোৰ্ডে ৰাজ্যিক চৰকাৰৰ লগত পৰামৰ্শক্ৰমে কৰিব। চেয়াৰম্যানৰ কাৰণে দুগৰাকী member ৰ কথা উঠিছিল তেতিয়া আমাৰ লগত আলোচনা কৰি বোৰ্ডৰ চেয়াৰ-ম্যান হিচাবে K. L. Rao য়ে সিদ্ধান্ত লৈছিল।

Shri Kamini Mohan Sarma : অসমৰ ঘিবিলাক Engineer আছে সেইবিলাকক ঠাই নিদিয়াতো দুৰ্ভাগ্যজনক কথা। উপযুক্ত ব্যক্তি থকাতো সেইসকলে ঠাই নোপোৱাৰ বাবে বিহিত ব্যৱস্থা কৰিবনে নকৰে ? ৫৫ বছৰ বয়সত অবসৰ লৰ লাগে তেনে ক্ষেত্ৰত ৬০ বছৰ ২ মাহ ৩ দিন হৈ যোৱা জনক

নিযুক্ত কৰিলে যাৰ ডিবুগড়ৰৰ পৰা ধুবুৰীলৈ ঘূৰা ফুৰা কৰা শক্তিও নাই। গতিকে ৰিহিত ব্যৱস্থা লবনে ?

Shri Mohendra Mohan Choudhury : ব্ৰহ্মপুত্ৰ বান নিয়ন্ত্ৰণ বোৰ্ডখন মন্ত্ৰী পৰ্য্যায়ত গঠন হৈছে। Comissioner হ'ল Exhibition ৰ কাৰণে আৰু Boad হ'ল policy Moving ৰ কাৰণে Commissioner এ কি কি কাম কৰিব সেই বিষয়ে পৰামৰ্শ দিয়া অনুসৰি দুজন মানুহৰ নাম দিছিল। প্ৰথম জনক কামটো offer কৰাৰ আগতে America লৈ গৈছে আৰু পিচৰ জন P. N. Komra নাম আছিল আৰু ডঃ কে এল ৰাওৰ পৰামৰ্শ ক্ৰমে নিযুক্তি দিয়া হৈছে। এতিয়া ৬০ বছৰৰ পিচত এইটো কাম কৰা উচিত হবনে নহয় এই বিষয়ে Board ৰ চেয়াৰম্যানৰ লগত আলোচনা কৰি সিদ্ধান্ত লব লাগিব। আৰু যদি সম্ভৱ হয় অসমৰ উপযুক্ত মানুহক দিয়া হব।

Shri Debeswar Sarmah : আমাৰ Topography সংগ্ৰহ কৰিবৰ বাবে যিজন মানুহ দিৰ্ব্বাচিত কৰিছে, সেইজন মানুহে ৪/৬ মাহৰ ভিতৰতে এখন নতুন ঠাইৰ Topography সংগ্ৰহ কৰিব নোৱাৰে। আৰু এইটো কথা মুখ্যমন্ত্ৰী মহোদয়ে জানে। গতিকে এইজনক বিদায় দি এজন উপযুক্ত মানুহক Topography data সংগ্ৰহ কৰিবলৈ নিযুক্ত কৰাৰ ব্যৱস্থা কৰিবনে ?

Shri Mahandra Mohan Choudhury : আমাৰ যিজন বিষয়া পি, এন, কোমৰা তেখেতে অসমৰ Topographycal data নজনা নহয়। কাৰণ তেখেতে প্ৰায় ২বছৰ কাল উৰিষ্যা, পশ্চিমবঙ্গ ত্ৰিপুৰাৰ Regional Chief Engineer হৈ আছিল। ইয়াৰ উপৰিও Retired হোৱাৰ আগতে তেওঁ C. W. P Chief Engineer আছিল। আৰু P. N Komra ই দিয়া data K. L. Rao য়ে গ্ৰহন কৰা নাছিল। অৱশ্যে এটা মন্তব্য দিছিল। অৱশ্যে তেখেতৰ বয়স ৬০ বঃ ২ মাঃ ৩ দিঃ হোৱাৰ পাছত পুনৰ তেখেতক ৰখাতো যুক্তি যুক্ত হবনে নহয় তেখেতৰ Flood control Commission ৰ চেয়াৰ মেনৰ লগত আলোচনা কৰিম।

Shri Prabhat Narayan Choudhury : ব্ৰহ্মপুত্ৰ কমিচনে আজিলৈকে যিভাবে কাম কৰিব লাগিছিল সেইভাৱে কাম হোৱা নাই। কেবল অসম চৰকাৰৰ

এটা বিভাগ হিচাবে চলি আছে কোমবাক অসম গৱর্ণমেণ্টৰ চেক্রেটৰী হিচাবে ৰখা হৈছে। কিন্তু ইতিপূর্ব্বে Flood control আৰু P. W. D. ৰ সমগ্র বিভাগ অকল এজন Chief Engineer য়ে চলাইছে। তাৰ ঠাইত এতিয়া দুটাকৈ বিভাগ খোলা হৈছে। ব্রহ্মপুত্র নিয়ন্তন কমিতিৰ এজন super Chief Engineer আৰু দুজন Chief Engineer পর্য্যায়ৰ construction Engineer কৰিলে তাৰ ফলত প্রশাসন ওপৰ গধুৰ হৈ পৰিছে। এই ব্যয় সাধ্য কথাটো ৰহিত কৰাৰ ব্যৱস্থা কৰিব লাগে আৰু ব্যয় সংঙ্কোচ কৰিব লাগে।

Shri Mohendra Mohan Choudhury : ব্রহ্মপুত্র বান নিয়ন্ত্রণ বিভাগ যেতিয়া কৰা হৈছিল, তেতিয়া এইটো autonomus body হিচাবে কৰাৰ সিদ্ধান্ত হৈছে। কিন্তু কেন্দ্রৰপৰা অর্থ সাহার্য্য পোৱাৰ কথা আছিল কিন্তু যিমান সাহার্য্য পাব লাগিছিল এতিয়ালৈকে সিমান সাহার্য্য পোৱা নাই। তাৰ ফলত কেন্দ্রৰ পৰা অলপ অচৰপ যি সাহার্য্য দিয়া হয় তাৰ লগতে আমাৰ plan ৰ টকাও যোগ দি ব্রহ্মপুত্র উপত্যকাৰ বান আৰু নদী নিয়ন্ত্রণ কৰাৰ ব্যৱস্থা কৰা হ'ল। কিন্তু এতিয়া দেখা গৈছে আনাৰ ব্রহ্মপুত্র উপত্যকাৰ বাহিৰেও কাচাৰ জিলাৰ বৰাক উপত্যকা বান নিয়ন্ত্রণ আৰু সমগ্র অসমৰ জলসিঞ্চন এই দুয়োটা বিভাগৰ লগত সমন্নয় ৰাখিলে এইবিলাক বিভাগত আমাৰ যিবিলাক চাকৰিয়াল আছে সেই সকলোকে একে কেডাৰতে ৰাখি যাতে বদলি আদি কৰিব পৰা হয় তাৰ ব্যৱস্থা কৰা হৈছে আৰু সেইকাৰণে ব্রহ্মপুত্র বান নিয়ন্ত্রণ বিভাগকো অসম গৱর্ণমেণ্টৰ এটা বিভাগ হিচাবে বিবেচনা কৰা হৈছে। এতিয়া আমি ব্রহ্মপুত্র বান নিয়ন্ত্রণৰ কাৰণে সকলো দায়িত্ব কেন্দ্রীয় চৰকাৰে লব বুলি আশ্বাস দিছে আৰু তেনে ক্ষেত্রত এইটো এটা autonomous body হব আৰু তেতিয়া এই কথাবিলাক বিবেচনা কৰা হব।

Re : 4th Grade employees in the Assam Medical College Hospital

Shrimati Lily Sen Gupta asked :

*83. Will the Minister-in-charge of Health be pleased to state—

(a) How many permanent and casual 4th Grade employees are there in the Assam Medical College and Hospital ?

(b) What is the scale of pay of 4th Grade employees there ?

(c) Whether the 4th Grade employees are given all facilities that they are entitled to get ?

(d) Whether there is any Government machinery of any non-official organisation to look after their grievances ?

(e) Whether it is a fact that Government has declared the services of 4th Grade employees as essential service ?

(f) If so, whether they are getting any additional benefit for that ?

(g) If not, why ?

Shri Chatrasing Teron (Minister, Health) replied :

83. (a)—The strength of the Grade IV staff in the College and Hospital Section are as follows—

	Hospital	College
1. Permanent	228	52
2. Temporary	26	69
3. Contigeney employees, ie., casual.	91	Nil.
Total	345	121

(b)—Rs. 80--1—90—2—100—2·50—115—3—130 p.m.

(c)—Yes.

(d)—The head of the Office, i.e., Principal-cum-Superintendent of the Hospital looks after their grievances as in the case of other Government servants.

(e)—No.

(f)—Dose not arise.

(g)—Does not arise.

Shri Prabhat Narayan Choudhury : Sir, Government in their notification No. GLR. 148/65/193 dated 24th July recognised this as one of the public utility service, then why Government have replied that this has not been done. I read out the notification.

"Where as the Governor of Assam is satisfied that public interests requires that industries mentioned in the Appendix below, being industries specified in the First Schedule to the Industrial Dispute Act 1947 (XIV of 1947) should be declared as public utility service for the purpose of the said Act.

"Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause VI of Clause (n) of Section 2 of the Industrial Dispute Act 1947 (XIV of 1947), Government of Assam is pleased to declare the industries shown hereunder to be the Public Utility Service for the purpose of the said Act for a further period of six months.

(1) All hospitals

Sir, when there is mention of services of hospitals and dispensaries in the notification, why Government have repliep in the negative ?

Shri Chatrasing Teron : (Minister, Health) Do you mean that to be a Public Utility Service ? The question reads like this "(e) Whether it is fact that Government has declared

the services of 4th Grade employees as essential service ? The notification is about Public Utility Service. The question is about essential service and therefore I have replied- 'No'.

Shri Prabhat Narayan Choudhury : That the Industrial Disputes Act is in operation here, why is not mentioned ?

(Voices - Questioner)

Shrimati Lily Sen Gupta : অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয় 'B' প্রশ্নত থকা মেডিকেল বিভাগৰ IV Grade বিলাকৰ দৰমহা কিছু কম পাইছে নেকি ? আমাৰ যিবিলাক Industrial dispute Act. আছে সেইমতে এই IV Gr. কৰ্ম্মচাৰীসকলৰ union বিলাকক চৰকাৰে স্বীকৃতি দিয়া নাই। গতিকে অন্যান্য Union বিলাকক দিয়াৰ দৰে এই 4th Gr. Union ৰ কৰ্ম্মচাৰী বিলাকে Recognition পাব লাগে। এই বিষয়ে চৰকাৰে বিবেচনা কৰিবনে ?

Shri Chatrasing Teron : অন্য Union ৰ ক্ষেত্রত কি হৈছে মই কব নোৱাৰো কিন্তু এই সকল কৰ্ম্মচাৰী Union অন্য চৰকাৰী কৰ্ম্মচাৰী সকলৰ Union আছে, তেনেকৈ কৰিলে আমাৰ আপত্তি নাই।

Shrimati Lily Sen Gupta : প্রশ্ন 'D' ত মাননীয় মন্ত্রী মহোদয়ে কেৱল চৰকাৰী বিষয়াৰ কথা উল্লেখ কৰিছে। কিন্তু এটি মাত্র Registered Union আছে যি Union ক কর্ত্তৃপক্ষই "Hospital Industry নহয় শিল্প বিবাদ আইনত অন্তভুক্ত নহয় বুলি স্বীকৃতি দিয়া নাই, অথচ চৰকাৰে ২৪ জুলাই ৭১ চনৰ No. G. I. R. 148/65/193 গেজেট নতিফিকেচনত হাসপতাল আদিক Public utility Service বুলি Notefy কৰিছে। গতিকে মন্ত্রী মহোদয়ে এই Notification ৰ মতে হাস্পতাল union ক অচিৰে স্বীকৃতি দিবলৈ College ৰ principal ক নিদ্দেশ দিবনে ? যিহেতু অন্যান্য Public utility Service বুলি পৰিগনিত প্রজেক্ট সমূহত Union ক স্বীকৃতি দিয়া হৈছে।

Shri Chatrasing Teron : এইটোৰ মই আশ্বাস দিব নোৱাৰো। চাইহে কব পাৰিম।

কাকী ৰিজার্ভত মাটি পাওতাসকলৰ নাম

শ্রীঅতুল চন্দ্র গোস্বামীয়ে সুধিছে ঃ

*৮৪। মাননীয় ৰাজহ বিভাগৰ মন্ত্রী মহোদয়ে অনুগ্রহ কৰি জনাবনে—

(ক) কলিয়াবৰ সমষ্টিৰ যিসকল লোকে কাকীত মাটি পাইছে সেইসকলৰ নাম আৰু ঠিকনা জনাবনে ?

(খ) পুবথৰীয়া মৌজাৰ ভুৰৱন্ধাত "বাপুজী সমবায় সমিতি"ক কিমান মাটিৰ পৰ্ত্তন দিয়া হৈছে আৰু সেই সমবায়ৰ লোকসকলৰ নাম আৰু ঠিকনা জনাবনে ?

(গ) আজুকপানীত (দ্বাৰশালনা মৌজা) কলিয়াবৰ সমষ্টিৰ কোন কোন সমবায়ক কিমান কিমান মাটি দিয়া হৈছে আৰু সেই সমবায়সমূহৰ সমজুয়াসকলৰ নাম-ঠিকনা কি কি ?

ৰাজহ বিভাগৰ মন্ত্রী শ্রীবিশ্বদেৱ শর্ম্মাই উত্তৰ দিছে :

৮৪। (ক)—(১) শ্রীকলিয়া বৰুৱা, পিতা হেমৰাম, চতিয়া গাওঁ, কলিয়াবৰ।

(২) শ্রীবদল বৰদলৈ, পিতা বুদ বৰদলৈ, কুৰিটাগাওঁ।

(৩) শ্রীবলোৰাম ভুঞা, পিতা কনক, পুবথৰীয়া গাওঁ।

(৪) শ্রীপ্রেম মজুমদাৰ, পিতা ……, কুৰিটনী গাওঁ।

(৫) শ্রীসোমেশ্বৰ বৰা, পিতা……, পুবথৰীয়া পাওঁ।

(৬) শ্রীনলিনী কান্ত শইকীয়া, পিতা নিৰাই, পূবথৰীয়া গাওঁ।

(খ)—পুৰথৰীয়া মৌজাৰ ভুৰৱ গাৱঁত বাপুজী সমবায়ৰ নামত কোনো মাটি পৰ্ত্তন হোৱা নাই।

(গ)—দ্বাৰশালনা মৌজাৰ আজুকপানীত কলিয়াবৰ সমষ্টিৰ তলত নাম দিয়া ৩ টা সমবায়ক মাটি পৰ্ত্তন দিয়া হৈছে—

(১) উত্তৰ কলিয়াবৰ কালেকটীত ফাৰম লিমিটেড—১৭০ বিঘা।

(২) নবজ্যোতি কোঃ অঃ সমবায়—৩১০ বিঘা

(৩) হাতিমুৰা কালেকটীভ ফাৰম—১৬০ বিঘা ।

সমবায়ৰ সমজুয়াসকলৰ নামৰ লিষ্ট বিধান সভাৰ টেবুলত ৰখা হৈছে ।

Re : Barnagar Circle office

Mrs. Pranita Talukdar asked :

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

(a) Why buildings of the Barnagar Circle Office, Kamrup have not yet been constructed ?

(b) When this Circle Office was established ?

(c) Why there is so much delay in constructing this office building ?

(d) When the office buildings, S. D. C's quarter and Mandal's barrack will be constructed ?

Shri Biswadev Sarma (Minister, Revenue) replied :

85. (a)—Due to financial stringency of the State.

(b)—In the year 1898.

(c)—Due to financial stringency of the State.

(d)—As soon as the financial position of the State improves.

Re : Tourist Centre at Matangapar near Darranga Mela

Shri Prabhat Narayan Choudhury asked :

*86. Will the Minister-in-charge of Tourism be pleased to state—

(a) Whether it is a fact that of late the Department received representation to construct a Spacious Tourist Centre

at Matangapar near Darranga Mela which is an important International Border Market of India and Bhutan and a Tourists haunt ?

(b) If so, what effective steps have been taken for construction of a Tourist Centre near Darranga Mela ?

Shri Prabin Kumar Choudhury (Minister, Tourism) replied ;

86. (a)—The honourable Member may please refer to the reply given to the question No. 74 (a) during the Budget Session of the Assembly, 1971.

(b)—No step could yet been taken due to paucity of fund.

Re : Central Assistance

Shri Maneswar Boro : asked :

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

(a) Whether the State Government has received additional amount for the current year 1971-72 from the Central Government in addition to Rs. $4\frac{1}{2}$ crores provided for plan period ?

(b) If so, the amount so received ?

Shri Kamakhya Prasad Tripathi (Minister, Finance) replied :

87. (a) & (b)—The promised amount of Central assistance for the State Plan for 1971-72 is Rs. 36.56 crores (Rs. 14·65 crores grant and Rs. 21·90 crores loan) and out of this an amount of Rs. 21·07 crores (Rs. 12·32 crores as loan and Rs. 8·75 crores as grant) has been received upto date. No intimation has been received regarding any additional Central assistance over and above the sum promised.

Re : Rural Water Supply Scheme

Shri Narendra Nath Sarma asked :

*88. Will the Minister-in-charge of Health be pleased to state—

(a) Whether it is a fact that Government has selected some areas Subdivision-wise to give facilities of Rural Water Supply Scheme ?

(b) If so, what are those selected areas and when the work will be started ?

(c) Whether it is a fact that Dergaon area in the North A. P. will be surveyed by the authority for this purpose ?

Shri Chatrasing Teron (Minister, Health) replied :

88. (a)—No Subdivision-wise selection was made.

(b)—Does not arise.

(c)—Does not arise.

Re : Misappropriation of money

M. A. Musawwir Choudhury asked :

*89. Will the Minister-in-charge of Co operation be pleased to state—

(a) Whether Government is aware of the fact that more then Rs. 68,000 have been misappropriated by the Co-operative Officers of Accounts, Registrar's Office, Nowgong East Zone ?

(b) Who are the Officers involved in this case ?

(c) The actual amount misappropriated ?

(d) The period during which the misappropriation took place

(e) Whether Government is aware that there is much public agitation for such misappropriation of public money ?

(f) The steps taken by Government against the officers involved in the case ?

Shri Jogen Saikia (Minister, Co-operation) replied :

89. (a) & (b)—A report was received from the Zonal Dy. Registrar of Co-operative Societies, Jorhat that a sum of Rs. 73,157·87 was misappropriated by (1) Shri Guru Prosad Bora, the then Bakijai Officer. (2) Shri Abdul Wahid, Additional Bakijai Officer, (3) Shri Cheniram Bora, Process Server Peon, (5) Shri Mohan Chandra Bora, Process Server Peon, (6) Shri Bhaben Kalita, Process Server Peon, (7) Shri Jairam Keot, Process Server Peon (8) Shri Hareswar Sarma Process Server Peon and (9) Shri Matiram Bora, Process Server Peon of the Bakijai Office, Nowgong (East).

(c)—A special audit was ordered and the report reveals that the actual amount involved was Rs. 67, 612·50.

(d)—From November, 1968 to June, 1971.

(e)—There may be agitations. Government is however not aware of it, but even whithout it the Government is taking suitable action in the matter.

(f)—All the Officers and employees have been put under suspension and orders have been passed for drawing up Departmental Proceedings against them. What further action can be taken is under consideration.

Re : Amendment of Article 352

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua asked :

*90. Will the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) Whether Government is aware of the Government of India's reported decision for amending Article "352" of the Constitution for declaring emergency in a Part of the Country ?

(b) If so whether Government of Assam has been consulted in the matter ?

(c) If not, what is the re-action of the Government of Assam in this regard ?

Shri Mahendra Mohan Choudhury (Chief Minister) replied :

90. (a)—No information about such reported decision of the Government of India has been received by the State Government ?

(b)—Does not arise.

(c)—The State Government will consider the implication of such proposed amendment when received.

Re : Payment of Dearness Allowance to the Non-Government Employees in the Panchayat Raj Training Centres' at Joysagar

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua asked:

*91. Will the Minister-in-charge of Panchayat be pleased to state—

(a) Whether it is a fact that the Non-Government employees in the Panchayat Raj Traing Centres' at Joysagar, Kahiku-

chi and Arunachal, who are enjoying identical scale of pay like those of their counterparts in the Government Services, have still dep ived of the benefit of additional dearness allowance (a) Rs. 20 00 p.m. which originally came into force from 1st April 1969 as per Government circular No. FEG. 99/67-pt/262, dated 21st January 1970 and circular No. FEG. 99/67/part/ 326, dated 10th April, 1971 respectively, for want of sanction from the Government ?

(b) If so, whether Government propose to take necessary steps immediately ?

(c) Whether it is a fact that the Government prefers to ignore the case of those poor employees for each additional dearness allowance whenever happen to be under the appointment of the Assam State Panchayat Parishad, Gauhati and Assam State Co-operative Union, Gauhati, to whom the management has been vested by the Government ?

Shri Devendra Nath Hazarika (Minister of State, Panchayat & C. D.) replied :

91. (a)—Yes. The Non-Government employees in the Panchayat Raj Training Centres at Joysagar, Kahikuchi and Arunachal have not been granted additional dearness allowance @Rs. 20. There is no provision in the Government circulars for granting such dearness allowance to the Non-Government employees and as such necessary sanction from the Government dose not arise.

(b)—The matter is under consideration of the Government.

(c)—No, if they are entitled to any such additional dearness allowance under the rules.

Re : Seniority of Inspectors of Statistics

Shri Lakshyadhar Choudhury asked :

*92. Will the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) Whether it is a fact that the seniority of the Inspectors of Statistics was prepared according to A. P. S. C's nomination list and was published in 1963 ?

(b) Whether it is a fact that this seniority list was ignored at the time of giving promotion in the year 1969 ?

(c) If so, why ?

(d) What was the principle followed for fixation of seniority in the revised list of 1969 ?

Shri Mahendra Mohan Choudhury : (Chief Minister) : replied :

92. (a)—In 1963, tentative lists showing inter se seniority of the officers of different categories in the Directorate of Statistics (including Inspectors of Statistics) were prepared and circulated inviting objections, if any, from the officers concerned. After receiving objections it was decided that the final lists would be prepared category-wise starting with the seniority list of Research Officers. By the time the list for Inspectors of Statistics could be prepared after disposing of the objections, it was 1969. In the meanwhile, a number of Inspectors had been promoted and there had been considerable addition to the cadre also. It was therefore, decided to circulate afresh a tentative seniority list inviting objection, if any in fairness to all the officers then in service. After considering the representations filed in

response thereto the seniority list was finalised on 16th September 1969.

(b)—There was no promotions in the year 1969. However there were promotions upto 1967 and the tentative seniority list circulated in 1963 was taken into consideration by the Assam Public Service Commission in giving their recommendation.

(c)—Does not arise.

(d)—The principles laid down by Government in the Appointment Department for fixation of inter se seniority from time to time had been followed while fixing the inter se seniority of Inspectors of Statistics on 16th September 1969. Extract of Appointment Department circular letter No. AAA. 2/44/39, dated 21st February 1945, AAP. 27/50, dated 31st March 1960, ABP. 50/61/204, dated 2nd June 1961 and No. ABP.51/63/1, dated 5th February 1964 are placed on the table of the House.

Re : Financial assistance to Gauhati Urban Co-operative Bank

Shri Sailen Medhi asked :

*93. Will the Minister-in charge of Co-operation be pleased to state—

(a) Whether there was a Cabinet decision to contribute financial assistance to Gauhati Urban Co-operative Bank by way of purchasing shares of that Bank by the Government ?

(b) If so, the date of arriving at that decision ?

(c) Whether the Government has given effect to that decision ?

(d) If not why ?

Shri Jogen Saikia (Minister, Co-operation) replied :

93 (a) - Yes.

(b)—14th October 1968.

(c)—Not yet.

(d)—As there was no Budget provision and plan funds were not allowed to be utilised for contribution of share capital to Urban Banks, attempts are being made to provide this money during the current financial year.

Re : Malaria Eradication Department

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua asked :

*94. Will the Minister-in-charge of Health be pleased to state—

(a) Whether the Malaria Eradication Department has been declared permanent ?

(b) If so, whether the employees of the Department have been confirmed ?

Shri Chatrasing Teron (Minister, Health) replied :

94. (a)—No.

(b)—Does not arise.

Re : Representation from the Assam Mandal Kanango Sanmilan

Shri Prabhat Narayan Choudhury asked :

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

(a) Whether Government have received memorandum, resolutions representalions of Assam Mandal Kanango Sanmilan to grant them some amenities to remove some long standing grievances and if so, what are they ?

(b) What steps have been taken by Government in this regard ?

Shri Biswadev Sarma (Minister, Revenue,) replied :

95. (a) & (b)—A statement show in various resolutions adopted in different meetings of the Assam Mandal Kanango Sanmilan and action taken by Government on the same is placed on the Table of the House.

Re : I. B. at Sarbhog

Mrs. Pranita Talukdar asked :

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

(a) Whether Government propose to construct an I. B. at Sorbhog ?

(b) If so, when ?

Shri Altaf Hossain Mazumder [Minister, Public Works Department (Roads and Buildings)] replied :

96. (a)—There is no such proposal at present.

(b)—Does not arise.

Re : Question on legislators, property.

Shri Atul Chandra Goswami : ১৯৬৯ চনতে মই এটা প্রশ্ন কৰিব

ছিলো যে ১৯৬৭ চনত নির্ব্বাচিত প্রতিনিধি সকলৰ বস্তিৰ খেতিৰ মাটি আৰু অনান্য ঠাইত মাটি কিমান আছে আৰু মাননীয় সদস্য সকলৰ বাচ ট্রাক কিমান আছে এইটো জানিব বিচাৰিছিলো। কিন্তু ১৯৬৯ চনৰ পৰা ১৯৭১ চনলৈকে প্রশ্নটো নাহিল আৰু এই বাৰো যোৱা আগষ্ট মাহতে এই প্রশ্নটো সুধিছিলো। S.D.C সকলে ইয়াৰ কাৰণে তথ্য পাতি আমাৰ পৰা সংগ্রহো কৰিছিল। চৰকাৰে এই কথাটো কি কাৰণে হেচা দি থাকিছে। মই আশা কৰো কালিলৈ মোৰ প্রশ্নটোৰ উত্তৰ দিব।

Shri Mohendra Mohan Choudhury : এই প্রশ্নটো সম্বন্ধে মই কব নোৱাৰো। তেখেতে আৰু এটা প্রশ্ন কৰিছিল যে মন্ত্রী সকলৰ লৰা-ছোৱালী বিলাক চৰকাৰৰ কোন কোন বিভাগৰ কামত আছে আৰু চৰকাৰৰ State project ৰ কোন কত আছে এইটোৰ হিচাব বিচাৰিছে। এই সম্পর্কত মই প্রশ্নটো Ready কৰি দিছো। কালিলৈ আহেনে নাহে কব নোৱাৰো।

Shri Atul Chandra Goswami: তাৰ পিচত দিয়া প্রশ্নৰ উত্তৰ আহিছে কিন্তু ১৯৬৯ চনতে দিয়া প্রশ্নৰ উত্তৰ কিয় অহা নাই।

Shri Mohendra Mohan Choudhury : এই প্রশ্নটো ব্যাপক। ইয়াত কোনো বিভাগেই বাদ নাই। চৰকাৰৰ সকলো বিভাগৰ পৰা আহিব লাগিব। গতিকে সেইবিলাক দেৰি হবও পাৰে।

Re : Motion on the report of the Enquiry Committee on land settlment.

Shri Promode Gogoi : On a point of order, Sir.

I submitted a motion on the report of the Enquiry Committee on settlement of land in and around Gauhati and that motion was announced by you also. But in the list of business for today my motion has not found a place. May I know from you, Sir, why my motion was not included though you announced. Tnere were two motions- one by me and the other by Shri Atul Goswami.

Mr. Speaker : I have asked the office to look into the matter and give it as a corrigendum.

Re : Site for the Railway Division at Rangiya

Shri Kamini Mohan Sarma : অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, মই এটা কথা উত্থাপন কৰিব খুজিছো যে অসমৰ জনসাধাৰনৰ বঙিয়াত Railway Division হোৱাৰ যিটো ইচ্ছা সেই Division ৰ কথাটো ৰহস্য হৈয়ে আছে। আজি দুই বছৰ ধৰি এই কথা কেন্দ্রত পৰি আছে। আৰু ইয়াৰ মাটি সম্বন্ধে কি হল আমাক জনাব লাগে।

Shri Mohendra Mohan Choudhury : এই সম্পর্কত Railway Board এ যি স্থান নিদ্ধাৰন কৰিছে তাৰ Possession সোনকালে দিব লাগে বুলি কৈছে। আৰু তেওঁলোকে যেতিয়াই বিচাৰে আমি তেতিয়াই দিব পাৰিম।

Re : Strike by P.W.D contractors for non-payment of Bills

Mr. Speaker : Mr. Bora আপোনাৰ কি কথা আছে কওক চমুকৈ কৰ।

Shri Phoni Bora : মই এটা কথা P. W. D Minister ক জনাব খুজিছো যে নগাৱৰ ঠিকাদাৰ সকলে যোৱা মাহৰ ১৫ তাৰিখৰ পৰা ধৰ্ম্মঘট কৰিছে যাৰ ফলত P.W.D ৰ সকলো বিলাক pending কাম বন্ধ হৈ আছে। এই ধৰ্ম্মঘটৰ কাৰণ হৈছে যোৱা মাৰ্চ মাহৰ পৰা যিমান বিলাক কাম কৰা হৈছে তাৰ পইছা দিয়া হোৱা নাই। সেই কাৰণে অন্য কামত বিভাগৰ অন্য কাম আগ বঢ়া নাই। প্রায় ১০ লাখ টকা ঠিকাদাৰ সকলক দিব লাগে। অকল ডবকা বাষ্টাটোতেই ৭০ লাখ টকা দিব লগা আছে। এই পৰিস্থিতিটো এটা বিপদ জনক হৈ পৰিছে কাৰণ পইচাৰ অভাৱত তেওঁলোকৰ পৰিয়াল আৰু কৰ্ম্মচাৰী সকলে ভুগিব লগীয়া হৈছে। গতিকে এই P.W.D Minister এ সোনকালে দিয়াৰ ব্যৱস্থা কৰিবনে ?

Shri Altaf Hossain Majumdar (Minister, P. W. D.) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, just now I have got notice of what Shri

Bora has stated. As a matter of fact there is some truth in it. Regarding other places also we are facing difficulty so far as the fund position is concerned payments are due in some places. My attention has been drawn about the difficulties faced by Nowgong people. I shall be definitely looking into it and see how far we can relieve this position.

Re: Famine Condition at mankachar

Shri Zahirul Islam: Under Rule 301 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Assam Legialative Assambly I want to bring to the notice of this August House, the acute famine condition prevailing in Dhubri Subdivision causing death and misery to the entire population for which many persons including one of the hon Member of House Shri Giasuddin Ahmed had to undergo 24 hours hunger strike on the 25th of this month.

Due to the total failure of crops (Aman in 1970 and Ahu in 1971) and also due to fall of the price of jute and also due to large scale influx of evacuees the economic condition of the people of Dhubri Subdivision has gone down to such an extent that not to speak of getting essential commodities at cheaper price the people are not in a position to buy even the most essential things of their day to day life as a result of which severe famine condition is prevailing and many people have died of starvation.

The District and subdivisional authorities have failed to cope with the situation. Government on the other hand inspite of repeated demand from the people is keep-

ing silent in this respect. Uuless immediate relief measures are undertaken more people may die and a chaotic condition will prevail throughout the region It is a very urgent matter which needs immediate attention of the Government and solution by the Govt.

Shri Biswadev Sarma (Minister, Revenue) : Sir, this will take a little time. In May and the early part of June, 1971, it was reported that parts of Nalbari and parts of Mangaldai had not received sufficient rainfall and that had affected Aus crop on the field and the raising of sali seedlings. While information thus available at that time related to portion of North Lakhimpur Subdivision, portion of Mangaldai and Barpeta Subdivisions, Amteka and Gossaigaon areas of Kokrajhar, Sijangram and Balijan circles of Goalpara Subdivision and isolated pockets of Nowgong District, a W. T. message was to the D. C., Dhubri amongst others, asking if there were any other such areas and also to signal daily rainfall figures in such draught affected areas.

On the 29th June 1971 a meeting was held in the room of the Commissioner for Agricultural Production regarding the growing of Sali seedlings and the Revenue Department agreed to make available a sum of Rs. 3 lakhs towards subsidizing the operation cost. The Seed Corporation was also authorised to raise Rs. 50 thousand worth of seedlings in the first instance and, if the draught continued beyond the month of July, to raise another Rs. 50 thousand worth of seedlings. A long W.T.

message was issued to the Subdivisional Officers, Kokrajhar and Goalpara. amongst others, and information was awaited from the D.C., Dhubri, in reply to our earlier message. Later on it was reported from North Lakhimpur, Kokrajhar and Goalpara that rainfall had taken place and our attention was given to Borpeta, Nalbari, North Gauhati and Mangaldai Subdivisions in relation to relief works for draught affected areas.

In July 1971 there was a Cabinet meeting in which it was decided to install tubewells, Towards the end of July and the beginning of August, 1971, the Chief Minister toured Goalpara and Dhubri Subdivisions and he telephoned me from Dhubri stating that some power-pumps were available in Goalpara and these would be immediately taken out and diverted to the draught affected areas and this was also done. For the first time, towards the end of July, 1971 information was received that Kukurmara and Karuabanda areas of Mankachar were hit by draught and were passing their days in difficulty. We immediately asked the D.C. and the Chief Engineer, Brahmaputra Flood Control, stating that works undertaken in the draught affected areas involving unskilled labour should use only the local labour to relieve the distress of such affected persons and further that if exception was to be made the prior permission of the Chief Minister should be obtained.

In reply to our W. T. message, the D. C, Dhubri reported that no draught was prevailing in area of Mankachar and Aus affected by incessant rain and heavy pest

and that anti-pest measures were taken up by the Agriculture Department by spending Rs. 2,200/. No information of draught in any other areas of the Subdivision was supplied even at the that time (6th August, 1971). On 16th August, 1971 the D.C., Dhubri wrote a letter enclosing a copy of the letter from the District Agricultural Officer saying that rainfall had not been favourable and informing Government that if the situation developed further and warranted further report, this will be submitted to Government. Another report was also received from the D.C., Dhubri that there was no draught condition prevailing in Mankachar area where there was an incessant rain and that the condition on rainfall recently had not been favourable which might affect Sali crop adversely. This letter was issued on 14th August, 1971 and did not mention that Aus was affected. The D. C., Dhubri had not replied to our earlier W.T. message asking for rainfall figures and the names of the draught affected areas. Another W. T. message was sent to the D. C., Dhubri asking him to furnish the names of the Anchalik Panchayats, the total areas in square miles, comparative rainfall figures of 1970-71 and 71-72 of the areas affected by draught. No reply was received for this W. T. message.

In the beginning of September, 1971 Shri Kabir Ch. Roy Prodhani, M.L.A. had submitted a letter addressed to you mentioning that there was acute food crisis in the western part of Goalpara District, i.e., Dhubri, Gauripur, and Golakganj and Agamani areas. A. W. T. message was

sent to the D. C. to submit detailed report and in the meantime to increase the number of Fair Price Shops in these areas and arrange to supply atta regularly. The D. C. for the first time wrote a letter on 16th September, 1971 to the Chief Secretary stating that during his tour in the interior areas pointed attention had been drawn to the deteriorating economic condition of the people and feared that some political parties might try to magnify the situation. He had felt that test relief work could not be the solution and had wanted that works be undertaken by P.W.D., Agriculture Department and other Departments. Though a copy of this letter was endorsed to the Revenue Department, we had not received it and came to know of it from another letter. However, on the 20th September, 1971 we receiced a long W. T. message from the D.C., Dhubri. He had specifically mentioned that Sali transplantation was not largely affected but continueous dry spell for last fortnight caused apprehension. Tnis indicated that while there was fear about Sali crop, there was no specific mention about Aus failure in any of the areas. The D. C. has also sent a letter forwarding a memorandum submitted by the M.L.A. of Golakganj, Shri Kabir Chandra Roy Pradhani, Shri Sahar Ali Ahmed, Shri Giasuddin Ahmed stating their demands which are-

(1) Supply of all commodities through Cheap Grain Shops at reasonable rate,

(2) Declaring these areas as famine areas,

(3) Making provision for test relief work.

The Chief Minister had also visited Dhubri, on 21st September, 1971 and at that time also the D. C, had indicated that he was taking steps to augment supply of food-grains but had not specifically reported that certain areas were suffering as a result of draught and were in need of specific relief measures.

It may be mentioned here that large scale construction of refugee camps has taken place in the whole of Goalpara District, involving an investment of an order of Rs. 1 crore. In Dhubri Subdivision alone, a sum of Rs.15.95 lakhs has been spent on the construction of refugee camps. These camps have been constructed with locally available materials and if there was distress there was no reason why these distress affected people should not or could not have found employment in the construction of these camps.

Further, as per Forecast Report the total area of Aus cultivation in Goalpara District this year is 1,35,000 hectares against the figure of 1,31,000 hectares last year. This figure was reported by the District Forecast Committee of which the D. C. himself is the Chairman. It is true, however, that the production per hectare has fallen from 96,674 tonnes to 71,866 tonnes. This means a shortfall of 25 p. c. in the total production which cannot be said to have caused such acute economic distress as sought to be made out. However, we may sanction such test relief schemes as found fruitful and also ensure that food-grains which are available in the State are equitably distributed so that there is no shortage of food-stuff.

Shri Giasuddin Ahmed : Sir, one point for clarification. The problem of Dhubri has been misunderstood. The problem of draught has been mentioned many times by the Minister but one thing he has missed completely, and that is due to certain disease more than 90% of the Ahu has been completely damaged, and due to the fall in the price of jute, the main cash crop of the District, the whole economy of the Subd vision has been shattered. That thing had not been mentioned in the statement of the Minister. He simply mentioned about the draught but the failure of Ahu has completely missed the attention of the Government and the local officers, and as a result famine condition is prevailing there. Already 6 or 7 people have died of starvation although Government may not admit it. Therefore the Government should make a thorough probe into the matter and take suitable steps.

Shri Biswadev Sarma : We shall take suitable measures.

Re : Kaligaon Krishipam

Shri Bhubaneswar Barua : অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, ৩০১ ধাৰা মতে মোৰা ২৮/১১/৭১ তাৰিখে কালি গাওঁ কৃষি পামৰ বিষয়ে মই মুখ্যমন্ত্রীৰ দৃষ্টি আকর্ষণ কৰিছিলো আৰু তাৰ বাবে স্বীকৃতিও পাইছিলো। সেই বিষয়টো ৫।১১।৭১ তাৰিখে আহিব বুলি মই চিঠিও পাইছিলো কিন্তু আজিলৈকে নাহিল কিয় ?

Mr. Speaker ; ৫।১১।৭১ তাৰিখৰ কাৰবিলাক সেইদিনা নহল অহা ৮ আৰু ৯।১১।৭১ তাৰিখে অহাৰ কথা আছে।

Shri Bhubaneswar Barman : আজিতো নাহিল।

Mr. Speaker : আজি নাহিল যদিও ৯।১১।৭১ তাৰিখে আহিব।

Complaint of Breach of Privilege against a Minister of state

Mr. Speaker : The day before yesterday, I have received a notice for privilege motion from Shri Dulal Chandra Barua at 10-32 A. M. Therefore it could not be taken up. According to the rule a member wishing to make a complaint of a breach of privilege shall have to give notice in writing before the commencement of the House. He has placed the complaint when the House was in session, So I could not study the case. In his complaint Shri Barua stated that Shri Jagannath Singh, Minister of State in charge of Industries has committed breach of the House and the matter may be allowed to raise a question of privilege. In support of his complaint he has not submitted relevant documents, but later on he has submitted them. According to rule, all relevant documents should be submitted along with the complaint. The subject matter is the core of the motion. If the honourable Minister against whom the complaint was brought does not know the subject matter, how can he defend himself ? As a matter of fact, Shri Jagannath Singh has received the complaint only today. He does not know what is the complaint against him. In view of this, I do not think the motion is adequate. Now, the honourable member has submitted it and I received it at my Chamber to day at 11 A. M., otherwise this motion would not have been in order. Now, it is in order. According to the rule, when the complaint is to be made against a member, copy of the notice should be given to me.

(Voice - I have given)

No. Copy of the documents has submitted today. So it is deferred to today.

Shri Jagannath Singh, (Minister of State, Industries) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have received the notice just now, but documents have not yet been supplied. Simply he has mentioned that a news item appeared before the Azad. I do not know what appeared in the newspaper.

Mr. Speaker : Now, I will ask the hon. Member to speak in brief about admissibility of the question of privilege

*Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : Mr. Speaker, Sir, under Rules 58 and 59, I have given notice for a privilege motion against Shri Jagannath Singh, Minister of State in charge of Industries for committing a gross breach of privilege of the House by obstructing the functioning of the House in general. Sir, in this connection, I would like to raise a matter, under rule 301, of urgent public importance which is related to the behaviour of a Minister towards a nurse in certain hospital at Silchar. The honourable Chief Minister has also admitted that he had also received such kind of complaint against the Minister. He assured the House that he would make enquiry into the matter and action taken in this respect would be apprised to the House. He further assured as that if anybody was found guilty, adequate punishment would be inflicted on him. But unfortunately, that matter is still pending in the House. Sir, after that discussion and when the entire

*Speech not corrected

m tter was before the House for disposal, Shri Jagannath Singh. Minister of State in charge of Industries by ignoring the convention of the House, and by disrespecting the House has issued a statement in a weekly of Azad which was published on 27th October 1971, under the caption of ভিত্তীহীন অভিযোগের প্রতিবাদ ? While I brought this matter to the notice of the Chief Minister I did not mention any body's name. Simply I stated that one Minister of the Cabinet misbehaved a nurse under alcoholic influence. Because he went out at 10-30 or 11 P. M. to the hospital in a drunken mood and behaved unmannerly way. As I have said, we have not mentioned the name of anybody, but what my friend has done ? Out of over zealousness he has given statement in a Bengali Weekly named Azad. It is a long statement, I need not go through it. But simply I want to draw your attention how he has committed the breach of privilege. Sir, under rule 159, a member wishing to make a complaint of a breach of privilege shall give notice. I have given notice. Under rule, 160, the matter requires the intervention of the House. As the matter is still pending in the House, there is no question and authority outside of the House who can deny the right of the house. When the matter is under investigation and when the Chief Minister has given enough assurance and when Mr. Upadhyaya raised a point of order at that time also the Chief Minister reaffirmed it, there should not be any topic outside the House about the same thing. If it is so, under what circumstance, the honourable Minister can go up to that extent for giving publication denying the allegation.

It is the responsibility of the Chief Minister to give to the House and not through public way. Sir, in this connection, I would like to mention here Mr. Kaul's Practice and Procedure, at page 201 - "refusal to produce documents in his posession". Now, the matter seems to be very simple. This gentleman has refused to give his evidence to the Chief Minister and as the Chief Minister did not inform us about the allegation or the truth, which is tentemount to refuse of his document. He refused to give the evidence to the House, but he went outside and gave his statement ignoring the House. Then again he has given false evidence, because we cannot accept any evidence which does not come before the House. He will fully wants to supress the matter. On the other hand he has given evidence outside by denying his allegation. Now, again I am quoting from the same book at page 202 - "disclosing of proceedings or decisions of secret sitting of the House in any manner". Sir, this is a secret session and the matter is still secret to the outside people. The honourable Minister instead of revealing the fact, he pleaded his innocence. He ought to have given all the documents to the Chief Minister and the Chief Minister would have given to the members of the House the whole affair Therefore, he has committed a breach of privilege by divulging the secracy of the House. Then, another aspect is that there is disobedience to the order of order of the Committee. "Disobedience to the orders of a Committee of the House is treated as a contempt of the House itself, provided the

order disobeyed is within the scope of the Committee's authority." Here, this is the scope of the authority of the House. He dishounred the House by giving a statement in the Press by denying the evidence and instead of giving substantial evidence to the Chief Minister, when the House is still to decide the particular matter whether there is allegation or not.

Now, as I have said just now, there is disobedience "by refusing to permit books or papers to be inspected when required by orders of Committee" Now, the Chief Minister has to investigate the matter and examine all the documents, and if necessary, he may carry on some verification also ...But we do not know whether the Chief Minister is going to do such thing. He is silent. But the question is that it is a fact that on the 27th October, no such evidence was given, otherwise this sort of things would not have been disclosed, and consequently we would not have discasion to bring such kind of motion before the House.

At page 303, we find- "endeavouring to persuade or induce a person to procure from another person a letter which such person had been required to produce before a Committee," Now, we are to expect from a young, energetic, most well well-educated person and he has visited many countries. He knows very much the practice and procedure of Parliament. He is aware that the matter is pending before the House, So, he ought to have known the rules and procedures. Because, his action is tentmount to breach

of privilege. So, we have every reason to small bad small. He might have influenced the editor of the paper who must be aware of the fact that this matter was pending in the House. But at page 205 (Kaul's Practice and Procedure of Parliament) it is said -" it is considered inconsistent with the dignity of the House to take any serious notice or action in the case of every defematory statement which may technically constitute' a breach of privilege or contempt of the House'. And at page-207 of the same Book, it has been clearly mentioned -"reflections on the character and impartically of the Speaker in the discharge of his duty (a) Reflections on members in the execution of their duties (b) Reflections on members serving on a Committee of the House (c) Reflections on the conduct of the Chairman of a Committee of the House (d)" By action, Shri Jagannath Singh, Minister of State for Industries, he was dishonoured you because under your authority we are functioning and under your direction the matter was pending before the House. No investigation, I think, was made and no statement has been made so far by the Chief Minister on this very particular fact. It tantemounts to a breach of privilege for dishonouring the authority of the Chair as well as of the House and also it is a reflection on the me, bers in execution of their duties. Sir, this statement which has been made by him obstructed the smooth functioning of the members of this legialature. It also affect on the members serving on the committee of the House ; in the same way, this statement which has

been made by the Minister of State, Industries, has obstructed all the Hon'ble members of the House including you in discharging thier duties sincerely and honestly in a parliementary democracy. Again in the same Book, it has been mentioned-" the publication of false or distorted, partial or injurious reports of debates or proceedings of the house or its Committees or wilful misrepresentation or suppression of speeches of prticular members, is an offence of the same character as the publication of libels upon the House, its Committees or members ; and the persons who are responsible for such publication are liable to be punished for a breach of privilege or contempt of the House". By publishing that thing, he has distorted the wishes and the Speaker of this House and this also tantmounts to a breach of privilege. Now at page - 208 of the same book, it is mentioned - "Thus, the breach of privilege or contempt of the House in this connection would be : (1) wilful misrepresentation of the proceedings in the House (c) or of the speeches of particular members (d) ; and (ii) Wilful suppression of speeches of perticular members (e) ". Sir, he wilfully mis-represented the proceedings of the House by giving such kind of statements to the press for publication. In the same Book at page 211, another aspect of the thing is mentioned. That is the publication of making of policy announcements by Ministers outside the House while the House is in session". When it is concerned with the particular Minister, and a code of Conduct in maintained by the Ministery, it tantemounts to a policy matter of the

House. Any statement which is to be given to the House, and which has been submitted to the House, only the House is to be given the top-most priority in such kind of information. Under these circumstances I feel that it is a fitcase to be taken up by the Privilege Committee. Sir, you can also decide the issue as is it a very serious matter concerning a person not less than a person but a Minister. When he does not know as to how to pay respect to the House, what will be the position of a layman outside the House. By considering all aspects of the matter I submit that Shri Jagannath Singh Minister of State, Industries committed gross breach of privilege to you and to the House as well and he is to be punished under the provisions of the Procedure and Conduct Rules of the House.

Shri Gaurishankar Bhattachyya : Sir, on the admissibility of the Motion I would like to make a few observations. I do not know whether Shri Jagannath Singh the Minister responsible for the Scandal on that particular night was drunk, I do not know that I also do not know whether under the influence of liquor he had misbehaved with a female nurse in a hospital at midnight. But I know this much that Shri Barua the other day brought a matter before the House and that matter raised certain issues Connected with the prestige & privileges of this House, the lst issue was that in a very unfortunate incident a Member of this House who happens to be a Minister of the Government was involved and that he made himself involved not

as a private citizen, but as a "Minister". He said, further that though here in this State there is "Prohibition" and though we are supposed to further the cause of prohibition, that Minister of the Congress Government was dead-drunk. Particularly, he said that though it was none of the business of that Minister to go to a Hospital at midnight to confront a young Lady Nurse, well, that Minister under the influence of liquor did so. Then he said that matter went so far as to lead the local authorities concerned to send representations to the higher authorities. He further said this matter has been so much talked about by the general public that the dignity of the Government the dignity of the House appears to be lowered and therefore this being a very important matter of public importance, he wanted a clarification from the Government. I presume that the Hon'ble Minister, Shri Jagannath Singh was present in this House that day. He did not make any statement at that time. The Chief Minister was present. He found that the allegations were really serious and therefore he thought.....

Shri Jagannath Sinha (Minister of State) : When Mr, Barua made the statement I was not present here.

Shri Gaurisanker Bhattacharyya : At any rate, if he was not present that was highly improper because the Ministers are expected to be persent in the House when the House is in session and if they are to be absent for any exceptional, urgent reason which reason should be more important

than the business of the House, then they may be absent only with your permission and with the permission of the Chief Minister. I do not know whether he had that permission and whether something much more important was writing for him out side the House than the business of the House. I do not know that. Now, the Chief Minister thought that it was a very serious allegation that a Minister should go to a yong lady nurse at midnight under the influence of liquor and that he should misbehave towars that young nurse. That was a serious allegation and the Chief Minister in all propriety thought that he should make a thorough investigation and should make a statement in the House, That was very good. It was thus that the matter became a matter of the House. It became a subject matter of the House, a property of the House and the matter was not decided. It was not settled by the house. It was in the possession of the House and had remained confined to the House and it was not settled. Now a property of the House which is still under discussion and on which a final verdict is yet to be had, on that matter the Minister has gone out or is alleged to have gone out and is alleged to have said that it is 'baseless' and he said this not inside the House but outside to a newspaper. He had every right to say this in this House. If he was not present at the time when the allegation was made, he could have said subsequently what he wanted to say. If there was any wrong allegation he had every right to say so and it would have been very good to say so. But he did not do that. It is alleged that

outside the House he gave a statement pertaining to a matter which is still in possession of the House on which no decision has been given and he calls it 'baseless. He said, As I said in the beginning, the allegation was meaningful. When one goes through his alleged explanation, one does not find that it is baseless. The first allegation was that the Minister was in a drunken coudition. In his statement nowhere he said that he was not drunk. In the allegation another point was mentioned that the Minister went there at night, Nowhere he has said that he did not go out at dead of night. The allegation was that the Minister did not go to the Hospital being ill. If of course, drunkenness is not considered as an illness, he did not go as a sick man. Anyway it is his statement ; and he says that it is baseless. Another thing is, how he behaved towards the Nurse. That behaviour anybody can take in any manner he likes. If patriarch like the Chief Minister pats a girl it will be taken that a father is patting his daughter ; but if a yong stranger does it, it may be taken otherwise. So, it is a matter of attitude and it is a matter of interpretasation. The only thing is that without specifically denying this specific allegation how can it be said that it is baseless ? This is yet another aspect. Particularly when the matter is in the House how could he say it out-side ? And what does he say ? He says that He does not say whether it was "Pratham" or "Madhya" or "Sesh ratri"

How can the Minister, Industry save somebody in the

Maternity Ward, I do not know.....This is his own statement. ....So, Sir, from his own statement it appears that it is not baseless. He may say that it is partly correct and partly incorrect. Atleast it is not baseless. So, first of all to say that something is baseless, his own statement does not prove it to be baseless. When it is a matter of the House, to give or make such statement actually comes under privilege of the House and it amounts to misrepresentation of the proceeding of the House. Therefore, Sir, I think, a prime facie case is there which should go to the Committee of Privileges for further investigation.

Mr. Speaker : Mr. Sinha, do want to make earlier statement to explain your position ? In Rule 168 is said"..... the member complained against shall be given an opportunity to be heard in explanation or exulpation."

Shri Ataur Rahman (Minister Parliamentary Affairs) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to speak a few words on the admissibility of the motion. About the irregularity of this motion of Privilege, I want to speak nothing because you have already dealt with it. It is true, on 26th October, 1971 Shri Dulal Chandra Barua had mentioned the contents of the allegation, but there he had not mentioned the name of any Minister particularly. Now, the contradiction which has been referred to in the "Saptahik Azad", has came out in the issue of the paper on 27th October, 1971. This is a weekly paper. It is not mentioned when Mr. Jaganath Sinha gave the interview to the paper. Only the publication is dated 27th October, 1971. In the interview

itself Mr. Jagannath Sinha was contradicting a report which had come out in the "Daily Sapath" dated 19th October, 1971. There certain report had come out which amounted to something like character assassination. Therefore, when there were reports tentamounting to one's character assissination one was surely justified to come out with a contradiction.

Under these circumstances Sir, I do not think that Shri Jagannath Sinha has tinkered with the property of the House. He was simply referring to the news item published in Sapath dated 19th October, 1971. He had not mentioned or made any reference to the proceedings of the House. The publication is of 27th october, 1971, but the date of interview is not given there.

Therefore, in the circumstances, I think that because of the transparent irregularity itself, and because what I have said the privilege motion is notfit to be admitted.

Mr. Speaker: (When Shri Sailen Medhi rose to speak). You also want to speak on the admissibility. If we go on like this then.....

Shri Sailen Medhi: We can seek clarification from the Minister. The Minister who has been complained against, has given a statement of facts and we want to clarify those facts whether these are correct or not. The Minister for Parliamentary Affairs has said that the Minister against whom allegation has been brought, has made a statement contradicting a report which appeared in another paper.

Now, when the matter came up before the House it would have been the duty of the Minister to ask that paper not publish the report of the interview as it would have brought a question of privilege. So the Minister has failed to perform his duty in that respect.

Mr, Speaker : That is not the rule of the House. You have already spoken about the admissibility and the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs replied to it. The facts are not to be discussed.

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : I have a submission. We have given our points. The matter is very delicate and we want that the matter should be referred to the Privilege Committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker : Sir, I have got a submission I think it amounts some infriengement on our rules. Because on the complaint made by Mr. Barua the hon. Chief Minister categorically stated before the House that within this Assembly Session after the receipt of the report from Silchar so far as this particular incident is concerned, he will make a statement. In the meantime this Privilege motion has come up. Now, Sir, if you accept this Privilege Motion then it will go to the Privilege Committee before the Chief Minister could make a statement because the moment you accept it, it goes to the Privilege Committee.

Mr. Speaker : It seems there are clear misunderstanding.

Mr. Deputy Speaker : If you enquire from the Chief Minister about it and then you can decide the next course of action.

Mr. Speaker : I have got the notice from the Chief Minister. He will make a statement after lunch. Now, the main question is whether any member of this House not only the Minister, can make a statement regarding the House or whether he can comment on it while the matter is pending before the House and if so whether it amounts to Breach of Privilege. There are two different matters. One relates to the merit of the Case under Rule 301. The other is whether it violates the Privilege of the House if any hon. member give certain opinion relating a matter which is under consideration of the House. In respect of these a matters I have heard both the sides and according to Rule 168 we can given the member the earliest opportunity to explain whether the allegation made are correct or incorrect. I have been giving you such opportunities always.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah : Mr. Speaker Sir, I think I should seek a clarification from you before you give your final decision. A member may be maligned with a purpose. In Assam such dubious methods are not very much practised but in other places it happens. Now, so far as member is maligned with scurrilous sort of an allegations the Chief Minister is keeping quiet for a long time perhaps he is thinking let the man get a little 'Moja'. Sir, in such circumstances has not a member got the right of expression that I am innocent without attacking the House. Supposing in the House a member is maligned as a burglar or saying that he has committed certain henious offence-Now, has he got no

right to say that I am innocent without attacking the House.

Shri Giasuddhin Ahmed : I have got a Point of Order Sir. From the discussion it appears that some of us have missed the main point. The question is whether the statement published in that particular paper amounts to Breach of Privilege of the House or not. That is quite different matter and that is upto the Privilege Committee to look into the matter. Now, the question before us is about the admisibility of the Privilege Motion. The conditions of the admissibility of the motion is laid down under Rule 160 of the Rules of Procedure.

Mr, Speaker : About admissiblity of the motion and whether the motion is in order or not that point is under investigation.

Shri Giasuddhin Ahmed : I want to exert on that point. Here it states, that "not more than one question shall be raised at the same sitting". No such point was raised. "The question shall be restricted to a specific matter of recent occurrence". This is a specific matter. "The matter requires the intervention of the House"...interruption ....

Shri Mahendra Mohan Choudhury (Chief Minister) : In this case Sir, the Privilege issue is that whether a member can discuss publicly any matter which is under the consideration of the House. If any member discuss a matter publicly which is pending before the House he commits Breach of Privilege and he is guilty of that offence. But

in this case as the Minister incharge Parliamentary Affairs has rightly stated that it has nothing to do with the proceedings of the House. Some newspaper report of 19th October made certain defamatory statement against a member of the House. Sir, should it go uncontradicted ? As soon as the matter is brought to the notice of the member that such and such defamatory statement is published in a newspaper which will lower him in public estimation he should immediately contradict it. It is the inherent right of the citizens. Therefore Sir, these two things should be distinguished and I hope you will consider these matters before you give your ruling.

Mr. Speaker : I have heard both the sides. I reserve my ruling. I have got a noiice for another Privilege Motion against Mr. Tripathi. And both these cannot be taken togather on the sameday it may be taken up tomorrow.

Calling Attention to A matter of Urgent Public Importance—The Assam Small Industries Development Corporation

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : Sir, Under Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Assam Legislative Assembly I draw the attention of the Minister-in-Charge, Industries to a matter of urgent public importance and of recent occurrence in a news item published in the "Saptahik Nilachal" dated 20.10,71 under the caption "Udyogik Unnayan Nigamar Joa Joa abastha" wherein it has been stated that all the Industries started by Major Industries Development Corporation, Small Scale Industries

Development Corporation, etc. organisations, are incurring loss and giving no benefit to the people of the State, either through employment or through economic development. I want to know whether the allegations as reported in the paper are true, and if so, what steps Government have taken to reorient the enure thing for the benefit of the people. It has also come to our notice that some people, who had very bad records in their service careers, are entrusted with certain responsibilities. More particularly, there are some retired persons who have no interest in their work. This is one of the causes for incurring heavy losses by these industries. I want to know if this is true. If so, what specific steps Government have taken to improve the condition of these industries.

Shri Biswadev Sarma : (Minister, Industries) The position in respect of the various matters mentioned in the news item published in the "Saptahik Nilachal" dated 20.10.71 referred to by the hon. Member, is as follows :-

As this august House would recall, towards the beginning of this year the Government had decided in principle to take over the management of the closed textile unit of the Associated Industries, Assam. In that connection it was felt necessary to immediately arrange cotton, in view of the acute scarcity of this raw-material in the country at that time. The Assam Small Industries Development Corporation Ltd. was accordingly instructed to

arrange for the purchase of cotton urgently. This Corporation purchased 500 bales of cotton from Punjab, out of which 400 bales were of relatively suprior quality and the remaining 100 bales were of relatively inferior quality. These purchases were made during the period 19. 1. 71 to 24.2.71. The ex-Punjab purchase price of relatively superior cotton ranged from Rs. 923.20 to Rs. 984.20 per quintal and that of relatively inferior cotton from Rs. 703 to Rs. 717.06 per quintal. The Corporation purchased these two varieties of cotton with a view to mixing them up. It would also be recalled that subsequently the Government came to the conclusion in consultation with the solicitors that it would not be prundent to take over the management of the closed textile unit of Associated Industries, Assam through negotiations as earlier intended. Therefore to avoid deterioration of this cotton in storage and to avoid further losses consequent upon anticipated further fall in the market price of cotton with the arrival of the new crop from the month of October, it became necessary for the corporatian to sell this cotton. It may be mentioned that the ruling price of cotton in the country was extremely high due to acute scarcity of that commodity at the time when the corporation purchased this cotton. However, shortly there after the Govt. of India decided to import cotton to relieve the situation, with the result that that the price of cotton came down steeply. The normal trade practice for selling cotton is to deal through cotton brokers. In Assam the only two consumers of this cotton were the Spinning mills

at Gauhati and Charduar out of which the former had already closed down. The corporation contacted the Charduar mill as also cotton brokers in Calcutta for disposal of this cotton. In response three offers were received, two of which were from Calcutta parties and one from the Charduar mill. The highest rate offered for delivery ex-Calcutta was Rs. 820 per quintal while the rate quoted by the Charduar mill for delivery ex-Gauhati was Rs. 780 per quintal. The rate of Rs. 820 per quintal for delivery ex-Calcutta works out to about Rs. 804 per quintal ex-Gauhati after excluding the transport, handling charges, etc. At that time, namely in the second half of September, 1971, it may be mentioned that both the road and rail cemunications between Assam and Calcutta were disrupted due to floods. Hence it would have been difficult to send the cotton to Calcutta. On the other hand the Charduar mills were on the verge of closure due to non-receipt of cotton from outside the State on account of dislocation of comications. Hence efforts were made to persuade the Charduar mill to raise its price and ultimately the mill agreed to raise its offer to Rs. 804 per quintal for delivery ex-Gauhati. As there was no chance of getting any better offer at that time and in view of imminent further fall in cotton price, this offer was accepted and 300 bales of cotton were sold to this mill to avoid further loss. 200 bales of cotton still remain to be disposed of and the Corporation is trying for their disposal also. On the 300 bales of cotton sold, the Corporation suffered a net loss of about Rs. 1,17,000.

For examining this whole transaction, the Government have decided to set up a committee of enquiry.

The Government have already appointed a committee consisting of Deputy Secretaries in the Industries and Finance Departments and the Joint Director of Industries (General) for studying the working of this corporation in detail. The report of this committee is awaited. In the meantime at the instance of the Government, this Corporation has engaged the services of a Chartered Accountant for examining its financial position quickly and for suggesting remedies for improving its financial management. His report is expected to be received shortly, whereafter the Government would consider the required steps.

It is a fact that inspite of a loss being incurred during the year 1970-71, a bonus 8% has been given to the workers of Assam Conductors and Tubes Ltd. (a subsidiary of Assam Small Industries Development Corporation Ltd.), as against the statutory minimum bonus of 4 per cent. This apparently was done as a gesture of goodwill to the workers. As this bonus has already been declared and disbursed, no further steps are possible at this stage. In this connection the hon. Members would recall the recent discussions at various levels for raising the minimun bonus to above 4 per cent.

Shri Lakshyadhar Choudhury : অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, মই মাননীয় মন্ত্রী মহোদয়ৰ পৰা জানিব বিচাৰিছো যে অসম চৰকাৰ তৰফৰ পৰা যিখিনি কপাহ আনি চাৰদুৱাৰ মিলক খুউব কম দামতে দিলে অর্থাৎ ৭ লাখ টকাত অসম চৰকাৰে কিনি আনি নামমাত্র মূল্য অর্থাৎ ৪ লাখ টকাত চাৰদুৱাৰ মিলক দিলে তাৰপৰা

উৎপন্ন হোৱা সূতাৰ মূল্য বঢ়ায় নিনি মুঠাত ৫২ টকা কৰিলে অথচ মাতৃৰা মিলৰ সূতাৰ মূল্য মুঠাত ৪৮ টকাহে। অসম চৰকাৰে অসমৰ বাইজৰ বাজহৰ ধনেৰে কিনা কপাহৰ পৰা হোৱা সূতা অসমৰ বাইজকে ১৬০ টকা বেলত বিক্রী কৰি লাভ লোৱা বিষয়ে চৰকাৰে তদন্ত কৰিবনে ?

Shri Biswadev Sarma : হয় কৰা হব।

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, মই এটা কথা জানিব বিচাৰিছো যে "অসম কন্দাক্টৰ যিটো অৱস্থা হৈছে তাত বাহিৰৰ মানুহ লোৱা হৈছে। কথাটো হয়নে।

Shri Biswadev Sarma : বাহিৰৰ নহয়, দেশী মানুহহে।

Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Report of the Public Accounts Committee.

Shri Gaurisankar Bhattacharyya : Sir, I beg to present the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Report of the Public Accounts Committee. In this connection, I beg to say that the Fifteenth Report is under print, so only a typed copy of it has been placed on the table of House. Printed copies will be made available to the hon. Members as soon as they are received from the Press. Probably by tomorrow we may receive them.

Report of the Commission on Secondary Education in Assam.

Shri Sarat Chandra Goswami (Minister of State, Education) : Sir, I beg to present the Report of Commission set up by the State Government on the problems of Secondary Education in Assam.

The Assam Contingency fund (Augmentation of Corpus) Bill, 1971.

Shri Kamakhya Prasad Tripathi (Minister, Finance) : Sir, I beg to move that the Assam Contingency Fund (Augmentation of Corpus) Bill, 1971 be taken into consideration.

Mr. Speaker : There is a message from the Governor. It reads as follows.

"Under the provision of Article 207 (3) of the Constitution of India, I, Braj Kumar Nehru, Governor of Assam, recommend that the Assam Contingency Fund (Augmentation of Corpus) Bill, 1971 be taken into consideration by the Assam Legislative Assembly.

Sd/ Braj Kumar Nehru
Governor of Assam"

Shri Premadhar Bora : অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, আঢ়ৈ মাহৰ ভিতৰত আঢ়ৈ কোটি টকা ordinance কৰি লোৱা হ'ল। এইটো কি উদ্দেশ্যত লোৱা হৈছে তাত কোৱা হৈছে যে—

An ordinance augmenting temporarily the corpus of the contingency fund by Rs. 2.50 crores was promulgated on 29th June, 1971. But subsequently as a result of continued influx the expenditure on relief to evacues from East Bengal increased. Therefore the necessity for further temporary augmentation of the corpus of the contingency fund by Rs. 2.50 crores was felt and accordingly another Ordinance was promulgated on 23rd September, 1971.……

কিন্তু আমাৰ ভাৰত চৰকাৰে কিমান টকা sanction কৰিছে। তাৰ পিছত কোৱা হৈছে। এই কেইটা কেনেকুৱা খৰছ ? গতিকে এই

ক্ষেত্রত যদি consolidated fund ৰ পৰা টকা withdraw কৰা নহয় তেতিয়া হলে আনবিলাক কথা বাদেই মন্ত্রীসকলেও দৰ্ম্মহা নেপাব। টকা পোৱা বন্ধ হৈ যাব। গতিকে মই মুখ্যমন্ত্রী মহোদয়কো জনাও যে টকা দিয়াৰ বিষয়ে Re-appropriation কৰি দিয়াতকৈ আগতেই আমাৰ estimate কৰি দিব লাগে। খৰচ নকৰাকৈ কিয় direct দিব নোৱাৰে। consolidated fund ৰ পৰা withdraw কৰা টকা কিয় ঘূৰাই দিয়াৰ মতলব নাই? Nagaland Security measure তো লাখ লাখ টকা দিবলগীয়া আছে। Refugee ৰ ক্ষেত্রত ইমান কোটি কোটি টকা Consolidated fund ৰ পৰা যদি খৰচ কৰা হয় তেনেহলে যদি সেই টকা কেন্দ্রীয় চৰকাৰে নিদিয়ে তেন্তে আমাৰ অন্যান্য Imergency মূলক কাম যেনে Brahmaputra flood control আদি কামবোৰ বন্ধ হৈ যাব পাৰে। গতিকে মই মুখ্যমন্ত্রী আৰু বিত্তমন্ত্রীক এই বিষয়ে আগতীয়াকৈ ধন দিবৰ কাৰণে কেন্দ্রীয় চৰকাৰক জোৰ দিবলৈ অনুৰোধ জনাও।

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : বিত্তমন্ত্রীয়ে আমাৰ আৰ্থিক অৱস্থাটো জানে। এই দুখলগা আৰ্থিক অৱস্থাৰ ক্ষেত্রত মন্ত্রী মহোদয় সকলে খৰচ মিতব্যয়ী কৰা নাই। আৰু এটা কথা আমি চাব লাগে যে আমি ভাৰত চৰকাৰৰ পৰা বহুতো ক্ষেত্রত প্রতিশ্রুতি পাইছো। যেনে—নগালেণ্ড সমস্যাত, সীমান্ত সমস্যা ইত্যাদি সংক্রান্তত আমি বহুতো টকা কেন্দ্রীয় চৰকাৰৰ পৰা পাবলগীয়া আছে। তেনেকৈ মিজোপাহাৰৰ পৰাও পাবলগীয়া আছে।

Shri Kamakhya Prasad Tripathi : এই বিষয়ে সন্দেহৰ কথা নাই। ভাৰত চৰকাৰে গোটেই খৰছৰ টকা বহন কৰিবলৈ গাত লৈছে আৰু ইতিমধ্যেই এককোটি ৯০ লাখ টকা আহিছে আৰু আহিব লগা আছে। এই বিষয়ে খৰছ কৰা দৰ্কাৰ কোনো interest ৰ প্রয়োজন নাই।

দ্বিতীয়তে Mizo Hills ৰ ক্ষেত্রত ১৪ কোটি টকাৰ adjustment ৰ প্রশ্ন আছিল। এইবাৰ দিল্লীলৈ য়াওঁতে যেতিয়া আমাক মাতিছিলে তেতিয়া আমি এইটো raise কৰিছিলো। ভাৰত চৰকাৰে এইটো বিবেচনা কৰিব। ইতিমধ্যেই ভাৰত চৰকাৰে যিটো টকা পঠালে সেইটো হিচাব কৰি নিকাচ কৰিবলৈ অসুবিধা হৈছে যে ইয়াৰ কাৰণে ভাৰত চৰকাৰে audit Report বিচাৰৰ সম্ভাৱনা আছে। তাৰ ওপৰত ভীত্তি কৰি এই ১৪ কোটি টকা মানি লৈছে।

ইয়াৰ দ্বাৰা আমাৰ যিকোনো planned বা non-planned খৰছৰ ওপৰত কোনো প্ৰভাৱ নহব। consolidated fund ৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত হৈছে যিমান টকা ভাৰত চৰকাৰে দিয়ে consolidated fund ক দিয়া হয়। তাৰ পৰা অলপ Budget Provision মতে আনিব লগা হয়। ৩১ মাৰ্চলৈকে চলাব লগা হয়। তাৰ পিছত lapse পৰি যাব। দ্বিতীয়তে ৩১ মাৰ্চলৈকে চলাব লগা হলে consolidated fund ৰ পৰা adjust কৰিব লাগিব।

Shri Debeswar Sarmah : ভাৰত চৰকাৰৰ কিমান কোটি টকা over-draft ত পাৰ লগা আছে ?

Shri Kamakhya Prasad Tripathi : ২৪ কোটি টকা over-draft আছিল।

Shri Debeswar Sarmah : Nagaland ৰ সমস্যাৰ কাৰণে ?

Shri Kamakhya Prasad Tripathi : Nagaland Mizo Hills ৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত কওঁ যে Mizo-hills ৰ বিষয়ে কৰিছে কিন্তু Nagaland ৰ কথাটো মধ্যপ্ৰদেশৰ ডকাইতৰ লগত একে প্ৰশ্ন বুলিলেই হবে। শ্ৰীদেশাইৰ দিনৰে পৰা এই বিষয়ে তৰ্ক চলি আছে। সন্মত কৰাব পৰা নাই।

Shri Debeswar Sarmah : অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, নীতিমূলক হিচাবেই মই চাবি-আষাৰমান কথা কব বিছাবিছোঁ। সাংবিধানিক article মতেই এই consolidated fund ৰ ব্যৱস্থা আছে আৰু কিবা গৰজ পৰিলে এই fund ৰ পৰাই টকা উলিয়াব পৰা হয়। কিন্তু ২/৩ বছৰ পাচ কৰি দেখা গৈছে যে কিছুমান শিতানত কিছুমান টকা ধৰা হয়। কিন্তু Budget হিচাবৰ বাহিৰেও বহুত টকা Supplementary Demand ত আহে। Supplementary demand হব নোৱাৰে বুলি কোৱা নাই। কিন্তু Supplementary demand উৎস্থাপিত হয় কিছুমান নীতিৰ ওপৰত। এইটো খৰছ আগতে বুজিব পৰা নহৈছিল। কিন্তু Imergency basis ত বহুতো কাম কৰিবলগীয়া হয় যি বিলাকত খৰছৰ মাত্ৰা বাঢ়ি গৈ দম বান্ধে। Supplementary Demand ৰ নীতি অনুসাৰে Supplement দি টকা লোৱা হয়। গণতান্ত্ৰিক নিয়মমতে আতাইতকৈ ডাঙৰ কথা যে নিৰ্ব্বাচিত প্ৰতিনীধিৰ সন্মতি নহলে টকা খৰছ নহয়। মই আকৌ

টকা খৰছ কৰিব নেলাগে বুলি motion টোৰ বিৰোধীতা কৰা নাই মই কব বিছাৰো যে আমাৰ নিৰ্ব্বাচিত প্ৰতিনীধিসকলে খুচিমতে টকা খৰছ কৰি থাকে আৰু পিছত consolidated fund ৰ পৰা লৈ লোৱা হয়।

Shri Kamakhya Prasad Tripathi : সম্মতি নোহোৱাকৈ ইমান টকা কি খৰছ কৰিব পাৰি নেকি ? ইয়াৰ দ্বাৰা গণতন্ত্ৰক দুৰ্ব্বল কৰিবলৈ চেষ্টা কৰা হৈছে বোলা কথাটো বুজিবলৈ টান কথা। গণতন্ত্ৰত আস্থা থকা আমাৰ মন্ত্ৰীসকলে গণতান্ত্ৰিক পদ্ধতিত আগবাঢ়িবলৈহে চেষ্টা কৰে।

The Assam Non-Government School and College Employees Centralised Provident Fund Scheme (Amendment) Bill, 1971

Mr. Speaker : The question is that the Assam Contingency Fund (Augmentation of Corpus) Bill, 1971 be taken into consideration.

(The motion was adopted)

Shri Kamakhya Prasad Tripathi : Sir, I move that the Assam Contingency Fund (Augmentation of Corpus) Bill, 1971 be passed.

(The motion was adopted)

The Assam Appropriation (No. V) Bill 1971

Shri Kamakhya Prassad Tripathi : I beg to move that the Assam Appropriation (No. V) Bill, 1971 be taken into consideration.

Mr. Speaker : There is a message from the Governor. It reads as follows :-

"Under the provision of Article 207 (3) of the Constituition of India, I, Braj Kumar Nehru Governor of Assam,

recommend that the Assam Appropriation (No. V) Bill, 1971 be taken into consideration by the Assam Legislative Assembly.

Sd/—Braj Kumar Nehru
Governor of Assam".

Now, the question is that the Assam Appropriation (No. V) Bill, 1971 be taken into consideration.

(The motion was adopted.)

Shri Kamakhya Prasad Tripathi : I beg to move that the Asssam Appropriation (No. V) Bill, 1971 be passed.

Mr. Speaker : The question is that the Assam Appropriation (No. V) Bill, 1971 be passed.

(The motion was adopted)

The Assam Non-Government School and College Employees Centralised Provident Fund Scheme (Amendment) Bill, 1971

Shri Kamakhya Prasad Tripathi : Sir, I beg to move that the Assam Non-Government School and College Employees Centralised Provident Fund Scheme (Amendment) Bill, 1971 be taken into consideration.

Mr. Speaker : The question is that the Assam Non- Government School and College Employees Centralised Provident Fund Scheme (Amendment) Bill, 1971 be taken into consideration.

(The motion was adopted)

Shri Kamakhya Prasad Tripathi : Sir, I beg to move that the Bill be taken into consideration clause by clause.

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi : Sir, I beg to move that in clause 3, Item

(1) In proposed sub-clause (i) in the first line, the word "and" appearing in between the words "Teachers and "Ministerial staff" shall be substituted by a coma (,) and after the words "Ministerial staff" the words "and Fourth Grade Employees" shall be inserted.

অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয় এই সংশোধনীটো এই কাৰণেই অনা হৈছে যে যদি কোনো এখন স্কুলত প্ৰভিডেণ্ট ফাণ্ড আঁচনি প্ৰয়োগ কৰা হয় তেনেহলে তাৰ শিক্ষক সকলে আৰু ministerial staff যেনে কেৰাণী এ এই provident fund আঁচনিৰ উপকাৰ পাব। কিন্তু তাত যিসকল ৪র্থ শ্ৰেণীৰ কৰ্ম্মচাৰী থাকে তেওঁলোকে এই আচনিৰপৰা উপকাৰ নাপাব। কিন্তু অনান্য ক্ষেত্ৰত দেখা যায় যে provident fund আঁচনি আমাৰ চৰকাৰী বা বে-চৰকাৰী কোনোবা উদ্যোগ আদিত প্ৰয়োগ কৰিলে যি বিলাক কৰ্ম্মচাৰী থাকে তেওঁলোকৰ সকলোৱেই এই আচনিৰ উপকাৰীতা পায়। হাইস্কুল কলেজ বা M. E. স্কুলত provident fund আঁচনি প্ৰয়োগ কৰিলে যিসকলে সৰহ দৰ্ম্মহা পায় অৰ্থাৎ কেৰাণী, শিক্ষক সকলে এই আঁচনিৰ উপকাৰ পাব। কিন্তু যিসকল চতুৰ্থ শ্ৰেণীৰ কৰ্ম্মচাৰী সকলোত কৈ কম দৰ্ম্মহা পায় সেই সকলে এই আঁচনিৰ উপকাৰীতা নাপায়। এইদৰে এটা শ্ৰেণীয়ে উপকাৰ পাব আৰু এটা শ্ৰেণী তাৰ উপকাৰৰ পৰা বাদ পৰি যাব এই ধৰণৰ বৈষম্য মূলক নীতি আমি কেতিয়াও সমৰ্থন কৰিব নোৱাৰো। স্কুল বা কলেজৰ ৪র্থ শ্ৰেণীৰ কৰ্ম্মচাৰী সকলক সেই স্কুল কলেজৰ কৰ্ম্মচাৰী বুলি নধৰে নেকি ? যোৱাবাৰ তেতিয়াৰ খাদ্যমন্ত্ৰী শ্ৰীহাগজেৰ ডাঙৰীয়াই এই আশ্বাস দিছিল যে স্কুলৰ ৪র্থ শ্ৰেণীৰ কৰ্ম্মচাৰী সকলৰ দৰৰ্মহাৰ নিৰিখ নিৰ্দ্ধাৰন কৰা হব আৰু কিমান অংশ স্কুলৰ ফাণ্ডৰ পৰা দিব আৰু কিমান অংশ চৰকাৰৰ তৰফৰ পৰা দিব তাৰ আশ্বাস আগতেই দি থৈছিল। কিন্তু এতিয়াও এইটো কাৰ্য্যত পৰিণত হোৱা নাই।

গতিকেই মই স্কুল সমূহৰ ৪র্থ শ্রেণীৰ কৰ্ম্মচাৰীকো এই provident fund ৰ আঁচনিৰ অন্তভূক্ত কৰিবৰ কাৰণে সংশোধনী ডাঙি ধৰিলো। আৰু এই কৰ্ম্মচাৰী সকলেও তাৰ সুবিধা পায়।

Shri Kamakhya Prosad Tripathi : মোৰ তেখেতৰ মতৰ লগত কোনো মিল নাই। ইয়াতে এটা অসুবিধা হৈছে যে কিছুমান স্কুল আছে যিবিলাক Deficit গ্ৰাণ্ট পোৱা নাই। সেই বিলাকক centralised কৰিব লাগিব। আৰু সেইবিলাক স্কুলক centralised কৰাৰ পাচতহে সেই স্কুল বিলাকত প্ৰয়োগ কৰিব পৰা যাব।

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : বোল মতে দিব পৰা নহলেও কিবা এটা provision ৰাখি থব লাগে যাতে ভৱিষ্যতে সুবিধা মতে প্ৰয়োগ কৰিব পৰা হয়। provision ৰাখি থোৱাতটো কোনো অসুবিধা থাকিব নোৱাৰে।

Shri Kamakhaya Prosad Tripathi : provision ৰাখি থলেই তাক Apply কৰিব লাগিব। কিন্তু Apply কৰিব কেনেকৈ। কিছুমান চকিদাৰ, পিয়ন আছে যি বিলাকক মাত্ৰ ৩০ টকাকৈ দৰ্ম্মহা দিয়া হৈছে। সেই সকলৰ ওপৰত এই আঁচনি প্ৰয়োগ কৰি টকা কাটি আনিলে তেওঁলোক চলিব কেনেকৈ ? গতিকেই Deficit scheme ৰ ভিতৰত নাথাকিলে দিব পৰা নহব।

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : মই মুখ্যমন্ত্ৰীৰ পৰা জানিব বিচাৰো আৰু আশ্বাস লব খোজো, যিহেতু তেখেত বৰ্ত্তমান শিক্ষামন্ত্ৰী—যে যি বিলাক স্কুলক Deficit system ৰ ভিতৰলৈ অনা হয় তাত এই providend fund ৰ আঁচনি লগে লগেই ৪র্থ শ্রেণীৰ কৰ্ম্মচাৰী সকলৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত প্ৰযোজ্য হয় তাৰ এটা provision ৰাখিব লাগে।

Shri Kamakhya Porsad Tripati : এইটো ordenance জাৰি কৰিও কৰিব পৰা হব।

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi : I do not press my amendment.

Mr. Speaker : The question is that the preamble to clause 2 of the Bill do from part of the Bill.

(The motion was adopted)

Now, in clauses 3 and 4 that is no amendment. I put the question. The question is that clause 3 and 4 of the Bill do from part of the Bill

(The motion was adopted)

আমি ১২'৩০ বজাত শেষ কবা কথা আছিল। কিন্তু এই আলোচনাটো যিহেতু শিক্ষক সকলব কাবণে কবা হৈছে গতিকে শুভ কাম সোনকালে সমাধা কবাই ভাল হব।

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi : Sir, I beg to move that in clause 3, item (5). proposed sub-clause (ii), in line 5, the words "under deficit system" shall be deleted.

(Voice-We have already finished Clause 3)

"Under deficit system sanctioned by the Govt of Assam under the Rule in force ; and includes schools of those categories in whose case, the maintenace grant has been frozen at any stage.

সেই কাবণে এইটো অবস্থা হৈছে গভর্মেণ্টে যিবিলাকে High School ক Grant দিয়ে তাব ভিতবত provident fund যিবিলাকে deficit Scheme ব টকা পায় সেইবিলাক provident fund অনা হৈছে। যিবিলাক adhoc grant স্কুল সেইবিলাকক এই scheme ব ভিতবলৈ অনা নাই।

চবকাবে যিবিলাক স্কুলত স্বীকৃতি দিছে আৰু যিবিলাকক মঞ্জুবী দিয়ে সেই বিলাক বর্ত্তমান আইনখনব তললৈ আনিছে। চবকাবে যিবিলাক স্বীকৃতি দিয়ে সেই চবকাবে মঞ্জুবী দিয়ে আৰু deficit স্কুলবপবা বেচি টকা আৰু non deficit স্কুলব পবা কম টকা আদায় কবে। এইটো বিভাজন নকবি যিবিলাক নিজা শিক্ষক

সেই বিলাকে মঞ্জুৰী আদায় কৰিব লাগে। কাৰণ আমাৰ প্ৰদেশৰ শিক্ষক স্কুলৰ-য়েই হওক বা কলেজবেই হওক তেওঁলোকে বিবেচনা কৰি চায়। আৰু সেইদেখি চৰকাৰে ভালকৈ বিবেচনা কৰি চাব লাগে সেই সকলো শিক্ষক সকলোৰে ইয়াৰ ভিতৰত হয়।

Shri Kamakhya Prosad Tripathi : মাননীয় সদস্য গৰাকীয়ে যিটো কৈছে সেইটোৰ অসুবিধা হৈছে non deficit আৰু Adhoc grant যিবিলাকে পায় তেওঁলোকৰ কোনো provident fund নাই। তেওঁলোকে কম দৰমহাও পাই বুলি জানো। গতিকে forth grade বিলাকৰ যি অসুবিধা হৈছে, তেনেকৈ শিক্ষক বিভাগেও ভুগিব। সেইটো নিশ্চয় চাব লাগিব।

Mr. Speaker : Now, we come to clause 5.

M. Shamsul Huda : Mr. Speaker, Sir, In Clause 5, in the proposed sub-section 7 (1), in the sixth line, in between the word "be" and the full stop, the words, "subject to the option of the subscriber concerned", preceded by a coma (,) shall be inserted."

অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, এই Amendment সৰু ৮ টা শব্দৰ amendment মই আশা কৰিছো, amendment সংশোধনী গ্ৰহণ কৰিব। এই কাৰণেই গ্ৰহণ কৰিব লাগিব যে চৰকাৰে কিছু সংখ্যক শিক্ষকক হাতত ৰাখি এই contributary providend fund কৰিছে। আৰু বাকী সৰহ সংখ্যক লোকেই ইয়াৰ মতৰ বিৰুদ্ধে। এই বিল সম্পূৰ্ণ সকলোৰে মানি লব যেতিয়া নিজৰ নিজৰ provident fund নিজৰ জিলাত লব পাবে। তেতিয়া সকলোৰে সুবিধা হব আৰু contributiry providend fund ৰ সকলোৰে সুবিধা লব পাৰিব। সেই কাৰণে গণতান্ত্ৰিক চৰকাৰক এই আইন দিব পৰাৰ কাৰণে এই সংশোধনী দিয়া হৈছে। যদি সকলোৰে contributary provident fund মঞ্জুৰ কৰে তেনেহলে শিক্ষক সকলৰ যদি টকা লগা হয় তেনেহলে, হয় স্কুল মঞ্জুৰ কমিতি আহিব

লাগে নহয় সভাপতি, নহয় শিক্ষক জন personally আহিব লাগিব। তথাপিও মাহৰ পাচত মাহ বছৰৰ পাছত বছৰ পাৰ হৈ যায়। দ্বিতীয়তে চৰকাৰে Teacher welfare fund খুলিছে T. B. cancer আদি বেমাৰৰ চিকিৎসাৰ অৰ্থে সাহায্য দিবলৈ। কিন্তু সেই সাহায্য পায় যেতিয়া বছৰৰ পাচত বছৰ মানুহ মৰি যেতিয়া ভূত হৈ যাব হাড়ত দুবৰি গজিব তেতিয়াহে। তাৰ উদাহৰন স্বৰূপে পিসানদৰ আলি আৰু জাহান আলি। এওঁলোকে নিজে ২১ বাৰ অহা যোৱা কৰিও কাম কৰিব নোৱাৰিলে। টকা পোৱা নাই। এই অভিজ্ঞতাহে পায় হৈছে। contributary provident fund ৰ টকা উলিয়াব মাত্র ২ হাজাৰ টকা আৰু অহা যোৱা কৰোতে খৰছ হয় তিনি হাজাৰ টকা। সেই কাৰণে বিৰাত আপত্তি কৰিছো। চৰকাৰে আইন নীতি সংসোধনী কৰিব লাগে। Subject to the option of the subscriber concerned,

আৰু আশা কৰো চৰকাৰে এই সংশোধনী গ্রহন কৰিব।

Shri Kamakhya Prosad Tripathi : সেই কথা আগতেই আলোচনা কৰা হৈছে। It will be going against the very purpose of the scheme of the Bill.

গতিকে provident fund scheme আছে সকলো ঠাইতে তেওঁলোকৰ কল্যাণৰ কাৰণে আৰু প্রমানিত হৈছে তেওঁলোকৰ উপকাৰ হৈছে আৰু অহা যোৱাৰো অসুবিধা নহয়। কাৰণ welfare fund আৰু provident fund গভর্মেণ্টৰ নহয় সেইবিলাক corporation অৰ তলত। গতিকে মাননীয় সদস্যই আচলতে যিটো আপত্তি কৰিছে সেইটো নহয়।

M. Shamsul Huda : যিটো ভাল সেইটোৰ কাৰণে নকৰি যদি কেৱল গণতান্ত্রিক আধিপাত্য বিস্তাৰ কৰে তেতিয়াহলে প্রত্যেক জন শিক্ষকৰেই অসুবিধা হব। যদি চৰকাৰে corporation ৰ হাতলৈ দিছে তেতিয়াহলেটো আৰু বেচি অঁসুবিধাটো হব। এনে ব্যৱস্থা নহৈ বৰং এনেকুৱা ব্যবস্থা থাকিলহেতেন যে central office এটা ৰাখি যদি ইয়াৰ Branch বিলাক জিলাই জিলাই থাকিল হেতেন স্থানীয় ভাৱে সুবিধা লব পাৰিলেহেতেন। মই আগতেই কৈছো চৰকাৰে বিবেচনা কৰি সংশোধনী কৰিব লাগে।

Mr. Speaker : আপুনি এইটো place কৰে নেকি ?

Clause 5 of the Bill do form part of the Bill,

Clauses 6 &7 do form part of the Bill. Clause 1 the title of the Bill form part of the Bill.

Shri Kamakhya Prosad Tripathi : I beg to move that the Assam Non-government School and College Employees Provident Fund Scheme (Amendment) Bill, 1971 be passed.

Mr. Speaker : Motion moved. The question is—that Assam Non-government School and College Employees Provident Fund Scheme (Amendment) Bill, 1971 be passed.

(The Motion was adopted).

The Gauhati municipal and Corporation Bill, 1969

Shri Jogen Saikia (Minister) : Sir, I beg to move that the Gauhati Municipal Corporation Bill, 1969 as reported by the select committee be taken into consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved. There is no amendment. The question is that the Gauhati Municipal corroration Bill, 1969 be taken in to consideration

(The motion was adopted)

Shri Jogen Saikia (Minister) : I beg to move that the Gauhati Municipal Corporation Bill, 1969 as reported by the Select Committee be passed.

Mr. Speaker : Motion moved. The question is that the

Gauhati Municipal Corporation Bill, 1969 as reported by the Select Committee be passed.

(The Motion was adopted)

ADJOURNMENT

The House then adjourned for lunch till 2.30 p. m

(The House reassembled at 2.30 P.M. after lunch break with Mr. Speaker in the chair

Statement by the Chief Minister—Allegations against a Minister of State

Mr. Speaker : According to the accepted time schedule the House was to be adjourned at 4.30 P. M today. At 4 P.M. the Minister was to reply. Now, we are late by half an hour. Now, what is the sense of the House in regard to extension of time ?

Shri Ataur Rahman, Minister : (Parliamentary Affairs) Sir, we will be inconvenienced. We have to break fast at 4.35. If the House is extended till 5 P.M. then we will be inconvenienced. (Voice-Some members may leave the House)

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi : Let the Minister reply at 4.30 P.M.

Shri Mahendra Mohan Choudhury, (Chief Minister) : Sir the Minister will start replying at 4.30 P.M. and it depends on how long the Minister takes. (Shri Biswadev Sharma, Minister I will take only 10 minutes).

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : Sir, there is another thing.

The convention is that the Members who were also Members in the Committee cannot take part in the deliberations of the House when that matter is discussed. The Minister being the Chairman of the Committee then cannot also give reply on that subject,

Shri Mahendra Mohan Choudhur : (Chief Minister) That is not the Convantion. The convention is that the Members of the Committee cannot speak against the report. If he wants to speak in support of the report, he can speak.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on 26.10.71 Hon'ble Member Shri Dulal Chandra Barua brought some allegations against a Minister. The substance of the allegation is that the Minister was in a drunken mood when he went to the Silchar Medical Hospital at about 10 p.m. on 5th October, 1971, and misbehaved with the Staff Nurse on duty there and that he also assaulted her.

In this connection I enquired into the matter and the following facts are revealed.

Regarding the incident, Shri Jagannath Sinha, Minister of State, Industries, gave first a written report in the form of a complaint on 5.10.71 to the Principal, Silchar Medical College with a copy to the Minister of Health & Family Planning. The complaint of Shri Sinha reads as follows :

"At about 10.30 p.m. today I went to see a relation of mine namely Shrimati Rajkumari Sinha in the

Civil Hospital who is a maternity patient (bed No. 19). While I was near the delivery room I heard a groaning sound of a patient eastward and moved to ascertain what it was. I found one Shrimati Prabhawati Roy, a patient in bed No. 5 in Female Surgical Ward was in a very bad condition and was groaning. I immediately went near the patient and found a nurse and enquired what it was and why the patient was in such a bad condition unattended. She could not give satisfactory reply. I suggested her to call for the doctor-in-charge. While she was hesitating one Staff Nurse suddenly came and I asked her the same question. She in a bad manner replied me that this was none of my concern. I again insisted that since the condition of the patient was not good she should give immediate call to the doctor-in-charge but all in vain. At this stage I had no other alternative but go disclose my identity. I said her that I am a Minister and I wanted that the doctor should be called immediately. I don't know why this infuriated the said nurse. She bacame furious and started uttering that whosoever I might be she did not care. I simply laughed at this and requested her to let me know where the doctor-in-charge was residing so that might go there personally and call the doctor. But God knows why the nurse was not interested to tell me where the residence of the doctor was. She simply said that the doctor-in-charge was Dr. Nandi. After disclosure of my identiy the nurse was althrough sitting on her chair keeping me standing replying to my questions in a most

objectionable and insulting manner. The name of the said Nurse is, I am told, Santi.....

So long I was listening about such behavious by staff of the hospital from the public and this has been done to me today. Hospital is meant for welfare of the public and anything of this nature is not only undesirable but unpardonable also.

Immediately after this Dr. Debi Dutta came to the hospital to see my relation but as the condition of the patient was very bad I request him to see the patient No. 5 of F.S. Ward.

When I went to the room with Dr. Dutta again that nurse mentioned something adverse at which Dr. Dutta said 'You don't know with whom you are talking'. I narrated everything to Dr. Dutta for his information and future improvement of the public relation in the hospital. I want that such things should not happen in the hospital in future and this particular nurse should be brought to book so that other staff of the hospital take lesson from this."

On the basis of the complaint of Shri Sinha the Director of Health Services suspended the Nurse, Srimati Santi Rajee, in connection with the complaint of Shri Sinha. The said Staff Nurse submitted a written statement dated 9.10.71. The relevant portion of her statement reads as follows :

".....That, Sir, on the 5th October 1971 night,

while I was on duty at about 10.20 p.m. one man entered into the Female Surgical Ward. He was heavily drunk. He came to me and questioned whether I have sent for a doctor as one patient had abdominal pain. I replied that a messenger has already been sent for a doctor and I am also waiting for him. All on a sudden he became angry and ordered me to stand up. As I don't know his whereabouts I did not stand up while he still ordering rudely saying 'Stand up, stand up'. He disclosed that he is a Minister. As he was fully drunk and he entered the Female Surgical Ward in which males are not allowed at that time of night, I thought that he was saying that word 'Minister' in his intexication mood and I did not belive him and did not stand up. Meanwhile Dr. Debi Dutta and Dr. Chatterjee arrived in the ward. He complained to them that I have insulted him and accused me in their presence".

Besides the Staff Nurse, Smti. Santi Rajee, the Matron of the Hospital, Dr. Sankar Chatterjee, the House Surgeon, Depatment of Surgery, and Dr. Debi Dutta, Registrar of Maternity & Gynaecology Department, Silchar Medical College, gave their statements.

After the allegations were brought before the House, I asked Shri Jagannth Sinha to submit a written statement which he did on 27th October 1971, wherein he has given further details. From his statement it transpires that he want to the Medical College Hospital on receipt of an information that the condition of a relation of his was

bad. He went along with his wife, aunt, cousin sister and brother.

From the statement of the Staff Nurse it appears that there is no allegation of any assault on her whatsoever by the Minister. It is evident from the complaint of the Minister, the statements of the Staff Nurse, Dr. Chatterjee and Dr. Debi Dutta Shri Sinha went to the hospital to see one of his relations who was a patient in the Maternity Ward, and that Shri Sinha enquired about a certain groaning patient and he was insisting for calling the doctor for attending to the groaning patient who was not a relation of Shri Sinha, and as a matter of fact Shri Sinha sent for the doctor who came and attended the patient. From the complaint of Shri Sinha it appears that the Nurse did not respond to the request of the Minister to call the doctor and she did not stand up when the Minister disclosed his identity. From the statement of Dr. Chatterjee it appears that the Staff Nurse did not reply to the queries of the Minister and when he disclosed his identity even then she did not behave properly. On this point the relevant protion of Dr. Chatterjee's statement reads as follows :

"She said that one man entered into the Female Ward and asked her whether she had sent the call to the doctor. She said that the call was already sent and she was waiting for the doctor. Then he wanted to know the person and moreover as he was drunk, out of fear she

did not tell anything. Then he said that he was a Minister and shouted to her to stand up. She then said to him that she was a Staff Nurse on duty and during her duty hours she did not care for a Minister ".

The above statement unmistakably shows the deflant attitude of the Staff Nurse. Even when the Minister disclosed his identity she was not telling about the residence of the doctor.

The only allegation that remains to be examined according to the statement of the Staff Nurse is whether the Minister was heavily drunk and that he ordered her to stand up. As stated above when the Nurse took a defiant attitude and did not stand up as a mark of courtesy then the Minister most likely got angry and asked her to standup. The allegation of drunkenness has been denied by the Minister in his statement submitted to me, The position is that the allegation has been contradicted by the Minister. Even the Staff Nurse has not stated or suggested of any overt act on the part of the Minister to confirm that he was under the influnce of liquer. Even Dr. Chatterjee did not state that he was under the control of liquor. Dr. Chatterjee thought to him to be drunk because some alcoholic smell come out from his mouth. The relevant portion of Dr, Chatterjee's statement is reproduced below:

".....It appeared to me that he was drunk because alcoholic Smell was coming out from his mouth".

Alcoholic smell in the mouth does not mean that some

body is drink. A person is said to be drunk when he gets overcome with liquor.

Dr. Chatterjee further stated in his statement that the Minister was trying to console a restless patient in the Female Surgical Ward from outside through a window and he requested them to see the case. He examined the ease. He examined the case and prescribed.

The action of a man when finding somebody groaning goes to console her and asks the Nurse to call a doctor obviously is not of a drunken man.

Admittedly Dr. Debi Dutta, Registrar of Maternity and Gynaecological Department, was also persent durieg that night. His statement is as follows :

"On the night of 5th October 1971, at about 10.30 p. m I was called by Shri Jagannath Sing, Minister, to attend a case at Maternity Ward in the Medical College Hospital. Accordingly, I went to the hospital and while going to the Maternity Ward I was asked by the Minister to see a case in Female Surgical Ward who was tossing in bed with pain. I examined the case and prescribed necessary medicine and told the House Surgeon to inform Dr. Nandi Purkayastha, the Registrar of Surgery, about the case. When I come out of the Ward the Minister who was on the verandah told me that he had been misbehaved by the sister of the Female Surgical Ward, He talked to me in a gentlemenly manner and I did not find any reason to think that he was intoxicated, I was in a hurry to see my patient with labour pain in the Maternity Ward and I left the place ''

The version of the Minister regarding insulting behaviour of the Nurse has been amply corroborated by the statements of Dr. Chatterjee and Dr. Debi Dutta. The relevant portion of Dr. Chatterjee's statement reads as follows :

"The Minister, Mr. J. Sinha told me that he was insulted by one Staff Nurse. He said to me that he went to the Ward on hearing cries and saw that a patient was tossing. He asked the Nurse to call for the doctor, but the Nurse did not pay any heed to it and she was sitting on the chair. He said to her that he was a Minister and she should stand up and talk with him, but she said that she did not care for a Minister as Mr. Sinha told me".

This has been corroborated by the Nurse herself in her statement to Dr. Chatterjee wherein she states that she was a Staff Nurse on duty and during her duty Hours she did not care for a Minister.

Dr. Chatterjee also has not attributed any act on the part of the Minister which could give the slightest impression that he was in a drunken state.

On the contrary the aforesaid statement of Dr. Debi Dutta fully negatives the alleged story of drunkenness. Dr. Dutta stated that he did not find any reason to think that the Minister intoxicated.

In course of enquiry I got the statements of patient Shrimati Prabhawati Roy and her mother Shrimati Sefali Roy and another patient Shrimati Sumitra Rani Mandal which also fully corroborate the complaint of the Minister.

From the above facts it has been conclusively proved that the Minister went to the hospital hurriedly with his wife and others to see an ailing relation and that the cries and groans of another patient drew his attention and the minister in his anxiety to see that she gets immediete medical help insisted for calling a doctor which in all probability was taken by the Staff Nurse as an interference and she took a deflant attitude so much so that even when the Minister disclosed his identity she continued in her defiance by saying that during her duty hours she did not care for a Minister which naturally annoyed the Minister and led to exchange of hot words. There was absolutely no molestation or assult whatsoever.

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : Sir, I have heard very attentively the statement of defence (Chief Minister) statement of facts) that has been made by the Chief Minister on behalf of his colleague. But the statement made hear completely from the statement that has been made in the paper. I want to know from the Chief Minister that the statements he has referred to have been obtained from another two patients, when the as have been obtained. But according to a renouned man of Silchar it depicts a different picture. After we have discussed the matter in the House, some people; by this or that way have obtained such statements from some persons. I will be very happy of the hon'ble Chief Minister is pleased to piace those documents and the statements in original before the House. The statements have been obtained later on and some ma-

nipulation was going on. I have got a letter which I will hand over to the Chief Minister. I do not know what is the defination of drunkenness or drunken mood. But this is not the way of defending the things which tell upon not only his career but the career of others. In the statement he has not mentioned that he accompanied his wife and others, It is a after thought. He went there alone and in a drunken mood. When he went to the hospital did he obtain the permission of the authority ? Sir, if we want to go the Civil Hospital even to see my wife I have to obtain the permission of the Civil Surgeon. Sir, do you have that authority to enter the Maternity ward of a Hospital because you are the Speaker ? So it would have been better on the part of the Chief Minister not to speak at all. What the people will understand of him ? To defend a man of this nature the Chief Minister is going to bring a slur on him. Whether he is the Chief Minister or not that is not my concern, but as a man I have got respect for him. I am sorry, the way in which he is defending him is really condemnable.

Shri Mahandra Mohan Choudhury (Chief Minister): I am sorry, I have been misunderstood. I have given all facts about this case (Voice : what is the conclusion ?) The Charge is that the staff nurse was molested. From the statement I have read I have quoted the statement of Dr. Chatterjee, Dr. Dutta and also the staff nurse. From all these, statements there is no element of any molestation of any assault or any mis-behaviour. It was the point at

issue and I have quoted from the statement submitted by the staff nurse. She also said that she was not assaulted. Dr. Dutta said that he behaved with him as a gentleman. Therefore, I have made a distinction between taking alcohol and drunkenness. One thing is that the man may have some intoxicating drink. But if he does not lose and does not act under the influence of the drink then he is not drunk.

Shri Gaurisankar Bhattacharyya : That is perfectly correct. The Supreme Court has gone a step further. Merely by the smell of alcohol will not do. You have to examine the gastric juice. As the gastric juice was not examined it is not know whether he was drunk or not.

Shri Mahendra Mohan Choudhury : That is why I cannot say that he was in a drunken mood.

Mr. Speaker : Some clarification was sought under 301 and the Chief Minister replied to that and thereafter here cannot be any debate on this point. Mr. Barua wanted some clarification and the Chief Minister has given the clarification.

Shri Atul Chandra Goswami : অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, মন্ত্রী ডাঙৰীয়াই এটা প্রশ্নৰ স্পষ্টীকৰণত কলে যে তেখেত Drunker নাছিল তাত আমি সন্তুষ্ট হলো। কিন্তু মন্ত্রী ডাঙৰীয়াই এটা কথা জনাবনে যে without Permission female ward ত মন্ত্রী হিচাবে প্রবেশ কৰিব পাৰেনে কি :

Shri Mahendra Mohan Choudhury : No Sir, it was an emergency ward: There was a delivery patient and the case was an abnormal one and on that patient a caeserian

operation had to be performed. After getting a frantic telephonic call as the matter is a very serious one he went there, as any citizen would have done the same thing. At that time one may not have time go and seek permission to see the patient. He went there accompanied by a Doctor and Doctor Chatterjee and the staff nurse was there which proves the bonafide of his visit. One Doctor said that there was nothing wrong with him and he was completely gentle, but Dr. Chatterjee got smell of alcohol in his mouth. Therefore Sir, whatever facts I have collected from the staff nurse, other doctors and Doctor Dutta I have put before the House. I have not included any other statement for my consideration.

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : Sir, he is giving the statements from legal point of view. Our points is from moral of view. It is not matter to be laughed at. It is a matter of disgrace.

Mr. Speaker : Shri Sailen Medhi. The Speakers should be brief and concise.

Result of the election to the Dibrugarh University Court

Mr. Speaker : Order, order. I have to announce the result of the election to the Dibrugarh University Court. The number of candidates equal big to the number of Seat vacant Mr. Puspadhar Chaliha elected un-opprosed to the Dibrugarh University Court.

Motion—Anomalies in the Settlement of land in and around Guwahati

*Shri Sailen Medhi : মাননীয় অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয় আমাৰ সম্মুখলৈ আজি এখন গুৰুত্বপূৰ্ণ দলিল আহিছে। এই দলিলৰ দ্বাৰা অকল সদনৰ সদস্য সকলেই নহয় অসমৰ সকলো জনসাধাৰণেই বিশেষকৈ উপকৃত হব বুলিয়েই যে আজি যোৱা কেই বছৰ ধৰি অসমত ভূমি সংস্কাৰৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত অসম চৰকাৰে যি ব্যৱস্থা লৈছিল সেই ব্যৱস্থাত ক্ষতিগ্ৰস্ত কৰাৰ কাৰণে তাৰ ধ্বংস কৰাৰ কাৰণে অসম চৰকাৰৰ মন্ত্ৰী সকল, চৰকাৰৰ বিষয়াসকল আৰু অসমৰ কেইজন মান প্ৰতিভাশালী লোক উপকৃত হোৱাহে আমি দেখিবলৈ পাইছো।

অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, মাননীয় সদস্য গোবিন্দ কলিতাই মাটি পট্টনৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত আৰু ভূমি সংস্কাৰৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত ৰচিত আইনসমূহ কাৰ্য্যকৰী কৰাৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত যি খেলি মেলিৰ সৃষ্টি হৈছিল সেই খেলি-মেলি অকল কেইজন মান লোকৰ জড়িয়তে নহয় তাত আমাৰ বিধান সভাৰ মন্ত্ৰী মণ্ডলৰ ঠাই আছে আৰু গুৰুত্বপূৰ্ণ বিষয়ৰ বিষয়াসকলৰ অনেকেই জড়িত আছে।

অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, মাননীয় সদস্য গোবিন্দ কলিতাৰ অভিযোগ আছিল যে চিলিং আইন মতে অসমৰ বেছি মাটি থকা লোকৰ পৰা মাটি অধিগ্ৰহণ নকৰি কিয় মাটিহীন লোকক বঞ্চিত কৰিছে। এই চিলিং আইনমতে মাটি অধিগ্ৰহণ কৰি মাটিহীন লোকক মাটি দিয়াৰ কথা আছিল। কিন্তু তাৰ পৰিবৰ্ত্তে অসমৰ কেইজনমান প্ৰভাৱশালী আৰু প্ৰতিভাশালী মানুহক মাটি বিতৰণ কৰিছে। ইয়াৰ দ্বাৰাই চিলিং আইন ফাকি দি অসম চৰকাৰৰ মন্ত্ৰী পৰ্য্যায় লোকক আৰু কেই-জনমান প্ৰতিভাশালী লোকক উপকৃত কৰিছে। এনে বিভিন্ন কিছুমান ক্ষেত্ৰত প্ৰমান পাই অভিযোগ আনিছে। এইবিলাক প্ৰতিক্ৰিয়াৰ ওপৰত অনুমোদন দিছে। সেই অনুমোদনৰ পাছত অসম চৰকাৰে জনাইছে কিছুমান ভূমি সংস্কাৰ আইন কাৰ্য্যকৰী কৰাৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত নতুনকৈ ব্যৱস্থা গ্ৰহণ কৰিব লাগে। অকল ব্যৱস্থা গ্ৰহণেই নহয় যিবিলাক অফিচাৰ, যিবিলাক কৰ্ম্মচাৰী এই কামৰ কাৰণে দোষী তেওঁলোকৰ শাস্তি হোৱা প্ৰয়োজন। তেনেকৈ বিভিন্ন ক্ষেত্ৰত যিবিলাক অনুমোদন জনাইছে তাত আমি দেখিছো এই কমিটিয়ে যথেষ্ট কষ্ট সহকাৰে বিভিন্ন তথ্য আমাৰ আগত ডাঙি ধৰিছে। মাননীয় সদস্য গোবিন্দ কলিতাই যথেষ্ট

*Speech not corrected

কষ্ট স্বীকাৰ কৰি কাগজ-পত্ৰ লৈ এই অভিযোগ আনিছিল। ঠিক একে দৰেই Land Settlement implementation ৰ বিষয়া সকলেও যথেষ্ট কষ্ট স্বীকাৰ কৰিছে।

উপাধ্যক্ষ ডাঙৰীয়া, মই কব বিচাৰিছো যে কেন্দ্ৰীয় মন্ত্ৰী ফকৰুদ্দিন চাহাবে প্ৰায় ২২০০ বিঘা মাটিৰ মালিক। সেই মাটিৰ বেছি ভাগেই একচনীয়া মাটি। একচনীয়া মাটি অধিগ্ৰহণ কৰিলে ক্ষতিপূৰণ পোৱাৰ কথা নাছিল। কিন্তু যেতিয়া সেই মাটিবোৰ বিফাইনেৰী আৰু সৈন্যবাহিনীৰ বাবে লোৱাৰ কথা উঠিল তেতিয়া দেখা গ'ল ফকৰউদ্দিন চাহাবৰ বেছিভাগ মাটিয়েই তাত সোমাল। তেতিয়া এই বিধান সভাতেই আইন পাছ কৰা হ'ল যে একচনীয়া মাটি অধিগ্ৰহণ কৰিলে প্ৰিমিয়াম কাটি বাকী টকাখিনিৰ পূৰণ দিয়া হব। এই আইন পাছ হোৱাৰ পাছত যদিও কিছু সাধাৰন মানুহ উপকৃত হ'ল তথাপি বিশেষকৈ এজন মানুহেই হে বেছি উপকৃত হল তেৱেই হ'ল ২২০০ বিঘা মাটিৰ মালিক শ্ৰীফকৰুদ্দিন আলি আহমেদ যিজন হল বৰ্ত্তমান কেন্দ্ৰীয় মন্ত্ৰী যাৰ লাখ লাখ টকা উপাৰ্জ্জন হল। শ্ৰীফকৰুদ্দিন চাহাবৰ ২ হেজাৰ ২০০ বিঘা মাটি আছিল। কিন্তু চিলিং আইনৰ সময়ত যেতিয়া দেখিলে যে তেখেতৰ মাটি যাব লগা হল তেতিয়া তেখেতে return নিদিলে। Committee ৰ Report ও আছে।

The original return submitted by Shri F. A, Ahmed in 1958 was not factually correct.

"An area of 556 bighas 4 K. 4 L. formerly stood in the name of Shri F. Ali Ahmed, son of late Col. Jalnur Ali Ahmed and included in Kheraj P. Patta No. 40. Out of the above area 74B-0—17L was mutated in the name of Shri Atesenuddin Ali Ahmed son of J. A. Ahmed vide A.S.O's Mutation order dated 26th September, 1959."

পিছত দেখুউৱা হ'ল সেই মাটিখিনি পৰিয়ালৰ লোকৰ মাজত ভাগবতোৱা হৈ গৈছে আৰু সেইবিলাক মাটিৰ নামজাৰিও হৈ গৈছে। তেখেতৰ আমচাংৰ মাটিৰ কথালৈ আহো। ইয়াত কৈছে—

Land Settlement Implementation Advisory Committee Enquiry Report.

"Further, it appears to the Committee that the interpretation of the term "Joint Family" as defined in the Act has not properly been applied by the Collector and that submission made by Shri Ahmed for shares for each of his borthers and sisters had been accepted in to even though no steps have been taken by Shri Ahmed till now for partition of the land as per the law of inheritence."

২৬ জুলাই ১৯৫৯ ত এই মাটি বিলাক দিয়া হয় কিন্তু মাটি বিক্রী বা ভাগ বতৰা কৰিলে Partition case বা mutation case হব লাগে কিন্তু তেনেকুৱা কোনো Partition case নহল। Land Settlement Committee ক প্ৰভাৱান্বিত কৰিছিল ? যিসকল লোকক জনসাধাৰণে শাসনৰ মুৰব্বী কৰি পঠিয়াই তেনে লোকেই এনেকুৱা কাম কৰিলে জনসাধাৰণৰ মনোভাৱ কেনে হব পাৰে চিন্তা কৰি চাব। শ্ৰীফকৰুদ্দিন চাহাবৰ বিষয়ে আৰু বেছি নকৈ আন কেইটামান কথা সদনত ডাঙি ধৰি মোৰ বক্তৃতা সামৰণি মাৰিম। মই পঢ়ি দিছো।

Thirdly the exclusion from theambit of the ceiling law of 220B—10K land falling between the embankment and the river in the Rangiya Circle was highly improper even though submission to that effect has been made by Shri Ahmed, As a result of this shortfall in acquisition even allowing for shares of brothers and sisters was over 150 bighas. The Committee would recommend the apart from setting right this impropriety in acquisition, action should be taken against the officers at fault for misinterpretation of the Act.

গতিকে দেখা যায় partition নকৰাকৈ মাটি বিলাক ভাগ হৈ গল। শেষত আকৌ তেখেত সকলেই কৈছে যে—

Shri F. A, Ahmed, who was a member of the Cabinet at that time and therefore had overall responsibility for implementation of the Government policies, does not seem to have been helpful in the quick and proper implementation of the Ceiling Law, particularly in his own case."

কমিটিয়ে বহুত মার্জিত ভাষা প্রয়োগ কবিছে। জনসাধাবণে এই মার্জিত ভাষা বুজি নেপাই। তেখেত সকলে বুজি পাই যে যি সকল লোকক শাসনৰ মুৰবী কবি পঠোৱা হয়—তেখেত সকলেই এনেকুৱা অন্যায় কাম কবে। শ্রীচেৰ নাৰায়ন শিলৰ যি মাটি ceiling Act ত যাব লাগিছিল এই মাটিও শিলিঙত নগ'ল। যান্ত্রিক কৃষি হব বুলি সেই মাটি চিলিঙত যোৱা নাছিল। কিন্তু তেখেত এজন গুৱাহাটীৰ নামকৰা advocate কোনোকালেই তেখেত খেতিয়ক নাছিল। Noti fication হৈ যোৱাৰ পিছত এই বিষয়ে enquiry কবি কেচ চলালে। তাত দেখা গল যে তেখেতৰ বেছি ভাগ মাটিয়েই চিলিঙত পবে। কিন্তু সেই case আজিলৈকে ৰজু কবিব পৰা নাই। সেইকাৰণে কমিটিৰ অনুমোদনত জনাইছে--

"The Committee therefore feels that proper action should be taken against the officers responsible for dropping of the original case and for the delay thereafter and immediate steps under the amended Ceiling Act should be taken."

গতিকে Case কি কাৰণে dropper কৰা হৈছিল সেইটো তদন্ত কবিবলৈ দিছিল।

ইয়াৰ বাহিৰেও এই কমিটিয়ে নির্দ্দেশ দিছে, যে, চৰকাৰে অনতিপলমে সেই কর্ম্মচাৰী সকলক শাস্তি দিয়ক আৰু এই মাটি চিলিং আইনৰ মতে তেওঁলোকৰ পৰা অধিগ্রহণ কৰাৰ ব্যৱস্থা কৰক। এনেধৰণৰ আমি বহুতো কেচ পাইছো। বাজা মোহন গোয়েঙ্কাৰ কথা মাননীয় সদস্য কলিতা ডাঙৰীয়াই কৈছে—

The petitioner stated that an area of 257 B 3 K 4 L were acquired by the Government under Notifications dated the 1st August and 2nd August, 1955. He also stated that the balance of land thus remained 1,062 B 6L owned by 27 persons living in Uttar Pradesh, Sitamorhee, Kanpur.

Banaras and Bombay. He also contended that they were governed by the Mitakshara School of Hindu Law. Hence none of the co-sharers, he stated, had more than 150 bighas each. The Collector heard the petitioner on 17th June, 1963 and passed orders as stated below.

A.D.C, C. Thomas ৰ order অতি গুৰুত্বপূৰ্ণ।

"Seen afidavit filed by Shri Ram Gopal Bhartia. Perused the pedigree statement and the Registered power of attorney which disclosed separate nature of their establishment. The objectors belong to the Mitakshara School and hold the landed property individual share amongst 27 families with separate establishment and so on. So even if the entire alleged excess area of over 1,255 B is accepted to be there when this is divided amongst 27 families the entire area will be excess and none can possibly be said to have more than 150 bighas. As such no excess is found and so the Ceiling Act does not apply.. The case is dropped.

গতিকে Affidevite ওপৰত নিৰ্ভৰ কৰিয়েই ২৭ টা পৰিয়ালক কোনো বিবেচনা নকৰাকৈ সকলো মাটিৰ পট্টন দিয়া হ'ল।

গতিকে এইটো পুণৰ বিচাৰ কৰিবৰ কাৰণে কমিটিয়ে নিৰ্দ্দেশ দিছে। শ্রীপুলিন ফুকন আৰু শ্রীশৈলেন ফুকনৰ যি অভিযোগ এইবিলাক প্রমাণ হৈ গৈছে আৰু প্রত্যেক অভিযোগৰ ওপৰত এই কমিটিয়ে অনুসন্ধান চলাইছে। শৈলেন ফুকনক মাটিৰ অনুমোদন দিছে। এইটো সমর্থন কৰি আমাৰ চিলিং আইনত থকা মতে জনাব খুজিছো।

The Committee is of the view that the Ceiling Act was not properly applied in this case. The case should be re-opened immediately and proper action in this behalf may be taken.

১৯৫৫ চনৰ পাছত কোনোবাই যদি মাটি বেনামী হিচাবে বিক্রি কৰিছে বা হস্তান্তৰ কৰিছে সেই মাটি যাতে বেনামী ভাৱে বিক্রি নহয় তাৰ বাবে চিলিং আইনৰ ব্যৱস্থা ৰখা হৈছিল। এই ক্ষেত্রত অফিচাৰ আৰু কৰ্ম্মচাৰীসকলে চিলিং আইন প্রয়োগ নকৰি মাত্র Affidevit ৰ ওপৰতে ভিত্তি কৰি মাটিৰ মালিক সকলক লাভজনক পৰিস্থিতিলৈ আনি দিছিল। পুলিন ফুকন আৰু শৈলেন ফুকনে গুৱাহাটীৰ জালুকবাৰীত Survey School ৰ ওচৰত Military Camp ৰ ওচৰত যি মাটি পাইছিল সেই মাটি ১৯৫৫ চনৰ পাচত চিলিং আইন পাচ হোৱাৰ পাছত বেনামী কৰি বিক্রি কৰি সেই মাটিৰ লগতে তাত থকা কিছুমান বস্তিও বিক্রি হৈ যায়। গতিকে তাত বসবাস কৰা লোকসকলে কোনো মাটিৰ পট্টা আদি পোৱা নাই। তেওঁলোকৰ ওপৰত notice দিয়া হল যে, ১৫ দিনৰ ভিতৰতে তেওঁলোক উঠি যাব লাগিব নতুবা দেৱানী মোকৰ্দ্দমা কৰা হব। Notice পাই সেই লোকসকল আমাৰ ওচৰলৈ আহিছে—তেওঁলোকে কৈছে যে, আমি ৩।৪ পুৰুষৰ আগৰ পৰাই এই মাটিত আছো, হঠাতে শুনিলো নতুন মালিক হৈছে আৰু Notice দিছে আমি উঠি যাব লাগে। গতিকে সেই মানুহবিলাকক উচ্ছেদ কৰি তাত মাত্র কেইজনমান মানুহে Building সাজিব নোৱাৰে। তেওঁলোকে সেই মাটিৰ মালিক হব লাগিব। কিন্তু মালিকৰ কু-চক্রান্তত এই নিৰপৰাধী লোকসকলে কষ্ট পাবলগা হল। গতিকে এটা কথা জনাব খুজিছো যে,—

In Sailen Phukan's case

In this the Committe found that in order to frustrate the provisions of the Ceiling Act, the lands were sold to persons or transfered to persons. This could happen because the law as it then existed did not provide any method to deal with such transfers which took place.

এইটো বৰ গুৰুত্বপূর্ণ বিষয়। ৫০ বছৰৰ আগতে যিবিলাক Free Simple grant ৰ মাটি আছিল সেইবিলাক মাটি কেইজন মান মানুহক চৰকাৰে দিছে। শ্রীকমলেশ্বৰ বৰুৱা Ex-Chief Engineer, খনিন বৰুৱা Chief Engineer Ex-office Secy, শ্রীবিমলা চলিহা Ex-Chief Minister,

আঘোনা দাস, প্রিয়লতা কাকতি ইত্যাদি লোকক প্রায় ১৫ বিঘা ১ কথা ৭ লোচা মাটি বেনামী বিক্রি কৰা হৈছে। গুৱাহাটীৰ ৭ ঘৰীয়াৰ ওচৰতো এইদৰে অঙহী বঙহীক চৰকাৰে মাটি দিছে। এইদৰে চৰকাৰে সাধাৰণ দুখীয়া জন-সাধাৰণক উচ্ছেদ কৰিছে। আনটোত কৈছে, মই সেইটো পঢ়ি দিছো।

Between the two cases Government has, in my opinion, a for stronger case. On the other hand if the Government recognises that the petititioner has a claim which may or may not amount to ownership of the land but which cannot be entirely dismisse and therefore which may have to be compensated for, so that the eventuality of an adverse decision by court or arbitration is avoided it may be possible to negotiate with the petitioner on what terms he proposes to withdraw all claims in this regard.

এফালে চৰকাৰে কৈছে ইয়াক ধৰি থাকক আনফালে কৈছে নহয় claim কৰি দিয়ক। সেই গৰাকী মানুহক অফিচাৰ সকলে কলে যে যিটো Premium দিব লাগে সেইটো পালে সন্তুষ্ট হব। শেষত দেখা গল Compensation দিয়া হল প্রায় ৪ লাখ টকা আৰু মাটি লৈ গুচি গল যদিও তেওঁ মাটিৰ মালিক নহয়। তাৰোপৰি সেই মাটি চৰকাৰী কাৰ্য্যৰ কাৰণে চৰকাৰে অধিগ্রহণ কৰি settlement দিছিল। পিচত সেই মাটিৰ ৫০ বছৰ আগত শ্রীৰাধিকানন্দ চৌধুৰী হেনো পট্টাদাৰ আছিল। চেক্রেটেৰী সকল তেওঁৰ সম্বন্ধীয় হোৱা বাবে এইটো হবলৈ পালে। এই সম্পর্কত কমিটিয়ে অনুমোদন জনাইছে যে এইটো এটা দুর্ভাগ্যজনক কেচ। অনুমোদনটো মই পঢ়ি দিছো—

The Committee observes that the land in question was shown as Sarkari for the last 50 years. The Committee could not find any record whatsoever to show that the so called owner either deposited any local rate for this land or submitted any return under the Celing Act. The Committee therefore is of the opinion that decision of the Government

to acquire this land on more presumption that the land might belong to the party and that the revenue record was wrong is questionable. The Government should have given proper weight to the note of the Deputy Commissioner, Kamrup, dated 18th September, 1963 and left the matter to be decided by the competent court or by arbitration.

Court ত লৈ যাবৰ কাৰণে কমিটিয়ে অনুমোদন জনাইছে কাৰণ এইটো এটা ডাঙৰ অপৰাধৰ কাম কৰিছে। তাৰ পিছত ইয়াত আৰু কিছুমান দুৰ্ভাগ্যজনক কথাৰ আবিস্কাৰ হৈছে। ইয়াত কামাখ্যা Temple ৰ কথা আছে। যেতিয়া Tax দিব লগা হয় তেতিয়া তেওঁ কলে যে Development authority ত ধৰক। গতিকে এই সক্রান্তত যিবিলাক বিষয়া দোষী তেওঁলোকক শাস্তি দিব লাহে। তাৰ পিচত এই ব্যৱস্থা বিলাক কার্যকৰী কৰাটো Existing Board ৰ দ্বাৰা সম্ভৱপৰ নহয়। সেই কাৰণে মই চৰকাৰক দাবী জনাইছো যে এইবিলাক কার্য্যকৰী কৰাৰ কাৰণে Revenue Secretary, Deputy Scoretary আদিক লৈ এটা কমিটি কৰক। এই কমিটিয়ে জিলাই জিলাই গৈ এই ভূমি সংস্কাৰ আইন কার্য্যকৰী কৰা হৈছে নে নাই আৰু জনসাধাৰণৰ মাটিৰ বিষয়ত কাৰ কি আপত্তি আছে তাক চাব। এই কমিটিত জনসাধাৰণৰ প্রতিনিধিও থাকিব লাগিব। কাৰণ তেওঁলোকে সময়ে সময়ে কত কিমান কাম হৈছে আৰু এই আইন কার্য্যকৰী হৈছে নে নাই তাক খবৰ লব পাৰিব। এই ধৰণে কৰিলে "গৰীবি হাতাওঁ" বুলি যি প্রতিশ্রুতি দিছে তাক কার্য্যত পৰিণত কৰিব পাৰিব। এইখিনিকে কৈ বক্তব্যৰ সামৰণি মাৰিলো।

*Shri Atul Chandra Goswami : উপাধ্যক্ষ মহোদয় জয়জয়তে মোৰ বন্ধু শ্রীগোবিন্দ কলিতা দেৱক ধন্যবাদ জনাইছো। তেখেতে বহুতদিনৰ পৰাই জনসাধাৰণৰ দুৰাৱস্থাৰ আচল প্রতিছবিটো জনসাধাৰণে বুজিব পৰাকৈ পবিত্র বিধান সভাত ডাঙি ধৰিছে।

উপাধ্যক্ষ মহোদয় ডাঙৰে কৰিলে লীলা কিন্তু সৰুৱে কৰিলে ধৰি বান্ধি কিলা। Union Minister Jagijban Ram আৰু Fakhruddin চাহাবে

*Speech not corrected

এক ৰাতিৰ ভিতৰতে সমাজবাদী হৈ তাৰ আগতে যি সকল সমাজবাদী আছিল তাক জাপমাৰি বহুত গল। তেনেকুৱা জগজীৱন ৰামে ১০ বছৰৰ Tax দিবলৈ পাহৰে আৰু সেইটো যেনিবা পাহৰা বুলি ধৰি লোৱা হয়। তাৰোপৰি যিজন প্ৰক্ষাত সমাজবাদী ফকৰউদ্দিন চাহাবে অসমৰ জনসাধাৰণৰ চকুত ধূলিমাৰি জীয়াই থকাটো অতি আচৰিত কথা। অন্য কথালৈ মই নাযাওঁ এই Committee ৰ Report ত আছে—

The original return sub nitted by Shri F. A. Ahmed in 1958 was not factually correct and there was an unusual delay in verifying this return.

এজন মন্ত্ৰী, সামান্য মন্ত্ৰীও নহয় এসময়ৰ অসমৰ বিত্তমন্ত্ৰী। তেখেতে আইনক ফাকি দি সত্যৰ অপলাপ কৰি অসত্যক আদৰি লৈ লাখ লাখ টকা অপহৰণ কৰিলে। অসমৰ জনসাধাৰণৰ তেজ শোষণ কৰি Tax ৰ নামত এই ফকৰৰুদ্দিন চাহাবে নিজকে সমাজবাদী বুলি কৈ ভাৰতবৰ্ষৰ মন্ত্ৰীৰ গাদীত থকাটো শোভা নাপায়।

মই এই বিধান সভাৰ জৰিয়তে দাবী জনাইছো যে তেখেত অতি সোনকালে সেই গাদীৰ পৰা পদত্যাগ কৰিব লাগে। আৰু এটা কথা ইয়াত আছে।

Lands settled with Shri Anil Kumar Choudhury, Deputy Commissioner, Kamrup.

Deputy Commissioner এ মাটিৰ সম্বন্ধে যথেষ্ট কথা কৈছিল, কিন্তু Chief Minister এ কৈছিল গুৱাহাটী টাউনত নহয়, গুৱাহাটী circle ত। গতিকে Deputy Commissioner ক Pitition নিদিয়াকৈ ১২ বিঘা মাটি কেনেকৈ ম্যাদী হয়, সেইটো ৰহস্যজনক কথা আৰু এইটো Tribal Land.

The Committee after examining the records of this case observes that the settlement of land with Shri A.K. Choudhury, the present Deputy Commissioner of Kamrup at village Maragdola in Sonapur Circle was irregular and

illegal as the land falls within the Tribal belt. The Committee therefore recommends that the settlement orders should be set aside and responsibility should be fixed on the officer or officer at fault. The Committee also recommends to the Govt. that appropriate action should be taken immediaely against Shri Anil Kumar Choudhury, the present Deputy Commissioner, Kamrup for obtaining illegal settlement in violation of rules and action taken reported to the Committee before 31st December, 1971.

১৯৭১ চনৰ ৩১ ডিচেম্বৰৰ আগতে তেওঁৰ ওপৰত action লৰ লাগে বুলি সমিতিয়ে অনুমোদন কৰিছে। আমাৰ ধাৰণা মাননীয় মুখ্যমন্ত্রী মহোদয়ে এই D. C জনৰ এডাল নোমো লৰাব নোৱাৰে। এই D. C জনে চক্রান্তকৰি এজন Deka বুলি SDC ক যথেষ্ট গন্দগোল কৰিলে আনকি arrest পর্য্যন্ত কৰিলে এই কথা মাননীয় সদস্য গৰাকীয়ে কৈ গৈছে। এই যিজন প্রফুল্ল বৰুৱা তেওঁ এই DC জনৰ ভনী জোৱায়েক হয়। তেওঁ ভাবিলে যে "মাছো খাব চিতিকাতো ভৰি নিদিব"। তাৰ পিচত এইজন SDC সম্পর্কে আমাৰ ৰাজহ সচিবে ৰাজহ মন্ত্রীলৈ এটা গুৰুত্বপূর্ণ নোট দিছিল।

"Shri P. C. Bora has since the beginning of his service in 1951, been in Kamrup District except for 1 Yr. 4 m. at Dudhnai. He is at Rangia since 19th August, 1968. He is the brother-in-law of the D.C. and I feel that is the interest of administration it will not be proper to post him at Sonapur (in Kamrup District), again under his brother-in-law. He should be, if at all, transferred to some other district like Cachar, Lakhimpur etc."

ৰাজহ মন্ত্রীয়ে তাৰ উত্তৰত লিখিলে।

Minister Revenue -

I understand the points raised by the Secretary. But there are certain pending matters in Sonapur Circle which I have not been able to settle inspite of my best efforts. Therefore, I suggested an experienced Circle Officer and in that connection the name of Shri P.C. Bora came to my mind. He may be given a trial for one year in Sonapur. The predicaments mentioned by the Secretary are all along there when he is serving in the same district without any complaint. Regarding Shri Lahkar I have nothing to say.

Sd/-M.M. Choudhury,
29.1.1971.

মাননীয় মুখ্যমন্ত্রী মহোদয়ে, তেখেতে কি বাধ্যা দিয়ে নাজানো কিন্তু সচাকৈ এইটো অন্যায় হৈছে। D. C ৰ অন্যায়ৰ প্রতি যি লোভ আছিল সেই লোভত সহযোগ কৰিছে।

উপাধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, এতিয়া Purchage of one House of Mr Kamaleswar Borua লৈ আহক D. C য়ে এই ঘৰটো কিনাত খৰধৰ লগালে। এই কথাখিনি পঢ়ি দিছো—

Purchase of House of Shri Kamaleswar Barua, Ex.-Chief Engineer.

"On 16th February, 1968 Shri Kamaleswar Barua who was then Chairman, Gauhati Development Authority wrote to the Chief Secretary that the Chief Secretary was pleased to see his building near the Commissioner's residence sometimes back with a view to considering if it could be purchased or acquired for a residence of a senior officer. He sent a site plan and two small photographs of the building along with the letter. On 21st February, 1968, the

Deputy Secretary, G.A,D., wrote to the Deputy Commissioner, Kamrup forwarding the letter of Shri Barua and requested the D.C. to inform immediately the reasonable rent of the building under UBRC Act in force.

The House was first requisitioned on 17th April, 1968 under section 31 of Assam (R&A) Act, 1964 for the purpose of accommodating an officer of the Government. The requisition was a preliminary step for acquisition of a property. Area of land requisitioned was B O K2 7L under Dag No. 4096 (Part) covered by PP No. 738 of Sahar Gauhati.

Another area of 10 lechas was requisitioned (under the same dag and same patta) on 21st July, 1968.

Order for aequisition of property, i e. land 2K-17L and the building standing thereon was passed on 21st July, 1968.

Mr. Dy. Speaker : Mr. Goswami, you are simply losing your time.

Shri Atul Chandra Goswami : Draft notification under Section 6 (1) sent to Government through Executive Engineer, P.W.D. (R & B) under letter No. XII.8/68/III dated 27th April, 1968."

উপাধ্যক্ষ মহোদয় আজি মাননীয় সদস্য শ্রীগোবিন্দ কলিতাই মাত্র গুৱাহাটীৰ কেইটামান নির্দিষ্ট case উত্থাপন কৰিছে যিবোৰ সত্য প্রমাণিত হৈছে। কিন্তু চোৱা যায় কি এনেকুৱা বহুত ঘটনা অসমৰ চাৰিওপিনে চলি আছে। নগাওঁ শ্রীদধিলাল উপাধ্যায়ে ১৫০ বিঘা বুলি কেনেকৈ চৰকাৰক ফাকি দি আছে। এইবোৰত নিশ্চয় চৰকাৰৰ সহযোগিতা আছে। আজি যিমানেই প্রগতিশীল আইন নকৰক

কিয় proper utilisation নহলে একো নহয়। আমাৰ বিধান সভাত মাটি সম্পৰ্কীয় যিমান প্ৰগতিশীল আইন পাচ হৈছে বোধকৰো ভাৰতৰ আৰু কোনো বিধান সভাতে ইমান বিল পাচ হোৱা নাই। আজি এই কমিটিয়ে যি অনুমোদন জনাইছে।

Recommendation

The Committee observes that the orders of the Chief Secretary to the Finance Secretary and the decision taken for purchase of the house in spite of Deputy Commissioner's opinion about the worth of the house seems to be arbitrary and most objectionable from the point of finacial propriety. The Committee is also surprised to know that the house had not yet been occupied by any officer in spite of the fact that large amount of money had already been spent. In view of the above, the Government should take suitable action against the persons responsible for the infractuous expenditure."

তাক কেনেকৈ কাৰ্য্যকৰী কৰে কৰ নোৱাৰো কিন্তু মই ভাবো কামৰূপৰ যিজন উপায়ুক্ত তেওঁ যিহেতু চৰকাৰৰ ক্ষতিগ্ৰস্থ কৰাৰ যথেষ্ঠ প্ৰমাণ পোৱা গৈছে তেওঁৰ ওপৰত action লবলৈ ৩১ তাৰিখলৈ নাৰাখি তাৰ আগতে উপযুক্ত ব্যৱস্থা গ্ৰহণ কৰিব লাগে। আনহাতে আমাৰ যিবিলাক act পাচ কৰা হৈছে সেইবিলাক ভালদৰে চাবৰ কাৰণে জিলাই জিলাই একোটকৈ cell কৰিব লাগে আৰু ভৱিষ্যতে যাতে এনে ধৰণৰ ঘটনা নহয় তাৰ বাবে সচেষ্ঠ হোৱা উচিত। এইখিনিকে কৈ মোৰ বক্তব্যৰ সামৰণি মাৰিলো।

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi : উপাধ্যক্ষ ডাঙৰীয়া, গুৱাহাটী চহৰত মাটি বিতৰণৰ দুৰ্নীতিৰ সংক্ৰান্তত উথাপন কৰা এই বিষয়টো সদনত আৰু লগে লগে গোটেই প্ৰদেশকে জনোৱা বাবে মাননীয় সদস্য শ্ৰীগোবিন্দ কলিতাক ধন্যবাদ দিছো। উপাধ্যক্ষ ডাঙৰীয়া, বিভিন্ন বিষয় সম্পৰ্কে মই ইয়াত আলোচনা

হোৱা শুনিছো। কিন্তু এই Report ৰ পৰা এইটো কথা প্ৰমাণ হয় যে আমাৰ প্ৰদেশত যিবিলাক আইন পাচ কৰা হৈছে সেই আইন বিলাক কাৰ্য্যকৰী কৰাৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত চৰকাৰ ব্যৰ্থ হৈছে। চিলিং আইন সম্পৰ্কত যিটো কোৱা হৈছে সেইমতে ফকৰুদ্দিন আলী আহমদেই হওক বা বাধা মোহন গোয়েঙ্কাই হওক বা আন কোনো-বাই হওক সেইমতে যিমানখিনি মাটি চৰকাৰে পাব লাগিছিল সিমান পোৱা নাই। সৰহভাগ মাটিৰ মালিকেই ভূল তথ্য-পাতি দেখুৱায়। ৰাধামোহন গোয়েঙ্কাৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত কৈছে—The Committee is of the view that the Ceiling Act was not properly applied in this case. The case should be reopened immediately and proper action in this behalf may be taken.

গতিকে যিমান বিলাক চিলিং আইনৰ case এই ক্ষেত্ৰত দেখুৱা হৈছিল সেই case বিলাকৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত যিবিলাক বিষয়ববীয়া জড়িত আছিল যিবিলাক মাটিৰ মালিক আছিল সেইবিলাক ক্ষেত্ৰত আইন প্ৰয়োগ কৰিব পৰা নাই। বৰ্ত্তমান কাম-ৰূপ জিলাৰ Deputy commissioner ৰ সংক্ৰান্তত এই কমিটিয়ে যিখিনি Report ত মন্তব্য দিছে সেই মন্তব্য কাৰ্য্যকৰী কৰা হলে চৰকাৰে Deputy Commissioner ক ততালিকে বৰখাস্ত কৰিব লাগে। তেওঁ অন্যায়ভাৱে জাল কৰি মাটি লৈছে। কিন্তু তেওঁ কৈছিল যে যদি তেওঁ নিজৰ নামত অন্যায় ভাবে মাটি লৈছে তেনেহলে তেওঁ সকলো ধৰনৰ শাস্তি লব। এতিয়া এই কথাটো প্ৰমাণ হল গতিকে তেওঁক সোনকালে দৰখাস্ত কৰিব লাগে। ৩১ ডিচেম্বৰৰ আগতে লোৱা হব বুলি report ত কৈছে কিন্তু প্ৰফুল্ল বৰাৰ কাৰণে শ্ৰীনলিনীকান্ত ডেকাক অন্যায় ভাৱে গ্ৰেপ্তাৰ কৰিছিল আৰু অন্যায় ভাৱে শাস্তি দিয়া হৈছিল। এইটোত Committee ৰ Recomened আছে নে নাই ইয়াত 46 ত কৈছে।

Committee recommendations ... The Committee after going through the case, is of the opinion that the Deputy Commissioner while showing great haste at the time of recommending the suspension and arrest of Shri Deka has not shown equal interest in forwarding draft charges

for departmental action against the officer and for submission of report called for by the government for consideration and sanction of prosecution. Delay on the part of the D.C. is viewed seriously by the Committee. The Committee therefore recommends appointment of a Special Officer to go into the conduct of the D.C. regarding delay in submission of the draft charges and the report required by the government regarding allegation in relation of the arrest of Shri N.K. Deka and whether there was any malafide in relation to the initiation of action against Shri Deka by the D.C. ....

উপাধ্যক্ষ ডাঙৰীয়া Deputy Commissioner সম্পৰ্কত মাটি লোৱাৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত সেই সময়ৰ SDC ডেকাৰ বিৰুদ্ধে তদন্ত কৰিবলৈ Committee য়ে এজন বিষয়ৱৰীয়া দাবী কৰিছিল। গতিকে তেওঁক ডিচেম্বৰৰ ৩১ তাৰিখলৈ নাৰাখি ততালিকে ৰৱখাস্ত কৰিব লাগে। কিয়নো কামৰূপৰ নিচিনা এখন গুৰুত্বপূৰ্ণ জিলাত তেওঁৰ নিচিনা এজন লোক Deputy Commissioner হৈ থকাটো উচিত নহয়।

আজি যিকোনো আইনৰ ক্ষেত্ৰতেই নহওক কিয় চিলিং আইন বা অন্য অৰ্থনৈতিক আইনৰ ক্ষেত্ৰতেই হওক কাৰ্য্যকৰী ক্ষেত্ৰত চৰকাৰ ব্যৰ্থ হৈছে। এই ব্যৰ্থতাৰ কাৰণ হ'ল চৰকাৰৰ আমোলাতান্ত্ৰিক প্ৰশাসন ব্যৱস্থা। ৰাজহ বিভাগৰ আমোলাতান্ত্ৰিক প্ৰশাসন ব্যৱস্থাৰ কাৰণে কোনো আইন কাৰ্য্যকৰী কৰাৰ ক্ষেত্ৰতেই চৰকাৰে সুফল পোৱা নাই। কেৱল প্ৰগতিশীল আইন হলেই নহব। সেই ক্ষেত্ৰত কমিটীয় কৈছে যে

The inadequacy of the administrative machinery together with the all pervasive influence of the richer section of the people have combined to defeat the basic purpose of one of the most primary land reform legislation. Government should therefore not only reorganise and stren-

gthen the administrative machinery but also ensure that it is susceptible to pressure.

গতিকে উপাধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, সদনত পাছ কৰা এই চিলিং আইন আৰু Tenancy বিল এই দুখন কার্য্যকৰী যদি কৰিবলগীয়া হয় তেতিয়াহলে ৰাজহ বিভাগীয় প্রশাসন ব্যৱস্থা যথেষ্ট পৰিস্কাৰ কৰিব লাগিব। কাৰণ বর্ত্তমান আমোলাতান্ত্রিক ব্যৱস্থাৰ যোগেদি ধনীক শ্রেণীৰহে সুবিধা দিয়া হৈছে কিন্তু দুখীয়াৰ ক্ষেত্রত একৰকমে আইন প্রযোজ্য হয় আৰু ধনীৰ ক্ষেত্রত আন একৰকমে প্রযোজ্য হয়। দুখীয়া লোকসকলৰ ঘৰ-দুৱাৰ জুই লগাই দিব পাৰে। উৰ্চ্ছেদ কৰিব পাৰে কিন্তু ধনীক উচ্ছেদ কৰিব নোৱাৰে। আৰু কৰাও নাই।

উপাধ্যক্ষ ডাঙৰীয়া, মই যোৱা ৪ বছৰ ধৰি অভিযোগ কৰি আহিছো যে শিৱসাগৰ জিলাৰ জিলা কংগ্রেছৰ সভাপতি শ্রীপ্রফুল্ল চন্দ্র বৰুৱাই প্রায়ে এহেজাৰ বিঘা চৰকাৰী মাটি দখল কৰি আছে। আজি ৪ বছৰে সদনত কোৱা স্বত্বেও উচ্ছেদৰ কোনো ব্যৱস্থা কৰা হোৱা নাই। কাৰণ তেওঁ চাহবাগানৰ মালিক আৰু জিলা কংগ্রেছৰ সভাপতি। সেই কাৰণে তেওঁৰ বিৰুদ্ধে উচ্ছেদ ব্যৱস্থা লব নোৱাৰে কিন্তু দুখীয়া মানুহৰ ক্ষেত্রত সকলো ৰকমে উচ্ছেদ কৰিব পাৰে। গ্রেপ্তাৰ কৰিব পাৰে।

গতিকে গুৱাহাটীত পুনৰ সংস্থাপন কৰা লোকসকলৰ সম্পর্কত পুনৰ তদন্ত কৰি যিবিলাকক মাটি অন্যায় ভাবে দিয়া হৈছে সেই সকলৰ নাম নাকচ কৰি পুণৰ বিতৰণ কৰাৰ কাৰণে কমিটিয়ে পৰামর্শ দিছে। আশাকৰো চৰকাৰে সেই-মতে কাম কৰিব আৰু অন্যায়ভাৱে উচ্ছেদ কৰা লোকসকলক পুনৰসংস্থাপন দিয়াৰ ব্যদস্থা কৰিব।

উপাধ্যক্ষ মহোদয় কমিটিয়ে শেষত কৈছে—

In conclusion, the Committee is of the view that the implementation of the various land revenue and land reform measures in the State of Assam had been unsat sfactory in the past and therefore, draw the pointed attention of the government for streamlining the administrative machinery

and for being careful about socio-economic forces in such matters in future.

গতিকে এই আইন কার্য্যকৰী কৰাৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত কমিটিয়ে দিয়া পৰামৰ্শ মতে প্ৰশাসন ব্যৱস্থা পুনৰ সংস্কাৰ কৰিব লাগে। তেহে এই আইনৰ যোগেদি আমাৰ দেশৰ সামাজিক আৰু অৰ্থনৈতিক জীৱন উন্নতি হব।

উপাধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, বেছি কথা নকৈ এই প্ৰতিবেদনত দিয়া গুৰুত্বপূৰ্ণ কথাবোৰ যিহেতু কমিটিটো সদনৰ পৰাই নিৰ্ব্বাচিত, ততালিকে কাৰ্য্যকৰী কৰিবলৈ কঠোৰ ব্যৱস্থা লবলৈ দাবী জনালো আৰু ৰাজহ বিভাগৰ তেনে দুৰ্নীতি পৰায়ণ লোকৰ বিৰুদ্ধে শাস্তিমূলক ব্যৱস্থা লবলৈ চৰকাৰক দাবী জনালো। আৰু লগতে এই কথা আমি আশা কৰিছো কাৰণ এই বিপটটোৱেই নহয়, আজি কেৱল গুৱাহাটী সম্পৰ্কে তদন্ত হলেও এই কথাবিলাক এতিয়া দেখা গৈছে। কিন্তু উপাধ্যক্ষ ডাঙৰীয়া, আমাৰ প্ৰদেশৰ প্ৰায়বিলাক জেগাতে ইয়াৰ পুনৰাবৃত্তি হৈছে। গতিকে সমগ্ৰ প্ৰদেশৰ ভূমি সংস্কাৰৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত যিবিলাক দুৰ্নীতি দেখা গৈছে সেইবিলাকৰ সম্পৰ্কে তদন্ত কৰিবৰ এটা ব্যৱস্থা অতি শীঘ্ৰে কৰা দৰকাৰ। শেষত উপাধ্যক্ষ ডাঙৰীয়া, আপোনাৰ অনুমতি লৈ এটা প্ৰস্তাৱ ডাঙি ধৰিব বিছাৰিছো, কাৰণ এই বিপটটো সদনত place কৰিছে ঠিকেই। এই বিপটটো সদনত গ্ৰহন কৰা দৰকাৰ আৰু কৰাৰ পাছত চৰকাৰে কাৰ্য্যকৰী ব্যৱস্থা লোৱা প্ৰয়োজন। প্ৰস্তাৱটো অতি সাধাৰন।

This House accepts the reports submitted by the Land Settlement Implementation Advisory Committee on the allegations brought by Shri Govinda Kalita, M.L.A. before the House on 9th and 20th of May, 1971 regarding settlement of land in and around Gauhati and other allied matters.

Shri Gaurisankar Bhattacharyya : Sir, I beg to support the resolution moved by my friend, Shri Promode Gogoi; because there should be, in my opinion a formal acceptance of the

report. Sir, at the outset I express my deep gratitude to the Hon'ble Member, Shri Govinda Kalita for the great services that he has rendered to the people of Assam by bringing in these illustrations which the Committee could get an opportunity to probe into. Sir, these instances are only illustrative and not exhaustive. Then, Sir, I congratulate the Committee for the very well-documented and sober findings and recommendations. This Committee was not only the Committee of the House but also it was presided over by the Cabinet Minister in charge of Revenue. Therefore, the findings of this Committee should be binding on the Government and the conclusions that would follow from these findings should be implemented by the Government early. It is also a great pleasure to note that the findings and the recommendations of the Committee are unanimous, that the members of the Committee could consider the country above party; could consider the interest of the people rather than small caucus. Therefore, all the Members of the Committee deserve our gratitude and congratulations. Having said this, Sir, I suggest that a copy of this report should be formally forwarded by the Speaker to the Prime Minister of India because here, in this report, remarks and findings are there which concern a very important Member of the Central Cabinet. That gentleman was a Member of the State Cabinet here at the time when in his interest and to his benefit quite a lot of irregularities and improprieties were done not only with his connivance but with his active participation and

his own interference. He is talked about either as Joy or as Bejoy of the Prime Minister's campaign for socialism. One "Ram" came into prominence as a Congress Socialist for his dodging of income tax and the other "Rahim" now stands prominently as the second piller of Congress Socialism for his concealment of landed properties in excess of statutory ceiling from the Government in which he himself was a Cabinet Minister and whereby he made for himself several lakhs of rupees of illegal gains at the cost of the people and the State. (Voice-who is that here ?). That hero is as everybody knows, and as the Committee found out, Shri Fakharuddin Ali Ahmed. who is now an important member of the Union Cabinet. Then, there are others - I need not go to enumerate but there is class of Fancy Bazar businessmen, including Jhumarmals, Bajorias and others. Quite a large number of Fancy Bazar businessmen have become owners of Kamakhya temple lands and many other lands. So, our beloved Prime Minister's socialism is so well-knitthat the big business not only of Delhi or Bombay or Calcutta but even of Fancy Bazar also is not excluded from unearned income and super-profit ! That also is a matter which our Socialist brotherhood should particularly underline. Then another thing. When the Government will go to implement the logical conclusions of this report they should see what type of persons have been involved. Those who are dead and gone cannot be caught though from them also there should be some lesson taken by the present personnel who are in power.

One thing you will see, Sir, when you refer to page 16 of the report. In one deal certain big guys were the beneficiaries, nemely Shri Kamaleswar Barua, Sri, K.C, Barua, G N. Dutta, Shri B. P. Chaliha, Shri Aghana Ram Das, Shri G.C. Phukan, Shri G.C, Goswami and others. Now, what is the matter ? One of them namely, Shri B.P. Chaliha was at that time the Chief Minister. Another namely, Shri Khanindra Chandra Barua was at one time the Commissioner of Divisions and then Revenue Secretary Still another. namely, Shri Ganesh Chandra Phookan was at that time the Finance Secretary. Another nemely, Shri Gokul Chandra Goswami was the ex-Chief Electrical Adviser to the Govt. and one namely, Shri G.N. Dutta was the ex-Chief Engineer. What did they do ? They got Gauhati city's valuable plots of land measuring 15B. 1K. 7L. settled in their name. They got these settled. But thereafter somebody came and said that the said land was not Sarkari it belonged to him. If Government settled wrong land it ought to be void ob-initio. Govt ought to have returned the premium which might have been realised and it would be all right. But instead doing that, Government purchased the land post-facto and paid the sum of Rs. 4 lakhs to the claimant and got the settlement ockayed by him at the cost of the poor people whose lotas and plates even are sold out in auction in order to get the public exchequer fattened to be feasted upon by the big guys. Public money was thus squandered about so that Govt. could make "Bhoodan" to the Chief Minister, Finance Secretary,

ex-Revenue Seeretary, ex-Chief Engineer, Ex-Chief Electrical Adviser atcetra in the heart of Gauhati. This is Congress Socialism (Shri Biswadev Sarma : It was before socialism) Yes, before sociali m, at the dawn of socialism so that morning could show the day ; From this the present Govt. should take a lesson. My Friend Shri Phani Bora once upon a time said that if you go in this way, people would take law in their own hands and having taken law in their own hands they might not be quite non-violent and peaceful and that they would relieve you of your skins. (Shri Phani Bora : I say even now), So, even now he has not changed his opinion. So before you lose your skin and bones you should try to take a lesson that there is a limit to the tolerance to the indulgence even of the indolent Assamese people. If you cross this limit any further, may God save your skin and bone from the wrath of the common people !

Sir, then I come to another aspect of the matter. So far as settlement of lands and taking other benifits are concerned, political leaders and public srvents should consider it not only improper, but inmoral. They should never make aggrandisement in their official capacity at the cost of our poor people. The second thing I want to say is this ; some temples, some relious institutions and other lands were acquired by the Government and the deities were deprived. But for whose benefit ? Well, benefits went to Jumalmals, Lakshminarayan Bajorias and others. What happened ? It is a very interesting case of investment of Kamakhya temple. It is at pages 31-35, In substance the matter is this :

In Fancy Bazar there was a piece of land belonging to Kamakhya Temple. One Jumarmal Jain of Fancy Bazar is the unofficial Treasurer of many ex-Ministers and at least one present Minister. His house called Hatigola belonged to Kamakhya Temple. Now, that Jumarmal Jain was a tenant of Kamakhya property. When the D.C. Kamup as the custodian of the Temple got some money from out of the sale of Kamakhya properties what did he do ? There was a piece of land belonging to one Lakshminarayan Bazoria. The D.C. purchased that land astensibly for the Kamakha Temple and he paid to Bajoria in two instalments the sum of Rs. 1,78,000/from the Kamakhya temples funds. Revenue records however were not corrected. On that land a building was constructed at the cost of Kamakhya Temple Funds, but in the name of Jumarmal Jain. The present Deputy Commissioner as the chairman of the Gauhati Development Authority at that time and he gave the permission. So the money is of Kamakhya Temple with which the land was purchased. The cost of the biulding was entirely born by the Kamakhya Temple ; but the building is in the name of Jumarmal Jain on the land of Lakshminarayan Bajoria accordig to revenue records. If Maa Kamakhya would have been 'jagrata', probably these people would not have spared !

Mr. Deputy Speaker : You Brahmins are responsible for this.

Shri Gaurisankar Bhattacharyya : Here, I am not as a Brahmin. Here I am the representative of those people whose

utensils you have sold out and have made them hungry and impoverished people. They have no other god except a piece of bread or a morsal of rice. God will be acceptable to these people only if he comes in the form of food. These people whom you have robbed, whom you have suppressed, whom you have made impoverished just to fatten yourselves, to fatten the Ministers, to fatten the black-marketers of Barabazar and Fancy Bazar are now slowly but surely undustanding the bluff of you brand of socialist. Are you not ashamed of your socialism thanks to which the poor people have became impoverished and fanished and the black marketiars have prospered ?

It is possible only in Congress regime when Finance Secretary, Revenue secretary Deputy Commissioners, S.D.C.s. and A.S.O,s all those who were connected with Revenue matters can conspired with impunity in defeating land reforms in Assam. We claim that in Assam we have passed many land reforms laws. But all these laws have been sabotaged. I was a member of land Reforms Implementation Enquriy Committee and along with Shri Jogen Saikia who is now a Minister, I toured the whole State. We found to our consternation all these legislations in fact, proved a fraud on the people. Because, even though we showed that we had done a lot of land reform it was only on paper. In actual implementation it has been implemented only in the case of small ones and not in the case big people.

In short, the whole report shows that up till now so far as land reforms measures of the Government of Assam

are concerned, these are not only on paper but these proved to be a fraud on the people and those who have committed this fraud including one Ex-Chief Minister, one present Cabinet Minister of the Central Govt, one Finance Secretary of the Govt. of Assam, one ex-Revenue Secretary of the Govt. of Assam, 3 Chief Engineers of the Govt. of Assam and one Deputy Commissioner, some A.S.Os and S.D.Cs. We need not mention the Mandals and Kanungos who are almost innumerable. If the protectors themselves become the carnivorous devourors then what happens can only be imagined, not described. So, Sir, I pray that if this Govt. really mean business, let me hope that the Cabinet Minister who presided this Committee has taken it seriously. Let this report be implemented in full & without any reservation. Let the Govt. not come with some more explanations and some comments so as to avoid the findings & recommendations or come with the plea that they are yet to study the report. There is nothing to study now. It is time to implement it and punish those who are liable for all these things.

Mr. Deputy Speaker : I am under the mandate of the House that it has been decided while Mr. Speaker was in the Chair that debate should close at 4. 30 and the Minister will reply thereafter. And the reply of the Minister concerned a resolution will be there on this particular subject. As the Ramjan is there it may not be possible to extent the time of the House therefore, may I call the Minister for the reply.

*M. Shamsul Huda : অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয় এই Report খনৰ ওপৰত বিভিন্ন আলোচনা কৰি মাননীয় সদস্য সকলে কথা কৈছে। মই কেৱল মূলমত কেইটা মানৰ কথা কব খুজিছো যে Report ৰ জৰিয়তে কেইটামান কথা প্ৰমান হৈছে, সেই কথাবোৰ হৈছে এই চৰকাৰৰ তলত চৰকাৰৰ আত্মনীতি উলঙ্ঘা কৰি তাৰ বিৰুদ্ধে নিজৰ আইনৰ মাটিৰ মালিক জন কামৰূপ জিলাৰ উপায়ুক্ত অনিল কুমাৰ চৌধুৰীয়ে বিধান সভাৰ বিৰুদ্ধে কাম কৰি তেখেতে নিজৰ নামত মাটি লৈছে। ২ নম্বৰত এইটো কথা প্ৰমান হৈছে অসমত চিলিং আইন যেতিয়াৰ পৰাই প্ৰবৰ্ত্তন কৰিছে তেতিয়াৰ পৰাই চৰকাৰী মন্ত্ৰী সভা মন্ত্ৰী সকলে আৰু চৰকাৰৰ বিভাগীয় কৰ্ত্তৃপক্ষ সকলোৱেই চিলিং আইনৰ বিৰুদ্ধে কাম কৰিছে। ইয়াৰ প্ৰমান আজি ইয়াত ফকৰুদ্দিন আলি আহমেদ আৰু মোহিনী কুমাৰ চৌধুৰীয়ে তেওঁলোক কোনো দিনেই চিলিং আইনৰ কাম কৰা নাই। তেওঁলোকে চিলিং আইনৰ বিৰুদ্ধে কাম কৰিছে আৰু সকলো আৱশ্যক অনুসৰি চৰকাৰে সেইসকলক মহাত্মা লোকক সহায় কৰি আহিছে। তিনি নম্বৰত এটা কথা প্ৰমান হৈছে এই যে চিলিং আইনৰ নামত সকলো মন্ত্ৰী, মন্ত্ৰী সকলৰ আত্মীয় সকলোৱেই অন্যায়ভাৱে মাটি দখল কৰিছে। চৰকাৰে অন্যায় ভাবে টকা খৰছ কৰিছে। সেই টকাৰ পৰিমান হৈছে ৪ লক্ষ্য টকা খাৰধূলিৰ মাটিৰ সংক্ৰান্তত প্ৰমান হৈছে যে মন্ত্ৰীৰ ফালৰ সদস্য ৰাজহ বিভাগৰ কৰ্ম্মচাৰী D.C. A.D.C. সকলোৱেই ভাগে ভাগে কাম কৰি দিছে। এই ঠাইত Reccomend ১০০ বছৰ আগতেই গভমেণ্টে দিছিল। কেচ হৈ গল, কিন্তু অধিগ্ৰহণ কৰি বেআইনী ভাৱে চৰকাৰে আগতে সুবিধা ললে। বিত্তিয় বিভাগ ৰাজহ বিভাগে এনে আত্মসাৎ কৰিছে যে ইয়াৰ দ্বাৰা এইটো কথা প্ৰমান হৈছে যে চৰকাৰে চিলিং আইন প্ৰবৰ্ত্তন কৰি আজিলৈ চিলিং আইনৰ মৰ্য্যদা দিব পৰা নাই। ইয়াত দেখা গৈছে ৰাজহ বিভাগত কৰ্ম্মচাৰী সকলো লোকক সকলো ক্ষেত্ৰতে চিলিং আইনৰ বিৰুদ্ধে কাম কৰিছে। যিমান খিনি দূৰনীতি প্ৰবৰ্ত্তন হৈছে কেৱল যে কামৰূপতেই হৈছে এনে নহয়। প্ৰত্যেক খন জিলাতেই চিলিং আইনৰ গোচৰ শুনিৰ। এই চৰকাৰে চিলিং আইনৰ বিৰুদ্ধে কাম কৰিছে এই ক্ষেত্ৰত এটা কথা কব খুজিছো এতিয়া আমি দেখিছো বৰ্ত্তমান ক্ষেত্ৰত চিলি আইনৰ ব্যৱস্থা

*Speech not corrected

নকৰাই ভাল হব। আমি দেখিছো ন-গাওঁ জিলাৰ মাটিৰ মালিক সকলে চিলিং আইনৰ সুযোগ লৈ মাটিৰ লাখ লাখ টকাৰ কাৰবাৰ কৰিছে আৰু তাত সহায় কৰিছে আমাৰ মন্ত্রী পক্ষৰ মানুহে। নগাওঁ S.D.C. জনে চিলিং আইনৰ মতে কাম নকৰি ৰাতা-ৰাতি মাটি বিতৰণ কৰে। দুগানন্দ চৌধুৰীৰ যিখন তদন্তৰ report দিছে বিভিন্ন ঠাইত মাটি দখল কৰিছে বুলি আনকি তেওঁ বিধস্ত পৰিয়ালকো উচ্ছেদ কৰি মাটি দখল কৰিছে।

এনেভাৱে চৰকাৰে তেওঁলোকৰ নিজা মতে মাটি বিতৰণৰ কাম কৰিছে। গতিকে এই Report ৰ ওপৰত দৃষ্টি আকৰ্ষণ কৰি Recomendation কাৰ্য্য কৰি মোৰ বক্তৃতাৰ শেষ কৰিলো।

Shri Sailen Medhi: Sir, the decision which was taken by the hon. Speaker had been taken just before the Chief Minister gave the statement The statement of the Chief Minister took half an hour and thereby we lost another half an hour.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Ahmed, can you finish within five minutes ?

*Shri Giasuddin Ahmed: Yes. মাননীয় অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, এই ৰিপৰ্ট খনত সামৰণিত যিটো কথা কৈছে সেইটো ৰৰ গুৰুত্বপূৰ্ণ কথা। ইয়াত কৈছে যে

"In conclusion the Committee is of the view that implementation of the various land revenue and land reform measures in the State of Assam has been unsatisfactory in the past and therefore draw the pointed attention of the Government for streamlining the administrative machinery and for being careful about the socio-economic forces in such matters in future."

*Speech not corrected

এই লাইন কেইটাত অসমৰ অর্থনৈতিক আৰু ৰাজনৈতিক আৰু ভবিষ্যতৰ কথা বিবেচনা কৰিলে এইটো সিদ্ধান্তলৈ আহিব লাগিব যে এই সমষ্টিগোট বৰ গুৰুত্বপূর্ণ আৰু এই Recomendation বা Committee ৰ যিটো মন্তব্য, সেই মন্তব্য যদি কার্য্যকৰী কৰিব পৰা নাই; তেনেহলে মই আশঙ্কা প্রকাশ কৰিছোঁ যে গণতান্ত্রিক পদ্ধতিত অর্থাৎ সংযদী গণতন্ত্রৰ জৰিয়তে আমাৰ দেশৰ সমস্যা সমাধান কৰাটো সম্ভৱ নহব। হয়তো এই প্রচলিত ভূমিৰাজহৰ সমস্যা লৈ ৰক্তাক্ত বিপ্লৱৰ সৃষ্টি হব।

মই এই Report ৰ কথা বিতংকৈ আলোচনা কৰিব খোজা নাই। মাত্র মই এইখিনি কথা আলোচনা কৰিব খুজিছো যে বর্ত্তমান আমাৰ প্রদেশখনত যি কেইটা আইন প্রৱোচিত হৈছে—তাত প্রত্যেকটো আইনতে কিছুমান দোষ ত্রুটি আছে। যে যাৰ ফলত এইখন কার্য্যকৰী কৰা সম্ভৱ নহয় ৰৰং কিছুমান দূর্নীতি পৰায়ন কর্ম্মচাৰীয়ে দূর্নীতিৰ সুযোগ লৈ দূর্নীতি পৰায়ন প্রতিবেশী লোকে ৰাজকার্য্যত শোষণ কৰাৰ এটা সুবিধা পাইছে—।

উদাহৰণ স্বৰূপে মই কব বিচাৰিছোঁ যে কিছুমান দিনৰ আগতে কেইখন মান আইন চবকাৰে সংশোধনী কৰা হৈছে। যেনে ছিলেট টেনেন্সী এক্ট আৰু গোৱালপাৰা টেনেন্সী এক্ট। মই যিটো আইনৰ কথা কৈছোঁ তাত এটা সংশোধনী আছে। তাত আধীয়াৰৰ যিটো সুবিধা আছে—under Tenency সেই সুবিধাটোত যিটো সংজ্ঞা বাহিৰ কৰি দিয়া হৈছে অর্থাৎ এনেকুৱা কৰা হৈছে, যে— আধিয়াৰ মূলত। under Tenency সুবিধাত তলতীয়া প্রজা হিচাবে আধিয়াৰক গণ্য কৰা হৈছে। দেখাত আইনখন প্রগতিশীল যেন লাগে। যিহেতু যুগ যুগ ধৰি ৰঞ্চিত এই আধিয়াৰ বিলাকৰ মাটিৰ বিত্তৰ ৰাবে এই আইন খন ৰচিত। গতিকে ই দেখাত প্রগতিশীল আইন। পিছে গোৱালপাৰা টেনেন্সী এক্ট আৰু ছিলেট টেনেন্সী এক্টত প্রজাৰ নামত পট্টন দিয়াত বহুতো বাধা আছে। যেনে—প্রথমতে survey কৰে, survey হোৱাৰ পাছত Draft কৰে তাৰ পাছত শুনানী হয় তাত কাৰোৱাৰ আপত্তি থাকিলে Civil Court ত মোকদ্দমা তবিব পাৰে। তাৰ পিচত চুৰান্ত হিচাবে যিটো record কৰা হয় সেইটো গ্রহণ কৰা হয়। গোৱালপাৰাৰ আধিয়াৰ বিলাকক যি খতিয়ান তৈয়াৰ কৰা হয় তাৰ আধিয়াৰ সকলৰ নাম সোমোৱা নাছিল এজন আধিয়াৰৰ নাম সেই খতিয়ানত অন্তভূক্ত কৰা হোৱা নাই। যেতিয়া আইন

সংশোধন কৰা হৈছে, সেই সময়ত তলতীয়া প্ৰজাক স্বত্ব দিবৰ কাৰণে সেই সম্পৰ্কত মই এটা সংশোধনী দিছিলো। কিন্তু সেই সংশোধনী নাকচ কৰা হল। এই আইনত স্পষ্টকৈ কোৱা হৈছে যে আধিয়াৰ বিলাকক তলতীয়া প্ৰজা হিচাবে গণ্য কৰা হব। কিন্তু আমি দেখিছো এই আধিয়াৰ সকলক ঘৰুৱা কামত ব্যৱহাৰ কৰা হৈছে। ঠিক সেই ধৰণে চিলেট টেনেন্সী এক্ট কৰাৰ পিছত আধিয়াৰ সকলক তলতীয়া প্ৰজাৰ স্বত্ব দিয়া হোৱা নাই। তেওঁলোকৰ নাম খতিয়ানত অন্তভূক্ত কৰা হোৱা নাই। বক্তৃতাৰ খুব ভাল ভাল কথা কোৱা হয় কিন্তু কাৰ্য্য ক্ষেত্ৰত তাৰ বিপৰীত। গতিকে কমিটিয়ে যিখিনি অনুমোদন জনাইছে তাক অচিৰে কাৰ্য্যকৰী কৰাৰ ব্যৱস্থা কৰক। এটা শক্তিশালী কমিটি গঠন কৰি ইয়াৰ বৈপ্লৱীক পৰিবৰ্ত্তন আনিব লাগে। কাৰণ বাজহ বিভাগৰ যিটো অত্যাচাৰ দেখিছো তাক আমি সহ্য কৰিব নোৱাৰো। কেতিয়াবা মই ভাৱো নক্সালাইট বিলাকেই ভাল কাম কৰিছে নেকি ? কিন্তু মই নক্সালাইটক বিশ্বাস নকৰো। গতিকে সময় থাকোতেই এটা ভাল ব্যৱস্থা কৰক নহলে ৰক্তাক্ত বিপ্লৱৰ শোচনা হব।

Shri Biswadev Sarma (Minister Revenue) : মাননীয় উপাধ্যক্ষ মহোদয় কমিটিৰ প্ৰতিবেদনত যিবিলাক কথা আছে সেই কথা বিলাক মই কব খোজা নাই কাৰণ কমিটিৰ প্ৰতিবেদন সকলো সদস্যৰ হাতত দিয়া হৈছে। এই কমিটিয়ে যিবিলাক পৰামৰ্শ আগবঢ়াইছে, এই সম্পৰ্কত কেবাজনো সদস্যই সন্দেহ প্ৰকাশ কৰিছে যে এই পৰামৰ্শ বিলাক কাৰ্য্যকৰী কৰিবনে নকৰে ? চৰকাৰে এই বিলাক পৰামৰ্শ গ্ৰহণ কৰিব আৰু তাক কাৰ্য্যকৰী কৰিব তাত কোনো সন্দেহ থাকিব নালাগে। অসমৰ ভূমি সংস্কাৰৰ আইন বলবৎ কৰা সম্পৰ্কত সদস্যসকলে পৰামৰ্শ দিছে যে জিলা পৰ্য্যায়ত কিছুমান কমিটি কৰিলে ভাল হয় নেকি ? কেইমাহমানৰ অভিজ্ঞতাৰ পৰা এটা কথা গম পাইছো যে সচাকৈয়ে যদি এই আইন বলবৎ হব লাগে আৰু প্ৰকৃত খেতিয়ক সকলে মাটি পাব লাগে তেনেহলে খেতিয়ক সকলৰ সংগঠনৰ জৰিয়তে যদি নকৰো, চৰকাৰৰ অফিচাৰ আৰু আইনৰ সহায়ত অসমত ভূমিসংস্কাৰ কেতিয়াও হব নোৱাৰে। প্ৰতিনিধিসকলৰ সংগঠিত শক্তিৰ সহায়ত যদি এই কাম নকৰো আমাৰ ভূমি আইন কেতিয়াও কৃতকাৰ্য্য হব নোৱাৰে বুলি মই ভাবো। যেনেকৈ চাহ বাগিছাৰবন্ধুৱা সংগঠন হৈছে আৰু তাৰ দ্বাৰা আইনবিলাক কাৰ্য্যকৰী হৈছে, ঠিক সেই ধৰণে কৃষক বন্ধুৱা সংগঠন কৰিলেহে আইনবিলাক কাৰ্য্য-

কৰী কৰিব পৰা হব। ইয়াৰ বাবে এটা স্থায়ী কমিটি কৰিলে জিলাই জিলাই গৈ কাম বিলাক চাব পাৰিব। কাৰণ অফিচাৰে জিলাই জিলাই গৈ এইবিলাক চোৱাত অসুবিধা আছে। তাৰ পিচত শ্রীপ্রফুল্ল বৰুৱাৰ মাটিৰ সংক্রান্তত সম্পূর্ণ বিপটটো অলপতে মোৰ হাতত আহি পৰিছে। মই এই কথা জনাব খুজিছো যে এই ক্ষেত্রত প্রফুল্ল বৰুৱাই হওক বা আন কোনোবাই হওক যথা বিহিত ব্যৱস্থা গ্রহন কৰা হব। চিলিং আইনৰ জৰিয়তে যিখিনি অতিৰিক্ত মাটি সেই মাটিৰপৰা উচ্ছেদ কৰিম।

Shri Dulal Chandra Barua : এতিয়া আইনৰ যোগেদি এইটো ব্যৱস্থা লোৱা হব বুলি কৈছে। আগতে return নিদিয়ে কিয় ?

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi : বেদখল কৰাৰ কাৰণে land settlement Board এ উচ্ছেদ কৰিবলৈ প্রস্তাৱ পাচ কৰিছে। তাৰ পিচত বিধান সভাত উত্থাপন কৰাত তদন্ত কৰিছে। D.C এ কলে প্রায় এহেজাৰ বিঘা মাটি এতিয়া বে-দখল কৰি আছে। আজি এবছৰ পাৰ হৈ গল উচ্ছেদ হোৱা নাই।

Shri Biswadev Sarma : বিৰ্পোটটো অলপতে আহি পাইছে। সেই বিষয়ত যি ব্যৱস্থা লব লাগে নিশ্চয় লম, তাত কোনো সন্দেহ নাই। তাৰ পিচত ভট্টাচার্য্য ডাঙৰীয়াই কৈছে যে কংগ্রেছে সমাজবাদ কৰিব নোৱাৰে। মই এইটোৰ প্রত্যাহ্বান গ্রহণ কৰিছো। আৰু কংগ্রেছে যে সমাজবাদী হব পাৰিব বা সমাজবাদ প্রতিষ্ঠা কৰিব পাৰিব, তাৰ প্রমাণ এই কমিটিৰ report খনে। কাৰণ এইবিলাক কথাৰ সুবহু আলোচনাৰ কাৰণেই কিতাপখন প্রত্যেক সদস্যকে দিয়া হৈছে।

শেষত মই কৈছোঁ যে কংগ্রেছেই সমাজবাদ তৈয়াৰ কৰিব লাগিব। এই কমিটিখনত যি কেইজন সদস্য আছে তাৰ প্রায়বিলাকেই কংগ্রেছ সদস্য আৰু তেওঁলোকে এনেধৰণৰ পৰামর্শ আগ বঢ়াইছে।

সেইকাৰণে আপোনালোকক প্রত্যাহ্বান কৰিছো যে সেইটো মই সাদৰেৰে গ্রহণ কৰিছো।

ADJOURNMENT

The Assembly then adjourned till 10 A.M. on Tuesday, the 9th November 1971.

U. Tahbildar
Secretary,
Assam Legislative Assembly,

Shillong
The 8th November 1971