

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA
1917

107-108	...
109-110	...
111-112	...
113-114	...
115-116	...
117-118	...
119-120	...
121-122	...
123-124	...
125-126	...
127-128	...
129-130	...
131-132	...
133-134	...
135-136	...
137-138	...
139-140	...
141-142	...
143-144	...
145-146	...
147-148	...
149-150	...
151-152	...
153-154	...
155-156	...
157-158	...
159-160	...
161-162	...
163-164	...
165-166	...
167-168	...
169-170	...
171-172	...
173-174	...
175-176	...
177-178	...
179-180	...
181-182	...
183-184	...
185-186	...
187-188	...
189-190	...
191-192	...
193-194	...
195-196	...
197-198	...
199-200	...

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

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber, Shillong at 10 A.M., on Thursday, the 10th December, 1959.

PRESENT

Shri Mohendra Mohan Choudhury, B.L., Speaker in the Chair, Eight Ministers, Four Deputy Ministers and Eighty-five Members.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

STARRED QUESTIONS

(To which oral answers were given)

**Occupation of Chapor Inspection Bungalow by
P. W. D. Overseer**

Maulavi JAHAN UDDIN AHMED (Bilasipara) asked:

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

(a) Whether Government are aware that a portion of Chapor Inspection Bungalow is being occupied by a Public Works Department Overseer ?

(b) On what term or condition the said portion of Chapor Inspection Bungalow has been occupied by the Public Works Department Overseer ?

(c) Whether the said Overseer pays to the Government any rent for it ?

(d) If so, what is the amount, and if not, why not ?

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

43. (a)—Yes.

(b)—Due to non-availability of rented house in the locality, Government has allowed the Overseer to occupy one room of the Inspection Bungalow as per rules.

(c)—Yes, he pays rent to the Government monthly as per Inspection Bungalow rules.

(d)—The amount paid by him is 50 nP. per day.

†**Shri BHUBAN CHANDRA PRODHANI (Golakganj)** : Sir, what is the maximum period that a person can occupy the Dak Bungalow or the Inspection Bungalow ?

†**Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI [Deputy Minister, P. W. D. (R. & B.)]** : Ten days.

†**Maulavi JAHAN UDDIN AHMED (Bilasipara)** : How long has this Overseer been in occupation of the Inspection Bungalow ?

†**Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI** : I think for a pretty long time Sir, due to dearth of accommodation in the locality.

†**Shri DANDESWAR HAZARIKA (Morongi)** : Is it a fact that all the furniture allotted to this Inspection Bungalow are used by this overseer as his personal property ?

†**Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI** : I have no information, Sir.

†**Shri DANDESWAR HAZARIKA** : Will the Government please enquire because I myself have lodged a complaint in the Complaint Book there ?

†**Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI** : Certainly enquiry will be made if the hon. Member so desires.

†**Shri RAMNATH DAS [Dergaon (Reserved for Scheduled Castes)]** : Do Government propose to allow this overseer to occupy the Inspection Bungalow for ever ?

†**Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI** : No Sir, he has already left.

Mr. SPEAKER : As the overseer concerned has already left the Inspection Bungalow, I think there is no point in putting in Supplementaries.

†**Shri DEBESWAR SARMAH [Minister, P.W.D. (R&B)]** : Sir, may I make a very brief statement ? Unfortunately due to expansion of the cadre that is necessary everywhere for the Development works and due to paucity of houses almost everywhere, certain rooms in the Circuit Houses, Dak Bungalows and Inspection Bungalows are being occupied by Government officers almost on a semi-permanent basis. This is a very undesirable state of affairs and we are trying to minimise the difficulty as best as we can everywhere.

(Starred Question No.44 standing in the name of Shri Hareswar Goswami was not put and answered as the hon. Member was absent).

Functioning of Cottage Industry Multipurpose Co-operative Society at Barpeta

Maulavi TAJUDDIN AHMED (Tarabari) asked :

*45. Will the Minister-in-charge of Cottage Industry be pleased to state—

- (a) When the Cottage Industry Multipurpose Co-operative Society at Barpeta was formed and who are the President and Secretary of the said society and how it is functioning now ?
- (b) What is the amount of loan the Society has received up till now from Government and how the money has been utilised by the Society ?
- (c) What is the stock position of the Society ?
- (d) Whether Government are aware that the Society is not functioning now ?
- (e) Whether Government are aware that the Society has encroached upon the 'Sankachi' P. G. R. by constructing a house and the Subdivisional Officer, Barpeta has started an encroachment case against it and if so, who will be responsible for the expenditure contesting the suit ?

Shri BISWADEV SARMA (Deputy Minister, Co-operation) replied :

45. (a)—The Cottage Industry Multipurpose Co-operative Society, Ltd., Barpeta, was formed on 10th September, 1957 and registered on 20th September, 1957 and numbered as G. 53 of 1957. The names of the President and the Secretary of Society are Shri Bhuban Ch. Das and Shri Rajani Kanta Mudoj respectively. The activities of the Society during the year 1957-58 have been far from satisfactory.

(b)—The Society received Rs.17,550 (refundable) as loan and Rs.5,500 (not refundable) as grant and subsidy from the 'Khadi Board' for the purpose as stated below:

(1) Rupees 5,000—For purchase of machinery, tools and equipments, construction of factory buildings, wells and tanks warehouse and for purchase of raw materials.

(2) Rupees 2,300—For manufacturing Oil Ghani and purchase of machinery for the said purpose.

(3) Rupees 10,250—For soap manufacturing.

Total Rs.17,550

In addition to Rs.17,550·00, the society received subsidy of Rs.300·00 in connection with the manufacturing of oil and a grant of Rs.5,250·00 for Soap-making activities. A brief outline about the activities of the society during the year 1957-58 is given below 'Department' wise.

Paddy husking.—The Society received an amount of Rs.12,648·74 nP. during 1957-58 as follows :

	Rs. nP.
(i) Construction of Shed to serve ... as 'Dheki' centre. ...	672·38
(ii) Expenditure on opening of ... 'Dheki' Centre. (Opening ceremony) ...	110·38
(iii) 'Dhekis' ... ,	936·94
(iv) Expenditure in connection ... with paddy husking such as purchase of paddy Rs.8,464. 45 nP.) payment wages (Rs.547·36 nP. and other Miscellaneous expenditure.	10,929·04
Total ...	Rs.12,648·74

The sale proceeds from Rice, Khud, etc., during the year (1957-58) amounted to Rs.5,164·21 nP. only.

Soap making.—The Society received a loan of Rs.10,250·00 and a grant of Rs.5,250·00 and incurred an expenditure of Rs.128·77 nP. only during the year 1957-58. The Society diverted a part of the funds (Rs.2,700·00) sanctioned under this scheme to paddy husking Department. The income from this source was nil during the year.

Ghani Oil.—The Society received a loan of Rs.2,000·00 and subsidy of Rs.300·00 for manufacture of oil and incurred an expenditure of Rs.1,497·95 nP. towards purchase of oil seeds (Rs.1,143·75) and other miscellaneous items. The income from this source during the year was nil.

The Society also incurred an expenditure of Rs.2,103.63 nP. towards establishment and contingencies, etc., during the year 1957-58.

(c)—The stock position stands as follows:—

	Md.	Sr.	Ch.	Rs.	nP.	
(1) Rice	43	21	0	1,087.50		Approx.
(2) Paddy	14	27	0	217.00		„
(3) Mustard oil seed ...	60	0	0	1,500.00		„
(4) Castor seed	1	31	8	26.21		„
(5) Til oil				90.00		„
(6) Bullock (one pair)				600.00		„
(7) Building with land				18,000.00		„
(8) Mustard oil	1	31	8	132.00		„
(9) Dheki shed with C.I. Sheets.				600.00		„
(10) Gunny bags				110.00		„
(11) Timber				1,600.00		„
(12) Dhara and bamboo				70.00		„
(13) Office Shed				250.00		„
(14) Tools and materials				490.00		„
(15) Furniture				200.00		„
(16) Dheki				440.00		„
(17) Ghani (Machine and tools).				600.00		„
Grand total				<u>Rs.26,012.96</u>		<u>nP.</u>

(d)—A complete picture about the present state of affairs of the society can be obtained only after completion of audit for the year 1958-59 ending on 30th June, 1959 and an enquiry into the affairs of the society for the period following the audit of the year 1958-59.

(e)- No. Government is not aware of this but it is learnt that an encroachment notice had been served by Sub-divisional Officer, Barpeta but no suit was filed against the society in this connection. It appears that the society submitted a proposal for settlement of 15 bighas of land where the society at present has erected its building and shed, to the Revenue Minister, Assam through Subdivisional Officer, Barpeta and Land Advisory Board as reported. If the encroachment case be contested, the society will be responsible for the expenditure of the suit.

Unstarred Questions

(To which answers were laid on the table)

Educational Qualifications of the promoted I. P. S. Officers of the State

Shri NILMONEY BORTHAKUR (Dibrugarh) asked:

57. Will the Chief Minister be pleased to state the educational qualifications of the promoted I. P. S. Officers of Assam ?

Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA (Chief Minister) replied:

57. The educational qualifications of the promoted I. P. S. Officers of this State are as noted against their names below:—

1. Shri Haidar Hussain, B. A.
2. Shri Bhabani Kanta Barua, B. A.
3. Shri Ataur Rahman, B. A.
4. Shri Shamsuddin Ahmed, B. A.
5. Shri Narendra Nath Barsaikia, B. A.
6. Shri George Hamilton, B. A.
7. Shri Nani Gopal Banik, B. L.

Shri DEVENDRA NATH HAZARIKA (Saikhowa): What is the procedure for giving promotion to the members of the Provincial Police Service to the I.P.S. ?

Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA (Chief Minister): There is a State Committee where either the Chairman or member of the Union Public Service Commission presides this Committee makes recommendations to Union Public Service Commission. If these recommendations are approved by the Union Public Service Commission, they are promoted to I.P.S.

Shri DEVENDRA NATH HAZARIKA: What is the educational qualification and the length of service that is required ?

Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA: I am not sure if I have all the information with me at the moment. I want notice for this question.

Shri PRABHAT NARAYAN CHAUDHURY (Nalbari-East): What is the basis of promotion of A.P.S. officers to the I.P.S. ?

Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA: The total strength of the I.P.S. cadre in Assam is 43 ; out of these 43, seven posts have to be filled up by promotion. These promotions are made according to the procedure which I have already stated before, that is, a Committee selects these candidates at State level and sends its recommendations to the Union Public Service Commission. These are the conditions. They must be substantive members of the State Police Service. Candidates must have completed 8 years of service, whether substantively or officiating, in a post of Deputy Superintendent of Police on the 1st January of the year of their selection for the post. Under Regulation 5, selection of such State Police Service officers is made by a Selection Committee consisting of 5 members *viz.*, the Chief Secretary, the Commissioner of a Division, the Joint Secretary in charge of the Home Department, the Inspector General of Police, the Deputy Inspector General of Police, C.I.D., and the Chairman or a Member of the Union Public Service Commission who presides over the meetings of the Committee. The basis of selection is merit and suitability in all respects with due regard to seniority. The list prepared by the Selection Committee has to be approved formally by the Union Public Service Commission.

Shri DEVENDRA NATH HAZARIKA: Is there any fixed quota for direct recruits ?

Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA: As I said before, the total strength of the I.P.S. cadre in Assam is 43, and the number of posts to be filled up by promotion is 7.

**Settlement of several Bighas of Sarkari Land in Laluk
Mauza (Dungi-bil side) with one
Shri Santaram Hazarika**

Shri MOHANANDA BORA (North-Lahimpur) asked:

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

- (a) Whether Government is aware or has received report to the effect that the revenue officials do not want to implement the new land policy of Government ?
- (b) Whether Government is aware that when asked for the officers express their ignorance of the new land policy of Government enunciated in its resolution on "Settlement of agriculture lands of 25th September 1958 ?
- (c) Whether Government is aware or received reports to the effect that in North Lakhimpur Subdivisional and in some other temporary settled areas of the State, often times officers' whims are more powerful than any existing law ?
- (d) Whether Government will be pleased to enquire why several bighas of Sarkari land in Laluk Mouza (Dungi-bil side) were settled with one Shri Santaram Hazarika ?
- (e) If, so, whether Government is aware that the said Shri Santaram Hazarika owns enough cultivable land elsewhere ?
- (f) Whether it is a fact that there was a good number of landless people near the land settled with the said Shri Hazarika praying for its settlement ?
- (g) Whether Government will make a thorough enquiry of this and punish the officers responsible for such settlement against the Government principle ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue) replied:

58. (a) to (c)—No such report or complaint has been received by Government.

(d) to (g)—Government will make an enquiry and take such action as may be considered appropriate.

Shri RAMNATH DAS [Dergaon (Reserved for Scheduled Castes)]: In reply to “(d) to (g)”, it has been stated “Government will make an enquiry and take such action as may be considered appropriate”. May I know from the hon. Minister when he received these questions?

Shri HARESWAR DAS : On 12th September, 1959.

Shri RAMNATH DAS: May I know when did the hon. Minister order the enquiry?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: I cannot give the exact date without searching the file, but a very big enquiry is necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has that enquiry been started or not?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: It has been started. It is necessary to enquire how much land a particular man has got in Assam.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then the enquiry is in process?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: Yes, Sir.

Shri RAMNATH DAS: How long will it take?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: That I cannot say, as it is a big enquiry.

Shri GOURI SANKAR ROY (Katlicherra): May I know whether there is any instruction to the Deputy Commissioners and Subdivisional Officers not to requisition further land unless Pattas have been issued to landless allottees with regard to previously requisitioned land?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: That is a different question.

Mr. SPEAKER: It does not arise..

Shri GOURI SANKAR ROY: It relates to question 58 (b).

Shri HARESWAR DAS: There is no question of requisition at all here.

Mr. SPEAKER: This question does not arise.

Shri RAMNATH DAS: May I request the hon'ble Minister to expedite the submission of the enquiry report?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: Yes, Sir, I shall do it.

Extensive sale and purchase of Lands with Annual Patta or no Patta in Temporary Settled Mouzas of North Lakhimpur Subdivision

Shri MOHANANDA BORA (North-Lahimpur) asked:

59. Will the Mintster, Revenue be pleased to state—

- (a) Whether Government is aware that in the temporary settled Mouzas of North Lakhimpur Subdivision specially in Dhalpur, Kherajkhat, Laluk, Nowboisha, Nokari, Kadam, Lakhimpur and Telahi extensive sale and purchase of lands with annual patta or no patta is going on unabated ?
- (b) Whether Government is aware or received reports to the effect that this is being done by unscrupulous with backing of officers ?
- (c) Whether Government is aware or received complaints to the effect that some influential people are occupying large plots of sarkari lands without any patta and no landless man can go near the same ?
- (d) Whether Government will take immediate steps to remove these irregularities so that innocent people are saved from unnecessary harassment ?
- (e) Whether Government will issue instructions to its officers not to recognise any such transaction and that severe action will be taken against these officials who will be found guilty in this respect ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue) replied:

59. (a) to (c)—Government have not received any such report.

(d) & (e)—Government will make enquiries and take such action as may be considered appropriate.

Shri RAMNATH DAS [Dergaon (Reserved for Scheduled Castes)]: In reply to (d), it has been stated "Government will make enquiries and take such action as may be considered appropriate". May I know from the hon'ble Minister when he received notice of this question ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue): This was a received along with the other question.

Shri RAMNATH DAS: Since he received the question about 3 months back, may I know why enquiry report has not come to him as yet ? When did he call for the report ?

Mr. SPEAKER: Enquiry takes some time. Possibly time is not yet ripe for getting the final report.

Shri RAMNATH DAS: That reply was in respect of question No.58.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it applies here also.

Shri HARESWAR DAS: This is a different matter. Here it is alleged that some innocent people were harassed. Unless complaints come from these innocent people it is difficult to enquire who have been harassed.

Shri KARKA CHANDRA DOLEY [North Lakhimpur (Reserved for Scheduled Tribes)]: (a) to (c) ব উত্তরত চৰকাৰে কৈছে Government have not received any such report—এই প্ৰসঙ্গত মই চৰকাৰক জনাব খুজিছো যে যোৱা 'চেচন'ত তেলাহি মৌজাৰ শ্ৰীকনক চন্দ্ৰ পেঙ নামৰ এজন মানুহে মাটি কিনি বেচা সম্পৰ্কে কিছুমান কগজপত্ৰ মই দাখিল কৰিছিলো। এই বিষয়ে চৰকাৰে কিবা প্ৰতিকৰণ ব্যৱস্থা হাতত লৈছেনে ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: এই ব্যাপাৰত চৰকাৰে কোনো দৰ্খাস্ত পোৱা নাই। ফাইলতো কোনো দৰ্খাস্ত নাই।

Shri MOHANANDA BORA (North-Lakhimpur): Do Government know that even in grazing land sale is going on in North-Lakhimpur subdivision, especially in the Bongalmara P.G.R. ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: Unless complaints come to us, it is difficult to say. If such a thing has taken place it is absolutely void and illegal.

Shri RAMNATH DAS: May I request the hon'ble Minister to ask the local officers to send their report without any more delay ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: Yes, Sir, this will be done.

Settlement of Sarkari Land by the Land Settlement Advisory Committee of North Lakhimpur

Shri MOHANANDA BORA (North-Lakhimpur) asked:

60. Will the Minister, Revenue be pleased to state—
- Whether Government is aware that no sarkari land in rural areas has ever been brought before the Land Settlement Advisory Committee of North Lakhimpur except in case of deserv- ing a V. G. R., P. G. R. or a reserved Dag?
 - Whether Government is aware that often times the members of the Land Settlement Advisory Committee of North Lakhimpur are told by the S. D. O. that the Advisory Board need not think over the settlement of sarkari land outside town at the S. D. Os. and S. D. Cs., are authorised by law to make settlement up to 50 bighas?
 - Whether it is a fact that Government have laid blame unnecessarily on the Land Settlement Advisory Committee in this respect in the last part of the resolution of Government, dated 25th September 1958.
 - Whether Government will clarify the actual position by another resolution or communique immediately?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue) replied:

60. (a) & (b)—Government will make an enquiry.

(c)—It is not a fact. Government have not laid blame on any body. But Government have informations that there were cases where available land could not be allotted to culti- vators for long, due to delay in arriving at a decision by the Land Settlement Advisory Committee. Government have in their resolution of 25th September 1958 suggested remedies to obviate such delay.

(d)—Government Resolution does not seem to have been misunderstood by the people. So, Government do not consider it necessary to issue communique to clarify the point.

Shri DADESWAR HAZARIKA (Morangi): In reply to (a) and (b), it has been stated "Government will make an enquiry". May I know whether there is a circular from the Government that any sarkari land which is to be settled within two miles from the town should be placed before the Land Settlement Advisory Committee?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue): There is an instruction that no land within two miles from a town should be settled without the previous sanction of the Government.

Shri MOHANANDA BORA (North Lakhimpur): With regard to (a) and (b), Government say they have not received any report. So far as my knowledge goes, innumerable petitions were submitted to the Minister which were sent to local officers and also to the local authorities. All these petitions are lying in the Deputy Commissioners and Subdivisional Officer's Offices undisposed for the last two or three years. Will the Minister enquire into this and see that action is taken on those petitions?

Shri HARESWAR DAS: Yes, I shall do it.

Regarding shifting of some of the Government offices from Shillong to Gauhati.

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

61. Will the Chief Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) Whether there is any proposal of shifting some of the Government offices from Shillong to Gauhati?
- (b) If so, what are the departments proposed to be shifted?
- (c) When these are going to be shifted?

Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA (Chief Minister) replied :

61. (a)—Yes.

(b)—The office of the Commissioner of Plains Division and such other offices as may be selected taking into account administrative and public convenience.

(c)—As soon as accommodation for offices and residences for officers and staff becomes available.

***Shri PRABHAT NARAYAN CHAUDHURY (Nalbari-East)**: The question was what are the departments proposed to be shifted but the reply is so vague and unintelligible that I cannot make out anything. The reply to 61 (b) reads "The office of the Commissioner of Plains Division and such other offices as may be selected taking into account administrative and public convenience."

Why could not the names of the departments be given?

***Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA (Chief Minister)**: Because there is no proposal of transfer of any department at the moment.

***Dr. GHANASHYAM DAS [North Salmara (Reserved for Scheduled Castes)]**: Will the Chief Minister be pleased to state whether any land is going to be acquired for the purpose?

***Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA**: There were certain lands at the Noonmati area that was actually proposed to be taken for building Government offices but since the Oil Refinery had taken these lands, Government would utilise other Government lands and such other lands as might be acquired for the purpose of establishing Government offices.

***Shri DEVENDRA NATH HAZARIKA (Saikhowa)**: Is there any proposal under consideration of the Government to construct building for such offices at Gauhati?

***Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA**: Government have finally decided to shift the office of the Commissioner of Plains Division to Gauhati. There is no specific proposal for shifting of any other department.

Allotment of P. W. D. Works to Contractors in Barpeta Subdivision

Dr. SRIHARI DAS (Barpeta) asked :

62. Will the Minister Public Works Department (R&B) be pleased to state :

(a) Whether it is a fact that new contractors have been given preference in allotment of Public Works Department Works than old ones of Barpeta Division?

(b) Whether Chief Engineer or the Superintending Engineer calls for the comparative statements of tenders and scrutinise them.

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

62. (a)—No.

(b)—No.

***Shri PRABHAT NARAYAN CHAUDHURY (Nalbari-East)**: I have got a supplementary to question 62(b). Government's reply is 'No'. Is it a fact that some Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes people have been given contracts simply because of the fact that they are Scheduled Castes and Scheduled tribes people, ignoring the fact that they are not contractors of standing?

***Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI (Deputy Minister, P.W.D.):** I want notice for this.

***Shri BHUBAN CHANDRA PRADHANI (Golakganj):** Government's reply to (a) is 'No.' Is it possible for the Government not to consider the cases of the old contractors?

***Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI:** Surely not.

Shri KARKA CHANDRA DOLEY [North Lakhimpur (Reserved for Scheduled Tribes)]: যেহেতু জনজাতি আৰু অনুসূচিত লোকসকল দুখীয়া আৰু পিচপৰা, আৰু তেওঁলোক ঠিকাদাৰ হিচাপে বেজিষ্টাৰ কৰা নহয়, তেনেদৰে জনজাতি আৰু অনুসূচিত জাতিৰ ঠিকাদাৰ সকলকো সুবিধা দিয়া হবনে?

Shri GIRINDRA NATH GOGOI: এতিয়া প্ৰশ্ন হৈছে নতুন ঠিকাদাৰ বিষয়ে। ইয়াত জনজাতি, অনুসূচিত জাতি আৰু অন্যান্য জাতিৰ ঠিকাদাৰো থাকিব পাৰে। অকল জনজাতি বা অনুসূচিতৰ কথা ইয়াত নাহে।

Shri PRABHAT NARAYAN CHAUDHURY (Nalbari-East): এইটো সচানে যেতিয়া দুজন ঠিকাদাৰৰ ভিতৰত এজন জনজাতি বা অনুসূচিত আৰু আনজন উচ্চ শ্ৰেণীৰ হলে জনজাতি বা অনুসূচিত জনে সুবিধা পায়? কিন্তু উচ্চ শ্ৰেণীৰ ঠিকাদাৰ এজন আৰু জনজাতি বা অনুসূচিত অন্য ঠিকাদাৰ এজনৰ মাজত কোন জনে সুবিধা পাব বা কোনজনক সুবিধা দিয়া হব?

Shri DEBESWAR SARMAH (Minister, P.W.D. etc.): Other things being equal জনজাতি বা অনুসূচিত লোকক সুবিধা দিয়াটো চৰকাৰী নীতি। P.W.D. Code Para 287 অনুসৰি চৰকাৰী ঠিকাদাৰ দিয়া হয়।

Complaint against S. D. M. O., Barpeta

Dr. SHRIHARI DAS (Barpeta) asked:

63. Will the Medical Minister be pleased to state—

(a) Whether Assistant Surgeon of a Government Hospital is to examine an ailing Government officer?

(b) If so, whether it is a fact that one Shri D. Ojha, B. Sc., B. L., Administrative Officer, Assam Evacuee Property and Management Committee, Barpeta was refused medical examination when he was running 104.2 temperature by S. D. M. O. of Barpeta, when he was called for on 19th August 1959 and on next day also?

(c) Whether Government are aware or received information to the effect that many a days the hospital is run by the Compounder as Doctors are not available in the hospital during the hospital hours ?

(d) Whether Government will enquire about these matter and take the necessary action ?

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

63.(a)—Yes.

(b)—A complaint has been received. The Civil Surgeon, Kamrup, Gauhati has been requested to enquire and to submit a report in the matter.

(c)—No.

(d)—Yes.

Dr. SHRIHARI DAS (Barpeta): In reply (b) it is stated that the Civil Surgeon, Kamrup, Gauhati, has been requested to enquire and to submit a report in the matter. Will the Minister be pleased to tell on what date the Civil Surgeon was requested ?

Shri RUPNATH BRAHMA (Minister, Medical): I cannot give him the exact date. I can inform him of it later if the hon Member wants it.

Shri GHANASYAM TALUKDAR: Are the Government aware that during hospital hours some doctors are found to be going out ?

Shri RUPNATH BRAHMA: The Government is not aware. I want notice for this.

Shri RAM NATH DAS [Dergoan (Reserved for Scheduled Castes)]: He does not know the exact date. May I enquire whether he possesses the file at the moment ?

Shri RUPNATH BRAHMA: That information is not in the file.

Regarding the staff of the Assam Survey Department

Shri GHANASHYAM TALUKDAR (Sorbhog) asked :

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

(a) Whether some posts of Field Supervisors and Head Traverser in the Assam Survey Department have fallen vacant since a long time ?

(b) Since what date the posts are lying vacant and why the vacancies have not yet been filled in ?

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

(a) Whether it is a fact that the field staff and Office staff, *i.e.*, Traversers and Computers are treated as separate establishments under Appendix 11, Staff of the Department, (e) Traverse section of the Assam Survey Accounts' Manual, 1931 ?

(b) If so, why the Head Computer from Office staff has been promoted as Field Supervisor ignoring the case of Seniors most field staff ?

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

(a) Whether it is a fact that there are some Traversers in the Assam Survey Department, whose periodical increments were allowed after three years, whereas their juniors were allowed increments earlier than the seniors ?

(b) If so, why ?

(c) Whether Government have taken any steps to regularise the above cases ?

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue) replied :

64. (a)—No. Only one post of Field Supervisor has fallen vacant this year. No other post is lying vacant.

(b)—The post of the Field Supervisor is lying vacant since 21st June, 1959. This could not be filled up as experienced hands in the Traverse section of the Assam Surveys was not immediately available.

65. (a)—It is not a fact. The staff of Assam Surveys as indicated in Appendix 11 of the Assam Surveys Accounts Manual was regrouped in 1935 and the Traversers and Computers were brought under one establishment.

(b)—Does not arise, in view of the answer at (a) above.

66. (a) & (b)—Some trainees were recruited in 1953-54 on a fixed pay of Rs.50 per month for 3 years. They were not entitled to any increment during the three years of their training. On February, 1956 some Trainees were recruited in the time scale of pay. The Trainees who were recruited on a fixed scale of pay were also brought to the time scale in June, 1956. Thus the group of Traversers recruited in 1956 earn their increments in February and the trainees who were later appointed on the time scale earn their increments in June every year.

(c)—Yes. As mentioned above at present both the trainees and the traversers have been brought into the same grade and are holding the posts of grade III Traversers, based on annual sanction.

Registration of Gobardhana Mauza Rindan Somabay Samity

Shri GHANASHYAM TALUKDAR (Sorbhog) asked :

67. Will the Minister-in-charge of Co-operatives be pleased to State—

(a) Why the Gobardhana Mauza Rindan Somabay Somity has not yet been registered?

(b) When this Society was organised?

(c) Whether any Co-operative Officer was present there?

- (d) If so, why did he mislead the people ?
- (e) What disciplinary action was taken against him ?
- (f) When this society will be registered ?
- (g) Whether any other Co-operative Society applying later for registration has been registered ?

Shri BISWADEV SARMA (Deputy Minister, Co-operation) replied :

67. (a)—There was no unanimity amongst the people regarding the Executive Committee to run the society and also regarding location of the Headquarters. The area of operation of this society was also considered to be too big for a single society.

(b)—The original society under the name of the Gobardhana Mauza Rindan Samabaya Samity was organised on 22nd July 1958 (But subsequently two other societies under the name of Gobardhana Samabaya Samity and the Bilasipara Samabaya Samity were organised in place of the original society).

(c)—Yes. Shri I. Brahma, Deputy Co-operative Officer was present there.

(d)—He did not mislead the people. He was only present in the meeting and explained matters. The decision was taken by the people themselves.

(e)—There is no question of taking any disciplinary action against him.

(f)—The Society cannot be registered as it does not conform to the approved pattern and the social cohesion, etc., required of a Co-operative Society are absent being too unwieldy.

(g)—Yes. Two other societies the Gobardhana Somabay Samity and the Bilasipara Somabay Samity have been registered covering a large portion of the area of operation of the originally proposed Gobardhana Mauza Rindan Somabay Samity.

***Shri GHANASHYAM TALUKDAR (Sorbhog):** In replay to (a), last line, it has been stated that the area of operation of this society was also considered to be too big for a single society. I want to ask if the Government considered that area to be too big, why then the Government organized the Rindan Co-operative Society comprising three mouzas?

***Shri BISWADEV SARMA (Deputy Minister, Co-operative):** It does not arise.

***Shri GHANASHYAM TALUKDAR:** It arises, Sir.

***Shri BISWADEV SARMA:** The pattern of these societies has since changed. Now there will be smaller societies for every 5,000 people.

***Shri GHANASHYAM TALUKDAR:** This society was organized before this decision.

Shri BISWADEV SARMA: The society cannot be registered as it does not conform to the approved pattern and the social cohesion, etc. required of a Co-operative society, and it was unwieldy.

Adjournment Motion 76: transfer of some Villages of Karimganj Subdivision, Cachar District to East Pakistan

Mr. SPEAKER: I have reserved a notice of an adjournment motion from Shri Gopesh Namahsudra, M. L. A. The subject-matter of the adjournment motion is to discuss the desirability or otherwise of an agreement arrived at between India and Pakistan. This House is not competent to question the propriety or otherwise of such an agreement between the two countries. There is no case of aggression on our country by Pakistan in this particular matter. If they had entered any part of our land, or had done anything else, they had done so in pursuance of an agreement. Therefore, I rule out the motion as out of order under Assembly Rule 57 (VIII) read together with Article 3 of the Constitution of India and Item 14 and 16 of the Union list thereof.

Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA (Gauhati): Will you please read out the contents of the Motion so that we may be able to understand properly your ruling?

Mr. SPEAKER: Here is the Adjournment Motion.

"This House do now adjourn to discuss definite matter of urgent public importance and of recent occurrence namely, insecurity of the life, hearth and home of about 2,000 Indian citizens comprising about 370 families in five villages, namely, (1) Chotaputni, (2) Baraputni, (3) Karkanaputni, (4) Dumabari and (5) Latitila as also a portion of Putni Tea Estate in Pratapgarh Pargana, Patharkandi Tahsil, Karimganj Subdivision, Cachar District, Assam, as a result of proposed handing over of the said Indian villages and Estate to Pakistan by 15th December, 1959, in preparation of which the Pakistani Army personnel have already entered into the said Indian territory and are digging trenches and felling trees to the great shocks and panic of the people of the said area particularly for the last one week."

*Speech not corrected.

The Assam Homeopathic Medicine (Second Amendment) Bill, 1959

Shri KHOGENDRA NATH BARBARUAH (Amguri): Mr. Speaker Sir, I beg leave of the House to introduce the Assam Homeopathic Medicine (Second Amendment) Bill, 1959.

Shri RUPNATH BRAHMA (Minister, Medical): Sir, I raise a point of order. I would like to draw the attention of the House to sub-rule (2) of Rule 65 read with sub-clause (3) of Art. 207. sub-rule (2) of Rule 65 at page 17 of the Rules of Procedure of this House says—

“If the Bill is a Bill which under the Constitution cannot be introduced without the previous sanction or recommendation of the President or the Governor, the member shall annex to the notice such sanction, or recommendation conveyed through a Minister, and the notice shall not be valid until this requirement is complied with.”

Then I would also like to draw your attention to sub-clause (3) of Art. 207 of the Constitution. It says—

“A Bill which, if enacted and brought into operation, would involve expenditure from the Consolidated Fund of a State shall not be passed by a House of the Legislature of the State unless the Governor has recommended to that House the consideration of the Bill.”

Now, Sir, here in this Bill my Friend, Shri Barbarua, seeks to increase the number of members in the Board, and it will involve additional expenditure on the Consolidated Fund of the State. So, there is definitely financial implication.

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA (Gauhati):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to submit that the point of order raised by the Minister-in-charge of Medical is itself out of order. Because this Art. 207 makes it very clear as to where this sort of objection may arise and at what time. Now, it has two parts—part (1) of the Article 207 specifies about the special provision relating to financial Bill and part (3) speaks about taking into consideration of certain facts in passing of a certain nature. Now the hon'ble Minister is very alert, and I am very glad for his being so. But I would have been more glad if he would have been equally so in all matters. At the present moment the hon'ble Minister takes exception to introduction of the Bill and has been pleased to raise certain objections. I am sure, the hon'ble Minister knows very well that when a certain legislative measure is brought before the House, it passes through certain distinct stages. One stage is, if he be a private member, to seek the leave of the House to introduce; then the second stage is introduction; then in the next stage, the consideration of the Bill; and therefore the second reading of the Bill; and then will come the final stage, the stage of passing of the Bill—even if the contention raised by the hon'ble Minister would have been correct. But here now, Sir, the objection raised by the Minister is too premature. It is not only premature but it is ill-conceived, or the hon'ble Minister is raising a point which is not conceived at all. Let us see what the Art. 207 says—

“A Bill or amendment making provision for any of the matters specified in sub-clause (a) (f) of clause (1) of Article 199 shall not be introduced or moved except on the recommendation of the Governor, and a Bill making such provision shall not be introduced in a Legislative Council;

Provided that no recommendation shall be required under this clause for the moving of an amendment making provision clause for the reduction or abolition of any tax."

I am sure, the hon'ble Minister's contention is not that the Amending Bill of my Friend, Shri Barbarua proposes to make certain provision for any of the matters specified in sub-clauses (a) to (f) of Art. 199. Now let us see what this Article 199 says. This Art. says—"For the purposes of this Chapter, a Bill if it contains only provisions dealing with all or any of the following matters, namely—

(a) the imposition, abolition, remission, alteration or regulation of any tax ;

This Bill does not provide any such thing.

"(b) the regulation of the borrowing of money or the giving of any guarantee by the State, or the amendment of the law with respect to any financial obligations undertaken or to be undertaken by the State."

This also does not come in. Then—

"(c) the custody of the Consolidated Fund or the Contingency Fund of the State, the payment of moneys into or the withdrawal of moneys from any such Fund ;

(d) the appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of the State ;

(e) the declaring of any expenditure to be expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State, or the increasing of the amount of any such expenditure ;

(f) the receipt of money on account of the Consolidated Fund of the State or public accounts of the State or the custody or issue such money.

As I refer to this 207 together with Art. 199(a) to(b) and also sub-clause (1) well, find that there is no such thing envisaged in the present Bill before us. Now the point that may be in his mind is that the number of members will be 12 instead of 11 already provided in the present Act if the present Amendment is passed. I am not sure whether I am exactly speaking his mind, but I presume that is in what is his mind and therefore. There might be certain more money necessary for the Board for the travelling allowances, etc., to the members coming to the Committees. That is probably in the mind of the Minister. Otherwise he would not have taken such a stand. Now, if he reads his budget proposal under the head "Medical", he will see that moneys are not set apart in the budget for different items of expenditure of the Board, i.e., Rs.4 for pencil, Rs.5 for paper, Rs.50 for a typewriter and so on. It is not like that. A consolidated grant is given to the board to spent according to its own discretion. This Board is more or less an autonomous body. Of course, there are official members and non-official members. Now, it is the Board to decide as to what will be the allocation of the fund that is in its disposal. We as members have never drawn any travelling allowance because we thought that it is necessary to do certain other things. So, it is entirely left to the Board to decide as to how this specific money is to be spent and how it should be allocated in different items. Does the Minister propose to say that these things shall also be earmarked ? Then of course his objection will have perhaps some meaning at the subsequent stage. As the different items of expenditure of the Board

is not concern of the Government or the Legislature, as this an *ad-hoc* grant given by the State Government to an autonomous or semi-autonomous Board to be spent on different items at the discretion of the Board, there is absolutely no financial implication in the Bill which has been brought by my friend. I therefore, submit, Sir, that the hon'ble Minister's objection falls flat.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon'ble Minister has any objection against the Bill, he can raise it afterwards and not at the present moment. Under Article 207, sub-clause 3 of the Constitution he can raise any objection at the time of the consideration of the Bill. Therefore, the hon. Member may take leave of the House to introduce the Bill. The question is that leave be granted to introduce the Assam Homeopathic Medicine (Second Amendment) Bill, 1959.

(The question was adopted.)

***Shri KHOGENDRA NATH BARBARUAH (Amguri):** I introduce the Assam Homeopathic Medicine (Second Amendment) Bill, 1959.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that the Assam Homeopathic Medicine (Second Amendment) Bill, 1959, be introduced.

(The question was adopted.)

Short Notice Resolution regarding Unprovoked Chinese aggression on Indian Soil and consequent deterioration in Indo-Chinese relation

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA (Gauhati):** Sir, I rise on a point of order on item No.3.

Mr. SPEAKER : First let it come before the House.

***Shri NILMONEY BARTHAHAKUR (Dibrugarh):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise on a point of order. Under Article 264 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Assembly 'a motion, resolution or an amendment, which has been moved and is pending in the House, shall not lapse by reason (*interruption*) only of the prorogation of the Assembly and shall have priority over all other motions, resolutions and amendments (*interruption*).

Mr. SPEAKER : Let the resolution be first introduced. I now give my ruling.

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA :** Sir, I want to clarify the position.

Mr. SPEAKER : Alright, that will be good.

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA (Gauhati)** : The point is that to-day is the day fixed for the private members' business. Now, there is a subject which is pending before the House. There was a motion on the sugar situation in the State and as a matter of fact I was in possession of the floor when on that day of private members' business, this matter was being discussed. Now, to-day is the fixed day for the private members' business and, therefore, according to this rule this being the private members' day, the subject which is in session of the House already should get priority. Now while I say this I am quite alive to your extraordinary powers. Sir, under Rule 115 of the Assembly Rules, it is stated in the proviso that "the Speaker may allow a resolution to be entered in the list of business with notice shorter than fifteen days :

Provided further that such a short notice resolution, if admitted by the Speaker, shall be taken up by the House on such day and at such time as may be fixed by the Speaker in consultation with the Leader of the House."

Now, so far as the consultation for the fixing of dates earmarked for the Government business and private members business is concerned, that is done by the Speaker not only in consultation with the Leader of the House but also in consultation with the Leader of the Opposition Party, Opposition Groups, the Minister-in-charge of Parliamentary Affairs and [a few other members, and thereafter the Committee which is known as the Business Advisory Committee of the House. After consultation with the Business Advisory Committee which includes of course the Leader of the House or his nominee, days are fixed for different business. Now, therefore, if that is to be over ruled there ought to be a full-fledged meeting of the Business Advisory Committee. That was in the fairness of things.

Secondly, the Speaker is not bound to confine his decision only with regard to the time at allotted for such motions or short notice resolutions nor to the day fixed for the private members' business. The Speaker may be pleased to fix a date or time if there is any such spare time from the Government Business also. As we have seen, we had Government Business for four days and we finished all this Business within two days. So from the time which was allotted on Government Business there could have been found out some time for discussion on this particular Resolution. I am not going to the merit or demerit of the Resolution ; I am only saying that why should there be a departure from the precedents which have been created in this House, from the healthy procedure of deciding the course of business in consultation with the entire Business Advisory Committee. How can Rule 264 be over-ruled or rather ignored. I would, therefore, beg to submit that the point of order which has been raised by my friend, Shri Borthakur on the question of priority is quite valid, and the motion on which I have started my speech should get precedence.

***Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED (Minister, Finance)** : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the point of order, when it is raised by any member must be on the basis of certain rules as are provided. If the hon. Member who has raised this point of order will be pleased to see Rule 115 he will find that the question raised by him is not at all tenable, I shall read out the Rule and then submit before you, Sir, why that point of order is not tenable. Rule 115 says "A member who wishes to move a resolution, except a resolution contemplated by Article 179

of the Constitution, shall give fifteen days' notice, before the opening day of the session, of his intention, and shall, together with the notice, submit a copy of the resolution which he wishes to move."

"Provided that the Speaker may allow a resolution to be entered in the list of business with notice shorter than fifteen days.

Now, it is clear from this that so far as the time required for giving notice is concerned, it is fifteen days, but the Speaker has the discretion to accept a resolution even with shorter notice. Here, Sir, when that discretion has been exercised by you and you have allowed a resolution to be entered in the list of business I submit that the discretion cannot be challenged, and (Shri Gaurisankar Bhattacharyya : Nobody has challenged it), there cannot be a question of point of order. When the resolution has been entered in the list of business it is entirely under discretion of the Speaker and the question of order does not arise. Rule 115 further says : "Provided further that such a short notice resolution, if admitted by the Speaker, shall be taken up by the House on such day and at such time as may be fixed by the Speaker in consultation with the Leader of the House. Now, my friend under this provision has no justifications in saying that if this resolution had been entered in the list of to-day's business in consultation with the Leader of the House or that it has been done by the Speaker could be challenged as a point of order in this House. This Rule does not say that the consultation with the Business Advisory Committee is necessary. My friend has raised a question of convention with regard to the other business and so on and so forth. But the Rule does not speak of consultation with the Business Advisory Committee and the hon. Members of this House have incorporated this Rule and they have given the entire discretion to the Hon'ble Speaker and the only person to be consulted in fixing the business of the House is the Leader of the House. If that is done I do not see any reason why my friend raised a question of order that this has not been properly entered in to-day's business.

***Shri NILMONEY BARTHAKUR (Dibrugarh)** : Nobody has questioned the discretion of the Speaker. I am referring to Rule 264 wherein it has been clearly stated that "A motion, resolution or an amendment, which has been moved and is pending in House, shall not lapse by reason only of the prorogation of the Assembly and shall have priority over all other motions, resolutions and amendments" Naturally this pending motion will get priority over all other motions, whether it is a short-notice resolution or a regular resolution, and the Speaker cannot override the provisions of the Rule. Though the Speaker has ample powers under Rule 115 to fix the time for the Business of the House, but this particular Rule 264 cannot be negated on that account.

***Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED (Minister, Finance)** : My submission is that the provision under Rule 264 is subject to the provision under Rule 115 in the matter of fixing any date. It is not a question that a resolution is allowed to be lapsed. Rule 115 only says "that such a short notice resolution, if admitted by the Speaker, shall be taken up by the House on such day and at such time as may be fixed....." There is no mention that is to be controlled by Rule 264. Complete discretion has been given to the Speaker under Rule 115.

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA (Gauhati):** The Speaker is bound by the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of this House.

Shri DANDESWAR HAZARIKA (Morongi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I quite appreciate the contention of my hon Friends, Shri Barthakur and Shri Bhattacharyya, that it is the precedent of this House that resolutions or any other motions that have been left out should get priority over other motions or resolutions in the next session. Although there exists that provision, special powers have been given to the Speaker under the Assembly Rules as have been pointed out.

Rule 115 lays down as follows: Provided that such a short notice resolution if admitted by the Speaker, shall be taken up by the House on such day and at such time as may be fixed by the Speaker in consultation with the Leader of the Houses. This item has been fixed in accordance with this rule. Therefore, I think there is no question of point of order can be raised as to the power given to the chair.

***Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED (Finance Minister):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I also say in support of my Friend Shri Hazarika that the date is to be fixed by the Speaker in consultation with the Leader of the House. Sub-clause (2) of Rule 23 at page 8 provides that "The Speaker may allot different days for the disposal of different classes of private members' business; and on days so allotted for any particular class of business, business of that class shall have precedence. On other days no business other than Government business shall be transacted." Now here it is entirely within the discretion of the Speaker to fix the time and date. The resolution as advanced, cannot therefore be taken into consideration.

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA :** No where it is said that the Speaker can override the provisions of these rules. He will have to work within the four walls of these rules.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard the arguments advanced by Mr. Bhattacharyya and Mr. Barthakur and also of Mr. Ahmed and Mr. Hazarika. I quite appreciate the arguments advanced by Mr. Bhattacharyya. There is only one point of disagreement is that under Rule 115, the Speaker in such a case may fix the date and time for taking into consideration in consultation with the Leader of the House. It is true that Rule 264 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Assam Legislative Assembly lays down as follows: "A motion, resolution or an amendment which has been moved and is pending in the House, shall not lapse by reason only of the prorogation of the Assembly and shall have priority over all other motion, resolutions and amendments." In this case it has become a factum valet. I hope that date and time have been fixed by the Speaker in consultation with the Leader of the House. Therefore I request my Friends in opposition to withdraw their contention. At the same time I assure them that in future the provisions laid down in Rule 264 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Assam Legislative Assembly will be strictly adhered to.

Now Mr. Das will speak.

***Shri MOHI KANTA DAS (Barchalla) :** Mr. Speaker Sir, I beg to move that this Assembly views with grave concern the unprovoked Chinese aggression on Indian soil and consequent deterioration in Indo-Chinese relations and out on record its deep sense of resentment at the aggressive action on the part of the Chinese. The Assembly approves of the just and firm stand of the Prime Minister of India in the face of grave provocation, and lends its full support to the decision that the occupation of Indian territory, and in particular of Longju in Assam should be vacated before negotiations with the Chinese Government can be resumed. On behalf of the people of Assam this Assembly pledges unstinted support to the stand taken by the Prime Minister and assures the nation that the people of this Frontier State will make any sacrifice that they may be called upon to do in defence of their mother land.

This Assembly draws the attention of the people of Assam to their special responsibilities in this matter as inhabitants of a Frontier State and appeals to them to stand united and firm for the purpose of resisting aggression. This Assembly further cautions against rumours and panic and asks the people to be vigilant against the activities of anti-national, anti-social and destructive groups in the State.

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA (Gauhati) :** Mr. Speaker Sir, before Mr. Das is allowed to move this resolution, I want to raise a point of order. I think this resolution cannot be moved in this House. This is in *ultra vires* of the Constitution of India.

***Shri MOHI KANTA DAS :** I have been permitted by the Chair to move this resolution.

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA :** According to the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Assam Legislative Assembly a point of order get precedence over everything. Sir, we are here on the strength of a very sacred document and that document is the Constitution of India. We are the creature under the Constitution of India. Sir, nobody can violate the provisions of the Constitution however lofty or otherwise the sentiment might be, however agitated rightly or wrongly one must keep his head cool about this piece of document. Now this Constitution has created the State the Union of India and this Union of India is of a federal nature. There are different lists of subject earmarked for the Parliament of the Union of India and for the different States Legislatures. There are also subject which form particularly within the list or purview of the Union and the State. There are three lists—Union List, States list and Concurrent list and we have the Union list under Article 246 of the Constitution. The Union list among other subjects shown the items 1, 10, and 15 as exclusive subjects of the Union.

One is defence of India and every part thereof including preparation for defence and all such as may be conducive in times of war, of its prosecution and after the termination to effective demobilisation. That is a exclusive subject of the Union and of the Parliament. Item No.10 is foreign affairs.

*Speech not corrected.

All matters which bring the Union into relation with any foreign country are exclusive subjects of the Union Parliament. And then item 15. The war and peace. All these 3 subjects are Union subjects, and I beg to submit that these Rules of procedure also are subject to the Constitution of India. If a conflict arises about the priority of this Constitution and this procedure the Constitution will get precedence. Our Rules of Procedure cannot over-rule or over-side the Constitution of India because not only this procedure but those who have made this Procedure are also creation under the Constitution of India. Even then our Rules of Procedure have also made certain things clear. In Rule 118 clause (6) may I draw your attention? Here the conditions of admissibility of Resolution are there. In order that the resolution may be admissible it shall specify the following conditions, *viz.* among other things, it has been said that it shall not refer to a matter which is not primarily the concern of the Government of this State. It shall not refer to a matter which is not primarily the concern of the Government of this State. It has also other provision *e.g.*, it shall raise substantially one definite issue in clause (2) of Rule 118 and not more. And then also it shall not refer to a matter which is primarily the concern of the Government of the State. As I have already submitted in connection with the provision discussed, Sir, you are there to interpret the Rules and also the Constitution and not to create Rules here. Now, therefore, I should like to submit with all humility interpret this Rule in relation to provisions of the Constitution of India the Seventh Schedule. What is the issue over which this Resolution has been brought? Well, I find that the issue is Indo-China Relations or Indo-China Border Dispute or Indo-China fight or struggle or war—whatever it might be called—this Indo-China dispute is the subject matter.

(At this state there was some disturbances from the Congress Benches).

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order.

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA (Gauhati):** Or if we go into detail a little more, not in blind agitation of course complete oblivion of realities what do we find in this Resolution. The first sentence says:—"This Assembly views with grave concern the unprovoked Chinese aggression on Indian soil and consequent deterioration in Indo-Chinese relations." Whether it is or is not is a different question but when a question of aggression or relations of the union of India with any other foreign country comes that is clearly a subject pertaining to defence and foreign relations. So, this is a subject for the Parliament, for the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha and not for the Assam Legislative Assembly.

Then there is another thing. We find subsequently the Assembly approve of the just and firm stand of the Prime Minister of India. Well, if we agree to bring in the Prime Minister of India as a subject matter of discussion, somebody may say "he is not just". So why bring in a person whom we cannot discuss according to Rules of Procedure of our Business because if you are to say something in his support you bring him for discussion. If you say something against him then you bring him for discussion. This is not within the purview of our Rules. We cannot discuss the action or inaction of the Prime Minister of India. Then, thirdly, in the same sentence in the last part, it is said what is the direction. Direction is to be called upon to do in defence of their mother

land. Categorically it is said that the issue is the defence and it has also been said in the last paragraph that this Assembly draws the attention of the people of Assam to their special responsibility in this matter, which has been said in paragraph 1, that is to say, in the matter of Indo-China relations, in the matter of the stand of the Prime Minister and in the matter of defence of the country.

So we find that all the 3 subjects of this Resolution are exclusively subjects for the Parliament and not for this House, and I submit also in this connection that there are numerous rulings given by your predecessors in office. Well, on this matter when a question of defence or such other things come it is not the subject of this House for discussion. Even when parts of our Assamese territory were attacked and our citizens had to suffer, when villages of Assam had been taken away, even then these matters are not to be discussed, because this is not the place for discussion.

(At this stage there was interruption from the Treasury Bench)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order.

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHAYYA (Gauhati):** So, Sir, on this question I have brought other things I have brought the Constitution of India. I have brought the specific rules of the House and I have also brought the president by the different Presiding Officers of this House in support of my point of order that however agitated my Friend might be, this is not the forum where this Resolution can be discussed in the form it has been brought. So this is entirely out of order.

Shri RAMNATH SARMA (Lumding): অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, ভাৰ্জাচাৰ্য্য ডাঙৰীয়াই যিটো rule quote কৰি resolution টো এই সদনৰ পৰিষদৰ ভিতৰত নপৰে বুলি কৈছে, সেই একেটা rule ৰ দ্বাৰাই resolution টো সদনত অবাঞ্ছন নহয় বুলি মই কব খোজে। Resolution টোৰ লগত আমাৰ Stateৰ সম্পৰ্ক আছে।

আমাৰ ৰাজ্যৰ লগত এই প্ৰস্তাবৰ বিষয়টোৰ গুৰুতৰ সম্বন্ধ আছে— ইয়াত আমাৰ ৰাজ্য তথা ভাৰতৰ নিৰাপত্তাৰ প্ৰশ্ন জড়িত আছে। মই ইয়াতে সুধিব খোজে Are we not Indians? আমি ভাৰতবাসী, সেই ফালৰ পৰাও এইটো আমাৰ গুৰুতৰ বিষয়।

এই প্ৰস্তাবটোৰ আবঞ্ছন পৰা আমাৰ কিছুমান মাননীয় সদস্যই যুক্তিকৰ অযুক্তিকৰ নানা বকমৰ point of order তুলি প্ৰস্তাবটো ব্যৰ্থ কৰাত লাগি গৈছে।

Mr. SPEAKER: Will you speak on the point of order?

Shri RAMNATH SARMA: হয়, চাৰ। আমাৰ ৰাজ্যখন বৰ্তমান ভয়ঙ্কৰ বিপদৰ সন্মুখীন হৈছে। ইয়াৰ প্ৰতিকাৰৰ কাৰণে আমি অহো-পূৰুষাৰ্থ চেষ্টা চলাবই লাগিব।

ভট্টাচার্য ডাঙৰীয়াই কৈছে যে এই প্ৰস্তাবৰ জৰিয়তে আমাৰ প্ৰধান মন্ত্রী ডাঙৰীয়াক টানি অনা হৈছে। মোৰ মনেৰে আমাৰ এই প্ৰস্তাবৰ দ্বাৰা কেন্দ্ৰীয় চৰকাৰে লব খোজা ব্যৱস্থাত সমৰ্থ নহে জনোৱা হৈছে। গতিকে ইয়াত point of order কোনো ভিত্তিয়েই থাকিব নোৱাৰে।

বোধকৰো ভট্টাচার্য ডাঙৰীয়াই এই প্ৰস্তাবৰ Last Paragraph টো দেখি ভয় খাইছে; কিন্তু These are open facts. মোৰ বোধেৰে আমাৰ প্ৰত্যেক দেশীয় বোৰ থকা মানুহৰে এনে ধৰণৰ বিদেশী আক্ৰমণ প্ৰতিৰোধ কৰাৰ চেষ্টা কৰা দৰ্কাৰ। আমি সংঘৰ্ষ হৈ ইয়াক বন্ধ কৰিবই লাগিব। গতিকে আমাৰ প্ৰস্তাবৰ মূল উদ্দেশ্য হ'ল—Appeal to our people in the State of Assam and to support. to the stand given by the Central Government in this very cause—ইয়াত তেখেতৰ point of order ৰ কি অর্থ থাকিব পাৰে? এনেদৰে মই সকলো point of order বিলাকৰ বিৰোধীতা কৰি মূল প্ৰস্তাবটো সমৰ্থন কৰিছো।

Shri RAM NATH DAS [Dergaon (Reserved for Scheduled Castes)]: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I support my friend Shri Ramnath Sarma and in supporting him I would like to say that my friend Shri Gaurisankar Bhattacharyya, in raising his point of order, himself is not in order. Mr. Bhattacharyya has said that Longju is not within the State of Assam..... (Shri Gaurisankar Bhattacharyya—it is not within the jurisdiction of this House). Sir, the Constitution is not with me but it is before him. (Shri Gaurisankar Bhattacharyya—I can lend it to you if you want it). Never mind. Now, under the Constitution N.E.F.A. is under the jurisdiction of the State of Assam. Here in this resolution what do we want to say? We want to say that our Prime Minister's stand is a just one particularly in reference to Longju. When Longju is within the boundaries of the State of Assam then we are within our rights to discuss it.

Shri NILMONEY BORTHAKUR (Dibrugarh): Where from does the hon. Member get that Longju is within the State of Assam?

Shri RAM NATH DAS : (voices from the Treasury Benches..... disturbance).

Mr SPEAKER : Order, order.

Shri RAMNATH DAS : I repeat that under the Constitution, N.E.F.A. is within the jurisdiction of the State of Assam and Longju is within N.E.F.A., it therefore follows that Longju is within the State of Assam. Now, when our own portion of the State has been occupied by the Chinese we can discuss about the stand taken by our Prime Minister including that of Longju. Therefore, Mr. Bhattacharyya is not right in saying that this House is not within its competence to discuss about this Resolution.

Secondly, he said that in this particular Resolution many issues have been raised. I submit Sir, that there are not many issues but there is only one issue and that is, that we the people of Assam are behind the stand taken by our Prime Minister in respect of the aggression made into our territories by China and particularly Longju which, as I have all along said, is within our State. Therefore, our issue is definitely only one and not

many. When in this Resolution there is only one issue and under the Rules we can discuss matters which concern our State, we are within our rights to discuss the resolution. Therefore, my friend Mr. Bhattacharyya is not correct when he said that this House has no jurisdiction to discuss about it. I again submit Sir, that we are fully competent to discuss this Resolution and I repeat that the point of order raised by Mr. Bhattacharyya is not in order.

Shri HARINARAYAN BARUA (Teok): অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, মোৰ এটা Point of Information টো আছিল যে মই ভটাচাৰ্যা ডাঙৰীয়াৰ পৰা জানিব খুজিছিলো, লংজুলৈ ভাৰতৰ প্ৰতিৰক্ষা বাহিনী আহি চীনৰ লগত যুদ্ধ কৰিলে আমি আমাৰ অসমৰ লোক সকলে হাত সাবতি বহি থাকিব লাগিব নেকি? সেইটো ভাৰত চৰকাৰৰহে কাৰ্য্য বুলি?

Maulavi JAHAN UDDIN AHMED (Bilasipara): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I raise to oppose the point of order raised by my friend Shri Bhattacharyya and in opposing it I would like to say that when something has happened in our country, that is, I mean to say whether it is within Assam or not within Assam, it is a matter which concerns our mother land and as we are the representatives of the people here we have something to say by way of expressing our opinion and our feelings about the Chinese aggression of Indian territory. As I have said Sir, as representatives of the people we must have the right to express our opinion regarding what we feel about this matter. So by this Resolution we are only expressing our opinion and our feelings towards this Chinese aggression. Certainly Sir, it concerns every people of Assam and we as such have every right to discuss the matter in this House. So I support the motion moved and I oppose the point of order raised by my friend Shri Bhattacharyya which is not in order ... (Voices of hear, hear from the Treasury Benches).

***Shri MOHI KANTA DAS (Barchalla):** Sir, my friend has pointed out certain items in the Union List of the Constitution and says that matters relating to defence, preparation for war or matters relating to foreign matters or relating to peace, etc., these things cannot be discussed here. Sir, I feel constrained to find such arguments from an experienced lawyer like him. How can he say so unless he is already prejudiced? What is there in the contents of this resolution that recommends to the Government of India to make peace with China? What does it speak of? The resolution expresses a grave concern. It is not a fact that the people of Assam expressed a grave concern over this issue? Can we, in this House, representing the people of Assam keep mum and not say anything?

Mr. SPEAKER : Your arguments should be supported by Rules of Procedure.

***Shri MOHI KANTA DAS :** My resolution simply expresses a feeling of concern of the people of Assam. The people of Assam as a part of the people of India approves the stand taken by the Prime Minister. They agree, Sir, to co-operate, to be united and to meet any eventuality—to be cautious, vigilant and prepared to fight against anti-social and anti-national and any other such disrupting forces. It is within the competence

of this House and it is the primary concern of the Government. Have we not the right to speak if in case the Chinese people come and occupy Tezpur? Will you not be alarmed, Sir, if such a thing happens? Do we not have the right to speak of our apprehensions and fears? I am afraid, my friend Mr. Bhattacharyya has not pushed his arguments well, he has done it half-hearted. Therefore, my friend's contention that it is out of order falls flat on the ground like a house of cards and it should not be accepted.

Shri TARUN SEN DEKA (Nalbari-West) : I am surprised to note that some of the hon. Members of this House are not in the know of Rule 300 of the Rules and Procedure, but have referred to the point of Order. Under Rule 300 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Assam Legislative Assembly, it says: A point of order shall relate to the interpretation or enforcement of these rules or such Articles of the Constitution as regulate the business of the House and shall raise a question which is within the cognizance of the Speaker". So the point of order which has been raised by my Friend Mr. Bhattacharyya is a point of order about the enforcement of certain articles of our Constitution and also 'Rules of Procedure'. But I am surprised to note that some of our friends have gone too far. They have gone into the merits and demerits, necessity or otherwise of this resolution. I think this is not the stage to discuss these things. Now at this stage the main point to be determined is whether this Assembly is competent to take this resolution about foreign affairs, about the border disputes with foreign countries. Sir, just now you disallowed one motion of adjournment raised by my friend Shri Gopesh Namahsudra stating that it being a matter of foreign affairs between India and Pakistan this House is not competent to discuss this. We are one for the defence of our mother land. If India is attacked from any quarter, we shall stand by this Government. But it is not the point here. The main point is whether the House is competent to adopt this resolution (*Voices*—That is not the point). Furthermore, it is clearly stated in Article 246 and also in the Seventh Schedule, clauses 1, 10 and 15, that actually this House is not competent to discuss about the Union List and this matter has been raised as being a matter of foreign affairs—a matter of defence—so it is clear that the very matter is not within the competence of this House. This point was only raised by my friend. In connection with my friend Shri Ram Nath Sarma's suggestion that Longju is a part of Assam, it is not quite clear but it does not matter. If Longju is attacked which is actually within the area of N.E.F.A., we are very much anxious about this attack.

Shri HARINARAYAN BARUAH (Teok) : তেখেতে লংজুনা
ক'ত বুলি ভাবে?

Shri TARUN SEN DEKA : It is not in the administrative geography of Assam. N.E.F.A. is not actually within the administration of Assam. It is already within the administration of the Central Government.

Shri RANENDRA MOHAN DAS (Karimganj-North) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have heard my friends who have spoken for and against the point of order raised by my friend Shri Bhattacharyya. From the paper which is before me I find that mover of the point of order himself is not sure about the point he has raised or he is not very keen about the points raised by him. If he would have been so, he would not have given notice for this Motion on this resolution moved by my friend Shri Mohi Kanta Das. Because if Shri Das is not competent to move this motion, then my friend Shri Bhattacharyya is similarly wrong or incompetent to move his amendment.

Secondly Sir, the point which has just now been raised by my Friend that we cannot discuss the border issues here in the house. But, I know definitely that the hon'ble Speaker of the House permitted more than one occasion previously to discuss not only issues like the relationship between two independent countries, but on the floor of this very House on many a occasion we discussed such issues as firings on the borders of this country and Pakistan. Now, Sir, here this is not a question of firing from this State or that. Here we only want to discuss about the stand taken by the Government of India on an issue which has directly affected this State inasmuch as a part of the State is taken over by another country. If we could discuss in the past about the question of border firings by Pakistan, I fail to understand why we cannot now discuss this matter of aggression by another country. I therefore do not find any logic in the contention of my Friend Shri Bhattacharyya. This is my point, Sir.

***Shri FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED (Finance Minister):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have listened with great attention to the point of order raised by my friend from Gauhati. He has invoked the assistance of the provisions of the Constitution and also of the provisions of the Assam Legislative Assembly Rules. I do not propose to refer to any extraneous matters but confine my observations to a purely constitutional and legal points which have been raised by my friend. In the first instance he has referred to Art. 246 of the Constitution of India and to the List 1 in the 7th Schedule and he has sought to make that because of these prohibitions this House is not competent to discuss the resolution which my friend Shri Mohikanta Das was about to move. Now, let us read the relevant provision of the Constitution of India, *i. e.*, Art. 246. It reads as follows.

“Art. 246 (1) Notwithstanding anything in clause (2) and (3), Parliament has exclusive power to laws with respect to any of the matters enumerated in List 1 in the Seventh Schedule (in this Constitution referred to as the “Union List”).

Now, all these provisions, if the hon. Member will only be pleased to care to read will find, only restricts the power of this legislature with regard to consideration of laws which are in respect to items made under this Schedule. It does not prohibit consideration of discussion of any resolution which is not subject matter of law at all. To-day this resolution does not say that such and such law should be enacted in respect to such and such matter whether that is a matter which comes under the Concurrent List, State List or Central List or anything like that. There is in this resolution, nothing to which Art. 246 may be attracted. I therefore fail to understand how an astute lawyer conversant as he is with the Constitutional provisions, can raise this question unless, of course, his intention is to bring about confusion in the minds of the hon. Members and make out a case for him to say that under the Constitution we are prevented from discussion this resolution. Under the Constitution there is no provision which debars us from discussing this resolution tabled by my friend and is about to move. So I challenge the contention of my friend when he says that we are debarred from discussion of this resolution in this House under the provision of the Constitution of India.

Secondly, I would like him to refer to Rule 118 of our Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business which says that in order that a resolution may be admissible, it shall satisfy the following, namely—

“(i) It shall be clearly and precisely expressed.

(ii) It shall raise substantially one definite issue.....” and so on so forth there are many conditions, but I am going straight to the one which is useful for our purpose now, *i. e.*, (vi) “it shall not refer to a matter which is not primarily the concern of the Government of the State”.

Now, I would, just for a moment, request to look at the last portion of the Resolution which has been drafted. It says

“This Assembly draws the attention of the people of Assam to their special responsibilities in this matter as inhabitant of a Frontier State and appeals to them to stand united and firm for the purpose of resisting aggression. This Assembly further, cautions against rumours and panic and asks the people to be vigilant against the activities of anti-national, anti-social and destructive groups in the State”.

Are these things not of primary concern to the people of our State? I beg to submit to the House that from whatever quarter the aggression might come, either from China or from any other country, it is the Central Government's duty to defend our country but when such activities are carried on in or near about the border, it becomes the concern of each and every individual of the State, and it becomes a matter worthy for this House to take into consideration. My friend says that this is a matter which primarily concerns the Government of India. Sir, in course of this Resolution reference has been made to stand by our Prime Minister, and I do not see any reason why we cannot discuss this matter and say that our Prime Minister has pursued a proper policy, I do not know why the opinion of this House should be expressed in clear and emphatic manner so that the hands of our Prime Minister may be strengthened. As has been rightly referred to by my friend Shri Ranendra Mohon Das that we have had on many previous occasions discussed similar matter of aggression into our country although the defence of the country is the primary concern of the Central Government. Whenever there was a firing and as a result of firing when there was a kind of discomfort, inconvenience and atrocities committed on the people of our land, we had the opportunity of discussing this matter and sending our views to the Central Government for necessary action. So I do not see any reason why my friend is going to move a resolution when he is aware that as a result of Chinese aggression on our soil certain anti-social activities are being carried on, particularly on the northern Bank. Can we shut our eyes on what is happening on that part of the State on the ground that it is not our primary responsibility? Now, Sir, I find from the Rules and Procedure of West Bengal Assembly, where more or less the same provisions exist, that all resolution can be discussed there provided they relate to a matter which is the primary concern of the Government of the State. The hon. Member may be aware that a similar resolution was discussed in the Bengal Legislative Assembly. Now, when a member of the Bengal Legislative Assembly, where the same Rules and Regulations obtain as here, can discuss this kind of resolution, I do not see any reason why a

Member of this Assembly can be incompetent to discuss a similar thing here. Therefore, I submit, Sir, that under Rule 118 the resolution substantially raises a definite issue and that issue is that in times of emergency it is the duty of this legislature to draw the attention of the people to stand united for the purpose of resisting any danger that may come to us. It is also our duty to caution our people against any kind of rumour. So, I cannot understand how a Member can raise an objection that it is an aggression by Chinese and, therefore, we cannot discuss it here. I have not been able to appreciate this line of argument and I submit, Sir, that having regard to the provisions of the Constitution and of the Assembly Rules it is quite competent for any member of this House to discuss a resolution of this nature, and for this reason I submit, Sir, that the point of order raised by the hon. Member is untenable and it should be rejected by you.

Shri DANDESWAR HAZARIKA (Morongi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have heard with attention the point raised by my hon. friend on the opposite about the admissibility of the resolution, that is whether it can be discussed in this House or not. Apart from the desirability of the resolution I would like to point out that if some unforeseen circumstances happen and if there is war between India and China then what will be the position of Assam? I think my hon. friends have the bitter experience of war and it is the people of Assam which is the frontier State will be the greatest sufferers should any unforeseen circumstances happen. Now, though it is not the primary duty of the State or of this House to discuss the policy of the Government of India, still we can discuss this matter. Nowhere in this resolution it is stated that it wants to discuss about the defence subject. In the resolution there is nothing else except giving support to the Prime Minister and except cautioning the people of Assam to be careful and they should come forward jointly in case of any emergency. In the last part of the resolution, as pointed out by my friend Shri Ahmed, it is stated that it only wants to draw the attention of the people of Assam to this important matter. As the hon. Members are aware that N. E. F. A. is a part of Assam, so, I do not think that this question cannot be discussed by this Assembly. I think my hon. friends are aware that about 9 soldiers belonging to Assam Police Battalion were killed and some were captured by Chinese soldiers. So, from that point of view also we are primarily concerned with the Border Security Force which is under Assam Government. It is in the fitness of thing, as has already been pointed out, that it shall not refer to a matter which is not the primary concern of the Government of the State. I should like to point out, Sir, that it is to be considered whether this matter concerns the State Government or not. In my opinion it is the primary concern of the people of our State as a part of the N. E. F. A. has been occupied by Chinese. So, I do not find any reason why it cannot be discussed in this House since a similar resolution, as pointed out by Shri Ahmed, has been discussed in Bengal Assembly. I would, therefore, request my hon. friends opposite to withdraw his point of order.

Shri HARESWAR DAS (Minister, Revenue): Mr. Speaker, Sir, possibly after what my hon. friend Shri Ahmed has said, no further elucidation of the point is necessary. But I feel that when Chinese aggression on a portion of our territory has taken place we have every right to discuss the matter and ask the Government of India to take steps. The Government of India have also taken steps and it is fit and proper for us to lend our support to the Government of India.

Mr. SPEAKER : The point of order raised by Shri Gaurisankar Bhattacharyya has been debated at length and Members of both sides have spoken out their mind. The main point at issue whether this Resolution primarily concerns the State of Assam. As has been pointed out by Shri Ahmed and Shri Das, I am constrained to accept that Longju which is in N.E.F.A. is within the territory of Assam, and, as such, an aggression has been committed inside the State of Assam. Then, again in the second part of the Resolution, which is the vital part of it, when it is a call to the people to rise to the occasion, I believe it is within the competence of this House. As has been pointed out also by Shri Hazarika and Shri Ahmed, the Resolution had been passed by a sister Assembly of West Bengal. I hold that this is a matter which primarily concerns the Government and the people of the State of Assam because the aggression if develops in to war of which there is every likelihood the people of Assam will be its first victims, its development programmes will come to a standstill. It will bring destruction to the country demolition of hearths and houses of the people of Assam. It will mean tears and toils to the people of Assam. When so many things are involved, we cannot hold that the subject-matter or a part of this Resolution does not concern the State primarily. I, therefore, allow the resolution to be moved.

***Shri MOHI KANTA DAS (Barchalla) :** Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Resolution is the most important resolution by which the attention of the people of Assam as to their responsibilities and duties in a national emergency is called. My resolution, Sir, means that: "The Assembly views with grave concern". Really it is a grave concern for the people of Assam as well as the people of India because the mass people think that the age old friendship and amity and historical relationship are going to be shattered by the Chinese warmongers and Chinese expansionists. Therefore, my resolution regrets and also views its deep concern the deterioration in the Indo-Chinese relations. We know that in the past we had cultural and historical ties with the Chinese people. Tuensang who came to our country from China mixed with our people; Lord Budha who is the founder of Buddhism was born in that country and preached his religion in China and Japan. Many Chinese students came to India and studied in the Nalanda University. Moreover trade and commerce were carried on between the two countries. The India Government, through their representative in the United Nations Organisation, fought tooth and nail for inclusion of China in the United Nations. Our Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru visited China and so also the Chinese Prime Minister visited India when he was given great ovation. Wherever he went and was treated by the India people as their own kith and kin. The Panch Sheela which envisages peace between the two countries was sponsored by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, our Prime Minister and which was accepted by the Chinese Government. We hope the Indian people and the Assamese people who are so cordially bound with the tie of friendship from time immemorial will pledge unstinted support to the stand taken by our Prime Minister. Moreover, Sir, the boundary between India and China was demarcated by the McMahon Line and accepted by both the Governments from time immemorial. So, there was no case for any boundary dispute between the two countries. If the Chinese Government had any dispute regarding the boundary line that could have been settled amicably by sitting round the table instead of resorting to unprovoked aggression. But, this peaceful course was never followed by the Chinese Government. On the otherhand,

they committed aggression in our territory by occupying Longju, our military outpost. They made an attack also in another military outpost at Ladakh and had taken 12 prisoners and all on a sudden occupied the Indian soil. From the above it appears, Sir, that the Chinese were contemplating attack on India from a very long time, though apparently they were friendly—they had an eye and heart on our land with a view to expanding their territory in order to accommodate their growing population. Hon. Members are aware that sometime some Chinese maps were detected which indicated the boundaries including large areas of Indian soil including N.E.F.A. and almost the entire length of the Brahmaputra in China. This matter was discussed in the Lok Sabha and the Indian Government had sought clarification from the Chinese Government and protested against this aggression. But the Chinese Government, taking advantage of our policy of peace, prepared from a very long time for war with India. As a matter of fact, the Chinese has attacked India and occupied the Indian territory. So it is not a boundary dispute. Sir, our Communist friends here said that it was a boundary dispute. In the Indian Parliament also the top ranking Communist leaders described it as boundary dispute. They find it difficult to utter the word 'aggression'. Sir, it is purely an act of aggression and the sons of India are asked to be prepared against this aggression. The youths of India have resolved to defend their mother land with the last drop of blood. They are prepared to sacrifice their lives in defence of their mother land. Yet our Communist friends here say that this is a simple boundary dispute and not an act of aggression. Again Sir, the Prime Minister of China demanded that the Indian force should be withdrawn $12\frac{1}{2}$ miles from our border. He has requested the Indian Prime Minister to withdraw our force $12\frac{1}{2}$ miles from the border with a view to occupy that area by the Chinese Force. Sir, once it is occupied this border by the Chinese Force it would be very very difficult problem to regain that position without shedding blood. Therefore, Our Prime Minister did not agree to withdraw our force. But at that time one of our top ranking Communist leaders, Shri Ajoy Ghosh visited China and talked with the Communist Leaders there and having returned to India he insisted upon the acceptance of the proposal of China. Sir, this is the attitude of the Indian Communists. Sir, our Prime Minister took a bold stand and made a clarion call to the country especially to the youth to be united for the defence of the country. We shall have to sacrifice our last drop of blood for the defence of our country. Our Prime Minister has adopted a separate policy measure in this National emergency. We have rendered all our assistance and co-operation to the army men in this grave national emergency. Sir, our country has to face the mischievous activities of the Fifth columnist in our country. In Tezpur, the Fifth columnist was trying to do a very mischief. Those who have read paper they are aware that the Chinese are occupying a portion of Subonsiri Area. To prevent this Army was sent to Tezpur by train and by some other conveyance. In the Harichinga Station, some Fifth columnist removed fish plates so that some mischief could be done to the train bringing the Army men. But this was detected by some villagers and immediate steps were taken to replace these fish plates. Thus a great catastrophe was averted. But there does not end the matter. The Fifth Columnist and the spy are making rumours that some military men were taking away some school girls and molested them and that some molested girls were kept in the Tezpur Civil Hospital. Sir, by this rumour, the Fifth Columnist and the spy are making the people panicky. Sir, hearing this rumour, immediately an enquiry was made in the Civil Hospital by the Deputy Commissioner and found that the rumour was absolutely false. This was done by the Fifth Columnist with a view to bring distrust on the soldiers who are working for the defence of the country.

Similar things had happened. Therefore my resolution seeks to caution our people about the actions of these volunteers, and our Prime Minister have taken a very serious view about these anti-national and anti-social elements of the society and have declared in the Rajya Sabha that drastic steps should be taken against those who in their thoughts, words and deeds give any indication in support of Chinese aggression. I find the tendency from a section of our people or from some political party who are going to minimise the importance of aggression and indirectly helping this part of the Chinese regarding the boundary dispute with India. This is another way of the Fifth-columnists. While the Chinese people and army are entering our N. E. F. A. when they are coming to take Tezpur and also the North bank of the Brahmaputra and when the Chinese army is firing on our people, according to our friends on the other side of the House, we will be fiddling when our country is burning. So these people should be treated drastically. That is why the West Bengal Government have adopted the resolution demanding, under the circumstance, to ban and declare illegal such organisations who, directly or indirectly, by their thought, word or deed, support the aggression by the Chinese people. Therefore, Sir we should keep our vigilant eyes on those who give any indication of support to Chinese aggression. Our vigilant eyes will always be on the anti-social and anti-national elements who are worst enemies—even worst than the Chinese. Chinese are our open enemies—we can face them, we can detect them, we can annihilate them, but not the Fifth-columnists who can create more mischief to the country from underground. We cannot fix the responsibility on the Government alone with the limited resources. If our people do not co-operate, if our people do not unite and help our soldiers, our Government, our police for the maintenance of law and order, and detect these anti-social and anti-national elements of our society then our army, our police and our Government alone will not be able to achieve the desired result in such national urgency and crisis. Therefore, Sir, my resolution expressed grave concern about the breach of the Indo-China relationship by the Chinese war-mongers and the expansions to our country. But that is not our case. Panditji has said, our General Thimayya has said “we have confidence enough on our army”. Our resentment is this that the Prime Minister of China Mr. Chou En Lai is stabbing at the back of Jawaharlal Nehru under the garb of friendship, under the screening of friendship, under the cloud of friendship and amity. He is stabbing from behind. That is why we expressed our grave concern on the Chinese aggression. We did not have their soil and we did not attack their land. We are believer in the doctrine of the Panch-Sheel. We do not want anybody's soil. We want to live in peaceful co-existence. We want to live peacefully and we also want others to live peacefully without any exploitation by another. When we are pursuing this doctrine of Panch-Sheel we got the applause of the whole world. Some shrewed people like the Chinese Prime Minister might took this to be a weakness on our part. They might have thought that India is weak, they are non-violent, and this led them to attack Indian soil. In this way we found that they have suddenly attacked our soil unprovoked without giving any indication, and they have shattered the principles of Panch-Sheel which the Chinese Government had accepted, by violation of our borders, by violating the existence of Tibet. They preached that they have no idea of expansionism nor do they want anybody's soil. But on the other hand we find that how the Chinese people are backing upon their words and occupying lands of our Indian soil. How did they treat the Tibetans? Thousands of Tibetans are

in the Missamari Camp and how they put torture on them. What I submitted before is that what they preached they have gone back upon their words. They have no faith on the Panch Sheel doctrines, and therefore, they have attacked India, attacked Tibet and they can attack any other country. They belied our Prime Minister that they are firm supporter of Panch-Sheel. But is this the Panch-Sheel, is this the spirit of co-existence. Therefore, Sir, we express the deep sense of resentment at the aggressive action on the part of the Chinese, and the next thing Sir, under this exigency our Prime Minister has taken a bold step. He is not yielded to the demand of the Chinese Prime Minister to remove the force 12½ miles from the border and then there can be negotiation. And our Prime Minister is not agreed to that and he gave a warning that if you do not move away from the Indian soil I am not going to discuss with you, I am not going to negotiate with you, and I will fight tooth and nail and bring back every inch of land that your soldiers have occupied illegally. But uptill now they have not taken any action on the reasonable conditions put forward by our Prime Minister that before negotiation they must withdraw their force. But that has not been accepted uptill now, and we are apprehending rightly that there may be regular attack and more serious attack by the Chinese. Therefore, we have urged the people to be united and also we have urged our youths to join the Territorial Army and have also urged the people to co-operate with the army and also to get ready for all sacrifices. Hence my resolution approves of the just and firm stand of the Prime Minister of India in the face of the grave provocation.

Mr. SPEAKER: How long will you take to finish your speech ?

***Shri MOHI KANTA DAS:** About half an hour, Sir.

Adjournment

The Assembly was then adjourned for lunch till 2 P.M.

***Shri MOHI KANTA DAS (Barchalla):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, my Resolution speaks about the stand of the Prime Minister in the face of the great provocation. Hon. Members know that our Prime Minister had asked the Chinese Government to withdraw all forces in their occupation of the Indian territory from the Indian soil. Moreover, hon. Members know that the Chinese have also occupied Longju in Assam. We are prepared for any discussion, but the discussion must not be based, must not be initiated by threat, by force or by coercion. Therefore, our Prime Minister has unequivocally declared that before any discussion can be taken there must be withdrawal of the Chinese forces from the soil and that the status quo should be restored and then discussion can be taken. But up till now the Chinese Government have not accepted the proposal of our Prime Minister and they have not yet vacated our land so that negotiations with the Chinese Government could not be taken up. Under the circumstances, when all our peaceful approaches for the solution of the problem have failed, our Prime Minister has appealed to the people of India to be united and to be ready for any eventuality so that the integrity of our boundary can be maintained. This Resolution also urges the people of Assam to give unstinted support to the stand taken by our Prime Minister. And it also assures the nation on behalf of the people of Assam that the people of

this frontier and strategic State are ready to make any sacrifice that they may be called upon to do in the defence of their mother land. Therefore, I would ask our friends here to mobilise public opinion in their respective constituencies about the emergent situation to which our country has been put by the Chinese aggression and also to educate the people about the responsibilities and the grave duties they may have to perform in the event of further aggression by the Chinese Army. Moreover, we as representatives of the people have got a special responsibility to caution and to educate our people about the possible activities of the anti-social and anti-national and subversive groups that are in the State who may by joining hands with the Chinese spies create difficulties in the operation of our army who are now taking their stand for the defence of our country.

Now Sir, I appeal to the youths of our country to be prepared and to be ready to meet any eventuality. Other students of other places in India have also expressed their determination to stand against the Chinese aggression and they are determined to give their support to our Prime Minister and even most of them are willing to go to mountainous regions for the construction of roads for quick movement of our army. Such example should be emulated by all the youth of Assam and they must not be led away by the sweet propaganda of the anti-social and anti-national elements that are working in our State so that they may give a good account of themselves. I am glad to announce here that the students of Tezpur assembled recently in a meeting and they have also passed a resolution by which they have voluntarily placed their services at the disposal of our Prime Minister under the national exigency to which this country of ours has been put to. I am quite confident that our youths would take this matter with all seriousness and would not listen to the lighthearted words of some of those who say that there is no aggression but only a boundary dispute and so on as propagated by our Communist friends. So, I would request our youths not to listen to such lighthearted words at a time when their motherland wants them to sacrifice their lives in order that the hard won Independence may be kept in tact. Our Independence is at stake by the Chinese aggression. Who knows that this Chinese aggression may not spread and may not involve all of us in another world war which means complete annihilation. Therefore, it is not a matter to be trifled away, it is not a matter to be taken lightheartedly, I once again appeal to the youths of our country to take this matter very seriously and be prepared and determined to defend the boundaries of our country, which have been encroached by the Chinese army. In this connection, Sir, I am sorry to note that when we are expecting the people to be united and join hands to face the situation created by the Chinese aggression, as we did when a similar threat come from Pakistan, our Communist friends are taking a different attitude. When a similar resolution was brought before the House when Pakistan threatened our borders, all the parties including the Communist friends joined hands. There were no amendments to that resolution, there was no difference of opinion and there was no opposition at all. We were glad that when a national emergency confronted us, all the parties came together to defend the integrity of our motherland and were prepared to make any sacrifices to check the aggressive tendencies of a hostile country. At that time Sir, my Communist friends did not bring any amendments because

Pakistan was not a Communist country. But now when a similar tragedy, a similar catastrophe confronts us, when we are faced with aggression by the Chinese army and we are moving a resolution in this House, I am surprised to find that an amendment is going to be moved which does not mention the vital word "aggression". There has even been opposition to the moving of this resolution and now an amendment is sought to be moved which will undermine the very structure on which this resolution stands. I am sorry my Communist friends are not giving a true account of themselves as they did when we adopted a similar resolution while Pakistan committed aggression against us. Why this difference in attitude? May I take it that because the Chinese are communists, and my friends here are sailing in the same boat with them, that they are differing with us to-day? If that is so, my words fail to condemn their attitude. If anybody says that their stand is anti-national, if anybody says they are enemies of the country, if anybody says they are fifth columnists and the Bibhisans of this country, I will not find a word to defend them. This is not the moment to take things light-heartedly. We should do nothing which minimises the seriousness of the situation which confronts our Motherland today. Therefore, we expect every section of this House, every party and every Member, to come together and join hands to adopt this resolution. But, Sir, it is really a matter for sorry that attitude is lacking in my Communist friends here. However, in spite of the fact that we may have fifth columnists, in spite of the fact that we may have Chinese spies, in spite of the fact that we may have anti-social elements who may try to create difficulties in the way of our taking proper measures against the aggressors, we have to take a vow here on the floor of this House that we shall be prepared to meet any eventuality that may befall us (At this stage the Deputy Speaker occupied the Chair, the Speaker having vacated it).

Every Member of this House should go to the villages and educate our people. They should be asked to stand prepared for any situation that may befall our country.

Therefore, Sir, with these few words, I again appeal to all sections of the House to unite, to join hands, withdraw all amendments and pass this resolution unanimously. We may have ideological differences, both inside and outside this House and we may fight over them at the time of election but when a national emergency has arisen, when the very foundation of our independence is at stake, when our very existence has been threatened by the Chinese Army, let us forget our ideological differences, let us not sit tight and do anything which seeks to undermine the seriousness of the situation and leads people to inaction. That will be a sin against the country, against Mahatmaji, who by dedicating his life brought independence to India. That will be a sin against Kanaklata and Mukunda Kakoti, the martyrs, who sacrificed their lives so that we might be free. At this hour of peril we should be imbued and inspired by their ideal and by the ideal of hundreds of martyrs who gave their lives so that we might live. I am glad that all parties including the Praja Socialist Party and Jan Sangha and other political parties have come to support the measures adopted by our Prime Minister but in their amendment they have eliminated the words "trust and proper" which are very important in this context. Therefore, Sir, I urged all my friends here to voice the feelings of this House

through our speeches to the people outside so that they may be encouraged, and so that we may take such measures in our villages and other parts that will not create havoc. I also appeal to the Government and the Police Department that they should take stringent measures and not spare any pains to unearth the subversive activities perpetrated by anti-social and anti-national elements of the country. We must ensure that they take stringent measures for the annihilation of the spies and other anti-national elements with a view to keeping our independence in tact.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Resolution moved is:—

“This Assembly views with grave concern the unprovoked Chinese aggression on Indian soil and consequent deterioration in Indo-Chinese relations and puts on record its deep sense of resentment at the aggressive action on the part of the Chinese. The Assembly approves of the just and firm stand of the Prime Minister of India in the face of grave provocation, and lends its full support to the decision that the occupation of Indian territory, and in particular of Longju in Assam should be vacated before negotiation with the Chinese Government can be resumed. On behalf of the people of Assam this Assembly pledges unstinted support to the stand taken by the Prime Minister and assures the nation that the people of this Frontier State will make any sacrifice that they may be called upon to do in defence of their mother land.

This Assembly draws the attention of the people of Assam to their special responsibilities in this matter as inhabitants of a Frontier State and appeals to them to stand united and firm for the purpose of resisting aggression. This Assembly further, caution against rumours and panic and asks the people to be vigilant against the activities of anti-national, anti-social and destructive groups in the State”.

***Shri PHANI BORA (Nowgong):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following amendment to the resolution under consideration :

“Substitute the wordings of the resolution moved by—

Shri Ram Nath Das, M. L. A.

Shrimati Padma Kumari Gohain, M. L. A.

Shrimati Jyostna Chanda, M. L. A.

Shri Mohidhar Pegoo, M. L. A.

Shri Mohi Kanta Das, M. L. A.

AND

Shri Purnananda Chetia, M. L. A.

"This Assembly views with grave concern the deterioration in Indo-Chinese relations in recent months and puts on record its firm opinion that it will be harmful to the interest of our country as well as to those of China and dangerous to the cause of world peace if the situation is allowed to drifts further and immediate steps are not taken to settle the border question in a friendly and amicable manner.

"This Assembly places on record its appreciation of the stand taken by Prime Minister Nehru in defence of the policy of peace and non-alignment and settlement of the Indo-China border dispute by peaceful negotiations and hopes that the Prime Ministers of India and China will meet in no time for ending the dispute."

"On behalf of the people Assam this Assembly pledges unstinted support to the above stated stand taken by Prime Minister Nehru and assures the nation that the people of this State will make any sacrifice that they may be called upon to do in defence of the mother country."

"This Assembly draws the attention of the people of Assam to their special responsibilities in this matter as inhabitants of a frontier state and appeals to them to stand united and firm for the purpose of resisting any aggression."

"This Assembly, further cautions against rumour and panic spread by reactionary and disruptive forces and appeals to the people to be vigilant against the activities of such anti-social and disruptive elements."

Sir, I have carefully listened to the speech of the hon. Member, Mr. Mohi Kanta Das and he seems to be deflecting a picture of national emergency. Had it been so, I would not have differed with him. But unfortunately that is not so.

Sir, the issue before us is a very delicate and sentimental issue. I would request the hon. Members not to generate heat, not to rouse sentiment but to be cool and calm and discuss the issue dispassionately.

Sir there cannot be two opinions inside the country on the question of defence of the mother country, its territorial integrity and national sovereignty. There can never be any hesitation on the part of any patriot to sacrifice his life to defend his country, his home and hearth if attacked by any foreign country and, Sir, there is no power on earth that can dare to subjugate the great land of ours and its independence.

Sir, myself and my party will be in the fore-front of the nation to defend it if any foreign country dares to attack us or to declare a war against us and let there be no doubt in the mind of any one in this respect.

But, today are we at war, even on the eve of a war with any country? The unfortunate and regrettable situation that has developed during the recent months, between the two great countries, India and China, is of course deplorable and harmful to the cause of both the countries—may be harmful to the whole of Asia and world peace. At the heat of the moment some people may manage to forget the great contribution of these two countries to the cause of Asian solidarity, freedom and world peace. But we cannot afford

to forget that it was India and China who first proclaimed the Principles of Panch Sheel, gave birth to the spirit of Bandung and Asian solidarity. When these two great countries drift apart over the question of settling the border, specially at a time when under the direct instigation of the Imperialists in many Asian countries military dictatorship have taken place, freedom and sovereignty of these countries are being crippled, I consider it to be the greatest calamity for the freedom-loving people of India and Asia.

Sir, unfortunately taking advantage of the differences between these two countries that started from the time of the activities of the Tibetan rebels, the reactionary forces of India who used to call the great five principles of peace and peaceful co-existence, *i. e.*, Panch Sheel as a thing borne of sin, foreign policy of non-alignment and peace as useless, etc., had already launched a campaign of hatred against China, they whipped up war psychosis.

The border developments are being deliberately exaggerated, magnified and exploited for diverting the peoples' attention from the problems of their life and living, for disrupting and suppressing the country's democratic movement. I am not surprised when these elements are concentrating fire against the Communist Party, which stands to day as a powerful unifier of the patriotic forces, as a champion of India's peace policy and also as a defender of the rights and interests of the masses.

Sir, these forces now under the cover of patriotism and nationalism really want to achieve their unholy design.

Their slogans are—"Panch Sheel was a failure, the Defence Minister was a failure, the Foreign Policy of India was a failure, and therefore change the Defence Minister, change the Panch Sheel policy and adopt a policy of war."

Therefore, Sir, what is supposed to be the main victim of this propaganda to-day is "not the Communist Party." The real target is the policy of peace and non-alignment and if possible, of course, the Government now functioning headed by Nehru.

The creation of war-psychosis, an atmosphere of war, will serve their above purpose. The war-psychosis will help in destroying Democracy and diverting the economy of the country to the advantage of the reaction and monopoly capitalism. Militarisation of the economy will give them a good dividend. Should we, the common people, fall a prey to the cunning designs of these element? The Government headed by Nehru has categorically declared that war has not started, that policy of peaceful negotiation and settlement of the dispute and that foreign policy of settlement of non-alignment will not be changed. I and my party extend full support to this policy of the Government.

Sir, I am quite sure that in view of the emotional and cultural ties of basic friendship between the two countries, namely India and China and as the foreign policy of these two countries stands today, there cannot be war between us. So long as China remains a socialist country it cannot and never have any aggressive design. So long as Nehru remains at the head of our Government and not somebody else, India also will not go for a war with any country, not even with Pakistan or Portugal which have still been forcibly occupying parts of India.

Sir, therefore, the issue before us is not one of war but of settling the border dispute between India and China.

The frontier of India and China stretches over hundreds of miles of high mountainous territory. In the eastern sector of our frontier Mc Mahon Line can be the basis of our boundary between our two countries and negotiation can be started to properly demarcate it on the actual ground, and I hope China will accept the line as a reality. So far as the Western Sector is concerned, traditional frontiers are vague and actual frontiers have never been clearly delimited. In these circumstances, charges and counter charges of aggression have no meaning and are harmful. I think the stand taken by the Government of India in relation to the Western Sector that the traditional border in this Sector should be accepted is a correct stand in order to properly delineate this traditional line. It would require a friendly discussion between our two Governments.

I therefore, request the hon. Members of this House to unite and urge the Government to immediately start negotiation between our country and China without any further delay. Sir, to create a proper atmosphere and to chalk out a life of approach it is necessary for the two Prime Ministers to meet first instead of asking the officials to start the preliminary work first.

Sir, I am optimistic about a negotiation. The latest letter of the Prime Minister of China of the 7th of November and the declaration of our Prime Minister in the Parliament of India indicate that weather is going to be clear. By the way, I may mention that in the letter of Mr. Chau-en Lie, the proposal was that both the countries should leave 12½ miles each as No-men's land before the settlement is reached. Mr. Das has misrepresented it, perhaps, in his eagerness to rouse heat. Therefore, Sir, we should not do anything and should not indulge in talking in a language which will serve only those whose main aim is not the integrity of the country but to change the foreign policy, and the Prime Minister, change the Defence Minister and divert the attention of the people thereby.

Lastly, Sir, I want to remind the hon. Members here that the Now-gong bye-election has given a verdict against such approach to this important issue.

With these few words, Sir, I move the Amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The amendment moved is.

“Substitute the wordings of the resolution moved by—

Shri Ram Nath Das, M. L. A.

Shrimati Padma Kumari Gohain, M. L. A.

Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda, M. L. A.

Shri Mohidhar Pegoo, M. L. A.

Shri Mohi Kanta Das, M. L. A., and

Shri Purnananda Chetia, M. L. A.

“This Assembly views with grave concern the deterioration in the Indo-Chinese relations in recent months and puts on record its firm opinion that it will be harmful to the interest of our country as well as to those of China and dangerous to the cause of world peace if the situation is allowed to drift further and immediate steps are not taken to settle the border question in a friendly and amicable manner.

“This Assembly places on record its appreciation of the stand taken by Prime Minister Nehru in defence of the policy of peace and non-alignment and settlement of the Indo-China border dispute by peaceful negotiations and hopes that the Prime Ministers of India and China will meet in no time for ending the dispute.

“On behalf of the people of Assam this Assembly pledges unstinted support to the above stated stand taken by Prime Minister Nehru and assured the nation that the people of this State will make any sacrifice that they may be called upon to do in defence of the mother country.

“This Assembly draws the attention of the people of Assam to their special responsibilities in this matter as inhabitants of a frontier State and appeals to them to stand united and firm for the purpose of resisting any aggression.

“This Assembly, further cautions against rumours and panic spread by reactionary and disruptive forces and appeals to the people to be vigilant against the activities of such anti-social and disruptive element.”

***Shri DANDESWAR HAZARIKA (Morongi)**: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification I would like to draw your attention to Assembly Rule 124 one clear days notice should be given before the day fixed for discussion of the Amendment. It has been stated here like this. “If a copy of such amendment has not been sent to the Secretary one clear day before the day fixed for the discussion of the resolution, any member may object to the moving of the amendment, and such objection shall prevail unless the Speaker, in his discretion, allows the amendment to be moved”. We have not received the copy of the amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But this is a Short Notice Resolution, so we are to proceed on that line.

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA (Gauhati)**: Sir, may I also submit that what my Friend, Shri Hazarika have stated is quite pertinent because I also suggest that the hon. Members should have sufficient notice for discussion of this resolution which has been moved by my Friend Shri Mohikanta Das. It was circulated only at 2 p. m. yesterday. We ought to have received the copy of that resolution, at least a week ago generally speaking. I do not mean to say that the hon. Speaker cannot allow discussion of the Resolution at shorter notice. What I mean to say is that this situation about China has not fallen on us all on a sudden.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Rule 124 is “If a copy of such amendment has not been sent to the Secretary one clear day before the day fixed for the discussion of the resolution, any member may object to the moving of the amendment, and such objection shall prevail unless the Speaker, in his discretion, allows the amendment to be moved.”

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA (Gauhati):** While respecting the discretion of the Speaker both with regard to the original resolution and with regard to the Amendment, I only want to suggest that copies of such resolutions as well as amendments should be circulated to the Members well ahead so that the Members may go through them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, but for the time being I allow the amendment.

Shri SARAT CHANDRA GOSWAMI (Kamalpur): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I take my stand to support the Resolution moved by my Friend Shri Mohi Kanta Das and to oppose the Amendment that has been moved by my Friend Shri Bhattacharyya and Shri Bora. While supporting the resolution I beg to make certain observations which are: That this resolution states or seeks to emphasis that this House and through this House, the people of Assam, lends its unstinted support to stand of the Prime Minister of India to which an amendment has been moved by Mr. Bora. I am glad that Shri Bora while bringing in the Amendment to the Resolution expressed his support to the stand taken by our Prime Minister. He also supports the stand taken by the Government of India. But at the same time, I am constrained to remark that while doing so, he wants to have the leaf and eat it too. While he has taken his stand behind the protecting shelter of the great Five Principles of the Panch Shel enunciated by our Prime Minister and non-alignment with power blocs at the same time he is trying to blow both hot and cold at the great reaction in the minds of the India masses that has set in as a result of the aggressive action of the Chinese Government calling it as war mongering spirit of a certain section of the people at the instigation of the imperialist which, he is afraid, is going to create estrangement between the two people, people of India and China. It is a plain fact that the friendship between India and China was generated by India and it was preserved by India for so many years. This friendship, this relationship has not been broken by India. On the other hand China has broken this friendship by making aggression into our territory. This resolution which has been brought by Mr. Das has merely expressed our grave concern over the matter, and as a matter of fact, as has already been stated by Shri Das, this State is directly concerned with it, as a part of our territory has gone into China's occupation. It has been suggested by Shri Bora that the two Prime Ministers should meet and settle the dispute amicably. India is always agreeable to start negotiation for a peaceful settlement and for the preservation of peace not only in India and Asia but also in the whole world. Our Prime Minister said that no negotiation should be started unless the occupants have vacated from the occupation. Again, my Friend Shri Bora has referred to a letter from Mr. Chou-En Lai in which he suggested that both the parties should go away $12\frac{1}{2}$ miles from the disputed area and then he is prepared to come for a negotiation. Now, if the Chinese go away $12\frac{1}{2}$ miles from the disputed line then also they will remain in the Indian territory. Shri Bora's argument sounds as if a friendly and amicable settlement has been offered by China and India does not like to accept it.

Again, as Shri Das pointed out, some subversive activities are going on to create some sort of disurbance. In Harisinga Railway Station when a military train was scheduled to pass, some fifth columnists removed some fish plates from the railway line so that some mischief could be done to the train carrying military personnel. But fortunately it was detected in time

and this calamity was overtaken. In this way subversive activities have started in our State. So, it is in the fitness of things that we should draw the attention of the Government of Assam and the Government of India to this important matter. Therefore, our State must be prepared to face any eventuality. Then again it has been stated in the amendment that the Indo-China relations have deteriorated. Now, what is the cause of the deterioration of the relationship? Is it because of the fact that Dalai Lama was given shelter in India? Or is it because of the fact that Indian people have shown sympathy to the Tibetans? What is the cause of this deterioration? It is because of the fact that Chinese have occupied a portion of our territory and they have become aggressors. Then again in the Western frontier in Ladakh so many military personnel have been killed. Should we remain silent at this juncture and let Shri Chou-En-Lai and our Prime Minister discuss the border dispute over tea? It is not a border dispute. It is a clear case of aggression. So we want every Indian to stand behind the Prime Minister and the Government of India.

***Shri RAM NATH SARMA (Lumding):** উপাধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, শ্রীমহীকান্ত দাস ডাঙৰীয়াই যি প্ৰস্তাব সদনত দাঙি ধৰিছে তাক সমখন কৰি দু-আঘাব মান কৰা যুজিছে। মোৰ আগতে এই সম্বন্ধে কেবাজনো সদস্যই কৈ গৈছে। বৰা ডাঙৰীয়াই amendment প্ৰস্তাব দাঙি ধৰিছে। সেই কাৰণে আচৰিত হৈছে। দেশলৈ যি দৰবস্থা আহিছে, যেতিয়া আমাৰ দেশ চীনে আক্ৰমণ কৰি আমাৰ এটি অংশ অধিকাৰ কৰি বহি আছে, তেতিয়া তেওঁলোকে কয় যে এইটো সাধাৰণ কথা। মানুহৰ এই সময়তে যদি Patriotic feelings নাই তেতিয়া হলে কোন সময়ত আহিব? Election অৰ সময়ত নেকি? প্ৰস্তাবটো তেওঁলোকে সামান্য কথাৰ কাৰণে অনা বুলি কয়। এইটো হেনো Peaceful settlement কথা। পিছে আমি পৰিস্কাৰকৈ জানো যে চীনে ভাৰতৰ ওপৰত aggression চলাইছে গতিকে দেশৰ প্ৰতিনিধি হৈয়ো এনে অবস্থাটো এই দুদিনত বেনেৰে এৰাব লাগিব পাৰে বজি নাপাওঁ। চীনে ভাৰতৰ ওপৰত আক্ৰমণ চলোৱাৰ সময়তো তেওঁলোকে Asian solidarity ব কথায়। আমাৰ প্ৰধান মন্ত্ৰীয়ে যোতয়া পৃথিৱীৰ শান্তি স্থাপনৰ কাৰণে দেখে কেহে লাগিছে তেতিয়া চৌয়েনলায়ে হাতত বুলি লৈ আগবাঢ়ি আহিছে। বিৰোধী সদস্য ডাঙৰীয়াই নিজে জানে ভাৰতে যোতয়া চীনক UNO, ত seat দিবৰ কাৰণে উঠি পৰি লাগিছিল—তেতিয়া—

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACARYYA (Gauhati):** On a point of information, Sir, in the amendment which was moved by Mr. Bora, he said that there are some elements who opposed the foreign policy of the Government of India and who want to replace the Defence Minister, and if possible, the Prime Minister and he has criticised those elements. Not that Mr. Bora has said that the foreign policy has failed and that the Prime Minister should be removed.

***Shri RAM NATH SARMA:** তাৰ পিচত চাৰ তেখেতে amendment ত Indo-china relationship ব কথা কৈছে আৰু এটা settlement লৈ অহা হব বুলি কৈছে তাৰ পৰা বুজা যায় তেখেতে চৌয়েনলাইৰ কথা সমখন কৰিছে।

***Shri GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA (Gauhati)**: On a point of order Sir, no Member can make any statement challenging the allegiance to the country of any other member.

***Shri RAM NATH SARMA (Lumding)**: I am only saying that from these records it can be guessed like that.....

***Shri GAURISHANKAR BHATTACHARYYA** : That is a derogatory statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. Nobody should go to that extent.

***Shri RAM NATH SARMA** : Sir, my point is this. If I can go, through it and I read it minutely the ultimate result can be guessed. That is what I am saying.

আমি বৰ্তমান যিটো অৱস্থাৰ সন্মুখীন হৈ আছো, সেই অৱস্থাত শান্তিপূৰ্ণভাৱে কথা বতৰাৰ বিনিময়ৰে সীমাংসা হোৱাৰ কোনো যুক্তি নাই। ইতিপূৰ্বেই চীনা চৰকাৰে আমাৰ ৰাষ্ট্ৰৰ সীমা অতিক্ৰম কৰি আমাৰ বহুখিনি ঠাই বে-আইনী ভাবে দখল কৰি আছে। আমাৰ প্ৰধান মন্ত্ৰীয়ে জনাইছিল যে চীনা সকলে বে-দখল কৰা ঠাই বিলাকৰ পৰা চীনা সৈন্য অপসৰণ কৰি পূৰ্বৰ সীমান্তলৈ নিয়াৰ পিচতহে আলাপ আলোচনাৰ মাজেৰে শান্তিপূৰ্ণ ভাৱে আপোচ সীমাংসাৰ অবস্থা হব পাৰে। তাৰ আগতে নহয়। তথাপিও তেওঁলোকে আজিলৈকে আমাৰ সীমান্তৰ ভিতৰত বহুখিনি ঠাই অধিকাৰ কৰিয়েই আছে। এয়েই নুবুজায় নে যে চীনা সকলৰ শান্তিপূৰ্ণ সীমাংসাৰ প্ৰতি কোনো ইচ্ছা নাই। তথাপিও আমাৰ কমিউনিষ্ট সকলে চীনাৰ প্ৰতিনিধিৰ ভৰুকিৰে এনে ধৰণৰ সংশোধনী দিয়াৰ কি যুক্তি থাকিব পাৰে? অনতি পূৰ্বে এই বিষয়টো যেতিয়া লোক সভাত আলোচনা হৈছিল তেতিয়াও এই কমিউনিষ্টসকলে এনে ধৰণেই এটা চাল দিছিল। ইয়াৰ দ্বাৰা এইটোয়েই পৰিস্কাৰকৈ ফাট উঠিছে যে তেখেত সকলে কেৱল কেবেলা নিৰ্বাচনৰ কাৰণে বাট চাইছে। কেবেলা নিৰ্বাচন শেষ হোৱাৰ লগে লগে ভাৰতৰ কমিনিউষ্ট দলৰ দৃষ্টিভঙ্গী অপৰ্ব্ব অভিনয় কৰি ভাৰতৰ বিৰুদ্ধে চীনা বাসীক ভাৰতৰ বুকুলৈ অহবান কৰিব যে তাৰ প্ৰধান বৰ্তমানৰ কাৰ্য্য কলাপৰ পৰাই পৰিস্কাৰকৈ দেখা যায়। ভাৰতৰ প্ৰতি জাতীয় প্ৰেম এসময়ত তেখেত সকলৰ থাকিলেও এতিয়া যে নাই সেইটো তেখেত সকলৰ কাৰ্য্য কলাপৰ পৰা ফটফটিয়াটক ওলাই পৰিছে। লগতে এইটোৱো পৰিস্কাৰ হৈ ফুটি উঠিছে যে তেখেত সকলৰ দেশাত্ম-জ্ঞান, জাতীয় প্ৰেম, নিজৰ অষ্ট্ৰ-জ্ঞান সকলো বিলাক জলাঞ্জলী দিছে। এই জাতীয় ভাব ধাৰা তেওঁলোকৰ ভিতৰত সুপ্ত ৰাখি চীনা ৰাজনৈতিক আদৰ্শবাদত নিজক আপ্লত কৰি আমাৰ প্ৰধান মন্ত্ৰী মহোদয়ৰ শিষ্যৰ ভাও ধৰি জনসাধাৰণক বিপথগামী কৰাৰ চেষ্টা কৰিছে। প্ৰধান মন্ত্ৰীয়ে কৈছে যে চীনা সকলে আমাৰ দেশৰ যি অংশ বে-আইনী ভাবে আক্ৰমণ কৰি অধিকাৰ কৰি আছে সেই ঠাই বিলাকৰ পৰা প্ৰথমতে সৈন্য অপসৰণ কৰি সেকমোহন লাইনৰ উত্তৰে যাব লাগিব। তেতিয়াহে দুজন প্ৰধান মন্ত্ৰীৰ ভিতৰত আপোচ সীমাংসাৰ আৰহাওৱাৰ সৃষ্টি হব পাৰে। এতিয়া আমাৰ কমিউনিষ্ট সকলে স্বীকাৰ কৰিবলৈ টান পাইছে যে চীনা সকলৰ ভিতৰত ৰাষ্ট্ৰ সীমান্ত অতিক্ৰম কৰি হাজাৰ হাজাৰ বগ মাইল অধিকাৰ কৰাটো তেওঁ এটা বে-আইনী আক্ৰমণ নহয়। তেওঁলোকৰ মতে Chinese aggression বুলি এটা কথা থাকিব নোৱাৰে। কাৰণ ভাৰত ৰাষ্ট্ৰৰ কিছু অংশ বলেৰে অধিকাৰ কৰাটো aggression নহয়। ভাৰতীয় লোকক মিত্ৰভাৱেহে মাৰিছে।

*Speech not corrected.

এই সদনত যিটো প্ৰস্তাব ডাঙি ধৰা হৈছে, তেওঁলোকৰ মতে Chinese aggression কথাটো উঠাই দিব লাগে, ভাৰতত Anti-National বুলি এটা কথা তেওঁলোকৰ মতে থাকিব নালাগে। সেই মৰ্মে আমাৰ কমিউনিষ্ট সকলৰ তৰফৰ পৰা ফনী বৰাই এটা Counter Resolution দিছে। তেওঁলোকৰ মতে চীনা সকলে আমাৰ বুদ্ধপুত্ৰলৈ চীন দেশৰ সীমা ধৰি যিখন মেপ তৈয়াৰ কৰিছে তাকেহে তেওঁলোকৰ সাব্যস্ত কৰিব বিছাৰিছে, চীনা সকলে আমাৰ লগত মিত্ৰ হৈ থাকিব ভাও ধৰি বহুদিনৰ পৰা আমাৰ ৰাষ্ট্ৰৰ সীমান্ত অঞ্চলত বে-দখল কৰি আহিছে। ই আজিৰ কথা নহয়, আজি বহুদিনৰ পৰা চোৰাংকৈ বে-দখল কৰি আহিছে আৰু এতিয়া সেই বিশৃংখলিতকটাই সুস্পষ্ট ভাৱে আমাৰ ওপৰত মিত্ৰদ্রোহী আক্ৰমণ ৰূপে দেশবাসীৰ চকুত দেখা দিছে। ইয়াৰ পিচতো কমিউনিষ্ট সকলে ক'ব বিছাৰিছে যে সকল আক্ৰমণকাৰী নহয় এইটো সীমান্তৰ সৰু গোলমাল। আপোচ মীমাংসা হ'ব লাগে। মই কওঁ যে এখেত সকলে চীনাৰ কাৰণে ওকালতী কৰিবলৈ ইয়াকে আহিছেনে নে ভাৰতীয় প্ৰতিনিধি হৈ ইয়াত আহিছে? নোৰ সন্দেহ হয়।

চীনা প্ৰধান মন্ত্ৰী চৌৱেন লাই বা সেই মেপ ভুল বুলি আমাৰ প্ৰতিনিধিয়ে দেখুৱাত আৰু সংশোধন কৰাৰ কথা কোৱাত তেওঁলোকে আমাৰ দেশ আক্ৰমণ কৰিবলৈ উদ্যত হৈছে। আমি ভাবো ভাৰতীয় কমিউনিষ্ট সকলে তেওঁলোকক নানাভাৱে সহায় কৰিছে। নহলে এনে এটা Counter Resolution দিয়াৰ কোনো অৰ্থ নাই বা নাথাকে।

মই এতিয়াও কওঁ যে কোনো War Block ত Join কৰা কংগ্ৰেছ তথা ভাৰতৰ নীতি নহয়। ভাৰত কোনো দিনেই যুদ্ধৰ পক্ষপাতী নহয়। শান্তি আমাৰ আদৰ্শ। ইয়াৰ উপৰিও একে সন্ধিক্ষণত চীন ভাৰতৰ, যুদ্ধ হলে, বিশেষকৈ আমাৰ পক্ষবাসীক পৰিকল্পনাৰ দেশ উন্নয়নৰ কামত বাধা পৰিব; আমাৰ বহুমুখী ক্ষতি হোৱাত আমি বহুক্ষেত্ৰত পিচ পৰি যাম। আনকি নানা কাৰণত আমাৰ Non-alignment Policy ও আমি চলিবলৈ সক্ষম নহ'ব পাৰো। প্ৰথমৰে পৰা যুদ্ধ আমাৰ নীতি নহয় কিন্তু যেতিয়া ৰাষ্ট্ৰৰ নিৰাপত্তা বক্ষাৰ প্ৰশ্ন উঠে তেতিয়াও যদি দেশৰ কোনো লোকে নিৰবে বহি থাকি aggressor সকলৰ হকে কাম কৰে তেন্তে মই কওঁ যে সেই সকল দেশৰ সুসন্তান নহয়—সেই সকলৰ দেশান্ত্ৰ-বোধ নাই। তেওঁলোকৰ দেশ প্ৰেম, জাতি প্ৰেম, আদি সুগুণ বিলাকৰ অভাব। তেওঁলোক ৰাষ্ট্ৰৰ বিশৃংখলিত ঘটক। আমাৰ ৰাষ্ট্ৰক বহিৰাগত শাস্ত্ৰৰ দ্বাৰা আক্ৰমণৰ সহায় কৰা লোকৰ উদাহৰণ আগৰ ভাৰতৰ ইতিহাসতো বিৰল নহয়। এই ভাৰততে টিপু, বদন আদিয়েও জন্ম গ্ৰহণ কৰিছিল। সকলোঠাইতে কসন্তান সুসন্তান থাকে। কিন্তু এনে এটা ভয়াবহ অবস্থাত সেই কসন্তান বিলাকক আগভাগ দিব নোৱাৰো। সেই কু-অভিসন্ধি কাৰী সকলৰ পৰা আমি সততে সাবধান হ'ব লাগিব। অৱশ্যে সেই বিশৃংখলিত লোকসকলে কেতিয়াও জয় লাভ কৰিব পৰা নাই। আজিও নোৱাৰে। আজি দেশৰ সুসন্তান সকলৰ শৰীৰত এটোপ তেজ থকালৈকে দেশ বক্ষাৰ কাৰণে উঠি পৰি লাগিব। দেশক বিপন্ন অৱস্থাত দেখিও হাত সাবতি থাকি দেশক বিদেশী আক্ৰমণ কাৰীৰ হাতত সমৰ্পণ কৰিব খোজা লোক সকলক আমি প্ৰশ্ন দিব নোৱাৰো। কমিউনিষ্ট সকলে অনা সংশোধনী প্ৰস্তাৱত তেওঁলোকে Reactionary and disruptive force ৰ কথা কৈছে, কিন্তু কোন Disruption forces? আমাৰ ৰাষ্ট্ৰক চীন সকলে আক্ৰমণ কৰি কাটি নিব ধৰিছে, তাক প্ৰতিহত নকৰি নিৰ্বিকাবে বহি থকাটোয়েই হল দেশপ্ৰেমীকৰ কাম। এতিয়া চীনাৰ আমাৰ ৰাষ্ট্ৰ দখল কৰিব দিয়াৰ পিচত আমি মীমাংসা কৰি কি কৰিব পাৰো দেখা যাওক এতিয়াই ৰাইজ সকলৰ মনত আতঙ্কৰ সৃষ্টি হোৱাৰ সকাম নাই। মনে মনে শান্তিৰে বহি থাকক। এনেকৈ কোৱা সকলেই দেশ-প্ৰেমীক ?

মই কওঁ যে ভাৰতৰ হৰ্ষধৰা ঘোৰ অন্যায় যিবিলাকে নিষিদ্ধকাৰে চাই থাকি আক্রমণ কাৰীৰ হকে ওকালতী কৰিব পাৰে সেই সকল দেশদ্রোহী প্ৰতিক্ৰিয়াশীল এই দেশৰ অনু-বস্ত্ৰে আব হাওৱাৰে, এই দেশ মাতকাৰ সহায়ত লাভিত পালিত হৈ এই দেশৰ জাতীয় স্বাধিক জলাঞ্জলী দি দেশপ্ৰেমীকৰ ভূমিকা লৈছে। তেওঁলোক যদি প্ৰকৃততে দেশপ্ৰেমীকেই হ'ল হেতেন তেন্তে এই সংশোধনী প্ৰস্তাৱৰ জৰিয়তে এটা দেশ বকা বাহিনী গঠন কৰি চীনা আক্রমণক প্ৰতি হত কৰিবলৈ চৰকাৰক আহ্বান জনালে হেতেন। মই দুখেৰে জনাওঁ যে চীন ভাবাপন্ন কমিউনিষ্ট সকলে আমাৰ জন সাধাৰণক চীনা আক্রমণৰ সন্মুখলৈ নিষিদ্ধকাৰে আগ বঢ়াই দিছে। আমাৰ জনসাধাৰণক সাৱধান কৰি দিব লাগিব যে এই বিপথ গামীৰ প্ৰবোচনাত যেন ভাৰতৰ সন্তান সকল ভোল নাযায়।

আজি আমি দুশ বছৰে বিদেশী ইংৰাজৰ তাত থাকি আমাৰ morale নষ্ট কৰিছো। গতিকে আমাৰ প্ৰত্যেক সদস্যই দেশৰ জনসাধাৰণক দেশৰক্ষাৰ কাৰণে সকলো বকমে সাজ হবলৈ জগাই তুলিব লাগিব। সেই কাৰণেই মূল প্ৰস্তাৱৰত এই কথা কোৱা হৈছে। তাৰ কাৰণে মই সদস্য সকলক নিবেদন কৰিছো যে সংশোধনী প্ৰস্তাৱ আমাৰ দেশৰ মঙ্গলৰ কাৰণে কমিউনিষ্ট সকলে আনিছে আৰু দেশবাসীক কৰ্তব্যৰ পৰা আতৰাই চীনাৰ ওচৰত সমৰ্পন কৰিবলৈ কৰা হৈছে। ই আমাৰ ঘোৰ অন্যায় কৰিব। ইমান দিনে ইংৰাজৰ লগত যুজি ভাৰতক স্বাধীন কৰা হৈছে নিৰর্থক হ'ব।

গতিকে মই সংশোধনী প্ৰস্তাৱৰ ঘোৰ বিৰোধীতা কৰাৰ লগে লগে তেখেত সকলক জনাওঁ যে দেশৰ মঙ্গলৰ নিমিত্তে এই জাতিৰ মঙ্গলৰ নিমিত্তে এই সংশোধনী উঠাই ২৫ৰ আৰু দেশৰ মঙ্গলৰ কাৰণে সকলোৱে একযোগে কাম কৰক।

ইয়াকে কৈ মই মূল প্ৰস্তাৱত মোৰ অন্তঃকৰণেৰে সমৰ্থন জনাইছোঁ।

অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, মই এই কথাই জানিব খুজিছো— সন্মত সঠিক মূলতে কোন ? এই সন্মত বাদৰ গুৰিতে আজি বহুদিন ধৰি বিৰোধী দল সমূহে অৰিহনা যোগাই আহিছে আৰু এইদৰে মানুহৰ 'মৰেল' নষ্ট কৰিবলৈ প্ৰয়াস কৰিছে আৰু শেষত যেতিয়া বিদেশী ফৌজে সীমান্তত আক্রমণ কৰিছে তেওঁলোকে তেতিয়া "পেনিকি নহবলৈ" দেশক বাহিৰা আক্রমণৰ পৰা ৰোধ কৰিবলৈ সাজু আছে বুলি অভিহিত কৰিছে। আনফালে ইয়াৰ ফলত আজি দেশৰ যি পৰিস্থিতি উদ্ভব হৈছে তাৰ সমাধান কল্পে, তেখেতৰ সংশোধনী প্ৰস্তাৱৰ ভিতৰত কোনা বকমৰ পৰামৰ্শ নাই। অথচ, এই অৱস্থাত, আজি দেশৰ জনসাধাৰণৰ মন জাগ্ৰত কৰি তুলিব লাগিব ইয়াৰ মহান উদ্দেশ্য এই সদনৰ সদস্য সকলৰ পৰ্য্যায়তেই। এই সন্ধিক্ষণত দেশৰ মঙ্গলৰ হকে আৰু আমাৰ কৰ্তব্য হিচাবে আজিৰ এই সদনত মই এই কথাই নিবেদন কৰিব খুজিছো যি বিৰোধী দলৰ প্ৰস্তাৱটো দেশৰ কল্যাণৰ হকে নহয় বৰং ই দেশবাসীৰ ভ্ৰান্ত পথেৰে পৰিচালিত কৰাৰ প্ৰচেষ্টাহে। গতিকে মই তেখেতৰ এই সংশোধনী প্ৰস্তাৱৰ ঘোৰ বিৰোধীতা কৰিছো আৰু লগতে তেখেতক অনৰোধ জনাওঁ যেন দেশৰ মঙ্গল ও দেশবাসীৰ কল্যাণৰ আৰু জাতিৰ মুক্তিৰ হকে তেখেতে, তেখেতৰ সংশোধনী প্ৰস্তাৱটো উঠায় লয়। লগতে মই সদনৰ মাননীয় সদস্য সকলক এই অনুৰোধ জনাওঁ যেন তেখেত সকলে, তেখেত সকলৰ প্ৰত্যাবৰ্ত্তনৰ পিচত নিজ নিজ স্থানত আজিৰ যিবিলাক 'নিচৰাপাটিত' 'ফৰচ' অথবা সমাজ বিৰোধী 'এলিমণ্টচ' আছে সেই বিলাকটো আঙুলিয়াই দি এহাতে সেই বিলাকৰ প্ৰস্তাৱৰ পৰা বিৰত থাকিবলৈ আৰু আনহাতে সেই বিলাকৰ শক্তি ধ্বংস কৰিবলৈ জনসাধাৰণৰ মাজত জাগ্ৰণৰ নৌ তুলিবলৈ পুনৰ অনৰোধ জনাই মোৰ বক্তব্য সাধিবলো।

***Shri HIRALAL PATWARY (Panery):** माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय! आज पहला मौका है कि आप की अध्यक्षता में हमें देश निर्माण की चर्चा करनी चाहिए थी। लेकिन हमें अपने पड़ोसी तथा भाई देश चीन और भारत सीमा-विवाद पर चर्चा करनी पड़ रही है। हमारे लिए मजबूरी है कि हम भारत-चीन के सम्बन्धों पर चर्चा करें। चीन और भारत की सरकार से चुकती ही नहीं बल्कि व्यवहारिक जीवन भी सत्य और अहिंसा के सूत्र में बन्ना हुआ है। आखिर ये बुद्धदेव के अनुयायी देशों की सरकार का यह रूप क्यों? हम पंचशील की महान नीति को मानते हैं। प्रधान मंत्री पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू और चाउएन लाई ने पंचशील पर हस्ताक्षर कर दुनिया को बता दिया है कि विश्व के सभी बड़े छोटे बड़े राष्ट्र एक साथ रह सकते हैं। विश्व के छोटे छोटे राष्ट्रों को इससे बहुत बड़ा बल मिला है।

भारत-चीन का संबंध बहुत पुराना है। फाहियान और ह्वैनशांग का भारत-भ्रमण पुराने संबंध पर प्रकाश डालता है। इतना ही नहीं भगवान बुद्ध के अनुयायी एवं उनके सिद्धान्तों पर दोनों देश विश्वास करते हैं। बुद्धदेव का जन्म भारत में हुआ था। अशोक ने भी चीन जाकर बौद्ध धर्मका प्रचार किया था। इससे उन्होंने भारत-चीन के बन्धुत्व का नाता जोड़ा। इस प्रकार चीन-भारत का संबंध बहुत पुराना है।

हिमालय भारत की आत्मा है। कैलाश-मान-सरोवर और गौरीशंकर की चर्चा भारत के दिन प्रतिदिन की चर्चा में है। माँ दुर्गा का प्रादुर्भाव हिमालय की गोद में हुआ। पार्वती हिमालय की पुत्री के रूप में आई। विष्णु पुराण, ब्रह्मपुराण में इस प्रकार की चर्चा बहुत आई है। महाभारत-काल में पांडव हिमालय को ही अपना वास-स्थान बनाया था।

Mr. SPEAKER: आप प्रस्ताव पर बोलियें।

***Shri HIRALAL PATWARY:** जी हाँ मैं प्रस्ताव पर बोलूंगा। लेकिन उसके पहले मैं भारत-चीन का सम्बन्ध पर प्रकाश डालना चाहता हूँ।

इन्द्र एवं भगवान् शंकर का क्रीड़ा स्थल हिमालय ही है। आदिकवि कालिदास ने अपनी रचनायें "मुद्राराक्षस", "मेघदूत", "शकुन्तला" में हिमालय का वर्णन किया है। भारत के आर्थिक जीवन में नदियों का महत्वपूर्ण स्थान है। वे पवित्र हिमालय की गोद से निकलती हैं।

भारत और चीन की जनता आज नहीं आदिकाल से हिमालय को अपनी सीमा मानती है। गिरिवर हिमालय इन दोनों महान देशों के बीच गम्भीर एवं शांति के प्रतीक के रूप में राजकीय मामलों में दोनों देशों को अलग रखा है। तेनसिंह शेरपा हिमालय के महान शिखर पर भारत का राष्ट्रीय झंडा फहराकर हिमालय को भारत के जनजीवन का अंग बना दिया है।

मान सरोवर, गौरीशंकर भारत के जीवन में समाये है जैसा कि मैंने पहले ही कहा था कि इससे साबित होता है कि हमारी सीमा मान सरोवर है, मानसरोवर के उत्तरी भाग तक हमारी सीमा है। भारत का मुकुट हिमालय है जिसका समावेश हमारे राष्ट्रीय गीत में भी है। हिमालय के अंचल में रहनेवाले लोगों के जीवन को देखा

जाय तो धार्मिक तथा सांस्कृतिक जीवन की पहचान है। यदि हम धार्मिक और सामाजिक जीवन की चर्चा करें तो बहुत समय लग जायेगा। समय सीमित है। अन्य बातों में न जाकर हमें यह सोचना चाहिये कि भारत और चीन का इतना निकट संबंध होने पर भी यह हालत क्यों? जहाँतक दोस्ती का सवाल है हमने उदारता के काम लेने सीखा है। तिब्बत की राजधानी लासामे भारतीय डाक-तार-विभाग कार्य करता रहा। घसी ४५ वर्ष पहले वहाँ की सरकार को सौंपा दिया गया। यह हमारे मित्र का प्रतीक है, और पंचशील का सिद्धान्त राष्ट्रसंघ में हम चीन को सदस्य के रूप में देखना चाहते हैं जिसके लिए हमारा देश भारत काफी प्रयत्नशील है।

Shri HARINARAYAN BORUAH (Teok) : माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, चीन-भारत सीमा समस्याएँ आज एक सफ़ाई के लिए कठिन हैं। यह समस्याएँ उभरती हैं कि रूप धारण करेगी। ताक आज कोरा टोन। आसि आशा करो। यह समस्याएँ खुब खूब भारे आर। बहुरूपपूर्ण हिचापे समाधान हव आर। चीन-भारत बहुरूप चिन्कालर कारिणे अटुट थकिव। यह बहुरूप अकुनु बाधिबव कारिणे। भारत प्रधान मन्त्री श्रीजरहबलाल नेहरूरे आप्रान चेष्टा करिछे।

भारत के ये पक्षशील नीति से ही नीति के मर्यादा रक्षा करिबव कारिणे आज भारत के सकलो व्यवस्था शांतिपूर्ण भारे पालन करिछे। भारत के यह पक्षशील नीति के प्रतिमान है प्रत्येक बाईस चिन्कित आवहक है। चीन देश के से ही पक्षशील नीति मानिले भारत के लगत चुक्ति स्थापित करिछे। आज ही ठाते चीने से ही चुक्ति भङ करि पक्षशील नीति त्याग करिछे आर। भारत के सीमा अतिक्रम करि भारत के एका समस्या के माझले ठेलि दिछे। आज भारत के अवस्था दुई नारत दुई भवि है। एकाले पक्षशील नीति आर आनकाले चीन के भारत आक्रमण। यह आक्रमण शब्दको लैये आमार माझत विवाद के सृष्टि है। यह कठिने चीने भारत के सीमा आक्रमण करिछे। यह सीमा विवाद आमार पक्षीयत के तिरिक के माझत होरा। सीमा विवाद के निचिना बुलि धरि लले तुल हव।

एक ही सीमा-समस्या के बुलिये कठक वा aggression or non-aggression के बुलिये कठक ये शब्दके प्रयोग नकरक एक ही ठिक कथा ये चीन सैन्य आमार सीमा के तिरत थका लांज अधिकार करि बहिछे। गतिके चीन के आसि aggressor बुलिकोरात कि आपत्ति थकिव पावे? एने अवस्थाको यदि तेङ्लोक के कर, एक ही सीमा सम-लीर के कथा एक ही निते तेङ्लोक के सकल के लगत आमार मत के पाथक्य है। आसि एकैधन करव मानुह हिचावे कोरा उचित हव ये चीने आमार माटि दखल करिछे। आमार बाडी के तिरत आसि तेङ्लोक सोमालहि। यदि बाडी के ही चीने दखल करि लैछे तेसे एकै करवते थका लवा-छोरालीये बेलेगे बेलेगे करे कर खनर समुहीया दानीकोर जोर कमि याव। से ही बावे ही आसि करवले चेष्टा करिछे ये देश के मानुह आसि, कोरा उचित हव ये भाईसकल चीने आमार सीमा के तिरत नहय बाडी के तिरत सोमालहि। चीने आमार आक्रमण करिछे। तेमालोक माझ होरा। मन के बल आर जाती के शक्ति केन्द्रीकृत कर। आनहाते याते दुरोजन, प्रधान मन्त्री के तिरत एका निष्पत्ति है याय तेसे जाती के मङ्गल यदि नहय तेसे देश के मानुह के माझ करिब नागिब, आक्रमण करीब पवा देश रक्षा करिबले। अध्यक्ष महोदय, विरोधी दल के कथा विलाक देखि यह आर आचरित है। यह सदन के पाकिस्थाने येतिमा टकेरथाम अधिकार करिछिल तेतिमा विरोधी दल के सदस्य सकले के छिल

গতৰ্ভাষ্যেণে কি কৰিছে, জৱহৰলালে আজি হাত সাৱতি বহি আছে। পাকিস্থানে টুকেবথাম আক্ৰমণ কৰিলে, পাখবীয়া বিজাৰ্ড দখল কৰিলে ইত্যাদি কত কথা; কি আজি যেতিয়া চীনে আহি আমাৰ দেশৰ ভিতৰত সোমালহি তেতিয়া তেওঁলোকেই কয় এইটো সাৰাৰণ কথা। মাত্ৰ সীমাৰহে বিবাদ। ইয়াৰ তাৎপৰ্য্য কি আমি বুজিবলৈ বৰ টান পাইছো।

Shri GAURISHANKAR BHATTACHARYYA (Gauhati): On a point of order Sir, I am afraid my friend due to his non-availability of the speeches delivered at that time is saying opposite to what was said on the floor of this House. I have got a certified copy of what was spoken of the Communists. It is said: "We should see that the situation is solved not by return of guns but by discussion round the table in a civilised way and for doing that it is most important at this stage to create a condition and an atmosphere whreby the proposed meeting of the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan may be successful. That is what was said with regard to Pakistan also.

Shri HARINARAYAN BARUAH (Teok): পাকিস্থানে যেতিয়া টুকেবথাম অধিকাৰ কৰে, আৰু পাখবীয়া বিজাৰ্ড আক্ৰমণ কৰে তেতিয়া জৱহৰলাল নেহৰুৱে একো ব্যৱস্থা কৰা নাছিল বুলি তেওঁলোকে কৈছিল। আজি আক্ৰমণ প্ৰতিৰোধ কৰিবলৈ ব্যৱস্থা কৰোতে জৱহৰলাল অপৰাধী হন। বিৰোধী সদস্যই কৈছে, যে চীনে এতিয়াও আক্ৰমণ কৰা নাই আক্ৰমণ কৰিলে আমিও প্ৰতিৰোধ কৰিম। এই কথা শুনি আমি সন্তোষ পাইছো। কিন্তু এই কথাটোতো আমাৰ মন পৰিস্কাৰ হোৱা নাই। কাৰণ এই কথা বিলাক শুনিগৈ আগৰ কথা বিলাক আমাৰ মনলৈ আহে।

১৯৪২ চনত যেতিয়া ভাৰত বাসীয়ে স্বাধীনতা আন্দোলন চলাইছিল হাজাৰ হাজাৰ মানুহ জেলত আবদ্ধ হৈছিল, কাঁচি কাঠত প্ৰাণ দিছিল তেতিয়া কমিউনিষ্ট পাৰ্টিয়ে কৈছিল যে এই খন জনবুদ্ধ, সেই কাৰণেই সন্দেহ হয় আকৌ এই সময়তো বা কমিউনিষ্ট পাৰ্টিৰ উদ্দেশ্য কি? বিশ্বাস হয় দেশৰ মানুহক ভুলপথত পৰিচালিত কৰিবৰ কাৰণে তেওঁবিলাকে নতুন ব্যাখ্যাৰ অবতাৰণা কৰিছে।

মই আমাৰ কমিউনিষ্ট সকলক স্পষ্টকৈ কব বিছাৰো যে নগাওঁৰ উপ-নিৰ্বাচনত জিকাৰ মূলত চীনা আক্ৰমণ এটা issue নাছিল। নগাওঁ উপ-নিৰ্বাচনত কমিউনিষ্ট সকলে জয়লাভ কৰাৰ মূলত অন্যান্য কাৰণহে আছিল। নগাওঁ উপ-নিৰ্বাচনত জিকাত আমাৰ নগাওঁ বাসীয়ে চীনাই আমাৰ দেশ আক্ৰমণ কৰাৰ সমৰ্থন জনোৱাৰ প্ৰশ্ন নুঠে। যি দেশৰ মানুহে প্ৰাণ দিও ইংৰাজৰ হাতৰ পৰা দেশখন উদ্ধাৰ কৰিছে সেই দেশৰ লোকে তেওঁলোকৰ দেশ চীনাৰ অধিকাৰত দিয়াত মান্তি হবলৈ প্ৰস্তুত কেতিয়াও নহয়। ভাৰতীয় জাতিৰ বিৰুদ্ধে, দেশৰ বিৰুদ্ধে কাম কৰাৰ পৰা আমাৰ কমিউনিষ্ট সকল বিৰত থাকক। সেই কাৰণে মই আমাৰ কমিউনিষ্ট সকলক আমাৰ সীমান্তৰ বিষয়ে সময় থাকোতেই এটা সুস্পষ্ট পথ বাচি লবলৈ আহবান জনাওঁ। দেশদ্রোহীতা কৰাটো তেওঁবিলাকৰ উচিত নহব।

অধ্যক্ষ মহোদয়, মই এই কথা কোৱাৰ উদ্দেশ্য হৈছে যে ভুল ব্যাখ্যাৰ দ্বাৰা দেশৰ অনিষ্ট হব পাৰে। দেশৰ মানুহৰ মনোবল তৈয়াৰ কৰিবলৈ হলে পৰিস্কাৰ ব্যাখ্যা দিয়াই উচিত হব।

আজি কোনোবাই চীনা আক্ৰমণক আওকান কৰি শাস্তিপূৰ্ণ ভাৱে প্ৰহেলিকা চাই সংশোধনী প্ৰস্তাৱৰ আৰত থাকি নিজৰ গা দৰ্ভাৰাৰ কাৰণে উঠিপৰি লাগিব পাৰে কিন্তু মই তেওঁলোকক আহবান কৰিছো যে, আমাৰ দেশৰ সীমান্ত চীনা বাসীয়ে আক্ৰমণ

কৰাৰ issue লৈ বাইজক সোধক যে বাইজে, গভৰ্ণমেণ্টৰ প্ৰস্তাব সমৰ্থন কৰেনে তেওঁলোকৰ চীনা আক্ৰমণ সমৰ্থন কৰিবলৈ যো-যা কৰি অন্যসংশোধনীপ্ৰস্তাব সমৰ্থন কৰে। কিন্তু মই জোৰেৰে কওঁ যে আজি আমাৰ জনসাধাৰণ সজাগ, তেওঁলোকে কমিউনিষ্টৰ চান নিশ্বয় বুজিব।

সেই কাৰণে মই অনুৰোধ কৰো যে আমাৰ প্ৰধান মন্ত্ৰীয়ে যি issue লৈছে সেইটোৰ সকলোখিনি তেওঁলোকে সমৰ্থন কৰি সংশোধনী প্ৰস্তাব উঠাই লওক।

Shri RAM NATH DAS [Dergaon (Reserved for Scheduled Castes.)]: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the amendment moved by my hon. friend Shri Bora and also to support the resolution moved by my friend Shri Mohi Kanta Das.

I cannot but oppose the amendment moved by Shri Phoni Bora because if this amendment is accepted then we would differ fundamentally with the main issue proposed in the resolution moved by Shri Mohi Kanta Das. Sir, in the amendment moved by our friend Shri Bora he has not touched the fundamental point on which our Prime Minister has taken his stand to negotiate and decide that dispute in connection with the border areas. He has taken a definite stand on the offer made by the Premier of China. Our Prime Minister is willing to negotiate for a peaceful settlement of the border dispute on condition that the Chinese should first vacate the occupied territories of India. Now in the resolution moved by my friend Shri Mohi Kanta Das he wants that this Assembly should give approval to the stand taken by the Prime Minister of India. What is that stand, Sir? Our Prime Minister decided that the occupation of Indian territory particularly of Longju in Assam should be vacated before negotiations with the Chinese Government can be resumed for settlement of any border dispute.

This is the pre-condition imposed by our Prime Minister for carrying on any negotiation for settlement of any border dispute. In the amendment moved by our friend Shri Bora he has supported the stand taken by our Prime Minister regarding his willingness to settle the disputes. But he has not said anything about the condition that has been imposed by our Prime Minister. Therefore, if we accept his amendment, then it will nullify the main point on which our Prime Minister has given his attention and emphasis.

Secondly, in the amendment moved by Shri Bora, he has not said anywhere the occupation of Longju or any other parts of India by the Chinese Government is an aggressive act or an aggression. In the last part of his amendment he has stated that we should be ready to resist any aggression made by China into our territory. But he has not termed the act of the Chinese Government in occupation of Longju and other Indian territories as aggressive one. This is another vital difference between his amendment and the resolution tabled by our friend Shri Das. In moving the amendment Shri Bora at the outset has said that there was no national emergency for which there should be any sentimental discussion or anything which rouses the sentiments in the minds of the people of our country. Sir, I am afraid I do not know what will be that act or what will be that situation which he can describe as a national crisis and not the present one? In the present border dispute in Ladakh 9 people of our army were killed and 10 captured by the Chinese, and many areas including Longju have been occupied without provocation. Have not all of these created a national

crisis in India? Is there any situation in Shri Bora's mind which only can be described as national crisis except this when the Chinese army has occupied our territories without any provocation? China and India were friends for thousand of years. China and India have cordial relations. India, has taken the initiative to include China as a member of the United Nations Organisation. India has not ceased that attempt. Despite all these friendly and cordial relations, China or the Chinese Government invaded our territory without any rhyme or reason. If such an action on part of the Chinese Government cannot be termed as an aggressive one, then what action of the Chinese Government could be termed as such? I do not know why Shri Bora being a citizen of India and being a son of Independent India should not describe in his amendment the occupation of Longju or any part of India as aggressive act. Why has he not stated that the Chinese have occupied Indian territories including Longju forcibly and as such they should vacate these areas before any negotiations can be made with them? In not doing this he has indirectly supported the stand taken by the Prime Minister of China. What the Prime Minister of China has said or what was the offer made by the Prime Minister of China to the Prime Minister of India about the settlement of the border dispute? The Prime Minister of China has said that before any negotiation can be started, there should a demilitarized zone to the extent of 12½ miles from the McMohon line (*Voice*—No, from the present position). All right, a certain portion of South of the MacMahon Line has to be demilitarized. What is meant by it? Why does the Chinese Prime Minister want this? He wants to take advantage and occupy some more areas over and above the areas already occupied. Therefore our Prime Minister has taken, the very right stand that before any negotiation is started, the Chinese Government should vacate the occupied area, mainly Longju. Therefore, Sir, I oppose the Amendment moved by my friend Mr. Bora.

In supporting the Resolution moved by my friend Shri Das I have got nothing to add to what the mover of the Resolution has stated at length. What the Resolution wants? It wants to express that we feel strongly against the action of the Chinese in their occupation of our territory, mainly Longju, which is a part of Assam. Secondly, by this Resolution the mover wants to express our deep concern for the gradual deterioration of the friendly feeling that existed between China and India. Now, who is at fault for this gradual deterioration of that friendly feeling? The fault lies definitely not with India but it lies with China. For the trouble in the border cannot be attributed to anything done by the Government of India. If anything wrong was done leading to the present state of strained relationship between these two countries, it was done by China. We regret very much for this and, therefore, we want to record our resentment against the action taken by the Chinese Government in occupying some parts of India, particularly, Longju by force. Thirdly, Sir, by this Resolution we want to give our full support to the stand taken by our Prime Minister, the stand that he is prepared and ready for settlement of any dispute provided the Chinese Government withdraw from the occupied territories immediately. We, Sir, as the representatives of the people of Assam should give our full support to the stand taken by the Prime Minister. And then in the last paragraph, the mover seeks to draw attention of people to the emergency which is now looming large in the Indian horizon, and mainly that of our strategic State and appealed to them to unite to meet that emergency.

With this paragraph of the resolution, the mover wants to draw the attention of the people of the State,—because ours is the nearest State to the eastern border. Because if as a result of refusal to vacate Longju or for any other Chinese action, actually war breaks out then ours is the State which will be immediately affected. The emphasis is the importance of unity amongst all at this critical juncture. Because in unity lies the strength of the nation to resist aggression. Then the resolution lays emphasis on the fact that our people should be careful not to get alarmed at the spread of any rumour created by any group or any element against the stand taken by our Prime Minister. There are many incidents created by subversive elements which have been enumerated by Mr. Das that have taken place at Tezpur. (the bell rang). Sir, I do not want to enumerate these incidents here as there is no time for me.

Last of all, I would like to say once again, that I oppose the Amendment moved by my friend Shri Bora and support the resolution moved by Shri Das. With these few words, I now resume my seat.

***Shri BISHWANATH UPADHYAYA (Patharkandi) :**

माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय ! हमारे मित्र श्रीमहीकान्तजी दास ने जो प्रस्ताव सदन की सेवा में उपस्थित किया है उसके समर्थन में दो-चार शब्द बोलने के लिए मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ। हमारी पार्टी के Deputy Leader साहब ने स्पष्ट शब्दों में इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन किया है जिस देखकर हमारे कई मित्र यह आरोप कर रहे हैं कि हमारी पार्टी कांग्रेस के साथ हाथ मिला रहे हैं। आप को मालूम है कि इस दिशा में हमारी पार्टी में अपनी संघ नीति की घोषणा की है। यह किसी पार्टी या किसी गट का प्रश्न नहीं है। यह राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न है। यह बात गलत बात है कि हम कांग्रेस के साथ हाथ मिला रहे हैं। इसमें किसी के साथ हाथ मिलाने का प्रश्न उठ ही नहीं सकता। यह राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न है। इसमें सब को एक होना चाहिये और साथ मिलकर इस जटिल प्रश्न का समाधान करना चाहिये।

यह हमारे लिए बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण समय है। यह अफसोस की बात है कि चीनियों ने हमारे राष्ट्र के ४० हजार वर्ग मील इलाके पर अपना कब्जा कर लिया है। इस संबन्ध में पार्टी और हमारे नेता बार बार हमारे धानमंत्री पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू की दृष्टि का आकर्षण कर रहे हैं। हमें अफसोस है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्रीजी ने हमें इस संबन्ध में अधिकार में रखा है। फिर भी आज हमारी एकता की आवश्यकता है। एकता के बिना हम इस संकटपूर्ण समस्या का समाधान नहीं कर सकेंगे।

इस संबन्ध में रूस की क्रांति के समय का उदाहरण आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। सन १९१४ में रूस में भिन्न भिन्न दल थे। आपस में उनमें वाद मनुमुटाव था। लेकिन जब क्रांति शुरू हुई तब आगस्ट महीने के आखिर और जुलाई महीने के अन्त में ही सभी भिन्न भिन्न दल मिलकर एकता के सूत्र में बंध गए। सभी मिलकर अपने राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न के समाधान करने के लिए जुट पड़े—इसका उदाहरण मैं आप की सेवा में रखना चाहता हूँ।

“In Petrograd the workers were out on strike again and demonstrating against the Government. The Duma was involved in a series of angry brawls against the Tsarist Ministers. Inside the Okhrana and the revolutionary parties of the same futile intrigues continued as venomously as ever. The aristocracy had meandered into a listless ennui where nothing mattered, where gossip spent itself in an aimless inflation of little things, and even the excitement of mysticism as a substitute for religion was growing dim.”

Mr. SPEAKER: What are you reading ?

***Shri BISWANATH UPADHYAYA (Patharkandi):** I am reading from a book "The Russian Revolution" by Alan Moorehead.

Mr. SPEAKER: Confine your discussion to this country alone.

***Shri BISWANATH UPADHYAYA:** Sir, I am just giving an example.

"Then on August 1, when war did come, this dismal atmosphere abruptly evaporated. Suddenly everyone discovers that he is possessed with an intense hatred of the Germans and a new emotional love for Russia and the Tsar. The workers abandon their strikes at once, and their demonstrations now are all in favour of the Government. The national flag comes out on the streets, and the churches are filled with vast congregations who can think of nothing but self-sacrifice and victory. This is no phenomenon confined to Petrograd. All over Russia the peasants and the workers respond willingly to the first army call-up; something over ninety per cent answer the summons, and the young sons of the nobility rush to take up their commissions in the army. On Saturday August 2, Nicholas publicly takes the same oath that Alexander I had taken at the time of Napoleon's invasions; he swears that he will not make peace until the last foreign soldier has been expelled from Russian soil. According to Bernard Pares, "The vast multitude fell upon their knees and sang 'God Save the Tsar' as it had never been sung before."

Mr. SPEAKER: Give the gist; you cannot read the book.

***Shri BISWANATH UPADHYAYA:** All right Sir. हमारा मतलब यह है कि हमें इस प्रश्नपर अच्छी तरह सोचना चाहिये। रूस में उस वक्त एक हफ्ता पहले भी किसी भी दल में एकता नहीं थी। लेकिन जब एक विकट राष्ट्रीय समस्या उनके सामने आई तो वहाँ उन सब दलों के अन्दर एकता आ गई। युद्ध के आते ही रूस के विभिन्न दलों में एकता स्थापित हो गई। इस समय भी हमारे बीच एकता चाहिये। यह राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न है। यह देश का सवाल है। हमें एकतावद्ध होकर इस प्रश्न का समाधान करना चाहिये। इसलिए मैं सब लोगों तथा सभी पार्टियों से अपील करता हूँ कि हम सभी मिलकर इस संकट का सामना करना चाहिये। हम सबको इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करना चाहिये।

इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करने के साथ साथ हम अपने प्रधान मंत्री श्रीजवाहरलाल नेहरू जी की कारवाइयों का हार्दिक समर्थन करते हैं। लेकिन साथ ही मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रश्नपर बार बार उनका दृष्टिगोचर करनेपर भी उन्होंने देश को अधिकार में रखा। चीन हमारी सीमा का लंघन करता रहा। कई सालों से उनकी हरकतें चलती रहीं। किंतु जब चीनी प्रधान मंत्री हमारे यहाँ आये तो हमने हिन्दी-चीनी भाई-भाई के नारे से आसमान को बुलन्द किया। चीन प्रगति के पदपर अग्रसर होता रहा। देश की सर्वांगिन प्रगति के लिए उन्हें समय मिला कि वह मैप (Map) जो गलत था उसे सुधारने के लिए उन्हें समय नहीं मिला। चीन हमारे साथ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाता रहा। किन्तु वह Map जो कि उन्हीं के अनुसार पुराने जमाने का है साम्राज्य शाही जमाने का है बदलने के लिये उन्हें समय नहीं मिला। क्या यह बात सत्य हो सकती है? क्या यह चीन की साम्राज्य-लिप्सा का ही परिचायक है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय हम चीन के आक्रमण का घोर विरोध करते हैं। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं श्रीदासजी के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

*Speech not corrected.

Shri BIMALA PRASAD CHALIHA (Chief Minister): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think there are many speakers who would like to participate in this debate and it is above 4 now. To-morrow we do not have much business as most of the businesses meant for tomorrow were disposed of on the 8th. So I would suggest that the debate may continue for tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER : Yes, the debate will continue till tomorrow.

Shri DEVENDRA NATH HAZARIKA (Saikhowa): Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution moved by Shri Mohi Kanta Das and oppose the amendment moved by Shri Phani Bora. In supporting the resolution and opposing the amendment I would like to place before the House that there is a fundamental difference between these two. In the resolution it has been stated that there is an unprovoked Chinese aggression on Indian soil whereas in the amendment this has been minimised by saying that there is only some border disputes. We know that a part of our territory, for example Longju, has been occupied by Chinese military force. If we term this as a border dispute then we will have to accept that Longju is not within India or in a place where both of us have got no claim

Sir, you know that this N. E. F. A. (the North-East Frontier Agency) is divided in four or five divisions. Longju is situated in Kameng Division and this Division is in N. E. F. A. and as part and parcel of Assam. There cannot be any dispute that Kameng Division or that Longju is within the territory of India.

ADJOURNMENT

The Assembly was then adjourned till 9 A. M. on Friday, the 11th December, 1959.

R. N. BARUA,
Secretary, Assam
Legislative Assembly.