

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The House will now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill. The question is :

“That clause 2 stand part of the Bill”

The motion was adopted

Clause 2 was added to the Bill

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The question is :

“That Clause 1, The Enacting Formula and the Long Title Stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adspctd

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill

SHRI SHIVRAJ PATIL : I beg to move :

“That the Bill be Passed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The question is :

“That the Bill be passed”

The motion was adopted

15.27 hr.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE :
DISAPPROVAL OF ARMS (AMEND-
MENT) ORDINANCE, 1988

AND

ARMS (AMENDMENT) BILL

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The House will now take up items 12 and 13 together. Now, Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura) : I beg to move the following Resolution :

“That this House disapproves of the Arms (Amendment) Ordinance, 1988 (Ordinance No. 5 of 1988)

promulgated by the President on the 27th May 1988.”

Sir, actually this Government has passed 36 ordinances in its lifetime, six in the last session. The interesting thing is that the last budget session ended on the 13th of May and this ordinance was issued on the 27th of May. Why was this ordinance passed? It was reported that the terrorists and anti-national elements, particularly in Punjab, have, in the recent past, acquired automatic fire-arms, rockets and rocket-launchers and other sophisticated weapons and ammunition. Is it between the 16th and 27th they understood that the ammunition, automatic weapons, etc., have been collected? If not, why wasn't this thing brought forward in the budget session itself? Why was there an ordinance?

Sir, everybody know in Punjab that automatic weapons were being used by the terrorists for a very very long time. Therefore, it is the habit with the Government to go on with ordinances. This could have been easily by a normal Bill. I may come on Monday but probably, I will not be there. Therefore, Mr. Indrajit Gupta will continue on my behalf because his name is also there. Regarding the ordinance, I challenge and I say that there is no necessity for this Ordinance. This could have been a law much before and could have been given much better opportunity to use this law, if they want to use, against the terrorist activities about which I want to say many more things. It is already 3.30 P.M. I would finish with these words now.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You may continue on Monday. Now we will pass on to the next item.

15.31 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEM-
BERS BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

[Translation]

Fifty-Fourth Report

SHRI CHANDRA KISHORE PATHAK (Saharsa) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I big to move :

"That this House do agree with the Fifty-fourth Report of the Committee on Private Member; Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 3rd August, 1988".

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The question is :

"That this House do agree with the Fifty-fourth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 3rd August, 1988."

The motion was adopted

15.32 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE : CENTRE-STATE
RELATIONS—*Condt.*

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now we will take up further discussion on the following Resolution moved by Shri H.M. Patel on the 18th March, 1988 :

"This House express its deep concern over the present Centre-State relations and demands their early restructuring so that federalism underlying our Constitution is made more meaningful."

We have only 26 minutes more.

DR. G.S. RAJHANS (Jhanjhapur) : There should not be any extension because in any case we are going to discuss Sarkaria Commission's Report. Let us finish it within 26 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : So many Members have given their names to participate. The Minister's intervention is there and the Mover's has to reply. I do not think that it will be over within 26 minutes.

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI (Adilabad): Kindly extend the time. We have no objection over it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Then, is it the pleasure of the House that we extend the time for this Resolution by one hour ?

MANY HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : All right. Mr. Amar Roypradhan.

SHRI AMAR ROYPRADHAN (Cooch Behar) : Sir, before I deal with that of Governor's role with, particular reference to Nagaland wherein rape on Constitution is going on, I would like to start with the three language formula where I had to be stopped in the last session. It is the idea of the three language formula that both southern and eastern Indian States will learn Hindi as one of the three languages compulsorily and on the other hand, the North Indian States will read one of the Southern languages, either Tamil or Telugu or Malayalam or Kannadam. But I am sorry to say that there is only State, *i.e.*, Haryana which started Telugu as the third language.

They started with Telugu as the third language, but after one or two years, they stopped it. There are so many States in the North India where Hindi is the first language, second language as also the third language. I would not like to mention the names of those States.

The main concept of the three-language formula is to create an atmosphere by which as required under Article 351 of the Constitution, we are able to develop Hindi, that is, Hindustani in the entire country for our national interest and national integration. What does the Sarkaria Commission report say at page 526 :

"The Expression Hindusthani has not been defined in the Constitution or in General Clauses Act. But in popular sense it means the language spoken by a very majority of the people. Interestingly, this simple and popular language also advocated by Mahatma Gandhi and experimented in Azad Hind Government by Netaji Subhash Chander Bose, is quite rich in its vocabulary because it has assimilated words from other Indian languages like English, French, Portuguese, Persian and Arabic after making necessary adoptions".