

23

NORTH-EASTERN HILL UNIVERSITY
BILL - Contd

MR SPEAKER The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Prof S Nurul Hasan on the 7th May, 1973, namely -

"That the Bill to establish and incorporate a teaching and affiliating University for the hill areas of the North-Eastern region, be taken into consideration"

The time left for this Bill is only 55 minutes, and so, we shall have to pass this Bill today. Shri M C Daga may now continue his speech

श्री मूलचन्द्र डागा (पार्ली) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल मैं क्लॉज 4 की तरफ शिक्षा मंत्री का ध्यान दिला रहा था जिममे कहा गया है —

"The objects of the University shall be to disseminate and advance knowledge by providing instructional and research facilities in such branches of learning as it may deem fit, to pay special attention to the improvement of the social and economic conditions and welfare of the people of the hill areas "

मैं यह बात समझ नहीं पाया हू कि एक यूनिवर्सिटी का यह लक्ष्य कैसे हाँ गया कि वह हिल एरियाज के लोगों की मोशन और टेक्नोलॉजिकल कन्डीशन्स को सुधारने की तरफ ध्यान देगी। यह फकशन और यह स्टूडी तो बैनफेयर स्टेट की है। इसका यनिवर्सिटी पर क्यों टाला जा रहा है? मेरे ख्याल में किसी यनिवर्सिटी का यह आबजेक्ट नहीं हो सकता है। हमारे यहाँ जितने भी यूनिवर्सिटी के एक्ट्स बने हुए हैं, उनमें वही भी यह प्राविजन नहीं होगा कि उसका एक लक्ष्य उस एरिया के लोगों की सोशल और इकोनॉमिक कन्डीशन्स को इम्प्रूव करना है।

इस बिल में क्लॉज 8 में कहा गया है .

"The Visitor shall have such powers as may be prescribed by the statutes"

लेविन क्लॉज 25 में कहा गया है

"The Executive Council may, from time to time, make new or additional statutes or may amend or repeal the statutes referred to in sub-section (1)"

यूनिवर्सिटी व विजिटर का राष्ट्रपति होगा। इस बिल के मुताबिक उनका पावरज को एक्सीक्यूटिव कौंसिल कर देगा। इस का मतलब यह है कि इस बिल के द्वारा राष्ट्रपति की तुलना में एक्सीक्यूटिव कौंसिल को ऊँचा दर्जा दिया जा रहा है। मेरे ख्याल में यह अच्छा नहीं लगेगा और कास्टीट्यूशनली भी यह बात ठीक नहीं है और यह नहीं होना चाहिए।

इस बिल में रूल-मेकिंग पावर के बारे में कोई क्लॉज नहीं है। यह नहीं हो सकता है कि किसी बिल में रूल-मेकिंग पावर की व्यवस्था न हो। सब बिलों में यह व्यवस्था जरूर हाती है। रूल-मेकिंग पावर के बारे में कहा गया है

"The general principles on which the rule-making power is based are that the rules and regulations should be laid before Parliament"

इस बिल में क्लॉज 25 में लिखा है "एज में वी प्रैक्टाइब्ड", लेकिन इसमें कोई क्लॉज नहीं है, जिममें रूल-मेकिंग पावर की व्यवस्था हो। किसी भी वानून के अर्धीन जो रूल और रेगुलेशन्स बनाए जाते हैं व सदन के मामने रखे जाते हैं। यह बहुत जरूरी है। जिनका भी वानून में एग्जिप्ट किये गये हैं, उनमें रूल-मेकिंग पावर के बारे में क्लॉज रखे गये हैं। लेकिन इस बिल में ऐसा कोई क्लॉज नहीं है। तो फिर इस सम्बन्ध में जो रूल और रेगुलेशन्स बनेंगे, उनको कौन एग्जामिन करेगा?

मन्त्री महोदय ने कहा है कि यह बहुत अच्छा बिल बनाया गया है। लेकिन इसमें यह नहीं बताया गया है कि एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन

[श्री मूलचन्द डागा]

में स्टूडेंट्स का पार्टिसिपेशन क्या होगा। इस सम्बन्ध में कोटी की रिपोर्ट में साफ कहा गया है :

“One of the important terms of reference of the Committee relates to the question of participation of students in the administration of the university, both in academic and non-academic matters. We have earlier stated that in our view the participation of students in the academic life and affairs of the university is an essential part of the functioning of the university and the concept of university autonomy has been discussed in a previous chapter.”

लेकिन इस कानून के मुताबिक जो एकाडेमिक कांसिल, एक्सीक्यूटिव कांसिल और दूसरी संस्थायें बनेगी, उनमें स्टूडेंट्स का कोई पार्टिसिपेशन नहीं होगा। मंत्री महोदय अपने भाषणों में भी कहते हैं कि स्टूडेंट्स का पार्टिसिपेशन जरूरी है। लेकिन इस बिल में कहीं कोई क्लॉज नहीं है कि एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में स्टूडेंट्स किस तरह पार्टिसिपेट करेंगे।

इस बिल की हर एक क्लॉज में गलतियां हैं और इस बिल के विभिन्न प्राविजन्ज की डीप स्टडी होनी चाहिए। मैं फिर कहता हूँ कि इस बिल को जायंट कमेटी द्वारा विचार करने के बाद इस सदन में लाया जाये।

आप ने कहा कि --

“Any dispute arising out of any disciplinary action taken by the University against a student shall, at the request of such student, be referred to a Tribunal...”

You have not defined a tribunal. What is the tribunal?

कोई डेफिनीशन नहीं दी है। आपने ट्रिब्यूनल डिफाइन नहीं किया है। ट्रिब्यूनल की कौन क्रियेट करेगा? आई डू नाट से— वह आपने कह दिया कि ए मैन विल बी नामिनेटेड। लेकिन वह स्टूडेंट कब तक

अपनी अपील कर सकता है? देयर शुड बी ए लिमिटेशन दु दिस। अगर किसी स्टूडेंट को कोई ग्रीवांस है तो फिर जो लेजिस्लेशन में सबसे बड़ी कमी मालूम हुई वह यह :

Within a certain period, either two months or three months or 15 days; no time limit has been mentioned.

Cl. 32: “Every employee or student of the University or of a College... not withstanding anything contained in this Act have a right to appeal...”

फिर जो लेजिस्लेशन में सबसे बड़ी कमी मुझे मालूम हुई वह यह कि लेजिस्लेटिव वाले जो हैं, लीगल डिपार्टमेंट वालों को साथ बैठाना चाहिए, एजूकेशन डिपार्टमेंट ने इसको बनाया है तो उन्होंने बहुत गलती की है।

They have not taken the help or assistance from the legal department.

कुछ चीजें तो प्रैस्क्राइब होती हैं, वह आप कर दीजिए। लेकिन क्या आप पालिसी मैटर भी उन पर छोड़ देते हैं?

There is no mention. They can appeal as prescribed.

तो आप एग्जीक्यूटिव एजेंसीज को, एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को इतनी पावर देना चाहते हैं। आप देखिए :

“Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, have a right to appeal, within such time as may be prescribed...”

मैंने कोई ऐक्ट ऐसा नहीं देखा।

Either say 30 days

30 डेज के बाद कहिए कि इन दिस फार्म ऐज प्रैस्क्राइब्ड, कि आप एक कामज पर लिखेंगे, यह लिखेंगे, यह इस तरह से होगा। लेकिन यह आपने उनको ऐसे ही दे दिया। दैट मीन्स अपने पालिसी मैटर में भी --

We have given powers to these executive agencies

और लेजिस्लेशन पर अगर एग्जीक्यूटिव एजेंसी हावी हो जाएगी तब तो यह लेजिस्लेशन बनाता ठीक है कि हम सारा ही इस तरह दे दें कि ऐज में भी प्रैस्क्राइब्ड।

By these two or three words, you can give powers to the executive agencies

फिर क्लॉज 38 देखिए : "No suit or legal proceeding shall lie against any officer or employee"

जो रिप्रेजेंटेटिव हो कर आए है यूनिवर्सिटीज मे उनके खिलाफ मुकदमा बन सकता है ? What will happen to those universities? What will happen to the executive council ?

You are defending any employe, officer, but what about those persons, those councils ? When you say "No suit or legal proceeding shall lie against any officer or employe of the University.

Because you have defined university.

तो यह तो आपका क्लॉज 38 है, 38 के अंदर भी आपको मालूम नहीं है कि आप प्रोसीडिंस किन के खिलाफ ला सकते हैं ?

इस के बाद में इस ऐक्ट के अन्दर एक बात आप को बताऊं, मैंने कल भी कहा था —

Then, what will be the procedure for the Visitor ? He will appoint a Vice-Chancellor; he will appoint a pro-vice-chancellor and

उसके लिए कोई गाइडलाइन नहीं है । आज भी इस बात का झगड़ा है कि आप किसी को वाइस चांसलर नियुक्त करना चाहें या टीचर के लिए एग्जीक्यूटिव कौंसिल को क्या गाइड लाइन है ? देयर इज नो गाइड लाइन । जब कोई गाइडलाइन नहीं है तो मैंने जो रिपोर्ट पढ़ कर कल सुनाई थी उसमें लिखा था कि हम एक बड़ा अच्छा बिल ला रहे हैं लेकिन इस सारे बिल को देख लीजिए, स्टेट्यूट जो आप बना रहें हैं :

"No teacher shall be recalled except on the recommendation of the Selection Committee constituted for the purpose in the manner laid down in the ordinance."

What kind of teacher ?

11 MAY 1900/77

कैसा टीचर लेना चाहते हैं । सारी सीनियरिटी किस तरह से क्रिक्स की जाएगी ? एग्ज्ेरी बिग यू हैज लेफ्ट । मैं समझता हूँ कि आपका जो यह बिल है उसमें यह भी एक झगड़ा है कि कालेज का जो आपने क्लॉज दिया है उसमें झगड़े को हटाने की बात आप के दिमाग में है, ठीक बात है

"No college or institution situated within the local limits of. . ."

यह कम्प्लेसी एफ़िलिएशन होने का सवाल नहीं है । तो यूनिवर्सिटी में कालेज का एफ़िलिएशन नहीं हुआ तो यूनिवर्सिटी किस तरह बनी ? मुझे यह झगड़ा मालूम होता है । मैंने इसको काउंट किया तो मुझे मालूम पड़ा कि इसमें यह भी आपने मेंब्रेट नहीं रखा, उस एरिया का कोई कालेज हो वह एफ़िलिएशन कराए या न कराए यह उनकी मर्जी पर है । तो उसी एरिया के कालेज हों, उनका एफ़िलिएशन न हो यह बड़े झगड़े का सवाल है ।

इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि इस बिल को फिर से चाहे आप सात दिन रखिए, पन्द्रह दिन रखिए, आप इस को एक बार फिर वापस जांच कराइए, यह मेरी हम्बल रिक्वेस्ट है जिसमें यह न हो कि थोड़े दिन बाद आप अमेंडमेंट लेकर पार्लियामेंट में फिर आए ।

श्री मधु सिन्धे (बांका) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है । मैंने लिख कर दिया है । इस वकन में विधेयक के आशय पर नहीं बोल रहा हू बल्कि आपका निर्णय एक महत्व के प्रश्न पर चाह रहा हूँ शिक्षा मंत्री ने . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह आप का प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है ?

श्री मधु सिन्धे : जी हा । इस पर निर्णय आप ही करेंगे । मुझल हुसल साहब नहीं करेंगे ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बोलना फिर चाहेंगे इसके बाद ?

श्री भृगु लिमये : बोलेंगे वाच में ।

मैं तो यह कह रहा हूँ कि आप इसको वापस करवा दीजिए । इस पर आप निर्णय दीजिए । अगर मेरा मुद्दा आप को जबे तो आगे क्या करना है यह देखा जाएगा ।

मैं आपका ध्यान नियम सख्या 70 की ओर खींचना चाहता हूँ । नियम सख्या 70 में यह कहा है .

'A Bill involving proposals for the delegation of legislative power shall however be accompanied by a memorandum explaining such proposals and drawing attention to their scope and status also whether they are of a normal or exceptional character "

इन्होंने इस विधेयक के साथ एक मेमोरेडम दिया है और इस मेमोरेडम के अन्त में कहा है -

"The delegation of legislative powers is of a normal character "

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह कहाँ पर कहा है ?

श्री भृगु लिमये : उस के अन्तिम वाक्य में औपचारिक ढंग से कह दिया है कि

"delegation of legislative powers is of a normal character "

लेकिन विधेयक के जो प्रावधान हैं उन की ओर यदि आप ध्यान देंगे तो आपको पता चलेगा कि वास्तव में ससद् का कार्य क्षेत्र है कि सिद्धांतों को तय करना और जो तफसील है वह सिर्फ कार्यपालिका के ऊपर सौंप देना, यह इस का आधार है, लेकिन आप इस विधेयक को देखिए, इस में किसी तरह के सिद्धांत निश्चित नहीं किए गए हैं । इसमें यह कहा गया है जो विजिटर साहब होंगे यानी राष्ट्रपति यानी कार्यपालिका यह तीन साल तक मनमाने ढंग से सारे नियमों को, स्टैट्यूट्स को बनाएंगे और इन स्टैट्यूट्स की व्याप्ति इतनी ज्यादा है कि उसके अन्धर कोर्ट का गठन, एग्जीक्यूटिव काउंसिल का गठन, हुसरी सख्याओं का गठन यह सब जाना है, ये सारे अधिकार

इन्होंने विजिटर को या कार्यपालिका को दे रखे हैं । क्या इस ससद् का यह फर्ज नहीं है कि जब कोई विधेयक उसके सामने आए तो वह सरकार से निश्चित रूप से यह जानना चाहे कि इसके मुख्य सिद्धांत क्या हैं और जो तफसील का काम है, वह सरकार पर छोड़े? लेकिन इस विधेयक से यह पता ही नहीं चलता है कि जो नार्थ-ईस्टर्न-हिल-यूनिवर्सिटी बनने वाली है, जिसकी मैं भी आवश्यकता समझता हूँ, उसका ढाँचा क्या होगा ?

आप इसकी 25वीं दफा देखिये -

25 (1) (5) Notwithstanding anything contained in the foregoing sub-sections the Visitor may make new or additional Statutes, amend or repeal the Statutes referred to in sub-section (1) during the period of three years immediately after the commencement of this Act

'Provided that the Visitor may, on the expiry of the said period of three years make within one year from the date of such expiry such detailed Statutes as he may consider necessary and such detailed Statutes shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament "

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इसमें कई धारामें ऐसी हैं । 19वीं धारा को देखिए

'The constitution of the Court and the term of office of its Members shall be prescribed by the Statutes."

20वीं धारा को देखिये-

'20(1) The Executive Council shall be the principal executive body of the University

(2) The constitution of the Executive Council, the term of office of its members and its powers and duties shall be prescribed by the Statutes "

जहाँ तक स्टैट्यूट्स का सम्बन्ध है, तीन साल तक राष्ट्रपति विजिटर के रूप में अपने मनमाने ढंग से काम करेंगे ।

मैं आपका निर्णय इस बात पर चाहता हूँ कि इंग्लैंड की तरह हमारे देश में कोई सार्वभौम सत्ता वाली सभा नहीं है, संविधान के अन्दर जो अधिकार संसद् को दिये गये हैं, कानून बनाने वाली संस्था को दिये गये हैं, उन अधिकारों को कार्यपालिका किसी भी हालत में छीन नहीं सकती, तफ़्सील का काम कार्यपालिका को दे सकते हैं, लेकिन संसद् का काम तो संसद् करेगी। मैं इस विषय पर बहुत विस्तार से बोल सकता हूँ, लेकिन इस समय संक्षेप में ही कहना चाहता हूँ—यह असाधारण डेली-गेशन-आफ़-पावर्स है यानी संसद् के द्वारा असाधारण तौर पर ये सत्ता चाहते हैं। नियम बनाने की बात पर केवल औपचारिक ढंग से कहते हैं कि यह तो नार्मल करैक्टर की सत्ता है—जब कि वास्तविकता यह नहीं है। इस लिये आप इस पर निर्णय दीजिये—यदि आप मानते हैं कि यह असाधारण है तो सरकार से कहिये कि पूरा ढांचा ले कर आये और नियम बनाने की सत्ता अपने हाथ में रखें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं देख रहा हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार के द्वारा विश्व-विद्यालयों की स्वायत्तता पर, खुदमुक्तारी पर तेजी से आक्रमण हो रहा है और इस समय तो यह अधिनायकवाद चरमसीमा पर पहुँच गया है। शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में स्वायत्तता रहेगी या नुरुल हसन साहब की तानाशाही शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में चलेगी—यह एक महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न है। मेरा ख्याल है इस पर कानून मंत्री साहब की भी राय ले लेनी चाहिये।

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (PROF. S. NURUL HASAN): Sir, I want to make a brief submission. The main point that has been missed by the hon. Member is that the statutes are not detailed enough. My submission is this.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not his point. It is not that the statutes are not detailed enough. The question raised by Shri Madhu Limaye as also by Shri Daga is this. The basic provisions of the Bill are not left to the Statutes. The Statutes only carry out

whatever is left. That is the spirit of the basic provision in the main Bill. I have heard Shri Daga and I have also seen the Bill. In the case of appointment of Deans, Planning Board etc., provision is made in the respective clauses. It seems that everything is left to the Statutes which may be prescribed later on. This is a departure from the previous pattern of the Universities Bills. This is what he has mentioned. I would like you to note that, as regards the basic principles which are the very foundation of this Bill, everything such as appointment of the Court, Planning Board, Executive Council, Executive Body, methods about their promotion, methods about their terms etc., must be provided for in the Bill. Anything that is left out has to be laid on the table of the House. For example, in clauses 14, 18 and 19, in the matter of appointment of Dean of a School, Court, Executive Council etc. everything is left to the Statutes. You being an academician, I need not explain about all these things.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: I beg to submit that the present Bill follows in its entirety the principle which this Parliament accepted in 1964 in connection with the Jawaharlal Nehru University Bill, that is to say, when you set up an entirely new organisation, when the teachers have not yet been appointed, when students have not yet been enrolled, it is a difficult task to ensure that the normal setting up of the university is undertaken. Therefore, in the Jawaharlal Nehru University Act also, the first Chancellor, the first Vice-Chancellor, the first Executive Council, the first Academic Council, the first Court etc. were all nominated by the Visitor for a brief period.

MR. SPEAKER: That should have been mentioned here.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: It is mentioned.

श्री मधु लिमये : नहीं, यह प्वाइन्ट नहीं है। आप ने जो बात रखी, उसको ये समझ नहीं रहे हैं। इस के लिये ला-मिनिस्टर को कन्सल्ट करें, यह शिक्षा मंत्रालय का मामला नहीं है।

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: I am reading the brief from the Law Ministry. I would like to remove this misapprehension.

MR. SPEAKER : You mean, this is just a temporary measure and you are bringing another amendment to this Bill later on after two years?

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN : So far as the powers of the various bodies are concerned, they are already given in this Bill. The only thing that has not been prescribed, is in all Central University Acts that the constitution and composition of the various bodies is given in the statutes. In the present case, what has been stated is that the first bodies will be created by the Visitor and then within three years Government will come forward..

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : On what principle ? What will be the structure and outline ?

MR. SPEAKER : I will think over it. I will see the Jawaharlal Nehru University Act and later on tell you. In the meanwhile the debate may continue.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप इसको चैम्बर में बुलाइये—मैं यहाँ संक्षेप में बोला हूँ। वहाँ आपके सामने सब अथॉरिटीज़ रखूंगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं भी पिछले 25 सालों में यूनिवर्सिटीज़ में रहा हूँ—ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है।

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore). Sir, this very interesting exchange which took place just now in the form of a point of order raised by Shri Madhu Limaye will, of course, be decided by you later on. I for myself am perfectly aware of the fact that there are many provisions in this Bill which I do consider suffer from some shortcomings and imperfections. There are some lacunae here which are quite obvious to anybody who is familiar with Central University statutes.
17-50 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARI in the Chair]

But, despite all that—although I may be saying something which is rather unusual—and conceding all that, it is my opinion that the highest priority must be given at this particular moment in this particular case, to the establishment of this University at an early date, and not allow it to be delayed any further, even if it means some inconvenience for us, for this House, because

later on I am quite sure that the hon. Minister will have to come before us with an amending Bill. It can be argued logically, as Shri Daga has argued, that rather than burden us with further arguments later on, why not put the Bill right before we pass it. Therefore, he has moved an amendment for reference to Select Committee and so on. But while we are aware of the shortcomings of this Bill, while conscious of the fact that this will have to be amended later on still I nevertheless plead with the House that we should now, at the fag end of the session, not allow this Bill to be further delayed or carried over to the next session.

Frankly, I am making a political argument. Because, the whole background of how this University has come into being is also something which is abnormal. Just as the delegation of powers is abnormal, the whole historical background of the evolution of this University is also abnormal, and it has to be seen in its political context, in its historical context.

I am sorry that the Education Ministry, or the Law Ministry perhaps, did not take sufficient pains to draft this more carefully. On that point I am critical of them. But nevertheless, I would say that if this Bill is further delayed, some political complications are likely to follow, which we wish to avoid. It will mean that this University cannot be established until the beginning of the next academic year. It will mean that the students belonging to these tribal communities of the Hill Area will continue to be put to great difficulties in view of the fact that both the Gauhati and Dibrugarh University, as you know, have taken a firm decision that Assamese should be their medium of instruction.

If I may briefly recapitulate, this Bill represents the consummation of ten years, long ten years, of aspirations and efforts made by the people of this region to have this kind of University of their own. It was in 1963 that four Members of this House, who at one time or the other had been our colleagues, our present distinguished Deputy-Speaker, when he was an ordinary Member of this House, coming from the region of Meghalaya, Shri Jamir who came from Nagaland, the late Shri Fring who came from what was then called NEFA and is now called Arunachal, and Shri Keishin

of Manipur, jointly made a representation to the then Government and the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, at a time when demonstrations, popular demonstrations, conferences and conventions were also being held in the Hill Areas, urging upon the Government to set up a Central University of a federal character.

We must remember that the then Prime Minister, who was very sensitive in respect of such matters, understood the problems well and he lost no time in responding to these requests. In 1963 itself, when these requests were first made, he took steps to see that the Wadia Committee was set up to go into this question. Of course, by the time the Wadia Committee gave its recommendations towards the end of 1964 in favour of the establishment of such a University with its headquarters at Shillong, Pandit Nehru was no longer there.

What happened then? As per the requirements of article 252 of the Constitution, the State Legislature of Assam, in 1965, passed a Resolution authorising and empowering the Central Parliament to put through this legislation. But there was no second Legislature at that time to be found to pass a Resolution. Nagaland was there which had achieved Statehood in 1962. Nagaland, at that time, was in turmoil, passing through a travail of fire and blood and the forces there, at that time, were perhaps more interested in separatism rather than in integration. So, the constitutional requirements could not be fulfilled.

Then, Meghalaya did not acquire Statehood till 1971-72. As soon as it did, its Assembly passed the required Resolution in April, 1972. But in the meantime, the Government of Assam had gone back on its previous Resolution and made it quite clear that it did not wish to stand by the previous stand it had taken and it wanted Assam to be excluded from the jurisdiction of this proposed University. Again, there was a constitutional deadlock. Assam had passed a Resolution. There was no second Legislature to pass it. Nagaland, at that time, was not in a position to do it. When Meghalaya came into existence, it passed a Resolution. But the Assam Government went back on its previous stand. So, there was a constitutional deadlock. Only in February of

this year, 1973, the Assembly of Nagaland was in a position to pass a Resolution and, therefore, broke the constitutional deadlock.

This is a long and tortuous path which has been taken and traversed for the last 10 years to bring into being this Central University. I think, the time has come now when at last this legislation has been put on the anvil, not to quibble too much just now on the imperfections or the technical deficiencies of this Bill which are there—I admit it—but to see that this University is established. I welcome this Bill from that point of view and my party supports the whole idea and the principle behind it. I will say—I do not wish to sound uncharitable—with all this historical background. I myself see no reason why at any time this University should have been named after our Prime Minister. I am very glad that the idea has been dropped and I am very glad that she has also concurred in the fact that her name should not be associated with this University.

Sir, we have come a long way from those days of 1962-63. At that time, the very concept of allowing these people of Hill regions the eastern and north-eastern border to develop in the shortest possible time to full Statehood was viewed by many sections and many people in this country with varying degrees of opposition, varying from the utmost caution to open hostility. There were friends here of the Jana Sangh who in the name of national security, saying that these areas are strategic areas on the border of our country, raised a bogey here that if the people are given Statehood, if the whole area is divided up in a number of separate States it will imperil the security and the defence of our country, and so on. Now, we have come a long way from that and we hold firmly to the idea that India is a family of peoples with different cultures, different backgrounds, different histories, different languages, and the task of national integration is to make all of them feel that they are equal partners in this family, not that one is inferior to another in some way or the other, but they must be made to feel that they have got equal opportunities of growth and development and that in the case of weaker and less developed areas,

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

special help, special encouragement and special consideration will be given to them.

I would say that it is now proved historically that Statehood for the different regions in this area was not a concession as some people wanted to make out, a concession to parochialism or a concession to regionalism in the bad sense. It was a positive step to promote a national outlook and to draw these people into the mainstream of national life and development. I feel that this new University, the proposed University, can be another potent factor in the accomplishment of this noble task. That is why I would appeal to my good friend, Mr. Daga, that he should not press his amendment because at this moment, from the point of view of national integration, from the political consideration of consolidating this assimilation of all the

great peoples of our great country into one family, it is of the highest importance that this establishment of the University should go ahead, and later on we can look into the matter and see how the thing can be improved. I would also appeal to Shri Samar Guha who has also tabled an amendment. His amendment, I think, at this particular moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would he like to continue tomorrow?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I can, if you like.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please continue tomorrow. The House stands adjourned to meet tomorrow at 11 00 a.m.

18 00 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, May 9, 1973/ Vaisakha 19, 1995 (Saka)