

बिहार विधान सभा वादवृत्त ।

भारत के संविधान के उपबन्ध के अनुसार एकत्र विधान सभा का कार्य विवरण ।

सभा का अधिवेशन पटने के सभा सदन में बुधवार, तिथि १४ अप्रील, १९५४ को ११ बजे पूर्वाह्न में माननीय अध्यक्ष श्री विन्ध्येश्वरी प्रसाद वर्मा के सभापतित्व में हुआ ।

अल्प-सूचना प्रश्नोत्तर ।

SHORT NOTICE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

ग्राम बराही में तालाब की नाजायज बन्दोबस्ती ।

२५५। श्री दामोदर झा—क्या मंत्री, राजस्व विभाग, यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे

कि—

(क) क्या यह बात सही है कि महन्त रामचन्द्र दास, ग्राम बराही, थाना बेल्ला जिला मुजफ्फरपुर की जमींदारी सरकार के अधीन कर ली गयी है ;

(ख) क्या कथित जमींदार की जमींदारी का कुछ हिस्सा ग्राम बराही, थाना मधवापुर, जिला दरभंगा में भी पड़ता था ;

(ग) क्या यह बात सही है कि कथित बराही ग्राम में खाता नं० ७९३, खेवट नं० ३०५, रकबा एक बीघा साढ़े अठारह कट्ठा का एक गैर-मजरूआ आम तालाब है ;

(घ) क्या यह बात सही है कि कथित जमींदार ने आखिरी समय में उसी ग्राम के किसी आदमी के नाम उस तालाब को बन्दोबस्त कर दिया है, यदि उत्तर स्वीकारात्मक है, तो क्या जिसके नाम बन्दोबस्ती की गयी है उस व्यक्ति ने—

(१) इस साल पटवन के लिये पानी लेने वालों से ५ रुपया बिगहा लिया है ;

(२) क्या इस समय उस तालाब को वे भर रहे हैं ;

(ङ) यदि उपरोक्त खंडों के उत्तर स्वीकारात्मक हैं, तो लैंड रिफार्म ऐक्ट के अनुसार उस तालाब की बन्दोबस्ती को सरकार नाजायज करार देकर अपने अधिकार में लाने का विचार रखती है और उसे अच्छी दशा में रखना चाहेगी जिससे सिचाई के काम में किसानों को लाभ पहुंचे ?

श्री कृष्ण बल्लभ सहाय—(क) उत्तर हां है ।

(ख) उत्तर हां है ।

(ग) इस गांव में एक तालाब है जिसका रकबा १ बीघा १८ कट्ठा है । खाता नं० ७९२ है जिसका खेसरा नं० ३०५ है और यह तालाब रेकॉर्ड है । यह तालाब गैर-मजरूआ आम नहीं लिखा हुआ है बल्कि गैर-मजरूआ बकब्जे मालिक लिखा हुआ है ।

(घ) जमींदार जिनकी जमींदारी ले ली गई है उन्होंने इस पोखरा को मधुकान्त झा के साथ जमींदारी सरकार के कब्जे में आने के पहले बन्दोबस्त कर दिया था परन्तु यह बात सही नहीं है कि बन्दोबस्ती के बाद श्री मधुकान्त झा ५ रुपया पर बीघा बसूल करते हैं ऐसे लोगों से जो इस पोखरे को इस्तमाल करते हैं । यह भी सही नहीं है कि श्री मधुकान्त झा इस पोखरे को मिट्टी से भर रहे हैं ।

(ङ) इस बन्दोबस्ती को रद्द करने के लिए कलक्टर कार्रवाई कर रहे हैं ।

श्री हरिहर प्रसाद सिंह—क्या यह बात सही है कि सीमा के निर्धारित नहीं होने से उत्तर प्रदेश के स्थानीय अधिकारी नाजायज फायदा उठा रहे हैं ?

श्री कृष्ण वल्लभ सहाय—दूसरे राज्य के सम्बन्ध में यह कहना कि नाजायज फायदा वह उठा रही है, मैं जायज नहीं समझता हूँ।

श्री विन्देश्वरी प्रसाद मंडल—पांच वर्ष से सीमा निर्धारित नहीं हुई है इसका क्या कारण है ?

श्री कृष्ण वल्लभ सहाय—उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार से इसके बारे में हमलोग पत्र व्यवहार और डिस्कशन कर रहे हैं इसलिये कि सीमा निर्धारित हो जाय मगर अभी तक उसका निपटारा नहीं हो सका है।

श्री विन्देश्वरी प्रसाद मंडल—मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसी जमीन का कितना क्षेत्रफल है जिसका कर हमारी सरकार बसूल कर चुकी है लेकिन अब वह उत्तर प्रदेश में चली गयी है।

अध्यक्ष—इस सवाल की जरूरत नहीं है।

अल्प-सूचना प्रश्न संख्या ३८५।

श्री रामानन्द उपाध्याय—अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रश्न संख्या ३८५ जो बहुत जरूरी तथा मुख्य है वह इस सदन में आना चाहिये, लेकिन यह प्रश्न नहीं आ रहा है, इसको आना चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष—सबसे जरूरी यह है कि जो वक्त जिस काम के लिये मुकर्रर है उसी विषय पर बोलना चाहिये और इसी बात को आप नहीं समझते हैं तो मेरी दिक्कत बढ़ जाती है।

STATEMENT MADE BY THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIES,

अध्यक्ष—माननीय श्री महेश प्रसाद सिंह प्रश्नोत्तर के सम्बन्ध में एक वक्तव्य आपके सामने रखेंगे।

Shri MAHESH PRASAD SINHA : Sir, the attention of the State Government has been drawn to a report published in the daily press that while replying to the debate on demands for grants of the Production Ministry, the Minister in charge Shri K. C. Reddy stated that Bihar Government were not invited at the last stage

of the discussion relating to the selection of site of the new Steel Plant because they did not send their views on the recommendations embodied in the German Experts' memorandum. This must create the impression that the case of Bihar went by default due to neglect on the part of the State Government. I want to place the relevant facts for the information of the House.

2. A comprehensive memorandum explaining the advantages of locating the proposed Steel Plant at Sindri was sent to the Government of India on the 7th March, 1953 with a D.O. letter from the Chief Minister, Bihar to the Minister for Commerce and Industry in which attention was also drawn to the fact that no official intimation had been given to the State Government about the visit of the technical mission appointed by the Government of India to Sindri in connection with the selection of a site for the proposed Steel factory. A copy of this letter and the accompanying memorandum was also sent to the Prime Minister, and to Shri. K. C. Reddy, Minister for Production. A little later, the State Government learnt from an unofficial source that the Planning Commission were meeting the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh on the 23rd April, 1953 for discussing the location of the proposed Iron and Steel Plant, and the Minister in charge of Industries, Bihar, immediately sent a telegram to Shri Reddy requesting that Bihar Government should be given an opportunity for placing their case before a final decision was taken in the matter. A senior officer was also sent to Delhi at this time to find out the exact position by personal discussions there. Shri Reddy sent a reply to the Industries Minister, Bihar, on the 30th April, 1953 requesting him not to press the claims of Bihar as the Government of India did not favour the proposal for location of the proposed Steel Works at Sindri, considering among other things the need for regionalisation of industry and also dispersal to avoid transport bottlenecks. The Minister, Industries, Bihar, however, again wrote to Shri Reddy pressing the claims of Sindri on economic and technical considerations, and Shri Reddy sent a reply on the 26th December giving the assurance that the claims of Bihar will be given the consideration to which they were entitled on merits. The German Experts visited Sindri on 5th December, before Shri Reddy's reply had been received and though the State Government had very short notice of their arrival, they deputed three senior officers, the Development Commissioner, the Divisional Commissioner of Chota Nagpur, and the Director of Industries, to discuss the issues involved with them on the spot at Sindri. The Chief Minister sent another letter to the Prime Minister on the 6th January, 1954 reiterating the advantages of locating the proposed Steel Plant at Sindri, and also pressing for the location of the Aluminium Smelter Plant in the Damodar Valley Corporation area where large quantities of Bauxite ore are available, and was informed in reply that this letter had been passed on to the Minister for Production. The Chief Minister

also took up the matter personally at the highest level at Delhi but found that the mind of the Government of India was practically set against the proposal for location of the proposed Steel Plant at Sindri.

3. The Government of Bihar had placed all the relevant facts before the Government of India. They had gone on pressing the claims of Bihar even after the receipt of Shri Reddy's letter to the Minister of Industries, Bihar requesting him not to press the claims of Bihar. Shri Reddy was thus fully aware of the concern and anxiety of the Bihar Government over this issue. I leave it to the members of the House and to public opinion in the country to judge whether, in the circumstances, Shri Reddy's plea that the Chief Minister of Bihar was not invited to participate in the final discussion to which Chief Ministers of the three other State Governments concerned were invited because the Bihar Government did not send any comment on the German Experts' memorandum is convincing or not. His plea will appear even more unconvincing when it is pointed out that the Government of India had not invited the comments of the State Government on the German Experts' memorandum. May I mention here that this State Government were not invited to join any discussions relating to this project at Delhi even at earlier stages. It would be interesting to know what Shri Reddy has to say on this point.

4. It is a matter of very great surprise and regret to the State Government, and to me personally, that Shri Reddy should have thought fit to make a statement publicly in Parliament which was bound to give rise to the impression that the Bihar Government had shown negligence in the matter. The Bihar Government had been reticent over the question so, long as they wanted to avoid causing any embarrassment to the Government of India, in spite of persistent demands from members of this House for full information, but the statement which Shri Reddy made in Parliament has left them with no choice, but to acquaint the House with all the facts and circumstances of the case.

Shri PURUSHOTTAM CHOUHAN: Can we put any supplementary Sir?

SPEAKER: It is not in answer to any question.

Shri PURUSHOTTAM CHOUHAN: Can we discuss it?

SPEAKER: Discussion may be allowed but it is altogether a different point.

Shri DAROGA PRASAD ROY: A day may be fixed for this Sir.

(No answer.)