

# LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

1907

1908

## LOK SABHA

Thursday, 2nd August, 1956

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

12 NOON

#### STATES REORGANISATION BILL. Contd.

Clauses 2 to 15

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the clauses of the States Reorganisation Bill. The total time allotted for the first group of clauses, clauses 2 to 15, was 12 hours out of which the time already taken is 6 hours and 52 minutes and there is a balance of 5 hours and 8 minutes. The time allotted for the next group of clauses, 16 to 49 and Schedules I to II, is 6 hours, I intended to devote the whole of today to these and then put the questions relating to amendments this evening. Even then, we will be extending it by an hour or so. But I received a telegram late last night from Shri A. K. Gopalan, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, Shri Deshpande and one other Member saying that they had been detained on account of the Centenary celebrations of Lokamanya Tilak and, therefore, asking me to postpone voting on these clauses to Monday.

The Minister of Natural Resources (Shri K. D. Malaviya): Is it fair?

389 L.S.D.

Mr. Speaker: That is a matter for my consideration and for the consideration of the House also. Whether it is fair or unfair, we shall see.

May I know how long the hon. Minister proposes to take to reply?

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I think one hour.

Mr. Speaker: Then, I will call him at 4 or 4-30 P.M.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): May I make a humble suggestion? Let the discussion end today and let the hon. Minister reply tomorrow. It would suit him very well because he will have the benefit of some of the speeches which are, according to him, finished today.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: In that case, so far as the discussion by Members is concerned, that must be finished today.

Mr. Speaker: That is what he suggests.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I do not know your ruling. When will the discussion on these clauses finish? When we have decided that the Home Minister will reply tomorrow, then, naturally, the discussion should be finished by 4 o'clock and the other clauses may be taken up and the reply and the voting may be taken up on another day.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): These are substantial clauses of the whole Bill. You are permitted to use your discretion and you can extend the discussion till 6 o'clock. The voting on clauses 8 and 9 can be taken up on Monday.

**Shri Satya Narayan Saha:** You have already extended the general discussion by 5 hours.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Minister has already suggested that the discussion may go on till 6 o'clock. He has already created that impression among hon. Members. We will go on till 5 o'clock. He wants it to finish at 4 o'clock. We will close discussion by Members at 5 and the hon. Minister will reply tomorrow. After 5, we will take up the discussion of the other clauses. So far as these clauses are concerned, we will have the voting afterwards as desired by the leaders of other Groups.

**श्रीमती मणोबेन पटेल (कैंग-दक्षिण) :**  
अध्यक्ष जी, जब से यह बहस यहां पर हो रही है, मुझे एक प्रकार का रंज हो रहा है। हम यह भी देख रहे हैं कि स्टेट्स रीऑर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन (राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग) की रिपोर्ट प्रकाशित होने के बाद से देश में प्रगति का मारा काम रुका पड़ा है। मुझे तो ऐसा लगता है कि इस बारे में जितनी क्षीघ्रता से निर्णय हो जाये, उतना ही देश को फायदा है। अब मैं कुछ खास बातों पर ध्यान चाहती हूँ।

पहले मैं कुछ शब्द डांग के बारे में कहना चाहती हूँ। जब राज्य पुनर्रचना पंच ने बम्बई के बारे में मोचा, तब उसने गुजरात में का अलग राज्य बनाने के बारे में विचार नहीं किया था। लेकिन अब तो हम अलग गुजरात राज्य बना रहे हैं, इसलिए हम को यह अच्छी तरह मोचना चाहिए कि वह कितना बड़ा हो, उस में कौन कौन से हिस्से हों, वगैरह। हमारी केवल एक ही मांग है कि आप किमी को डांग भेजें, जो कि वहां पर जा कर सारी स्थिति का अध्ययन करे। उस स्थल पर गये बिना किसी को वहां की हालत का ठीक ज्ञान नहीं हो सकता है, क्यों कि वह जगह ही ऐसी है, अगर आप वहां पर जायें, तो आप देखेंगे कि डांग के दक्षिण में नासिक है और डांग और नासिक के बीच में तीन हजार से तीन हजार पांच सौ फीट

ऊंची पहाड़ियां हैं, डांग की तीन दिशाओं में तीन हजार से पांच हजार फीट ऊंची पहाड़ियां हैं। इतना तक पहुँचने के लिए केवल वेस्टर्न रेलवे की एक लांच लाइन है, जो कि उसको मुरत और बिबीनोर से मिलाती है। इस के प्रतिरक्त डांग का सम्बन्ध किमी और प्रदेश से नहीं है।

अब मैं आपके सामने सेन्सस (जनगणना) के आंकड़े रखती हूँ। १९३१ में की सेन्सस में भीली बोलने वालों की संख्या ३२,३२४, गुजराती बोलने वालों की ७३१ और मराठी बोलने वालों की ६१३ लिखी गई थी। इसके बाद १९४१ में भीली बोलने वालों की संख्या ३६,२६०, गुजराती बोलने वालों की संख्या ७३१ और मराठी बोलने वालों की संख्या ६३० लिखी गई। लेकिन यह कितनी अजीब बात है कि १९५१ की सेन्सस में भीली बोलने वालों की संख्या कुछ भी न रही, गुजराती बोलने वालों की संख्या १८१० दिखाई गई और मराठी बोलने वालों की संख्या ४५,०१७ दिखाई गई। इन आंकड़ों से आप स्वयं देख सकते हैं कि किम तरह से सेन्सस की फ़िगर्ज (आंकड़ों) को बदला गया है। आप को इस बारे में पूरी तरह जांच करनी चाहिए और पता लगाना चाहिए कि आखिर सब के सब भीली बोलने वाले कहां चले गए।

अब आप स्कूलों को देखिये। गुजराती स्कूलों की संख्या ४७ है और उन में लगभग १७०० बच्चे पढ़ते हैं। मराठी स्कूलों की संख्या ५१ है और उन में २२५२ बच्चे पढ़ते हैं। बम्बई राज्य ने डांग की प्राइमरी एजुकेशन (प्राथमिक शिक्षा) के विषय में एक मंडल बनाया है, जिम के चेयरमैन कनेक्टर है, जो कि एक मद्रासी गृहस्थ है। वहां का एजुकेशन इंस्पेक्टर (शिक्षा निरीक्षक) एक मुसलमान भाई है, जो कि कर्नाटक का है। उन्होंने २५ और गुजराती पाठशालाओं खोलने के लिए सरकार को लिखा है।

अब मैं डांग की राजकीय परिस्थिति के विषय में कुछ शब्द कहना चाहती हूँ। १८८० तक वह बड़ोदा राज्य का अंग रहा और उस के बाद वहाँ के चौदह राजाओं को सरकार ने स्वतंत्र कर दिया और उन को गुजरात स्टेट एजेंसी के नीचे रखा। इस दरम्यान कई साल तक उस की शासन-व्यवस्था बड़ोदा से और बाद में सूरत से होती थी। अब हम स्वतंत्र हुए, तो डांग का एक डिस्ट्रिक्ट बना कर मध्यस्थ सरकार ने बम्बई सरकार के नीचे रखा और डांग की आमदनी के चालीस लाख रुपये भी उस के उत्कर्ष के लिए निर्धारित कर दिये।

आज भी शासन के सब आफिसें गुजरात में हैं। कलेक्टर का हेडक्वार्टर, सेवान्त जज, पुलिस, जेल, ट्रेजरी (कोष) के कार्यालय सूरत में हैं और इनकमटैक्स (आयकर), सेल्स टैक्स (बिक्रीकर), बेट्स एंड मेजर्स (नाप तोल) के कार्यालय नवासरी में हैं। नेशनल सेविंग का कार्यालय सूरत में है और मेडिकल हेल्थ (चिकित्सा स्वास्थ्य), प्राहिबिशन (मद्यनिषेध) वगैरह के कार्यालय सूरत में हैं और पब्लिक वर्क्स (सोक निर्माण) का कार्यालय नवासरी में है। आज पच्चीस तीस सरकारी आफिस गुजरात में हैं— बड़ोदा में हैं या सूरत में हैं। इस के अतिरिक्त उन लोगों के सब सामाजिक सम्बन्ध, रोटी-बेटी के व्यवहार सोनगढ़—व्याया, वांसदा जो गुजरात का हिस्सा है—उनके साथ है। वह एक जंगली प्रदेश है और वहाँ ५२ लकड़ी, घास और बांस वगैरह जो कुछ उत्पन्न होता है उस का ध्यापार दिल्लीमोरा और सूरत के साथ होता है।

कुछ लोग यह दावा करते हैं कि वह इलाका मराठी-भाषी है। श्री मोगर जो आई और सर साहब ने १९४८ में डांग की hurried visit की थी तब कहा था कि वह प्रदेश मराठी-भाषी है, लेकिन लोग यह भूल जाते हैं कि साथ साथ यह भी कहा था कि वह एक बार्डरिंग (द्विभाषी)

एरिया (क्षेत्र) है और अब मैं गुजराती और मराठी दोनों स्कूल खोलने वाले।

१९५१ में चुनाव के लिए बस्की टेक चन्द ने यह निर्णय दिया कि डांग को फिन कांस्टी-युएन्सी (निर्वाचन क्षेत्र) में रखा जाये। तब यह साफ बात उन्होंने कही थी कि केवल इन्वेन्शन (निर्वाचन) के लिए ही उसको डांग में रखने की बात है। उसके बारे में उन्होंने यह कहा था : "without prejudice to either state"। उ- समय जो चुनाव हुआ था उसके परिणाम को ध्यान देंगे। उस समय डांग में १८,००० मतदाता थे। उनमें से १४,००० ने उस स्वतंत्र उम्मीदवार को मत दिये जिसने इस इश्यू (प्रश्न) पर इन्वेन्शन (चुनाव) लड़ा था कि डांग को गुजरात के साथ जाना चाहिए, और कांग्रेस के उम्मीदवार को केवल चार हजार मत ही मिले थे। यह परिणाम बतलाता है कि डांग को गुजरात में जाना चाहिए। हमने शायद यह गलती की कि तारा डांग नहीं मांगा निर्रं अपनी तरफ का ही मांगा। हमने तो केवल सही बात कही कि इस तरफ का डांग हमारी तरफ जाना चाहिए। हमारे सही बात कहने का ही यह परिणाम है कि तारा डांग महाराष्ट्र में मिलाया जा रहा है। एक माननीय सदस्य ने तो यहाँ बहस करते करते सूरत तक अपना हाथ फेला दिया था।

अब मैं अबू पर आती हूँ। मुझे इस बात का बड़ा दर्द है कि अबू के बारे में कोई सोचने के लिए भी तैयार नहीं है। इसमें भी हमने सही मांग की है और गैर-वाजिबी मांग नहीं की इसीलिए यह परिणाम हो रहा है। सिरोही एक बार्डर state है। अगर कोई पैदल जाकर देखे तो उसको मालूम होगा कि अबू को कहाँ रखा जाना चाहिए और वह प्रदेश किसके हिस्से में आता है। सन् १९४८ तक सिरोही प्रजामंडल का सारा व्यवहार गुजराती में चलता था। सिरोही प्रजामंडल ने हमारे आज के राष्ट्रपति की सम्पन्नता में

## [श्रीमती मचिनेन पटेल]

एक प्रस्ताव पास किया था वह मैं आपको बतकर सुनाती हूँ। वह इस प्रकार है :

"The Parishad has fully considered the question regarding the merger of Sirohi with Rajasthan or Bombay. Regarding this question of merger of Sirohi with Bombay or Rajasthan, different opinions prevail among the people. The Parishad is aware of this fact. There is also an opinion that Sirohi should be placed under Central administration. Considering the geographic, historic, social, economic and industrial economy, administrative and linguistic relations of Sirohi, the questions as to where Sirohi should join and what will be the benefits by such merger has been difficult of solution for the people of this border State. Therefore, this Parishad resolves that the Rajputana Branch of the All India States Peoples' Conference should hold consultations with our leader, the Minister for States, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, and should get guidance for the Sirohi Praja Mandal, and should obtain a proper decision of the question at the hands of Sardar Patel."

यह प्रस्ताव लेकर वे लोग आये। उसके ऊपर काफी सोचा गया। एक स्पेशल आफिसर वहाँ भेजा गया। उसने वहाँ काफी धूम कर एक रिपोर्ट दी। उस पर विचार करने के बाद श्री कबीनेट में भी उस पर विचार होने के बाद २५ प्रश्न को कांस्टीट्यूट प्रसेम्बली के सामने रखा गया और उसने तै किया कि इस प्रदेश को बम्बई में मिलाया जायें। उस समय कांस्टीट्यूट प्रसेम्बली (संविधान सभा) की बैठक में श्री जैनारायण व्यास और गोकुल भाई मट्ट भी हाजिर थे। पर उन्होंने इसका कोई विरोध नहीं किया।

आखिर में मेरा इतना ही कहना है कि हम यह राज्य पुनर्गठन करने की बात इसीलिए

सोच रहे हैं कि लोगों को किस तरह से ज्यादा आराम मिले और सुविधा हो और किस तरह से हमारे देश की जल्दी से जल्दी तरक्की हो। मैं कहती हूँ कि डांग का हिस्सा और अबू का हिस्सा गुजरात में जाना चाहिए तभी वहाँ के लोगों की भलाई होगी। अगर आपको मेरे मतभ्य पर विश्वास न हो तो मैं नहीं कहती कि आप उसे अवश्य स्वीकार कर लें। मैं तो इतना ही कहती हूँ कि आप एक अफसर भेजें जो कि पैदल जाना करे और तब अपना निर्णय दे कि कौन हिस्सा कहां जाना चाहिये।

अब मैं बम्बई पर आती हूँ। मुझे इस बात का बड़ा दुःख है कि बम्बई के बारे में कहा जाता है कि यह तो महाराष्ट्र का ही है और चूंकि बम्बई में रहने वालों के दिल में घाव लगा है, जब वह भर जायेगा तब बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र में मिलाने की बात की जायेगी। पिछले सेशन में भी जब इस विषय पर चर्चा हुई थी तो मैं ने बताया था कि जब तक पहाड़ों में से होकर रास्ता नहीं बनाया गया था उस समय तक महाराष्ट्र का बम्बई से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं था। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि जब जे० बी० पी० रिपोर्ट लिखी गयी थी उस समय में और अब मैं बम्बई की हालत में क्या फर्क आ गया है। कहा जाता है कि शान्ति रखो, धीरज रखो, बम्बई की हालत ठीक हो जाने दो, लोगों को स्वस्थ होने दो, तब उस पर विचार किया जायेगा। अगर वह महाराष्ट्र का हिस्सा है तो उसको दिया जा सकता है। यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती। मैं समझना चाहती हूँ कि बम्बई में महाराष्ट्रियों के अलावा जो और लोग रह रहे हैं उनके बारे में क्यों नहीं सोचा जा रहा कि वे क्या चाहते हैं। यह कहना कि सभी महाराष्ट्र वाले इसी स्थान के हैं कि बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र में मिलाना चाहिये, मैं इसको मानने को तैयार नहीं हूँ। मैं आपको एक दो किस्से कहना चाहती हूँ। क्यों सोच साफ बात नहीं कहते। अबू क पास के बांसवाड़ा और डूंगरपुर गुजरात में आना चाहत हैं। परन्तु

कह नहीं सकते, यह रिपोर्ट प्रगट होने के बाद अबू के आकितर को कहा गया कि अब तुम को देखा जायेगा। जब लोग यह हालत देखते हैं तो अपनी सही बात नहीं कहते। हमारे देश में सोच इतने हिम्मत वाले नहीं हैं कि ऐसी हालत में भी सही बात कह सकें। इसी तरह से इस रिपोर्ट के बाद बम्बई में कुछ लोगों से कहा गया कि तुम्हारे इंटरेस्ट (हित), तुम्हारा रोजगार महाराष्ट्र में है। हमको स्पष्ट दो नहीं तो तुमको देखा जायेगा। यह बात मायूसी भादमियों ने नहीं कही बल्कि जिम्मेदार भादमियों ने इस तरह की बात कही और स्पष्ट लिये। इस हालत में कोई कैसे विपवास कर ले कि कुछ नहीं होगा। लोग गारंटी देने की बात करते हैं, लेकिन यह सब कहने से क्या होता है। हमारा जो धाब का अनुभव है उसको हम कैसे भूल सकते हैं। इसलिए मैं कहती हूँ कि जब जे० बी० पी० रिपोर्ट लिखी गयी थी उस समय की स्थिति में और धाब की स्थिति में कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ा है और धाबे भी क्या पड़ने वाला है? मैं समझती हूँ कि अगर इस तरह से सरकार बमकाने वालों से दब कर काम करेगी तो बहुत गलत बात होगी और वह ला एंड आर्डर (विधि तथा व्यवस्था) की पोजीशन को नहीं संभाल सकेगी। पहले धाबने इसी तरह से दबकर आन्ध्र दिया, अब महाराष्ट्र को देना चाहते हैं, पीछे पंजाब को इसी तरह से देना होगा और बिहार और बंगाल का प्रश्न भी इसी तरह से सामने आयेगा। इस तरह से देश का एकीकरण नहीं होगा बल्कि उसके टुकड़े टुकड़े हो जायेंगे। इसलिए मैं कहती हूँ कि डांग और अबू को गुजरात में मिलाया जाये और बम्बई को जो अलग रखने की योजना है उसी के अनुसार कार्य किया जाये।

**Shri C. C. Shah (Gohilwad-Sorath):** I wish to confine my observations to clauses 8, 9 and 10 of the Bill. I wish to support amendments Nos. 2, 444 and 445, and oppose amendments Nos. 442 and 443. These amendments relate to boundary areas.

As just now pointed out by Shri-mati Maniben Patel, the Commission had no occasion to consider the boundary areas between Maharashtra and Gujarat because they recommended a bilingual State. Therefore, they come up for consideration for the first time.

I also appreciate the force of the arguments of my friends, Dr. Jaisorkya and Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, that this House hardly has the time or the material before it to consider boundary question of this nature. Within the short time at one's disposal, one can hardly place before the House enough material to judge the rightness of each case. I appreciate the force of that argument. So, such questions can be decided either by agreement between the parties or by a proper boundary commission. It may enter upon its task two or three years after the new States are formed so that passions might have cooled down by that time and they may not come in the way of quietly considering these questions. That suggestion appears to be a sound one. I will not, therefore, take up the time of the House by speaking on the boundary questions like Dang, etc.

There is one point which I would like to stress. It is about Umargaoon. Even my Maharashtrian friends say that it legitimately belongs to Gujarat. They have admitted that.

**Shri Gadgil:** Not the whole taluk—a group of villages from Umargaoon. That has been our position right through that a boundary commission should be appointed. Whosoever does not want to be with us, let them go.

**Shri C. C. Shah:** We hope that we will consider these things in a proper atmosphere.

Coming to clause 8 which deals with Bombay, there are several amendments to this clause. Some of them have some merit in them and probably deserve consideration in a proper atmosphere at the proper time. For instance, there are amendments for a

[Shri C. C. Shah]

bigger bilingual Bombay State. As far as I can judge, there is at present no possibility of its being considered in any calm or dispassionate manner. There are other amendments also. There is an amendment for a coastal State. I do not know the reactions of the people of Maharashtra or the reactions of Shri Deshmukh.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): What is your reaction?

Shri C. C. Shah: What I say is this. Unless we know whether that amendment has the support of the people of Maharashtra, we cannot consider it now. It has to be considered at the proper time. These are all constructive suggestions which should be considered in a calmer atmosphere. In order that such suggestions may be considered at the proper time, I suppose any suggestion which speaks of automatic merger after a certain period. It does not then leave any room for the consideration of this question. What the Prime Minister says is that at the proper time, after five years or even earlier, it can be considered. Therefore, we need not take an irrevocable decision here and now. All these amendments which speak of automatic merger after a certain period are amendments which destroy the very possibility of the good suggestion which the Government have made.

Much has been said about Bombay. I have no desire to add to the controversy or bitterness. But persons in responsible positions whose words carry weight have made statements which have distorted facts and which contain all kinds of insinuations and level all kinds of charges against people who are not here. These statements have got to be replied to, however briefly, even unwillingly.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow charges and counter-charges on the floor of this House. The hon. Members will confine themselves to any particular area, whether it is to be included or excluded, the nature

of the Government, namely, whether it ought to be Part A or C State. Enough has been said about these recriminations.

Shri C. C. Shah: I will confine my observations to clause 8 as it should be and why it is not possible to accept any other amendment.

Shri Deshmukh, the other day, said:

"I find that so far as Gujarati leaders are concerned, they have secured what they exactly set out to gain—Mahagujarat and a fine new port."

With great respect, I beg to submit that Gujarati leaders did not set out to get either of these things. We did not want Mahagujarat. We never asked for it.

Dr. Rama Rao: People asked for it if he did not ask for it. (Interruptions)

Shri C. C. Shah: I will read the memorandum of the Gujarat Provincial Congress Committee which we submitted to the SRC

"While it is true that, as a result of persistent linguistic propaganda and agitation, some section of political opinion in Gujarat might have felt that the constitution of Gujarat as a separate State was inevitable, the general consensus of opinion in Gujarat as a whole would favour the continuance of the present composite State of Bombay in the larger interest of national unity."

That was our stand and that has always been our stand. The leaders of Gujarat did not set out to achieve Mahagujarat. It comes to us because the two other partners in the composite State, the Maharashtrians and Kannadas want a separate State for themselves and so, inevitably, the State of Gujarat is formed.

Then, they say that we set out to get a fine new port. Our leaders did not set to get a port. After Partition, Karachi was lost to India. In order to have a second port on the western coast, the Government decided to have

a port here as it was found to be the most suitable place after an enquiry by experts. That place was decided upon to relieve congestion in Bombay port and also to settle refugees. People seem to think: "You have Kandla port; why do you want Bombay or why do you not agree for giving Bombay to Maharashtra?" There is no comparison between the two.

Shri S. S. More: Then, have both.

Shri C. C. Shah: You know that I have very limited time at my disposal. We say that Bombay should be a separate unit not because of the port only. Five lakhs of people from Gujarat are settled in Bombay for generations. They earn their livelihood in Bombay. They cannot go to Kandla and settle there. (Interruptions). Merely because there is Kandla Port, it does not mean that we have no interest in Bombay. Port is a Central subject—and whether Bombay is in Maharashtra or not, it will remain to be utilised for the benefit of India. But it is the largest employment centre in the whole of India. Most of these five lakhs of people are of lower middle class in small, retail trade or employment, some of them getting less than a mill-employee.

Shri Deshmukh's statement seems to imply as if Gujarat has got everything it wanted and so it should be content. What is it that we are getting after all? Every border area either in the north—Abu, Doongerpur, and Banswada or in the South, Dang Umargaon and Navapur,—is denied to us. Every single border area that we asked for is denied to us. What is left is the irreducible minimum which, one may call, is one hundred per cent Gujarat. Nobody else can lay a claim on that area. If they could have found some reasons for claiming Surat and Baroda they would have claimed them and if they did not get them, they should have said there is a terrible sense of frustration in us. What is left to us is the irreducible minimum of Gujarat. We did not ask for a single inch of territory not belonging to us and we have not got any.

What is Gujarat? It will be comparatively a small State consisting of 1,60,00,000 people compared with giants like the U.P. and Bihar or Andhra or Tamil Nad or Maharashtra where there would be more than three crores of people. Maharashtra will be a very big State and a powerful State in the heart of India extending from Poona to Nagpur. With the utmost respect, I ask: "Why should there be any jealousy of Gujarat?". You will not get anything by jealousy of this kind. It is a small State and we hope to develop it in a manner which will be the pride of India. Gujarat of Gandhi and Sardar Patel will give something to India of which it can be well proud. It is not as if the leaders of Gujarat set out to achieve these things and they have achieved or secured something. All such statements do not benefit people who ought to know better than others.

Now, after all what is Gujarat? It will be a backward deficit State. Take Saurashtra. It has been a feudal State for centuries divided into two hundred and two jurisdictions. It never had an opportunity to develop. Take Kutch. It is still more backward. Take the north of Gujarat; the whole of Sabar Kantha and Banas Kantha. Take Panch Mahal and the greater part of Surat. They are all backward areas. Ahmedabad is not Gujarat. It is so coveted by Kaka Sahib Gadgil who has always his eye on Ahmedabad. For him, Ahmedabad is not Gujarat. Calcutta is not Bengal. Bengal is something entirely different from Calcutta. India is not Bombay. Similarly, Ahmedabad is not the whole of Gujarat. Gujarat is as poor as any other part of the country. But we have some qualities and we hope we will develop Gujarat in a manner that the whole nation will gain something out of it.

Why is it that we resist the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra? Bombay was the capital of a composite State, both Gujarat and Maharashtra and our association with Bombay are

[Shri C. C. Shah]

for the last 150 or 200 years. We were as much as closely associated economically, politically, socially and culturally with Bombay as the Maharashtrians.

Shri Gadgil: Calcutta was...

Shri C. C. Shah: Sir, I do not want any interruptions from Shri Gadgil. He is very clever at it and I do not want to be interrupted.

All that I say is this. What did we ask and what do we ask? Preserve Bombay for the common benefit of all. What does Maharashtra ask? "Give us Bombay; give Bombay to us alone." We do not ask Bombay for ourselves. We say Bombay belongs to the nation. We have been associated with it for 150 years. It is not that we are now getting Bombay. Bombay is being separated from Gujerat. We were with Bombay all these years. It was our capital. It was the hub of our social life, political life and economic life. Now it is being separated. It is also being separated from Maharashtra. Therefore, we do not feel that Bombay is lost to us. It is not lost either to Maharashtra, because it is being Centrally administered. When it is being Centrally administered, it is being done for the benefit of all. Shri C. D. Deshmukh does not seem to admit that Central administration is for the benefit of all. He has all kinds of apprehensions. He says, even if it is Centrally administered, there will be a major rehabilitation problem for Maharashtra and within this period of Central administration one or two lakhs of Maharashtrians forced by economic circumstances will have to leave Bombay.

Now, the Prime Minister and the Home Minister have given categorical assurances, if assurances were at all needed. The very fact that assurances are needed shows the distrust even of the Central Government. I would like to ask this question. When Bombay is under the Central Government, if you even distrust the Central Government to protect your interests, how do

you except the non-Maharashtrians in Bombay to trust you to protect the interests of non-Maharashtrians when it is under your rule? I will ask this question. The whole of his speech was full of distrust even of the Central Government. Now, so many people have so many apprehensions. The S.R. Commission has spoken of the apprehensions of the non-Maharashtrians in Bombay. When a mention of those apprehensions is made, they say: "We are insulted as a race. Are we not fit to rule? Do you fear us? Do you not trust us?" When you say that you do not trust the Central Government to protect your interests, when you say that your interests should not suffer even when it is under Central administration, is it not an insult to the nation? Is it not an insult to the Prime Minister and the Home Minister? The assurances they have given have no meaning then, because you say that there will be a major rehabilitation problem even if Bombay is Centrally administered. I say, if Bombay becomes part of a unilingual State, then there will be a major rehabilitation problem for the whole of India.

Dr. Rama Rao: Not at all.

Shri C. C. Shah: 5 lakhs of people from U.P., 5 lakhs of people from Gujerat 3 lakhs of people from South India and some more will be affected. They have their apprehensions. What is the insult about that? Every linguistic minority has apprehensions. My friend Shri Frank Anthony spoke of apprehensions of linguistic minorities in the atmosphere which exists in India today. The minorities have their apprehensions. If they mention those apprehensions, that does not mean that there is distrust or insult. So, wherever there are legitimate apprehensions they must be protected. Because somebody says that he has some apprehensions, to raise up a theory of insult upon it and then to rouse the passions of the people to say that their racial pride is wounded and therefore, no matter whether Bombay comes to us or not, that insult must be vindicated, is not correct. With all respect I submit that there is no insult



in it. Biharis in Bengal have their apprehensions and Bengalis in Bihar have their apprehensions, Hindus in the Punjab have their apprehensions and the Sikhs in the Punjab have their apprehensions. In the atmosphere in which India is today, there are bound to be apprehensions. Therefore, to take it as an insult is wrong. My friend Shri Kanavade Patil said: "We are insulted as a martial race".

**Shri Kanavade Patil (Ahmednagar North):** I said only race and not martial race.

**Shri C. C. Shah:** Who are the people who have expressed these apprehensions? It is not Gujeratis alone. The SRC has said this:

"During the course of our enquiry, a vast majority of persons—mark these words—"who appeared before us and did not belong to either of the two contending language groups expressed themselves strongly in favour of placing the Bombay City under a separate administration in the event of the disintegration of the State."

It is not the Gujeratis alone who have apprehensions; it is a vast majority of persons who did not belong to either of the two contending language groups.

There is a very good reason for that. Take for example the Dhar Commission. It has recorded that the entire non-Maharashtrians of Bombay were against Bombay being made a part of any unilingual State.

**Dr. Rama Rao:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. I wan't allow this kind of interruption. What is this? If there is a mistake somebody else will correct it later on.

**Shri C. C. Shah:** I will read to you the resolutions passed by important organisations representing minorities in the City of Bombay. The Uttar

Bharatiya Sangh, of which Shri Shiva Kumar Sharma is the president, say:

उत्तर भारतीय संघ उत्त बहुर में सङ्गे  
 छः भाष उत्तर भारतीयों का प्रतिनिधित्व  
 करता है।"

They say that Bombay should not become a part of any unilingual State. The Parsi Federal Council has also passed a similar resolution. The South Indian Association in the City of Bombay, whose President is Shri A. C. Ramalingam, Secretary of the Indian Merchants' Chamber, and who knows what he talks about, has also passed such a resolution. There is also the Kannada organisation in the City of Bombay. All these organisations have passed resolutions. Shri Patil knows them very well. It is not as if merely the Gujeratis, as is sought to be shown here, are the villains of the piece. All linguistic minorities have their apprehensions; and they have expressed themselves for the very reason that the hon. Shri Deshmukh mentioned.

He said, you have assured us that the Government employees will not suffer, but what about the private non-Maharashtrian employers. I do not know what he meant by it. He admitted that the Government has neither any right nor any way of preventing the private non-Maharashtrian employers from behaving as they like. But I ask him this. If he were the ruler of Bombay, what would he have done? Would he issue an order to the private non-Maharashtrian employers that they should employ only Maharashtrians and none else? That precisely is the fear of all non-Maharashtrians in Bombay. They feel that if Bombay becomes a part of a unilingual State, the ruling majority party will use its power for the advantage of that group only and to the disadvantage of the rest. Of course, legally they can't do it, but when a ruling party is in a majority, there are a thousand and one other ways of achieving what they want. When law and order is a State subject, when labour legislation is a

[Shri C. C. Shah]

State subject, when the location of industries is a State subject, when education is a State subject, you can very well understand, Sir, what the position of the non-Maharashtrian employers in Maharashtra will be.

Sir, I do not blame them. What I say is, it is the very formative principle of a linguistic State. It is formed for that purpose, namely to seek the political and economic advancement of that linguistic group and work for the benefit of that particular linguistic group. That is the purpose, and it will be false to its purpose, it will be false to the very formative principle, if it did not seek to achieve it, in all ways it can.

I will tell you, Sir, one other thing, Shri C. D. Deshmukh gave currency to many rumours. There are all kinds of rumours everywhere. It does not behave us to give currency to rumours. These are evil thoughts which pass in the minds of many people at many times. Do not put them in the hearts of people so that they can follow them. Here is only yesterday's paper which says:

महाराष्ट्राची प्रतिज्ञा

प्रत्येक महाराष्ट्रीयानें महाराष्ट्रीय  
दुकानदाराकडूनच माल घ्यावा

Every Maharashtrian in Bombay should purchase his goods only from a Maharashtrian dealer.

Shri Gadgil: That is the reaction.

Shri C. C. Shah: I do not know what is the reaction. I entirely agree that their actions and reactions—whether your action in Bombay is a reaction to the others or the action of others is the reaction to yours. But these are the things which happen in Bombay. I would appeal to Shri C. D. Deshmukh, now that he has come to public life, to realise this position and I would expect him and the Maharashtrian friends to realise what should be done and what should not be done.

They say, take any safeguards. Of course safeguards must be there. But

even as regards safeguards, I would draw the attention of Shri Frank Anthony in particular to what the States Reorganisation Commission has said. I shall quote from the report:

"We wish to emphasise that no guarantee can secure a minority against every kind of discriminatory policy of a State Government. Governmental activity at State level affects virtually every sphere of a person's life and a democratic government must reflect the moral and political standards of the people. Therefore, if the dominant group is hostile to the minorities, the lot of minorities is bound to become unenviable".

Of course, guarantees have their values. But they have only a very limited value, as I said earlier.

Lastly, I shall stress this point: what is it that all of us wish? We have said that we want to settle this question with goodwill. Everybody has said so. We want to do it peacefully. I humbly ask this House and particularly Shri Deshmukh and Shri Gadgil, is this the way of achieving goodwill? Is this the way of achieving your goal, or, is this the way of removing the distrust and fear of the people? They have made all kinds of insinuations against Gujarat and Gujaratis. They have levelled—what shall I say, or what words shall I use—reckless and baseless charges against the Chief Minister of Bombay and they have used this House as the forum for making charges against the Chief Minister of Bombay.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will address the Chair.

Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik Central): Sir, you have not allowed us to say anything about the law and order position, or about the Chief Minister of Bombay. But they are praising him now. I want to point out that there is another side also to the picture.

Shri Gadgil: Let him say it. I welcome it. I can give him proof.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member, Shri C. C. Shah, will address the Chair. I had said that no reference need be made for or against, so far as the law and order situation and the connected issue are concerned. That issue will have to be decided elsewhere and not in this House. The hon. Member may conclude, as he himself said that he would conclude.

Shri C. C. Shah: I was saying that what they were doing is not the way of achieving goodwill at all. I do not want to go into the charges at all. I have lived in Bombay all the years of my life—54 years of my life. I am a Bombay man. I do not know whether Shri Deshmukh knows Bombay as well as I do. I know Bombay better than probably he does. Shri Gadgil has not lived in Bombay so long as I have lived there.

Shri Gadgil: I have lived there for five years, as a law student.

Shri C. C. Shah: From birth upto now, I have lived in Bombay. I appeal to you.....

Shri S. S. Merc: Appeal to whom?

Mr. Speaker: When there is so much of heat and emotion, the hon. Member will still kindly address the Chair.

Shri C. C. Shah: I do not know how to express my feelings, honestly speaking, after I heard Shri C. D. Deshmukh. He has excelled everybody in this game, and has probably eclipsed even Shri Gadgil. But what is the character of this movement which we are witnessing in Bombay? What is the character of this movement, I ask again. The Gandhi cap was the target of attack, a thing which has been sacred to us. Why is it that the Gandhi cap is the target of attack?

Mr. Speaker: I have ruled that I would not allow any such reference during this debate.

Shri G. H. Deshpande rose—

Shri C. C. Shah: Shri G. H. Deshpande was with me. His cap was also snatched away as much as mine.

Shri G. H. Deshpande: It is an old affair. It was resorted to by the communists in the old days.

Mr. Speaker: There has been equal justice to both Maharashtrians and Gujaratis.

Shri C. C. Shah: I shall submit this with the utmost respect and great humility. Let us have some time for peace. Let the people of Bombay have some time. As the Prime Minister has said, let them have about five years. During that period, goodwill and peace could be restored. You want to convert our hearts.

Mr. Speaker: They want to convert you. The hon. Member will kindly address the Chair.

Shri C. C. Shah: I can assure this House and my friends over there—if my assurance has any meaning or any worth—that the Gujaratis will fully co-operate in any solution that may be found in the national interest. We will not lag behind others, even if it means any sacrifice to ourselves, to find a solution which will command the confidence of the nation. But, for Heaven's sake, do not force the issue by any means; do not force it to a stage when it will mean disunity of this country.

Shri Asoka Mehta (Bhandara): Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the very outset, I must apologise to you for trying to catch your eye in spite of the advice that you had given. I have spoken on this subject before, yet I rise to speak again because I feel deeply and profoundly on this subject. I believe that we are, wittingly or otherwise, witnessing the enactment of a tragedy. We would be unworthy of the trust that has been reposed in us if we do not try to avert this tragedy.

I rise to support the amendment No. 462, which has been moved by Shri Frank Anthony and a few others. We have witnessed the fact that every single Member of this House has taken great interest in the city of Bombay. Everyone recognises that this great debate on the States Reorganisation Bill has been dominated by

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

the issue of Bombay city. Why should this much interest in the city of Bombay be shown? I was brought up in Bombay. There are others who have intimate ties with Bombay city. Why is it that everyone in this House, no matter from what part of this country he comes, is deeply disturbed by what is happening in Bombay and is profoundly concerned about the future of Bombay city? It is because Bombay city is a unique city. Everyone has felt that therein he has a home, a place. My friends, Shri S. K. Patil, Shri Kajrolkar and Shri V. B. Gandhi have the privilege of representing the city of Bombay in this House, but each one of us here speaks for the city of Bombay, though everyone is not a Member from Bombay. Each one speaks for Bombay as if he is a Member representing Bombay. Why is it so? There must be some reason for the outpouring, for the welling up of the tremendous interest and the tremendous allegiance to this great city of ours. That needs to be understood. If there is this kind of emotional stir in the minds of the people who live hundreds and thousands of miles away from Bombay, is it difficult to understand what the people of Bombay must be feeling on the matter? Is it difficult to understand what the people of Maharashtra must be feeling and what the people of Gujarat must be feeling on the matter?

The people of Maharashtra and the people of Gujarat have long laboured together, in a common vineyard, and the hub of that vineyard has been the city of Bombay. Friends from Maharashtra have inextricable ties with Bombay. Those are the ties which make them tremendously and passionately emotional in respect of the future of the city of Bombay. Why is it that they come forward and feel that a separation of Bombay from Maharashtra is like separation of the head from the body? Because there is a kind of organic unity—whether it is there in polity or not is a different thing—about Bombay city. It is carv-

ed in their hearts which they cannot forget and which they cannot forgive.

Likewise, may I remind you and the House about the Gujaratis? I know the Gujaratis. They have also their emotional ties with Bombay. You cannot rend this thing apart suddenly. There has got to be an attitude of give and take, some mutual adjustment, some willingness to sit back and think. Let things settle down. But, trying to disassociate Bombay from Maharashtra or create conditions where the people of Gujarat will feel that they have lost their home, either of these solutions will be ultimately to the ruin of that vineyard of Bombay. If this is to be avoided, even now it is not too late to realise that the only abiding solution is to have a bilingual State. You have heard my friend, Shri Deshmukh; you have heard Mr. Patil; I do not know if my voice has been able to reach you. My friend, Shri Tulsidas Kilachand, has also spoken. We have all taken up different positions in public life. Look at our background; it has been very different. Each one of us, in our own way, has tried to serve the country. But we are all agreed on one thing, namely, that the only worth while solution is to have a bilingual State. Whether he is a money bag, or not, Shri Tulsidas has expressed his view. Shri S. K. Patil is the only solitary Maharashtrian who has taken up a different stand from the rest of the Maharashtrians. We are all agreed on one thing that the only abiding solution is that Bombay should be a bilingual State. Why? It is because the citizens of Bombay, by the Grace of God or whatever you call it, feel so. Neither Shri Deshmukh, nor Shri S. K. Patil nor myself nor, I hope, Shri Tulsidas, would be at home either at Poona or Ahmedabad. It is only in the city of Bombay that we feel at home, because of the unique quality of the city of Bombay. If it is to be preserved, this apple of discord must cease to remain. Therefore, if we want to face the difficulties that have been

created, we should have the courage to go forward. I am surprised to find that there is a kind of Greek tragedy being enacted; some unkind fury seems to be there. There is no one in the whole of Maharashtra today whose word will command greater respect or weight than Mr. Deshmukh; and he says that the right solution is to have a bilingual State. My friend, Shri Patil, who has played a historic part in the making of modern Bombay, is also of the same view. Ask every one of them individually; every one of them recognises that this is the only solution. We all recognise this; we give expression to it; but, as I have said, some cruel fate seems to be preventing us from having the right solution. I would like to say this that ever since I came to the House, I have expressed my esteem for Mr. Deshmukh and, if he will permit me to say so, my affection for him. I say that his word carries weight in this House as well as outside. Today his word carries a tremendous weight wherever the Marathi language is spoken. May I make an appeal to him? He is today in the unique position to come forward and bring about a reconciliation. Reconciliation is a thing in which, I believe, strangely enough, Shri Deshmukh would be able to play a decisive part.

Mr. Pataskar—I do not know if he is here now—spoke the other day. He told us about the quadrilingual state of Bombay. Sind was separated, but were all the problems solved? Now Gujarat and Maharashtra will be separated; but, will our problems be over? I do not think so. I love Maharashtra and I love Gujarat; and, I can see the future. The future is dark and gloomy for me, because our very vitals are going to be affected. There is going to be no glorious future for democracy either in Gujarat or Maharashtra. There are going to be serious difficulties. We had communal and linguistic tensions. Unless we realise that the rearticulation of our country should be not in terms of tensions, but in terms of mutual goodwill, tolerance and reconciliation,

we are going to create new kinds of internal conflicts and new kinds of internal tensions. My friends from Gujarat and Maharashtra know these things better than myself.

What is happening elsewhere, I do not know; but, here, it is not a spontaneous solidarity that is emerging. It is a solidarity based upon antipathy; and, a solidarity based upon antipathy is a dangerous solidarity. Therefore, let us try to create a solidarity without antipathy. I believe the Gujarat P.C.C. made a serious error in turning down the idea of a bilingual State. It is never too late to retrieve from an error and I hope it is not yet too late. I hope my friends from Gujarat who are here will permit me to say this that by that one single act of the G.P.C.C., a terrible blow has been given to the reputation of Gujarat. What has been my pride in Gujarat? It is this that they tried to think in terms of India as a whole. Dadhabai Naoroji, Mahatma Gandhi, the father of Indian national awakening and the Father of the Nation, Pherozshah Mehta, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, the greatest general of the forces of freedom—how were they able to occupy the position they occupied in the hearts of the people? They had no conception of anything narrow; they thought in terms of the nation as a whole. There was no political life in India before Gandhi; the whole political life of Gujarat was established by Gandhi and the Gujaratis were able to rise above narrow particularism and sectional outlooks. But, it has been a tragedy, something of a terrible heart-break for me to find that today Gujarat would not rise to the heights one was entitled to expect from it. With your permission, Sir, I would ask my Gujarati friends: Do they realise that these Members here today feel that there is a provincial feeling in Gujarat, which they did not suspect before? Let them not go away with the feeling that before the bar of history, Gujarat has a clean bill.

To my friends from Maharashtra, I would say this. I have known the

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

young people of Maharashtra; I love them. Do you know what terrific social energy they have and also tremendous power, passion and fervour which they have got? Have you seen the *satyagraha*? It may be wise or unwise, but hundreds and thousands of them came forward. Nobody purchased tickets for them; nobody provided food for them. But, the young people without any resources, begging and borrowing, have come forward in hundreds and thousands for a cause which is most dear to them. That social energy, that tremendous outpouring of strength and that passion—is this to be permitted to be drained down the rocks to the sands? In all humility, I ask this question. Here is this tremendous force; the flood of emotion and passion comes. Kaka Saheb was once Minister for Works and Power; and he knows that.

When a flood comes, if you permit it, it inundates the land and destroys. It only brings destruction. The flood has got to be trained, restrained. If this flood has to be made useful for the purpose of irrigation and creation, the flood has to be brought under control. May I appeal to Kaka Saheb, who is an elder statesman, who did me a great honour by calling me an adopted son, to rise to the occasion and see that this tremendous outpouring of energy, this flood that is coming forth, shall be restrained and controlled for the greater glory of the nation? That is possible only if there is a bilingual State.

1 P.M.

This morning, when I was reading hopefully and prayerfully about the celebration of Lokamanya's centenary in Poona, what did I find? I found there a reference saying, what is our new birthright? What is our *Janmasiddha hakka* without the realisation of which we will not rest? The new birthright that was enunciated yesterday in Poona by friends whom I respect was that the people of Maharashtra will not rest until they have got Bombay. What a parody of Shri Lokamanya's message? He said, *swaraj* is my

birthright? Whose *swaraj*? The very integrity of India. Not merely the independence of India. India was independent in various ways, in the past. The unique achievement of the national movement has been unity and integrity of our land. That is a priceless jewel. Over and over again in the history of India we were free. Freedom is not something new. That is integrity that is more important: awareness that we are one, an awareness that a common destiny unites us. It was Lokamanya Tilak who gave us that awareness. It is that dimension that is in danger of disappearance. I know Kaka Saheb will rise to the occasion and see that that dimension does not disappear. Is this the tribute that we pay to the great Lokamanya on his centenary celebration, that we permit that dimension to be narrowed, that we permit the annihilation of all that he worked for and laboured for? That is why I say there has got to be found a reconciliation in which there will be neither victors, nor vanquished, no money-bags and no common people who are being exploited. I understand the depth of feeling which made my hon. friend Shri S. S. More turn round and say, Asoka Mehta is right, one is an exploiter and another is the exploited, one is a metropolitan power and the other colonial, and yet they have united for more years than one can count. Shri Kaka Saheb, Shri S. S. More and myself were in the same yard, in neighbouring cells, during the British period, playing cards in the afternoons, reading books in the morning, discussing, fighting, joking, Kaka Saheb always being the very heart and core of the picture. In spite of that, if this is the feeling that is going to be, you can realise what the situation must be.

Recently, I went to a few countries. Many people, some tauntingly, some sympathetically, asked me about Pakistan and Bombay. They were asking questions about Pakistan and Bombay because the world expects some kind of a solution

from us. Somehow or other, we seem to have built up a moral leadership. Mr. Bertrand de Jouvenal a French socialist and philosopher, told me that economists talk of growth but philosophers talk of decay. The moral fabric of the world is breaking down because we are not able to find ways and means of reconciliation. We must find a solution. Why is India great? We are poor economically, politically, militarily. But, since the days of Raja Ram Mohun Roy up till the days of Shri Jawahar Lal Nehru, we have been somehow or other trying to work on the lines of reconciliation. I do not know why Bombay and Pakistan are up on their sleeves. I do not know what we can do about Pakistan. But, if we fail to come to a solution on Bombay, it will not be a set back for Maharashtra and Gujarati alone. It is going to be a set back for the whole of India. I feel that there has got to be a solution which would be acceptable to every one, which will reverse certain forces that are at work. Bombay merely pin points the dangers that are there. The danger is, either you win or I win. Somehow or other we are not prepared to realise that in any worth while solution, no one wins, no one loses. Therefore, the solution of the Bombay problem will put us back into the temper that is needed for solving not only the problems of State reorganisation, but the problems of State reconstruction. Reorganisation is made in the beginning for reconstruction. Unless we approach in a new temper which says that we are going to re-dedicate ourselves, that spirit of re-dedication will not come. If a man from Mars were to come and listen to speeches that we have been making, would he feel that we have a spirit of re-dedication? Mine is a weak voice. I have no right to say what I have been saying. I have been saying that because I feel howsoever weak I may be, howsoever unworthy I may be, I would be wrong before the bar of history, before my own conscience if I did not testify to the truth, as I see it.

Shri Gadgil rose.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Heda. I will let go some time before one speech and another.

Shri Gadgil: I thought he asked me to rise to the occasion, and so I rose.

Mr. Speaker: I will call him next.

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): Mr. Deputy-Speaker,.....

Some Hon. Members: Speaker.

Shri Heda: I was away for the last four months and therefore I made a mistake, a deplorable one.

I too feel in the same way as Shri Asoka Mehta has felt. In other countries, particularly in the U.S.A. and European countries, the prestige of India which had been rising higher and higher is at stake on this question of States reorganisation. The disturbances at Bombay were given great publicity and everywhere, we were asked, what is happening, whether the unity of India would be retained or whether we are going towards destruction and disunity. They have no proper conception of the tremendous problem that we are handling. In fact, I gave the reply that if there are disturbances at one place, we should not be surprised because the problem is so big and if in any other country, one had to handle a problem of this dimension, there would have been many more disturbances. Whenever, we think of this problem, we have got not only to think of our country, but we have also got to think of our country's prestige in the international sphere. Whatever we may debate, I hope that hon. Members, when we have arrived at a decision, will in a spirit of sportsmanship and follow the decision, accept it in a democratic way and go ahead. In the world, if there is anything wrong, there are many ways of remedying that. We can do it in this House and in other proper places.

Then, I come to my amendments. I would divide them into three groups. Firstly, I will talk about the two

[Shri Heda]

cities-Raichur and Bidar. Then, I would talk about a few tehsils in Raichur Taluk. Then I would talk about Sarwanha Tehsil in Chanda district. We are re-distributing the boundaries according to language. The difficulty is that we have not fixed a village, tehsil, district or revenue circle as the unit. That is the whole trouble. We have been told again and again that if we bring some agreed formula it would be accepted. Sometimes the agreed formula comes, and sometimes it does not come. It is not only the Members of Parliament or Members of the respective legislative assemblies who are concerned with this matter. In fact, the people living in those areas are the persons who are really concerned with them, and therefore we have to think about them.

So far as Hyderabad is concerned, we are fortunate in one thing. As it is a tri-lingual State, the Government of Hyderabad had taken the census language-wise in every village, and they have printed them. Villages which are predominantly Telugu-speaking have a particular mark, those speaking Marathi have another mark, those speaking Kannada have a third mark and if no language predominates that is given a different mark. Therefore, the work done by the Government of Hyderabad and its Census Department should be fully utilised. It is very easy to find out the areas where the different languages predominate. Even without appointing a boundary commission we can demarcate the lines and solve the problem having the village as the unit or any other unit.

Now I come to the two cities of Raichur and Bidar. These are very strange cities. No language predominates there. Rather, in Bidar the language spoken by the majority is Urdu. Next to Urdu, in Raichur it is Telugu which is spoken more. In Bidar, of course, it is Kannada, but, as I said, no language is in a majority. These cities were allotted to Karnataka only on the basis that formerly they were called the Kannada

Districts, though their commercial and other interests, even cultural interests, lie with the City of Hyderabad rather than with Bangalore or Mysore. Therefore, it would be a great disturbance to these towns themselves and to the people round about.

So far as Raichur Taluk is concerned, about three revenue circles are clearly Telugu-speaking, and therefore whatever the House may decide about Raichur town itself, these revenue circles should go to Andhra Pradesh. In certain cases cent, per cent. of the people speak Telugu, and in no village less than 70 per cent. speak Telugu.

The same is the case with some revenue circles in Gulbarga District. So, I hope this House will appoint a boundary commission and thereby decide it. If they do not do so, so far as Hyderabad is concerned, the matter is very clear as every village has been demarcated language-wise. Taking the village or the revenue circle as the unit you can demarcate the areas.

Lastly, I come to the tehsil of Servanha in Chanda District. Chanda is an adjacent district in the present Madhya Pradesh. This district is going to Maharashtra. When the legislators and other leaders of Telengana and Marathwada sat together, they decided that Rajura Taluk of Adilabad District, being predominantly Marathi-speaking, should go to Chanda District and Servanha Tehsil of Chanda District which is predominantly Telugu-speaking should go to Adilabad District.

Shri G. B. Khedkar (Buldana-Akola): Servanha is in Madhya Pradesh.

Shri Heda: My friend has pointed out the mistake that we made, because the talk we had was with the Marathwada leaders. We agreed to give Rajura Taluk because it was Marathi-speaking and they said that Servanha Tehsil is Telugu-speaking and that we should have it. We did



not have the talks with the Chanda District people, but simply because of our good gesture, now my hon. friend, a reasonable and rational man like Shri Khedkar, comes forward and says this. Of course, if he has got only this plea that the Marathwada people have got no right to speak about Servancha, it is quite different, but can he say that Servancha is not a predominantly Telugu-speaking tehsil? If he says that I have nothing to say, but as far as my information goes, more than 90 per cent. speak Telugu, and the gentleman who represents Servancha in the House admits and everybody admits that the tehsil as a whole is predominantly Telugu-speaking. Therefore, since Rajura from Adilabad has gone to Chanda, Servancha from Chanda should naturally come over here. I do not think Maharashtra or any State will gain anything by having some portions speaking some other language. It will only create a headache for them. When they do not want a bi-lingual State, what is the use of creating a bi-lingual area?

**Dr. Jaisooriya (Medak):** May I inform him that we have had talks with the Maharashtrian leaders and they are willing to transfer it after they get it?

**Shri B. Y. Reddy: (Karimnagar):** Why not now? Why after they get it?

**Mr. Speaker:** I am sure whatever is agreed to—that is what the hon. Home Minister said the other day—by the various groups will be accepted. Even here it may be done if really that has been agreed to.

**Shri B. Y. Reddy:** But they are not coming forward for discussions even. We have been contacting them, but they are not coming forward. So, what is to be done then? Who is to convene such a kind of meeting?

**Mr. Speaker:** The agreement has been broken, I think.

**Shri B. Y. Reddy:** It has not been broken. The agreement is there, but people are there belonging to diffe-

rent States and Members belonging to Madhya Pradesh are not agreeable. They say: "This is not your concern, it is our concern."

**Shri Meda:** We will make efforts in that direction also, and we hope everything will be quite all right.

With these words, I commend my amendments.

**Shri Gadgil:** Mr. Speaker, my friend Shri C. C. Shah and my friend Shri Asoka Mehta in the course of their respective speeches appealed to me and in a way inflated my status by calling me an elderly statesman. For the purposes of this discussion I accept it though it is not true.

There are two questions now before us in this hon. House. One is about the adjustment of boundaries and the other about the problem of Bombay City. So far as the problem of border areas is concerned, I may respectfully draw the attention of this hon. House to what we have said in our memorandum before the States Reorganisation Commission. In that memorandum we have taken this stand that the Commission should lay down certain principles on which border areas should be delimited and there should be a uniform application of those principles. That was our stand and even today that is our stand. We have declared time and again—in my speeches here before, and also in the speech which was delivered by my esteemed friend Shri B. S. Hiray in the Legislative Assembly of Bombay—that if any village does not want to be with us, we do not want it. At the same time, if those villages which are culturally and linguistically ours do not want to stay in the other area, they should be transferred to us. Whether it is the district of Dang or a small portion of Umargaon or Nawapur, whatever be the area, and whatever be the population, we do not believe in forced coexistence. We behave in honest heart-to-heart contacts of feelings. Therefore, this is our view. In view of what has been said on the floor of this House yesterday, namely

[Shri Gadgil]

that many of our people do not know what the taluks are, what the villages are, what the boundaries are, what the nature of the terrain is, and so on, and in view also of the fact that it has got to be fitted in, after all, into the context of administrative convenience, I feel that this is really the job of someone who has to look after these areas exclusively. He has to collect the data, see the particular terrain concerned, and then give a sort of award for the other parties to accept.

It was suggested by the Home Minister that this question can be adequately and properly dealt with through the zonal councils. But by their very constitution, they are incapable of dealing with these questions. The zonal councils will consist of contestants. Take the Western Zone, for instance. The Chief Minister of Gujerat, the Chief Minister of Maharashtra, and the Chief Minister of Bombay—if the separate State ultimately comes into existence—will be there. But, how are they to agree?

Shri S. S. More: But Karnataka will not be there.

Shri Gadgil: That is what I am telling.

How are they to agree? They may agree on certain problems that concern them. But what about Belgaum, and what about Karwar, and what about certain border areas bordering Madhya Pradesh? Therefore, I would suggest that this is not a mechanism which is adequate for the purpose of a satisfactory solution of this problem. I would, therefore, request the Home Minister, in all humility, through his son-in-law and through his deputy there, that he might consider this; let him not think that because he has said that he will not have a boundary commission, therefore, what is provided here must be good for all time to come. I suggest that a boundary commission should be appointed to go through all these things, so that the tensions of today may considerably ease, and just as when we put the matter before an

arbitrator or a court, the decision of the arbitrator or the court is binding, unless there is gross injustice or there are some circumstances that justify the challenging of the award, likewise in this case also, the verdict of the boundary commission may stand. If that could be done, I have no objection. When I say this, I am sure I am practically echoing the feelings and considerations which weigh with the hon. Members of this House.

Then, there is the question of Bombay. Either you consider it on merits, or you consider it in the larger context in which my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta tried to consider it. In the first place, I have to clear a little bit of misunderstanding on this issue. I heard the speech of our great leader, and I heard also the speech of our Home Minister. Both the speeches have improved the matter to some extent. But the fact remains that in the absence of a precise solution, in the absence of a precise scheme, it is impossible for anyone of us to carry our people, namely, the Maharashtra community, with us. When we are told that we should think in the larger context of all-India, I am entirely with them. No Maharashtra has ever said that he is a Maharashtra first, and an Indian afterwards. Right from the days of Lokmanya Tilak up till today, we have said we are Indians first and Maharashtrais next. If we want to be better Maharashtrais, it is precisely because we want to be better Indians. As I said the other day, in the case of Keats, the Irish poet, the more Irish he became, the more universal was his appeal. That is the basis of our approach also.

If you decide to give a special discriminatory treatment to Bombay, so far as Maharashtra is concerned, then, I ask in all humility, why the same treatment should not be meted out to Calcutta. As a matter of fact, from 1952 onwards, we have got newspaper cuttings of the speeches made and the resolutions passed by many non-Bengalis from Calcutta, requesting that the government of Calcutta should be

taken over by the Centre, so that their interests may be safeguarded. I do not want to give those quotations here, because those quotations were given in the course of the speech made by my hon. friend Mrs. Roy.

Shrimati Bena Chakravarty (Basirhat):....Mrs. Chakravarty.

Shri Gadgil: I am sorry, it was by Mrs. Chakravarty. But the names do not mean much in the modern world.

The point here is this. The nearest Gujerat border is about 110 miles from Bombay. All round, it is Maharashtra-ian territory. But you are just taking this out and saying that this city has to be given a special treatment. On what grounds are you doing so? You are doing so, because certain people have expressed distrust.

We asked the States Reorganisation Commission to let us know the causes for this distrust. We tried to contact those forty citizens of Bombay, through the good offices of Shri Vairkuntlal Mehta, but they would not meet us even. In the absence of any precise description or definition of their distrust, we were absolutely at a dead wall. Then, we had this finding that 'Somebody distrusts you, and therefore, we cannot give it to you'. Now, just consider this. My hon. friend Shri C. C. Shah may not be able to understand the implications of this. But we understand the implications. The implications are, 'We cannot give it to you, because firstly, you are so-and-so, and secondly, you are incapable of administering this State of Bombay'.

So far as distrust in a particular sphere is concerned, I would ask them in all humility to go round and see for themselves the whole economic life of any area of Maharashtra. They will find that the whole economic life of our region is dominated by Gujaratis and *marwaris*, or to put it generally, by the non-Maharashtrians. They will find this to be the position in every village and every taluk that they may visit. You may go wherever you like, but you will find that this is the posi-

tion. Take the case of the big city of Poona, for instance. 90 per cent of the wholesale trade in textiles and silk is in the hands of the Gujaratis; 50 per cent of the retail trade is also in the hands of the Gujaratis; again, in the case of general trade in grocery and other things, nearly 40 per cent is in their hands.

Their educational needs were looked after much more than those of other minorities outside Maharashtra. I do not want to say what I did when I was vice-president of the Poona Municipality, or what Shri S. S. More did when he was the president of the local board. But you go wherever you like. Go to Sangli, go to Miraj, go to Sholapur, and will find that everywhere they are there.

I do not want to repeat how many non-Maharashtrians have been returned to this House from Maharashtra, or for that matter, to the Bombay Legislative Council, out of the 156 seats allotted to them. I want to know how many non-Gujeratis have been returned from Gujerat. I am not giving all this with a view to incite or criticise anyone. All that I want to prove is that we have never been Communal. The interests of the minorities in our region have been absolutely safe.

Then, I want to ask my hon. friends how much of capital these Gujarati men of enterprise have invested in South Africa and other countries. Have they asked for any guarantee? Have they shown any distrust in those countries? They do not show distrust in a foreigner, but they are showing distrust in us. You can imagine the insult that I am feeling. As I said the other day, I have been educated in Baroda, and I can assure you that there is not one shred of hatred in my mind, and if I were to entertain it, I shall be entirely unworthy of myself.

But the fact is that they have shown distrust and without giving any proof. Then, a number of arguments have been made to the effect that Bombay has been the capital of

[Shri Gadgil]

a multilingual State etc. So has Calcutta been, before Bihar and Orissa were separated. So, was Madras before Andhra was separated. So, these arguments are of no account whatsoever. The fact is that roundabout, the entire region is Marathi-speaking, and as Shri Asoka Mehta put it, naturally, culturally and organically, the city of Bombay as a whole is Maharashtrian in character.

The best solution, in my humble opinion, is this. Having accepted unilingual States everywhere, you cannot propose a solution which is not in keeping with the general trend and tendency of the political thought that is existing and operating today. If you want to make a single exception in this case, again I feel insulted, because I am told, 'Oh, it is all right, but not here'. Just consider my feeling. Consider the feelings of other people. Let me tell you this. If you give the Marathas a little place of honour, you can take all their house, properly and everything, because they care for honour. If there is injustice done to them, they will die, and they will leave the legacy of struggle. In the words of a Marathi poet:

या मातीचे पुष्य अकें कीं, हिर्यो भूखें  
धन्यायाचे पुढे झुकवितो कधीं न माया

"The holiness of this land of Maharashtra is that her children will die, but will never bend before an act of injustice". That is our feeling this is our tradition. That is a great asset, as Shri Asoka Mehta said we should use for national purposes. Why do you become a little perverse and a little unjust? We were told that there were a million reasons why Bombay should be kept away from Maharashtra. I waited with my soul in patience for the last so many months to know them but not a single one has been put to me.

Shri S. S. More: Those millions are in the bags.

Shri Gadgil: I do not like to look at it from that point of view.

The point is this. The Prime Minister simply said: 'I will plead your cause. Have patience'. I admit that it has done a little good, but, as I said in the beginning, there must be a precise statement. Give Bombay today and I give him a blank cheque for safeguards. My friend, Shri S. K. Patil asked: where is the account Kaka Sahib has in the bank? I confess I have none, because we are poor. That is the reason why we have been penalised.

All over the country there has been propaganda, false propaganda, about our violence, about this, that and the other. At least make an inquiry and have a finding and then hang me, if you like. But nothing of the kind is done.

I do not want to refer to what the Chief Minister said "I will not rub in this point because I know it pays nobody, and certainly I do not want to offend any of my Gujarati friends, least of all Morarjibhai who has been one of my friends for 30 long years. It will be very unbecoming of me to do that.

The solution now proposed is that within five years, the position will be reviewed. There won't be any plebiscite or referendum or any cumbersome procedure. All to the good. But having gone so far, why do you want to keep this tension? If there is any method, cumbersome or otherwise, of ascertaining the wishes of the people, I entirely agree with my hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, that passions will rise. Everybody will try to get more number on his side. That was exactly what happened when separate electorate was given by Lord Minto in 1908. Later on, the Government of India Act, 1919, was enacted. Many people offered to take Harijans into this religion or into that religion

\*Extingued as ordered by the Chair.

only because they thought that power depended on numbers. If the issue is to be decided by numbers, then, take it from me, that there will be trouble.

Then we are appealed to: let calm be restored. I am entirely with Shri C. C. Shah. I will perform *pada yatra* with him in all the streets of Bombay. I assure him of that, because I am not practising, and that will also prevent him from practising if he joins in this holy *yatra*. Let us go. But at the same time, we must not be blind to the realities of the situation in Bombay. In Bombay, you can have conferences and riots at a moment's notice, if you have money. Then it means that whenever this question is to be decided, on the eve of that you will have a riot, and all the calm and all the good work that I and C. C. Shah propose to do will go to dogs.

We are accusing the Government of giving a veto to a minority. This means we are giving a veto to the goondas. Consider, then what will be the situation. I am entirely with Shri C. C. Shah and Shri Asoka Mehta that we should come together and build up and give a lead to the whole of the country. Whatever constructive powers he attributed to me, whatever the fund of inspiration he attributed to me, he knows I have kept that at the service of the country. Not one moment have I denied to the country what I could spare for the country; not one farthing, if I have it, have I denied it. Whatever is best and whatever is noblest in me has always been at the service of the country. Even today it is. But let us be realists. I assure Shri Asoka Mehta. Give Maharashtra its place of pride. The Marathi pride will be satisfied, even if it is for five or ten years.

If bilingual or unitary State for Bharat is kept as the ideal for the whole country, we shall all move towards it. But today psychology should be considered. It has become so impossible that if you force this, then the situation is explosive. Let me

not describe it. If I were to describe it, people would say, 'You have brought it about'. So any intelligent anticipation of events is at a discount today, particularly in this country.

I also appreciate what Shri Asoka Mehta has said. The best solution today is: give Bombay immediately to Maharashtra. Put it in any safeguards, whether by way of bigger powers to the Corporation or by some other way, by which the fears of those who are really afraid of us may be allayed. Let any safeguards be put—either by the Prime Minister or the Prime Minister plus Shri C. C. Shah. I am prepared to accept.

Now so far as the bilingual State is concerned, as I have said, it cannot be today. I may give a little history. While the great Sardar was alive, he made a statement at Rajkot, when Saurashtra was integrated, that one dream was realised, and the greater dream of Maha Gujarat would be soon realised. I am in honour bound to see that Maha Gujarat comes into existence, and if I am holding firm to it, it is out of my grateful memory to him. That I can quote from a government publication.

Shri C. C. Shah: God save us from our friends.

Shri Gadgil: That is exactly what I say. God save me from you.

The point is that Maha Gujarat is now a fact. I wish them all success and all happiness, and if ever they want my services—I know they do not want them—I am prepared to put myself at their service.

Therefore, now in all fairness, they should concede to our request which is just. If it has been unjust, I can understand it. Everybody says it is just, but they say 'no'. Therefore, I honestly feel that given goodwill, some evidence of which I found in the speech of Shri C. C. Shah, and quite an abundance of it in the speech of Shri Asoka Mehta, we will see this problem through. We can

[Shri Gadgil.]

not want this problem to fester for months together.

The Prime Minister referred to the fact that we are all children of revolution. So we are, and a revolutionary is one who does not bend his head before any act of injustice. What has happened today? He said in Bombay: geography is there, but it is not everything; arithmetic is there, but it is not everything; arguments are there, but they are not everything. Then what is left? These are the contents of democracy. If they are gone, I should say it is the beginning of the end of democracy. It is there that the revolutionary spirit in me is challenged. Therefore, I say, where reason is devalued, where justice is delayed and, therefore, denied, where truth is seconded to political convenience, my soul will rise; every soul and every real revolutionary in this country will rise, whatever be the consequences. I would, therefore, in all humility say that while theoretically accepting what Shri Mehta said—if that is the idea not for Gujaratis and Bombay but for the whole country—for the time being, in the context of circumstances in which things have developed, the demand of Maharashtra for inclusion of Bombay city should be conceded. I very respectfully request the Prime Minister, having come to the rivulet willingly, why not drink the water.

We were told that the Maharashtra leaders did that or did this. I do not want to detail the circumstances when they were offered not the thing they wanted but were asked whether they would like to be hang by the noose or by the chair. They were just asked to take either what the S.R.C. offered or the three states formula. If there was a tie in their minds between loyalty to the party and loyalty to the people and if in this conflict they have come to the ground, you must have sympathy for them. Speaking for myself, right from the beginning, orally and by letters, I had informed the Prime Minister, and the Home Minister that

any formula that separated Bombay city from Maharashtra will be resisted in a manner I shuddered to think. That was what I said in December and even now I repeat that. This position is intolerable. If our arguments do not count, if our requests are rejected and if our satyagraha is not appreciated but ridiculed, what is left for an honest citizen? The very fact that Government depends upon the consent of the people means that when they do something against the consent of the people, the bond of loyalty is dissolved and we are loyal to the Bharat State and not loyal to this Government. If today I am taking the risk, if it comes to that, of breaking party discipline, it is exactly as what Gandhiji said in 1942. He said: 'Look here, the elephant is in the cage; but, he knows that the custodian cannot prevent the incoming flame, the fire and therefore he is breaking the bonds of that cage and getting out in order to save himself.' This is exactly the position of some of us, Congressmen. We have been with the Congress; grown with the Congress; we have done some thing with the Congress; we have never been opportunists in our life. Gadgil, minus Congress is a third-rate lawyer and a fourth-rate man of letters; but Gadgil in Congress is a power because he has reason on his side and has no other argument. I have no money; I am not well-connected; but, I am honest and straightforward. The only appeal I have is the appeal of the heart; the only argument I have is the argument of reason. The question, therefore, before the hon. House is, 'Are you going to vote according to reason, that means, according to your conscience, or are other considerations to weigh with you?'

In Marathi *mat* is analysed as *Matwa diyate iti*. *Mat*, the vote is something which is given after due consideration. I do appeal for that due consideration. If your conscience gives you some other inspiration, I have nothing to say. But, from what

I heard last time, in April. I have every reason to believe, whatever may be the party discipline and may be ultimately decided, so far as I am concerned, I have decided to vote against the exclusion of Bombay from the proposed Maharashtra.

**Shri Tulsidas (Mehsana West):** I am one of the joint movers of amendment No. 462. This question of the Bombay city has become.....

**Mr. Speaker:** I must have allotted some separate time for Bombay. There are clauses 2 to 15 before the House but Bombay is consuming all the time. There are Members from Hyderabad, from Himachal Pradesh, Punjab and other places but it is impossible for me to resist the temptation of calling, one after the other, Members from Bombay only I am exceedingly sorry I yielded to the sub-committee's recommendations. I must have kept Bombay separate of course, it is too late now.

**Shri Tulsidas:** You would remember that at the time of the first reading I had said that we should shelve this problem of reorganisation for some time because this is creating an atmosphere in the country which is really very disturbing and painful. My friend, Shri Asoka Mehta appealed this morning to every Member of this House to consider the question from the larger interest and not from any particular point. You know very well that a number of Commissions and Committees have been appointed in the past. They all came to the conclusion that the only solution of this problem is that there must be a composite State.

What was the quarrel with the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission? The quarrel from the side of the Maharashtra was that it is not a sort of composite State with all the Marathi-speaking and Gujarati-speaking people joined together. I have moved an amendment, which my friend Shri Asoka Mehta has also supported and a number of other Members have also joined in, that

there should be a complete bilingual State including Vidarbha, Saurashtra, Kutch, Bombay city, Maharashtra and Gujarat.

**Mr. Speaker:** What will be the population of that State?

**Shri Tulsidas:** It will be 4½ crores, not bigger than U.P. It would be the second biggest State in population.

The reason why I have been telling this and doing what little I could do from my side to persuade my friends from all sections of this particular State to come to the position of accepting the question of a composite State is because this is the only solution to my mind. When I talked to most of the leaders of this country personally, they were also of the same view. I have gone round and talked to most of the leaders, almost all, including the Prime Minister, Shri Deshmukh, when he was the Finance Minister, Pantji, the Home Minister and even Morarji Bhai of Bombay, and everyone of them told me that this is the only solution.

The tragedy is that in spite of all the people being of the same view, the result is that we are not finding a solution. The other day, when we were there in the Central Hall when the Prime Minister unveiled the portrait of Lokamanya Tilak, I was watching. There are three portraits in the Central Hall and all the three portraits are those of the leaders from the Bombay State. Bombay as a composite State has given to this country people whose memories we are cherishing, who have brought us the freedom of this country. If this State is to be divided as is now suggested in the Bill, nobody is going to benefit; the country is not going to benefit nor any one of the States that are going to be formed. The problem will continue to remain unsolved.

I have been born in Bombay; brought up in Bombay; and I studied

[Shri Tulsidas]

in Bombay and stayed in Bombay among the thickest Maharashtra population. In fact, I have read much more of Maharashtrian books than Gujarati books. I know, probably, a little more of Marathi than of Gujarati. Having lived with them, having been old friends and associates, I fail to understand why there is all this trouble. I do feel that at the present juncture the only solution is that the saner elements should prevail, let us not think about any other things, let us try to concentrate on how to from this bigger bilingual State.

My friend, Shri Gadgil said just now: let us have this ideal, let us not decide this issue now; but first of all, give Bombay city to Maharashtra. My friend, Shri Asoka Mehta said that that is not going to solve the problem, that the problem has to be settled, and if it has to be settled, it must be settled today and not afterwards. According to him, it is not possible to solve the problem afterwards. If my friend, Shri Gadgil, says that we must have this ideal, and let us combine together afterwards and so on, then what is his objection today to settle this issue? The only point that he could say is "my pride", the pride of having Bombay city first in Maharashtra, and then settling this question.

When we consider this problem from the whole country's point of view, let us not think in terms of what is the pride of any particular State or of particular persons. Let us find a solution today and I do not see any difficulty in finding it when there is a large volume of opinion in favour of it in this House. I have spoken to a number of friends in this House from Maharashtra and Gujarat, Bombay City and also from other States, and they all feel that the only solution is the formation of a bigger bilingual State.

Shri G. B. Khedkar: Have you consulted the Vidarbha people?

क्या आपने विदर्भ की जनता से भी पूछ  
लिया है कि आप को सिफारिश कर रहे हैं  
उसके बास्ते से तयार है

Shri Tulsidas: I have talked to them individually. Whatever may be the position with regard to the details, I am only talking about the broad principle whether it would not be in the interest of the entire country to have this problem solved. What is the solution? There is no other solution that can be found excepting this where there is the least amount of controversy. Only on this point the controversy is very little. I do not say there is absolute unanimity, but there are certain small things which may have to be settled here, but I do not think there will be much difficulty. You yourself, Sir, said just now that you wanted to take this question of Bombay, Maharashtra and Gujarat afterwards because it was taking the time of the House too much and that other Members did not get their opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to do it hereafter. I thought I must have done this earlier. No question of putting it again hereafter.

Shri Tulsidas: It is not only an important problem from the point of view of Gujarat or Maharashtra, but also from the point of view of the whole country. We do not want the disintegrating forces to take over the saner elements of the country. It is better that this matter is settled just now. I appeal to my friends in Gujarat and in Maharashtra that they must rise to the occasion, accept the position and settle this question now. It is no use speaking something against another community or linguistic province, because it does not benefit anyone nor solve this problem. After all we have lived together for 150 years and I do not see any reason why there should have been so much difficulty. In Bombay city we have lived together for a number of years and there has never been any problem or question of thinking



in terms of Maharashtrians or Gujaratis. My friend, Kaka Sahib, said that a number of Gujaratis are staying in Maharashtra and there is no trouble. He knows fully well that a number of Maharashtrians also stay in Gujarat and there is no trouble either. Does that not prove that we want this question to be settled in such a manner that both the communities do not have any grievances left. A number of people from Gujarat are staying in Maharashtra and a number of people from Maharashtra are staying in Gujarat—the number may be a little more here or a little less there—and, therefore, quite a large number of people are staying on both sides. In Bombay city, practically the whole of the city, where they stay together, there is not one house perhaps where there are only Gujaratis or only Maharashtrians. There are houses where both the communities stay together and live together. I do not understand the reason for this controversy.

Even the S.R.C. has stated that the question of this particular State is entirely different from that of Madras or West Bengal. They have definitely said that Bombay State should be a composite one. They left a part, that is, Vidarbha, separately, because at that time Vidarbha people did not feel happy to join hands with a bilingual State. Perhaps they may not like it today, but I appeal to them also that since they are joining with Maharashtra, they may as well agree to join this bigger bilingual State as that is the only way of solving this problem.

Even from the point of view of unity of this country, for which the Commission have devoted a whole chapter in their Report, they have stated that such a separatist attitude must be stopped, and the only place where it can be stopped is in the Bombay State. That is why they have recommended the composite State of Bombay.

I consider it was a mistake that they had left out Vidarbha. I feel that it

is absolutely essential that this problem has to be settled now and not later on, and it cannot be settled in any other way than what I have suggested. As my friend Shri Ashoka Mehta said, let us suppose that Bombay goes to Maharashtra, does it settle the problem? On the one hand, Shri Gadgil says, "Let us have Bombay in Maharashtra, let the Gujaratis have as many safeguards as they like". It shows that the problem is not settled. When you talk of giving safeguards, it automatically follows that even if Bombay is taken by Maharashtra, the problem will not be solved. Therefore, the only solution to this problem is to have a bigger bilingual State. I want the Vidarbha people also to join it and I am sure they will join in getting together into this bigger bilingual State. It will have an important place in the country. It will be the second largest State, after U.P., and it will have the greatest importance in the administration of this country and it will set an example to others.

The Prime Minister wants five big composite States in this country. This will be the biggest State and will have the honour of being the first composite State in the country—Paschim Pradesh. According to the zonal arrangement, Paschim Pradesh consists of nothing else than Maharashtra, Gujarat and Bombay city. If you form this whole bilingual State, then you have got the Paschim Pradesh, which will be giving a lead to the country. In spite of all the troubles, we may with pride say that we have solved this question by the establishment of Paschim Pradesh. It is time that we consider this aspect from all sides. After all, it is no use talking about the question of "money bags" and things of that sort. Everyone in the country is fully entitled to create money-bags. . .

Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur):  
What is a "money-bag"?

Shri Tukidas: I do not know. Please ask the person who has spoken about it

[Shri Tubidas]

Shri Asoka Mehta has made a very eloquent and emotional appeal to the Members from Maharashtra and Gujerat in this House. I join him in this appeal and I hope that my friends here will support us in this task of forming a bigger bilingual State in order to settle this question.

2 P.M.

When I alked to my friend, Shri Deshmukh, only yesterday, he fully supported my amendment for the creation of this bigger bilingual State. He has, unfortunately, resigned as Finance Minister on the issue of the Bombay city. He strongly feels so. He has openly said so. He believes in the bilingual State. He should come and give a lead to the country. He should see that a Paschim Pradesh is established. I once again appeal to the hon. Members here to support this amendment which will solve the problem without leaving any bitterness.

2.02 P.M.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

There have been certain other suggestions to form Bombay as a Part A State. I do not think it is a good solution. Again there will be three States. I do not want three States but only one State. It was formerly one State. Unfortunately, my friends from Karnataka have gone out to join with the Karnataka State. I wish them the best of luck; they have been with us all these years. We wished that they should continue with us but if they prefer to remain out, I wish them the best of luck. My friends from Vidarbha have come and we will form a composite State. I am sure that this appeal will not go unheard and that the Members will support this amendment so as to solve this problem.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi (Yadgir): The States Reorganisation Bill is going to solve the big problem of linguistic States but it has created other problems also. Let us hope that we will be able to solve these problems also.

I have moved two amendments. One is regarding Kashmir. The first amendment, No. 318 reads:

Page 9, line 21

add at the end:

"including Chitral and that part of Kashmir which is under illegal occupation of Pakistan."

The whole State of Jammu and Kashmir has acceded to Indian Union. Pakistan, as everybody knows, is the aggressor in Kashmir. It has got a portion of Kashmir against the will of the people there. My amendment aims at including that portion of Kashmir which is under illegal occupation by the aggressor. There are six representatives of Kashmir in Lok Sabha and these six representatives represent the whole of Kashmir's population which is about 42 lakhs. I think there are four representatives in the Rajya Sabha also. Again, our Prime Minister has recently stated that Chitral is a part of India. It is for the House to consider this amendment and accept it.

My second amendment is a very simple one. It is regarding the name of Karnataka State. It is neither against the Maharashtrians nor against the Andhra people. I have stated in my amendment that wherever the word 'Mysore' occurs the word 'Karnataka' should be substituted. That is my amendment. The S.R.C. have given the name, Karnataka State. I do not find any reason why that name should be changed. In the surrounding area, there is the Maharashtra State, there is Andhra Pradesh and then, there is Kerala. There is no reason why Mysore should not be changed to Karnataka State.

This word has a history behind it. Even in old scriptures like Baratham and Bharavatham, the name Karnataka appears. The words "कांठ कर्नाटक, दक्षिण कर्नाटक" appear there. In history also, we find the same word. A small section of the people in Mysore are against that. But people

in other parts, namely, in Hyderabad-Karnataka and in Bombay-Karnataka want that the future State should be named as Karnataka State. I fail to understand why the framers of the Bill have preferred to name it as Mysore. Mysore is not a comprehensive term. I appeal to my friends here who are from Mysore to accept this. There was the cultural unity and we used to sing a song:

अदयवागलि नम्म चलुव कन्नड नाडु ।

"Let our beautiful province dawn."  
Henceforward we will sing:

विजयवागलि नम्म चलुव कन्नड नाडु ।

It means 'Glory to Karnataka.'

There is no rhyme or reason in calling it Mysore. All the people residing in Karnataka would prefer to have the word Karnataka instead of Mysore.

Some friends in Andhra are again claiming Bellary. This question was decided once, twice, thrice and many more times. Again they are raking up this issue. They are whipping up a dead horse. They should not rake up that question again. There is not much difference between Kannada and Telugu people. Our languages have got common words and it is so regarding our scripts also. As neighbours let us maintain friendly relations.

My friend, Shri Heda, has raised the question of some of places in Raichur. According to him, he is a non-Telugu-speaking Telugu member and he is claiming that Telugu area from Raichur. I must say that this is not proper. Our Telugu friends want to take whatever portion is in Karnataka but not prepared to give to Karnataka the portions which are in their possession.

There is the same thing with regard to Maharashtra. We have got a number of circles in Sholapur and Akkalkot.

Shri E. S. Diwan (Osmanabad):  
On behalf of the Maharashtrians I

offer the Kannada villages to my friend.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi: Thank you for the offer.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It has been offered and accepted.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi: We are happy at the formation of the Karnataka State but we are sorry that injustice has been done in not including the Kannada-speaking areas of Adoni, Alur, Raydurg and part of Anantapur in Andhra State, Akkalkot, South Sholapur in the proposed Maharashtra State, the Nilagiri Hills in Tamil Nad and Kasargud in Kerala and parts of Narayankhod and Makh-tal taluks in the present Hyderabad State. We are prepared to have any amicable settlement so far as these areas are concerned.

A word to my Maharashtrian friends. They are fighting for Bombay. We have sympathy for them. But, I fail to understand why they are opening a second front in Karwar and Belgaum. They have been culturally linked and they are a part of Karnataka and they cannot be separated, from Karnataka State.

People were demanding linguistic States for so many years and they are going to have linguistic States. I think that India would now emerge as a strong and powerful nation.

श्री टंडन (जिला इलाहाबाद पश्चिम) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे बोझ से शब्दों में अपने पुराने प्रकट किये हुये विचार फिर उपस्थित करने हैं। श्री गाडगील जी ने जो अपील की उस ने मेरे हृदय को छुआ।

श्री गाडगील जी हमारे देश के एक पुराने मान्य सेवक जन हैं तथा मेरे वैयक्तिक मित्र हैं। इसलिए उनकी अपील का प्रभाव मेरे हृदय पर पड़ना ही था। यह बहुत ही स्पष्ट है कि उनके हृदय के ऊपर बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र से अलग रखने का गहरा प्रभाव पड़ा है। साथ ही उनके भाषण से मुझे यह पता चला है कि उन्होंने श्री अशोक मेहता जी के भाषण

[बी टंकन]

की भी सराहना की है और उसको भी सामने रखा है। श्री अशोक मेहता जी का यह कहना था कि एक बड़ा राज्य बनाया जाय जिसमें गुजरात, सीराष्ट्र, कच्छ और भाज जो महाराष्ट्र प्रदेश बनने जा रहा है वे मिल जायें और उसमें बम्बई को भी शामिल कर लिया जाए। यह प्रस्ताव मैं ने भी पहले इस सदन के सामने रखा था। मैं ने तो उस समय यहाँ तक कहा था कि अगर कुछ सन्देह हो इस बात का कि इसमें गुजराती और महाराष्ट्रीय तत्वों को समानता नहीं मिलती तो कुछ भाग मालवा का भी इसमें जोड़ दिया जाए। उस समय से अब हम बहुत धागे इस विषय में घा गए हैं। जो अधिनियम भाज हमारे सामने उपस्थित है, उसको देखते हुए मैं मालवा के भंश मिलाने की बात को सामने नहीं रख रहा हूँ। परन्तु जो विषय अबस्था देश में उपस्थित है उसमें मुझ को यह अवश्य जान पड़ता है कि जो बात श्री अशोक मेहता जी ने कही उसमें बल है। मुझ को यह बतलाया गया है कि श्री देशमुख ने भी यह स्वीकार किया है, अपने उस भाषण में जो कि उन्होंने इस सदन में दिया है, कि गुजराती भाषियों और मराठी-भाषियों का एक ही राज्य बनाये जाने में उन्हें कोई आपत्ति नहीं है और वह इसके पक्षपाती हैं। जब महाराष्ट्र के एक उच्च प्रतिनिधि इस बात को स्वीकार करते हैं तो मैं यह आशा कर सकता हूँ कि गाडगील जी भी और अधिक विचार करके इस के पक्ष में हो जायेंगे। मैं भी ऐसे ही प्रदेश के बनाये जाने के पक्ष में हूँ और उसी का समर्थन करने वाला हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट, मराठी भाषी तथा गुजराती भाषी अपने अपने आग्रह को थोड़ा कम करें और तीनों ही कुछ और अधिक निकट आयें।

गाडगील जी ने कहा कि अभी बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र के साथ मिला दो और फिर जब हम साथ रहने लगेंगे तब फिर इस प्रश्न पर विचार ही सकता है। उनका कहना है कि इस समय गहरी चोट मराठी भाषियों को लगी है और उनका मान यह सहन नहीं कर सकता

कि बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र से अलग रहने दिया जाय। उन्होंने मान और अपमान का प्रश्न सामने रखा है और उनको इसमें अपमान दिखाई पड़ा है। जो विचारवान पुरुष होते हैं वे जब अपने मान अपमान को देखते हैं तो उनको इस पर भी विचार करना होता है कि मान अपमान का प्रश्न दूसरों के हृदय में भी उठ सकता है। अपने मान अपमान का तो स्थान उनको रहा परन्तु थोड़ा सोचने पर उनको तथा आपको पता लग जायेगा कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री और गवर्नमेंट के सामने भी यह मान और अपमान का प्रश्न आ सकता है और आ जाता है। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने महाराष्ट्र के सम्बन्ध में बहुत सहानुभूति पूर्वक अपने विचार प्रकट किए हैं। परन्तु साथ ही साथ उन्होंने यह भी दुहराया है कि यह प्रश्न कि बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र में तुरन्त मिलाया जाए, उठाया नहीं जा सकता। गवर्नमेंट भी इतने दिनों से उस विचार को मथ रही है और उसने समुद्र मंथन से शीपथि निकाली है। उस शीपथि को हमारे महाराष्ट्रीय भाई विप मानते हैं। समुद्र मंथन में जहाँ शीपथि निकली है वहाँ विष भी निकला करता है। इस मंथन में बहुत विष उत्पन्न हुआ है, यह हम देख सकते हैं। बहुत ही गहरा घक्का हमारे देश की एकता को लगा है। इस वास्ते मैं गाडगील जी से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वह इस प्रकार के मान अपमान का प्रश्न न उठावें। मैं गवर्नमेंट (सरकार) से भी यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह भी अपने मान अपमान का प्रश्न न उठावें और उनको अलग रख दें। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कई बार कहा है कि बम्बई के अविष्य का फैसला संसद् को ही करना है। जब उन्होंने यह बात कह दी है तो मेरा उम्त तथा उनके सहयोगियों से यह कहना है कि आप इस प्रश्न को अपने मान अपमान का प्रश्न बिल्कुल न बनावें। आप कोई चेतक न निकालें। इस प्रश्न का फैसला करने की बात तो आप हर एक मम्बर पर छोड़ दीजिये, और उससे कह दीजिये कि हूँ बताओ आपका क्या मत है और उनसे आप

कह दीजिये कि वे ईमानदारी से अपनी राय दें। लेकिन अगर आपका चेतक उनके ऊपर लगा रहता है तब तब उनका मत आपकी विलेना नहीं और जो प्रधान मंत्री जी का मत है, वही मत वे दोहरा देंगे। तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप आप मान अपमान के प्रश्न को छोड़ दीजिये। अब आपने यह कह दिया है कि इस प्रश्न को आप पार्लियामेंट के ऊपर छोड़ते हैं तो सबमूब पार्लियामेंट के ऊपर ही छोड़ दीजिये और हूर एक सदस्य को अवसर दीजिये कि वह अपना मत प्रकट करे। इसी तरह से मेरा गाडगील जी से कहना है कि आप इसको मान अपमान का प्रश्न न बनायें।

हमारे भाई श्री तुलसीदास कीलाचन्द जी ने कहा है कि उन्होंने बहुत से सदस्यों से बात की है और उनको ऐसा लगता है कि अधिक सदस्यगण इसके पक्ष में हैं कि गुजरातियों और महाराष्ट्रियों का मिला जुला एक बड़ा राज्य बने। यदि यह बात सही है तो गवर्नमेंट का यह कर्तव्य है कि वह माननीय सदस्यों को अपना अपना मत प्रकट करने के अवसर दे। यदि पार्लियामेंट के अधिक सदस्य इस बात को चाहते हैं तब तुरन्त ही, आवश्यक परिवर्तन इस बिल में कर दें। मेरा विश्वास है कि वह सच्चा न्याय होगा और जो झगड़े उत्पन्न हो गये हैं उनको समाप्त कर यह मराठी और गुजराती भाइयों को प्रेम के बन्धन में बांधने वाला काम बन जायगा।

इसीलिये श्री प्रशोक मेहता ने जो सुझाव दिया है, मैं उस का समर्थन करता हूँ। मैं गवर्नमेंट से भी और गाडगील जी से भी—और गाडगील जी का नाम ले कर अन्य महाराष्ट्रीय भाइयों से भी यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अब इस में अधिक आग्रह न बढ़े। सब का मान इस में रख लिया जाता है और आगे के लिये प्रेम की नींव बनती है। हम लोगों को यह बात अपने सामने रखनी चाहिये कि अगर आज बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र से अलग करने पर कड़ापन उत्पन्न होता है, तो महाराष्ट्र में बम्बई

को मिला कर भी कड़ापन उत्पन्न होता है—दोनों तरह से कड़ापन उत्पन्न होता है। इस विवाद को ठव करने का रास्ता यह है कि उन सब क्षेत्रों को मिला दिया जाय और उस नये राज्य की राजधानी बम्बई हो। तब वह पुराने प्रेम का रिस्ता, जिसकी चर्चा गाडगील जी ने बड़े प्रेम के शब्दों में की है, फिर से स्थापित हो जायगा। मैं गाडगील जी का पूरा विश्वास करता हूँ जब कि उन्होंने कहा कि मैं तो अपने को बिल्कुल अयोग्य मानूंगा, अगर मेरे हृदय में गुजरातियों के प्रति कृपा होगी। मेरा विश्वास है कि गुजराती भाइयों पर इस बात का असर पड़ेगा। गाडगील जी ने सच्चे हृदय से एक मर्मभेदी वाक्य कहा है और गुजरातियों को उसे स्वीकार करना चाहिये। गुजराती और महाराष्ट्रीय मिल कर रहें, यही मेरा निवेदन है। गवर्नमेंट अपने आग्रह से उतर कर इन को एक करने का यत्न करे, यह भी मेरा निवेदन है।

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay City—North): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I have moved my amendment No. 194 to clause 8. It reads:

“Provided that the Government of India shall within a period not exceeding five years review the question of continuance or otherwise of the State of Bombay as a Part C State and place the matter before Parliament.”

Now, Sir, my position on this question of States reorganisation should be fairly well known by this time and it is that the future of Bombay City is bound up with Maharashtra. I do not, of course, exclude the possibility of any other arrangement in which the three parties, Maharashtra, Bombay and Gujarat could agree.

In this Bill the status envisaged for the City of Bombay is that of a Union Territory, is that of a city under Central Administration. However, we are told that it is the intention of

[Shri V. B. Gandhi]

Government to review this decision in five years. This intention is conveyed to us in the Prime Minister's speech in Bombay on the 3rd June, and a reference also has been made to it in the Joint Committee's report. The limited objective of my amendment is, therefore, to provide in this Bill right here in clause 8 the means by which this intention of the Government can be implemented. If we have the intention there should be no difficulty in providing that that intention can be implemented today, or after two years, or after whatever the period is. Now, we have, of course, the intention of the Government given to us by no less a person than our Prime Minister. We have also had it from the Home Minister who was the Chairman of the Joint Committee. The word of the Prime Minister and the word of the Home Minister are of course a bond to us. But there is no harm in being practical in these matters. What I am trying to secure really is that whoever may be the Prime Minister, whoever may be the Home Minister, whoever might be in the Government at the time when the review becomes due, that review shall be made and Parliament shall be given the opportunity to consider the decision. It should not happen, for whatever reason, that this Parliament will be denied the opportunity of reconsidering this position. Is it so improbable a thing, or is it a thing that we cannot think of, that our Prime Minister may entertain an idea of laying down the burdens of Government and devoting himself to constructive work. Another Prime Minister in a neighbouring country has done it. I am referring to U Nu. Our Prime Minister is known to have once entertained a similar idea. We have our Home Minister; we have all reverence for him; we all want to hold on to him; but we also know the affection in which his own State, the Uttar Pradesh holds him. Uttar Pradesh has a prior claim on him. Therefore, when we legislate we legislate for all contingencies, and as I have

said, the limited objective of this amendment is to secure that in any contingency this Government will be bound to have a review of this decision and will be bound to place it before Parliament and that Parliament shall not be denied the opportunity of reconsidering it in due time.

Sir, I have the good fortune of representing the City of Bombay and I share that good fortune with my friend Shri S. K. Patil, with my friend Shri Kajrolkar and also with my friend Shrimati Jayashri Rajji. Now we are here four of us, three Mahashtrians and one Gujarati and we four together represent the City of Bombay and yet I hope you have all seen that we all work together as a team and we four of us hold three different opinions and still we continue to have great regard for one another which we had ever before this controversy started. That really is the democratic spirit which symbolises the City of Bombay. Now the whole question of this States reorganisation and in particular this question regarding the future of Bombay City has taken on an entirely new aspect, a new complexion in the last few days, particularly after the two great speeches that have been made in this House, one by the Prime Minister and the other by the Home Minister. In these two speeches the atmosphere has been very much cleared happily for all concerned. We are grateful to the Prime Minister and to the Home Minister for having helped to lift the mists which had hung over this very unfortunate question about the decision of the future of Bombay City. One must admit that as a result of these two speeches, many gaps have been filled; many doubts have been removed. But I feel constrained to say in all humility that if these speeches had been made a little earlier, if we had not been made to wait for months to have these speeches and explanations, and to have the gaps filled and the doubts removed, a good deal of anguish and

rankling in the hearts could have been avoided.

As I said, the prospect for the future of Bombay has certainly brightened a little in the last few days. For the future of this city there are three distinct things that have been gained. The first is, we now have the personal views of the Prime Minister as well as those of the Home Minister on the question of the future of Bombay city. The second gain is, we have now the categorical assurance that the fixation of a period of five years is not something that is rigid, is not something that has a finality about it. The reference to a period of five years was intended to convey the desire that the question will be opened during this period. The third gain is this, and it is a very important gain. All ideas of plebiscite and referendum have now been declared to be irrelevant to the context before us. We have now been assured that plebiscite and referendum are not necessarily the only way for ascertaining the wishes of the people of Bombay.

What are we doing now actually, when we are discussing the States Reorganisation Bill? We are changing the status of the city of Bombay from that of the capital of a great State to that of a Union territory, a city which will be Centrally administered, and we are changing this status of the great city without ascertaining the wishes of the people of that city. But on that account, are we doing anything undemocratic? We are not, certainly. This Parliament is the supreme authority in all these matters. The Constitution gives that authority to this Parliament. If Parliament decides this question of the status of the city of Bombay one way or the other, I do not think we can have a more democratic form for taking such a decision. If that is so, when the review comes to be made, and when an opportunity is given to Parliament to reconsider this decision, I think it would be perfectly a democratic way to leave the decision in the hands of Parliament, and I do

not see any good reason why all these ideas of plebiscite, referendum and all that cumbrous procedure should be found to be necessary to be discussed.

I shall finish by quoting a passage or two from the speech of the Prime Minister who has expressed his personal views on this issue of the future of Bombay the other day. He says:

"As for Bombay, I understand, I concede the logic, fairly strong logic. The logical aspect on behalf of Maharashtra, I do not deny."

Then again, in his own very charming way, he expresses his regard and affection for Maharashtra.

Shri C. C. Shah: What about the second part?

Shri V. B. Gandhi: I do not want to appear that I am taking any unfair position in quoting from his speech. Of course, when a great statesman like our Prime Minister says that he accepts the logic of one thing, he does not mean to say that there is no logic on the other side. So, I do not object to the interruption. Further on, the Prime Minister has said:

"For my part, I would be exceedingly happy if Bombay went to Maharashtra. I have absolutely no reason against it and I shall be completely and absolutely frank in this House that I think there are many valid arguments, good arguments for Bombay going to Maharashtra".

I just quote this, because I want that this should help to improve the atmosphere both in the city of Bombay and in Maharashtra in order that a solution to the problem could be arrived at in the atmosphere which we all desire.

The Prime Minister has, of course, said that there are arguments on the other side also. Then, he also says:

"I am perfectly prepared to plead the cause of Maharashtra with others".

[Shri V. B. Gandhi]

These are some very cheerful prospects in the sky.

I shall give one more quotation on the question of plebiscites and referendum. In this connection, the Prime Minister has said:

"I do not naturally mean that you will have a plebiscite or referendum and all that; but if there is a good atmosphere, I have no doubt that it would be far simpler to settle this matter without any such cumbrous procedure".

पंडित ठाकुर दास भागंब (गुड़गांव) :  
जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब (उपाध्यक्ष महोदय), इस बम्बई के मामले पर, जो इतना पेचीदा हो गया है, मैंने अपनी उन तीन चार, तकारीर (भाषण) में जो इस बिल पर कीं, एक लफ्ज नहीं कहा। असलियत यह है कि जब तक कोई आदमी अपने दिल में सही फैसला न कर ले उसको मेम्बर साहबान के सामने बसूक (निश्चय) के साथ कोई बात कहने का हक नहीं है। लेकिन अब चन्द दिनों से सारी बातों पर गौर करके मैं एक नतीजे पर पहुंचा हूँ और मैं चाहता हूँ कि हाउस में उसको कहूँ और अपने कांशंस (आत्मभाव) को ईज (शांत) कर लूँ।

जब शुरू में यह एस० आर० सी० (राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग) की रिपोर्ट छपी तो उन तीन बड़ी शक्तियों का फैसला यह था कि जहाँ तक इस स्टेट का वास्ता है वह बार्दोलिम्बल स्टेट (द्विभाषी राज्य) बने और बम्बई उस स्टेट (राज्य) का कैपिटल (राजधानी) बने। यह फैसला हमारे उन भाइयों को पसन्द नहीं आया जो कि यूनिवर्सल स्टेट (एकभाषी राज्य) बनाना चाहते थे और अलाहिदा अलाहिदा स्टेट्स बनाना चाहते थे। मुझे तफसील में जाने की जरूरत नहीं है। हमारे भाइयों के बहुत से डेपूटेशन (प्रतिनिधि मंडल) पंडित जी से और दूसरे लीडरों से मिले और देर तक इसके बारे में गुप्तगु चलती रही।

बहुत सी तकलीफ़ सोची गई थीर होती होती यह मसला इस मेस (उपसदन) में था पड़ा जिसका बिल हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर (प्रधान मंत्री) साहब ने तीन चार दिन हुये हाउस में किया था। आज गवर्नमेंट के अपने कहने के मुताबिक यह मसला एक मेस में पड़ा हुआ है। मैंने यहाँ स्पीचेर सुनीं, देसमुख साहब की, श्री पाटिल साहब की, श्री वाडनिल साहब की। उनमें इतने मुस्ताफिक वीराने से प्वाइंट (बार्ते) पेश किये गये हैं कि शायद मामूली आदमी के बास्ते कोई ठीक फैसला करना मुश्किल हो जाये। लेकिन इन सारी चीजों को देख कर जो नतीजा मैंने आजादाना तौर पर सोचा था आज मैं इन सब तकरीरों को सुन कर उसी नतीजे पर कन्फर्म (निश्चित) हुआ हूँ और काश मेरे पास भी ऐसे ही खूबसूरत अल्फाज होते जैसे कि श्री अशोक मेहता ने इस्तेमाल किये तो मैं भी उतने ही खूबसूरत अल्फाज में उस चीज को हाउस के सामने रखता। श्री मोहन लाल सक्सेना और श्री अशोक मेहता ने इस मोशन (प्रस्ताव) को एक नई जान दी है और एक नई तहरीक हाउस में शुरू की है जो कि इटैलेक्चुएली (विवेकपूर्वक) सही फैसला है और जिसको कि जिक्र करते हुये हम लोग डरते हैं और अपने आप को फाल्स साबित करते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हाउस उस फैसले को कबूल कर ले और वह फैसला वही है जो कि बम्बई के सम्बन्ध में एस० आर० सी० के उन तीनों महानुभावों ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में लिखा था और मुझे यकीन है कि अगर पंडित जी की सही राय देखी जाय, प्राइम मिनिस्टर की तौर पर नहीं बल्कि पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू की तौर पर और जिनकी कि हब उनके प्राइम मिनिस्टर होने के नाते नहीं बल्कि उस रेवोलुशन (क्रांति) के हैड (नेता) होने की वजह से बहुत ज्यादा इज्जत करके हैं उनकी राय को देखा जाय और उनके दिल को देखा जाय तो उन्होंने खुद फरबाय है कि बम्बई के बारे में यह बार्दोलिम्बल



(हिमाची) फैसला ख़ादा पसन्द है। उसी तरह मैं कहूंगा कि पंत जी को होम मिनिस्टर के पद से हटा कर पूछिये तो उनका भी यही मत है कि बम्बई के बारे में कमिशन ने जो बाइलिग्वल स्टेट की सिफारिश की थी वही सही फैसला है। हमारे श्री सी० डी० देवमुख हंलांकि फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर (वित्त मंत्री) अब नहीं रहे हैं और बजारत से हट गये हैं, उनके दिल को कुरदा जाय तो वह खुद फ़रमा चुके हैं कि उन्हें बाइलिग्वल का फैसला पसन्द है. . . . .

एक माननीय सदस्य : एक कमी है अब विदर्भ नहीं रहा है।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : मुझे कोई ख़ुबहा नहीं है कि अगर उन लोगों की जाती राय को देखा जाय तो वे एक ही फैसले पर पहुंचते हैं जो कि मैंने अभी अर्ज किया।

अभी हमारे पूज्य श्री टंडन जी ने हाउस से जो इस बम्बई के सवाल पर अपनी की है, मैं उस अपनी का अपने टूटे फूटे अल्फ़ाब में समर्थन करना चाहता हूँ और मैं चाहता हूँ कि हम सही नुक्तेनिगाह (दृष्टिकोण) से इसका फैसला करें। मैंने अभी अपने दोस्त श्री गाडगिल की तकरीर सुनी और वह तकरीर इतनी पेशोज (करुणा) और फीलिंग (भावना) से भरी हुई थी कि उसका असर हर एक के दिल पर जरूर हुआ होगा। उन्होंने भी यही बात रक्सी और वह उन के दिल की बात थी कि अगर आज नहीं तो चन्द वर्षों के बाद हम उसी रास्ते पर जायेंगे तो मेरा कहना है कि सही ज़दम उठाने में देरी क्यों की जाये और उसको टाला क्यों जाये और आज ही हम लोग उस गोल (सध्य) की तरफ क्यों न बढ़ें। मुझे यकीन है कि आप सही तौर पर अपने दिल का फ़ोटो रखते हैं जब यह कहते हैं कि यह जो बात

आप २ या ७ वर्ष के बाद करना चाहते हैं और जिसके कि रास्ते में इतने "इपत्र" और "बटम" आयेंगे, तो उसको आज ही क्यों नहीं करते। श्री कालिदास ने इस सम्बन्ध में अपने एक ब्लोक में क्या ही सुन्दर लिखा है :

"अल्पस्य हेतोः बहु हातुम्  
इच्छल विचारयुक्ती,  
प्रतिभामि मे त्वम् ॥

एक छांटी सी चीज के बास्ते कि आज महाराष्ट्र यह महसूस कर ले कि हमने बम्बई को ले लिया इस छांटी चीज के बास्ते आप इतने बड़े भाइयल (भादर्स) को जो सारे देश के सवाल को हल करता है जो सारे मुल्क को सही लीड देता है उस को आप छोड़ देना चाहते हैं और उसके पीछे नहीं चलते क्योंकि आप समझते हैं कि इसमें कोई अपमान होगा, तो मुझे यह बात दुस्त नजर नहीं आती। मैं बड़े अदब से और बड़ी ह्यूमिलिटी (विनीत भाव) के साथ महाराष्ट्र के भाइयों की खिदमत में अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि आज हमारी हिस्ट्री (इतिहास) में साइकोलोजिक (मनोवैज्ञानिक) मोमेंट (क्षण) आ गया है और एक अइसिब (संकट) का दिन हमारे सामने पेश है और अगर हम आज गलती करेंगे तो वह गलती ऐसी होगी कि पीछे उसको एटोन (सुधारना) करना मुश्किल हो जावेगा। आज मुझे महात्मा गांधी के वह अल्फ़ाब जिन पर वह अमल करते थे याद आते हैं जिनके कि अमर अमल करने का उन्होंने हमें उपदेश दिया।

Trust no party, sect or faction  
Trust no leaders in the fight  
But in every word and action  
Trust in God and do the right.

मैं अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि आज वह अदबसर पेश है जब कि हम सब को मिल कर के जो सही चीज है और जिसको कि बुजुर्ग लोग सही चीज मानते हैं, उसके

[पंडित ठाकुर दास नारनब]

ऊपर ध्यान करना चाहिये। मुझे यकीन है कि इतने बड़े हाउस के अन्दर जहाँ कि तमाम देश के प्रतिनिधि मौजूद हैं, उनका फैसला बिल्कुल सही होगा। मैं मैं बहुत दबा पंत जी की ओर पंडित जी की भी तकरीर में इस मसले पर भी यह कहते सुना है कि हर मसले का आखिरी फैसला पार्लियामेंट (संसद्) का होता है, तो मेरा कहना है कि अगर इसका आखिरी फैसला फिलवाक्या पार्लियामेंट के हाथ है तो पार्लियामेंट को आप खुला छोड़िये और किसी के ऊपर आप बंधन न लगाइये और हर एक सच को इस सवाल के ऊपर आजादी के साथ जो वह अपने दिल में सही राय समझता है उसको हाउस में रखने का हक और अवसर दीजिये और किसी तरह से उसको बंधन में मत बांधिये और मुझे पूरा यकीन है कि अगर ऐसा हुआ तो इस पार्लियामेंट का एक ही फैसला होगा और वह यह होगा कि यहाँ पर बाइसिग्वल स्टेट हो जाय।

मैं उन बजुहाब में नहीं जाना चाहता जिनकी कि बिना पर हमारे महाराष्ट्रीय भाई यह चाहते हैं कि बम्बई महाराष्ट्र में शामिल किया जाय लेकिन मैं सिर्फ इतना ही धरुं कर देना चाहता हूँ कि मेरा नतीजा बिल्कुल दूसरी तरफ़ है। मैं इस समस्या का यह सही और माकूल हल नहीं समझता कि आज बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र को उठा कर दे दिया जाय बल्कि सही हल में यह सपन्नता हूँ कि एक बाइसिग्वल स्टेट बनाई जाय और उसके बास्ते आज ही फैसला किया जाना चाहिये और इसको धाने के लिये टाला नहीं जाना चाहिये। श्री एस० के० पाटिल ने बड़ी पुरखोस तकरीर फरमाई और उन्होंने यह कहा कि हम नाइगील साहब और श्री देशमुख के साथ हाथ मिलाने को तैयार हैं। मैं पूछता हूँ कि आखिर फिर किस चीख की कसर है जो आप सब एक साथ मिल करके जो आपके दिल में है उसके मुताबिक सही हल क्यों नहीं पार्लियामेंट

में पेश करते और सही नीड कंट्री को देखें और क्यों इस सवाल को १ वर्ष के लिये टाल रहे हैं। अगर आप १ वर्ष तक या किसी धरुं तक इस मसले के हल को टाले रखिये तो मुझे यकीन है कि उस वक़्त इस का फैसला करना मुश्किल हो जायगा। हम सब जानते हैं और सबल मकहूर है कि  
"Drive the nail aright while the iron is red."

आज इस सवाल को हल न कर ले और इसको धाने के लिये टाल देने से हमारों तरह की तरकीबें चलेंगी, गुजराती कुछ सोचेंगे और बम्बई वाले कुछ सोचेंगे और जो लोग इंटरस्टेड हैं वे कुछ और ही सोचेंगे और मैं यह अदब से धरुं करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आपने इसको १ वर्ष के लिये टाल दिया तो यह बड़ी भारी नकती होगी और उस धरुं के अन्दर न मालम किजने एनफनुएस (प्रभाव) बरुं करिये और हम आज के फैसले को पाये तखमीन तक नहीं पहुँचा सकेंगे और इतनी कोसंब (कफितयां) इसके पीछे लण जायेंगी कि आज जो बात मौजूद है उसको फिर से हासिल करना मुश्किल हो जायगा।

श्री मेरे भाई श्री जी० जी० गांधी ने पंडित जी की कई स्पीच (बायन) पढ़ कर सुनाई और पंडित जी कहते हैं कि इसकी बड़ी माकूल बजह है कि बम्बई महाराष्ट्र को दे दिया जाय लेकिन मैं नहीं समझ सका कि उन्होंने क्या पसकर सुनाया। जहाँ तक पंडित जी की राय का तात्लुह है, मैं जानता हूँ कि इस सवाल पर पंडित जी की क्या राय है। अगर उनकी आजादाना राय भी जाय तो यह बिला शुकहा बाइसिग्वल स्टेट की है और अगर पंडित जी को प्राइव मिनिस्टरशिप (प्रधान मंत्रित्व) से हटा दिया जाय, पंत जी को होमनिमिस्टर (बृह मंत्री) पद से हटा दिया जाय और हमारें देशमुख साहब तो पहले ही मिनिस्ट्री छोड़ें बैठें हैं इन तीनों की एक ही राय है जो मैंने आपसे धरुं की और पूज्य टंडन जी की भी

आबाद उनके साथ है और मैं समझता हूँ कि हाउस को बाइलिम्बल स्टेट बनाने के बारे में अपनी राय पेश करनी चाहिये और मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे लीडरान को आपस में सलाह भ्रष्टाचार करके बाइलिम्बल स्टेट बनाने की लीड कंट्री को देना चाहिये और इस मसले को धाने के लिये टालना नहीं चाहिये। मुझे इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि अगर आज हम इस सवाल को गवर्नमेंट के प्रेसटिंग प्वाइंट आफ्यू (सम्मान की दृष्टि से) से देखेंगे, या महाराष्ट्रियन प्वाइंट आफ्यू से देखेंगे तो हम अम्बल दर्जे की गमती करेंगे। मैं एक ही बात धरं करना चाहता हूँ और वह चीज यह है कि जो दिन में लीडरान सही फैसला समझते हैं उसको धमस में लामें और ५ वर्ष के बास्ते इस बम्बई के सवाल को सटाई में न डाले रखें क्योंकि पंडित जी कह चुके हैं कि हम इसके लिये रेफ़ॉर्म (जनमत संग्रह) नहीं करायेंगे, प्लेबिसाइट नहीं करायेंगे तब मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस सवाल को हल करने के लिये कौन सा डेमोक्रेटिक (लोकतंत्रात्मक) रास्ता अपनाया जायगा और किस की राय से इस मसले को हल किया जायगा और जिस वक्त इसको करेंगे उस वक्त फिर यह झगड़े बाजी और टेंटाजी की सूरत पेश हो जायगी। जो कुछ प्राप को गच वर्ष के बाद करना है, वह प्राप ५० क लिये और सही नतीजे पर पहुँचिये। अगर प्राप को देश में धमन व धमान रखना ३ और कुवत व बल से बचाना है, तो सुदा के लिये इस सवाल को पांच वर्ष के लिये न उठा रखिये। मैं जानता हूँ कि महाराष्ट्र की फीलिम्स (भाषनायें) इस चीज पर बहुत ज्यादा एक्सपेक्टिड प्रभावी है, और कोई साजुब नहीं कि बावजूद सारी रिस्ट्रेंट संयम के इस देश के अन्दर एक ऐसी सिचएशन बन जाय जिस पर हम सब को अक्रोस हो और हम उस पर काबू न पा

सकें। लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि ऐसी नीयत न धाये और इस लिये सही फैसला कीजिये। प्राप हर तरफ से पुकार है कि प्राप सब लोग मिल कर, ऐसी रिप्रेजेंटिब वाडीज (प्रतिनिधि निकाय) को ले कर, जो कि सही रिप्रेजेंटेशन लोगों का करती हों, जो अघारिटेटिव (प्रामाणिक) हों, जो अउठ की फीलिम्स के सामने अपने को अवाडिनेट (अधीन) न कर दें या उन से भुतास्तिर न हों, सही नतीजे पर पहुँचे। प्राप हम लोग यहाँ पर हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को रिप्रेजेंट करते हैं, हम उन की फीलिम्स को जानते हैं, इस लिये प्राप ही फैसला किया जाय और सही फैसला किया जाय। अगर ऐसा किया गया तो फैसला सही होना कि बम्बई बाइलिम्बल होना, बम्बई उधी तरफ से रहेगा जिस तरह से कि मैं ने धरं किया है। बम्बई के बारे में तो मैं सिर्फ यही धरं करना चाहता था।

जनाब वाला के सामने कई ऐमेंडमेंट्स (संशोधन) धाये हैं, मैं किसी पर ज्यादा बोलना नहीं चाहता। सिर्फ एक ऐमेंडमेंट के बारे में थोड़ा सा धरं करना चाहता था जो कि हमारे हिमाचल प्रदेश के भुतात्तिक था। जनाब वाला को मालूम है कि प्राप हमारे हिमाचल प्रदेश के भाई इस कोशिश में हैं कि कहीं किसी तरह से उन को पंजाब के साथ न मिला दिया जाय। पंजाब के भी कुछ लोग इस म्यु के हैं कि उस की इस वक्त नहीं मिलाना चाहिये। मैं बड़े धरद से धरं करना चाहता हूँ कि जो मेरी पुरानी लजबीज थी, और जिस पर मैं प्राप जी स्टिक (दृढ़ होना) करता हूँ, वह यह है कि जैसे बम्बई-बरीरह सब को मिला कर साढ़े चार करोड़ प्रादमियों की स्टेट बनानी चाहिये वैसे ही पंजाब को भी सब तरफ के इलाकों की मिला कर कम से कम तीन करोड़ प्रावादी की स्टेट बनानी चाहिये, बहुत के लोग और भी चाहने लगे हैं कि उन को मिला जाना चाहिये

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ कि शायद आज वह हो नहीं पायेगा। गवर्नमेंट की राजबीज है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश के बास्ते सेकेण्ड फाइव इयर प्लान में १२ करोड़ रुपये रखे गये हैं और हमारे कांगड़े के बास्ते, जो कि उतना ही बड़ा इलाका है, और वहां के लोग इतने मालदार भी नहीं हैं, वहां के लिये सिर्फ डेढ़ करोड़ रुपये रखे गये हैं। मैं नहीं चाहता कि आप हिमाचल प्रदेश का इन फायदों से महफूम (बंचित) रखें। उम्मीद है कि उन्हें फ़ायदा होगा और उन्हें गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया (भारत सरकार) की मदद मिलेगी। मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि हम उन की मर्जी के खिलाफ उन को मजबूर करें कि तुम मौजूदा पंजाब में शामिल हो जाओ। गोकि मेरी नाकिस राय (हीन मत) में सही और मुनासिब हल यही है कि वह पंजाब के साथ शामिल हो और जो पांच बरस का अर्सा पंडित पंत ने फरमाया था वह गुजरने न दिया जाय। लेकिन ताहम में समझता हूँ कि इन दकीक मामलों में महज यही चीज काफ़ी नहीं होती है कि किसी एक आदमी की राय में सही हल क्या है। इसके लिये लोगों की फ़ोर्लिम्स, लोगों की राय और लोगों का फ़ायदा, यह सभी चीजें देखी जाने के काबिल हैं। मैं इसे प्रैक्टिकेबल सोल्यूशन आज नहीं समझता कि हिमाचल प्रदेश को वहां के लोगों की मर्जी के खिलाफ़ जबदस्ती पंजाब में शामिल कर दें। हालांकि मैं जानता हूँ कि जो एस०आर०सी० का फार्मुला और रिजनली था और उस के साथ यू०पी० के दो प्राबिसिंज और इलाकों का मिलाना बेहतर होता मौजूदा हाल में भी हमें कोई दिक्कत न होती अगर एक तीसरा रिजन पहाड़ी इलाकों का बना कर पंजाब में शामिल कर लिया गया होता। लेकिन कुल हालात को देखते हुये गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया ने हिमाचल प्रदेश के बारे में जो फंसला दिया है, साथ ही जो हिमाचल प्रदेश का फंसला है और पंजाब के भी कुछ लोग इस को

चाहते हैं, उस को देखते हुये मैं आज हिमाचल को जबदस्ती पंजाब में शामिल करने के हक में नहीं हूँ गो बाखिर पांच बरस में इस को शामिल होना ही पड़ेगा।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members will please appreciate the difficulties of the Chair. There are about 30 names that I have got in the list, while a large number is pouring in. How to accommodate them, passes my comprehension. I would only request hon. Members that they should take as little time as possible so that as large a number might be accommodated as possible within the time that we have got. I can only appeal to hon. Members.

श्री काजरोत्कर (बम्बई नगर उत्तर रक्षित अनुसूचित जातियां) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया इस के लिये मैं आप का आभारी हूँ। मेरे दो अमेंडमेंट नं० २२१ और ४८१ हैं। मेरा और मेरे मित्र श्री गांधी का अमेंडमेंट एक ही है। उन्होंने जो अपने विचार आप के सामने रखे हैं मैं उनसे पूरी तरह सहमत हूँ।

दूसरा जो मेरा अमेंडमेंट है ४८१ नं० का है वह यह है:

Page 5—

for lines 9 to 13, substitute:

“(b) territory of Konkan composed of Thana, Kolaba and Ratnagiri districts”.

जब से यह स्टेट रिऑर्गनाइजेसन (राज्य पुनर्गठन) का मसला पार्लियामेंट के सामने आया है, छः सात महीने हो गये, तब से देश में बड़ी सलबली मची हुई है। बिल का मुख्य उद्देश्य यह था कि राज्य को ठीक चलाने के लिये भाषावार प्रान्त बने। लेकिन अब एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट निकली तब से बहुत से प्रान्तों के लोग नाराज हो गये और कहने लगे कि उनके साथ न्याय नहीं हुआ। जैसी हमारी बराठी में एक कहावत

है कि बनाने नये गणेश और बन गया हनुमान । गणेश के जो बूढ़ होती है वह सामने होती है, लेकिन वह सामने लगाने के बजाय पीछे लगा दी, इस लिये बन्दर बन गया । इसी तरह से एस० धार० सी० की रिपोर्ट जब से निकली है तब से बहुत से लोग बजाय कुछ होने के नाराज हो गये हैं । पहले जब उन्होंने बाइलिम्बल का सुझाव रखा तो महाराष्ट्र ने उस का विरोध किया कि बम्बई तो महाराष्ट्र के भीतर है । नहरहाल इस के ऊपर मैं ज्यादा समय नहीं देना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि उस के बारे में कई दलीलें पेश की जा चुकी हैं पर नतीजा उन से कुछ नहीं निकला । यह समस्या इतनी कठिन है कि जिस का हल निकलना मुश्किल हो गया है । इतनी घटनायें हो गईं जिनका ठिकाना नहीं है । तीन चार प्रस्ताव भी आये कि बम्बई स्टेट, विदर्भ, गुजरात और बम्बई शहर और महाराष्ट्र को मिला कर बना दी जाय । अगर यह प्रस्ताव पालियामेंट में डिस्कशन (बचा) होने के पहले बाहर मंजूर होकर आये होते तो अधिक अच्छा था, लेकिन अभी भी वक्त गया नहीं है । अगर महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात के लीडर मिल कर और एक साथ बैठ कर सलाह कर लेते और हमारे लीडर के पास जाते तो यह मामला जल्दी से जल्दी हल हो जाता । लेकिन दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि हम यह नहीं कर सके । यहां पर महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात के जो प्रतिनिधि बैठे हैं उन को फिर एक होना चाहिये । हमारे बम्बई के लीडर श्री पाटिल साहब, गुजरात के लीडर श्री मोरारजी देसाई, और कोई महाराष्ट्र के लीडर, हूँ कॅन डिप्लिबर दि गुड्स (जो प्रभावपूर्ण है) सब मिल कर समझौता करें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह समस्या जल्दी से जल्दी हल हो सकती है । बम्बई में जो महाराष्ट्र के लोग हैं वे भी बहुत नाराज हैं क्योंकि वह सोच रहे हैं कि अगर बम्बई सेंपरेट (पृथक्) हो जायेगा तो बहुत से महाराष्ट्रियों को बम्बई छोड़ना पड़ेगा ।

हमारे लीडर तो वादा कर रहे हैं लेकिन ऐसे बंग का जो कि डीफिनेशन नहीं है । बम्बई के अन्दर मेरे एक मित्र हैं, उन्होंने मुझे पत्र लिखा है कि अगर बम्बई महाराष्ट्र में चला गया तो मेरा नामपुर को ट्रांसफर (स्थानान्तरण) हो जायगा ।

मेरी पत्नी बम्बई के अन्दर रहती है और वह एक स्कूल में टीचर है । मेरे पिता भी वहीं पर रहते हैं । अगर एक कॅमिटी को दो-तीन बगह्र जाना पड़ा तो उन के ऊपर क्या बीतेगी, उनको किन किन कठिनाइयों का सामना करना पड़ेगा, इसका भ्रंदाजा भासानी से लगाया जा सकता है । तो इस तरह की कठिनाइयां पैदा हो सकती हैं । हमारे मित्र श्री पाटिल ने एक सुझाव इस सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत किया है, जिसको मैं ने बहुत पसन्द किया है और उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ । उनका कहना था कि अगर घापने तीन राज्य बनाने ही हैं तो तीनों राज्यों के जो मेन्ब्रेटिरियट हों, वे बम्बई में ही होने चाहिये । मेरा भी यही सुझाव है ।

3 P.M.

मैं एक और सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि बम्बई को किसी राज्य में न मिला कर उसको एक अलग स्टेट बना दिया जाय । अगर उसमें रत्नागिरि, कोलाबा और थाना, ये तीन जिले मिला दिये जायें । अगर इस सुझाव को मान लिया जाय तो मेरा विश्वास है कि यह बहुत से लोगों को पसन्द आ जायेगा । महाराष्ट्र से रत्नागिरि तथा कोलाबा को कोई खास आर्थिक लाभ नहीं होगा । ये दो जिले इतने बैकवर्ड (पिछड़े हुये) हैं कि उनको इन्हें फ्रीड (देना) ही करना पड़ेगा । अगर गवर्नमेंट आज भी इस चीज को मान ले तो मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर सौ फीसदी नहीं हो

[श्री काजरोत्कर]

७५ फीसदी मोक्ष इस चीज को पसन्द अवश्य ही करेंगे। इस बारे में मैं ने बहुत से लोगों के विचार लिये हैं और वे इसके पक्ष में हैं। अगर गवर्नमेंट भी इस बात को मान ले तो यह ठीक ही होगा। मैं आपको यह भी बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जो रत्नागिरि का इलाका है वह सब से ज्यादा पिछड़ा है। रत्नागिरि ने भारत को बहुत से रत्न तो दिये हैं लेकिन अब उनके नसीब में पत्थर और पहाड़ ही रह गये हैं। यह एक पहाड़ी इलाका है। यहां पर जो जमीन है, उसमें से जो खेती के काबिल है, वह बहुत ही कम है। यहां पर चोटियां चाहे हों लेकिन काबिले काफ्त जमीन बहुत ही थोड़ी है। लड़ाई के पहले वहां रंगून से चावल आया करता था और अब दूसरे प्रान्तों से चावल आता है। वहां के लोग बहुत गरीब हैं और इस गरीबी के कारण रत्नागिरि तथा कोलाबा के लोग लाखों की तादाद में बम्बई के अन्दर काम करने के लिये आते हैं। आज कोलाबा और थाना से हजारों लोग रोज बम्बई में नौकरी करने के लिये आते हैं। इस वास्ते इन जिलों को मिला कर यदि एक अलग से बम्बई राज्य बना दिया जाये तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बहुत ही अच्छा होगा।

मैं महाराष्ट्रियों तथा गुजरातियों से अपील करता हूँ कि अभी भी वक्त है, और उन्हें किसी न किसी हल को ढूँढ निकालना चाहिये। जब हम से दूसरे प्रान्तों के भाई कहते हैं कि तुम्हें क्या हो गया है, तुम तो सदियों से भाई-भाई की तरह रहते आ रहे हो, तो हमारे-सिर धर्म से झुक जाता है और बहुत ही बुरा महसूस होने लगता है।

अब अन्त में मैं आपको एक कविता पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ :

मैं भी अब थोड़ा कहता हूँ,  
क्योंकि बम्बई में रहता हूँ।  
रत्नागिरि का रहने वाला,  
जहां तिलक था हुआ निराला।

रत्नों की कुछ बातें सुनाई,  
समुद्र मंथन गया दिवाळी।  
मेरी भाषा तेरी भाषा,  
तेरी भाषा मेरी भाषा।  
बाह्र देख मैं मचा समाधा,  
हाथ देख मैं मचा समाधा।  
एस० आर० सी० का बुला पिटारा,  
प्रान्त प्राप्त का धारा-धारा।  
गये बनाने को गणेश जी,  
धीर बन भये हनुमान जी।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The whole speech cannot be delivered in verse.

श्री काजरोत्कर :

शहर-शहर में, गली-गली में,  
मनुज मनुज के मस्तक-भी में।  
छाया संशय, छाई शंका,  
मानो रण का बजता डंका।  
भाई-भाई जहां युगों से,  
रहते थे जो बंधु प्रेम से।  
जहां चक्रधर नरसी मेहता,  
तुकाराम मीरा संग रहता।  
लोकमान्य तिलक, महात्मा गांधी,  
दोनों ने मिलकर सी आजादी।  
उसी देश में उसी शहर में,  
नहीं रह सकेंगे एक घर में।  
एस० आर० सी० का युद्ध बन गया,  
देवासुर संग्राम ठन गया।  
चौदह भाषा रत्न निकलते,  
बड़े मेरू मंदार भी हिलते।  
इसमें से कुछ धमूत निकला,  
प्रसन्न हिन्दी भूमि सकता।  
धीर जब कि कुछ जहर पा गया,  
सबकी निन्दा सबकी टीका।  
कौन पियेगा रे अब विष को,  
कौन पियेगा रे अब इसको।  
वह शंकर वह शिव वह धीर,  
हिम्मत वाला धीर सुधीर।  
सह सकता है उसकी ज्वाला,  
केवल एक धवाहरसाल।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri M. D. Joshi. Hon. Members should now try to conclude their speeches within ten minutes.

Shri M. D. Joshi (Ratnagiri South): I have moved amendments 430, 431 and 436, similar to those moved by Shri Kajrolkar. I want Bombay to be a Part A State, the territories to be comprised in it being Greater Bombay and the districts of Thana, Kolaba and Ratnagiri.

Before I come to my amendments proper, I would like to make my position clear. I am one of those who are firm believers in a bi-lingual State. In fact, when the resolution of the Maharashtra Provincial Congress Committee for a bigger bilingual State of Bombay was passed on October 21, I went about my district and delivered about ten speeches in which I pleaded for the formula of a bigger bi-lingual State offered by the Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee. Unfortunately I was very sorry to find that some high personages from Gujarat characterised that resolution as *mala fide* and the Gujarat Pradesh Congress Committee most unfortunately, as pointed out by Shri Asoka Mehta, spurned the offer. As said by him, it is never too late. They can retrace their steps even now, and even now if a bigger bilingual State were to come into existence, none will be happier than myself.

However, we must face the realities of the situation. We must not merely ascend into the clouds and speak of abstractions. What is the position today? Maharashtrians distrust Gujaratis and Gujaratis distrust Maharashtrians. Bombay is made the crux of the problem. Maharashtrians feel that denial of Bombay to Maharashtra is a reflection on their honour. Go to any village in Maharashtra. If you talk to a child of five years of age, the child asks: "Sir, why is it that our dear Nehru has perpetrated this injustice on us?" This is no mere propaganda. It is as if the head of Maharashtra is being separated. It is an emotional problem and I ask my

Gujarati friends to look upon it as a very serious problem, not to be trifled with. I can understand their feelings also. The Gujaratis and Maharashtrians have been connected with Bombay. But if we are forming unilingual States, then where would the natural place of Bombay be? If a bigger bilingual State is an ideal to be cherished, it should come with mutual goodwill, with love and affection for both the communities on both sides. But today, that is absent.

Just as our great Prime Minister and Home Minister are pleading for time to let the wounds heal, so also, I would plead: "Please do not trifle with the feelings of Maharashtrians. Kindly take into consideration not only the great traditions of Maharashtra but also the part that Maharashtra earnestly wants to play in the great national adventure that we have undertaken".

Maharashtrian leaders, who spoke in the name of Maharashtra have been blamed—perhaps rightly, or perhaps wrongly, I do not know. But it has been said *ad nauseam* that they have bungled. If you take into consideration the very great problem which they were faced with, you will find that they were confronted with a grave issue, and they were also face to face with the biggest leaders in the country.

The biggest leaders put forward a certain proposal. What was the first proposal? The first proposal was the three-State formula. Our leaders took some time, because it was impossible to say, 'no', straightway. When the biggest leaders put forward a proposal, it is not right, and it is not good manners to say, 'no', immediately. So, they took time. They went back, and then they came again and said, 'we are sorry, this would not be acceptable to Maharashtrians'. Then, another proposal came forward, namely the bigger bilingual State, which was not acceptable to one of the parties. Then, the three-State formula was put forward, with Bombay Centrally administered.

[Shri M. D. Joshi]

Again, the Maharashtrian leaders took time. It would have been better if they had rejected that, right on the spot. But simply because they did not do so, and they took time to consider, is it right to blame them? This aspect of the question has never been taken into consideration, and they are being blamed for having bungled the whole situation.

I submit in all humility that it would have been very improper on the part of the Maharashtrian leaders to have summarily rejected the offer made by our biggest leaders. I can understand the difficulty before our big leaders. I am viewing the problem, as a humble disciple of Mahatma Gandhi, as a humble follower of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru—both of whom have fashioned our thoughts and have given tone to our public life. So, it will be a sin on my part, if I were to hate my Gujarati friends, or for that matter, any Indian friend of mine in the country. As Shri Gadgil said, I am an Indian. I am proud to be an Indian. But I am also a Maharashtrian. If I am looked upon with suspicion and distrust as a Maharashtrian, I shall certainly resent it, and I would rather go out of existence as an Indian, if I were to be distrusted as a Maharashtrian. It is this that has hurt us most, and it is this, I plead in all humility before our big leaders, that has made a simple question complex and difficult for solution.

Without going into the emotional aspect of the problem any further, I would say that let the bigger bilingual State come, whenever it is going to come—I do not know when. But before that, it is a problem before me as to what I should tell people of my district. When I go into my district, I am confronted with the problem of the people of my district asking me, 'Are we going to lose our Bombay?' They say, our 'Bombay'. Ratnagiri district has a population of 17 lakhs. Nearly 5 lakhs are resident in Bombay today, including my hon. friend Shri S. K. Patil and Shri Kajrolkar. ....

• Shri V. B. Gandhi: What about me?

Shri M. D. Joshi: and including of course my hon. friend Shri V. B. Gandhi. They are all from Ratnagiri, and all educated in Ratnagiri. I have spent the formative period of my life, fifteen precious years of my life in Bombay. In fact, Bombay is my second home. Where will all these people find their home tomorrow? Will you have no feeling for them?

If Bombay is to be Centrally administered and cut off from Maharashtra, then what would be the result? I am conscious that the Prime Minister has given an assurance in Bombay. He realised that there was a very serious problem in Bombay, and therefore, he gave an assurance to the people of these three districts that their interests would not suffer. But the consequences of circumstances, are inexorable. Assurances cannot cure those harmful results. Although I would be the last person to doubt or distrust the assurance given, yet the consequences of a fact that is now going to come into existence, namely Bombay separated from Maharashtra, cannot be avoided.

The consequences will be as follows. When the capital of the new proposed Maharashtra State is not going to be in Bombay, about 18,000 to 20,000 people will have to leave Bombay, with their families, dependants, students, peons, petty traders and so on. All of them will be seriously affected. And that will create, as was said earlier by some hon. Member, a bigger rehabilitation problem.

I am extremely sorry that my hon. friend Shri C. C. Shah should say that if Bombay were to be in a unilingual State, it would create a major rehabilitation problem. I would ask him to consider whether, the thousands of Maharashtrians in Baroda are facing a rehabilitation problem.

An Hon. Member: 60,000.

Shri M. D. Joshi: Is a major rehabilitation problem being created for them? It is ridiculous to suggest that. After all, we are Indians, India



is one and united. Though there are unilingual States, yet the whole of India is multilingual. As the Prime Minister has said, there are 14 national languages. Every language is national. And every person is an Indian.

In my own district, over 500 families of Gujaratis are living peacefully for the last three hundred years. Even when there was violence in Bombay on both sides, violence in words and violence in acts, not a hair of any Gujarati was touched in my district. I regard it as my sacred duty that if a hair is going to be touched of any Gujarati friend or of any person belonging to a minority community, I should rather die in order to save him. I consider that it is my sacred duty to save him. It is in that spirit that I am viewing this problem. It is in that spirit that the Maharashtrians view this problem. It is extremely unfortunate that Maharashtrians are still being distrusted. The separation of Bombay from the rest of Maharashtra is like the separation of the head from the body.

Therefore, as the last resort, not with any separatist tendency, not with any idea of running away from Maharashtra, I have moved my amendment to the effect that the three districts of Thana, Kolaba and Ratnagiri, which along with Bombay, from the territory known as Konkan, should form a separate State. That State would be viable and admirable unit, and it would in no way come in the way of any unilingual or bilingual State. If, later on, a bilingual State were to come into existence, I would be the first to welcome it.

The House will be interested to know that only this afternoon, I received a telegram from Bombay—after my amendment was published in the papers of Bombay—from certain Bombay citizens. With your permission, I shall read it.

"I on behalf of Konkani speaking people of Santwadi", (which is a taluk in my district), "Goa"

(which is going to merge in India), "Karvar and Mangalore give you every support in forming a Konkan State".

He has said 'Konkan State', I have said 'Bombay State'.

The signature is 'Mussolini Minista Macropolos' Bombay.

An Hon. Member: Mussolini?

Shri M. D. Joshi: The name of that gentleman happens to be Mussolini.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If we do not know who the senders are, what credence can be placed on it?

Shri Aitek r (North Satara): They are all Christians.

Shri M. D. Joshi: Yes, they are Goan Christians. 'Mussolini' is rather a historic name. Somebody doubted it. That is why I said that.

Therefore, I move my amendment rather as an *apad-dharma*, a duty cast on a person when some evil consequences have to be averted. If the evil consequences of the separation of Bombay cannot be avoided at least for five years, I say, have this State that I am proposing. Bombay, which has been the spear-head of our struggle for freedom in the years past, is being denied democratic rights. We should not deny Bombay those rights. Bombay has the pride of place in our country. Therefore, Bombay should have a democratic Constitution. A City State is undesirable. Therefore, along with these three districts, Bombay will form an ideal State—which may be called Konkan State or Bombay State—which can be merged in the bigger bi-lingual State later.

Shri S. K. Patil (Bombay City-South): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have to apologise to the House that once again I am constrained to take the floor, though this time perhaps for the last time on this question, to make an appeal and not to settle any scores.

It would have been very imprudent on my part if such a noble, emotional

[Shri S. K. Patil]

and constructive appeal coming from my friends, Shri Asoka Mehta, revered Tandonji, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava and Shri Tulsidas Kilachand was not responded to in the proper manner. I can once again repeat that the only national solution, and the most correct solution—and if I may humbly submit, the most practical solution—of the Bombay problem at this stage is the bigger bilingual State and nothing else. If that solution is not attempted just now, God forbid, it can never be attempted again.

Everybody says that he likes this solution but he is afraid that it is not practical. He is afraid that the time for that is gone. One thing that our Prime Minister said, to which I would invite your attention, as it appealed to me the most, is that we, most of us in this House—not only the people belonging to the Congress Party—are the children of revolution. And we are proud that we are children of revolution. Cannot the children of revolution rise above these petty feelings and once decide something which is in the highest interest of this country? What is the meaning of this? There are times in life when one forgets the surroundings and circumstances and does something which is so essential and which is so noble. If there was any such time, it is this time. If we fail the country just now, we will rue the day when we had another alternative on the subject and yet we did not rise to the occasion. Let us forget all that we have said in this House and elsewhere. Sometimes, poets and philosophers have said, love and hatred are merely alternative sentiments and feelings. Very often wars have ended in love; in our mythology, even matrimony was arranged at the end of a war. (An Hon. Member: And love has ended in war.) I am not superficial when I say this.

Superficially it may appear today that the Maharashtrians and Gujaratis are such inveterate enemies that they are not going to look at each other,

they are not going to live together. All that is false. If Maharashtrians and Gujaratis do not live together, then all hopes for national unity are dashed to the ground. If people who have lived together for 150 years without any trouble whatsoever, if when the nation requires that unity, cannot stay together, please tell me what is this talk of zonal councils and big, big States coming together. If people who have lived together cannot forge their temporary differences, whatever they might be, however vital they might be, how is national integration of this country going to be achieved at all?

Everybody says that he wants a bi-lingual State. In spite of our differences, my hon. friend, Shri C. D. Deshmuch, says that he wants a bi-lingual State. From the very first, I have been saying the very same thing again and again. The Prime Minister has said a hundred times that left to himself, he would like a bi-lingual State. Go anywhere, to the lobbies, to any other place. Everybody says that he wants a bi-lingual State. But somehow or other, the question is, who should bell the cat? Tempers have been frayed, so many things have been said against each other. Many things have happened.

Therefore, when we consider this unfortunate history of the murky atmosphere during the last nine or ten months, what is the way out? The practical solution, the national solution appears to be an impossible solution. But in my eyes, it is not an impossible solution at all. Go to Europe and see how the problem of borders or re-division has been solved. It was done and in every case a bloody war had to be invoked in order to do it. There are most impossible things that this nation has attempted. Did not this nation attempt a revolution without recourse to arms? If the children of revolution could perform such wonders, is it impossible for these children of revo-

lution to perform this miracle, namely, what appears to be impossible today? With the advice and guidance of our Prime Minister, we shall make it possible and we shall have a bi-lingual State comprising all the areas which are going to Maharashtra, Gujarat and the city of Bombay.

I will refrain from going into the question of the city of Bombay. A hundred times I have pleaded, pleaded not for a separate State, pleaded not for a Centrally governed State. I have pleaded that it should have its natural position, that it should be the capital of a bi-lingual State. What is the rub? You remember very well that the SRC came to the conclusion, after considering everything, that there should be a bi-lingual State. And what was the most important point that they considered? The city of Bombay. They knew that both Gujaratis and Maharashtrians and everybody there were emotionally attached to the city of Bombay. They thought: if we separate the city of Bombay, all these difficulties would come. Therefore, they recommended a bi-lingual State. Gujarat accepted that. The city of Bombay accepted that. Maharashtra did not accept it because they thought a part of it had remained apart. Whatever it is, I do not go into that subject at all. But the Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee was wise enough, good enough, to pass a resolution—almost a unanimous resolution—that if Vidarbha was given to them, they would have a bigger bi-lingual State. Then the GPCC did not accept it. Somebody criticised the GPCC. Shri Asoka Mehta did it. Let us not criticise anybody. Let us understand the human feeling. After all, when there is, for the first time, give and take, somebody says 'yes' and somebody says 'no'. But you must not run away because somebody says 'no'. If we are genuine and earnest about it, we can have the GPCC accept it. Even at this time, we can make the GPCC accept that position. What the G.P.C.S. said was that in this big

bilingual State the Gujaratis were going to be a small minority. Roughly, the situation would be like this. The population of this big bilingual State would be somewhere about 8 crores only next to U.P. as somebody pointed out. The area of this would be somewhere about 191,000 sq. miles; perhaps, the biggest, bigger even than Madhya Pradesh. Nothing wrong about that. The Marathi population would be somewhere about 55 to 60 per cent. and the Gujarati population will be about 35 per cent; the rest of the population will be others. It is true, numerically they would be less. But are we here worrying about this? If numerically somebody is small and somebody is big, we do not quarrel. We should have gone to the G.P.C.C. then—and even now it is possible—and said, 'Good friends, let us have this bilingual State'. They would have agreed; if I had the opportunity I could have convinced them. They are sound and patriotic people. They are good people, people who have produced a Mahatma Gandhi and a Sardar Patel; they would be the last people finally to reject a solution which will be to the ultimate good of the country. Never was such an attempt made. Even now go to the Gujaratis and say, 'Here in this big bilingual State; it is by accident that we the Maharashtrians are 25 millions and you Gujaratis are 15 millions; nobody planned it. The Maharashtrians everywhere in India may be 35 millions and in this State we could not bring in more than 25 millions and you are 15 million including all the Gujaratis of India put together. It is not because of something that you have done or that we have done that this disparity exists; for God's sake let us live like brothers and live together as we have lived so far.' Even in the existing State of Bombay the proportion is almost the same and yet a common Government and a common administration has been going on for the last 150 years. If that approach is taken, if that constructive approach, that humble approach, the approach of give and take, the ap-

[Shri S. K. Patil]

proach of accommodation were taken and had been taken at that time, things would not have happened like this. I do not blame anybody for whatever might have happened.

But, since we now know and the House knows that whatever solution you have, ultimately, it is going to result in trouble for everybody, whether you review it after five years, or within five years, whether we have a plebiscite or a referendum, all that is useless. In my capacity as President of the B.P.C.C. I had offered an immediate plebiscite. The Maharashtrians declined it even without consideration for they said, "What belongs to us should be ours and there should be no plebiscite about it." Let us forget all that. As I said it is not my object to settle scores. I appeal to their hearts; it is impossible for us to live and make progress nationally if Bombay does not become a bilingual State. What is the impossibility? In democracy, numerical strength is the most important criterion. We can go to the Gujaratis and tell them, 'We are 55 per cent. but don't you be afraid; anything that you might require, any safeguards that you required, any reasonable safeguards that you require, anything you want, we shall give as an elder brother gives to a younger brother; let us live in the whole family, let us not part'.

What will happen within 5 years? I can tell you, there will be such a tussle and tug-of-war on either side; everyone will try to justify his case; the people may go or may not go; that is a different matter. If your hearts are clean, then, of course, nothing will happen. But, you know what type of hearts people bring to bear upon this question. Therefore, what will happen? There will be an attempt on either side to see that the *status quo* is not disturbed. And, you cannot blame them. If they were angels, the position would not have been brought to this unfortunate

pass. We are not angels; we have behaved as we should not have behaved. But the time has come when we shall stand together and do it.

A question has been asked in this House and it is said that it is too late. Even supposing it is too late, supposing it takes 8 days, 15 days or even 6 months, rather than taking a decision or adopting a solution which is fraught with dangerous consequences both to the State and to the country as a whole, is it not worth while that it is stopped, by taking a solution which is the national solution and which will ultimately redound to the credit not only of that State but to the whole of India? That is exactly the problem today. It is asked if the Prime Minister and the Home Minister want it, where is the impossibility. I do not know; I have not probed the heart of the Prime Minister or of the Home Minister. But I can understand their feelings. Whenever they say something in national interests, they are also doubted. Some Member said here today, 'What is the good of this assurance?' Now, you can understand the feelings. Even when the highest of us says something and you doubt it, naturally, he may be feeling in his heart that although he is for a bilingual State, if the people are not going to listen to him what is going to happen. There is something like that feeling. There is something like the will of this House. I believe in democracy; I believe in partly government. But, believing in all that, overriding all those considerations there is a thing like the will of this House and if this will of the House is unmistakably expressed before the Prime Minister that a very considerable and large majority of this House, in the national interests, requires that ideal solution of a big bilingual State, surely, the Prime Minister could be moved to bring it about. But let us not give the support parochially or mention it to some friend or somebody else or merely talk in the lobbies and feel that we have done our duty. When the time

comes, when the issue has got to be finally decided, surely, we must rise above all considerations and say that we want a bilingual State because India requires that the Gujaratis and Maharashtrians living together shall form the bulwark of democracy, the bulwark of our national strength and unity. If that is done, that is the only solution.

My friend Shri Kajrolkar talked something about a new Sagar State. Why multiply our troubles; why put the suggestion that was not there? Why say that we should drown ourselves in that Sagar? I come from Ratnagiri district which forms part of what is known as the Konkan. It has 5 lakhs or 6 lakhs of people in Bombay; 20 per cent. of the entire population of the city comes from my district. I do not claim anything special for that. I do not even think that way. Surely, our prosperity lies in Bombay becoming a bilingual State.

What does Maharashtra want? I am a Maharastrian; they may not regard me as a Maharastrian today because I do not talk their language. But I can tell my Maharastrian friends that I will do nothing that is harmful to Maharashtra; I should be the last man to give support to any such thing. I feel for Maharashtra and for my people. What is good for us is a bilingual State; we should live together. Do you want merely the geography of Bombay? Even an enlarged Bombay is going to be something like London, not more than 189 sq. miles. Are you happy with these 189 sq. miles of area alone? Do you want that a fishing village which was 200 or 300 years ago given as dowry by one king to another? Or do you want Bombay to be peaceful and prosperous; Bombay's trade and everything that we have done in order that Bombay always remains the *urbs prima* in India, the premier metropolis of India? For that you must create the conditions. Can you create that? Have you the power to create that? If you get Bombay today these

problems will come. If you do not give, then also this will happen. If you give it after 5 years, then also it will happen. Therefore, my humble submission to this House is that this time the opportunity has come for the last time to indicate in unmistakable terms the will of this House to the Government and to the Prime Minister. Let us indicate it—it is never too late to do a good thing—that if India is to be saved, if the national unity is to be saved, if our States have to function as one integrated nation and not as separate units for-fung and having no co-ordination between themselves, there should be this bilingual State.

My appeal on this occasion is let us forget all the harsh things that we might have said against each other; let us forget anything that might have happened; let us not go into the murky past and the murky history; let us write a new chapter of history, a chapter of national unity, a chapter of robust commonsense, a chapter which will prove that when the time comes, the big bilingual State with the city of Bombay shall continue to lead country as before. If we adopt this, then let us leave it to the Prime Minister to bring it about. There are the Gujarati people who have got to be satisfied; we must give them whatever guarantees they want. There are the leaders of Gujarat like my friend the Chief Minister of Bombay and they have got to be consulted. All that could be done. If the Gujaratis know that a large majority of this House want a bilingual State and they want the Gujaratis to play their legitimate part in the formation of that State, I do not think there will be any Gujarati worth the name, who is really born in a community among whom were born stalwarts like Mahatma Gandhi and Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, will lag behind in patriotically responding to their call.

With these words, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the proposal that has been made here for a bilingual Bombay State. There

[Shri S. K. Patil]

is nothing impossible about it, if this Parliament so desires. This is not a plea to force things. Let us not mind slight delay. If for the national good that can be done some delay may become necessary and we need not be afraid. I hope we shall all leave this House when the present session is over, not with a divided country but with a united country once again.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I am a signatory to the amendment, No. 463, and I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity.

I add my support to what I feel will lead to much greater harmony in this whole job of reorganisation of States. Again and again, I have said on the floor of this very House that I am totally opposed to making language the major factor in the redistribution of States. I have taken a consistent attitude in this matter not because I am, in any way, hostile to the force of this or that language, but I do feel that, in a poor and backward country like ours, if we have to hang on to language, we shall have to have a couple of centuries of States and that would not be possible except, perhaps, in some unitary system of government where we would not have States but we might have districts—a make-up for a truly linguistic redistribution of this country.

It has been most painful to those of us who do not belong either to Maharashtra or to Gujarat or to Bombay to listen to the vitriolic attacks that one party has made against the other. We are not interested in supporting one or the other group, but I have the honour to be a prescriptive citizen of this country. Many Members have said that they are proud to be Indians. I do not think you can find a greater Indian than an Adivasi. May I humbly make this appeal: let us not overestimate ourselves.

Much has been said by hon. Members speaking about Congressmen, what this or that Congress Committee

has decided and so on. I am not concerned with the political strength of this or that political party. This problem is something above the political horizon, and, if we are to make a permanent and lasting solution, we shall have to rise above party politics. That is why I feel I must get up and say things bluntly to the Leader of the House.

Appeal after appeal has been made to all of us, not only to the hon. colleagues on the other side of the House but also to those on this side as well. An appeal will be made to us when the next Bill comes up. Let us be receptive but that reception must emanate from the people who make the proposals. It is not that we have to accept exactly what has been asked of us. It is something where we have to get together and try to understand each other—not only each other, because most of us might be completely outside the real problem and we may not be able to know exactly where the shoe pinches. But I do submit that sometimes a person who is detached, who is away from the thick of the problem, is in a better position to make a more correct appraisal of what a solution might be. That is why I feel that I must drop my own demands. My demands have been completely ignored in this Bill, and, for the time being, I am prepared to be silent and come to this burning question and make a contribution, if that is possible.

I have been a signatory to this particular amendment which appeals not for a bilingual State but for a multi-lingual State. Much has been made of a bilingual State for Maharashtra and Gujaratis, as if there is no other language in the territory that is sought to be brought together. I plead that the real solution is to have a strong Western India of a multi-lingual State, where there shall be not only Marathi and Gujarati, but other languages also. There are other people also. My own fellow Adivasis are there. What have you done for their language? You have been shedding tears! But what

have you done for them all these years? Where is Ehill Boli? Does it thrive? I heard an hon. Member pleading—I think she is a Gujarati—for the Danga, Danga, Danga. Does it mean anything? In what way is it a human appeal? Is it not merely a territorial, sectarian appeal?

I plead that if we are to have a solution, it might be necessary for the Leader of this House to give effect to, and not to make appeals. He has made plenty of appeals but there have been barren fields that have not borne fruit. Now he must give effect to what he believes—and I believe with him—is the right solution. Let us not talk too much of democracy. We are still at a nascent stage of democracy. It is very easy to invoke the tenets of democracy when it suits us, but when they have to be implemented or executed, we seem to squirm and rebel away from it. Here is an instance where we complain that the democratic procedure has not been put to the test. I shall come to this particular problem when we are deciding certain issues that are at the eastern sector.

Now we are talking of the western sector. What is the democratic procedure? It is not the view of the Leader of the House nor is it my view; the view of the people as a whole has to be taken into account. We can only say that it is a democratic process when a specific issue has been placed before the electorate. This has just not been done. You cannot go and have a manifesto for a referendum, plebiscite or things of that kind just for one issue. There are so many issues, and all the issues may not appeal to the people. They may vote on one issue and ignore the others. But here is a question, a national problem, which is something more than the issue of language and the like. I feel very strongly that it is not too late. One of my hon. friends here on the left, Shri S. K. Patil, and my equally hon. friend on this side, an ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer, Shri Chintaman Deshmukh, and other antagonists and

protagonists of this particular problem tell us solemnly on the floor of this House that they are for a bilingual—I do not like this word, and so I shall say a large multi-lingual Vidarbha, Maharashtra, Bombay, Gujarat, Kutch, Saurashtra minus Mt. Abu and the like. What is there that is preventing the Leader of the House? They are committing to his hands a particular, definite, positive task—here you are, you do this, we are with you, we agree with you. I am not one of those who will leave everything to him. I will not leave everything to him. I will not leave everything to others. The question of national—I do not know the Urdu word—izzat perhaps is the Urdu word—is involved. We have exposed ourselves very very badly over these things by a great deal of unfortunate and sordid talk. I appeal to him. It is not too late. There are people in this House and outside, who feel like me. I am prepared to prove this to him. There is a very vast volume of opinion of hon. Members in this House, who would be willing to wait on him as soon as he wants, who do not want this, who do not believe in the continuation of this sort of bitterness and friction and internecine warfare. I am prepared to prove to him from the hon. Members who are representatives here, democratic, elected representatives of this country, and assure him that they would stand by him and abide by what he genuinely has felt. He has expressed that. It is not as if I am trying to interpret his mind. He has patently, openly and repeatedly tried to appeal to all of us. There may be some people who, in their purblind backwardness which is worse than primitive backwardness do not respond to him. But, I do want to tell him that there are plenty of people who may not articulate themselves on the floor of this House but who will stand by him if only he will take a firm decision in the national interest of this country for a multi-lingual State of Vidarbha, Maharashtra, Bombay, Gujarat, Saurashtra, Kutch and the like minus Mount Abu.

Shri S. S. Mera: What about Bengal-Bihar merger?

Shri Jaipal Singh: That come afterwards.

श्री गोपी राम (मंडी—महासु—रक्षित—अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एस० प्रार० सी० बिस, (राज्य पुनर्गठन विधेयक) १९५६ की क्लॉज १३ पर मूव की गई एमैंडमेंट (संशोधन) नम्बर ४०१ को प्रपोज करने के लिये सड़ा हुआ हूँ। श्री मन्द लाल शर्मा जी ने इस तरमीम के द्वारा हिमाचल प्रदेश को पंजाब में मिलाने की मांग की है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हिन्दुस्तान के नक्शे को धरसिरे नौ (आरम्भ से) सींचते वक्त काफी गरमा गरमी रही है और हर एक पहलू से अपने अपने नुकते निगाह को पेश करते वक्त काफी जोर भाजमाई हो चुकी है। मैं हिन्दुस्तान के नक्शे को सामने रखते हुये, हिमाचल प्रदेश के बारे में अपने खयालात का इजहार करना चाहता हूँ। मैं धापका मशकूर हूँ कि आपने मुझे भी अपने खयालात का इजहार करने का मौका दिया है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे जोर भाजमाई तो नहीं करनी है और न ही हमारे लोगों को जोर भाजमाई करने की आदत है ही। मैं तो उन गरीब और पिछड़े हुये लोगों की सिर्फ एक आवाज इस दिन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ और उस आवाज को रोशनी में साने के लिये न तो हमारे पास कोई प्रैस है और न ही हमारे पास प्लेटफॉर्म है और न ही फार्नेसिज (वित्त) है। इसके अलावा हम किसी किसिम के मुजाहरे करके अपने नुकतेनगर (दृष्टिकोण) को पेश करना नहीं जानते हैं। हमारे प्रदेश के लोग सीधे खादे अप्पों में देश के नेता, सिर्फ देश के नेता ही नहीं बल्कि दुनिया के नेता, भी बजाहर

साम नहर क्या पंक्ति बंध और इस समय क तमाम मीम्बरान के सामने एक ही मांग पेश करना चाहते हैं और वह मांग यह है कि हिमाचल में रहने वाले पिछड़े हुये तथा गरीब लोगों की तरक्की और बहुमती को मद्देनजर (ध्यान में) रखते हुए उनको अपने पैरों पर सड़े होने का एक मौका दिया जाये।

हिमाचल के लोग खुश हैं। उनका एक स्वप्न था, एक साव था कि कुलपलेज्ड स्टेट (पूर्ण राज्य) उनको मिले। तो वह बकल भी दूर नहीं है जब कि जो हमारी यह दिख की मांग है, जो यह हमारी हकत है, यह पूरी होगी। भाज जो तसवीर हमारे सामने है उससे इस मांग को तकवीयत मिलता है। मौजूदा हालत में हम कोई भी एसी भइचन नहीं चाहते जित से कि मुल्क की मकमहती और तरक्की में स्कावट पैदा हो।

मुझे अफसोस है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश की हस्ती को खत्म करने के लिये भाज श्री नंद लाल शर्मा जी ने यह तरमीम पेश की है। मुझे जाती तौर पर उनसे कोई मिला नहीं है। लेकिन मुझे इस बात का अफसोस है कि हम कितने पिछड़े हुये हैं, हमारा रहन सहन कितना गरीबी का है, इन चीजों पर सोच विचार किये बगैर, धाईदा घाने वाले जैनरल इलेक्शन को ही मद्देनजर रखते हुये, इस तरमीम को पेश किया गया है। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि इस अमैंडमेंट (संशोधन) को देकर उन्होंने श्री नि० चं० चटर्जी के फार्मूले का खुला मुजाहरा किया है। श्री चटर्जी ने बेस्टन पाकिस्तान के सतरे से बचने के लिये अपने फार्मूले में महा पंजाब का नक्शा दिया है। लेकिन दूसरी तरफ ईस्टन पाकिस्तान से जो सतरा पैदा हो सकता है, उससे बचने के लिये उन्होंने बिहार और बंगाल के मजूर को कबल नहीं किया और उसकी मुसलमिफत करते रहे हैं और कर रहे हैं। उनको बिहारियों की डीमिनेशन से नफरत है और हिमाचल प्रदेश की जनता



की अलहदा रहने की भावाज की वह परवा नहीं कर रहे हैं। यह उनकी अपनी राय है और मुझे इसके बारे में कुछ ज्यादा नहीं कहना है। मुझे सुनी होगी अगर पंजाब तरक्की करे। हम पंजाब की तरक्की में रोड़ा नहीं बनना चाहते। हम नहीं चाहते कि हिमाचल का पिछड़ा हुआ इलाका पंजाब की तरक्की में किसी तरह से अड़चन पैदा करे। हम जानते हैं कि पंजाब का भारत की तवारीख में एक खास स्थान है। पंजाब ने बहुत कुरबानियां दी हैं। हम यह भी जानते हैं कि डिवेलपमेंट (विकास) और फील्ड (क्षेत्र) में हम पंजाब का मुकाबला जल्दी नहीं कर सकेंगे। लेकिन हमें यकीन है कि हम चन्द सालों में पंजाब के मुकाबले पर तरक्की कर जायेंगे। अगर एक बात जो माफ है वह यह है कि हिमाचल के पिछड़े हुए लोग सदियों तक पंजाब के पालिटिक्स (राजनैतिक दाव पेंच) का मुकाबला नहीं कर पायेंगे। हरियाना वाले और कांगड़ा के रहने वाले पंजाब की पालिटिक्स में तंग आ गये हैं। जब बड़ा के ही तंग आ गये हैं तो हम जो पिछड़े हुए हैं किस तरह में उनके साथ मुकाबला कर पायेंगे।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इन लपड़ों के साथ इस अमेंडमेंट की मैं मुखालिफत करना हूँ और सदन के तमाम मंत्रियों में पुनर्जन्म अपील करता हूँ कि वे मंजूदगी के साथ हिमाचल की नीडयत पर गौर करें और इस अमेंडमेंट को मुखालिफत करें ताकि हम भी मुल्क की चलती हुई गाड़ी का एक डिब्बा बन कर उसके साथ चल सकें।

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** I am very glad, Sir, that at this very last stage of the second reading of this momentous Bill I have an opportunity to again put before this House the great and important desire of the people to reorganise the States on the basis of linguistic principles. The at-

mosphere in this House today has again been changed by some very eloquent speeches which I appreciate from the point of view of the desire to see that the animus, which has grown between the two great communities of Gujarat and Maharashtra, is bridged. Time and again they say that the cause of all ills is the desire for linguistic States. It has to be refuted. I feel that we are living in too centrally-cooled chamber and far too far way from the desire of the people.

I am not a Maharashtraian or a Gujarati. But, I do come from the State of West Bengal where our Chief Minister tried to merge Bihar and Bengal and we, the people of Bengal, defeated that proposal. Yet, we proudly say that we are the best friends of Biharis. We have hundreds of thousands of Biharis in the city of Calcutta and we have taken it upon ourselves to see that not a hair on the head of one Bihari is touched within the city of Calcutta. That is why I am very perturbed when I hear my friend, Shri C. C. Shah, saying "What would become of me, who is living for 54 years in the city of Bombay? Immediately the answer comes to my mind. I say he will continue to live in the city of Bombay as I have been living in my city. Maharashtraians, Gujaratis, Andhras, Tamilians, Frenchmen, Chinese, English, all are there. It is an international city. That is why I am surprised, as a person who can take a more deached view of things, when many of my friends from Bombay have again and again pleaded for a special approach because of the special position of Bombay.

4 P.M.

I have felt very deeply that these special provisions and specialities which are being propounded for the city of Bombay constitute a dangerous proposition, because I feel it is putting a time-bomb beneath every city which today I claim, though they may belong to Bengal, Tamil Nad or Madras Presidency, are not only multi-lingual but

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

they are centres of international communities.

Sir, today we, who come from Calcutta, ask what is the special status of Bombay which is not there in Calcutta, except, I agree, that the people in Bombay may be richer and it may be a richer city than my city? Is that why you say that in Bombay the Gujeratis and Maharashtrains can not live side by side if the city goes to Maharashtra? Tomorrow I know that the question will be raised again in the city of Calcutta where the same conditions prevail. Our city is a cosmopolitan centre of all communities. We are proud to say that although Calcutta is in the Bengal State, we see that the city remains a cosmopolitan centre. Yet we are the greatest protagonists of linguistic States, because we believe that we in India have a special type of unity which we will have to build up and show to the world; the unity in diversity, the unity of various national languages. The Prime Minister said that there are 14 national languages. Which country in the world can get up and say, "we have got 14 national languages"? Yet we blend those national languages towards one nationhood. That is why we say that we are proud to have so many different States based on languages. Yet, at the same time, we are an Indian nation.

I think it is important that those who do not belong to Bombay have to express themselves, because of the dangerous theories that are being propounded demanding that Bombay must be a special State; it can only exist as a bilingual State, what is meant by unilingualism? I do not like the word 'unilingual'. I want to call it 'linguistic State'. From this point of view we stand for linguistic States, which means that States of major languages will be formed, but within each State there will be various other languages.

It is in this connection that we say it is very important to take up the question of the linguistic minorities

and the safeguards to them. We shall take up that question in the appropriate clauses when we come to them.

Sir, I do not want that there should be any delay in giving Bombay to Maharashtra. I do not want that any delay should be there when there is a question of principle. You have accepted a principle. Whether you liked it or not, you have been forced to accept it in Andhra. You have been forced to accept it for Hyderabad. The Prime Minister did not want disintegration of Hyderabad, but yet the will of the people prevailed and Hyderabad has been disintegrated on the basis of language. It has been disintegrated into linguistic provinces. We have also seen that the linguistic principle prevailed in the State of Bengal. It has to a certain extent been even recognised though not fully, in the Punjab and yet there has been no disintegration. Then Karnatak has been formed. Where that linguistic principle has been betrayed, it is there where all the trouble has started. That is why I say that the linguistic principle will be the principle on the basis of which we shall build an India, unified India, based on diversity.

I do not want to take too much of your time. But I do, in this connection want to support my amendment for substitution of the word "Karnataka" for Mysore, and that is for this very reason. I have nothing against the name of Mysore, but it reflects the name of one city. Today the name should rather reflect the entire people of that area. That is why today the people of Tamil Nad want that their State should be called Tamil Nad and not Madras. We do not call the Bengal State as Calcutta State. It is trying to narrow down and to a certain extent give less value to the sentiments of the people. That is why I have moved that small amendment saying, that instead of Mysore the new State should be called the State of Karnataka.

The last amendment of mine is on the Boundary Commission. If unanimity was an indication of what the Government will accept or not, I should say that it should accept this amendment that we have moved with regard to the Boundary Commission. I remember, a few months ago, when we proposed the Boundary Commission the Prime Minister ridiculed the idea. It was easy to take things out of context in order to gain a political point. He did not realise the importance of it. He did not try to understand the complicated problem that we would be faced with in the reorganisation of States in the boundary areas. That is why he said: "Oh! The Communist Party wants to take disruption to every village". Today when every State is facing this problem of settling the boundaries, all persons, of whatever point of view they may be—even such differing people as Shri C. C. Shah and Shri C. D. Deshmukh—are coming forward and saying that they are prepared to think about the Boundary Commission. That is why we have said that it is necessary to have this Boundary Commission and the three principles on which we would like the Boundary Commission to function are: language majority, contiguity of area and also taking the village as a unit.

Sir, we have seen the intricate questions that have arisen between Bihar and Orissa boundaries. The entire State of Orissa rose up on the question of Seraikella and Kharsawan. I do not want to go into that question, because I am not competent enough to do so. I know the majority of the Members of this House are not competent to do so. Yet we know that there must be certain things that are to be decided there. I might personally know a little more about my own border, but there may be many others who will not know anything about it. There are many intricate questions like the question of language, census figures and so on. All that have to be gone into and it cannot be done by this House. That is why the question of Boundary Commission is very very important.

Lastly, the question has been raised that the great Tilak has said: "Swaraj is my birth right", but that today the Maharashtrian leaders have forgotten that great, broad and bigger concept. But I would say, to my mind Swaraj today means not only Swaraj at the top-most level, that is national independence, but Swaraj even down at every level of local self-government, provincial government, administrative government and the utilisation of the inherent qualities of the people, their understanding and the ability of the people to take it upon themselves to self-govern their States. That is why we believe that linguistic States is an expression of that desire for Swaraj and we believe that in fighting for Samyukata Maharashtra with Bombay as their capital, the Maharashtrian leaders are doing and carrying on the behest of the great Tilak. Most of us believe so. Throughout India and in most of the States that is the case. We see that the merger of Bengal and Bihar has not been gone through. Why? Our Chief Minister okayed it, but many people did not want a bilingual State. So, if you put it to the people of Maharashtra will they be prepared to accept it? Andhra and Madras were together and now they have separated. Yet today, does the Chief Minister of Madras stand for a Dakshina Pradesh? Let us see the course of history. Let us see where the course of history is leading us. Let us not try to turn it backwards, because, there we shall fail. It is the linguistic provinces that have come to stay and they will be corner-stone of a unified and a strong India.

**Dr. Gangadhara Siva (Chittoor-Reserved-Sch. Castes):** I rise to support amendment No. 217 to clause 3 moved by Dr. Lakka Sundaram and a few others. The amendment reads as follows:

"(3) As from the appointed day there shall be added to the State of Andhra Pradesh the territories

[Dr. Gengadhara Siva]

comprised in the Sirugappa taluk, the Bellary taluk, the Hospet taluk and the area of the Mallapuram sub taluk in which the Dam and head works of the Tungabhadra Project are situated in the present Bellary District in Mysore State. The said territories:

(a) shall cease to form part of the existing district of Bellary in the State of Mysore; and

(b) shall become part of the Bellary district in the State of Andhra Pradesh."

Before proceeding with my speech, I would like to enlighten this House about the very sane judgment which has been brought to bear on the report of the States Reorganisation Commission by the eminent members of the Commission. I would be failing in my duty if I do not offer my compliments to the authors of the report whom I might call the modern Tirumurthis of India,—Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva—and who have carved a new map of India for the unity, solidarity and development of the various States in India. With regard to the qualifications of the members of the Commission, I might say that they are highly cultured and are eminent lawyers. Above all, they do not belong to any party. Such people have made this report and I commend their work to Parliament before I proceed to make my remarks about Bellary.

The Tungabhadra project came into existence by the hard labour, blood and sweat that were contributed by our revered Andhras in the then composite State of Madras, in the course of a number of years. I am sorry I do not find any reason why the people of Mysore should now claim Bellary as part and parcel of Mysore. It is for the sake of poor Rayalaseema that the leaders fought for the formulation of the Tungabhadra project in view of the persistent famine in Rayalaseema in and out of season. In the recent years, you might have heard of the famine that gripped Rayalaseema and which opened the eyes of the whole world. Of course, the others gave

their support to tide over the famine situation. For this reason, the Commission recommended as follows:

"For these reasons, we recommend that one Karnataka State should be formed. This State, should, in our opinion, comprise the following areas:

(a) the present Mysore State, excluding the following portions of the Bellary district as now constituted, the Sirugappa taluk, the Bellary taluk, the Hospet taluk and a small area of the Mallapuram sub-taluk in which the dam and head-works of the Tungabhadra project are situated....."

This is the observation made by the Commission. They have clearly included Bellary in Andhra State. Further, the Commission has observed as follows:

"One such area is Kolar district, which has a Telugu majority of fifty-four per cent and a Kannada-speaking population of barely twenty-one per cent. It has intimate ties with Mysore which are of such long standing that they cannot easily be ignored."

So, with regard to Kolar, it has been clearly stated that the Telugu-speaking population is in a majority there. Thus, I plead that Kolar should also be included in Andhra State.

About Bellary, the Commission has again observed as follows:

"After very serious consideration we have decided to recommend the exclusion of a portion of the present Bellary district along the course of the Tungabhadra from Karnataka and its transfer to the Andhra State."

This is a valid recommendation which has been given after deep consideration by the three eminent people who had been members of this Commission and who have drafted the report. In spite of this, I do not see any reason why the recommendation

has not been followed in respect of Andhra, any why Bellary is still retained in Karnataka.

It has been stated that the judgment of certain authorities is also in favour of retaining Bellary in Karnataka State. But the judgments of judges are not considered to be valid; they are like passing birds or clouds, because if a case falls in one court, it is taken to a higher court, say, the district court. Then, from the district court, the case is taken to the High Court and from the High Court to the Supreme Court. In the same case, different judgments are given by these respective courts. So, in the same way, how could one rely upon the judgment of certain persons that Bellary should be retained in Mysore State?

So, with all due respect, I would urge upon the Members of this Parliament to take a sane view of the report of the SRC and to see that Bellary is included in Andhra State. I appeal to the Members of the House to realise that Mysore is a prosperous State. The Rayalaseema area is direly in need of hydro-electric projects and also irrigation projects. As I have already pointed out, the report of the Commission has also pointed out that only in the interests of Rayalaseema, the Tungabhadra project and other hydro-electric schemes have been initiated. Rayalaseema is backward in all senses and it will be a burden on both the Central Government and the State Government if famine occurs there in season and out of season. It has entirely to depend upon the rain-god for supply of water. In the years 1951 and 1952, we had to suffer very heavily owing to drought. At last, our beloved Prime Minister rushed to our rescue and sent the military forces to sink wells and undertake similar relief measures and thereby, we got the benefit of drinking water. Recently, the Home Minister also visited Rayalaseema and was convinced of all our difficulties. In these circumstances, I hope the hon. Members of the House would take a very sympathetic

view of the claims of these poor unfortunate Rayalaseema people and do the needful by seeing that Bellary is included in Andhra State.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): Some days back I said that this question that has excited such strong feelings in various parts of the country should be postponed for sometime to allow the physical and psychological wounds, that have been mutually inflicted to heal. When I speak, I find that Congressmen feel the force of my argument; they also feel that it would be much better for the country if this question of the reorganisation of States is postponed for sometime for tempers to cool and for the wounds to heal. It is easy for physical wounds to heal; but psychological wounds that are inflicted by one community on the other are very hard to heal. I am sorry that neither the Prime Minister nor the Home Minister thought it proper to respond to my appeal.

Now, a simple question has arisen, namely, that of the Bombay State and I think persons representing different parties who have spoken today have said that Bombay should remain as it is, with Vidarbha, Saurashtra and Kutch added to it. I do not say "bilingual", because on the one side my Communist sister here has objection to it and on the other side, the representative of the original inhabitant to whom once all India belonged does not like the phrase. Therefore, I do not talk of "bilingual Bombay". But, most of the spokesmen from Gujarat, from Maharashtra and the powerful speaker from Bombay are all for a bilingual State. What difficulty is there then? What is the hindrance? The Prime Minister has often said that he wants an agreed solution. Here, I think, is an agreed solution; I have not heard anybody raising his voice against this united Bombay. I think in his speech, Shri Deshmukh also said that he stood for united Bombay. Mr. Patil stands for it and, so far as I can see, the Gujaratis have no objection.

**Shri G. B. Khedkar:** Vidarbha is against.

**Acharya Kripalani:** Vidarbha seems very easy to be induced to any particular course of action.

**Shri G. B. Khedkar:** For unilingual, not bilingual Bombay.

**Acharya Kripalani:** The objection that is raised is that India must be divided on a linguistic basis and this objection comes from our communist friends. So far as I know, before we got independence, it was not the provincial languages that smothered each other, but it was rather the foreign language—the language I am speaking now—that smothered the provincial languages. We had in those days no fear of each other; but, the fear was that at the expense of our provincial languages, the foreign language was prospering. This fear of one language of another language is a very recent creation, which is one of the fruits that we have after independence. I have lived in Gujarat and I have as well lived in Maharashtra; I did not see that Gujarat had to suffer because it was conjoined with Maharashtra—I mean, the Gujarati language—nor did I see that the Marathi language had to suffer in any way. In Gujarat all the primary schools were in Gujarati; in Maharashtra they were in Marathi. There was no conflict that I saw anywhere, nor did I see that one language was suffering because of the other language. Generally, the fate of a language depends upon those who use that language. If you can create a few first class writers, your language prospers and nobody can put it down. The Bengali language was just like the other provincial languages, but a few geniuses—literary geniuses—rose and today Bengali is more advanced than other languages. Gujarati and Marathi had also powerful writers and they have also developed. So, there is absolutely no fear to the Marathi language or to the Gujarati language from a union of Gujarat and Maharashtra.

Many people including Shri Deshmukh said that Maharashtra and

Gujarat could be complementary and supplementary to each other. I have lived in both places, I have dear friends in both places and I know they have been complementary and supplementary to each other. The practical, commercial, industrial ability of Gujarat and the theoretical ability of the marhatis and their deep scholarship and artistic sense can be combined together and this can be a model State. It would be a State that would be an example for the whole of the country. I really do not see any objection it. Congressmen are in favour of it. But, I do not know why they are so silent. In the lobby they say, "What you say is correct. The union of Gujarat and Maharashtra will be a good arrangement". But, I do not know what they do at the party meetings.

**Shri Feroze Gandhi (Pratapgarh Dist.—West cum Rae Bareilly Dist.—East):** The same as you were doing.

**Acharya Kripalani:** As far as I am concerned, I think it is very well known that I did not say "ditto" to everything that was done by the leaders—whether in the party or in the open House. If I might remind Shri Feroze every speech that I have made in the House, before I left the Congress, was a call for a meeting of the party to take disciplinary action against me. This charge, therefore, cannot be made against me. But, I suppose after I left the Congress some kind of blast has come on the party and they are unable to speak out their minds. In the lobby they say, "This is not the time and the atmosphere for a rearrangement of the States; many things have happened which have roused great tempers and excited people. There will be no harm if the thing is postponed." But, I cannot understand why this does not come about. Why cannot they make themselves effectively vocal? I think that, if they express their opinion freely at least on this matter, nobody will misunderstand, because this is a matter concerning the unity, the prosperity and the progress of our country.

I do not want to take more time of the House. If the whole rearrangement cannot be postponed, at least Maharashtra and Gujarat should be formed into one State with Bombay as its capital. This will be a very fine solution which, I think, would be acceptable to everybody outside and also to this House.

Shri V. P. Pawar (South Satara): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am thankful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak on the clauses under consideration and my amendments to the respective clauses.

The synopsis of my amendments, fourteen in number to the respective clauses is briefly as under. First, about Border Problems: I have given notice of amendment No. 154 to the effect that a Boundary Commission may be appointed to determine and finally decide questions regarding the border disputes. I have also proposed amendment No. 155, that there must be some basic principles to determine the boundaries of bi-lingual tracts, namely, the village being the unit, contiguity of the area, homogeneity, major language, wishes of the people, geographical and cultural unity and administrative convenience of these areas etc. Then, I have proposed amendments to clause 7 about Belgaum and Karwar. In view of the aforesaid basic and fundamental considerations, let the border disputes be settled once for all. I have proposed in my amendments 134, 135 and 136 that the predominantly contiguous Marathi-speaking areas having more than 70 per cent. population—from Belgaum and Karwar Districts should be integrated with the newly proposed Maharashtra State. I have also proposed in my amendment No. 150 that the territories specified in clause No. 8 i.e. Greater Bombay should be integrated in the proposed Maharashtra State. Then, I have proposed amendment No. 141 in which I have suggested that if Bombay city is not integrated now and here in the proposed Maharashtra State, and in view of the declared proposals by our beloved Prime Minister and Home Minister,

let there be a dead line fixed for the automatic merger of Bombay within a stipulated period.

The substance of the amendment is, that Bombay city shall be integrated with and form part of Maharashtra State within a period of five years unless Parliament by a Resolution decides otherwise about the future of Bombay city. Then I have proposed amendments numbers 165 to 171 relating to clauses 13 to 14. They are of a minor nature. But, they are very important about the remaining of the States: instead of Mysore, Karnataka and instead of Madras, Tamil Nad, etc.

Before I justify and explain my amendments and commend them for the acceptance of the House, I want to make my position clear about certain issues. I entirely agree with the minute of dissent submitted by Shri Deogirikar about clauses 7 and 8 of the Bill. Shri Deogirikar is a member of the Congress Working Committee and the head of the Maharashtra P.C.C. I support him. I feel that there is an impression that the Maharashtrians are for a bi-lingual or tri-lingual state. It is far from truth. With due respect to my Konkani friends and barring a few of them, the whole of Maharashtra is deadly against bi-lingual or tri-lingual or multi-lingual States. I would quote instance after instance. Here is my friend Shri G. B. Khedkar, who is the President of the Vidarbha Congress Committee. Vidarbha strongly opposes bilingual State. Here is another Member from Marathwada Shri Swami Ramananda Tirtha. None from Marathwada favours a bi-lingual or tri-lingual state. As I said, barring few friends nobody from Maharashtra will commend this proposition of bilingual whether balances or bigger one. In the exigencies of circumstances, and when there was a national call, even though we unanimously stood for the uni-lingual state of Maharashtra with Bombay as its capital we had proposed this bigger bi-lingual State. But, unfortunately that was stamped out with *malafide* motives by our

[Shri V. P. Pawar]  
 counterparts. Now, in the context of developments and also in the context of unfortunate happenings on the Maharashtra front, I think no Maharashtra will accept this proposal of a bi-lingual or multi-lingual State. It has been said that this Parliament is supreme and it has got the right to decide any proposals. I accept the proposition. But, what about the Maharashtrian people. A few persons may commend the bi-lingual State. But, the people of Maharashtra have emphatically and categorically opposed any bilingual state. If the authorities want to impose it, I for one make myself bold to say that it will never be tolerated by the Maharashtrians.

The question of bi-lingual or multi-lingual state has been already ruled out. In my last speech also I had said:

"The Commission themselves have admitted that in the composite states a sense of loyalty to the State does not develop. In a bi-lingual state, the real harmony of co-operative working will be difficult to be maintained and one of the two language groups of people who suffer remain indifferent and inactive in the work of national development. Bi-lingualism would not put confidence and enthuse all the people to willingly put in their efforts in the vast nation building work which we have to do."

Now, coming to the problem of Bombay, most weighty and effective arguments have been put forward and counter arguments have been advanced. But, I am sorry to submit—it pains my heart—that there is no cogent, convincing, and valid reasons coming forth from the authority to warrant the separation of Bombay city from Maharashtra. It has been said, let normal conditions be restored, let passions subside, let there be a calm and quite atmosphere. I do concede it. But, why those things are so? The just, legitimate and rightful claim of the Maharashtra has

been denied. There is a feeling of discontent, dissatisfaction and frustration amongst the Maharashtrians. So a vicious circle and a tangle exists in the solution of Bombay problem. Now, the position is that no normalcy, no Bombay; and also no Bombay, no normalcy. We are on the horns of a dilemma. The leaders of Maharashtra put their heads together and tried to get out of this dilemma. But, unfortunately, there was no response either from a section of our people or from Higher quarters. Who is to break this vicious circle? The persons in authority and on the helm of affairs alone can break this vicious circle. It was said that the poison is created by the Reorganisation of States. But who can digest poison? There is a saying:

विष सहजचो पचवी शिव

God Shiv, that is, God Shankar alone can digest poison. In all humility and with due respect, I submit that the leaders should take courage boldly in their hands and solve this problem. It was suggested that the whole problem of States Reorganization should be kept in cold storage. But our leaders were bold enough to face those problems. If our leaders are convinced that the claim of Maharashtra is just, genuine and reasonable, I would appeal to them to make themselves bold to solve it here and now and to do the right thing at the right time. We have been advised to have patience for five years. All right. It is not a matter of five years or two-three years. This sword hanging over us and keeping us in suspense will not be useful either to Maharashtra or the nation as a whole. Hence, let it be gracefully done now. Sir, about the Border problems I have said that there should be some basic principles in the light of which a uniform policy should be applied to all the border disputes, whether they are between Maharashtra and Mahakoshal, Maharashtra and Gujarat or Maharashtra and Karnataka. I shall read only one paragraph in which I have said that the predominantly Marathi-speaking contiguous area of



Belgaum and Karwar should be integrated in Maharashtra:

"Nearly 5 lakhs of Marathi speakers live in this compact homogenous tract of about 3,000 sq. miles contiguous to Marathi Districts of Kolhapur and Ratnagiri. Geographically, linguistically and culturally this whole tract forms a part of Maharashtra. Marathi-speakers are over 70% of the total population of this whole area. They have intimate social and economic relations with Maharashtra.

Administratively, a large majority of these Marathi-speakers tagged on to the tail-end of a Kannada State, is bound to involve a severe strain on the political life and administrative machinery of the State. Any arrangements of expedients which may be evolved to safeguard the interests of this large minority are bound to be unsatisfactory."

This will be made clear from all the statistics provided by my friends in the discussion on the Clauses.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The following further amendments to clauses 2 to 15 of the States Reorganisation Bill have been indicated by the Members to be moved subject to their being otherwise admissible:

Clause No.	No. of amendment
3	163, 164
7	484
15	486
15A (New)	487

Shri Gopala Rao (Gudivada): I beg to move:

Page 3—

(i) after line 25, insert:

"(h) Kolar district except Kolar taluk and Malur taluk;

(l) Srivancha taluk of Chanda district."

Page 3, line 27—

(ii) for "State of Hyderabad" substitute:

"States of Hyderabad, Mysore, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa."

Shri Sivamarthi Swami (Kushtagi): I beg to move:

Page 4, line 35—

(i) before "South Canara" insert:

"Nilligiri district and Tadwali firka in Coimbatore district, and"

Page 10, line 3—

(ii) after "name" insert "of State"

Page 10—

after line 4, insert:

(iii) 15A. Nothing in the provisions of this Part shall affect the power of the Central Government to alter or adjust the extent and boundaries of any State by appointing a judicial Commission or Commissions on linguistic and economic basis."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These amendments are also before the House.

Shri Mathew (Kottayam): I was feeling a kind of inner satisfaction, almost a modest degree of pride in that we in South India on the whole kept our heads cool in the course of these months of turmoil and of clashes elsewhere. We too had our own arguments against each other. We made fervent appeals to each other, but then we did not lose our equipoise of mind. It may be said that it was because our problems or our disputes were not very acute, and the issues were not so serious. It is however possible to get excited over anything and everything! So, I think part of the credit goes to our mentality and our outlook.

I was expecting that once the scheme was looked into by the Joint Committee and emerged from their hands, we would not have any more of amendments which would seek to make violent inroads into that scheme. But yesterday, no less an esteemed

[Shri Mathew]

friend than Shri B. Shiva Rao came forward with the rather surprising, may astounding suggestion that Kasargod Taluk which is to be part of Kerala should be divided and that part of it to the north of Chandragiri river should be retained in Karnataka. An effective, clear and calm reply was given by my young and esteemed friend Shri A. M. Thomas and I thought there would be an end of that, but yesterday afternoon my esteemed friend Shri Gurupadaswamy reverted to that same contention. Unconsciously he made a mis-statement, not a slight but a serious mis-statement in the context, that in that part of Kasargod which lies to the north of the river Chandragiri, the Malayalam-speaking population by itself was not in a majority. He must have misunderstood. Mr. Thomas; anyhow it was a mistake. The Malayalam-speaking population by itself forms a definite majority, whether it be 52 or 55 per cent—we need not go into that. In any case, by itself that section has a clear majority. My friend Shri A. M. Thomas pointed out further that the language 'Tulu' was very much akin to Malayalam. But even leaving aside the Tulu-speaking population, the Malayalam-speaking population by itself is a clear decisive majority. I am not one of those who say that language should be the sole criterion and everything should be decided or determined on that issue. No. If there are over-riding considerations on the other side, I am certainly prepared to look at them. But in this case there is no kind of relevant consideration, over-riding or not over-riding, which can be reasonably placed over against this simple fact. Therefore, I was rather surprised at the way in which that contention was brought forward again and again. I do not see any reason which can be alleged in favour of such an amendment.

Now, let me very briefly turn to, shall I say only in good humour, the attack from another side by the Tamil

friends. I said we appealed to each other and we adduced arguments in support of our appeals, at an earlier stage. Some of us pointed out in all humility to our friends in South Travancore that in their own interests—never mind the interests of the whole State—it might be better for them to remain in Kerala, but our arguments or appeals failed to carry conviction. It is not their fault perhaps, it may be our fault. Whatever it be, they had made up their minds to join the great State of Madras and they have our blessings and all our good wishes are with them, though they did not respond to our appeal. But then, they again repeat, I hope not in a very serious mood, that Devicolam and Peermade should be taken away from the new State of Kerala and tacked on to Madras. I do not go into the arguments, because it may suggest it is a debatable point! It is not a debatable point; they were simply repeating the same old contention. Without Devicolam and Peermade there would be hardly any Kerala State stable from the economic point of view. If that were to be done, our humble plea is let the whole of Kerala State be merged with the Madras State. But then, strangely enough, the big majority community of Tamil speaking people seem to be nervous of that suggestion. It is generally the minority that feel nervous, but strangely here in the present case, the minority are not feeling nervous, while it is the big majority community that are feeling nervous. Anyhow, they are not agreeable to the suggestion and there is no point in pressing it further.

Shri Boovaraghasamy (Perambalur):  
Join Andhra.

Shri Mathew: That is not to the point. There are geographical and so many other considerations which rule it out. Whether it is Devicolam or Peermade, or that portion of South Travancore which is now going to Madras State, there is one point concerning them all and about which all

of us should be agreed. The interests of the Tamil-speaking population in Devicolam and Peermade should be entirely safeguarded. In the schools in Devicolam and Peermade, there must be adequate provision for the Tamil medium of instruction. Similarly, I would say, in the southern taluks which are now added to the Madras State, there should be adequate provision—I would not use repeatedly the word “safeguards”—for the encouragement of Malayalam. In those taluks, there must be many schools where Malayalam should be the medium of instruction. I need not emphasise this point, because I have every confidence that my Tamil friends will see to it, and I am sure that our Kerala State will see to it that the Tamil-speaking population in Peermade or Devicolam will not suffer in the least, in any way, as far as this matter is concerned.

So, I oppose amendment No. 261 and certain other amendments to the same effect. Despite the little disappointment that has been caused in certain points, I accept the scheme of the Kerala State, as it has emerged from the Joint Committee.

**Shri Bahadur Singh** (Ferozepur—Ludhiana—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I wish to make a few observations on clause 13 of the States Reorganisation Bill, as amended by the Joint Committee. There is an amendment to this clause by my hon. friend Shri Nand Lal Sharma, namely amendment No. 401. I stand here to oppose that amendment.

My hon. friend wants that Himachal Pradesh should be added to Punjab right now. From the Punjab, there were demands for a Punjabi-speaking province, for a Hariana Prant, and for greater Himachal Pradesh. There was also the demand that all these States should be tagged together, and a Maha Punjab should be formed.

Then, an arrangement was found out by negotiation between the representatives of the Sikhs and the Central Government, whereby Punjab and PEPSU were merged, and regional committees were formed in accordance with that formula. Under that arrangement, Himachal Pradesh was kept out.

Now, there are certain reasons why I plead that Himachal Pradesh should be kept out. When the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission was debated upon in the various States, so far as Himachal Pradesh was concerned, 29 members participated in the debate, and only one member spoke in favour of merging Himachal Pradesh with Punjab. 28 members opposed the merger. At the time of voting, 38 members participated, and 34 members voted against the merger, and four members voted for the merger. Now, the position has improved further. The four members who voted for the merger belong to the party of the hon. Member Shri Anandchand, who is a Member of this House.

From the minute of dissent which Shri Anandchand has given, we find that he agrees with the report of the Joint Committee, which means that he is prepared to accept the arrangement suggested, namely that Himachal Pradesh should be kept apart. So, all the representatives of the State Legislature are opposed to the merger of Himachal Pradesh with Punjab. All the political parties, including the Congress, the Praja Socialists, the Communists etc., and a great majority of the people who live there, and who appeared before the Commission, have strongly opposed the merger.

There are reasons, and very sound reasons why they want that Himachal Pradesh should be kept as a separate State. One reason is that they are backward people. They do not want to be associated with Punjab, because there is deepseated distrust in the minds of the hill people against the people of the plains. The people of

Himachal Pradesh are backward, educationally, economically and politically. If they are tagged on to Punjab, they would suffer, and their interests would suffer. We have got the glaring example before us of the Harijana people, because the people belonging to the Harijana Prant have been having genuine grievances against the rulers of Punjab, who happened to be a few persons from the Jullundur division. The Sikhs also had certain genuine grievances against those rulers. If the people of Himachal Pradesh are compelled to go to Punjab, there is the danger that those persons who have been exploiting the Harijana people may exploit also the people belonging to Himachal Pradesh. So, we should respect their sentiments. When all the people belonging to Himachal Pradesh, and all the political parties there, do not want that Himachal Pradesh should be tagged on to Punjab, it will not be wise on the part of Government to yield to the demand of those who want that it should be tagged.

The merger proposal of 'unwilling' and unequal parties will be extremely unpopular, and will not provide the mutual goodwill and co-operation, so necessary for the successful functioning of democracy. The merger proposal will place the people of Himachal Pradesh in a position of subordination, and instead of contributing to their progress, will in fact retard their progress.

Some people plead that if Himachal Pradesh is tagged to Punjab, certain administrative economies can be effected. Administrative economy is of little value, if sufficient attention is not paid to the much more important consideration of administrative convenience and efficiency.

With these words, I oppose the amendment of my hon. friend, and plead that Government should not yield to the pressure which is being put on them from Punjab by certain political parties and certain interested persons.

श्री गौतम (बालाघाट) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं मध्य प्रदेश के सम्बन्ध में बोला सा आपके सामने बोलना चाहता हूँ ।

इस नव प्रस्तावित राज्य के जो दूसरे समीपवर्ती राज्य हैं उन्होंने इस राज्य की बहुत सी भूमि की मांग की है । इस मांग के लिये जो तर्कालोकन दिये गये हैं मैं उनका विरोध करता हूँ । ६ या ७ असेम्ब्लमेंट हैं जिनके द्वारा महाराष्ट्र ने सोनर, बरहानपुर, मुलताई, भैरदेही, बस्तर और बालाघाट जिले की मांग की है, जो कि दाने बालाघाट जिला मेरी कान्स्टीट्यूएन्सी (निर्वाचन क्षेत्र) है । उन्होंने बताया है कि इन मांग किये हुए क्षेत्रों की जनसंख्या पांच लाख है परन्तु यदि सेंसस रिपोर्ट (जनगणना प्रतिवेदन) का देखा जाये तो मालूम होगा कि केवल बालाघाट जिले की जनसंख्या साढ़े ६ लाख है, बरहानपुर की डेढ़ लाख है, सोनर की डेढ़ लाख है और मुलताई की दो लाख है तथा वे कहते हैं, कि बस्तर की सात आठ लाख के लगभग है, वे केवल पांच लाख जनसंख्या मांग रहे हैं जब कि यथार्थ में वे इतना बड़ा क्षेत्र मांग रहे हैं जिसकी जनसंख्या बीस लाख है । उन्होंने अपनी मांग को बहुत कम बताया है परन्तु वास्तव में उनकी मांग बहुत ज्यादा है । अगर सन् १९५१ की सेंसस रिपोर्ट, सफा २७, पार्ट १ को देखा जाये तो मालूम पड़ेगा कि छिदवाड़ा जिला जियमें ने सोनर भाग उन्होंने मांगा है, वहां पर मराठी बोलने वाले सिर्फ १२ प्रतिशत हैं, और वह पूरी सोनर तहसील मांग रहे हैं : जिला बैतूल में स्थित मुलताई और भैरदेही के इलाकों को महाराष्ट्र में मिलाने की जो मांग पेश की गई है वह मेरी समझ में अनुचित है क्योंकि बैतूल जिले में मराठी बोलने वाले सिर्फ १९ प्रतिशत हैं । इसी तरह से मैं आपको बतलाऊं कि निमाड़ जिले में, जिस में से बुरहानपुर की मांग की है, वहाँ पर सिर्फ १५ फीसदी मराठी बोलने वाले हैं । हमारे महाराष्ट्री दोस्तों ने पूरे बालाघाट

जिले को महाराष्ट्र में मिलाये जाने की मांग पेश की है। बालाघाट जिले की जनसंख्या ७ लाख है और वहाँ पर मराठी बोलने वाले सिर्फ १४ प्रतिशत हैं। यह मांग हमारे महाराष्ट्रियन मित्रों ने अपने सात प्रमॉडमेंट्स के द्वारा हाउस के सामने रखी है जो कि बिलकुल अनुचित है और ग्राह्य नहीं हो सकती।

मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि बालाघाट जिले में महार, कोहरी और कुनबी यह तीन जातियाँ मराठी बोलती हैं जब कि पंवार जाति वाले पंवारी बोलते हैं और मरार लोग मरारी बोलते हैं और यह बहुसंख्यक जातियाँ सब हिन्दी बोलने वाली हैं। यह मरारी और पंवारी हिन्दी से बहुत मिलती जुलती हैं। बालाघाट में हिन्दी बोलने वालों की संख्या कम से कम ७० प्रतिशत है। इसके अलावा इस जिले में १ लाख से कुछ धाड़े ही कम गोंड लोग रहते हैं जो कि गोंडी बोलते हैं और जिनका कि मराठी भाषा से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। कहने का मतलब यह है कि बालाघाट जिला हिन्दी बोलने वालों का इलाका है और मराठी भाषा-भाषी क्षेत्र में इसको नहीं मिलाया जाना चाहिये और इस लिये उन्होंने जो उसको महाराष्ट्र में मिलाने की मांग की है वह अनुचित मांग है और पाने जाने योग्य नहीं है।

मेरा सुझाव यह है कि गोंडिया जो कि महाराष्ट्र में चला गया है उसको मध्यप्रदेश को दे देना चाहिये क्योंकि वहाँ पर हिन्दी बोलने वाले काफी तादाद में हैं और इस नाते उसको हिन्दी इलाके में शामिल करना उचित होगा और मध्यप्रदेश का बुरहानपुर, भैसदेही, मुलताई और सोंसर के भाग, गोंडिया की लोकसंख्या के प्रमाण से बदलबदल कर लेना चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह का एक्सचेंज का सुझाव

बहुत अच्छा सुझाव है और अगर वह मान्य है तो मैं समझना हूँ कि वह बहुत उचित होगा।

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry we have to close the discussion on this group of clauses now, as the House took a decision earlier that we will finish discussion on these clauses by 5 P.M. Therefore, this debate is closed. The Minister would reply tomorrow and then vote will be taken on these clauses.

Clauses 16 to 49 and Schedules I to III

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up clauses 16 to 49 and Schedules I, II and III of the Bill for which 6 hours have been allotted. Hon. Members who wish to move their amendments to these clauses and Schedules will kindly hand over the numbers of their amendments specifying the clauses to which they relate, to the Secretary at the Table within 15 minutes, which will be treated as having been moved, subject to their being otherwise admissible.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore): Before we go to the next group of clauses, I have got a suggestion to make for your consideration. After nearly a week's discussion, there seems to be a possibility of a compromise in regard to Bombay State, and if the matter is pursued still further, there might be further reapproach-ment possible. If the hon. Home Minister brings together the leaders of several parties and the protagonists of various views in respect of Bombay, there might be a possibility of a compromise which was ardently wished for by the Home Minister and also the Prime Minister. In that view, I would suggest that the hon. Home Minister may not speak tomorrow morning, but postpone it until tomorrow evening so that any possibility of a compromise

[Shri Ramachandra Reddi]

might be explored. When the hon. Speaker said this morning that he would request the Home Minister to reply tomorrow morning, evidently this position had not been very clear to him. Today a different mood and spirit have developed. I would only wish that proper opportunity is given for a compromise to be effected. I am sure that the Maharashtrians will use not only their valour but also their discretion, in order to come to an agreeable settlement.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not think the Chair has to do anything in this matter just at this moment. Perhaps the Home Minister would consider the suggestion that has been made and give his reaction. Meanwhile, we will proceed according to the programme that we have got before us.

Shri Thanu Pillai (Tirunelveli): In regard to certain matters, we from Madras have moved some important amendments in clause 2. But none of us has been given a chance to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does the hon. Member refer to the group of clauses on which we have finished discussion?

Shri Thanu Pillai: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not as a matter of right that every hon. Member who has moved an amendment is allowed to speak.

Shri Thanu Pillai: None from our State has been given an opportunity.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That may be very unfortunate, but I cannot help it.

Shri Thanu Pillai: At least we can be given an opportunity to submit written representations. We will be prepared to submit written representations.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Still there is need for written representation? Every point of view has been exhaustively represented by this time. I do not think we need do anything further about it. We will proceed with the next group of clauses.

Shri N. R. Muniswamy (Wandiwash): Can we not give amendments tomorrow morning?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendments are to be given within 15 minutes. Those that are left might be given tomorrow also.

श्री ए० इ० विषय (बिला बुलन्दशहर) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं मसूरा हूँ कि आप ने मुझे थोड़ा सा समय इस बिल के ऊपर और अपने अमेंडमेंट्स (संशोधन) के ऊपर बोलने का दिया। मैंने १६ क्लॉज (सं०) से लेकर ४९ क्लॉज तक अपने अमेंडमेंट्स मूव किये हैं जो कि हाउस के सामने पेश हैं। इस के पहले मैंने क्लॉज २ से लेकर १४ क्लॉज तक भी अपने अमेंडमेंट्स दिये हैं और वे भी हाउस के सामने पेश हैं। मेरे तमाम अमेंडमेंट्स को मंजूर शुरू से लेकर स्याखिर तक एक ही है। मैंने इन में कोई भी अमेंडमेंट इस किस्म का नहीं पेश किया है कि कोई एक इलाका निकाल कर दूसरे प्रान्त में दे दिया जाय या जो गवर्नमेंट की स्कीम मौजूदा बिल में है, उस बिल में मैंने कोई खास तरकीब की है, मेरे सामने एक कानूनी दिक्कत थी और उस कानूनी दिक्कत को दूर करने के लिये मैंने यह कोसिश की है कि यह एस० आर० सी० बिल (राज्य पुनर्गठन विधेयक) कांस्टीट्यूशन (संविधान) के मुताबिक इस हाउस में पास हो। मैं देखता हूँ कि यह जो हमारी स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन (राज्य पुनर्गठन) की स्कीम है वह दो बिलों में बांट दी गई है और उस के दो बिलों में बांट जाने की वजह से कुछ दिक्कत पैदा हो गई है। मैं यह नहीं समझ पा रहा हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया (भारत सरकार) के लीगल एक्सपर्ट्स (विधि विशेषज्ञ) ने यह राय किस तरह दे दी कि इस बिल को कांस्टीट्यूशन के खिलाफ पहले पास किया जाय और उस के बाद कांस्टीट्यूशनल अमेंडमेंट (संविधान संशोधन विधेयक) बिल को पास किया जायगा।

हम ने देखा कि सेलेक्ट कमेटी से जब यह एस० आर० सी० बिल हमारे सामने आया तो उस एस० आर० सी० बिल के प्रिंसिपल्स (सिद्धान्त) को बदल कर उस की शक्ति को बदल दिया, चाहते वही चीज है जो एस० आर० सी०

स्कीम में धीरे-धीरे एम० आर० सी० बिल में है लेकिन उस की शकल यहां पर बदल दी धीरे-धीरे कांस्टीट्यूशनल अमेंडमेंट (संवैधानिक संशोधन) बिल में उन को शामिल कर के पेश किया है। एम० आर० सी० स्कीम तो नहीं बदली है क्योंकि दोनों बिल मिला कर के उस स्कीम को लेते हैं। इन्होंने कुछ ऐसा कर दिया है कि इस एम० आर० सी० बिल में से कुछ एक बातों को निकाल दिया है और उन को कांस्टीट्यूशनल अमेंडमेंट बिल में रख दिया है। एक तरफ हम इस एम० आर० सी० बिल को पास करें और उसके बाद कांस्टीट्यूशन अमेंडमेंट बिल को पास करें तो दिक्कत यहां पर यह आ कर पड़ गई कि जिस वजह हम इस बिल की बात सोचने हैं तो देखते हैं कि यह बिल मौजूदा कांस्टीट्यूशन से टक्कर खाता है, और कांस्टीट्यूशन अमेंडमेंट बिल बाद में आयेगा। जरूरत यह थी कि कानून के मूलाधिक हमारे कांस्टीट्यूशन ने पार्लियामेंट को जो अधिकार दिया गया है उस के मूलाधिक हम पहले इस कानूनी भूल को दूर कर लेते, उस के बाद यह बिल लिया जाता। जैसा मैं समझता हूँ उस के मूलाधिक अगर इस एम० आर० सी० बिल को बनाया जाय तो कानूनी दिक्कत दूर हो जायेगी और स्टेट रिआर्गनाइजेशन भी समाप्त हो जायेगा। पर मैं इस की तरफ पार्लियामेंट की तवज्जह दिलाना चाहता हूँ और मेरे जो अमेंडमेंट हैं १६ से लेकर ४६ तक वह भी उसी कानूनी बात के ऊपर मबनी हैं। यह बात नहीं कि जिन्होंने यह कांस्टीट्यूशन बनाया उन को यह बात मालूम नहीं थी कि पार्लियामेंट के सामने कभी यह दिक्कत आयेगी। यह बात वह जानने थे कि जब कभी स्टेट्स का रिआर्गनाइजेशन होगा, एक स्टेट तोड़ी जायेगी और दूसरे हिस्से में उस का भाग मिलाया जायेगा तो ऐसी अनफोरमीन (अनदेखी) बातें आ जायेगी जो कि कांस्टीट्यूशन से टक्कर खायेगी। इस बात को सोच समझ कर ही उन्होंने आर्टिकल ४ बनाया। मैं आर्टिकल ४ की तरफ गवर्नमेंट की, आप की

धीरे इस हाउस की तवज्जह दिलाना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने इस आर्टिकल में लिखा है :

"Any law referred to in article 2 or article 3 shall contain such provisions for the amendment of the First Schedule and the Fourth Schedule as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions of the law...."

यह दो चीजें तो साजिमी हैं।

"and may also contain such supplemental, incidental and consequential provisions (including provisions as to representation in Parliament and in the Legislature or Legislatures of the State or States affected by such law) as Parliament may deem necessary."

जब आप नई स्टेट्स बनायें तो उन नई स्टेट्स के बनाते समय आप को फर्स्ट शेड्यूल (प्रथम अनुसूची) को बदलना ही पड़ेगा क्योंकि उस में जो स्टेट्स हैं वह दूसरी तरह की बन जायेगी और चौथे शेड्यूल में जिन का राज्य सभा में जितना रिप्रेजेंटेशन (प्रतिनिधित्व) है वह भी बदल जायेगा क्योंकि स्टेट्स की आवादी बदल जायेगी। इस तरह से शेड्यूल को बदलना ही होगा। उन के लिये नाजिमी तौर पर लिख दिया गया :

"This law shall contain".

मतलब यह है कि आप ने इतने अमेंडमेंट शेड्यूल में करने के लिये रख दिये। कोई ऐसी बात नहीं कि हर समय कांस्टीट्यूशन बदलना ही पड़े, लेकिन कभी यह भी हो सकता है कि वह कानून कांस्टीट्यूशन की टक्कर खाने लगे। तो यह एक ऐसी बात थी जिस के लिये उन्होंने भाग बल कर रक्खा है :

"Any may contain".

अगर जरूरत पड़े तो ऐसी बात रक्की जाय कि जिस से कांस्टीट्यूशन बदल दिया जाय और जरूरत न हो तो कोई जरूरत नहीं

## [श्री २० द० मिश्र]

उस को बदलने की। इस लिये भाग लिखा गया है :

“And may contain such other provisions”.

ऐसी और दफात इस कानून में लगा दी जायें जो सप्लीमेंटल (अनुपूरक) हों, इंस्टिट्यूटल (अनुपूरणिक) हों या कांसिक्वेशल (फलस्वरूप) हों, जैसा कि इस समय स्टेट रिआर्गनाइजेशन में ऐसा करना एक जरूरी और लाजिमी चीज हो जाती है। मिसाल के तौर पर मैं बताऊं। आप ने जो स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन किया है उस में हम ने बी क्लास स्टेट्स तोड़ दी हैं। ऐसी हालत में राजप्रमुख और उप राजप्रमुख के चैंप्टर की जरूरत नहीं है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : कश्मीर रह गया है।

श्री २० द० मिश्र : Kashmir is not a B Class State. वह पार्ट ७ से गवर्न नहीं होता है। फिर आर्टिकल ३ के जो ए० या बी० पार्ट हैं उन का भी असर उस पर नहीं पड़ रहा है। इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि जितनी जगह यह कांसिक्वेशल चीज आती है, कांस्टीट्यूशन के अन्दर जहाँ कहीं भी राज प्रमुख और उप राजप्रमुख लिखा हुआ है, उन को हटा दिया जाय क्योंकि वह कांसिक्वेशल हैं और उन के रखने से झगड़ा बढ़ता है। चाहे वह इंस्टिट्यूटल हों या कांसिक्वेशल, वह सब जाना चाहिये। इस पर सब एग्री करते हैं, कोई पार्टी इस से डिफर नहीं करती है कि जो स्टेट्स की कैटेगरीज आज हैं उन को मिटा देना चाहिये और यह सब अमेंडमेंट्स उस में आने चाहियें।

इस स्कीम के अन्दर यह बात भी कर दी गई कि हम ने दो तीन स्टेटों को मर्ज (संविलय) किया, लेकिन इस कांस्टीट्यूशन (संविधान) के अन्दर कोई चीज साफ नहीं है कि हम इस स्टेट को तोड़ दें, उस को ऐसेम्बली को तोड़ दें, और दूसरी चीजें कर दें। जब ऐसी चीज

हो जाती है और कोई ऐमा करने में कोई झगड़े की बात आती है तो आर्टिकल में लिख देना चाहिये कि हम ने जो मध्य प्रदेश में तीन स्टेट मिला दी हैं उन की असेम्बली की मियाद खत्म न होगी, वह मेम्बर रहेंगे, पांच वर्ष की मियाद है, हम किसी को निकाल नहीं रहे हैं, तीनों असेम्बलियों के मेम्बर साथ बैठेंगे, मियाद के बाद फिर से असेम्बली बनेगी। यह एक कांसिक्वेशल अमेंडमेंट हो जाता है। परन्तु इस बात को कांस्टीट्यूशन में कांसिक्वेशल अमेंडमेंट के रूप में रख देना चाहिये। इसी प्रकार जो और बातें हों उन को इस बिल में रख देना चाहिये।

ऐसे छोटे छोटे अमेंडमेंट हैं जो मैं ने दिये हैं। मिसाल के तौर पर मेरा अमेंडमेंट ३८१ है जो कि मैं ने बिल की दफा ३० के ऊपर दिया है। वह एक बहुत मामूली सी बात है। कांस्टीट्यूशन की जो दफा १७० है, जिस के मुताबिक स्टेट असेम्बलियां बनती हैं उस में मैं ने कहा है कि चूंकि स्टेट्स का रिआर्गनाइजेशन हो रहा है लिहाजा उस में क सबक्लाज ६ और जोड़ दिया जाय।

Page 17—

after line 10, add:

(6) In article 170 of the Constitution the following clause (5) shall be added:

“(5) Notwithstanding anything contained in the preceding clauses of this article the Legislative Assemblies of the States specified in the First Schedule to the Constitution as amended by the States Reorganisation Act, 1956 shall, as from the day the States Reorganisation Act, 1956, comes into force, be constituted in accordance with the provisions of section 30 of the aforesaid Act.”

जो आप ने क्लाज ३० में लिखा है उसी के अनुसार आप की असेम्बलियां बनाई जायें, यह बात कांस्टीट्यूशन में आ जाय। यह एक इंस्टिट्यूटल चीज है।



इसी तरीके से और भी अमेंडमेंट्स हैं जो कि मैं ने इस बिल के सम्बन्ध में पेश किये हैं कि यह कानूनी चीजें बिल में आ जानी चाहियें। इस में एक मामूली सा अमेंडमेंट है कि जहां पर कौंसिल आफ स्टेट (राज्य परिषद्) के रिप्रेजेंटेशन (प्रतिनिधित्व) की बात लिखी गई है वहां पर क्लोजेज के अन्दर कौंसिल आफ स्टेट (राज्य परिषद्) के शब्द नहीं हैं। अगर उस क्लोजेज को उठा कर पढ़ा जाय तो यह पता नहीं लगता कि यह चीज किस के लिये है जब तक कोई व्यक्ति हीडिंग (शीर्षक) और मार्जिन (हाशिये) को न देखे। कानून के संवन्ध (धारा) जो होते हैं उन को अपने आप बताना चाहिये कि वह किस चीज के लिये क्या कह रहे हैं और उस में वह शब्द आने चाहियें। बिल के सेक्शन २६ में जो अमेंडमेंट्स मैं ने नं० १६५ से लेकर २०६ तक दिये हैं वह इसी लिये दिये हैं कि उस के सबक्लोजेज में कौंसिल आफ स्टेट्स शब्द जोड़ दिये जायें। आप देखेंगे कि दफा २६ के पहले सबक्लोजेज में लिखा हुआ है :

"26 (1) *The twelve sitting members representing the State of Andhra Pradesh and such six of the eleven sitting members representing the State of Hyderabad as the Chairman shall by order specify shall, as from the appointed day, be deemed to have been duly elected to fill the eighteen seats allotted to the State of Andhra Pradesh.*"

कहीं आप को पता लगा कि किस के लिये वह है? न तो वह प्रान्त की असेम्बली के लिये है, न कौंसिल के लिये और न कौंसिल आफ स्टेट के लिये। अगर उस में कौंसिल आफ स्टेट के शब्द जोड़ दिये जायें तो सारी चीज साफ हो जाती है। इसलिये मेरे यह अमेंडमेंट कानूनी हैं। चूंकि अभी कानून से साफ तौर पर नहीं मालूम होता कि वह किस के लिये है ऐसी बातें वह बाद में हाई कोर्ट (उच्च न्यायालय) और सुप्रीम कोर्ट (उच्चतम न्यायालय) में जायेंगी।

नवर्नमेंट को चाहिये कि वह हमारी दिक्कतों को दूर करें। इस लिये गवर्नमेंट को चाहिये कि जितने अमेंडमेंट मैं ने दिये हैं वह उन पर और करे और सोचे कि वह कानून के मूलाधिक ठीक हैं या नहीं। अगर वह ठीक हैं तो उन के लिये जरूरत इस बात की हो जाती है कि वह उन को माने, यह सोच कर कि दूसरे लोग जो उस को मरबिरा देते हैं वह भी कुछ मेहनत करते हैं ताकि कानूनी दिक्कतें दूर हों। इसी चीज को देखते हुए मैं ने यह अमेंडमेंट दिये हैं।

मैं सबसे पहले बता दूँ कि बिल के क्लोज २ में जो डेफिनीशन्स (परिभाषायें) दिये हुए हैं उस में स्कीम को 'ला' की डेफिनीशन में रख दिया है। नोटिफिकेशन (अधिसूचना) को भी कानून मान लिया है। स्कीम कभी कोई ला (विधि) होती है याप ला की डेफिनीशन (विधि की परिभाषा) न मालूम कहां से उठा लाये हैं। आप देखेंगे कि जो कांस्टीट्यूशन है उस में भी एग्जिस्टिंग ला की डेफिनीशन दी हुई है। उन्होंने जो वर्ड्स (शब्द) इस्तेमाल किये हैं उन में दिया हुआ है कि एग्जिस्टिंग ला क्या होता है। मैं कहता हूँ वह ला (विधि), प्रोविन्स (अध्यादेश), आर्डर (आदेश), वाइला (उपविधि), रूल (नियम), रेगुलेशन (विनियम) या कोई ऐसी चीज जो कि कानून की तरह इस्तेमाल होता हो, जिस को किसी लेजिस्लेचर (विधि मंडल) ने या किसी ऐसी अथॉरिटी (अधिकार) ने बताया हो जिस को कानून बनाने का एक हक हो, वही ला की डेफिनीशन में आ सकता है। इसलिये मैं ने उस के लिये भी एक अमेंडमेंट दिया है।

उसी तरीके से मैं ने क्लोज १४ में अमेंडमेंट दिये हैं। वहां आप ने इस बिल में लिख दिया ऐज स्पेसिफाइड इन एक्ट क्लॉस, ऐज स्पेसिफाइड इन एक्ट क्लॉस। इस में कोई चीज साफ साफ नहीं दी हुई है कि आप की मंशा क्या है। आप फर्स्ट शेड्यूल को पढ़ें,

[श्री २० द० मिश्र]

कांस्टीट्यूशन में इस श्रेड्यूल के लगने पर कांस्टीट्यूशन स्वयं कुछ नहीं बताता। आप ने तो रख दिया कि ऐज स्पेसिफाइड इन एक्ट फलां। अब आप इंडिये कि फलां एक्ट कौन सा है। कांस्टीट्यूशन जो है वह एक सेक्शेड डाकुमेंट है, मैं इस को मानता हूँ लेकिन वह इतना मुकम्मल होना चाहिये कि वह स्वयं बताये, उस को दूसरे बिल या कानून पर आधारित न रहना पड़े, एम० प्रार० सी० बिल के अन्दर जो तारीफ दी हुई है, उस के अन्दर तो आप को सारी चीजें लिख ही देनी चाहियें। कम से कम कानून तो हमारा साफ हो जायेगा। लिहाजा मैं ने श्रेड्यूल (अनुसूची) के लिये अमेंडमेंट दी है। इस मिलसिले में आप जो प्रापटी बगैरह ट्रांसफर कर रहे हैं, उस पर इस का कोई असर नहीं होगा। मैं तो सिर्फ यह चाहता हूँ कि कांस्टीट्यूशन अपनी जगह एक काम्प्रहेंसिव (व्यापक) और मुकम्मल डाकुमेंट हो, ताकि वह गवर्नमेंट, जनता, अदालतों और वकीलों के लिये सहूलियत का बायस हो।

मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट और उस के लीगल एक्सपर्ट्स (विधि विशेषज्ञ) मेरी लीगल अमेंडमेंट्स पर अच्छी तरह गौर करें। वे सब विल्कुल माइनर (साधारण) अमेंडमेंट्स हैं, जो कि इसी एक्ट में इनकारपोरेट (मिलाना) की जा सकती हैं। आर्टिकल ४ में लिखा हुआ है :

"No such law as aforesaid shall be deemed to be an amendment of this Constitution for the purpose of article 368."

आर्टिकल ३६८ के मुताबिक साधारणतया कांस्टीट्यूशन में अमेंडमेंट करने के लिये एक तो उस हाउस की दो तिहाई मँजारिटी (बहुमत) चाहिये और साथ ही मँजारिटी आफ टोटल मेम्बरशिप (कुल सदस्य) चाहिये लेकिन कुछ हालतों में स्टेट्स की रेटिफिकेशन (अनुसमर्थन) की भी जरूरत

होगी। आर्टिकल (अनुच्छेद) ४ पर आर्टिकल ३६८ की प्राविजन लागू न होगी। न किन्ही स्पेशल मँजारिटी (विशेष बहुमत) की जरूरत है और न स्टेट्स की रेटिफिकेशन की जरूरत है। इसलिये कांस्टीट्यूशन बनाने वालों ने लिखा कि जब स्टेट्स री-आर्गेनाइज करें नई स्टेट्स एस्टाबलिश (स्थापित) करें, एक का एरिया दूसरी को दें, नाम में तबदीली करें तो उसके मुताबिक सप्लीमेंट, इंसीडेंटल और कान्सीक्वेन्शियल प्रावीजन भी उसी ला में रखनी चाहियें। आर्टिकल ४ में जो अस्तित्व आप को दिया गया है, उस के मुताबिक ये सब बातें—सब कान्सीक्वेन्शियल और इंसीडेंटल प्राविजन—आप को इस बिल में ही रख देनी चाहिये। मेरा ब्याल है कि या तो इस सवाल पर गौर ही नहीं किया गया या यह बात समझ में ही नहीं आई। अब भी योका है कि गवर्नमेंट इन लीगल अमेंडमेंट्स (विधि सम्बंधी संशोधन) को एक्सेप्ट कर लें। अगर वह उन को एक्सेप्ट (स्वीकार) कर लेगी, तो हमारा यह बिल कांस्टीट्यूशन के मुताबिक हो जायेगा, सही हो जायेगा और मुकम्मल हो जायेगा। इस का फायदा यह होगा कि कांस्टीट्यूशन अमेंडमेंट बिल में से बे फालतू बातें निकल जायेंगी, जो कि हमारे लीगल एक्सपर्ट्स ने उस बिल में शामिल कर दी हैं, जिन का उस से सम्बन्ध नहीं है। कांस्टीट्यूशन अमेंडमेंट बिल में बहुत सी बातें रख दी गई हैं। कुछ बातों के लिये दो तिहाई मँजारिटी चाहिये और कुछ के लिये स्टेट्स की रेटिफिकेशन चाहिये। मेरे ब्याल में उन सब को अलग अलग कर देना चाहिये।

इस के बाद मैं ने जोनल कौंसिल (प्रादेशिक परिषद्) के बारे में भी कुछ अमेंडमेंट्स रखी हैं। आप ने यह तय किया है कि बे कौंसिलज (परिषद्) बौडरी डिस्प्यूट्स (सीमा विवाद) बगैरह के बहुत जरूरी मामलात को तय करेंगी। मेरे ब्याल में बे कौंसिलज बौडरी डिस्प्यूट्स को किसी भी बौडरी कमिशन (सीमा आयोग) से ज्यादा बेहतर

तरीके से हल कर सकेंगे, क्योंकि उस में इलाका सेने धीर देने वाली स्टेट्स धीर उस फंसले को मन्जूर करने वाली सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट (केन्द्रीय सरकार) के नुमायन्दे होंगे। उन में स्टेटों के चीफ मिनिस्टर होंगे इसलिये मेरा कहना यह है कि उन में सेन्ट्रल कैबिनेट मिनिस्टर रहना चाहिये।

दफा २४ में मैं ने यह अमेंडमेंट रखी है कि जोनल कौंसिल में जो भी फंसले हों, जो भी बातें तय हों, जो भी कार्यवाही हो उसकी रिपोर्ट बाकायदा पार्लियामेंट (संसद्) के सामने रखी जानी चाहिये ताकि हम लोगों को मालूम होता रहे कि जोनल कौंसिल कैसा काम कर रही है और इस बारे में हम कितना आगे बढ़े हैं। यह पार्लियामेंट इस मुल्क की सावीरेन बाडी (प्रमुख सम्पन्न निकाय) है और यह जरूरी है कि उस को जोनल कौंसिल के काम के मुतालिक बाकायदा इत्तिला मिलती रहे।

इसी तरह से मैं ने राज्य सभा के रिप्रेजेंटेशन के बारे में अमेंडमेंट्स पेश की हैं। इस सिलसिले में पहले एस० आर० बिल में जो रखा बाद में उस को बदल दिया और फिर कांस्टीट्यूशन अमेंडमेंट बिल में वही रख दिया। इस से गलतफहमी होने का इमकान है। मेरे स्थाल में उस कम्प्लोट लिस्ट (पूर्ण सूची) को, जो कि पहले एस० आर० बिल में है, एडाप्ट (स्वीकार) कर लेना चाहिये। इस सिलसिले में मैं ने अमेंडमेंट्स नं० २३५, २३६, २३६, २४०, २४१, २४२, २४३, २४४ और २४५ रखी हैं।

स्पीकर के चुनाव के बारे में मैं ने जो अमेंडमेंट रखी है, वह कौंसोक्वेशियल है, इसलिये उस को स्पीकर के क्लाइम में शामिल कर लिया जाय। जहां तक लेजिस्लेटिव कौंसिल (विधान परिषद्) का सवाल है, उस के मुतालिक आप को कांस्टीट्यूशन में अब भी अन्विकार है, इसलिये इस बारे में आप को ज्यादा परेशानी नहीं होगी।

डीलिमिटेशन आफ कांस्टीट्यून्सीज के मुतालिक भी मैं ने अमेंडमेंट रखी है। इस वकत यह प्रावीजन है कि जिस समय कमीशन अपना आर्डर (आदेश) पास कर के गवर्नमेंट के पास भेज दे, तो वह आर्डर निकाब में आ जाये। मेरा कहना यह है कि जब कमीशन आर्डर पास करे, तो वह गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया के गजट में छपना चाहिये, तब उसे ला माना जाना चाहिये। फर्ज कीजिये कि कमीशन अपना आर्डर किसी मिनिस्टर के पास भेज दे और जनता को मालूम भी न हो, तो यह मुनासिब न होगा। मेरा अमेंडमेंट यह है कि वह गजट में छपने के बाद ही आर्डर समझा जाय, पहले नहीं।

फर्ज कीजिये कि आप यहां पर बम्बई के मामले को हल कर लेते हैं—कम्प्रोमाइज (समझौता) करते हैं, वोट से तय करते हैं या किस तरह भी हल कर लेते हैं। लेकिन जब कांस्टीट्यूशन अमेंडमेंट बिल धायगा, तो फिर वोटिंग (मतदान) होगा, फिर जोर-आजमाई होगा। अगर आप मेरी अमेंडमेंट को मान जायें, तो आप का बिल सिम्पल मैजोरिटी (साधारण बहुमत) से यहीं पास हो जायगा। अगर आप मेरी बात को मान जायेंगे, तो इस बिल को कम्प्लोट करने के बाद स्टेट्स री-आर्गनाइजेशन की प्रावीजन्स को कांस्टीट्यूशन अमेंडमेंट बिल में लाने की जरूरत नहीं रहेगी।

और अगर किसी वजह से आप मेरी बात नहीं मानते हैं और समझते हैं कि इस कानून के खिलाफ है तो मैं उस के सपोर्ट में सुप्रीम कोर्ट का एक रुलिंग पेश करता हूँ क्योंकि बड़े बड़े वकील जब तक रुलिंग उन के सामने न रखी जाये किसी बात को नहीं मानते। इसलिये मैं सुप्रीम कोर्ट की रुलिंग दे रहा हूँ। यह केस है शंकर प्रसाद देव बनाम यूनियन आफ इंडिया एंड स्टेट आफ बिहार, जो कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट की सन् १९५१ की रिपोर्ट में पेज (पृष्ठ) ६६ पर दिया गया है। उस में बतलाया गया है कि कांस्टीट्यूशन बनाने के सम्बन्ध में

[श्री र० द० मिश्र]

किस को क्या प्रतिस्तिार है। यह अजमेंट (निर्णय) अस्टिस पातंजलि शास्त्री का है। वह इस प्रकार है :

"Various methods of constitutional amendment have been adopted in written constitutions, such as by referendum, by a special convention, by legislation under a special procedure, and so on. But, which of these methods the framers of the Indian Constitution have adopted must be ascertained from the relevant provisions of the Constitution itself without any leaning based on a priori grounds or the analogy of other constitutions in favour of one method in preference to another. We accordingly turn to the provisions dealing with constitutional amendments.

Now, the Constitution provides for three classes of amendments of its provisions. First, those that can be effected by a bare majority such as that required for the passing of any ordinary law. The amendments contemplated in articles 4, 169 and 240 fall within this class and they are specifically excluded from the purview of article 368. Secondly, those that can be effected by a special majority as laid down in article 368. All constitutional amendments other than those referred to above come within this category and must be effected by a majority of the total membership of each House as well as by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the members of that House present and voting; and thirdly, those that require, in addition to the special majority above-mentioned, ratification by resolutions passed by not less than one-half of the States specified in Parts A and B of the First Schedule. This class comprises amendments which seek to make any change in the provisions referred to in

the proviso to article 368. It will be seen that the power of effecting the first class amendments is explicitly conferred on 'Parliament', that is to say, the two Houses of Parliament and the President (article 79)."

5-33 P.M.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

तो मेरा कहना है कि पालियामेंट को यह अस्तित्वाग्न आर्टिकल ४ में दिया गया है। सुप्रीम कोर्ट की इल्लिग भां यही कहती है। अगर आप मेरे अमेंडमेंट को मंजूर कर लें तो आप को सहूलियत होगी और इस में आपने दिक्कत नहीं होगी। मेरा नम्र निवेदन है कि आप मेरे अमेंडमेंट को अपने लीगल एक्सपर्ट्स के सामने रखें और उन से दरियापत्त करें कि ऐसा करने से एस० आर० बिल कानूनी तौर पर और कांस्टीट्यूशन के मुताबिक पास हो जाता है। मेरा निवेदन यही है कि अगर आप मेरा अमेंडमेंट स्वीकार कर लेंगे तो सारी दिक्कतें दूर हो जाएंगी। अगर ऐसा नहीं करेंगे तो जो दिक्कतें मैं ने बतलाई हैं वे आवेंगी। कल भी मैं ने यह प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर रखा था पर इस का जवाब नहीं मिला। ज्वाइंट कमेटी प्रिंसिपल के बाहर चली गई थी तो इस वजह से नया बिल बन जाता है। अगर हम अपने पुराने बिल को ले आवें और उस में जो कानूनी दिक्कत है उस के लिये प्राविजन कर दें तो हमारी दिक्कत दूर हो सकती है। ऐसा करने से हमारा बिल सही बन जाता है।

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member said that a point of order was raised yesterday and that was meant for discussion in this House. So that was deferred and it would be discussed later on.

Shri R. D. Misra: That discrepancy will be removed without giving any decision. That is my point of view. I say this....

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala—Bhatinda): A point of order was raised by the hon. Member yesterday.

There was a suggestion by Shri More that there were certain other legal objections also and that the point of order might be deferred for some time so that it could be discussed subsequently at a suitable time. Therefore, that was deferred at the suggestion of Shri More and the House agreed to that. So, that is not before the House just at present. There are the amendments to clauses 16 to 49 and the Schedules.

Mr. Speaker: I thought the hon. Member was referring to this point of order raised yesterday and saying that no ruling was given so far.

Shri R. D. Misra: I was referring to this point. I had to raise a point of order because I found one difficulty. The Joint Committee had gone beyond the scope of the Bill and had brought a new Bill in this House which could not be thought to be the same and hence it could not be considered by this House. That point has been deferred. That difficulty will be removed if all these amendments which I have tabled for clauses 2 to 49 are considered by the Government and accepted.

Mr. Speaker: I looked into all the three points of order that were raised yesterday. One of them was disposed of by the Deputy-Speaker. There was another point regarding the insertion of certain provisions by the Joint Committee about the abolition of the offices of the Rajpramukh and so on. That is another point. The third point was that the States Reorganisation Bill was dependent upon the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill.

Shri R. D. Misra: The point of order under rule 85 has been deferred.

Mr. Speaker: I looked into all these matters. But, if it is the desire of the House, it can do so. It has been stated that for further elucidation of this matter, it may be discussed in the House. I have no objection to defer it.

Sardar Mukam Singh: That was the decision because other hon. Members wanted to raise some other point.

Mr. Speaker: I have no objection. But let not the hon. Member say that a point of order has been raised but no ruling has been given. I am willing to give the ruling.

Shri Thang Pillai: On clauses 2 to 16 I had no opportunity to speak on the amendments. I suggest that we may be allowed to make a report and submit written statements or something like that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Members, who could not, for want of time, speak in favour of the amendments that they had tabled may pass on to the notice office or at the Table, written memorandum, not exceeding two pages containing the arguments in support of their amendments. I shall pass them on to the hon. Minister so that he may reply to them or he may take them into consideration.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): I wanted to ask at what time the voting would take place on the clauses which had already been debated. You can fix some time tomorrow. Some of us want to leave tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately, the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is not here at the moment and so I am not able to take any decision. There was a request from Shri Gopalan, Shri Chatterjee and others that, inasmuch as they were in Poona, they were not able to come here today or tomorrow to vote on clauses 5, 8, etc. so far as they related to Maharashtra and Bombay and so, it might be put off till Monday. Dr. Suresh Chandra informs me that some of them have arranged to be here only today and tomorrow and for the week-end they would like to go away and not stay here. We have to wait for some people who have gone away already and we will have to lose some people who are here today.

**Dr. Suresh Chandra:** The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs said that he would be agreeable if the voting took place at 3 P.M. tomorrow.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not able to say. It is for the various parties to come together and arrange as to what ought to be done.

**Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda):** There may be an announcement tomorrow.

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not want to take the responsibility. I have received some telegrams....

**Shri Gidwani:** Sir, I want to point out one more thing. Shri Ramachandra Reddi has pointed out that the clauses relating to Bombay may not be put to the vote of the House now for other reasons. He said some talks are going on for some kind of reapproachment. Therefore, apart from other things, in the larger interest it is desirable that the matter should be postponed.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am sure the hon. Members will also have a talk with the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs who represents the Congress group. The leaders of other groups may also join together and come to an agreed solution.

**Shri Ramachandra Reddi:** I said that the hon. Home Minister may speak tomorrow evening, so that by that time....

**Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam):** Tomorrow is Friday.

**Shri Ramachandra Reddi:** ..... there may be some possibility of negotiation with the several group leaders.

**Dr. Rama Rao:** Voting may be done on Monday.

**Mr. Speaker:** Personally I am in favour of any course which will be convenient to the whole House and by which there will be the largest number of Members here. But Dr. Suresh Chandra pointed out to me that some Members have come here only for this, they have got some other engagements elsewhere and they are likely to go

away. So there seems to be equal weight on both sides.

**Dr. Suresh Chandra:** Bombay was fixed for today.

**Mr. Speaker:** That is all right. But I am not able to decide without any assistance.

**Shri R. S. Diwan:** Here. So I suggest question of Hyderabad it was advised by our leaders and other people that the boundary problem should be settled between the Members themselves. So we are due to convene a meeting of the Members of Parliament from Andhra, Karnataka and Mysore on Saturday.

**Mr. Speaker:** Where?

**Shri R. S. Diwan:** Here. So I suggest that voting may be done on Monday.

**Mr. Speaker:** Very good. All hon. Members on this side will talk to the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs. The leaders of the other groups will also try to meet one another and then have an agreed solution. I am willing to have it put off as long as is necessary.

**Shri R. D. Misra:** So, has it been decided that voting will be done on Monday?

**Mr. Speaker:** That is exactly what I have been saying all this time.

**An Hon. Member:** How are we to know whether it is today or tomorrow?

**Mr. Speaker:** It will be decided tomorrow. I do not want to spend any more time on this. Hon. Members may carry this information to the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs and he will certainly move in the matter, and whatever the House suggests to me tomorrow, as far as possible to have an agreed solution, I am prepared to abide by it.

**Shri R. N. S. Deo (Kalahandi—Bolangir):** Mr. Speaker, I have given an amendment, No. 145, seeking to

introduce a new clause No. 24A. It reads as follows:

"Page 13—

after line 24, insert:

"24A. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, if any State is dissatisfied with the recommendations of the Zonal Council in regard to border disputes or linguistic minorities, and represents to the Government of India for the appointment of Boundary Commission or for arbitration, the Government of India shall appoint a Boundary Commission or Tribunal consisting of Judges of the Supreme Court or High Courts for investigating into and adjudicating upon such representation, and the Government of India shall take necessary steps to implement the award of such Commission or Tribunal as the case may be."

Sir, this is an alternative proposal to the amendments that we have moved regarding the appointment of Boundary Commissions. As the hon. Home Minister has given an indication that he is not enamoured of this idea of constituting Boundary Commission, and it is not yet clear what the attitude of the Government on this suggestion would ultimately be, I am giving my reasons for this amendment at this stage.

It is quite clear from the large number of speeches in this House that the majority of Members who have spoken, as well as majority of the States, are interested in the settlement of these border disputes and most of the Members realise the necessity of the appointment of Boundary Commissions. It is also not very clear why the Government is hesitant to accept this suggestion. If we analyse the reasons for the hesitancy, we will find that, barring probably one State, most of the States are interested and want the appointment of a Boundary Commission. But the Home Minister has given the reasons that there should be some respite or some period of rest to the country and therefore he does not

like the idea of appointing Boundary Commissions at present. Secondly, he has said that the present wrangling is not in the interest of tranquillity or emotional integrity of the country. Thirdly, he says that the Zonal Councils can discuss such problems. Lastly, he has expressed the hope that the new States will settle such disputes.

Sir, the difficulty is about the disputes of the old States. What happens, for example, regarding the border disputes of Orissa, which has been completely ignored and, I am sorry to say, has been treated with contempt even in the reply of the hon. Home Minister? Though three Members from Orissa spoke on this Bill and brought to the notice of this House the grave injustice done to Orissa, the intense feelings of the people of Orissa, and though we prayed fervently for even partial justice, at this late stage, not a word was said in the reply of the Home Minister; not even mention was made of the name of Orissa. When a great democrat like our Prime Minister, who is a great democrat by tradition and training, refuses to see a delegation from the people of Orissa and takes the plea that in view of the violence there Orissa's case cannot be reopened, is it not natural that the people of Orissa would think that the powers that be at Delhi have got apathy or rather antipathy towards the people of Orissa?

I am glad that, when our leaders realised the feelings of the Maharashtrians, the feelings of Bombay and Gujerat, they have now taken a conciliatory attitude. They have not closed the door; they have kept the door open. That is the correct attitude. But what hopes have you given to Orissa? You are dashing all the aspirations and hopes of Orissa to the ground and you are practically closing the door by not even agreeing to accept the proposal for a Boundary Commission. Yesterday Shri H. G. Vaishnav asked, when majority of the States, when majority of the Members seem to be in favour of appointment of Boundary Commissions it is not understood why the Government is not agreeing. The

[Shri R. N. S. Deo]

reason is that one big State with a big pull is afraid of this boundary commission. It was the one State which was opposed to the appointment of the States Reorganisation Commission and which was opposed to the idea of reorganisation because it is an artificial State and that State is likely to lose. Therefore, because they opposed it, is it right that the other States should be penalised and all these warnings be allowed to continue and all these tensions should be kept alive? Not only the old claim but the new claims that the Members have made here made it amply clear that this is not the end, and that there will be these tensions continuing. They may be small tensions but they may be spread all over the country. These small tensions collectively make a big tension. Why should we allow these tensions to continue? Is it not statesmanship, is it not wisdom that we should decide these issues once for all? That is the feeling and that is the grievance, namely, that these things are not decided according to merits.

Take, for example, Orissa's case. Nobody even went into the merits of the case. They have been simply ignored completely. What we have been asking for is that one should decide the thing on a principle and that the principle should be applied equally to all. The principles should be decided upon first and then they must be applied to settle the disputes. If they cannot do it, they may ask the parties to get together, but that is an impossibility. It is quite clear that the parties cannot come together. There are so many examples in this respect. They have not been able to come to a settlement. Therefore, the only alternative is, a third party arbitration. For that, instead of deciding it on a political level, why not they appoint an impartial commission so that the issues may be decided by them? But, if they are not prepared to accept the suggestion for a boundary commission at this stage, then I would certainly urge the House to accept my amendment.

We do not like the idea of zonal councils. When people are opposed to that idea, if you have the mand if you are going to entrust them with this work of going into boundary or border disputes, then, it will only mean that there will be constant wrangling and they will never be able to do any useful work or devote time to other important matters, unless you provide for the resolution of all the differences.

It is quite clear that there will be three or four, and in some cases, five or six States in each zone. How can the majority decision be expected from such a zonal council? There will be border disputes between two States and then each State will stick to its own point of view and they cannot come to an agreement. Otherwise States naturally would not like to take the odium of taking sides.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** One of the States may sometimes fall in a different zone—I mean the State which is involved in a dispute.

**Shri R. N. S. Deo:** Then there will be inter-zonal meetings. What I say is, why should the other States take the odium of taking sides. What will happen is, they will shelve the matter. This is not the way of solving the issues. This is only shelving the issues. There is a saying: "A stitch in time saves nine". It is no good delaying matters, and therefore, if the zonal councils are entrusted with the border disputes, we should make a provision, namely, if there is difference of opinion and the issues are not solved, then, at the request of the State which is aggrieved, a boundary commission would be appointed by Government. I commend my amendment to the acceptance of the House.

**Shri Raghavachari:** I rise to support the ideas behind the amendment moved by Shri Deo. As all of us know these boundary disputes have been responsible for much discontent and disappointment and bitterness in the country, though they are not very numerous and now there



are only about 10 or 15 prominent disputes. The Home Minister very cleverly suggested, yesterday, a solution. I presume he is very conscious of the existence of this bitterness or the cause for bitterness and the need for solution. He said: "All Members belonging to the neighbouring States should meet together and come to an agreement and then he will consider the decision". Member after Member including Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava have pointed the impracticability of that suggestion, because, personally, I feel that if I talk about a few *firkas* in Bellary I cannot expect other Members even to realise what the situation is. They may not have heard the names and they may not have known the geography of the place and of other details. They cannot make up their minds and vote one way or the other. Therefore, it is impossible to expect that these border disputes can be decided amongst ourselves without the co-operation of the State Governments and the Central Government. The reason is that we do not know all the particulars in many cases and even if we should come to an agreement, the previous commitments of the Government will come in its way.

Thus, the Home Minister's offer makes it appear as if he was very reasonable in regard to the suggestion he made. He said: "You all come to an agreement amongst yourselves and then we will see". It is something like asking two children who are quarrelling among themselves to come to a settlement between themselves. They can never agree. Therefore, the suggestion that he made is impracticable. The only alternative is, we have to settle it otherwise. Now how are we to settle it? In the zonal councils, one of the items is settlement of boundary disputes. Shri Deo has cogently pointed out the difficulties in the way of the zonal councils and said that they are not the proper authorities to deal with these disputes. After all, the Ministers of the concerned States are members and they are all interested in their own disputes and an arbitrator is not to be found

there. They are all contestants themselves. To my mind, if the proposal to appoint a boundary commission is not agreed to, let a committee of high court judges at once be appointed. Let the judges decide the matter and give an award. That is the best solution.

The only argument against what I suggest is, how long will you keep the iron in the fire. One might say that it comes in the way of economic progress and interferes with economic progress; that it comes in the way of the existence of settled conditions and the programme during the Five Year Plan period, and all that. But I say that these boundary disputes also come in the way of progress, and co-operation will not be available without a settled and happy condition of affairs. Therefore, such arguments will not really answer the question. The best thing is to appoint a boundary commission at once so that within ten to twelve months the whole matter could be decided. Legislation in the light of those decisions could be brought in later. If you do not want to do it now, the other very reasonable and realistic way is to have a provision in the Bill under which disputes may be referred to a committee or a commission consisting of impartial people who can quicken the decisions over the whole matter and those decisions could be implemented later. Otherwise, you will simply continue some of the unhappy and bitter developments while appearing to be reasonable, and the problems will not really be solved.

Pandit S. C. Mishra (Monghyr North-East)—rose—

Mr. Speaker: It is now 6 o'clock. The hon. Member may speak later.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: You wanted to know the reaction of the Government in regard to the time when the voting should take place and also when the Minister-in-charge would like to reply. Tomorrow is a non-official day and after 3-30 P.M. non-official business will be taken up.

[Shri Satya Nārayan Sinha]

The Home Minister would like to reply after Question Hour, i.e., at 12 o'clock. So far as the voting is concerned, the idea of the Government is this. We have consulted friends on the Opposition also; most of them want that voting should take place on Monday. So, the voting will take place on Monday and the Minister-in-charge will reply tomorrow at 12 o'clock after Question Hour.

Mr. Speaker: As has been suggested by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, I will call upon the hon. Home Minister to reply soon after the Question Hour is over. Of course, I shall hold over the voting on clauses 2 to 15 and the amendments to Monday. Is that the sense of the House?

Several Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: So, I will postpone the voting on clauses 2 to 15 to Monday. But, let it be specifically understood that if any hon. Members do not find it convenient to attend on any particular day or days, they cannot withhold the proceedings of the House. I have got very great regard for leaders of groups, but I do not want to create any precedent.

The House will now stand adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 3rd August, 1956.*