

paragraph 15 of the Report of the Joint Committee on the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956.

The extract is as follows:

"Continuance of Central Administration of Bombay.

I said that the provision in the Bill before Parliament providing for central administration of Bombay represented the Government's point of view and the Congress also agreed with it. There is nothing more to be said about it. I added, however, that, subject to the Central administration of Bombay, it was our intention to make some suitable arrangements to associate representatives of Bombay with this administration. I further added that after a certain period which might be about five years, the people of Bombay should have the opportunity to decide for themselves about their future. The method to be adopted for this purpose could be decided later in consultation with the people concerned."

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): I want a clarification....

Mr. Speaker:... Of the extract for which I am not responsible?

Shri Kamath: No, Sir, not of the contents of the statement. Considering that it is not customary, except in totalitarian countries, to make announcements of Government policy at party meetings, will the Prime Minister clarify and say whether this was made in his capacity as the Prime Minister or merely as a party leader?

Mr. Speaker: All this was asked yesterday.

Shri Kamath: But no answer was given yesterday, Sir.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): May I know whether it will be circulated to all the Members so that we can make use of it.

Mr. Speaker: It will form part of the debates. I shall see to it that it is circulated.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): Has the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs got anything to say about the programme of work for the next week? Today is Friday.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): The House is sitting tomorrow. Whenever the House sits on Saturday, I propose to make that statement on Saturday.

STATES REORGANISATION BILL —Contd.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): Yesterday I was dealing with the question of Bombay. Most of the Members of the House feel that Bombay should belong to Maharashtra. I am sorry that the attitude of the Government, especially of the Prime Minister was strange and even unjust. The other day, the hon. Member, Shri C. D. Deshmukh made a historic statement giving us the truth behind the Bombay decision. I cannot improve upon his language but I may just draw the attention of the House to the statement of Shri Deshmukh. He said that the decision on Bombay was not the decision of Government. He also said:

"There was no consideration of the proposal in the Cabinet or even by circulation. There was no individual consultation with members of the Cabinet known to be specially interested, as for instance, myself. There is no record even of a meeting of a Committee of the Cabinet, and to this day no authoritative text of the so-called decision is available to the members of the Cabinet."

If this is a fact, I must say that the attitude of the Prime Minister is highly irresponsible. I may further say, if I am permitted to use the phraseology of H. G. Wells, that the policy of the Government in regard to the States reorganisation is a 'pitiful jumble of incoherent nonsense.'

Mr. Speaker: Did he use it in Parliament? Did Bernard Shaw use it in Parliament?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: It is not Bernard Shaw; it is H. G. Wells, but he was not a Member of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker: Simply because X says something, it need not be repeated here.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I thought that it was an apt expression to describe the present policy of Government.

Shri S. S. More: By linking it with the name of that gentleman, you may take it as a joke and you may not take the matter seriously.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I feel that socially, economically and even morally, Bombay is part and parcel of Maharashtra. If you separate Bombay from Maharashtra, you would be more or less separating the soul from the body. It would be just like cutting the womb from the mother. Before further injustice is done to Bombay, the people who make decisions for the Government should revise their opinion; and even now it is not too late to do it.

Then there is the question of the Central administration for Bombay. According to the present proposal, Bombay has to come under the Central administration. I feel that under the Central administration it would deprive the citizens of Bombay from participating in a democratic set-up which would otherwise result if Bombay is given to Maharashtra. I wholeheartedly endorse the opinion of Shri Chatterjee in this matter. He has said in his minute of dissent that the Central administration deprives the citizens of Bombay of their democratic rights. We should not do that. About the time limit that is set by the Prime Minister when Bombay might be given to Maharashtra, I do not find any indication of the same in the Bill.

However I do not want that Bombay should be made a part of con-

tention and be treated like a football between parties for five years. I do not want tension to continue. I do not want that any portion of the territory should be left undecided. The reorganisation question should be settled once and for all now, and no issues connected with the reorganisation of States should be left to be decided in future. If you leave the issues for future decision, I am afraid that peace in the land will be marred or disturbed. With a view to have a full and satisfactory settlement of this question, I would urge upon the Government to take a good, fair and reasonable decision on Bombay.

I refer now to another important question which has taken a serious turn, and that is the question of law and order, the question of the civil liberties of the people. The hon. Member, Shri C. D. Deshmukh, has referred to this question and said that the Chief Minister of Bombay had issued oral instructions to the Police that they may shoot at sight and shoot to kill people. It is a very grave charge.

श्री ए० व० मिश्र (बिना बुलन्दशहर) :

“मान ए प्वाइंट आफ़ ऑर्डर तर” [एक शौचित्य प्रश्न के सम्बन्ध में] मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि माननीय सदस्य को कहां से यह इनफार्मेशन [मानकारी] मिली है जिसके कि आधार पर वे ऐसा कह रहे हैं।

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: There is no point of order here. I am referring to the statement of the hon. Member, Shri C. D. Deshmukh. He has said this in his statement and I have got a copy of his statement with me.

Mr. Speaker: Even the other day I thought about this question of statement regarding Ministers and Assemblies which have been established under the Constitution. Those Assemblies are also equally democratic Assemblies and it is primarily the concern of the particular Assembly to

take up such matters, and when those matters are taken up, the Minister will have an opportunity of explaining the position as to what exactly the statement is and whether it is true or false. Those Ministers are not here to give any explanations in that regard. Normally, under the rules, whatever happens in other Assemblies, is a matter for them, not for us. Regarding the statements of those Ministers when the Bombay Assembly met, it was for them to take it up. I do not know what explanation was given. Under those circumstances, to make a statement here merely because one hon. Member of this House referred to it is not permissible. The hon. Member said that he has evidence, but it refers to a serious allegation against an outsider, against a member of another Assembly, and it is unfair to make such an allegation against a person in his absence. Further, it is rather inconvenient for this House to take it up or reject it; it is rather difficult also. Under those circumstances, that need not be referred to, although it has already been said here.

Shri Kamath: On a point of order, Sir. Will that not mean that this House will be precluded from referring to statements or speeches or other charges made in other Parliaments of the world because after all we depend on Press reports or some other sources for information? Certainly we are at liberty to give that information and allow it to be contradicted by the Government.

Mr. Speaker: Statements made in other Parliaments stand on a different footing, altogether; we have no control over them except through the diplomatic channels. Any person who sees or gets such information must bring it to the notice of this House and this House will give directions to its Ministers in the matter. But so far as the other Assemblies and other Governments here are concerned, they are equally autonomous in their respective spheres, they are sovereign so far those items that are given to them are concerned. We have no jurisdiction or control over them in

those matters. We have, of course, jurisdiction exclusively in matters which are in our List and also in matters which are in the Concurrent List. This is a matter of law and order which is exclusively a matter for them to deal with and we have no jurisdiction. Whether the shooting was there, whether it was right or wrong, is a matter which falls in their own sphere. Under the same Constitution under which we are functioning, some powers are allocated to the State, and the question of law and order is one such thing. It may have been used excessively or not, but it is for that Assembly to take it up and not for this House. That is my view. I will, however, consider this point in detail but I do not want that this matter should be pursued here in the absence of the Minister, who works under the same Constitution, whose duty is to maintain law and order in his State; we have not taken it up as a matter falling in our sphere. Under those circumstances, I think it is not proper to make a reference of that kind about a particular act done by a particular Ministry of a State, which is equally responsible to its Legislature for that particular matter, under the same Constitution.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh (Kolaba): I gave a copy of my statement to the Speaker 24 hours before I made it. In the course of the statement, I said that the alleged misbehaviour of Bombay was a reason given by the Prime Minister why the decision about Bombay could not be reconsidered. The extent of that misbehaviour is intimately connected with the use of police powers and the allegation whether there was any excess of it or not. Moreover, the proposal is that Bombay will come under Central administration in a couple of months or in three months, in which case it will still be relevant for us to refer to what happened in the past and to move the Central Government to make an enquiry.

Now, all that I said was, that it was, in connection with the States Reorganisation Commission's Report and

[Shri C. D. Deshmukh]

the subsequent happenings, the duty of the Central Government to promote, that is to say, persuade the Bombay Government to make an enquiry. That point was taken up by the Prime Minister and a reply was given to it. Therefore, directly, we are not considering this matter as a matter of law and order. But we are considering this as something unavoidably connected with the Bill that we are now considering. After all, what happens to the citizens of Bombay today may be an indication of what might happen to them in the future. It is in that light that I referred to that statement.

It remains for me to deal with the point made, namely, that the Minister is not here to defend himself. Well, it is expected that the Home Ministry of the Government of India, which would be the successor in power, I suppose, of the Government of Bombay, would be in a position to convey to the House whatever truth there is in these allegations. It is not possible for a private citizen to go further into the verification of these matters and it is because of that consideration that everyone has been urging that, considering the scale of this firing, a judicial enquiry was called for, in which case all these matters can be decided satisfactorily and everyone concerned will have an opportunity to study what the real truth is.

Shri R. D. Misra: My objection is this. Shri C. D. Deshmukh happened to be the Finance Minister till recently. Did he ever write to the Home Minister about these facts alleged in his statement? And now, that is being made the ground for further discussion about it. I want to know whether he has verified those facts or not and whether it was not his duty to verify them.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Gune): Was Shri R. D. Misra the Home Minister? I should be allowed to answer him.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri R. D. Misra raised a point of order. I asked for a short reply regarding this matter from Shri C. D. Deshmukh who is connected with the statement which he made. I am afraid there is a confusion of issues. Shri Deshmukh had a right to make a statement after he resigned his post as Minister, and then in reply to his statement, the hon. Prime Minister also made a suitable reply. In the statement that was made by Shri Deshmukh, he referred to certain considerations which weighed with him, on account of which he felt that he should not be in the Cabinet and therefore he resigned.

Now, a reference to the shooting in Bombay and what the Central Government or this House is going to do or may do at a later date and asking for an answer to that question in advance is rather curious. I do not know whether, even after taking up such a question, he is competent to go into that further. Of course, that is another matter altogether. But today, that Government—the Government of Bombay—was competent to take what action it did and it is its duty to do so. It is only a question whether it was in excess or not. But it is its duty to deal with law and order, and it did so. Now, to refer to the happenings that might occur, in anticipation, because of what has happened now, is not relevant. It sounds rather curious to me. What might happen as far as his resignation is concerned, and what might happen after his resignation, are not relevant to this issue. We are now considering the States Reorganisation Bill. What has that to do with the shooting in Bombay?

An Hon. Member: The Finance Minister resigned on that issue.

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Let him resign on that issue or not resign. We are not concerned with it. I will give an oppor-

tunity to every hon. Member. Why should he or she be impatient?

What I say is, to refer to the statement about shooting is absolutely irrelevant. Further, if some accusation is made, it is not for the Home Minister here to reply to that, and it is not as if one can go on asking him as to what has happened elsewhere and also ask him to place the matter here. A person, against whom an allegation is made, has not got the opportunity to reply to the allegations. If he has got that opportunity, by all means, the reference could be made. Very often, the hon. Members here forget that there are a large number of Members elected by the people to the Bombay Assembly, just as Members have been elected by the people to this House. They represent the people in that Assembly just as the hon. Members here represent their constituencies in this House. Of course, in the Assembly there, they represent a smaller number of people than we do here.

Under these circumstances, let us go strictly by the Constitution. It is a matter of law and order. Whatever was done—and whether there is necessity for an enquiry or not—it is for the Bombay Legislative Assembly to go into the matter. I do not know how this House can come in the picture. Of course, Shri Deshmukh has referred to the shootings there and he has said he had already given me a copy of his statement. No doubt that was given. But there may be a time when he himself may withdraw; anyhow I allowed him to make the statement. But that ought not to be made the ground for referring to it perpetually on the floor of this House.

Shrimati Bena Chakravarty (Basirhat): Before you make up your mind about the ruling, I may say a few words. It is true that if the question is one of law and order it appertains to the State concerned. But in this particular instance, we are intimately looking at the entire thing from the point of view of the reorganisation of States and the SRC report. If the question of Bombay

has been decided on the issue which relates to excesses being committed and when the Prime Minister had made up his mind that excesses had been committed, then the Parliament is quite justified in knowing how far these excesses are correct and how far those charges levelled against the people are correct. As such, it is completely within the competence of this Parliament to ask for a judicial enquiry and raise the matter here. It is only from that limited point of view that I say that we are completely within our rights to raise that matter.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): May I point out that we are censuring the Prime Minister and the Government of India for the policy which they are pursuing. The policy is this. The Prime Minister made it clear that he deliberately turned down the demand for a judicial enquiry and he justifies the stand. So, he also said that this was one of the points which they took into consideration with regard to the decision about Bombay. Therefore, we humbly submit that this point is relevant not only to know how many people were shot down but to know whether the extent of misbehaviour was such as to justify the pronouncement of the Prime Minister, namely, condemnation of the city of Bombay so far as the Government of India is concerned and also so far as the Prime Minister of India is concerned.

Shri Kamath: The Prime Minister said that Bombay misbehaved.

Mr. Speaker: All that I say is this. So far as the States Reorganisation Bill is concerned, this matter is not relevant. The hon. Members may choose other remedies to bring the matter to the notice of the House; they may bring the matter to the notice of the hon. Prime Minister and say whether excuses have been committed or not. There are a hundred ways of bringing such matters to the notice of the Government. It is not for me to mention them here. But it is for me to say here and now that

[Mr. Speaker]

so far as the States Reorganisation Bill is concerned, the Bill must be disposed of after calm discussion. Whether Bombay ought to be joined to Maharashtra or it should be kept separately under the jurisdiction of the Centre because of the shooting or because there was a protest against the report of the S.R.C. are not relevant here. Merely because there was shooting and say, 80 people died, can anybody come and say, "Give me Bombay"?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: That was given by the Prime Minister, rightly or wrongly, as a ground for the decision that they have taken.

Mr. Speaker: No.

Mr. Kamath: Is the Prime Minister wrong?

Mr. Speaker: The grounds are different. Whether Bombay is part and parcel of Maharashtra, whether it is part and parcel of Gujarat, whether there are or not grounds for its being treated separately and if so, for how long, whether there should be an electoral process or not for deciding its position—these are the points which are left for this House to discuss. But I definitely rule that any reference to the happenings and the shootings, whether they were in excess or not and who was responsible for them, is irrelevant so far as the discussion of the States Reorganisation Bill is concerned. I will not allow any such reference.

Shri Kamath: Do you also rule, as a corollary, that the Prime Minister's statement about firing and the misbehaviour of Bombay was wrong and should be expunged from the records of Parliament?

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I want to know whether, by this ruling, only reference to the shooting is irrelevant or reference to the misbehaviour of the people of Bombay or looting would also be irrelevant?

Mr. Speaker: Looting shooting—everything will be irrelevant, so far as this Bill is concerned. Whatever might have happened, let us not refer to it. Let us go on the merits of the case whether Bombay ought to be in the Centre or should be immediately joined to Maharashtra. Let us discuss this matter dispassionately, put forward points for and against and so on. Therefore, any reference to misbehaviour either by the public or one section of it or to the action taken, whether it is excessive or not, is beyond the scope of the Bill and I am not going to allow them. (Interruptions).

Shri R. D. Misra: My point of order was this.

Mr. Speaker: I have disposed of it.

Shri R. D. Misra: We can criticise the Prime Minister or the Home Minister or other Ministers of this House. But, can we criticise the Chief Minister of a State who is not present here to defend himself? That is the only point.

Mr. Speaker: I have already disposed of it. So far as such persons are concerned, in the normal course there cannot be a subject-matter of discussion in this House. Here it is intimately connected with the shooting, excesses, etc. That portion will go off. It is not the sole concern of persons resident in Bombay. Other hon. Members are keenly interested in this matter because it may develop into an all-India difficulty. So, let us discuss this calmly and put forward the arguments for and against and come to a conclusion.

Shri M. K. Mehta (Calcutta—North-West): I beg to submit that when Shri Deshmukh made that statement, he was not pulled up and that statement has become the property of the House and it is on record. Am I not within my rights to refer to any record of this House?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is entitled to read any record of this House but not to use it irrelevantly.

Shri S. S. More: I am submitting an entirely different point for your consideration. A resigning Minister makes a certain statement under certain rules. Is a statement of that sort governed by the rules which are applicable to ordinary debates? Has he not the freedom to clarify his own position? An attempt is being made to show that Shri Deshmukh made certain demands, which he thought important, in his statement. But he made that statement under a certain specific rule and under the Constitution. Can the same restrictions, that are put on the ordinary speeches, be put on his freedom to make the statement?

Mr. Speaker: This question does not arise now. (*Interruptions*).

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: May I seek a clarification?

Mr. Speaker: I do not know. He has got only one minute.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: In view of your ruling, can I deal with the question of setting up a committee of enquiry?

Mr. Speaker: No. That does not form part and parcel of this Bill.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Finally, I want to say this. The question of Bombay has not been considered by the entire Cabinet. No attempt was made by the Prime Minister or any other Congress leader to consult the leaders of the various opposition parties in the country. So, the decisions taken were on a party level or on the personal responsibility of the Prime Minister. That decision should not be imposed on this House or the country. I appeal to the Prime Minister to revise the decision, even now and include Bombay in Maharashtra.

I know it may create a little disturbance in the minds of my Gujarati friends but I feel that Bombay will not lose its cosmopolitan character if it is joined to any State. Take the instance of Calcutta, Bangalore or any big city. The cosmopolitan character

of these big cities has not been destroyed merely because they are in a particular linguistic area. On this analogy, the case of Bombay is very strong and it should go to Maharashtra. It will not in any way militate against the interests of Gujarat.

I am not holding any brief on behalf of Maharashtra. I feel that, if Bombay is separated from Maharashtra, it is a gross injustice to the people of Maharashtra. This sore will persist. It will not be conducive to the healthy growth of Indian nationalism. The Prime Minister was very eloquent in saying that Indian unity should be maintained at all costs. On the same ground, I appeal to him that Bombay should go to Maharashtra for promoting healthy and harmonious relations between different sections of our people. I hope it is not too late to revise the decision in this matter.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): Mr. Speaker, this country, and more so this hon. House, is entering upon the last stage of national efforts to ensure that the administrative and political set-up of this country is organised on a predominantly linguistic basis. I consider, as this Bill is going to be placed on the statute-book with such amendments as the House, in its wisdom, may possibly adopt to the report of the Joint Committee, that 5,000 years of our national history are harking to us to do the right thing at the right moment. Looking back at our national history, I cannot come across any particular instance where a conscious, democratic national effort was made to arrange the administration of the land on a linguistic basis. I am glad that we are now in this process, as I said a minute ago, in the last lap of our national effort—for the time being, at any rate.

I wish that this Bill has come much earlier than today for disposal by this House. Half a century of national thinking was at the back of this Bill. Under Gandhian leadership for nearly

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

forty years, the great Congress Party has offered the people of this land linguistic redistribution.

1 P.M.

You know, Sir, at the time of the Constituent Assembly, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, as President of the Constituent Assembly, appointed the Dhar Committee. That was in 1948 and the linguistic re-distribution of States should have arisen then. Unfortunately, that report was shelved. Later, at the Jaipur Session of the Congress a three-man committee report was brought before the people. Even the recommendations of that report were not fulfilled. Then there was the Congress election manifesto of December, 1951 at the Bangalore Session of the AICC offering linguistic re-distribution of States on which plane the elections were fought in 1952. I am recalling all these things only to make one point. It is not right for anyone to say that linguistic re-distribution of States or organisation of States in India on a linguistic basis is anti-national, disruptive and otherwise unbecoming of the genius of the great people of this land. As far as I am concerned, when this Parliament was formed, it fell to my lot to be the President of the All-India Linguistic States Conference for a period of 4 continuous years, inviting all parties to keep the idea afloat, to keep the imagination of the people, so that we in this country will have an opportunity, as we are having now, of having reorganisation of States on a predominantly linguistic basis.

Sir, I wish each one of us in this House will approach this question—whatever the passionate positional points which are dear to us may be, as they are dear to me in certain instances—in a spirit of dedication. I am sure, once the heat of debate, the wrath and fury of controversy, points and counter points are exhausted, all of us will join hands together to see that after the reorganisation of States is over India is an integral

unit will be maintained. That should be—I am sure each one in this House will have that feeling—the approach to this problem.

Having said this, I should like to say a couple of words about the Joint Committee. I had the honour of being a member of this Joint Committee. I am glad to say here, as I said in my vote of thanks in the Joint Committee itself, that the Chairman has developed new techniques of approach. Sir, I have served on several committees. I have not come across any instance where there was unanimity or almost near unanimity on all major problems confronting the country through the medium of this Bill.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: That is not correct.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I am sure my hon. friend will bear with me. There is only one point of substantial difference and that is of Bombay City. I only said 'unanimity or near unanimity'. I have no reason to disparage the position taken up by my colleague Shri N. C. Chatterjee. I also fought bitterly with reference to Andhra-Telangana. I also moved an amendment about Andhra Pradesh. But owing to the persuasive approach which each one of us adopted towards the other and also the Chairman, most of the points were resolved. All this is good. But my difficulty has been, from the beginning, that if only the Joint Committee had been permitted,—I hope I will be permitted by you, Sir, to make a statement of this character—if only there was free voting on the part of my colleagues opposite, things would have been slightly different. I will give you one or two instances later, not to reveal the proceedings of the Joint Committee but only to show.....

An Hon. Member: That is the unanimous opinion.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram:.....that things would have been much better.

Before I proceed with the discussion on the report and also some of the new clauses which have been introduced, I would like to say—as I have written in my minute of dissent—that there are a number of improvements introduced in the Bill as it is now before this House. For example, the powers and functions of the Zonal Councils have been made clear. I am glad that my suggestion for inter-zonal sessions, to be held has been accepted and is now a part of the Bill.

Shri S. S. More: Sir, is it permissible for any Member to say that a particular suggestion, which has been finally accepted by the Joint Committee, was his suggestion? Is it permissible to make such a statement claiming a certain thing?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Sir, if you read the minutes appended to the report you will find, for the first time in the Select Committee procedure, that reference to names have been made—Shri Deogirikar's name, my name, Shri Chatterjee's name and so on are there—and that was the reason why I said this.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members know fully will that the name of the Member who raised a particular point in a Select Committee is not mentioned for the reason that others may take offence.

Shri S. S. More: Others might have said so many other good things.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I only made a reference because the names were there in the minutes for the first time.

Mr. Speaker: I will see that it is avoided.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Sir, I am very glad that Bombay, Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Tripura and Manipur have now got increased representation in this House and also in the Rajya Sabha. As regards the procedure regarding High Courts, there is going to be a screening of the Judges

in Part B States as they exist today. That I consider is a very great improvement on the original provision. I am glad that, as regards the provision for financial corporations, particularly my friends from Maharashtra will have satisfaction from the amended clause in the Bill whereby the distribution or the placement of investment in Bombay City will not be put on their shoulders. I am glad that the Bill is not cultered with far too many provisions for the incorporation of legislative councils in almost every State which is to be created in future. In particular I am happy the new coming Andhra Pradesh State will not be burdened with a legislative council automatically as a result of the passage of this Bill in this House. Sir, I hold very strong views on this matter, and I am sure most of my colleagues will also agree with me, that we should not in the present context of reorganisation of States burden the tax-payers with the luxury of giving them, or forcing down their throats, where they are not wanted, legislative councils. These are some of the improvements that have been made in the Joint Committee. There are other points which I should like to list, but, as I have said, I only want to say that the Joint Committee, to my mind, has discharged its task carefully and in all conscience satisfactorily.

Having said this, I would like to draw the attention of this House to one very important point, which, I am sure, has not been brought before this debate so far in all its details. Every time we brought in proposals in the Joint Committee—whatever they may be; whether questions of principle or questions of details—we were told that there must be agreement between the parties concerned. The House will realise—and I am sure, you will agree with me—that in a Select Committee representation is not given on a territorial basis. There are a number of territories in India which were not represented in this Joint Committee and if there was a dispute between one area and

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

another which was sought to be reconciled, disposed of or settled as a result of discussion in the Joint Committee, every time it was brought up we were told: "You people from Andhra and Karnataka should come together and have an agreed settlement". I regret, Sir, this is one of the weaknesses of the procedure. It was debated in this particular Joint Committee—as I will have occasion to show presently—and it was found that agreement will not be possible by mutual consent among the disputants. Again, even when there was a possibility for arriving at a sort of an agreement among the members of the Joint Committee, the other point, namely, that the agreements of the governments concerned also should be there, was brought in. Whether it was Sirvancha or Rajulabanda of Hyderabad State, even though a vast majority of the members of the Joint Committee agreed, the Governments did not agree with the result that the Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Committee, which could have disposed of most of the vitriolic or difficult problems which are facing this country today could not dispose of, on the score that the free vote of the members of the Committee was not obtained on the issues, but the condition was put down that the disputants must come with an agreed formula. I hope the House, now that it is taking up this Bill, will keep this defect in view and in the collective wisdom of this House solutions will be found for all the problems that are before us and the numerous amendments which are being now circulated to us will be disposed of.

In particular, I would like to draw the attention of this House to one point, namely, that however unanimous the view points expressed in the Joint Committee may be on the imperative need for a statutory Boundary Commission, everything was done to prevent the incorporation of that particular demand through a suitable provision in the Bill as it has

emerged from the Joint Committee. Sir, I concede, as I have said earlier, that the Zonal Committee procedure is an improvement compared to the original Bill. I also referred to the fact that inter-zonal committee meetings were possible under clauses 23 and 24 of the Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Committee. I am convinced that this will not be the manner in which we can solve the disputes involved between one State and another. I am sure every one of my colleagues in the Joint Committee will bear me out that irrespective of party affiliations most of the Members brought in amendments indicating the imperative necessity for a statutory Boundary Commission. You will see, Sir, from the amendments that have already come and others which are likely to come that there is a concerted effort irrespective of party affiliation to point out to this House that without a statutory boundary commission, the problems in this country will not be resolved.

To my mind, the reorganisation of States will be incomplete unless and until we dispose of inter-boundary disputes, unless and until we dispose of minority problems and unless and until we dispose of the problems relating to domiciliary rights, the reorganisation of States will not be complete. I understand that Government is likely to bring some sort of a legislation to tackle the question of domicile policy which has been imposed on minorities by various State Governments by Central Act. I would like to hear what exactly will be the implications of the proposed legislation. Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly on this point. Nearly 4 crores of people in this country happen to be linguistic minorities. They are there in every part of the country and I consider that unless and until this question of boundary disputes, minority problems, and domiciliary rights are satisfactorily settled and disposed of, I regret to say that the problem of the reorganisation of States will not be completely or satisfactorily solved. In other

words, there are a number of residual problems, some of which I am going to mention in detail in the next few minutes, which have got to be tackled right now.

There are disputes between Andhra and Madras. The Chief Ministers of both the States have been almost in continuous session to resolve these disputes for three long years. They have had consultations at the highest Cabinet levels and both of them have confessed failure. They could not resolve these border disputes and they have made a representation to the Government of India demanding the appointment of a boundary commission. This is only of the many instances which I can give to this hon. House. Do not expect the disputants to solve these problems; if they can solve the problems, there can be no disputes at all to be brought before the Government. However, ugly these problems are, I am convinced without a statutory provision through the medium of this Bill, and more so, perhaps, if I am not mistaken, through the medium of the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill, the problem of linguistic minorities will continue to be a festering sore and will not be solved as a result of the reorganisation of the States arising out of the provisions of this Bill.

I will take Andhra as an example and I will mention other States also. Andhra State has got disputes with the Orissa State; Orissa has got disputes with Andhra with regard to Parlakimidi, Ganjam and Koraput on our side and Tekkali on their side. How are we going to settle these problems? Between Andhra and Madhya Pradesh there are disputes in regard to Bastar and Chenda, particularly Sironcha. The House will know that some of us, Andhras and Maharashtrians, made an attempt at the end of the last session of Parliament to arrive at some sort of a settlement, but the Madhya Pradesh Government was not available for consultations, with the result that none of us in the House could do anything at all, because we do not have special mandate or

powers to enter into agreements between myself on the one hand and Mr. Datar on the other. There are disputes between Andhra and Karnataka with regard to Bellary, Kolar and Tumkur and also Chitaldrug. There are problems between Andhra and Maharashtra as a result of the dismemberment of the Hyderabad State, and as a result of Hyderabad City and Telangana coming to us. How are we going to solve all these problems? I have got here a complete list of the border disputes between Tamil Nad and Karnataka, Tamil Nad and Kerala, Maharashtra and the Hindi-speaking areas, and so on. How are we going to solve them? I regret to say the Bill is highly defective to the extent that provision for a boundary commission has not been made in it. This lacuna must be filled; this breach must be repaired. Something adequate must be made available to the people of the country to arrive at enduring and honourable solutions. I know that under articles 3 and 4 of the Constitution, the President is empowered to appoint *ad hoc* committees; why is it that the President has not appointed a committee to solve the problem which Kamaraja Nadar and Gopala Reddy could not solve? As I have said earlier, they have confessed failure of their talks for over three years. The moment a statutory provision is made in this Bill, and more so, as I said earlier, in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill, that a statutory boundary commission will be there, a psychological atmosphere will be created in this country that it will no longer be possible for the politicians to exploit the local situations, because there will be a quasi-judicial body, the highest possible body, available to this country which will be seized of the matter and which will dispose of it. I feel very strongly on this point, Sir, that we must prevent politicians from becoming what you call agents of, shall we say, agitations.....

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: (Gurgaon): Political agitators.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I make a very sincere plea with all the convic-

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

tion that I can command that this question must be tackled by this House. I am given to understand that there will be an almost all-party combined amendment which will be placed before this House very soon, apart from other amendments. I make an earnest appeal to my friend, Shri Datar, to convey to his senior colleague, the Home Minister, not to resist this demand, because we were told at every stage in the Joint Committee by the Chairman, "There are problems which have got to be tackled; do not raise them now. They will come to the surface if you are going to make a provision for a boundary commission." I regret to say that this is an argument which is not valid in the present context of things. The problem exists; it is an ugly and serious problem. It has got to be tackled forthwith and should not be delayed beyond endurance. I am convinced that the moment the linguistic reorganisation of the States is completed by November 1, or whatever it may be, immediately these problems will plague our country, and will destroy every possibility for peaceful living as between one State and another, because new balances of power are going to come into existence. Ever since we had the first debate on the linguistic reorganisation of States in May or June, 1952, these problems have been discussed. Let not the Government adopt an attitude of tinkering with the issue; do not allow the politicians to tamper with the peace and security of the country. Let them argue before a quasi-judicial body; then decisions will be announced which will be enduring and honourable.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to another point in my minute of dissent, which is not unrelated to the point that I have made so far. That is with reference to minority rights. My hon. friend, Shri Frank Anthony, made an eloquent speech, though in some places the language was a bit raucous. I heartily endorse—as I have endorsed in my minute of dissent appended to the report—that

there must be statutory guarantees available to linguistic minorities, wherever they exist. Articles 29 and 30 of the Constitution are already there giving protection to the linguistic minorities, but they are not operative in the sense that there is no machinery available for making them operative. There is article 347, for example; I can quote other articles, Mr. Speaker, to show that the intention of the Constitution which we have given to ourselves is to take the question of the linguistic minorities out of the hands of the State Governments and make it a Central responsibility. But, there is no statutory provision made for making it possible for the Government of India to ensure that the linguistic minorities are not affected as a result of the situations prevailing in various States. You are aware of the problems, Mr. Speaker, and I do not wish to ruffle feelings by making mention of individual States. All of us are aware of the problems existing in the various parts of the country. I see that para 55 of the report of the Joint Committee is not satisfactory. I said it in my minute of dissent and I repeat with all the conviction at my command that something statutory must be done. The Report, as amended, goes to a certain extent, namely, some sort of an officer is to be appointed by the Government of India to keep in touch with the problems of linguistic minorities. But the area of agreement between the Government and every section of public opinion is very wide indeed. If an officer is going to make a report, naturally that report must come before the House. What we are asking is: let the President, like in the case of the Scheduled Castes and Schedule Tribes, be statutorily vested with powers (a) to appoint a Commissioner, (b) to invest the Commissioner with powers to be seized of matters, to send for documents and to make a competent report to himself (President) which will be presented to this House; again finally it is for this House to debate that report.

I think it is a very reasonable demand, a demand which the Government cannot possibly reject out of hand. I am here to say with a certain amount of knowledge that the Home Minister was very sympathetic to this question. Every one of the members of the Joint Committee who have spoken on this question was unanimously of this view. There was not even one single minute of dissent on the question of the protection of minorities. It is not the Anglo-Indians alone who are going to be protected. There are nearly 30-40 million Urdu speaking people. There are Andhras in Orissa and Oriyas in Andhra and every linguistic minority is involved in this question. I have got some experience. You know about Kharagpur. 80 per cent. of the people there are Andhras though it is in West Bengal. All the attempts by the Andhras to open a high school were not successful. I have got all the correspondence with me about Orissa and I am prepared to place before them all the correspondence with the Maulana Saheb and the Education Ministry about the educational facilities for Andhras. I am sure my Oriya and Tamil friends will be feeling in the same way about the Andhra Government. It is a proposition which is valid for the protection of minority rights everywhere in India, with the result that I make a very sincere plea to the Government to accept this suggestion. Yesterday some of us saw the Prime Minister. My hon. friends Shri Gopalan, Shri Asoka Mehta, Shri Frank Anthony and Shri Jaipal Singh were also there to make the same representation which I am now voicing here on the floor of this House. It is a representation which was voiced by some of us in the Select Committee and even in my Minute of Dissent it is there. Since there is no dispute about the principle of the protection of linguistic minority rights and since the area of agreement is very wide, it is only a question of apparatus being adjusted in such manner that the President will be entrusted by the House with power and the President will direct the Commissioner to make

a report to this House and the House will be seized of the matter. That is all the plea that I am making now and once these boundary disputes and the problem of the linguistic minorities are attempted to be solved in an adequate constitutional and statutory manner, I am sure the linguistic re-organisation will become a reality. If you leave these two loopholes, I regret to say that this territorial readjustment will only create further problems of a minority character—looking to the rights of the minorities—and moreover the festering sore will lead to the disfigurement of the face of this country.

Sir, at a later stage when the clauses are taken up I hope I will be given an occasion to offer one or two concrete suggestions. But I do say that we in this House must approach this question of States re-organisation in a spirit of dedication to the cause of the security and the greater glorification and, more than everything else, to the unity of this country. Once these passions cool down and arguments are exhausted, I am sure each one of our colleagues will join hands and see that the Constitution is upheld and the States are only subordinate—I would say 'subordinate' in the generic sense—collaborators with Parliament and the Government of India.

Shri R. N. Reddy (Nalgonda): My approach to this Bill on Reorganisation of States is rational. When I go through the Bill I find that certain age-long demands of the people of States have been conceded. But, at the same time, when the Bill is considered we find that quite a number of irrational and undemocratic decisions have been included in this Bill. Some of the provisions in the Bill which concede linguistic States are certainly welcome. For example, the formation of the Andhra Pradesh, for which I have also been a participant in the struggle, is certainly to be welcomed. But the formation of the linguistic States is not being done with grace. Mental reservations have been shown in the shape of zonal councils.

(Shri R. N. Reddy)

What are these zonal councils? There is no mincing of matters. Prime Minister Nehru had unequivocally declared in the last debate that these are harbingers of multi-lingual States, if I can understand the Prime Minister's declaration or speech correctly. The zonal councils are the beginning of the future of multi-lingual States. It is surprising to note that the ruling party, in spite of their bitter experience in the recent past about the formation of bi-lingual States, still dogmatically persist in the hope of forming these bi-lingual States somewhere in the future. This arises out of a fear-complex that the protagonists of linguistic States are bent upon disrupting Indian unity. But this fear is absolutely unwarranted, unjustified. There is no group or party in this country which today pleads for linguistic areas or linguistic States for that purpose. All of them today, I can say, stand for the unity of India. If there had been certain incidents, if there had been disturbance of peace and if there had been clashes, the people are not to be blamed for it is because of the undemocratic and irrational decisions and attitudes of the ruling party itself.

I can give you one example from my own State. Ill-will, ill-feelings and tension existed between Andhras and Tamilians when Andhra was part of the multi-lingual Madras State. But after the Andhra State was formed, especially today, I can say, the relations between Andhras and Tamilians are definitely better, definitely cordial than at any time in the past. I can also say that the tension or the difference of opinion that exist between the Tamilians and Malayalees will certainly diminish after the formation of the Kerala State. That is a fact. But what I would like to stress that wherever the decision of the Government has been undemocratic and irrational, it is there that these things have arisen.

I take the example of Bombay. Those incidents in Bombay would not

have happened and nothing would have taken place in Bombay if Government had only conceded the democratic demand of Bombay to Maharashtra. But, on the other hand, Government have brought in arguments which go against the Maharashtrians. Our Prime Minister said that Bombay belongs to Maharashtra. 80 miles around Bombay there are Maharashtrian people and the biggest single group in Bombay is the Maharashtrians. All that is conceded and then Maharashtra is denied Bombay. That is the thing. It is there that the rub comes. If only Bombay had been conceded to Maharashtra, I can definitely say that all these incidents would not have taken place and there would have been peace. The problem will not be solved unless Bombay City is conceded to Maharashtra.

What are the arguments advanced? I had the opportunity of hearing Shri S. K. Patil giving out his arguments. The question of cosmopolitanism of the city is brought in, and other intenable arguments are brought in. This question of cosmopolitan city is a very strange argument. If you look to any city in the world, every city is cosmopolitan. Hyderabad is an example. Hyderabad is going to become the capital of Visalandhra. We, Telugus, in Hyderabad are only in a minority. The other people from a majority. If this kind of argument is to be followed, if the Bombay pattern is to be followed everywhere, no city can be included in any State. Neither can Madras be the capital of Tamil Nad, nor Hyderabad the capital of Visalandhra or Andhra Pradesh, nor Calcutta the capital of Bengal. These are hard facts. I hope that wisdom would still dawn upon the ruling party. If this problem is to be solved amicably I would suggest—that Maharashtra be allowed to keep its capital in Bombay City for five years and after five years the City be automatically given away to the Maharashtra State. This way I think the problem can be easily solved. With regard to Bombay it is said that after five years there is going to be

some people's opinion to be taken. I cannot understand this. After the States Reorganisation Commission's Report, even with regard to Telangana the Cabinet Sub-Committee, the High Command of Four, had said that the wishes of the Telengana people would be respected. There was a lot of hullabaloo about that. What happened? No wishes of the people were ascertained. The thing was settled. What is this "wishes of the people"? If this means that a plebiscite is going to be taken in Bombay, then that is the biggest injustice to the Maharashtra people. If the Government is shifted from Bombay City, what happens to all the Maharashtrais who are there, especially the Secretariat officials and so on? Many of the Maharashtrais will go to the capital of Maharashtra and the percentage of Maharashtrais in Bombay will lessen. They are today 42 per cent. They say that along with the Konkans they are 47 per cent. After the formation of the Maharashtra capital in another place, either in Nagpur or Poona, if the Maharashtrais go away from Bombay, then I think even this 42 per cent, the Maharashtrais will not be able to retain in Bombay. So this is another way of saying, "We are not going to concede Bombay at all to Maharashtra". That is the meaning of saying that after five years a plebiscite or a people's opinion is to be ascertained in Bombay.

I cannot understand why a people's opinion should be ascertained only with regard to the Maharashtra people and nowhere else in India. This argument is absolutely incomprehensible. Why is it? Other things were conceded to other States. Was the people's opinion ascertained about it? Nothing of that sort has been done. Why should this injustice be done to the Maharashtrais, and the Maharashtrais alone?

I would therefore request both the Prime Minister and the Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs, who is sitting there, to reconsider this problem. It is taking a very serious

turn in the country. So I would request the Government and the ruling party to reconsider this and come out with a democratic and rational decision. If you are afraid that any incidents will happen after that, I can assure the Government that nothing is going to happen. Only, the country will appreciate the democratic decision and march forward.

Only one more point I would like to make and then I will finish. That is with regard to the Boundary Commission. Our friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram has put the case for a Boundary Commission very ably. When there are differences, when things cannot be solved, when feelings rise high, what is to be done? The only solution would be to appoint a Boundary Commission. For example, with regard to the Andhra Government Dr. Lanka Sundaram made a reference in his speech. The Andhra and Madras Governments are not able to come to a decision or agreement on the border problems. What is to be done? A Boundary Commission is the only solution. If you think that without a Boundary Commission all these problems can be solved, you will only be continuing these tensions in the borders for a very long time to come, and you are not going to solve the problems. So the only way in which these boundary questions can be solved is by the appointment of Boundary Commissions.

And with regard to these Boundary Commissions we have given certain principles. It has been our conviction—and even today we stand by our conviction—that these boundary questions can only be settled on the basis of language and village as the basis. The village should be taken as the unit. Without doing that, these things are not going to be solved and the problem of minorities will remain. It is by this means that the boundary questions can be solved. When we put this proposal before you, we were condemned or strongly criticised as disruptionists. We were told that it was a most disruptionist proposal that

[Shri R. N. Reddy]

we were putting forward. But the Government has also taken the village as the basis in certain States, in certain places. If I read clause 8 of the Bill, which is with regard to Bombay, you will find that Government has taken the village also as the basis, and language too. Here it is said:

“As from the appointed day, there shall be formed a new Part C State to be known as the State of Bombay comprising the following territories, namely:—

(a) Greater Bombay,

(b) Borivali taluka of Thana district, except the villages of Bhayandar, Bongri, Ghod Bunder, Kashi, Mire, Rai Murdhe and Uttan” etc.

Why have these villages been taken into consideration if Government are not going to take villages into consideration at all? Why does the Government criticise us for making a similar suggestion? And why not apply the same principle to other areas also? If Government really want to solve these problems and avoid the problem of minorities in the future, the only method through which you can proceed is by the method of appointing Boundary Commissions and taking contiguous linguistic areas and villages as the basis of decision. That is all that I have to say on this.

In the end I have to make one point with regard to Hyderabad State, and that is about Sirvancha taluk. Certain taluks in Hyderabad State were given away to other States according to the States Reorganisation Commission's Report. A certain formula has been evolved, and readjustments have been made. For example, in Raichur district, Gadwal and Alampur taluks were made part of Andhra Pradesh, instead of Karnatak. The formula is that if there are taluks where there are seventy per cent. of Telugu-speaking people or people speaking other languages, they

must be given away to respective linguistic states. So, accordingly Gadwal taluk and Alampur taluk were given to Andhra Pradesh. And also, Rajura and other taluks in Hyderabad were given to Samyukta Maharashtra. But the same thing has not been applied to Sirvancha taluk of Madhya Pradesh. In the Hyderabad Assembly this was discussed, and there was absolutely no difference of opinion between the Telingana Members and Maharashtra Members with regard to Sirvancha being made part of Andhra Pradesh. But I understand in the Joint Committee, only because the Madhya Pradesh Assembly has not discussed this point, they have not included it in Andhra Pradesh. I would request the Home Minister to go into this matter, because the very same formula which they have applied to other taluks can be applied to Sirvancha also and Sirvancha can easily be included in Andhra Pradesh. There is absolutely no controversy about it, because it contains more than seventy per cent of Telugu-speaking people. I would request the Home Minister to consider this point and include it at a later stage.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Mr. Speaker, as elected representatives of the nation, it is our duty not to foster or stimulate any centrifugal forces or disruptive tendencies in the Indian Union. Naturally, the Bombay Maharashtra issue has overcast the Indian horizon. We are sorry that this problem could not be tackled in a rational manner. There has been no settlement yet acceptable to both the parties. I visited Bombay after the tragic disturbances which took place there and I had consultation with the leaders of both the communities and also leading members of the industrial and business classes and I found that there was a genuine desire on the part of all concerned that there should be some honourable settlement. I expected the Prime Minister to go down to Bombay, and call a round table

conference to thrash out the differences. I made that appeal in the Parliament also and to the Prime Minister personally. If that had been done and the Prime Minister was relieved of party pressure coming from Bombay, then possibly something could have been done. Unfortunately, that has not been done. The result has been the exit of, if I may say so with respect, the most valued member of the Cabinet next to the Prime Minister. I said some time back in Parliament that the resignation of Shri C. D. Deshmukh from the Finance Minister's portfolio would be a first class national disaster. I still stick to that. I say this not because I have some respect for him as a man of unquestionable integrity, experience and ability as a financier, but because the very fact that Shri C. D. Deshmukh held the post of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Indian Union gave India a reputation, gave India a certain standing in the international field and that would have helped the working out of the Plan, for the successful implementation of which we have got to get financial aid from friendly countries outside. There, we have been disappointed. He has gone; he has left his portfolio. The result has been that our unfortunate Prime Minister, who is already overburdened with so many portfolios, is still more overburdened with the post of Chancellor of Exchequer. It is not merely the carrying on of routine duties of an ordinary Finance Minister now. You know, Sir, after the Company Law and other legislations that we have sponsored in this House, the Finance portfolio means looking after the intricate working of an ever-expanding bureaucratic and administrative machine, which is expanding in all directions. That would mean a terrific strain on him.

I am sorry for some of the observations that the ex-Finance Minister made. He had a reputation for balanced judgement; he had a reputation for objective thinking. I do not

think that it would be right to say that he made the indictment against the Prime Minister and against his colleagues out of passion or anger because he was leaving the Cabinet. He is too big a man for that kind of strategy. He has made certain statements of facts which need elucidation. The Prime Minister while he was in England at the Guildhall Banquet declared that India is the biggest democratic country in Asia. Some of us, who have had the privilege of visiting countries outside, have also said that we take delight and pride in the fact that we are the biggest democracy functioning in the east. What will the world think of us if one of the most valued colleagues of the Prime Minister makes an open indictment against the Prime Minister in this House, in this democratic chamber, that decisions on a matters so vital as that of Bombay, which concerns, not merely Maharashtra not merely one State or one people, but concerns the future of the whole of India, were taken without discharging even the constitutional obligation of consulting the colleagues in the Cabinet. He has painted our Prime Minister as a dictator, pursuing dictatorial methods and....

Shri Mohanlal Saksena (Lucknow Dist. cum Bara Banki Dist.): On a point of order, Sir, the Prime Minister has already denied the allegations made by the Finance Minister. It is not proper now to say all this. He has stated that this is not correct representation of facts.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: May I point out that the Prime Minister said—my hon. friend did not listen to him with the attention that he deserved—that this thing will be dealt with later on in the course of the debate. Therefore, this is very pertinent. All I am pointing out is....

Shri Mohanlal Saksena: About the decision of the Cabinet, the Prime Minister said that what he said was not correct.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I want to point out that it ill behoves the head of the executive of a democratic State if these facts are correct. I want to know categorically from the Prime Minister. He has not made merely a sweeping generalisation. The ex-Finance Minister has given facts. The factual statements are these. The first is that the Prime Minister's explanation that he was always free to announce Government's decisions is not valid as in on sense was the decision a decision of Government's. One Member of the Cabinet, and the only Maharashtrian Member of the Government is saying in open Parliament that the decision which the Prime Minister announced in Bombay as the decision of the Government was not a decision of the Government, because the Members of the Cabinet were not consulted. The second fact is that,—that is a factual statement that he is making—

"There was no consideration of the proposal in the Cabinet or even by circulation."

That means that it was the ukase of a dictator.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister said that he said in Bombay what was already in the Bill and the Bill is one which has been....

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I know that he has said that. I want a categorical statement from the Prime Minister whether this fact is true or not. One member of the Cabinet stands up and says that there was no consideration of the proposal in the Cabinet or even by circulation. He does not stop there. The third statement of fact which the ex-Finance Minister makes is:

"There was no individual consultation with members of the Cabinet known to be specially interested..."

Then he makes the point that there was no consultation even with the single Maharashtrian member in the

Cabinet, Shri C. D. Deshmukh, Then, he says:

"There is no record even of a meeting of a Committee of the Cabinet and to this day (that is yesterday) no authoritative text of the so-called decision is available to the members of the Cabinet."

Shri Kamath: No minutes.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: If these facts are correct, there is a good deal in the ex-Finance Minister's charge that the Prime Minister acted in an unconstitutional manner and decisions had been taken and announced on behalf of the Cabinet by certain unauthorised members of the Cabinet including the Prime Minister.

I am not interested in any inner circle. This kind of irregular camarilla developing in the Cabinet, arrogating and superarrogating to itself the powers of the Cabinet, in defiance of the elementary principles of parliamentary democracy or parliamentary form of Government, is a serious matter. I hope the Prime Minister will take the trouble of clarifying this matter.

The last sentence is clear and definite. He sent a copy to you, as he mentioned this morning, 24 hours before. He must have sent a copy to the Prime Minister also, because the Prime Minister had a reply ready. He says:

"The decision of last January in regard to placing Bombay City under Central administration was, again, without prior reference to the Cabinet."

This is a sad thing and it requires to be dealt with. But, apart from Bombay there are other States and other who have a great grievance, who have been treated unfairly, who feel they have been treated unjustly by the States Reorganisation Commission and also by the Government of India. The people of Maharashtra

are labouring under this kind of frustration. The people of Bengal, the people of Orissa and of the Punjab have also suffered. As a matter of fact, I had some experience having regard to my recent visit to some of the districts of the Punjab, and I found that the situation was very tense and acute. This Parliament should know it and should do something to ease the tension. Something was done due to the co-operation of Pandit Pant and Maulana Azad to ease the tension which developed in one town in the Punjab, but I am sorry to say that the tension is still there and it is still acute, and the Government of India will be labouring under a delusion if it thinks that it has settled the Punjab problem by the regional formula.

The regional formula, I am sorry to say, has not been accepted by large sections of the people of the Punjab. As a matter of fact, it is a crude device to divide the State on communal lines, and that will lead to no lasting peace. The States Reorganisation Commission has clearly found that there is no real language problem in the Punjab. Their finding is that the line of demarcation between the Punjabi and Hindi speaking areas in the State is more theoretical than real. They have also pointed out certain facts which Parliament should recognise. The Commission has observed that due to the large-scale influx of millions of Punjabi-speaking people from Western Punjab to all the districts of the State, the line has been further blurred. The Commission's definite and final finding is that there have been no distinctive cultural zones in the State. Therefore, I am afraid there is a good deal of force in the comment that this crude regional formula is something undemocratic something unconstitutional. You are really setting up two regions on a communal basis and you are pressing into service cultural or linguistic arguments for the purpose of camouflaging the real object, the real ob-

ject being the division of the Punjab on communal lines.

There is one other fact with regard to the Punjab which not merely concerns that unfortunate State, but the whole of India, and that is that the Joint Committee has not accepted, and the Government of India have not accepted, the basic recommendation of the States Reorganisation Commission that in the interests of the Punjab and both the plains and the hills, in the interests of India herself there should be an integration of the Punjab, PEPSU and Himachal Pradesh. I am very much impressed by one argument in the States Reorganisation Commission's Report. They have pointed out that the Indo-China border admits of easy infiltration and that considerations of security require the establishment of a stronger and more resourceful unit than the present Himachal Pradesh. No doubt the primary responsibility for defence must be that of the Centre, but the Commission rightly points out that a considerable burden relating to security arrangements must be borne by the State. It is in the national interests that this border State should be well-administered, stable and resourceful, capable of meeting emergent problems arising out of military exigencies. And you know what is happening in the Indo-China border. Therefore, we must be particularly careful. We should build up a resourceful, stable, resilient unit in that part of the country. Therefore, I strongly urge that the recommendation of the Commission that both PEPSU and Himachal Pradesh should be merged in the Punjab should receive very sympathetic consideration from this House, and the proposal for the formation of regional Committees with the Governor having the despotic power to even veto the legislature should not be accepted. That is undemocratic. That is against the spirit of the Indian Constitution and will really mean detracting the Governor from his position of neutrality

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

and will land him in continual and controversial politics.

I am sorry to say that with regard to Orissa nothing has been done. They have a genuine grievance with regard to Seraikella and Kharswan and also the Sadar Sub-Division of Singhbhum District. On account of technical reasons these claims were not considered at all. Something should be done, otherwise there will be continued cleavage and continuous trouble.

Coming back to Bombay, what I want to point out is this. I see no logic, no principle in the decision of the Government of India. You will remember that the Commission has recommended that with regard to Andhra and Telengana, they should be kept two separate units. They said there should be no merger, there should be no immediate integration. They pointed out that they should continue so for five, six or seven years and they said that after the next general elections if the legislature of Telengana by a two-thirds majority voted in favour of integration, then and then only there should be an integration of the two States. That recommendation has been negated by the wisdom of the Government and that of the Joint Committee. In my opinion that is the right thing to do. The right thing to do is to have immediate integration and not to keep the two States separate. They are both speaking the same language, they have got the same cultural background, it was not therefore right to keep them separate. Not only that. I think the Prime Minister himself said: "Why keep them separate for five years and then think of integration? During these intervening five years their energies will be dissipated and their attention will be diverted over this artificial issue of integration or no integration and therefore all plans for economic development will be completely held up and we will never be

able to build up Vishal Andhra." We want linguistic States for marking real advance towards social democracy. We do not want it for the purpose of weakening India. We all want to build up a dynamic concept of India but that dynamic concept must be based on the recognition of the fundamental fact of our Indian social fabric, that through the ages and centuries and decades Indian nationalism has been built up on the united and combined strength of the federating or constituent units. And that has never stood in the way of Indian nationalism. As a matter of fact, the Commission itself has recorded its deliberate finding that since Mahatma Gandhi sponsored this regional formula and formed the Congress constitution on that basis, on the basis of linguistic principle, it became a dynamic organisation, and became a potent instrument for fighting India's battle for freedom. Therefore, I am pleading for a harmonious and real synthesis between regional patriotism and Indian nationalism.

You have negated the basic recommendation of the Commission in regard to Andhra and Telengana. They were meant to be kept separate for five years and they said after five years, through some kind of democratic set-up the people would vote and decide what would be their future. You have completely negated it, and I maintain you have rightly negated it. Now, what is good for Andhra-Telengana is good for Bombay and Maharashtra. Will not through all these five years tension continue? Will not for all these five years their energies will be utilised and dissipated, if I may say so, over this unfortunate squabble?

With regard to the future set-up, the Commission has unanimously recommended that whatever you do, never make Bombay an enclave under the Centre, that would be a retrograde step, that would be an unfortunate step. What are you doing today? You are paying lip homage to the great cosmopolitan and progressive city of Bombay. You say it is inhabited by

all people and is a miniature of India, but you are reducing it to the status of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, of Tripura and Manipur, without a democratic set-up. Even if you had made it City-State with a certain kind of paraphernalia of a City State legislature, I can understand that the spontaneous demonstration of popular will be exercised and expressed through popular channel but what are you doing? You are completely weeding out the local legislature. Is this paying homage to the cosmopolitan City? What is this cosmopolitan City I cannot for the life of me understand. The first day I went to the Prime Minister I told him : "For Heaven's sake do not listen to this kind of argument of a cosmopolitan City, the big bosses of capital dictating to you and the Government of India and the Parliament of India that there shall be no integration with the geographical hinterland." I told him and I am telling all my hon. friends today that if you push that argument to its logical conclusion, tomorrow all the Marwaris and capitalists the Armenions and Parsis in our big commercial cities can advance such a claim. The commercial life of Calcutta is dominated by non-Bengalis. They can demand tomorrow that they shall not be under Dr. Bidhan Chandra Roy, but shall be under the Prime Minister of India. You are stimulating these disruptive forces by following this kind of weak-kneed policy towards big capital. I can tell you that this has been overdone. This so-called apprehension of big capital has been exaggerated, has been overdone and there is very little foundation for it, I think Shri Asoka Mehta said it, I have also said it; I can tell you that the Maharashtra leaders have told me that they are perfectly willing to sit round a table for the purpose of discussing any constitutional safeguards which the Gujerathi capitalists want, which the Ahmedabad millowners want, or anybody else want for having some kind of safety and security. To allay their apprehensions they are perfectly prepared to do that. I maintain even today if the Prime Minister takes

people into confidence and has some kind of a round table conference....

Shri S. S. More: He has confidence only in Congress people.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I do not want that kind of confidence. I appeal to him to get out of the party ruts. I appeal to him to take a wider perspective. I appeal to him that in this crisis he should rise to great heights and call all parties together, all interests together and it is not beyond the bounds of constructive statemanship to devise some kind of a formula or safeguard for the purpose of allaying the apprehensions of other communities and enlisting their sympathies.

I do not share the feelings of my comrades: down with capitalists and finish with them. I do not even share the feeling of Shri Gadgil who says: we will sweep away the capitalists from Bombay when we get it. That was an unfortunate statement. What I am saying is this. Everybody who has got the right to function under the Indian Constitution and to carry on his business and industry has the fundamental right to do so, unfettered, undeterred, unchecked, unmolested by any kind of pin-pricks of difficulties or impediments created by unfair or improper administration. But even beyond the Constitution of India if you think that the constitutional safeguards in Part III in the Constitution are not quite enough, if you think that having regard to the peculiar sentiments, or the peculiar proclivities which the unfortunate people of Maharashtra have recently displayed, something more is needed, they are perfectly prepared to do it.

I am not going—it is your ruling and I must bow down to your ruling—into the shootings and killings and other things. I know that non-violence is much more potent than violence. My friend Mr. Maltra would not have been here defeating one of the most powerful rival candidates, if we had not stuck to the path of non-violence. And through non-violence we defeated the

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

crazy move for merger. Even if some Maharashtrians have misbehaved, can the misbehaviour of a few hundred people be debited against an entire people or against an entire community? Should they be stigmatised for ever? Should they be deprived of their just birthright? The Prime Minister of India had the candour, had the courage to announce clearly, candidly, categorically, that Bombay belongs to Maharashtra geographically. Very eminent people sitting on the Treasury Benches also admit that it shall have to go to Maharashtra. Then why create trouble unnecessarily?

I thought that the Pataskar formula was something which was worthy of consideration. I know it was rejected. But that was a formula which with certain amendments and certain modifications could be rationally accepted by all concerned. Remember that this is the province which produced Ranade, Gokhale and Bal Gangadhar Tilak. That is the province which has produced some of the greatest sons of India. The father of Indian nationalism, Valentine Chirel has said it was Lokmanya Tilak. The British took India not from the Moghuls; the British captured power from the hands of the Marathas. I was reading Lokmanya Tilak's last words before he died. His last words were: "Oh, what a misery? 1818 to 1918, one century of servitude—I cannot tolerate." And then he died. That great son of India was not merely thinking for the liberation of Maharashtra. He was fighting with his life-blood not merely for raising his community or his province. He was not a communalist; nor a provincialist. He was an all-India leader, the greatest nationalist born to give a new turn to our freedom movement. You know it was the names Bal, Lal, Pal which galvanised young India, which gave a unique momentum to our independence movement. That great man said: from 1818 to 1918. 1818 was the year of the collapse of the Maharashtra power, when the British took India from the Marathas. They were the people who ruled from one end of

India to the other. They supplanted the greatest Empire by their valour and statesmanship. Do not do anything to stigmatise them for the crimes of offences, or aberrations or misdeeds of few dozens or hundreds of them. Still they are a great people. As Pandit Pant said they are a proud people and a sensitive people. Now what crime have they committed that this kind of doom should be pronounced on them? Is it a crime which can never be atoned in any way? Can't you say that for one year or two years they will be under the Centre and then automatically they shall go to Maharashtra?

I am absolutely sure that whatever may be the advertised apprehensions of the big capital, not one of them shall run away from Bombay. Suppose Mr. Deshmukh is made the Chief Minister of Maharashtra, not one of them, neither Birla, nor Dalmia, nor any of the great Parsi or Gujerati houses will run away from Bombay. I am quite sure that they know the art of adjusting themselves, they know the art of adaptation, fitting in with the new set-up. Kindly remember one thing. We have been looking at it from a wrong perspective. Apart from Bombay, throughout Maharashtra, is not the commercial life, is not the economic life, is not the business life, completely in the hands of non-Maharashtrians? Are not the Gujerathi and Marwari traders and capitalists dominating to a large extent the economic life? Take Sholapur Is not the biggest mill in their hands. The same is the case with Jalgaon, Chalisgaon, Nagpur, Poona and other places. Go to any important place in the hinterland of Maharashtra. Not in one place has there been any report of any persecution or torture, or looting or shooting or murder or anything in any part. Take Nagpur. It is going to be one of the important places in the new Maharashtra set-up. The biggest mills, the Empress and other mills are in the hands of non-Maharashtrians. Have they ever complained or demanded any safeguard? Have they ever demanded

any constitutional rights over and above those guaranteed by the Constitution of India? There might have been temporary misunderstandings or temporary frenzy. But for the sake of that temporary frenzy or misunderstanding do not inflict this terrible verdict on this great people. I am still hoping that some thing will be done in order to bridge the gulf and that will be doing a great service not merely to Bombay and Maharashtra but to the whole of India. I am hoping that even now sanity will dawn. Something should be done on a rational basis. Some mechanism acceptable to all should be evolved and if necessary certain constitutional safeguards can be devised for the purpose of allaying the legitimate apprehensions in certain quarters, economic, uneconomic, genuine or not genuine. But if they are genuine, well, they have got to be met and they can still be completely met by proper safeguards or by proper administrative rules or administrative formula which can be devised through the goodwill and co-operation of all concerned.

Shri Anandchand (Bilaspur): As a Member of the Joint Committee, I think I would be failing in my duty, if I did not acknowledge the tribute paid to us by the Home Minister yesterday. We on our part have also been quite charmed by what I might name as the 'Pant touch', which was one of unfailing courtesy, firmness and humour, and giving due credit to the other man's point of view, howsoever he might differ from him.

I this debate, in this great House, even after so many months, the issue, of Bombay still remains a controversial one. But I believe we forget in the heat of Bombay a very vital matter, a matter for great satisfaction, that barring Bombay, at least the other issues concerning reorganisation have been amicably settled. Otherwise, the lime-light would have come upon them in this debate.

Shri Begawat (Ahmednagar South): What about border issues?

Shri Anandchand: So far as border issues are concerned, I shall come to them later.

If that is so, and if what I have stated is correct, it is some tribute to this House, and in a small measure, to the Joint Committee also, for the labour that they have put in during the first fourteen days of this month, in trying to improve in whatever manner they could, the provisions of the Bill they had in their hands.

Before I proceed further, I should like to touch briefly the question of the border disputes, which has been raised by my hon. friend there. There is quite a lot of substance in what Dr. Lanka Sundaram has said about the appointment of boundary commissions. But in my opinion, such a step should be taken only in the last resort. I think every effort should be made to tackle the issues of boundary disputes between the States and to see with the Union Government acting as a referee, that justice is done in all those cases. There are, of course, cases—I hope they will be very few—in which both the States who are parties to the dispute do not agree, or where even the goodwill and good wishes of the Government of India do not prove to be of any avail to bring about the necessary accommodation between the parties. In that case, I think there would be special grounds for the appointment of a boundary commission, because, after all, we must close these issues by some kind of a judicial pronouncement, and a boundary commission would be the proper forum for giving such a pronouncement in these difficult cases.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: With or without a statutory provision?

Shri Anandchand: Of course, with a statutory provision.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: But there is none in the Bill.

Shri Anandchand: I support the view that there should be one.

Speaking now about the new States I personally am one of those who

[Shri Anandchand]

have supported the linguistic idea. I think linguistic States are good for this country, because they bring about an expression of view, of opinion, of harmoniously living together and also they bring out the best in a community having the same ties of culture, of language and of living. But there is always the danger in these States of one tendency which can be a drawback, such as the extreme, linguistic loyalty, an exhibition of which we have seen in the resignation of our former Finance Minister, I am not going into the merits or demerits of what he did. But I am only saying that if a person right at the top, right at the helm of affairs, a person who has been in the Union Cabinet for so many years, could have his emotions swayed on linguistic grounds, on grounds of linguistic affinity or linguistic loyalty, then that shows that here is something which can be a danger to this country in the long run.

[Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]
2-14 P.M.

If the component units of the Indian Union work as a rainbow, with their various colours blending into one, then, all these linguistic States will do good to the country. But if the loyalty to the State comes before the loyalty to India, and if we consider that we are citizens of the State only and not citizens of India, then there is a great danger to the unity of this country, and safeguards must be provided for from now on, if we are not to break as under in the times to come.

I welcome the idea of the zonal councils. Some of my hon. friends here, I have seen, are rather apprehensive about the utility of these zonal councils. They say, "These are being created as States over States, doing nothing, and having only advisory powers. What will they achieve in the long run. After all, they are just a heterogenous collection of several people who have been brought together." In certain respects, perhaps, their argument is valid. But then

they have a certain utility. That utility, to my mind, is that they would, and they are bound to, act as a sort of check on separatist tendencies. They would be a forum for the discussion of various problems of common concern. They will also serve very useful in this sense that joint action can be taken through them on a social and economic planning. Therefore, in my opinion, the scheme of zonal councils, in the Bill, as it has now been presented before us, is a welcome proposal, and I am sure, it is bound to prove helpful to this country in times to come.

Now, coming to the question of Bombay, although it has raised a storm of controversy, I think I would be failing in my duty, if I did not touch it. Of course, I cannot say much about it with authority, because it is separated by hundreds of miles from my homeland. But still, from whatever I have seen, and whatever I have heard—in fact, I have been to Bombay even recently; I was there only two or three days ago;—I have found, (by talking to people in Bombay, whether they were taxi-wallas, panwallas, or fellows in the Irani restaurant) that there is a feeling among people other than Maharashtrians, that so far as the Bombay city is concerned, its immediate merger... (Shri Bogawat: Hear, hear) ...with Maharashtra would not be desirable.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Premature jubilation!

Shri Bogawat: Exactly the wrong information.

Shri Anandchand: Why is that feeling there? I tried to go to the root of that feeling. I find that the feeling is mostly on account of the happenings, which were so unfortunate, in Bombay, after the announcement of the report, and the decisions about Bombay and so on. The Speaker has just ruled that it would be improper to go into all those riots, killings and so on and so forth. But I was only

going to say that a certain amount of apprehension has been created in the public mind that there is a kind of force being employed.....

Shri S. S. More: May I know how many non-Maharashtrians my hon. friend met?

Shri Anandchand: I met over three hundred, in fact, more than the number my hon. friend Shri S. S. More has met in the recent past.

Shri S. S. More: He met only three hundred in a population of more than thirty lakhs.

Shri Anandchand: Yes, in ten days. But my hon. friend has not met even so many during the last six months, for he has not been in Bombay.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may proceed with his speech.

Shri S. S. More: Non-official investigation?

Shri Anandchand: Whatever I am speaking, I am speaking with a full sense of authority. I am sorry that my hon. friend has not met even that number. I consider Shri S. S. More as a great friend of mine, and I value his opinion very much.

Shri S. S. More: It is my misfortune.

Shri Anandchand: If he says so, I think it is mine also.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Unfriendly friends!

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Let us resume the discussion on the point.

Shri Anandchand: I was saying that there is this feeling among the people there. I think my hon. friend was only trying to jump to the conclusion from this that, therefore, Bombay should not be given to Maharashtra. I was only going to say, 'In that context, what would be the correct thing to do?' Would it be correct just to yield to all the pressure tactics, whether they be inside the House or outside, and say, without any opinion

being taken, and without any opportunity being given to the people of Bombay proper to voice their opinion, that automatically the city of Bombay will go to the Maharashtra States? That, to my mind, would not be proper. I am absolutely certain that that would look improper in the eyes of everybody who considers it dispassionately.

I know that there is a lot of passion excited in this matter, whether in the minds of the Maharashtrians in Poona, or in the minds of those at Nagpur or elsewhere. And I find in this House also there is a lot of passion on this matter. It is quite true that geographically, Bombay is surrounded on all sides by Maharashtra. But what is the position? I think undue emphasis is being placed on this matter that Bombay is going to be under Central control.

Now, what is Central control? To my mind, Central control, or reducing the city of Bombay to the status of a Union territory, is just a stop-gap 'make-device' for letting passions cool for the time being and then taking a decision about its ultimate future. The time interval may be five years, two years, or even two months. But the point is that there is an opinion in Bombay, howsoever small it might be, and therefore, it is not absolutely right to give the city straightway to Maharashtra. Why not give a chance, and why not give some time to the people of Bombay to express themselves in a democratic manner? That is what I would like to urge.

I think personally that this was accepted by the Joint Committee also. My own proposal in the Joint Committee was that after a time, things should automatically be settled. But the point was this. We discussed this matter very fully there, and one thing that was realised there was that the people of Bombay should be consulted about their future at some stage or other. And that stage can only come if Bombay remains under Central administration even after the creation

[Shri Anandchand]

of Maharashtra as a separate State. Now, the point is that the Prime Minister's decision that it should be taken up in five years and so on has been very largely protested against. All right. If five years are too long, I do not see why five years should be put in why there should be anything in these five years. There was the formula of Shri Pataskar; who is sitting on the Bench opposite. The Pataskar Formula, I believe—if I have read it correctly or known it correctly is that after two years, the thing should 'automatically go'. Now, two years might be all right. I have no objection to it. But why automatic? I cannot understand the question of 'automatic'.

That is why, Sir, I have also tried in a small note I have appended to the Report to say that once you create these territories, I am certain that the wishes of the people residing there—in Himachal Pradesh or in Bombay or in Tripura or in Manipur—should be taken into account. They must be consulted. Eventually, it is for Parliament to decide.

There was the Bengal-Bihar Bill here. Perhaps it would be premature for me to say anything about it now. But are the other Members of Parliament not going to decide about these two States? There is a great deal of feeling in these two States. One is against surrendering any area to the other, and the other thinks that the area given is not large enough. But then, is not the whole country the arbiter of these things? Is only one State to be the arbiter? Are we going to succumb to people when they shout out? Are we going to say to them, 'We agree because you shout loud'? No, Sir. That would be wrong. That would never be democratic.

Whatever be the effect of the decision about Bombay—and I am sure Maharashtra has got a case for Bombay—this is not a recent decision. There are voices raised that this is a

recent decision. How is it a recent decision? I tried to find out even old books about this matter. As far as back as 1946, in the Dar Commission's Report, although the question of linguistic provinces was discussed—they had specially discussed the question of Bombay and the question of Madras also—they said that when Andhra was formed, the question of Madras should be looked into. The Telugu-speaking people said that they had a certain amount of interest in Madras. The Telugu-speaking people in Madras numbered about 2 or 3 lakhs out of 9 lakhs, and the Tamilians numbered about 6 or 7 lakhs. I think the Tamilians were in a majority of over 51 per cent. But even then, the Commission said that when the State of Andhra was formed, the question of Madras should be properly looked into. They also said in 1948 that when the question came of the creation of Maharashtra and Gujarat, there should be proper emphasis, there should be proper looking into about the special position of Bombay. They said the decision about Bombay would have to be on that basis. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons why the Dar Commission recommended what I might call the postponement of the question of the immediate creation of linguistic States was that they were apprehensive that these questions like Bombay and Madras would tend to disrupt unity rather than bring about unity. They were also apprehensive that the Indian States, which were just coming into the Union, were not properly integrated with it. Therefore, sometime must be given before they were properly integrated.

So, Sir, I submit that passion and heat should not come into the picture. I would appeal to my friends, Shri S. S. More particularly, who seems to be annoyed with me at the moment, to consider this dispassionately.

Shri S. S. More: Passion and heat ought to be reserved only for Bilaspur and no other State.

Shri Anandchand: Not at all. I think there again it is passion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It has been equally shared.

Shri Anandchand: I do not share at all.

I will not say anything further about it, and I will leave it at that.

The other question is about Punjab. There again probably there may be something which this hon. House might not like. But I feel that whatever it is, whatever I feel I must speak out. The Punjab problem is also very much there, as you yourself know. But, as I stated in this House last November or December, the problem the Punjab was faced with at the time of the reorganisation of States was its complete dismemberment. On the one side, there was Himachal Pradesh which wanted to be a separate State. On the other, there was the Haryana Pranth which wanted to be separate from the Punjab. There was then the question of the Sikhs wanting a Punjabi Suba. So unless some means was evolved to solve the Punjab tangle, there was the question of the complete breaking up of that State on the border of India.

Now, with all its faults, to my mind, the regional formula has produced one good result, and that is, that there is going to be one Punjab, one Legislature, one Governor, one Ministry and one Cabinet.

Dr. Jaisoorya (Medak): But not one mind.

Shri Anandchand: I am sure that also will blend in due course.

Therefore, there is something that it has brought about. But there is an apprehension which the hon. Member, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, expressed when he just now spoke about the Punjab—I know he speaks with authority on the subject. The apprehension is that this regional formula is laying the foundation for the creation of a Punjabi Suba. So, is this

regional formula going to result in the coming together in amity and goodwill of both the communities of the Punjab, Hindus on the one hand and Sikhs on the other?

Now, as far as I have been able to see, most of the agitation that has been launched by the Maha Punjab Samiti and otherwise against the regional formula has been based on their apprehension that in due course of time perhaps this formula will have laid the foundation of a Punjabi Suba or a separate Sikh State. That apprehension might be coming into their minds because of the Sikh population of the Punjabi-speaking areas, as now demarcated, in the districts of Amritsar, Jullundur, Ludhiana, Ferozpur, Gurdaspur, Hoshiarpur and parts of Ambala, and in PEPSU, in the districts of Patiala, Bhatinda, Kapurthala, Barnala, Fategarh and, to a certain extent, in Sangrur. The total population of these Punjabi-speaking areas, as it is according to the Sachar formula and the PEPSU formula, comes to about 91 lakhs, and in this the Sikh population accidentally would be more than 52 lakhs. If that is the question, the apprehension might be there that probably in the carving out of these Punjabi-speaking areas, if the Sikh population is over 56 or 57 per cent in the Punjabi zone, the Hindus in that region will be relegated to a subordinate position. Therefore, they have this fear and apprehension expressed in various forms.

Now, whatever facts there are—or there happen to be—geographically or linguistically, on account of the people who are living there, we cannot alter them. But I believe that if the demarcation of the Punjabi zone or the Punjabi-speaking areas were done with due consideration to geographical contiguity, cultural and linguistic affinity and administrative convenience, much of these apprehensions could be removed, and the fear that this is just the beginning or the thin end of the wedge would go to a very large extent.

[Shri Anandchand]

Lastly, I come to the question of the Union territories. I for my part would agree with the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission that the number of Union Territories were as small as possible, because there is a lacuna, a serious drawback, in these Territories that they are going to be without a democratic form of Government in their day to day administration. Now, as the picture has emerged, four Territories have been added to them. Even according to the States Reorganisation Commission's Report, there were three and now there are seven, and they are to include—for a short time, I hope—the City of Bombay also, which is being relegated to the status of a Territory.

Now, although I am grateful to the Joint Committee for considering this question dispassionately—they were very considerate and they have given due weightage, more weightage really, to the Union Territories in Parliament which is going to be the legislature for these Territories henceforth—at the same time, two things need further attention of this House and of Government so far as the administration of these Territories is concerned. Firstly, I would request that a clear indication as to the administrative patterns of these Territories, especially with regard to the association of the people with the day to day administration, may be given in this House at the appropriate time, when the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill is under discussion, because although the relevant article, 239,—and I think my hon. friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram, has also in his Minute of Dissent said that there should be some sort of pronouncement by Government as to the set-up of these Territories—as amended, gives Parliament the power to legislate about these Territories, which is a distinct improvement on the old draft, still I hope and trust that Government will do something and make a pronouncement about the method in which the association of the people

of these Territories is to be brought about with their day to day administration.

Then, the second point which I want to bring to your notice is this, the method of choosing the representatives of these territories. Under the Constitution (Amendment) Bill, as it will now come, this has been left to Parliament. It is good. Parliament, naturally, would like that the representatives of the Union territories in this sovereign House could be directly chosen from the territorial constituencies in the territories in the same manner as in the other States. But, I only want to put in a word about the Upper House, that is, the Rajya Sabha. I think the system of electoral colleges that has worked in the States like Kutch, Manipur and Tripura, where there were no Legislative Assemblies even now is a suitable one and in the case of election of Members to the Rajya Sabha this system should be adopted rather than any other system such as election direct or indirect by the Panchayats or other similar bodies. I may only say that the Panchayats or other bodies, though they are elected, at the present moment, as the law stands, they are not elected under a system of free and secret ballot. I know that most of the elections in panchayats are held by the raising of hands or otherwise by voices. After all that will do for local administration. To my mind, therefore, people elected by such bodies would not be the proper persons for electing Members of Parliament, to the Upper House and the present good system of electoral colleges directly elected from the people would be the correct thing to do.

Shri Dabhi (Kaira North): I express my great satisfaction at the idea that, as a result of the passing of this Bill, Gujerat State could be formed. But, at the same time, I cannot conceal my dissatisfaction at the knowledge that certain areas which legitimately belong to Gujerat are not

likely to be included in Gujerat State. But, Gujrat is not, I assure you, going to take to the methods which certain sections of our Maharashtra brethren have adopted with a view to getting Bombay included in Maharashtra.

I could have described in detail these methods of coercion, intimidation and molestation of women but I refrain from doing that because the hon. Speaker has ruled that we must not refer to those matters. I hope that you will not allow other Members also, including the ex-Finance Minister, to speak on these matters. If I were allowed to refer to those methods, then, I would have certainly shown very effectively how baseless and reckless and malicious the allegations that the ex-Finance Minister has made against the Bombay Government and the Chief Minister of Bombay are. Several hon. Members of this House have tasted the hospitality at the hands of the Bombay Maharashtra people at the time of the last All India Congress Committee meeting.

I only want to refer to one matter which concerns one of my hon. friends in this House and which shows what sort of mentality these Maharashtra brethren have. You know the hon. Members from Maharashtra was a Member of the Joint Committee. He failed to send a minute of dissent. For the fault that he did not append a minute of dissent, I am reliably informed, his house in Khandesh was stoned. This is the atmosphere there. This is not only in Bombay but in other parts of Maharashtra also. I shall say nothing more about it.

Yesterday, Swami Ramananda Tirtha said that there was not one valid argument for not including Bombay in Maharashtra. With due respect to him I say there is not one valid argument for including Bombay in Maharashtra.

An Hon. Member: Not even one!

Shri Dabhi: Not even one. (Interruption) It belongs to the whole of India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: At least this House is meant for hearing different opinions.

Shri Dabhi: Practically all the arguments which could be advanced in favour of including Bombay in Maharashtra have been stated in the joint minute of dissent written by my friends Shri Altekaf and Shri Deogirikar. I will briefly refer to each of these arguments.

The first argument which has been advanced is this:

"The geographical position of the city is happily no longer a matter of controversy. The city is a part of and surrounded by the territory of Maharashtra...."

Everybody knows that Bombay is an island. It is surrounded on 3 sides actually by the sea and on one side there is a small strip of land which is no more than a corridor which is inhabited by bilingual people. There are people speaking different languages, most of whom are aboriginals.

They have also said that the Prime Minister has said unequivocally that Bombay is a part of Maharashtra. Let us see what words have been used by the Prime Minister. There was some discussion and some Maharashtra friends suggested that they would have some consolation if the Prime Minister said something to satisfy them. The Prime Minister used those words—that Bombay may be considered as part of Maharashtra geographically. This is what the Prime Minister said. Somebody also said that Bombay formed part of Maharashtra and it was proved. Even taking it for granted that the Prime Minister had said that Bombay forms part of Maharashtra geographically, if you quote him you must quote him completely. He also said that only geography should not be the reason for including Bombay in Maharashtra.

An Hon. Member: Do you accept geography or not?

Shri Dabhi: I say that is an island. (Interruption).

The second argument is that Maharashtra feeds Bombay with water and electricity and therefore it should go to Maharashtra. If this argument is to be accepted, then the Punjab is going to feed Delhi and Rajasthan and so these should go to Punjab. This is a most funny argument which has been advanced by our friends.

The third argument advanced is this: "The fact that Maharashtrians are not in absolute majority in Bombay has no significance." That Maharashtrians are not there in a majority has been admitted by them, but yet they say that it is of no significance. It is a strange argument to say that because they are in a minority, Bombay must go to Maharashtra. I think it does not lie in the mouths of those who talk of provinces based on language, to speak in this way.

An Hon. Member: What about Hyderabad?

Shri Dabhi: I will reply to everything in due course. Everyone of them has forgotten to speak about the Dar Commission Report and the J.V.P. Report. According to my friends here, only those portions which suited them in these Reports are valid and the rest is invalid.

Yet another argument is this: "It is contended that Bombay has grown not as a capital of any unilingual State but of a multi-lingual one. But such is the case with Calcutta and Madras." To this argument, the members of the S.R.C. themselves at page 116 of their Report have given a reply: "The Maharashtrians in the city, according to the 1951 Census, still remain a minority, being only 43.6 per cent. of the population. The position of the city, therefore, is different from that of Madras and Calcutta, where the dominant language groups account for about two-thirds of the population." So, the

Commission itself has stated why the Bombay State is quite different from Calcutta and Madras.

In the Dar Commission and J.V.P. reports it is also said that "in the event of the disintegration of the Bombay State, Bombay City should be constituted into a separate unit." The members of the S.R.C. themselves describe these conclusions as weighty expression of opinion—I refer to the opinions of the Dar Commission as well as of the J.V.P. Report. The S.R.C. themselves say that the reasons given by these two bodies were weighty observations. Still our friends here attach no importance whatsoever to these previous Reports because they go against them.

Again, in their joint minute of dissent, the hon. Members after stating that the Prime Minister has made a declaration that Bombay should be Centrally administered for about five years and then its future should be determined by a democratic process add:

"Though Bombay may not be styled as the capital of Maharashtra, all the offices of the Government of Maharashtra should be allowed to remain therein. Otherwise thousands of Maharashtrian families will be uprooted therefrom, and when Bombay becomes the capital of Maharashtra, the returning officers, staff and their families will find no place for residence there. The Prime Minister does not desire that this should happen."

Of course, the Prime Minister does not desire that all Government servants should go. Therefore, he has categorically assured the members of the service that even if the Bombay city is Centrally administered, they would not be at any disadvantage. If Bombay is Centrally administered, it does not mean that all those now serving there will go to Maharashtra. Out of the Maharashtrian officers serving there, only a few topmost officers may have to go to Maharashtra. I do

not know how that will affect the whole population of Bombay. Our friends seem to think (*Interruptions*)....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I can assure the hon. Member that there will be less of trouble for him if he looks towards me instead of directing his attention to other Members.

Shri Dabhi: Our friends seem to think that Bombay should remain the capital of Maharashtra for this reason, namely, that Bombay is sure to go to Maharashtra after some time. They say, why not make it capital of Maharashtra just now. They make it to appear as if even the Prime Minister has realised that and conceded that. They take it for granted that Bombay is going to Maharashtra. How can you now say that Bombay will go to Maharashtra? That has to be decided in future.

Our hon. Members are talking of democracy and yet they do not approve of the democratic process by which Bombay's future is to be decided. If I have read anything of history anywhere, 'democracy' means the will of the people. The Prime Minister has said that, after five years, Bombay's future will be decided by a democratic process. That is what the Prime Minister wrote in reply to Shri Deogirikar who asked for a clarification. He is of the opinion that the will of the people will be taken, and what the people will then decide will be final. This is a definite promise that is given by the Prime Minister. I do not understand by what logic my hon. friends opposite assert that Bombay is sure to go to Maharashtra. The real fact is that they have no confidence in what will happen after five years or even for that matter after two years. They have their fears about the fact whether the people as a whole would vote for Bombay going to Maharashtra if any plebiscite is taken in the future. Other wise, I cannot understand for the life of me why an individual or group of individuals talking of democratic pro-

368 LSD.

cesses should be against this democratic process being adopted in the case of Bombay.

Shri Gurupadaswamy stated that if Bombay is to be Centrally administered, the people of Bombay would lose their democratic rights, the right of having their Assembly, etc. The Congress Working Committee recommended that Bombay should be made a City State and the Government were prepared to accept that recommendation, in which case the people would have got their democratic rights and would have had their Assembly. But the Maharashtrian friends do not want Bombay to be made into a City State. On the other hand, they are opposing democratic methods. So, I think that the real reason why they oppose this is because they are not sure of their own ground.

I have only one more point and then I shall finish. From the report of the States Reorganisation Commission it is clear that the surplus from Greater Bombay will be more than Rs. 12 crores per year. My suggestion is that the surplus of Bombay should primarily be used for the purpose of providing greater amenities to the people and for raising the standard of living of the people of Bombay, now that Bombay is going to be a Centrally administered area. Only after providing all the necessary amenities for the people of Bombay, and only after raising the standard of living of the people of Bombay, should the balance, if any, be taken over by the Centre for other purposes. That is a practical suggestion of mine, because I think that the Bombay people themselves are entitled to the revenue surplus of Bombay. So long as all their legitimate requirements are not met properly, it is not proper either for the Central Government or for any other State Government to have a share in that surplus amount.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena: I rise to support the motion before the House. In doing so, I would like to make a few observations. I agree with the

[Shri Mohanlal Saksena]

Home Minister that the Bill, as it has emerged from the Joint Committee, is an improvement upon the original Bill. It is not a small achievement, looking to the conditions obtaining and considering that passions have been roused and are still running high, and even leaders have been excited and those who have the reputation for balanced judgment have been swept off their feet. When motives are attributed to the leaders and when even the highest amongst us are not spared, it is indeed creditable that the Joint Committee should have hammered out a Bill which is an improvement on the previous Bill. The credit goes both to the Chairman of the Committee, the hon. Home Minister, for his ability and tact with which he guided the deliberations as also to the Members of the Committee, for their reasonable attitude and farsighted statesmanship in producing a Bill which has not got as many Minutes of Dissent as many of us must have apprehended.

Having said this, I proceed to make my next observation on the Bill. It does not mean that I agree with every provision of the Bill. I do not say that there are no provisions in the Bill with which I am not at all in agreement. My views have been known to the Members of the House as I have spoken more than once. I have said that I am not in favour of linguistic States. I have given my reasons for that. I do not want to repeat them. I have also said that I am not for the zonal councils as provided in the Bill. The zonal councils as provided in the Bill are merely advisory bodies, and I have always thought that the zonal councils should have some powers to start with, these powers might be delegated to them by the Centre. In any case they must have some powers and that would give an opportunity for the different States to come together and provide a framework for the future bilingual States or multi-lingual States. Not that I believe any material

changes will be made at this stage, but I believe that this Bill is going to be changed, say, within five years. I hope that when the dim and heat of the controversy have subsided, when the tempers have cooled down, when people set to work calmly, the people will realise—many of us will realise—that we have not been fair or just in what we have said or expressed.

At present, the target of all the criticism is that the sub-committee of the Cabinet or the High Command have not been fair. It is said that they have not been fair and just to this State or that State. I know that the sub-committee of the Cabinet tried to consult the people outside as well as inside this House, the question was asked: "Why were not the leaders of the Opposition parties consulted?" But was not an opportunity given to the Members of this House to express their views in the House on the report of the States Reorganisation Commission? The leaders of the Opposition were given ample time and those Members who were not able to find time to speak in the House were permitted by the Speaker to express their views in writing and sent them on to the Secretariat. This was done. So, the grievance that the views of the Members of this House were not obtained or that they were not consulted does not arise. It cannot be made a grievance of. The hon. Prime Minister has said in his reply to the statement made by Shri C. D. Deshmukh that he has consulted all sections of this House as also the Members of the Cabinet and also public opinion outside, and that the decisions of the sub-committee of the Cabinet were communicated from time to time to the Cabinet. Still in the face of this statement, Shri N. C. Chatterjee has tried to pick holes and stated that the decision taken and announced by the Prime Minister was without authority. He said that this action of the Prime Minister will make the world feel that the Prime Minister was functioning as an autocrat, though

he has been described as the greatest democrat elsewhere.

The Prime Minister has been accused by one of his erstwhile colleagues. It is unfortunate for the gentleman who made that statement and it is unfortunate for the country as a whole. But still, some Members repeat that statement or are basing their arguments on that statement even after an emphatic contradiction by the Prime Minister. I think the Member who made that statement has broadcast the very thing which he wanted to avoid.

When the Prime Minister was in London and was presented with an address while being conferred the Freedom of the City of London, the greatest compliment was paid to him by the Lord Mayor of London, and it was the greatest compliment paid to any one in the world. The Lord Mayor said that the Prime Minister had overcome two greatest weaknesses or two great human failings, namely, anger and hatred. We were proud and we were thrilled with delight when we read that compliment. But what do we find now? We find that one of his colleagues has charged him with animus, not against any individual but against a whole community—Maharashtra. Is that fair and is that just?

Let me examine the question and see how the present solution about Bombay has been brought about. The House knows that I am not for linguistic States. My first preference is for a bigger bilingual Bombay State with Bombay as capital. My next preference is for a city State of Bombay. I would even prefer Bombay being the second capital of India, but I do not like a Centrally-administered Bombay. But let us examine how a Centrally-administered Bombay has been accepted by the High Command and by the Prime Minister. What is the history about it? The Commission had made certain recommendations and said that Vidarbha should be separated from Maharashtra and that Gujarat along with

Maharashtra should form a bilingual State. Then there was an agitation for Samyukta Maharashtra. There was opposition from Vidarbha including our revered leader Shri Aney. They were opposed to joining Maharashtra for certain political reasons, on account of certain communal complex. It was because of the influence exercised by the High Command that they could be persuaded to join Maharashtra, and now, the charge is that the High Command has an animus against Maharashtra! Is the charge just and fair? I ask everyone in this House to say whether, to charge the Prime Minister or to charge the High Command like this is just and fair.

Not only this. Later on, it was pointed out that there was an offer of a bigger bilingual Bombay including Vidarbha. But before that offer was made, there were talks and speeches everywhere. It was said: "We cannot carry on with the Gujaratis. It is not possible to do so. If you want Gujarat to join, you make a condition that Gujarat could go out later on but Bombay will remain with Maharashtra. What does it mean? You never gave them any chance to accept it. Gujarat is no doubt Congress minded but is it not too much to expect it to accept this humiliating offer. The Cabinet took the decision that there should be a city State of Bombay. It was at the instance of the Maharashtrian leaders that there was a change in that decision. Later on they felt that, if such a State was formed, it might exist separately and they might never be able to get it back. So, it was suggested that a Centrally Administered Bombay would meet the wishes of Maharashtrians. It was not because of the diction of the capitalists or the big business as had been pointed out by my hon. friend, Shri Chatterjee, who is pleading for them every day in the court, that this had been done.

3 P.M.

Having driven the Prime Minister to do that, the Maharashtra Congress

[Shri Mohanlal Saksena]

Committee has made two suggestions: firstly, that the headquarters of the Maharashtra Government should be located at Bombay in the meantime and secondly that discretion should be given to the Prime Minister, without consulting the people of Bombay, to transfer Bombay to Maharashtra. Is it democracy? I know the Prime Minister enjoys not only the confidence of this House but the confidence of the whole country. I can also say without fear of contradiction that he is the greatest democrat among us. You do not speak out your minds and if he does something he is not to blame. You must have the courage to tell him what you feel.

What has been done in Andhra? It was about four years ago. Did Shri Deshmukh submit his resignation at that time? Did he point out that it was wrong at that time? He never did. Now, he asks: 'Where are the proceedings?' He knows that the proceedings of the Cabinet are not kept. There are only discussions and the points are noted. Decisions are taken and they are circulated on the files. One Minister generally does not concern himself with what is happening in the other Ministry notwithstanding joint responsibility. So, you should not blame the Prime Minister. I had my differences with him. But I know that he is the one person, after Gandhi, who will accommodate opposition point of view once he knows that he is not in the majority. He may be opposed to that view but he will try to implement it.

Having driven him to that decision, you now say that it has not been decided by the Cabinet. It was at the instance of the Maharashtrian leadership, and in consultation with them, that the decision to make Bombay a Union Territory was taken. Why should you blame him for that? Bombay people are going to be deprived of their democratic rights. Who is responsible for it? I say it is the Maharashtrians, themselves who are responsible for such a situation.

I will make a reference to the statement made by Shri Deshmukh. About a year back, it had become apparent to me that he could not continue as Finance Minister for long. I mentioned it to some of my colleagues here. But, I was not prepared for it in the manner in which it had come. Apart from the many qualities of the head and heart, I have associated with him a certain amount of dignity and restraint. I knew that he uses language very carefully. If one uses one's language carelessly, one does not injure others but oneself. I was shocked at the statement he read out the other day. I read that statement over and over again. Many questions came to my mind and I was reminded of the Biblical saying that the hands were of Essau but the voice was of Jacob. The statement might have been written by him but I felt that he had written it under certain influences. If his object was to serve Bombay and his constituency, Kolaba, then he should not have done anything which was likely to provide fuel to dying fire. He has said that he was always for a bilingual Bombay and both Maharashtrians and Gujaratis favoured it, but because of the leadership it was not feasible. If he had come out on this issue, if he had gone to the people and told them that the leaders were saying this while he felt otherwise, then I could understand. Did he give expression to that view? If he was for that, I offer my co-operation whole-heartedly. If he came out and worked for a bigger bilingual State, I would also go round Gujarat and Bengal. (Interruptions.)

An Hon. Member: Bengal.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena: I am sorry, Maharashtra. But, I am for bigger bilingual States all over the country. I am prepared to go to Bengal and Bihar. But when the move for their merger was made, I had warned the Home Minister and the Prime Minister that it was not the proper time to launch it. There were interests working against it. There

were already about 35 Ministers in Bengal and an equal number in Bihar. If these two States were merged, then there would be fewer Ministers. Then, there were the officers. There were two Chief Secretaries, two Inspectors-General of Police and so on. The officials were also interested in keeping them separate. Then, there were the political parties with their eyes on the elections. They wanted to make capital out of it as they thought that smaller units would suit them better. So it was not the proper time for launching that move. I felt that the zone councils with executive powers would later on develop into bilingual States.

I was talking about Bombay. Whatever Shri Deshmukh has said would reflect upon him. I am sorry for him and for the country. His reputation has suffered. He might have been in the civil service but he has been with the Prime Minister for six years.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not want to bind the discretion of the hon. Member but we should keep near the main issue.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena: I am not going into his statement. I wanted to point out that after acknowledgment of the courtesy and everything that the Prime Minister had shown him, he should not have done what he has done.

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह (हजारी बाग
परिषद) : अरे भाई ठीक ही तो बोला है
उन्होंने ।

Shri Mohanlal Saksena: At least he should not have gone to the length to which he has gone, charging the Prime Minister with animus against the whole of Maharashtra. He may get excited, he may use harsh words. He might even come to blows. But there is one man who will forget everything afterwards and that is he. Now, Shri Chatterjee said that the decision has been dictated by big business magnates of Bombay. That is wrong. What is the history behind it? We are referring to Gandhiji's

policies and Shri Chatterjee was very eloquent when he said that it was because of that we won our freedom struggle. We should not forget, at the same time, that while we were carrying on the struggle for freedom, Bombay was kept separate. It had a Provincial Congress Committee of its own. There was no Provincial Congress Committee in Calcutta or in Madras, but Bombay always remained with a separate Provincial Congress Committee.

Then there were three commissions appointed. If this was so obvious, if this was a natural thing, then why was it that this question was referred to three commissions? Each of these commissions gave the finding that Bombay should not be made the capital of a unilingual State. On the face of such findings how can you expect the Prime Minister to be fair and just, or the Cabinet to be fair if a decision is taken, in view of the policy that has been followed before, against such a finding? It was asked: "why have you made that decision in regard to Telengana"? Was there any decision by any commission before about Telengana? There is the S.R.C. Report, but there were no other commissions which reported on this.

After all, Bombay—I concede Bombay is a chip of the Maharashtra block but it has become the corner-stone of national edifice and so we have to see that this national edifice is maintained. I may use another analogy. You allow your son to be adopted by another family, to be brought up by another family and later on you want to take him back you do not want even to consult the wishes of your son. That is what has happened here. I can give you another analogy. Our Prime Minister is there. He belongs to U.P. I am sure if he goes back to U.P. he will be very helpful to U.P. But will it be proper, will it be fair for the whole country to lose the services and guidance of the Prime Minister because U.P. is going to be so selfish? So, what are you going to lose?

[Shri Mohanlal Saksena]

After all it was with your tacit consent that these commissions were set up. I think for 5 years you can wait. You can watch and prepare the ground. As your case is very strong.....

Shri M. D. Joshi (Ratnagiri South): The hon. Member forgets that the Prime Minister is not a geographical territory.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena: I never said that. I said that Bombay may be a chip of the Maharashtra block. I believe that within 5 years India is going to turn its face back upon linguism. I hope very soon people of this generation will realise, and our young men will realise, that what we are fighting for is not good. They will laugh at us. Our young men will laugh at the frenzy with which we have been carrying on this controversy. I hope that within five years there should be a more favourable climate for a bilingual State and the question of separating Bombay from Maharashtra will not arise.

With these words, Sir, I support the Bill.

Shri Bogawat: Sir, when we are carving the map of India, it is very essential that there should be peace in the country. If we do not find out solutions for these very important problems under the States Reorganisation Bill, I think there would be the danger of enmity, hatred and ill-will against one another amongst the people of our country. It will be a blunder if the Bombay question is not decided soon. It will be a serious blunder if the boundary questions are not settled or some Boundary Commission is not appointed. We see the mental agonies of the people. We see what amount of agitations are going on. Therefore, some settlement should be reached soon.

So far as the Bombay question is concerned, all have admitted that geographically and culturally Bombay is in Maharashtra. What harm would

be there if Bombay remains in Maharashtra? Are the Maharashtrians so wicked and so unpatriotic that they will not look to the interests of the Bombay City? Are they so short-sighted that they will not look to the development of the city which will be in their own State? It is a wrong idea and it is false to say like that. Only some people with vested interests are trying to keep Bombay away from Maharashtra. These capitalists and people with vested interests are afraid, lest there should be a socialistic pattern of society. They want to make a precedent. It will be a precedent if we allow Bombay to be separate from Maharashtra. Then there will be no socialist pattern of society. They are afraid of this and so some bosses have tried to influence and see that Bombay is kept Centrally administered. This is an attempt at that.

Sir, we talk of co-existence and Panch Shila. We try to have co-existence with other countries. Then what harm is there to have co-existence between Bombay-people and Maharashtrians? Are there no safeguards? Will there be no regional committees? Will there be no Governors? Everything will be there and there is nothing wrong if Bombay is allowed to remain in Maharashtra. To keep it separate is quite unnatural, it is undemocratic, it is against the natural aspirations of the people of Maharashtra. All the people—I should like to say 100 per cent. of the people—from Maharashtra, Marathawad and Vidarbha are crying that the decision given is against their desire. When the Joint Committee was sitting and when the Parliament's decision was to be taken, it is not a proper thing that there should be a statement made that Bombay will remain Centrally administered for five years. This has really prejudiced the case. I learn that the question was not considered by the Joint Committee because there was a statement of the Prime Minister. This has prejudiced the issue. The statement of the

Prime Minister, I should like to say with all my respects for him, was untimely. That has prejudiced the issue. Some of the members of the Joint Committee, who were for including Bombay in Maharashtra, refrained from giving their votes. I know from their speeches here that they are for including Bombay in Maharashtra, but they refrained from expressing their opinion because of this statement by the Prime Minister.

If Bombay is kept separate from Maharashtra many things will happen. The condition of Bombay and Maharashtra will be economically crippled. There would be all kinds of agitations. People will be always agitating. Their attention will not be diverted towards the development of the State and the Second Five Year Plan. They will always be doing something to see that this injustice is undone. That is actually what is happening. 2000 people have come from the various parts of Maharashtra, Marathawad and Vidarbha for offering satyagraha. Not only that. About 30,000 people have gone to jails and still there is agitation. If you go to any village in Maharashtra people ask about Bombay and why Bombay is kept separate. They ask why there is a decision to Keep Bombay separate for five years. We are helpless to answer them. Mental agony is there in their minds.

I can tell you, Sir, why this period of five years has been provided. When we go to Bombay we hear that so many Maharashtrians—*gumastas* and others—have been dismissed from service. They are asked to go away. If Bombay is kept separate so many Maharashtrians who are in service will have to go to Maharashtra and there would be a reduction in the Marathi-speaking population in Bombay. Several attempts will be made in that direction. I am quite sure, if after 5 years some democratic solution is tried, then the people, especially the capitalists, will see that Maharashtra would not succeed.

Why should we not take the decision just now? If a decision is taken

now in regard to Bombay, I am quite sure that it would be a decision in favour of Maharashtra. My hon. friend, Shri Anandchand has said that he has consulted *pawaldas*, *surpatri-waldas*, *beddiwallas* and so on. I had been to Bombay several times and I had ascertained the opinions of Tamil-speaking people, Telugu-speaking people, Parais, Mohammedans and several other people. All the economists and other important persons have expressed the view that Bombay must be merged with Maharashtra. Look at the statement of Dr. Kunzru, one of the Members of the S.R.C. He has made a statement on the 12th June that Bombay must not be kept separate from Maharashtra and it must be merged with Maharashtra. If an early decision is not taken to that effect, there would be agitation and energy would be wasted. There would be disadvantage economically to Bombay and Maharashtra also.

The present decision in regard to Bombay is not fair and justifiable. It has been done unconstitutionally and illegally against the interests of Maharashtra. I would submit that for the sins committed by very few persons, the whole of Maharashtra should not be punished by taking such a decision.

Having said so much about Bombay, I must say something about the border areas. As regards the border area, there is much agitation in Belgaum and Karwar. Several people have gone to jail, but in spite of it, there is great agitation. I will give the percentage of the population in the various taluks speaking Marathi and other languages. In Chandgad, 82 per cent. is Marathi-speaking and 4.2 per cent. is Kannada-speaking; in Khanapur, 76.9 per cent. is Marathi-speaking and 11.9 per cent. is Kannada-speaking; in Belgaum, 50.9 per cent. is Marathi-speaking and 23.9 per cent. is Kannada-speaking; in Chikodi, 74.6 is Marathi-speaking and 16.7 per cent. is Kannada-speaking; in Hukeri, 60.9 per cent. is

[Shri Bogawat]

Marathi-speaking and 25.2 per cent is Kannada-speaking; in Athni, 65.9 per cent is Marathi-speaking and 29.5 per cent only is Kannada-speaking. Taking the total, out of a population of 5,11,835, the Marathi-speaking population is 3,62,513 or 70.8 per cent while the Kannada-speaking population is only 92,132 or 18 per cent. If this is the percentage of the Marathi-speaking people in Belgaum, it is sheer injustice that it should be forcibly given to Karnataka.

There is no provision made in this Bill for a boundary commission. I appeal to this House to make a provision in that regard, because by appointing a boundary commission, all these disputes, animosities and enmities will be removed and there will be peace so far as border areas are concerned. I have given an amendment to the effect that a boundary commission should be appointed. Similarly, I have also given an amendment that so far as Bombay is concerned, after a period of three years, it should be automatically merged with Maharashtra. This was the suggestion of Mr. Pataskar. In order to have peace in our country, within a period of three years, and not five years, there should be an automatic merger of Bombay with Maharashtra.

There are also other places beyond Bhusaval where the Marathi-speaking population is considerable. But still, those places are not given to Maharashtra. In spite of the requests made by several important people to the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh, they do not give those places to Maharashtra, because once people get something, they are very reluctant to part with it. I want to ask them, "Why do you want to keep other people by force? Let there be some compromise." They are prepared to give some villages here and there, but not the most important town and city that we want, which is a Marathi-speaking area. My humble submission is that the bound-

dary question is also a very important one. So far as Gujerat is concerned, in Surat District, there are two taluks where there is a large Marathi-speaking population.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member knows that he has to conclude by 330.

Shri Bogawat: I will not take more time. It is quite necessary that all these boundary disputes must be settled and for this there must be a boundary commission. I request the Home Minister to bring some amendment before the House and have the boundary commission appointed, so that all the disputes between States and States may be settled. Also, as I have said, Bombay must be merged with Maharashtra after three years. Otherwise, the fire will continue to burn and there will be agitation. The energy of the people will be wasted and our Five Year Plan also may suffer. Consequently, the economy of the country will also suffer. Not only that; there will be political differences also. We have achieved our independence very recently and if we want to bring peace into the country, if we want harmony, good relation and co-operation among our people, it is quite incumbent and necessary that all these questions must be considered calm and very prudently. The resolutions that I have suggested may also be kindly considered. I appeal to the Home Minister to use his influence, get the necessary amendments passed and bring peace to the country. That is my humble request.

Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik Central): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I rise to express my views on the report of the Joint Committee. I am really thankful to the hon. Members of this House for the sympathies that they have expressed for the cause of Maharashtra and for the integration of Bombay with Maharashtra. All of us Maharashtrians think that from this difficult position it is only the

Prime Minister of India who can get us out. He is our only hope and he is our only friend; the Maharashtrian people are behind him and they have faith in him. Nobody should have any doubts about it.

Everybody in this country should consider the situation in Maharashtra very seriously. We form nearly one-tenth of the population and if anybody is going to create the impression in the mind of the Prime Minister that things are safe in Maharashtra, it is not true. Dissatisfaction is there. It is very widespread, and it is going deeper and deeper. I would like to enlighten this hon. House on the causes of it and how it can be removed tomorrow because I quite see that the time for today's debate is over. I would, with your permission, Sir, continue tomorrow.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member might continue tomorrow. Now we will take up private members' business.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FIFTY-SIXTH REPORT

Shri Altekar (North Satara): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-sixth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 25th July, 1956."

This is in connection with the categorisation of the Bill of Shri S. V. Ramaswami to enforce monogamy in India and to punish people indulging in polygamy. So far as that Bill is concerned, it is given Category B because it is not so urgent or important as to be put in category A.

The next question is whether the Bill sought to be introduced by Shri K. K. Basu to amend the Constitution should be allowed. He wants to amend the Constitution so that preventive detention can be retained only for the purpose of taking action against enemy agents. He says that

only that provision should be retained and the rest of article 22 should be deleted. In this connection, the recommendation made by the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions in its Forty-second Report was that this should await the decision on the discussion of the working of the Preventive Detention Act, which was to come in the next session. In the next session it was discussed and the House has resolved that the Act should continue till the end of 1957. Now, in view of the decision of the House, the Committee recommends that there is no necessity to introduce this Bill at this time.

On the question of making the directive principles justiciable the Committee is of the opinion that in view of the present circumstances and the financial condition we cannot make them justiciable because at this time we cannot give work to everybody or maintain everybody. Of course, every attempt is being made to do so but the time is not ripe to make them justiciable.

So far as the allotment of time is concerned, I commend that the House should accept this Report.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-sixth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 25th July, 1956."

There is an amendment to this Report by Shri Basu.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion the following be added:

"Subject to the modification that permission be granted to Shri Kamal Kumar Basu to introduce his Bill to amend the Constitution."

My amendment is very simple. I find that article 368 of the Constitution, which deals with the manner