

[Shri L. B. Shastri]

Railways in the changed conditions of today. At the same time I feel that the present set-up of the Board requires strengthening and proposals towards this end are under our consideration. The former status of the post of Secretary, Railway Board, has already been restored.

I must also acknowledge the conspicuous role of railwaymen as a whole in helping to increase the efficiency of the Railways in spite of many handicaps. Drawbacks and short-comings could no doubt be pointed out against railwaymen and the Railways. The fact, however, cannot be denied that Railway staff have tried to discharge their duties in tune with the spirit of the times and that they have done very well indeed. They cannot afford, however, to be complacent because in the multifarious and complicated nature of their work they might err at any moment, and hence an attitude of vigilance and watchfulness on their part is always essential.

In unity lies the real strength of railwaymen. It has pained me to see that the trends in the field of Railway labour have not been quite happy for some time past. I am glad, however, that persistent efforts have been made to maintain the old unity although they may not have been fully successful. Still I believe that where there is a will there is a way, and I would earnestly appeal to them to put their house in order so that they will be able to function in the best interests of the Railways and the workers.

The Second Five-Year Plan is a big and bold venture, and the Railways have to play a significant role in the destiny of the nation in this respect with the cooperation of all, whether officials or non-officials. Railwaymen should feel proud of being partners in this venture and thus make it a great success. Needless to add, they will have all the good wishes of this House and of the whole country.

#### MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT—Contd.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The Lok Sabha will now resume discussion on the motion of thanks to Address by the President. Out of the total of twenty hours allotted to the purpose, 15 hours and 51 minutes have so far been taken. This leaves 4 hours and a few minutes. Dr.

Sinha will now continue his speech. The hon. Prime Minister will reply at 4.15 or according to his convenience.

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** I shall be here at that time or before that time.

**Dr. S. N. Sinha (Saran East):** So far as the security and unity of India is concerned, the uplifting of its masses and the economic prosperity of its people are the main factors. It is at the current period precisely that we are adding through our wisdom and hard work the brightest chapter in the annals of our illustrious country. The President has correctly appraised our brave overall achievement. It is only a pity that our friends on the other side of the Lok Sabha are blind and ignorant of this most fascinating and existing drama which is played today on the stage of Indian history. They prefer to remain *koop mandukas*—frog of the well in the fables.

Greater pity it is that they converted the debate on the President's Address into a second chapter of our States reorganisation. The President had just mentioned it cursorily on the 20th paragraph of his speech. I, for myself, would not attach any special importance to this point but for a very particular reason which is of some practical value. Tomorrow the West Bengal Assembly is going to debate the merger question between West Bengal and Bihar.

The Communist Party of Bengal has made a plan about it to torpedo this merger by any means; not by any means but precisely by violent means. Only a few days ago their leader in Calcutta, Jyoti Basu, has issued a circular to his party members that: tomorrow when the Assembly meets in Calcutta, at that time, there should be pandemonium inside the Assembly and outside there should be a demonstration, a big demonstration and even force—I emphasise and repeat this word "force" again—should be used to see to it that the decision of the Assembly does not take place. Well, it is a very serious matter. We have to forestall their plan so that the ugly incidents of Bombay are not repeated in Calcutta. Therefore, I will request the Home Minister specially to see to it that in public interest and in the interest of peace and tranquillity also on human grounds, strong steps are taken against the communists of Calcutta today; tomorrow it will be too late because if the incidents once started, as it did in Bombay, it will

be very difficult to stop them. And if any ugly incidents take place tomorrow in Calcutta, of course, it will be the Communist Party which will have to be blamed and which must be accused. May be that the Government is complacent about it. But the public will never forget or forgive such occasions when the instigators instigate a thing and ugly incidents happen as they did happen in Bombay.

1 P.M.

Now in this light the Lok Sabha should re-read the statement of the communist Members which they made from the floor of the House. Well, an hon. Member, Mukerjee, professor for misinterpretation, has very mischievously tried to distort the statement of Dr. Roy, our noble leader of very tall stature. Professor Mukerjee says:

"The West Bengal Chief Minister said that by reason of the quality of the Bengali brain or whatever it was, the Bengalis could dominate the Biharies."

Well, I may say what actually Dr. Roy said was quite different. It is just the opposite. Dr. Roy in reply to that says :

"Those who think in terms of domination, they are shallow in their thinking. In human affairs it is quality and not the quantity which counts."

Further he says :

\* "Those who consider in terms of lesser numbers or more in numbers are still thinking in terms of Bengalis and Biharis. It is a United State. People will be divided on political issues, not on the language issue."

This is what Dr. Roy has stated. They are still thinking in terms of Biharis and Bengalis. But tomorrow the political issues will become important. People of small stature should try to rise a little higher to appreciate and hear the words uttered by people of tall stature. What has Bidhan Babu said? It has also been concluded in one word.

"The merger will no doubt turn the peoples' mind from narrow provincial rivalries to their integration and to the Indian unity."

It is India's unity which counts, which is important. Every other consideration is a minor issue.

And what is domination? Only a neurotic is afraid of domination by a brother of another brother. To speak of

the quality of brainy Bengali, what do they mean by it? Do they mean Bankim Chandra and Tagore or Aravindo? Let me tell you that not only the Biharis but the whole of India is very proud of all those sons of Bengal who have contributed appreciably to the human thought. It has been the privilege of those people of India to sit at the feet of those masters and to take the dust of their feet.

Well, we are not worried about that domination. What we are worried slightly is about the perverse interpretation to excite the masses and it is the Communist Party which has taken to it. I have no time to go into the details of the present pattern of the anti-national communist party conspiracy. But I cannot but remind the House about the activities of the Communist Party during the Bombay riots. They have taken a very leading part, a leading role in those riots. They made their prey also of some of the Maharashtrians, who used to claim at one time to be very good politicians.

**The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi):** They still are.

**Dr. S. N. Sinha:** I am very sorry that Kaka is not here. But I know he is a frustrated man. It is due to this frustration that today he cannot open his mouth without offending somebody or other. During his last speech also he went so far as to challenge the statement of the Chief Minister of Bombay who is the best administrator today in our country. I would not have taken Kaka seriously. But I would have to. His statement has done definite harm to the country. On the 16th of last month he made an outburst and on the 18th about 7,000 persons from Satara invaded the city of Bombay. Some looted the houses of particular communities. Not only that but social standards were also lowered to a great extent. Of course there was a plan, as the Chief Minister of Bombay has stated, to overthrow the Government by violent means and the conspiracy was going on for quite some time. The communists thought that if they created trouble for some days then the Centre will yield to their demand. Kaka also joined them and he said: perhaps another three days and then we will have what we want. I fail to understand how the molestation of anybody, a poor person in the street or robbing the poor passengers at some stations or burning of maternity homes is going to bring Bombay to Maharashtra. I fail to understand. It has no reasoning at all. Loot one can forget. The money that Bombay has lost, that also can be forgotten.

[Dr. S. N. Sinha]

But the lowering of the social standards, people will never forget. India will never forget that. To put it very mildly this question of Bombay, it is shameful. Of course, it includes the statement which was made during the time of the conflagration in Bombay. Kaka's statements are mostly to be blamed for that. He complains about the casualties. Let me make it clear.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member will refer by the name which is known to the House.

**Dr. S. N. Sinha:** Let me make it clear.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There are many Kakas.

**Dr. S. N. Sinha:** For us, in the Bombay riots, there was only one Kaka whom we have lost and he has gone over to the communist party camp now and was with them also during the riots. That is our great pity. We have lost our dear Kaka that way. Yesterday many Members complained—I think Mr. Kamath also complained—that there were excesses in Bombay. I would go to the extent of saying that never was any uprising suppressed so mildly as it has been done in Bombay.

**Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad):** Have an enquiry.

**Dr. S. N. Sinha:** It was only the brain and tact of the clever administrator, who is the Chief Minister of that Province which rose to the occasion and handled the situation correctly and that is why there was peace and order, especially in Bombay, in a short time.

Bombay rightly feels proud of many things, and we all are very proud about the high standard there in many fields, but during those occasions they were lowered. Judging the intensity of the crisis, the minimum necessary force was used on that occasion. We endorse every word of what the Chief Minister of Bombay has said about those riots there and which have been published also in this morning's papers.

It is not a surprise that Shri Gadgil made an alliance with our communist friends. Frustration, counter-revolution and reactionary forces go hand in hand many times. The mistake of the Central Government has been that they have been very lenient on these occasions. Shri Gadgil says "let Bombay go to Maharashtra and I would give a blank

cheque for safeguards". Well, there will that cheque be cashed? Will it be cashed in a *muftisi* bank? What is the credit that he commands? I do not think that in Maharashtra itself he has any follower left, after what he has done; at least not in this Sabha any more. This Sabha used to give him great respect and it used to hear him with the greatest respect also. But today he has lost everything. He has no following anywhere. It is the same way as saying that some robber has come to you and says that he will leave your house in order if you just part with your wealth, or some communists coming to the Minister and saying, "you part with your power and then only the public will be saved. Otherwise we will kill the innocent people". Is there any reasoning behind this?

**Shri Kamath:** None at all.

**Dr. S. N. Sinha:** It is amazing. Only a perverse mind can think that way; not a proper or a reasonable mind.

There are not only Maharashtrians and Gujaratis in Bombay. There are also about five lakhs of Bhaiyas like ourselves. We are called Bhaiyas in Bombay. On behalf of those five lakhs, I can say that we have also our say in the matter of Bombay. It is not only the city of Gujaratis or Maharashtrians but it is also our city. We have also our claim. The verdict that Bombay should be a centrally administered city has been given by our leaders and it has been endorsed by everybody else in India and also to a great extent by the Maharashtrians themselves—it was also proposed by them—and that verdict should remain and must be acted upon, by the wisdom and tolerance of the nation.

But the difficulty is that those gentlemen are bewildered with our success. They do not find any place in today's set-up, and they do not know where they stand. They are going to be wiped out from the political field altogether. The next elections are coming and that will show it very clearly and that is why they are very much worried. In their bewilderment, they instigate people towards rioting and robbing, and robbing not the rich people but robbing the poor people in Bombay. It is mostly the poor people who have been robbed and the poor women who have been molested in the streets of Bombay. This is what they do on behalf of the poor people! What face have they to show here?

Tomorrow, in Calcutta, if anything happens, the public will of course retaliate. If the Government sits idle, even in that case, the people will have to come out in protection against the members of the communist party so that their members do not tear the poor people into pieces. That is the stage to which it is coming.

The strength which we are going to show in tackling these internal problems will strengthen also our position in the international affairs. There, we have done marvels. It is such a marvel that also an ordinary man here understands the communist party very well. For myself—I think, they have made me famous on that account. These communist benches have done great honour to me unnecessarily and I should not have been the recipient! Now, their connection with Moscow is totally cut off. They are not getting any money from there, and they are trying to find out some money from the loot of Bombay. Our foreign policy has achieved such an amazing thing that the same masters who used to rule them have sent me a gold fountain-pen to kill them with! Is it not wonderful? What amazing things our foreign policy has achieved? That is our greatest achievement perhaps. It is a miracle no doubt. The communists will be liquidated by Moscow itself, and if they persist in their endeavours, then we are going to have our steel also from the same source, and they, the communists, will have the consolation of getting killed by the Soviet steel squadron. They will have to stand before the firing squad if they molest people in the streets. Nobody and no Government can tolerate their activities and their alliance with the goondas and all the undesirable elements in any city or in any part of India. It cannot be tolerated.

Of course, everything is not going on according to our liking, as everybody knows. We have not taken the Himalayas on our thumb or something like that. Nobody can do it. Goa has not come to us yet. In the Middle East, the Baghdad Pact is not in our interest. But that is not very important. The most important thing is that we are not falling prey to the provocation of anybody, either internal or external. Our line is correct and that correct line is going to take us very far.

This is the Buddhist year. This is the 2500th year after the Mahaparinirvana, of the great engineer of the human soul. The world around now is not of the Buddhist pattern, applying Buddhist

logic. We find that in today's world, there is a very vicious chain, which is going on, and it can be put in one sentence. *Peace lasts till atoms explode and atoms explode till peace comes.* That is the chain. We have to see the problem in the same way according to the Buddhist logic. As Shanti Deva has explained in the *Budhicharyavatar*, if there was no misery in the world then there is no necessity of the coming of Buddha to this world. In the same way, if there was no tragedy in the world, if there was no bloodshed, if there was no communist here in the Lok Sabha, I would not have worried. So, according to the Buddhist logic, in order to remove that misery, in order to remove that bloodshed created by the Indian communists, somebody must come. These are the historical forces which bring them forward.

Thus, in this Buddhist year, 2500th year after the Mahaparinirvana of the great Buddha, let us resolve, let all of us resolve, and invite also our friends from the Opposition, to realise the truth and try our very best to stop the bloodshed everywhere. Whether it is Bombay or Calcutta or any village, no place should have an ugly face, because, we lose our face if anything happens either in Bombay or in Calcutta or in any corner of India. It is a shameful thing if any bad thing happens. So, let us resolve in this year that we would stop bloodshed everywhere, wherever we can in the world, and bring once more peace for humanity as it was done in the time of Asoka. The hopes of the world for peace are today focussed on us. We are facing these problems and certainly we are not going to disappoint the people. We are determined to play our proper role in the building of human destiny of today and the wonderful dawn of tomorrow.

**Shri Lakshmayya (Anantapur):**

While supporting the motion of thanks to the President, I would like to make a few observations. This is an occasion to take stock and make full assessment of our achievements of past years and discuss future policies. You are aware that our country's foreign policy has been acclaimed by all the world. We have achieved a place—a place of prestige which is more glorious than ever before. Our policy has won the appreciation of all the nations in the world. The policy which has been pursued is one of non-alignment with any of the power blocs and friendly relations with all the countries. When the fate of the world has been hanging on the balance of power, when there was a great tension, mutual

## [Shri Lakshmayya]

suspicion and fear, among nations everywhere in the globe it is our country, though it is only a few years since we achieved Independence, that pursued the path of peace and non-violence and could ease the world tension. The noble traditions of truth and non-violence have been declared by our great *Rishis* and the same policy is being pursued now as well as during our long struggle for freedom. This policy has won the admiration and appreciation of the whole world. When the whole world is very much afraid of the newly invented, modern weapons—like hydrogen bomb and atom bomb—lest they may be used if war breaks out all the nations would look to our country with eagerness for peace and guidance. Our noble and illustrious leader, the Prime Minister, has declared of and on that peace is the only way for the progress and prosperity of the countries of the world. On account of that accredited and noble policy that we have been pursuing, I repeat world tension has been eased to a great extent and we have received the admiration and praise of many nations of the world. The Panch Shila contains the noble principles enunciated by our old *Rishis*; and particularly 'Buddha' and several countries have recognised and accepted those principles. Particularly peaceful co-existence; non-aggression, and non-interference with other country's affairs. Our policy is to follow the path of non-violence and create the area of peace; establish and extend it as far as possible and as much as we can. No question of joining any power block. Therefore, in the sphere of foreign affairs, our country has been—though in the beginning her policy was suspected and abused and attributed as one of cowards—successful throughout. It is no exaggeration to say that our policy gained ground slowly and was able to evoke the appreciation and admiration of several nations of the world. Like 'Asoka' the great in the past, our Prime Minister carries the message of peace to the edges of this wide world. Coming to domestic affairs, we have the Five Year Plans. The period of first Plan has come to an end and the second Plan is on the anvil. Very rightly, top priority has been given to food and agriculture and also to irrigation projects in the first Plan. An enormous amount of Rs. 2,800 crores has been spent in the first Five Year Plan and major projects are under construction. In the long run these projects would provide irrigational facilities

to irrigate the barren and arid lands. It goes to the credit of our Government that they were able to solve the food problem in a short time. No independent country could go with a begging bowl to other nations for food. So it was disgraceful and humiliating for an agricultural country like India to depend upon other nations for food and clothing. Now having solved it we can proudly say that not only will we not go to any other nation for food, but we will be in a position to export food grains to other countries. India would be the granary of the whole world when all the major and minor projects are completed and when we grow foodgrains in considerable quantities in the lands under these projects. In the first Five Year Plan, the emphasis was not so much on industries. Even then, some industries have produced very good results like the Chittaranjan workshop and Sindhri factory. Very rightly, in the second Five Year Plan, emphasis has been laid on basic and heavy industries and production of machinery. But, that does not mean that they have not given any importance to food, irrigation, electricity and other necessities. The most important problem with which our country is confronted today is the unemployment problem. To solve this unemployment problem, various measures have been contemplated. Cottage and village industries would be started in the rural areas. Rural banks will also be established to give credit facilities to the agriculturists and other measures will be taken to step up the tempo of home production. The establishment of a socialist pattern of society has been accepted as the goal. As a first step towards that direction the Imperial Bank has been converted into the State Bank and a number of rural banks are being established. That is really an encouraging thing.

I will now come to the question of the reorganisation of the States. I must say that unfortunately a number of unhappy and most ugly incidents have taken place,—of course, not in Andhra and Rayalaseema but in Bombay, Orissa and other places. I must say that the Government and also the people must admit the integrity, honesty and ability of the Members of the Commission. There is no doubt that they are eminent judges and they have produced a historic document. Naturally, there may be some misgivings in their proposals. To err is human; but that does not mean

that the Government should interfere with every proposal of the Commission and change it as they please under some pressure or other. I would submit to the Government that unless there are extraordinary reasons, the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission should not be interfered with. Unfortunately, at the time of the debate on the S.R.C. Report, I could not get chance to speak in the Parliament and express my opinion. I would like to say a few words now in this connection. Though the solidarity and unity of the country should remain as the supreme aim, we have to give some importance to linguistic question. Every picture has two sides; the dark side being on account of this linguism many disturbances and ugly incidents have taken place no doubt in some places. This should not stand in the way of implementing it. In regard to Bellary, I could not submit my view point at the time of the discussion of the S.R.C. Report. Bellary is the premier town of Rayalaseema. It is the headquarter of the regional offices for the whole of Rayalaseema. It has all connections—economic, social historical with Rayalaseema districts. The Tungabhadra project which is the life line of Rayalaseema, and Bellary, which is the crown of this area have been given away by the S.R.C. to Andhra State. They have recommended that it should be merged with the Andhra State. They have given due weight and importance to the previous decisions and they have come to the conclusion that it should be merged with the Andhra State in the interests of Rayalaseema. As you know, Rayalaseema is subject to periodic famines. Though our lands are fertile and agriculturists are hard-working and pains-taking, our agriculture is a gamble with rain. We have to depend upon the monsoon which always fails and very rarely favours. Therefore, we badly need irrigation facilities. Tungabhadra is the only major river we have got. After considerable agitation for 40 years, we got that project only for the salvation of poor Rayalaseema. But, unfortunately, it was recommended to be given away to the Mysore State along with Bellary by Justice Misra.

Throughout, we have had to put up a fight with the people of Mysore, for a period of forty years who stood in the way of the inauguration and construction of this project. In fact, it could not materialise for a long time. It is an irony of fate that on its completion, it should be given away to the Mysore State on the report of Justice Misra, who took

only language factor into consideration. Really, it is a misfortune of the Rayalaseema people that this rice bowl of Tungabhadra Project was snatched away from them, on the report of Misra. Like the Gods of the Trinity, Brahma, Vishnu and Maheshwara, the S.R.C. have come to our rescue and our salvation. This rice bowl, which is very necessary for the famished people of the Rayalaseema, is given back to Rayalaseema. We feel, we are very lucky. This decision is fair, just and sound. I request this should not be interfered with Raichur, one of the districts of Hyderabad, has been recommended to be merged with the Kannada State. We have no objection. Let them have full control over the northern canal of the project. With regard to the canal, in the south the high level canal as it is called, the Rayalaseema people, that is, the Andhra State should have full control, so that the little water that we could get from the Tungabhadra project could be rationed between the three districts of Anantapur, Cuddapah and Kurnool, and even Chittoor if there is surplus water. Though rationing and control on food and clothing have been abolished long ago in the country it is our bad luck that we have to ration this water of the high level of canal of the Tungabhadra Project among the three districts just for the purpose of drinking water in several villages in my district, where people are crying for water, and for dry cultivation in other places. That is why I appeal to the Government that the Tungabhadra project area should be merged with the Andhra State.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

Bellary town is a predominantly a Telugu area. Being a premier town in the Rayalaseema, the S.R.C. has recommended its merger with Andhra. It cannot be merged with Mysore. My hon. friend Shri T. Subrahmanyam says that the J.V.P. report and so many other reports are in their favour, for the merger of Bellary with the Mysore State. It is also said that a decision was taken by Parliament in favour of this merger and this should not be changed now on the proposal of S.R.C. My hon friend is a very good advocate. He pleaded very ably and efficiently in favour of the merger of the Tungabhadra project area and Bellary with the Kannada State on the ground that finality was reached, decision taken by Parliament and also included in Mysore two years ago and it should not be reopened. I may submit

[Shri Lakshmayya] one thing. For instance, a suit has been decided in favour of A. Then, it goes in appeal and the appeal is dismissed. Then it goes to the Supreme Court. There also, it is decided in favour of A. On account of some question of law or some other point, it is referred to a Full Bench of the Supreme Court. Considering all the points, factual and legal, they decide in favour of B. Can we then say that the lower court decided in favour of A, that the High Court has also decided in favour of A and in the Supreme Court also one single Judge has confirmed the decision? Now, that the Full Bench has decided in some other way, does it mean that the decision is not valid? And it should not be reopened? The S.R.C. consisting of three eminent people, with all their efficiency, honesty and integrity, having considered all matters, not only linguistic, but other factors like economic well being and administrative convenience have decided that Bellary and Hospet with Tungabhadra dam site should be merged with Andhra. What is the good of saying that previously Parliament has decided like that and our Prime Minister has stated like this. At that time the only question was language. Now, it is not so. Several other factors have been taken into consideration. On the ground of administrative convenience and on account of economic links with Rayalaseema, Bellary has been recommended to be merged with Andhra. I appeal to the House and the Government once again that the Tungabhadra project which is our rice bowl should not be snatched away from us and that Bellary, our premier town should necessarily be merged with the Andhra State. I submit that the S.R.C. proposals in regard to Bellary should not be tampered with under any circumstances. It is an unanimous proposal and it should be implemented *in toto* in the interests of the famished people of Rayalaseema as well as the people of Bellary town and Taluk.

Coming to the Second Five Year Plan I may repeat the most difficult problem faced with is that of unemployment. This problem could be solved by providing more work to the unemployed educated people as well as the uneducated people, particularly poor villagers. More importance should be given to the villagers. The people in the villages are living in dirty, filthy, mud houses. They are living in those houses which are fit only for cattle. They are not at all fit for human habitation. No provision has

been made in the Second Five Year Plan for the construction of houses in the villages. Adequate provision should be made for this and every encouragement and financial help should be given to the villagers. India is a land of villages. It is only if our villages are developed we could rebuild India—India of our dreams and we would have Rama Rajya which the Father of the Nation has thought of. We can only achieve that by improving the villages, and the conditions of the poor agriculturists and workers in the villages. Let our second plan aim at it and let all the political parties cooperate in working at it. Our country will grow in plenty and prosperity in a short time and become glorious in the world. With these words, I support the motion of Thanks.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore): I wanted to say something to Dr. S. N. Sinha because he has given us some advice. As he is not here, I do not deal with that.

Like other hon. Members, I shall also deal with the most important question, the reorganisation of States. It is important not only because some things have happened in this country, but also because we have to understand the causes that led to these unfortunate things and the remedy. The President in his Address has said :

“Recent events in some parts of India have caused me great distress, as they must have pained all of you also. In our legitimate love of languages some of us have forgotten for the moment that this great land is our common heritage and common motherland.”

He has also said on page 6, that our capacity to progress depends on our

“devotion to the basic ideals and principles which were laid down for us by the Father of the Nation.”

What I have to say is this. As far as the first portion is concerned, I do not think that it is because we have forgotten for the moment our common heritage and our common motherland that these difficulties have arisen.

It is the reverse. Nobody has forgotten the over-all unity of the country, or our common heritage or our common motherland. What is forgotten is something else, and I shall try to show what it is that has been forgotten.

We have forgotten today that in the broad stream of what we call Indian

culture and civilisation we have got various cultures, various ways of life, various languages and ways of thought. Not only have we forgotten this, but in the question of merger what we have done is the opposite of it.

There are certain basic ideals and principles that have been laid down as far as the reorganisation of States is concerned. I have already said before when I was speaking on the S.R.C. Report, and I want to point out even now emphatically that these principles have been forgotten.

The first principle is that the redistribution of the provinces on a linguistic basis is necessary if provincial languages are to grow to their full height. This is a very important principle which we have forgotten.

The second principle that we have forgotten is the principle laid down by the Congress that the main consideration must necessarily be the wishes of the people and the linguistic unity of the area concerned.

The next principle that we have forgotten is that the mere fact that the people living in a particular area feel that they are a unit and desire to develop their culture is an important consideration, even though there may be no sufficient historical or cultural justification for their demand.

The next consideration, though not of the same importance, is administrative convenience which should include the geographic position, the economic resources and the financial stability of the area concerned.

The first principle I mentioned had been laid down by the Congress as early as 1905 and repeated from time to time afterwards till 1947. In order to make out that linguistic redistribution of the provinces is incorrect, it is now said that it hinders the unity of India. The unity of India is strengthened by developing mutual and fraternal bonds between the various groups. It is achieved by serving the material and cultural needs of the various groups and by showing them that there is a bright future before them. If that had been done, the present difficulties would not have arisen.

Then, I come to the principle of democracy. I want to know if it is the desire of the people of Bengal and Bihar to merge.

**Dr. S. N. Sinha** (Saran East): Yes, it is.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan**: If the majority of the people of Bihar and Bengal want it.

**Dr. S. N. Sinha**: Yes.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan**: He may say "yes", but in order to be convinced, we must have some facts. The people does not mean only the Chief Ministers and their friends and some others. The people means something else.

**Dr. S. N. Sinha**: That is only an expression.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan**: If the majority of the people want.

**Dr. S. N. Sinha**: They are duly chosen representatives.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan**: My friend has come now to interrupt me. I ask him not to do it.

If it is the desire of the people, whether I say or the great Doctor says, nobody can stop it, because the desire, good or bad, of the majority of the people of Bihar and Bengal, whoever may oppose it will be achieved.

I say the demand must come from the people. Nobody should force the idea of a merger on the people not only of Bihar and Bengal, but also of the South.

As far as this question of Dakshina Pradesh is concerned, Kerala is now put to trouble. Tamil Nad says it does not want it. Then it is carried to Karnataka. It also says it does not want it. Now with which part of the country it is to be merged is not known. Even now, according to today's papers, talks are going on for the formation of a Dakshina Pradesh.

Let the idea come from the people. If the Government finds that there is a strong move on the part of the people of Tamil Nad, Kerala and Karnataka for merger, then certainly nobody can oppose it.

In the present case, democratic principles have been thrown to the winds. After Parliament has discussed the Report and after Government has taken a decision, it is wrong to bring forward a proposal like merger. It is because these principles have been forgotten that



[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

troubles have come now. Otherwise, certainly the redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis would have been accepted by all.

From 1947 the Congress moved away from what it had said before. It slowly progressed. If the Congress thought that the principles which it had enunciated before for the redistribution of the provinces were wrong, it was the duty of the Congress as an organisation and as the ruling party to put it before the people. Up to 1947 there was unity among Congressmen on the basis of the principles that had been enunciated, but when after 1947 the Dhar Commission came, it was said that language was not the main consideration, and redistribution must not be only on that basis. After that also the question was not taken up and in the country, even among the ruling party, there were men who formed themselves into an organisation called the Unity Platform which said that there should be no reorganisation on a linguistic basis, that there should be no reorganisation of States at all for some time to come, that it must be postponed.

There were others who said that there must be redistribution of States on a linguistic basis. If the Congress wanted to go back on their past declarations, then they should have done so on a democratic basis. But they did not do any propaganda on that basis. They did not try to convince their own ranks, as well as the other sections in the country that in the conditions existing in the country the redistribution of States on a linguistic basis would be harmful and injurious to the country. It was the duty of the Congress to have carried on such a propaganda and convince the people that though the Congress had always stood for the redistribution of States on a linguistic basis, yet now they could not agree to it in the interest of the country. They did not do anything of that sort. Even at the time of the Dar Commission, it was said that language was the main consideration. But when the Congress went back on it, they did not explain to the people why there was a departure from their previous stand.

Even in the terms of reference to the States Reorganisation Commission, we find that language was the main consideration for the redistribution of States. Though the SRC have not stated that in so many words, yet when we pursue their report, we find that the decisions taken

by them are more or less on the basis of language, with some slight changes here and there.

But after the discussion that we have had on the SRC report, we find that the question is not one of formation of linguistic States, but one of the formation of bilingual and multilingual States; and even the question of the merger of the States is in the offing. I would like to point out that the main reasons—for the big calamities that we have had in our country is only this, namely that the principles which had been laid down by the Congress have been forgotten by them now; and conveniently, it is stated that the formation of linguistic States will be against the unity of the country and the common heritage of a common motherland.

So far as the merger proposals are concerned, we do not know how far they have developed. In the President's Address, nothing is said about. But we find from the papers that even now there are proposals for such merger, and Government want to see that at least in respect of some of the States which agree, the merger proposal should be put through.

My hon. friend Dr. S. N. Sinha has referred to what has happened in Bombay, and in that connection, he has said something about us. I am not going to give any statement such as the one he has given.

**Dr. S. N. Sinha:** Because you do not know the affairs of Bombay.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** I am more responsible than my hon. friend.

**Dr. S. N. Sinha:** I challenge his statement that he is more responsible than I.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** I had been to Bombay myself, and that is why I say.....

**Dr. S. N. Sinha:** He is most irresponsible.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** I say, I am more responsible than my hon. friend.

**Mr. Chairman:** Unfortunately, the responsibility of one Member cannot be weighed against that of the other. Both are responsible Members. At the same time, it is certainly deprecatory for an hon. Member to hear from another hon. Member that he is less responsible. All the same, a Member has the right to say that he is the most responsible, of all the Members. He can say that about himself. But to say that another Mem-

ber is not responsible is not right. I would request the hon. Member not to use language which deprecates or offends any other hon. Member.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** I said, more responsible, in this sense.

Let me explain it. I went to Bombay. I interviewed certain persons there; I interviewed the Chief Minister of Bombay; I interviewed also the Governor of Bombay.

**Dr. S. N. Sinha:** So did I.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** I met Congress leaders and also the leaders of other political parties. I had been to those places where these incidents had happened. And I am saying here only what I have heard and what I have seen. That is why I say what my hon. friend said was hearsay, whereas what I say....

**Dr. S. N. Sinha:** It is not hearsay. I have also been there.

**Mr. Chairman:** Let there be no dispute on a point which is not very much important. Both hon. Members have said that they were not there during those riots, and they are saying only what they have heard and what they have seen subsequently. So, so far as the content of hearsay is concerned, it is equally good or equally bad in both cases.

But so far as the question of responsibility is concerned, the hon. Members has been pleased to explain that he did not mean any offence at all. So, none should be taken.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** I do not want to offend anybody. In the speech of my hon. friend, there were certain words and sentences which offended me, but I did not interrupt him. But if my hon. friend feels that there have been certain words in my speech which have offended him, then I am prepared to withdraw them. I did not want to say anything which offends my hon. friend. If my hon. friend feels that I have offended him, then that shows that there is something. I would bow to his desire, and withdraw the offensive words, if any.

**Dr. S. N. Sinha:** Thank you.

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, order. Let the hon. Member proceed.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** I want to place before the Lok Sabha a real account of what has happened in Bombay. I would like to place on the Table of the Lok

Sabha a report that was sent to the Prime Minister by Dr. Vasant Randave, who is not a communist, but is a Congressman who had taken part in the Congress activities in 1930, in 1942 and so on, and who has organised a Red Cross organisation to help even in the present movement. In his report, he has given certain facts and figures. I want that an enquiry should be made by Government as to whether those facts and figures are correct. If those facts and figures are wrong, then it is the duty of Government to say that they are wrong, because what has happened in Bombay is certainly a very sad thing.

When such a sad thing has happened, it is the duty of Government to say how it happened, and what were the causes for it and so on. I was told by a responsible newspaperman that when these incidents were happening, foreign press correspondents and others were freely wandering along the roadside and taking photographs and some of those photographs have been published also, along with their report. We want to know whether those reports are correct or not. It is said by the pressmen that those report had been given just to shame our country. When we find that such permission had been given to the foreign reporters, and we find also an eminent doctor of that place giving a report like this, then certainly it is for Government to come forward and say whether those facts are correct or not. These are the things that I have seen, and these are the things that I have heard. Dr. Randave has given certain facts and figures in his report, and he says that he is ready to prove them also.

**Dr. S. N. Sinha:** But you are not correct in regard to the statement about foreign reporters.

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, order. The hon. Member has given facts as he understands them. If he is going to be interrupted like this every minute, then there will be no good argument at all.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** When I saw the Chief Minister of Bombay, I told him that there must be an enquiry in the matter, and I had also told him that there are certain facts which have been put forth before Government.

I do not say that they are correct or that they are not correct. But there are persons who say that they are prepared to prove them and corroborate what they are saying.

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

Now, what was the background to what happened in Bombay? It is said in the report of Dr. Randave, the SRC report was published on 10th October 1955. A week before the SRC report was actually published, the whole city was thrown into an atmosphere of unholy suspense. Armed police patrols in batches of six or more started parading in the streets of Bombay. The number of those armed policemen was so plentiful that one could not walk even half a furlong without encountering a batch of these rifle men in blue.

When I was in Bombay, I went and saw some of the looted Gujarati shops. I enquired of them how their shops had been looted, and I took also statements from them. Some of the Gujarati merchants told me that they had insured their shops sometime in October or November. I also learnt that there was a note from the Chamber of Commerce to the effect that the merchants thought it better to insure their shops against rioting and looting. I asked them why they had insured. They said, that there was a rumour that there would be rioting and looting when the SRC report was published. I could not see all those merchants. But those that I saw told me that they had insured sometime in October or November. There were policemen patrolling on the roadside. Merchants were ready with insurance because they knew that when the SRC Report is published there will be looting and rioting. So, against looting and rioting they had insured themselves. I do not want to go into details about it because I have no time. But, I know how much of insurance business was done in October, November and December; I have got reports about it.

2 P.M.

As far as the people were concerned, there were speeches both for and against Samyukt Maharashtra. I do not want to go into the details of those speeches. It was said that there were provocative speeches by both the parties. On the one side people thought that the decision of the Government will be against Samyukt Maharashtra with Bombay. The people understood it in that spirit. They had to understand so because everything was ready; the police was ready and the merchants, on their part had also insured themselves against looting and rioting. I do not want to say who created that atmosphere but the atmosphere was there. As far as the policemen were

concerned, they were ready to stop something and naturally people thought that the decision of the Government will be against them. This was anticipated and there was provocation. What I say is there was very much provocation and the rumours in the papers also provoked them. What happened on the 16th November?

**Mr. Chairman:** Was this insurance a provocation?

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** There was the rumour that there might be rioting and looting and the insurance was against rioting and looting. It was rumoured that when the SRC Report came in December or January there might be looting and rioting. If the merchants had insured one or two years before, that would be a different matter. I do not say that insurance by itself meant provocation. But the rumour created in the mind of the people an idea that something was going to happen. So, they wanted to save their property and save other things.

**Shri Tyagi:** What the hon. Member perhaps means to say is that all this rioting was premeditated.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** I do not say anything like that. I want you to decide about it. I give certain facts. From the facts I want you to judge what the thing is. I cannot, from this fact alone, say that it was premeditated. I say, these are the facts and from these facts I understand something and I want my hon. friend, the Minister of Defence Organisation to understand things.

On the 16th of January, 1956, the first day of the present disturbances, there was no rioting, no arson, no stone-throwing but the Police opened fire on a crowd in Central Bombay resulting in the death of Gokhale, a young student who was supporting his family and studying in the Matric class. Rukmini Bai Salvi, along with her son standing on the steps of her residence also received a bullet wound in the firing. On the next day a man died, who was sitting in a cot and chewing tobacco. He fell down by a bullet wound and when he fell down he had tobacco in one hand and *chunam* in the other. Another man who was sitting with him was seriously injured.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member has already taken about 25 minutes.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** There are other cases; I will briefly mention them. A poor working class family....

**Mr. Chairman:** My submission for the consideration of the hon. Member is this. He is reading from a certain book. There are certain things mentioned in that book. He himself is not responsible for that.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** I am only reading those cases where I have gone and verified.

**Mr. Chairman:** Verification is different from actually seeing. The hon. Member himself admitted that he was saying what the doctor said. Such verification is not very material; it is only hearsay. There are only four or five minutes left for the hon. Member. He may bring out more important points rather than read something from the book. The book can be read by every person. I would rather request him to utilise his time in building up his arguments.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** I shall place the book on the Table, Sir. I shall not read it. I only wanted to say that there are certain things said in this. I have also verified some of them. I have gone to the places; I have seen those persons and visited their houses. There were persons who were in their shops and who never went outside and who were shot down. These are the cases that have been brought out here. There was a school and hardly three hundred yards behind it there was a small house. Bullets came and a father and child were sitting in front of the house. A child of 9 years was shot. Whether it is hearsay or not, what I want to say is this. According to Government itself 75 people have died. According to Government itself—as given in this book—no policeman had been killed; no officer had been killed. The wounded among the police are only 18—that is, minor injuries. So, in a week's scuffle like this, where there was rioting and looting, only 75 people, according to Government, were shot dead and 600 or 700 seriously wounded, whereas on the other side, there was not a single death and there were only 18 minor injuries and there were some 100 people who were going to the hospital and getting some treatment. I want to say it is the responsibility of the Government. If the State Government did not discharge that responsibility, it should be the responsibility of the Centre. When such a big thing has happened and when there are persons who are ready to come and say :

We have not only heard but we have seen these things,—it is the responsibility of the Central Government to see that there is an enquiry because the enquiry will show what happened and how it happened and who were responsible for this. I do not say it was shooting; it was massacre; it was nothing but a massacre; because, if an enquiry is made you will find out that several persons who never went out, who were inside their houses, who had nothing to do with the movement were shot. Among them there were 14 or 15 persons who were below the age of 25, boys between 20 and 25; an old woman above 60 was also involved. On the basis of this, there should be an enquiry; not only to understand the thing but also to know how these things happened.

As far as molestation of women is concerned, I met the Speaker of the Bombay Assembly and he told me that because there was news in the papers that women were molested, his wife and a lady doctor went round the areas concerned and they got no report from anybody about molestation of women.

**An Hon. Member :** Can he assure us that there was no molestation?

**Shri C. R. Narasimhan (Krishnagiri):** My intention is not to interrupt the speaker. But, I want to know authoritatively from you as to whether in this discussion we can go through all the incidents of law and order that happened in Bombay city. Is it within the purview of this discussion to raise those things? Can we go into the details of these matters which are really within the purview of the State Government?

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** Here, it is said in the President's Address :—

“Recent events in some parts of India have caused me great distress, as they must have pained all of you also.”

On the basis of this, I want to say what is the matter.

**Mr. Chairman:** The House has been discussing for some days what happened in Bombay and many hon. Members have given expression to their knowledge and even to hearsay and, perhaps, some of them were present there. At the same time, when the Address is here and when we are discussing the general question of what is embodied in the Address and saying that some things have appeared and other things have not appeared in it and when some hon.

[Mr. Chairman]

Members are pressing for an enquiry, it is perfectly right for the hon. Member to give some examples. After some examples had been given, I myself said that there is no point in giving very many instances. It is perfectly competent for the hon. Member to suggest what steps should be taken, the grounds that led to the thing, and that there should be a committee of enquiry. This has been argued by several other hon. Members also. I do not think I can object to the hon. Member suggesting that there should be an enquiry and that the Address has not considered these points that there was indiscriminate firing and slaughter etc. This is what the hon. Member is suggesting. Other hon. Members may not agree with that; that is a different matter. But, at the same time, the hon. Member cannot be debarred from expressing his point of view or suggesting any course of action which he thinks proper.

**Shri C. R. Narasimhan:** I did not want to obstruct or prevent the hon. Member from speaking, but I only wanted to know the authoritative position in this respect.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** As far as rioting was concerned. . . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** I am very sorry to say that the hon. Member has already taken more than half an hour and so I will request him to finish within one or two minutes.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** I request you to give me some more time as it is the fag end of the debate and I want to place certain things before the Lok Sabha—things which I have not only heard but which I have also seen myself.

**Mr. Chairman:** I do not doubt the importance of those things; I do not doubt the right of the hon. Member to place all those things before the Lok Sabha. At the same time I am in a difficult position because I have a very large number of speakers on my list whom I wish to accommodate so that everyone may get a chance. I think it is desirable to accommodate as many Members as can be accommodated and I have already allowed more than half an hour to the hon. Member. He will excuse me if I ask him to finish very soon.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** I do not wish to continue with my speech as there is

no time and it is unfortunate that I have not been able to speak before.

In conclusion what I wish to say is that an inquiry should be made into this question of the happenings at Bombay. Secondly, regarding the merger proposals, I wish to say that without the desire and wish of the people if any action is taken by the Government, which goes against the decision of the Government itself, certainly trouble will be created and it is the responsibility of the Government to see in the situation today that as far as the SRC Report and the reorganisation of States are concerned, the Government takes a decision on the basis of certain principles. And wherever there are difficulties or differences of opinion, let the Government along with the other parties in the country and the people, try to decide it. Unless that is done, I think more trouble will take place and I do not know what will be the position in many parts of the country where, in the reorganisation of the States, merger or something else is decided upon. Because I have no time I am unable to explain the other things, which I hope I will be able to explain afterwards when the discussion of the States Reorganisation Bill comes up here.

I have stated that there should be an inquiry into what has happened in Bombay. If there is no inquiry, that means that what has happened in Bombay may also take place somewhere else and is not good for the future of our country. Let the country know who are responsible for these happenings in Bombay. I again urge that an immediate inquiry must be instituted. This is all what I have to say now.

**Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda):** I am one of those who are of the opinion that our Government are giving greater attention to external affairs than to the home front. From a cursory glance at the Address also I can say that much greater space is devoted to external affairs than to home affairs—four pages against three, the last page being mostly about Bills.

I agree that so far as the basic foreign policy is concerned, it is sound. I congratulate the Government on it and I agree with them. It is in consonance with the genius and the spirit of the Indian people. We are told that our relations with other countries have been friendly. This is also correct and we can take credit for that. We have continued

to be friendly with all other countries but that does not mean that they have not given us occasions for ceasing to be so. There were many provocations and many aggressions that have taken place by other countries which could have impelled us to discontinue that policy, but we have not done that. I can quote instances. Pakistan has committed aggressions on our territory and has refused to abide by agreements. She has declined to negotiate on evacuee property and other issues and is pushing out the minorities from East Pakistan. But we remain friendly with her. Portugal is consolidating herself in Goa, and has brutally, I should say, murdered our peaceful citizens who went there. She has refused to see reason and has persisted in her colonial policy. But we are friendly with her too. South Africa has been following the racial discrimination policy. Many laws have been passed by which our people there are being segregated. But we are being friendly with her. Ceylon has not implemented the spirit of the agreement that was entered into with our country so far as the citizenship of our people is concerned. But surely we are friendly with her too.

I cannot also deny that our prestige in the international field has gone up and we have gained in the esteem of others, but I can say this much that the other nations have gained more than we ourselves from the policy that we have followed. It has benefited the world no doubt. We have been instrumental in promoting peace—that is correct and I will also acknowledge that. But what are the actual achievements that we have got? Whenever an issue has arisen in the United Nations or any other place, there I doubt whether we have been able to achieve very much. Many issues have arisen during this period but they remain unsolved. The Kashmir problem is there and it is not nearing solution. Nor have we been able to enlist greater support during the time that has passed. The Goa question is getting more complicated. Then, as I have already said, Pakistan is committing aggressions. The efflux from East Pakistan is increasing. These are some of the problems before us and they have arisen from time to time, but whether our foreign policy has succeeded in getting any solution for them or enlisting international support for us is a matter where I differ from other friends.

Leaving aside foreign relations or foreign policy, I come now to the home front which I feel is more important

than the one that I have just dealt with. We had the First Five Year Plan and those five years are almost over. This is perhaps the last month or one more month is yet to run out. But do we feel that we have been able, to a considerable extent, to eradicate the corruption that we complain of? Do we feel that we have been able to reduce the unemployment that we complain about? Do we find now that the ordinary masses feel enthused that this is our Plan, that we are working it out and we will benefit by that? I am of the opinion that that much has not been done so far. Our Plan has not achieved that objective. Now the Second Five Year Plan is coming up. Unless the ordinary masses can be enthused with that spirit, it will not do as much good as we desire. My basic complaint is that unless we can root out inefficiency and corruption in our administration, unless the people begin to feel that the agency that is employed is our agency and is to our benefit, and unless that contact has been created and that spirit enthused, it is very doubtful whether this Second Plan also will achieve as much as we desire so far as development, eradication of inefficiency and corruption, removal of unemployment, etc., are concerned. It has been admitted in the draft outline of the Second Five Year Plan that even at the end of that period we may not be able to achieve much so far as the problem of employment is concerned. There had been some impression during the first year, but we have not been able to create so many new jobs, and the net result is that so far as the number of the unemployed is concerned, that has rather increased.

मर्ज बढता गया ज्यों ज्यों दवा की

It looks like that.

Briefly, I want to refer to this burning question of the reorganisation of States as well. There has been a movement for linguistic provinces for the last two generations. The matter has become one of passion rather than of reason. It is the Congress itself which was responsible for that. Now, there is a sudden change and a reversal of the gear. There are unions of bigger States; there is talk of forming bigger units. To me it appears to be only the result of frustration because Government has not been able to resolve certain issues and feels that perhaps by this method, those difficult problems might resolve themselves. It is only escapism and a cry of frustration.

[Sardar Hukum Singh]

There is one other thing which I want to urge here. People have felt that way and there is mention of it in the SRC Report that U.P. on account of its size has been carrying great influence in the administration of the country—greater than any of the other State. People were anxious that this State should, therefore, be divided. I was not anxious; let it not be taken that way. But people were anxious that this should be done so that this influence might decrease and they might find themselves on a par with U.P. The SRC did not recommend that.

**An Hon. Member:** By the majority.

**Sardar Hukum Singh:** By the majority, as my friend says. But I am of the other opinion if it were to be analysed. Mr. Fazl Ali did not take part so far as Bihar was concerned because he had spent most of his life in Bihar. But he belonged to U.P. and he ought not to have taken part so far as U.P. was concerned. Only one member was left as two were from U.P. and he recommended partition. Therefore, the report had been for the partition of U.P. But here I am not dealing with that question. I am only dealing with the union of two States that has arisen out of frustration. When they found that the State of U.P. could not be divided according to the SRC Report, then came a sudden change in the thinking of our Prime Minister. Previously he was of the opinion that smaller and well-administered units were much better than bigger States. But now he was of the opinion that bigger States were more useful. People thought that they could not compete with U.P. So, they now thought that they should swell to the size of U.P. and then perhaps they might be able to exercise as much influence as U.P.

**Shri Raghunbir Sahai** (Etah Distt.—North-East cum Budaun Distt.—East) : Where does U.P. come in?

**Shri Kamath:** It comes in India.

**Mr. Chairman:** Why should the hon. Member from U.P. be so sensitive?

**Sardar Hukum Singh:** I am sorry if I have offended his feelings but I did not mean it. I was not saying or arguing against U.P. I said that there were two reasons which I could think of. One reason is that the Chief Ministers might have thought that U.P. was exercising much greater influence in the administration of the country. They tried that

it should not be so and that it should become smaller so that its influence might be as much as theirs. When they failed they might have felt that they should become as big as U.P. so that they could exercise that much influence. The second thing is this. Government found that there were certain questions which present many difficulties. Many permutations and combinations were there so far as Bombay was concerned. Everything was done but there was not a solution that was acceptable to the Maharashtrians. They found that nothing could succeed. There were rather more and more complications and so they thought that by this method they might be able to resolve all these difficulties automatically. That frustration and the desire to wield that much influence are responsible for this so far as I can think. Others might differ. According to me they are responsible for this move to merge the States.

But I am apprehensive whether this would result in the unity of India. If these regions are as big as is being contemplated, they may not be *pradeshas*; they would be *deshas*. They would be countries; there is very likelihood of such a thing happening. We want and pray that the Prime Minister may live long. But after all, at some time we may have some other Prime Minister. If there are such big States, the Chief Ministers of such big units might consider themselves superior to those who are at the Centre. There would then be tendencies to separate and to get more and more powers. It would not lead to unity but to a tendency to move away from the Centre.

**An Hon Member:** Make them provinces.

**Sardar Hukum Singh:** Do whatever you like. There would be the tendency to move away rather than to come together. If they are small units depending upon each other, they would depend more on the Centre and the tendency to move away would be less. That is how I view it. Therefore, I feel that this move to unite big provinces and blocks together would make big areas, big countries and they will be self-sufficient in everything. That is rather not conducive to the unity that we desire. That is how I view it.

I have also to reply to one or two remarks that were made by one of my friends here, a representative of the

Jan Sangh; unfortunately he is not present. He complained that there were certain negotiations going on between the Akalis and the Government and he felt apprehensive about it. He talked of linguism of the Akalis; he said they were communalists; so many other things. My complaint to him is only this. He has first been advising his brethren to disown Punjabi and when they had disowned it and the Akalis were isolated, does he want that they should also become persons like those nationalists in disowning that language?

**Shri Tek Chand** (Ambala-Simla): Punjabi was never disowned.

**Sardar Hukum Singh**: Census records show and the Home Minister's statement is here.

**Shri Tek Chand**: That is the script of the language.

**Sardar Hukum Singh**: There is no column of script in any of the census record. It is only the language that is there. I challenge anybody to show me anything in the columns of the census records where there is any question put about the script. It is the language that is there. I am amazed to find that now the question of script is pushed in.

**Shri Tek Chand**: My friend will be stunned to find that the only dispute is about the script.

**Sardar Hukum Singh**: People disowned Punjabi language. He challenged me that they did not do so. I said that the Home Minister's statement was there and there was also the census report. There was no column in the census reports which pertains to script. It is only the language that is asked and that was disowned. I am complaining that first my friend advised his brethren to disown the language. When they had done it, the Sikhs were isolated and were left alone. We are accused of communalism, linguism, this and that. There was an inaugural address at Amritsar, in the place named after the late Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee, and there Shri Dogra observed that when they found communalists were collecting there, and were crying for something the nationalist forces decided to assemble for nationalists unity in Shyama Prasad Mookerjee's camp. It was stated by the great, eminent lawyer and jurist, a Member of Parliament, while giving his address that he was amazed to find Maharashtrians and Gujaratis fighting. Both of them were Hindus and so they should not fight. That was the nationalism that was displayed. But

he never expressed it so far as Hindus and Sikhs were concerned though he expressed it so many times about Gujaratis and Maharashtrians because both were sections of Hinduism. But he did not think of Sikhs under that canopy of nationalism. That was not necessary for him. What would happen if all those nationalist forces come into ascendancy? Even now they object to our meeting the Prime Minister or the Government giving us only an audience; nothing has been done; they could complain of it if anything had been given; but nothing has been done; only an audience; they are giving us hearing.

**An Hon. Member**: Eternal audience.

**Sardar Hukum Singh**: May be. I am, coming to that. Only audience and there it is objected to that it should not have been given. Even the hearing should be denied to us. You can imagine what voice we would have if these nationalist forces come into power and have their own way.

I have some words to say about my esteemed friend Mr. Mukerjee as well because he referred to me and he said that I am a good, esteemed friend. I am prepared to say that with greater force and with greater sincerity also. I do not say that he has less sincerity. But I have as much as he has. He said that he wondered what was happening behind the scenes between the Congress reactionary forces and the Akali communalism. He supported the demand for a Punjabi-speaking State. I am thankful to him that he advanced arguments for this Punjabi-speaking State which ought to have been formed. But one thing I am apprehensive of and I must convey it to him. When Akalis were fighting and when they were struggling for so long and when they sent 10,000 men to prison for shouting slogans etc., not a finger was raised by the communist supporters to give us any assistance. If it is that there might be some understanding between the Akalis and the Congress, between the reactionaries and the communalists, then perhaps the position might be different. He, in fact, asked whether the masses might not be betrayed. I assure him that he should have no fears of that kind. The Akalis would not betray the masses. I can also say that he can rest assure that the Sikh masses are not such as can be lured by sermons and lectures. They want concrete things and complete sacrifices. If he can advise his party here in the Centre and its branch in Punjab, then certainly they would be able to support the



[Sardar Hukum Singh]

movement and in the struggle—God forbid—if that is resorted to. We will make the best endeavours so that we need not have any struggle but if that comes, I hope that his party would participate.

An Hon. Member: Oh, yes.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I hear 'Oh, yes'. If the voice of the Minister represents the true heart of our communist leader—that is not my experience during the period that has gone by—it means a new heart. But so far I have not seen that heart in the past deeds. Therefore I may request and ask Mr. Mukerjee to sound his own party first whether what he represented here is really shared by others, and would they be prepared to do something for us or it is only what has been done now when the party thinks that some negotiation or some settlement between the Sikhs and the Congress is taking place. That is another aspect.

I will take only a few minutes. I will now turn to the displaced persons. That subject has been ignored. It has not found any place in the Address of the President for the last three years. The Minister gave the President to understand that that question has been solved. We are grieved to learn that this is the impression created and no attention has been paid to this question. I admit that the problem of East Pakistan has grown much acute and greater attention is required there. That should be given. But what I find is that the pace at which we are proceeding ~~our Government is proceeding~~ in awarding compensation, if this goes on, perhaps it might take 25 years to award compensation to the people who deserve it. It appears strange. Leaving aside what we have left behind, the property that has been assessed here, we were told, was worth Rs. 2,000 crores. On assessment it was reduced to Rs. 500 crores, that is, one-fourth. Then compensation was at 20 per cent. That means, it will be Rs. 100 crores. The delay in the payment of that compensation is taking away all its worth. There is delay even in awarding that Rs. 100 crores. Some time back we were given to understand, in this House perhaps, that one Minister—there are two Ministers; one is the chief and the other is the deputy; may be both are equal; I do not know—one Minister would devote his time entirely to the West Bengal problem and would remain there. That was a welcome move. But they have not acted upon it. That

was only a suggestion. I do not know because I do not have any access to that. But that impression was given and now I feel that the West Bengal problem does require the attention and energy of a Minister for the whole time for the whole year, he should remain there and he should not have this burden of paying compensation as well. It may have been a huge problem, I admit. But now it is only execution, that is, the distribution of the funds. Why should they take so much time? Now it is greater energy, initiative and imagination that is required. It is difficult to determine what difficulties and handicaps are there. But the thing is not proceeding well. This pace, this snail's pace, would not solve the question within any reasonable time. If the Government are serious enough then they should certainly give authority and powers to the man who is on the spot to deal with the case. They have to increase the staff and go on with it earnestly. I find that there is no enthusiasm anywhere and it is being taken up leisurely as if this problem also should be prolonged for a certain number of years, as if someone was interested that this rehabilitation and compensation should go on for ever.

Then I have to say about the auction of property. I think there is something wrong somewhere and the way in which it is done is rather shameful. The properties are put to auction. I wanted to bid in an auction three or four times. A house has been put to auction. There are so many bidders there and they are very anxious to buy that. They would give any price because they have lost all their properties and they are not sure whether they would get any compensation at all. That is the reason why they are selling away or transferring their claims at 50 per cent. of their value. A notification was issued that this would not be recognised, and that they are not free to transfer the property, but even then that has not stopped, because they found that it is much better to sell it. A house worth Rs. 8,000 is auctioned for Rs. 20,000 or Rs. 25,000. So it is better for them, if they can get 50 per cent. of their value. It is much better than going in for the house. Therefore, those transfers are taking place freely, and the Government has not been able to check those transfers. What do we find when we go to the auctions? There are touts bidding. There are purchasers who have no claims, but those auctioneers have appointed them because they have

to get something from them. One displaced person says 20,000 and then the other person who is a tout of the auctioneer says 25,000. Perhaps the displaced person who requires some house to live in is compelled to say 26,000 though he knows it is much beyond his power. He goes on bidding, because they inflate the prices. I know it and I have seen it with my own eyes. Now, it has become a machine-like thing. This Rehabilitation Ministry, as capitalists would do, builds the houses, puts them to auction. It spends Rs. 8,000 and carries away Rs. 20,000. That is how they are working. I do not know whether it is in the interests of the displaced persons or anybody else. Anyway, that is going on.

These are some of my remarks that I wanted to make about the Rehabilitation Ministry. I urge upon the Government to pay greater attention to this business. At least there is one Minister who is solely engaged in this work. But the pace which is at present being followed is much too slow and the displaced persons are getting disappointed every day.

**Shri T. Subrahmanyam (Bellary):** We are grateful to the President for his inspiring and noble Address that he delivered. Friends from the Opposition, some of them, have described it as an insipid Address. One friend has said that it is a meagre one and that it does not go into details. The Address outlines our endeavours and achievements in the past and indicates the line of advance and progress for the future. It does not purport to be a detailed description of the programmes and policies of the Government. We have got three and a half months more and we will deal with these matters. But I am surprised to see one hon. Member, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, saying that the Address is the performance of an Under Secretary—the third class performance of an Under Secretary or something like that. I was very much pained to listen to that observation, because those of us who have lived in the Gandhian era, if I may use that word, have been accustomed to use terms and propositions which are simple and which are even humble and we have always associated real dignity with a certain measure of restraint. Therefore, it is unfortunate that such an expression has been used, and those expressions of Shri N. C. Chatterjee have caused me very great pain. I must say that we are not accustomed to use high-sounding or fire-eating or thundering phrases and propositions, because we consider such

statements to be rather fussy and as a sort of juvenile performance to which there should not be too much of importance attached from the point of view of practical politics and social and economic achievement.

The first thing that the President has referred to is of course foreign policy. He mentioned that our relations have improved—our relations with the foreign countries. We have become more friendly and we have developed a very co-operative atmosphere and cordial climate and there is increasing appreciation of our policies from all countries. It is particularly true in the context of our relations with Soviet Russia. Hon. Members will remember that three years back, when the representatives of our Government on the UNO mentioned some proposals with regard to the repatriation of prisoners in regard to the Korean Armistice, the proposal came in for very extreme and unrestrained criticism, and even abuse, from the representatives of Soviet Russia on that body. Now after these three years, much water has flowed in the Volga and the Don. Recently, we have been very much interested—and it has been revealing also—to read the proceedings of the 20th session of the Communist Party's Congress which has been taking place at Moscow during the last one week. They have said that for the last 20 years there has been no collective leadership, that several faults have been committed in their foreign policy and also in their economics and even history. It was gratifying to note that their Prime Minister and their Foreign Minister paid tributes to the part played by India as being one of very great significance in the cause of world peace.

The same thing, unfortunately, cannot be mentioned with regard to the United States of America. We want to remain friendly with all countries—the United States of America and every other country. But Mr. Dulles has been doing his best or worst to spoil this relation. His recent joint statement issued along with Dr. Cunha that Goa is a province of Portugal has done very great disservice to the cause of the United States, to the cause of freedom and to the cause of democracy.

In this connection, I would like to mention that recently a joint statement was issued by Mr. Eisenhower and Sir Anthony Eden in which they said that they would help themselves and others to peace, freedom and social progress; maintaining human rights when they are

[Shri T. Subrahmanyam]

already secured, defend them where they are in peril and peacefully restoring them where they have been lost. In the context of this statement made by responsible Heads of States, the statement of Mr. Dulles and his actual policy should be construed as not merely unfortunate but tragic, because, Goa is an acid test not only for India but also for America and the United Kingdom. They have been stating that they are the champions of freedom, of democracy, of anti-colonialism and all that, but actually, their doings have not been supporting this position. I said Goa is an acid test for India also. We have been proclaiming in the Bandung Conference in our Panch Shila and in our joint statements with Soviet Russia, Yugoslavia and all other countries that we will only adopt peaceful means for the solution of all problems. In the face of this, if we do not stick to this policy even with regard to Portugal, however provocative and however tragic the relations may be we shall be false to ourselves, untrue to our own policies, untrue to our principles and would have betrayed the cause of peace and the hopes of humanity.

Next, I come to our domestic affairs. The President has referred to the first Five Year Plan. He has said that all the targets with regard to agricultural production and industrial production have been reached and in fact more than reached, and then indicates the line of advance we are taking with regard to the second Five Year Plan. He says that the socialist pattern of society will be adopted and that inequality will be decreased or abolished and that they propose to increase the national income from Rs. 10,800 crores to about Rs. 13,400 crores, that is, by about 25 per cent. It is a great thing. They also want in the coming five years to give greater encouragement to industries, to minerals and to the development of transport and communications. They want to spend nearly Rs. 2,275 crores for these items out of Rs. 4,800 crores. I may mention that they have also decided to start three steel factories in India. Although all of them are in northern India, I welcome them, because we must take an all-India point of view and we must see that the country becomes prosperous and strong.

The second Five Year Plan also states in paragraph 29 thus :

"There is another type of disparity which should be mentioned in this context, namely, the disparity

in levels of development as between different regions in this country. In a comprehensive plan of development, the special needs of the least developed areas have to be kept in view so that the entire pattern of investment is adopted to the securing of planned regional development in this country."

I may mention that there are places in South India where we have got limitless quantities of excellent iron ore of very precious variety. Take my own district of Bellary.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem):** Salem also.

**Shri T. Subrahmanyam:** Yes. My friend Shri S. V. Ramaswamy is here; Shri C. R. Narasimhan also is here. They both come from Salem. In Salem and Bellary and also in other places in South India there are almost limitless quantities of excellent iron ore. They could all be put to good use and then the basic industries could be started there. I want to suggest it.

Another point is that they want to spend about Rs. 200 crores for the development of cottage and small-scale industries during the next five years.

I would like to make one suggestion to the Government. They want to spend about Rs. 30 lakhs for training and technical research with respect to *ambar charka*. But, unfortunately, this matter has been put into the hands of private agencies. Of course, I respect them very much and they have done valuable service. But even then, I suggest that our Production Ministry and the Industries Ministry which have got a number of factories and technological institutes must give the utmost priority to this aspect. The *ambar charka* has infinite potentialities for giving employment to the masses. They want to provide about 25 lakhs of *ambar charkas* in the coming years. I suggest that the Government technological institutes and factories must take up this matter and give it top priority. My suggestion is that this *ambar charka* should be something like the Singer sewing machine.

**An Hon. Member:** It is really like that.

**Shri T. Subrahmanyam:** I am not joking. Singer sewing machine is worked by hand power. I say that the *ambar charka* should be as efficient, as trim

and as clean as the Singer sewing machine. Again I repeat, they must be efficient. Decentralisation and cottage industry should not mean inefficiency. They must be efficient and their production capacity must be increased more and more.

I now come to another important matter, namely, transport and communications. The Railway Ministry wants to construct new lines for a length of 850 miles. Unfortunately, they have not been able to take up the whole length of 2,000 miles. This morning our Railway Minister was giving in his budget the names of some new lines which will be undertaken in the coming year for being surveyed. I was gratified to hear that he mentioned the line from Kothar to Harihar and other lines. I hope some of the lines in South India which have not been taken up so far will also be included. Geographically, if we proceed towards the south, the country tapers and becomes narrower. With an extension of 40 to 50 miles, we can connect whole regions together for the purpose of the development of industries and business.

I now come to the question of States reorganisation. My hon. friend, Mr. Lakshmayya, was saying something about Bellary. Though I represent the Bellary constituency, I did not want to say anything in this context because we have said enough about it. We are going to have a Bill also in the Lok Sabha. I would only say this much : There is no other district in the whole of India, except Bellary, which has been subjected to so many enquiries and so many decisions. Even this Parliament passed an act and several Government spokesmen have made pronouncements and given assurances. In the face of these pronouncements, I appeal to the Government that the *status quo* of Bellary in Mysore should not be disturbed. Mr. Lakshmayya said that Rayalaseema friends should be assured of water-supply. I can tell him that adequate safeguards could be provided and everything will be done to provide good water-supply to Rayalaseema.

Some friends have been saying that if the States Reorganisation decisions are not proper, the decisions will be taken in the streets. I would like to say that in the interests of the country and the supremacy of the Parliament in the interests of the unity of India and the prestige that we have commanded from the whole world, whatever decisions may be taken by the Parliament,

we must abide by them. We must feel that we are all one. The President has said that for the moment in our legitimate love for language—he has used the word “legitimate”—we have forgotten our national unity. We have been preaching the path of non-violence to all countries. Some friends have said that these principles are all only for foreign export. I say that they are for our practical experience and for our realisation in our every-day life. Mr. Gadgil was saying that he was a true prophet and therefore he referred to what took place in the streets of Bombay. He may be a true prophet, but I request him to use his good offices and his great talents to strengthen our national unity. We are passing through a very critical period. We have seen what has happened recently in the various parts of the country. I strongly urge that whether it be the name of a State or the area of a State, whatever is decided in the Parliament should be supreme and should be loyally obeyed by everybody. Unless we do that, our country will go to pieces. We have the great heritage that has been given to us by Gandhiji and other great leaders; let us profit by it and work for future prosperity. Let us leave to posterity a united, strong and prosperous India.

**Mr. Chairman:** I will request the hon. Members not to take more than ten minutes. Time is very short and there are number of speakers. Mr. Tek Chand.

**Shri Tek Chand (Ambala-Simla):** Kindly give me about 12 minutes.

**Mr. Chairman:** As there are a number of speakers, I have fixed the time-limit at 10 minutes.

**Shri Tek Chand:** I feel honoured in associating myself with the mover of the motion and with the galaxy of distinguished supporters of this motion. In whichever direction you may cast your eyes, whether towards the domestic horizon or towards the international horizon the achievements of the Government of this country stand out in bold relief. You will find that the country is soon going to be a humming bee-hive, with the setting up of cottage industries and other industries, big and small, and other beneficent activities. Time prevents me from enumerating and categorising these multifarious activities which are occupying the attention of the Government of this country. Most of the schemes and most of the plans are under way, some nearing completion and

[Shri Tek Chand]

others having already reached completion. The Government of this country have raised India's stature and nobody will gainsay the fact that India's Prime Minister today is the world's tallest man of this century. He is a tower of strength and a beacon of light to the peace-loving, peace-seeking people in the peace-denied world. This country's great role is being progressively realised and appreciated by the other countries. I shall read the speech delivered in October last by Mr. Richard Nixon, the Vice-President of the United States of America. Because of the encroachment upon my short time, I will read only a sentence from that speech :

"600 million uncommitted people hold the balance of power in the world today. Over one half of these people live in India."

Therefore, according to this statesman India is in a position today to hold the balance of power and the message of peace which emanates from India is being avidly grasped and widely appreciated. Certain disappointments are no doubt there and certain criticisms have been levelled. Certain type of criticism is even laudable. We have scaled many a peak and many a peak still remains to be scaled. But, people are naturally restive and impatient. This impatience on the part of the critics, on the part of the people is a sign of the vitality of the nation, not of its bitterness or disappointment.

3 P.M.

There is also another and different type of criticism, which is carping, cavilling and captious. Detractors wax eloquent. They are censorious, but when we expect them to give suggestions, they are minus suggestions. That is a type of criticism which one cannot appreciate, though one can understand the motive behind it. Some puny political ends motivate certain criticisms in the hope that if some mud is thrown, possibly some of it may stick.

There have been several important topics touched. States reorganisation seems to have the pride of place. It is this matter that has loomed large in the Lok Sabha and elsewhere, and very rightly so. The controversies which have raged over this issue are replete with useful lessons. We have almost an awry and lopsided way of our preferences. We consider classes first and caste later; then comes caste and community later; then comes com-

munity and country last. That is the lopsided order of our preferences. That has emerged as a result of some dissatisfaction shown with regard to the States reorganisation. Regional considerations have got the pride of place before national considerations. Language has been used as a cloak to foster personal ends. Parochial loyalties seem to submerge the larger loyalty to the country. In this state of affairs, what is to be done? Is narrow communalism, whether on the question of unilingualism, whether on the question of religion, whether on the question of regionalism, going to balkanise the country into as many countries as there happen to be linguistic States? Is this country going to be split into so many islands divided by seas of linguistic differences? Are we going to be a one nation, one country, one culture? I feel that linguistic interests can be left safely in the hands of the common man who loves his folk lore, who loves his folk songs. That can be left in peace and security with educational institutes in the country and the Universities. But, pray, do not leave it to the professional politicians. The petty political mountebank is the most dangerous custodian of languages. Language is used by him as a peg or cloak to hide Machiavellian machinations and which he pursues rigorously and vigorously.

An Hon. Member: Perfectly right.

Shri Tek Chand: Linguism has raised a frankenstein, a monster, that seems to be stalking the land lately. He has an abode virtually everywhere. The demon has been seen in action in Bombay and elsewhere. What are his presents? Rapine, damage, looting and molestation. These are understandable. But what is worse, this frankenstein has besmirched and besmeared the fair name of India. The criticism of India and the way that our message has been treated as a mere platitude in the name of peace, and how we have been scoffed at and criticised is not only unedifying, it is almost agonising. This is the gift of the unilingual champions, the parochial champions and the regional champions. I feel that the time has come when we can even thank all these advocates of unilingualism, that they have given us a good warning, a warning in good time. We are grateful to them. We will be more careful of their activities in future. We will prevent free India from being split up into half a dozen Indias or a dozen Indias.

The hon. Shri Gadgil shed copious tears for the people who were tear-gassed.

**Shri Syamnandan Sahaya:** Crocodile ones.

**Shri Tek Chand:** He had not one sigh to heave for the victims who have been robbed, who have been ruined, who have been molested, who have been assaulted. There is a great clamour for an enquiry. Enquiry into what? The incidents. Everybody knows how it was motivated, how concerted action took place, how it was designed and how it was engineered. There is no gainsaying the fact. If there be an enquiry, I have no doubt in my mind that the result of the enquiry most probably will be a considerable criticism, nay even condemnation of the forces of law and order, but on the ground of moderation, because they did not take early steps to prevent or sufficiently severe steps to punish those who destroyed peace, who tarnished the reputation of a great country. It is for this reason that I say it is likely that any enquiry will result in some criticism. The result of the enquiry is not going to be that the police committed excesses on innocent people.

The hon. leader of the Communist Party brought out a most fantastic suggestion. He said, look, the shopkeepers, in anticipation of some trouble, had insured their goods, therefore, the story about looting is tall talk, it was only with a view to get their insurance money. It is a most fantastic suggestion that people are robbed, looted, contents of shops are thrown out in the streets and all this has been deliberately engineered in order to get some insurance money.

There are some other matters. One thing I feel like submitting and it is this. So far as the disruptionist elements in the country are concerned, so far as those who feel disaffected are concerned, let them place their case, whatever they like before the Government. The Government is bound to consider it justly and fairly. Let their case be treated generously. But, let there be no palavers or pourparlers with the disruptionists. It causes disappointment among those who are thinking of a higher goal, and a nobler destiny for this country.

Apart from this topic, there are other matters which require immediate attention and one of these matters is unemployment in the country. A considerable number of speeches were made suggest-

ing as if Government had created unemployment. We forget that there is no unemployment in the country in the sense that the hitherto employed have been turned out. There is unemployment only in the sense that there are a large number of people who have not had employment so far, who are seeking employment, and the avenues are not sufficiently expanded in order to accommodate every able-bodied man who is fit to be employed. But there are other causes over which Government has no control, and not the least is the prolificity in this country. There is an addition of 35 or 36 lakhs immortals to the population of this country, they have got to be fed and looked after. I do not think Government can be blamed for that.

Lastly, something has been said about rampant corruption. I feel some effective steps should be taken to see that this propensity is substantially curbed if it cannot be entirely exterminated in the circumstances of the case. The report that was circulated to us yesterday has disclosed lakhs of rupees going down the drain either out of sheer callousness or carelessness. Therefore, in certain matters there has been waste that is almost wanton, in other cases there is extravagance that is almost reckless. Care should be taken to see that money is not ill-spent, is not misused. It is the hard-earned money of the tax-payer and it should be utilised to the best possible purposes in the interest of the country, for the benefit of the nation.

I am happy to associate myself with this motion.

✓ **श्री राधे लाल व्यास (उज्जैन) :** सदन के सामने राष्ट्रपति जी को धन्यवाद देने का जो प्रस्ताव है उस का मैं हार्दिक समर्थन करता हूँ।

पिछले वर्षों में अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों में जो हमारी ध्वाजा सुनी गई और जिस में विश्व-शान्ति कायम होने में एक बहुत बड़ा कदम आगे बढ़ा है, उस के लिये हम सब को बहुत ही अभिमान और गर्व है। यह वह समय था जब कि एक बहुत बड़े शक्तिशाली राष्ट्र रूस का दुनिया के दूसरे देशों के साथ इतना निकट सम्पर्क नहीं था। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की नीति के कारण ही आज रूस का दुनिया के देशों के साथ काफ़ी निकट का सम्पर्क हो गया है।

[श्री राधे लाल व्यास]

पंचशील के जो माने हुए सिद्धांत हैं वे यद्यपि बहुत पुराने हैं, लेकिन इतिहास यह बतलाता है कि आज से २५०० वर्ष पहले इस देश के एक बहुत बड़े नर-रत्न महात्मा बुद्ध ने इन सिद्धांतों को विश्व के सामने रखा था और तभी से हिन्दुस्तान की यह परम्परा रही है कि विश्व-शान्ति और विश्व-बन्धुत्व के लिये वह प्रयत्न करता रहा है। महात्मा बुद्ध के उस सन्देश को और उन सिद्धांतों को सारे विश्व में फैलाने का श्रेय महान् अशोक को हुआ था। उस के बाद हिन्दुस्तान की यह स्थिति नहीं रही कि विश्व में उसकी आवाज बहुत जोर की हो और उस की बात सुनी जाये। लेकिन इस जमाने में जब कि दुनिया हिंसा की ओर जा रही थी हमारे देश में महात्मा गांधी का जन्म हुआ और उन्होंने उन सिद्धांतों को फिर से दुनिया के सामने रखा। यह हमारा दुर्भाग्य है कि हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी के बाद महात्मा गांधी अपने सिद्धांतों का प्रचार और प्रसार करने के लिये जीवित नहीं रहे। परन्तु जिस तरह से महात्मा बुद्ध के सिद्धांतों को सारी दुनिया में महान् अशोक ने फैलाया था उसी प्रकार महात्मा जी के बाद उन के विचारों को और उन के सिद्धांतों को फैलाने का श्रेय हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी को है और जिस तरह से कि अशोक महान् हुआ है उसी तरह से इतिहास में नेहरू महान् भी प्रसिद्ध होगा इसमें हमें कोई संदेह नहीं है।

हमारे प्रयत्नों से अभी अभी १६ राष्ट्र संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में सम्मिलित किये गये हैं और यदि विश्व शान्ति को कायम रखना है तो यह निश्चित है कि चीन को जो उस का पद है वह देने के लिये दूसरे राष्ट्रों को राजी हो जाना चाहिये। इसी तरह से जापान और मंगोलिया जो भी संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की सदस्यता से वंचित हैं, जब तक उस में सम्मिलित नहीं होते और आज जो सद्भावना के वातावरण का अभाव है और जो शंका और भय रूस और अमेरिका के बीच में है, वह दूर

नहीं होता तब तक विश्वशान्ति कायम नहीं हो सकती। लेकिन मुझे विश्वास है कि अभी तक जैसे प्रयत्न भारत की ओर से विश्वशान्ति के लिये किये जाते रहे हैं वैसे ही आगे भी किये जाते रहेंगे और यह भय और आशंका का वातावरण दूर हो जायेगा और सारी दुनिया में मित्रता और सद्भावना का वातावरण कायम होगा और जो लड़ाई का खतरा है वह अवश्य दूर हो जायेगा।

घरेलू मामलों के सम्बन्ध में मुझे इतना ही निवेदन करना है कि हमारी प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना पूरी हो रही है। हमारे सामने जो मुख्य प्रश्न था वह अनाज की कमी का था और उस को हल करने में हम को आशातीत सफलता मिली है। आज हम अन्न के मामले में आत्मनिर्भर हो चुके हैं और जो हमारा अरबों रुपय अन्न के लिये विदेशों में जाता था अब हमें उसको विदेशों में भोजने की जरूरत नहीं रही है।

जो सामुदायिक विकास योजनाएँ और राष्ट्रीय सेवा योजनाएँ देश में लागू की गयी हैं उन से देहातों में और ग्राम जनता में एक नये उत्साह का जन्म हुआ है। और यदि कुछ काम कम हुआ है तो उस के लिये हम ग्राम जनता को दोष नहीं दे सकते। अगर उस के कोई दोषी हैं तो हमी लोग हैं जिन्होंने जनता से सम्पर्क स्थापित नहीं किया और हम को इस काम में जितना हाथ बंटाना चाहिये था उतना नहीं बंटाय। अगर हम को अपनी दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना को सफल बनाना है और देश की उन्नति करनी है तो जितने देश सेवक हैं उनका यह कर्तव्य है कि वे इस काम में अधिक से अधिक हाथ बंटायें।

हमने अपनी प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना से इतनी तो आशा भी नहीं की थी कि वह हमारे सारे दुखदर्द को दूर कर देगी और हमारी सारी कमियों को मिटा देगी। अभी हमारे माननीय सदस्य सरदार हुक्म सिंह ने पूछा कि क्या देश की बेकारी की समस्या हल हो गई, क्या गरीबी

दूर हो गईं आदि । लेकिन मैं निवेदन करूँगा कि यदि बारीकी से देखा जाये तो मालूम होगा कि वर्तमान परिस्थिति में कांग्रेस को और शासन को दूसरी पार्टियों का इस दिशा में जितना सहयोग मिलना चाहिये था उतना नहीं मिला बल्कि उनकी ओर से केवल टीकाटिप्पणी और विरोध ही मिला । इतना सब होते हुए भी जो कुछ सफलता प्राप्त हुई है उसे कम नहीं कहा जा सकता । अभी तो बहुत थोड़ा ही काम हुआ है । अभी तो केवल हमारी भावी इमारत की नींव ही पड़ी है । वास्तविक निर्माण कार्य तो आने वाले पांच सालों में शुरू होने वाला है । अगर इस काम में सारी पार्टियाँ सरकार के साथ मिल कर सहयोग और सद्भाव से काम करें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि देश में बहुत काम हो सकता है और देश बहुत आगे बढ़ सकता है ।

देश को आगे बढ़ाने के लिये जिस चीज की मुख्य रूप से आवश्यकता है वह है शिक्षा । आज देश में निरक्षरता बहुत ज्यादा है । हम देखते हैं कि जहाँ स्कूलों और कालिजों की शिक्षा उपलब्ध है, वहाँ वह बहुत महंगी है । विद्यार्थियों में जो अनुशासन होना चाहिये उसका भी अभाव है । यदि हमारे देश में शिक्षा की उन्नति नहीं होगी और विद्यार्थियों में अनुशासन नहीं होगा तो आगे आने वाली दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना के लिये और उस से बाद वाली योजनाओं के लिये हम को योग्य टेकनीशियन्स नहीं मिलेंगे, योग्य सेवा करने वाले नहीं मिलेंगे । इसलिये मेरा सुझाव है कि जहाँ तक हो सके स्कूलों के साथ होस्टल हों और उन में विद्यार्थी अनुशासन में रह कर अध्ययन करें । आजकल यह नहीं हो रहा है । मेरा लड़का एपीकल्चर कालिज में पढ़ता है और होस्टल में रहता है । वह मुझे बतलाता था कि वहाँ तो लड़के पढ़ने नहीं देते । अगर होस्टलों में इस प्रकार की अनुशासन-हीनता रही तो उन से कोई लाभ नहीं हो सकता । इसलिये देखा जाय कि होस्टल में रह कर हमारे विद्यार्थी ठीक ढंग से विद्याभ्यास कर सकें और उनकी पढ़ाई में बिघ्न न हो और उस में

गड़बड़ी न पड़े । आज हमारे देश में हजारों विद्यार्थी प्रोवेंसरसियरी, इंजीनियरिंग और दूसरी उच्च शिक्षा में प्राप्त कर रहे हैं और सरकार को इस बात का ध्यान रखना चाहिये कि उनकी पढ़ाई ठीक तरह से हो । दूसरी चीज जो मैं इस सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि मामूली आदमियों के पास इतना पैसा नहीं है कि वे अपने लड़कों की इंजिनियरिंग और प्रोवेंसरसियरी की ट्रेनिंग दिला सकें क्योंकि उनकी पढ़ाई पर होने वाला व्यय उन की सामर्थ्य के बाहर है । हमारा ध्येय देश में समाजवादी समाज की स्थापना है और इस नाते हमारा यह देखा जाना चाहिये कि योग्य विद्यार्थी चाहे धनी हों अथवा गरीब उस को इनकी पढ़ाई की सुविधा मिले । बिना धनी और गरीब का भेदभाव किये हर एक योग्य लड़के को इस तरह की उच्च शिक्षा प्राप्त करने का अवसर मिले, हर एक को समान रूप से ऊँचा उठने का अवसर सरकार द्वारा मिलना चाहिये और उस का तरीका यह हो सकता है कि वह योग्य गरीब विद्यार्थियों को स्कालरशिप् देकर इंजिनियरिंग, प्रोवेंसरसियरी और मेडिकल कालिजों में भरती करवायें, गरीब विद्यार्थियों को सरकार द्वारा आर्थिक सहायता मिलनी चाहिये, और आगे चल कर जब वे कमाने लगें तब उन की तनख्वाह में से सरकार अपनी दी हुई रकम कर्ज समझ कर वापिस ले ले या उन को तनख्वाह कुछ कम देकर सरकार अपनी दी हुई रकम को वापिस ले ले । इसलिये सरकार को इस ओर ध्यान देना चाहिये और आम जनता का सहयोग प्राप्त करने के लिये ताकि सभी उस में सहयोग दे सकें, यह तरीका अपनाया चाहिये । अगर सरकार ऐसा नहीं करती है तो सिर्फ उन के ही लड़के जो अपने लड़कों पर १०० और १५० रुपया प्रति माह खर्च करने की क्षमता रखते हैं, इन चीजों की शिक्षा प्राप्त कर सकेंगे और आम जनता के गरीब लोगों के लड़के भले ही वे योग्य हों, इस प्रकार की शिक्षा पाने से वंचित रह जायेंगे । इसलिये सरकार को इस



[श्री राधे लाल व्यास]

श्रीर ध्यान देना चाहिये और योग्य विद्यार्थियों को जो कि गरीब हैं, उन को प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिये ।

इंडस्ट्रीज (उद्योगों) का जहां तक सवाल है, यह जो दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना है, इस को इंडस्ट्रीज की योजना ही कहा जा सकता है । इस के अनुसार देश के भिन्न भिन्न कोनों में काफी इंडस्ट्रीज कायम करने की योजनायें हैं और प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना में भी इस की व्यवस्था थी लेकिन यह खेद के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि पिछले पांच वर्षों में हमारे मध्य भारत में एक भी बड़ी या छोटी इंडस्ट्री कायम नहीं हुई । अभी हमें मालूम हुआ है कि यहां पर बिजली की कल का एक बड़ा कारखाना खुलने वाला है और उस के लिये मध्य भारत में भेलसा के पास सर्व (परिमाण) किया जा रहा है तो मैं बतलाना चाहता हूं कि भेलसा से ५ मील की दूरी पर काफी विस्तृत जमीन पड़ी है और वह हजारों बीघा जमीन गवर्नमेंट बहुत सस्ते पर या मुफ्त में भी दे सकती है और वह स्थान इस प्रकार के कारखाने के लिये सर्वथा उपयुक्त है क्योंकि वह देश के मध्य में कायम होगा और जहां से सारे देश में आसानी से माल पहुंचाया जा सकेगा । यह जरूर है कि हमारे पास कोयला और लोहा नहीं है लेकिन अगर कहीं लोहा और कोयला है तो वहां पर पानी नहीं होगा और वहां इतनी जमीन उपलब्ध नहीं हो सकेगी जितनी कि भेलसा के पास हमें प्राप्त है और वहां पानी भी काफी है । सब चीजें एक जगह उपलब्ध नहीं हो सकती हैं लेकिन दो चीजें और जो कि अत्यावश्यक हैं यानी भूमि और पा े यह दोनों चीजें वहां पर काफी हैं, जमीन वहां पर काफी पड़ी है और पानी भी काफी है, इसलिये मैं समझता हूं कि सरकार कारखाने को वहां पर कायम करने के लिये आवश्यक कदम उठायेगी ।

कौटेज इंडस्ट्रीज (कुटीर उद्योगों) के

लिये काफी गुंजाइश हमारी दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में रखी गई है । अभी जैसे अम्बर चर्खे का प्रश्न हमारे सामने है । एक तरफ हम ने स्पिंडल्स नये लगान के लिये प्रतिबन्ध लगा दिया है लेकिन मुझे ऐसा मालूम हुआ है कि स्टेप्लि फाइबर और नये स्पिंडल्स की इजाजत देने की कार्यवाही चल रही है । मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या स्टेप्लि फाइबर से अम्बर चर्खे पर सूत नहीं काता जा सकता है ? उस से तो बहुत अच्छा सूत काता जा सकता है और धागा निकाला जा सकता है । इसलिये मेरा यह नम्र सुझाव है कि स्पिंडल्स की जहां इजाजत देना है वहां स्टेप्लि फाइबर और नये स्पिंडल्स की इजाजत देकर बेरोजगारी को और अधिक फैलाना बुद्धिमानी का कार्य नहीं होगा, इसलिये उस पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाना ही चाहिये ।

ला एंड आर्डर (विधि और शान्ति) का भी एक प्रश्न हमारे सामने है । आज मध्य भारत में ला एण्ड आर्डर की समस्या भीषण रूप में हमारे हल करने के लिये उपस्थित है । यह ठीक है कि भिड़ और मुरैना के इलाकों में डाकू मानसिंह और उसके कुछ साथी बाद में मारे गये हैं लेकिन आज भी वहां पर डाकुओं का आतंक विद्यमान है और वहां की जनता आज भी डाकुओं के भय से आतंकित है और डाकू मानसिंह के मरने के बाद भी वहां कई हत्याएं और सूटमार की घटनायें हुई हैं और सूटमार पहले से बहुत अधिक बढ़ गई है । यह सही है कि इस सम्बन्ध में हमारे यहां के नवयुवक और उत्साही गृहमंत्री श्री नरसिंह राव दीक्षित बड़ी लगन और योग्यता से वहां काम कर रहे हैं, रात दिन उन को इस बात की लगन है लेकिन वह अपने सीमित साधनों से वहां की स्थिति पर काबू नहीं पा सकते हैं । सभापति महोदय, आप को यह सुन कर आश्चर्य होगा और मुझे आपको यह बतलाते हुए बड़ा दुख होता है कि हमारे वहां जो स्पेशल आम्बेड पुलिस ने काम किया और वहां रही, उसकीत नखाह मध्य भारत की सरकार से मांगी जाती है । यदि वह नीमच में रहे या

दूसरी जगह न रहती तो शायद उस को केन्द्र में तनखाह देनी नहीं पड़ती। यह ठीक है कि ला एंड ग्रांडर का प्रश्न मध्य भारत की सरकार से सम्बन्ध रखता है लेकिन केन्द्रीय सरकार को उसकी गम्भीरता को समझना चाहिये और उस को इस को हल करने के लिये सक्रिय सहायता करनी चाहिये और उसे भ्रव राज्य का विषय नहीं रहने देना चाहिये। काफी वर्ष डाकुओं के आतंक को चलते हुए हो चुके हैं और वहाँ शान्ति स्थापित न होने से दूसरे प्रान्तों में जो डाकू लोग हैं उन को समाज विरोधी कार्यवाहियाँ करने के लिये उत्तेजन मिलता है। मध्य भारत में जीघ्र ही डाकुओं के आतंक को खत्म किये जाने की आवश्यकता है और इस के लिये केन्द्र की सरकार को वहाँ की प्रान्तीय सरकार की सब प्रकार से सहायता करनी चाहिये। केन्द्रीय सरकार को वहाँ पर कुछ एक्सपर्ट्स (विशेषज्ञों) को भेज कर यह देखना चाहिये कि आखिर इस स्थिति पर कैसे काबू पाया जा सकता है। आज वहाँ पर लोगों में डर और आतंक फैला हुआ है और अशान्ति विद्यमान है और लोग देहातों से डर के मारे भाग रहे हैं, छोटे-छोटे दुकानदार गांवों को छोड़ कर बाहर भाग गये हैं और गांवों की जनता हमेशा अपने को खतरे में समझती है कि किस क्षण डाकू लूटमार करने आ जायें और डाकू जो भी उन से रुपया मांगते हैं उन को उतना देकर अपनी जान बचानी पड़ती है। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि इस ला एंड ग्रांडर की ओर सरकार को विशेष ध्यान देना चाहिये और यह खाली मिड और मुरैना का ही सवाल नहीं है बल्कि सारे देश के लिये ला एंड ग्रांडर स्थापित करने का प्रश्न हमारे सामने है। हम देख रहे हैं कि देश के अन्य भागों में भी लूटमार, अशान्ति और चोरी डकैती आदि की घटनायें बढ़ती जा रही हैं।

आखिरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि जब तक करप्शन (भ्रष्टाचार) नहीं मिटेगा तब तक हमारी कोई योजना सफल

नहीं हो सकती। जिधर भी हम जाते हैं और चारों तरफ यही घावाज घाती है कि करप्शन पहले से ज्यादा बढ़ गया है। करप्शन का एक उदाहरण मैं आप को बतलाऊँ कि मेरे एक मित्र के मित्र मिले और उन्होंने अपने साथ बीती बात बतलाई कि वह ग्वालियर से "सेकेंड क्लास" में सवार हो गये और उन्होंने गार्ड को बतला दिया कि वे टिकट नहीं ले सके हैं, गार्ड ने कहा कि कोई हर्ज नहीं आगरे में मैं टिकट दे दूंगा लेकिन आगरा भी गुजर गया और दिल्ली पहुंच गये जहाँ पर कि हम = आदमियों से सिंगल-फेयर लेकर हमें स्टेशन से बाहर निकाल दिया। जब उन्होंने टिकट मांगे तो उस ने जवाब दिया कि अगर आप टिकट चाहते हैं तो ग्वालियर से देहली तक का डूना किराया दीजिये, डबल फेयर लाइये, मैं आपको रसीद बना दूंगा। तो इस किस्म का भ्रष्टाचार चल रहा है। यह तो मैंने उदाहरण स्वरूप एक गार्ड द्वारा करप्शन करने की बात बतलाई, वैसे सारे देश में भ्रष्टाचार और घूसखोरी विद्यमान है और मैं आप को बतलाऊँ कि हम कम्युनिटी प्राजेक्ट एरिया में जाते हैं तो लोग हमें बतलाते हैं कि हमें जो वहाँ पर कर्ष मिलता है उस में से बहुत कुछ दूसरों को देना पड़ता है। कहने का मतलब यह है कि आज देश की यह दयनीय प्रवस्था हो रही है जिस की ओर सरकार को ध्यान देना चाहिये। इसलिये सरकार को देखना चाहिये कि इस तरह बीच वाले जो सरकारी ग्रामदनी खा जाते हैं उन पर अंकुश लगाया जाय और अगर हम ऐसा करने में सफल हो गये तो हम काफी रकम राष्ट्रीय योजनाओं के लिये बचा सकेंगे जो आज इस तरह नष्ट हो रही है। इसलिये आज सब से बड़ी आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि सरकार यदि दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना को सफल बनाना चाहती है तो देश में जो चारों ओर भ्रष्टाचार और घूस-खोरी विद्यमान है, उस को दूर करे। डाफ्ट फाइव डयर प्लान में काफी योजनायें हैं और काफी कार्यों को किये जाने की ओर संकेत है लेकिन मैं यह

[श्री राधेलास व्यास]

चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि केवल कोरी कागजी कार्यवाही से काम पूरा होने वाला नहीं है और हमें कोई रास्ता ऐसा अवश्य निकालना चाहिये जिस से करप्शन कम हो और उसी हालत में हमारी यह दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना सफल हो सकती है और देश का भविष्य उज्वल होगा।

अन्त में मैं सभापति महोदय, आप का आभारी हूँ कि आप न मुझे इतना समय बोलने के लिये दिया। राष्ट्रपति को जो धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव दिया गया है, मैं उस का समर्थन करता हूँ।

श्री टंडन (जिला इलाहाबाद पश्चिम) : सभापति महोदय, मैं भी उस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ जो राष्ट्रपति जी को धन्यवाद देने के लिये रखा गया है। उन्होंने, राज्यों के पुनर्गठन के कारण जो कठिनाइयाँ उपस्थित हुई हैं, उन पर खेद प्रकट किया है। इस लोक सभा में भी बराबर हमारे सदस्यों ने पुनः संगठन समिति की रिपोर्ट की चर्चा की है।

हमारे इन चार दिनों के विवाद में उस प्रतिवेदन का बड़ा स्थान रहा है। वह विषय भी हमारी वर्तमान समस्याओं से सम्बन्ध रखता है और यह स्वाभाविक ही था कि हम उस पर समय दें। मैं भी दो एक बातें इस विषय में सब से पहले कहना चाहता हूँ।

एक तो यह कि पुनः संगठन के विषय को हमें इस समय निराशा में छोड़ नहीं देना है। हमारे एक मित्र ने सुझाव दिया है कि आज यह समय है कि जो टंटा हमें दिखाई दे रहा है उस को शान्त करने के लिये इस सारे मामले को ही समाप्त कर दिया जाये। न रहेगा बांस, न बजेगी बांसुरी। बांसुरी जो बेसुरी बज रही है उस को बन्द करने के लिये बांस को ही समाप्त कर दो। मेरी राय है कि यह निराशा की सम्मति है। मैं इस से बिल्कुल भी सहमत नहीं हूँ। मैं तो अपनी सरकार को यही सलाह दूंगा कि अब जो कुछ सामने आया है, जो समस्या उपस्थित है उस के लिये

हमें उचित कार्य करना है। जो विषय उठा लिया उस से हमें हटना नहीं है। अब उस पुनः संगठन की रिपोर्ट पर विचार करना ही है। जितने भी प्रश्न हैं उन में सब से बड़ा प्रश्न महाराष्ट्र, गुजरात और बंबई का है। उस का हल निकालना है। आज उस को इस तरह से छोड़ देने में हमारा लाभ नहीं है और साथ ही यह गवर्नमेंट की मर्यादा के भी विरुद्ध भी है। इसलिये इस विषय को जो उठाया गया है हल करना ही है।

हमारे भाई श्री अशोक मेहता जी ने कहा कि गुजरातियों और महाराष्ट्र निवासियों को साथ रहना है और उन्हें मिल कर ही इस विषय को हल करना है, तथा यह उचित है कि यह राज्य द्विभाषी राज्य हो। उन्होंने इस मत पर बल दिया। कुछ समय हुआ जब पुनः संगठन के प्रतिवेदन पर विचार हो रहा था, मैंने निवेदन किया था कि इस राज्य को द्विभाषी ही बनाना चाहिये। इस को गुजराती स्वीकार करें और मराठी बोलने वाले भी स्वीकार करें। मैं ने नम्रता के साथ दोनों से निवेदन किया कि जब मिल कर साथ रहना है तो संस्थाओं का प्रश्न नहीं उठना चाहिये। आभाग्य से संस्थाओं के इस प्रश्न का आरम्भ हमारे मराठीभाषी भाइयों ने इस हिसाब से किया था कि वह कुल मराठीभाषी जनता को एक में रखना चाहते थे, नहीं तो जो रिपोर्ट समिति ने दी थी उस के ऊपर गुजराती तो राजी थे ही, उन्होंने स्वीकार किया था कि यह राज्य द्विभाषी हो। मराठी भाषियों ने भी यह बात मानी थी कि द्विभाषी प्रदेश हो किन्तु विदभं भी साथ मिलाया जाये। विदभं के आ जाने से मराठीभाषियों की एकता हो जाती है, उन की संख्या बढ़ जाती है, पर द्विभाषी प्रदेश वह फिर भी रहता है। आज श्री अशोक मेहता जी ने जो कहा कि द्विभाषी राज्य हो, वह प्रतिवेदन में भी था। यह बात गुजरातियों को भी स्वीकार थी और मराठी भाषियों को भी स्वीकार थी। इस विदभं ने आकर कुछ अन्तर किया। विदभं के मिलाने से आज कठिनाई

अपस्थित हो गई। परन्तु इस कठिनाई को हल करना है। अब तो यह एक प्रकार से निश्चित हो गया है कि बिदर्भ साथ रहेगा। अब बम्बई प्रदेश पहले के प्रपेक्षा बहुत बड़ा बन गया। मैंने यह सुझाव दिया था। आज फिर मैं उस की ओर ध्यान दिलाता हूँ। द्विभाषी राज्य हो इसमें न मराठी भाषियों को आपत्ति है और न गुजरातियों को। ऐसा जान पड़ता है कि कुछ संख्याओं की बलाबली है जिस के कारण इतना उधम मचा। यह समस्या कोई इतनी कठिन नहीं है। जो आज सामने है उस को दोनों मान लें तो विवाद समाप्त हो जाता है। यदि न मानें तो मैं सरकार से निवेदन करूँगा कि वह इस में थोड़ा अन्तर कर दे। इन दोनों प्रदेशों को मिलाने के बाद उन में कुछ भाग मालवे का मिला दें। मैंने पहले भी यह सुझाव दिया था कि इस में इंदौर के घास पास का भाग मिला दिया जाये।

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** वह मिलना नहीं चाहते हैं।

**श्री बी० जी० वेंकटारं (गुना) :** नहीं, वह चाहते हैं।

**श्री टंडन :** मेरा निश्चय है कि इंदौर के घास पास के भाई बम्बई के साथ रहना बहुत अच्छा समझेंगे। अगर इन्दौर के घास पास जो मालवा का प्रदेश है उस को इस में मिलाया जाये तो इस में कोई कठिनाई नहीं होगी। हाँ, यह संभव है कि वह द्विभाषी की जगह त्रिभाषी प्रदेश हो जाये क्योंकि कुछ हिन्दी का भाग भी आ जायेगा। परन्तु जो तीसरी भाषा हिन्दी है उस से तो दोनों को ही प्रेम है। मैं जानता हूँ कि मराठी भाई और गुजराती भाई दोनों ही हिन्दी के पक्षपाती हैं और राष्ट्रभाषा के रूप में दोनों ही हिन्दी को मानते रहे हैं। साधारण रूप से यदि यह प्रदेश त्रिभाषी होगा तो भी कुछ तो हिन्दी चलेगी ही। इसलिये मेरा यह निवेदन है कि यदि इस तरह से यह प्रदेश बनाया जाये तो वहाँ के लोगों में बिल्कुल मेल रहेगा। जब साथ रहना है तो मिलकर काम भी करना है। मैं इस बात का

मानने वाला हूँ कि दुनिया में देश की मुख्यता और छोटे-छोटे राज्यों को गौणता दी जाती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि देश मुख्य है और छोटे राज्य इधर से उधर गये या उधर से इधर आये, बम्बई इधर आये या उधर जाये, यह एक गौण प्रश्न है। मेरे कहने का यह मतलब नहीं है कि इधर से उधर हटाने में किसी को कष्ट नहीं होता, अवश्य कष्ट होता है, कई स्थानों में मैंने देखा कि अगर आप एक छोटे से टुकड़े को भी इधर से उधर कर दें तो टुकड़े वालों को कठिनाई होती है, किन्तु हमारे सामने जो देश की एकता का प्रश्न है उस की तुलना में यह सब प्रश्न छोटे हैं। महाराष्ट्र के सम्बन्ध में मेरा यह सुझाव है।

पंजाब के सम्बन्ध में भी मैंने उस समय कुछ कहा था। अब मुझे आशा हो रही है कि उस का रूप कुछ अच्छा बन रहा है। अजी अमृतसर में सिखों का एक समारोह हुआ था। उस में मास्टर तारा सिंह ने एक भाषण दिया था। उस भाषण में उन्होंने हिन्दुओं से अपील की थी। मुझको उन का भाषण बहुत अच्छा लगा। उन्होंने बड़े मार्मिक ढंग से अपील की थी और पुरानी बातों का स्मरण दिलाया था कि सिखों को किस लिये बनाया गया था। यह एक ऐतिहासिक बात है कि समाज को उठाने के लिये ही सिख पैदा किये गये थे। इस प्रकार से उन्होंने एकता की अपील की। मैं उन की अपील के एक एक अक्षर का समर्थन करता हूँ। साथ ही आज मैं हिन्दुओं और सिखों दोनों से निवेदन करता हूँ कि वे इस प्रश्न पर बड़ी उदारता से विचार करें तथा जो देश के हित में हो उस की अधिक आगे रखें।

हमारे भाई सरदार हुकम सिंह जी ने यह कहा कि छोटे राज्यों के बनने से बड़े राज्य बनने की प्रपेक्षा ज्यादा लाभ होगा, अर्थात् छोटे राज्यों से अधिक एकता स्थापित होगी। यह ऐसी बात है जो किसी और भी मुड़ सकती है। उन का कहना है कि बड़े राज्यों की प्रवृत्ति लड़ने की

[श्री टंडन]

उलझने की और केन्द्र से भ्रमलग होने की अधिक होगी। आखिर ऐसा क्यों माना जाये कि जो बड़े टुकड़े होंगे उन में भ्रमलग होने की प्रवृत्ति अधिक होगी? साथ ही हम देख रहे हैं कि छोटे छोटे राज्यों के बनाने में कितनी असुविधा है। स्वयम् पंजाब के छोटे छोटे टुकड़े बनाने में हम विशेष असुविधा देख रहे हैं फिर विदेशों के पड़ोस के कारण तो वहाँ हमें बड़ी शक्ति और दृढ़ता का प्रदेश चाहिये।

छोटे राज्यों के होने से केन्द्र को अधिक मदद मिलेगी, यह दलील तो मुझे नहीं जंचती। मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि यदि देश में बड़े बड़े टुकड़े रहे तो एकता अधिक होगी। कुछ हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश की भी उन्होंने चर्चा की। उन्होंने कहा कि यू० पी० को इसी तरह से बनाये रखने के लिये हमारी केन्द्रीय गवर्नमेंट और शायद हमारे प्रधान मंत्री भी बड़े प्रदेश खड़े करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। कुछ इस प्रकार की दलील उन्होंने बूझी है। यह मुझे कुछ ठीक बात नहीं लगी। मैं समझता हूँ कि यदि इस प्रकार का मत किसी का है, तो वह ठीक नहीं है। उस के साथ यह कहना कि वह उलझन से भाग रहे हैं जिस की कि उन्होंने अंग्रेजी में इन्फेपिज्म कहा यह बात भी मुझे दिखाई नहीं देती है। यह जो कहा गया है कि बंगाल और बिहार इस लिए एक हो रहे हैं कि चूँकि यू० पी० बड़ा है इसलिये हमें भी चाहिये कि हम बड़े बनें, यह भी मुझे कोई सही बात नहीं दिखाई देती। पंजाब के बारे में बात करते हुए जो उन्होंने बंगाल और बिहार की चर्चा की उस के विषय में मैं उन से तथा दूसरे भाइयों से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह प्रश्न एक भ्रमलग रूप से आया है। इन दोनों प्रदेशों की अपनी कठिनाइयाँ हैं। बंगाल की अपनी कठिनाइयाँ हैं और बिहार की अपनी कठिनाइयाँ हैं। बंगाल की कठिनाई तो यह है कि बहुत भारी संख्या में लोग पूर्वी बंगाल से आ रहे हैं जिन के लिये स्थान की बहुत कमी है।

डा० राय के दिल में यह बात आई हो कि हम यू० पी० के बराबर हो जायें यह बहुत दूर की कोड़ी है। उन के सामने तो समस्या यह थी कि उनको भूमि कहाँ मिले। बिहार के साथ उनका पुराना सम्बन्ध रहा है और यदि अब बिहार और बंगाल मिलते हैं तो उसमें कोई अस्वाभाविक बात नहीं है।

हमारे जो प्रजा समाजवादी भाई हैं उन्होंने इस विषय में अपने दिल का रास्ता निकाल लिया है और उन्होंने सोचा है कि जब बिहार और बंगाल का सवाल आए तो वह इसका विरोध करें। उन्होंने इस का विरोध किया भी है। श्री अशोक मेहता से मैं यह आशा करता था कि वह कुछ कहेंगे। उन्होंने अपने भाषण में इस विषय पर कुछ नहीं कहा। उन्होंने जो दलील गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र को एक करने की दी वह मुझे अच्छी लगी। मैं बंगाल और बिहार को भी मिलाने में कोई बुराई नहीं देखता हूँ। इस में मुझे हर तरह से भलाई ही नजर आती है। यह बात होगी ही—यह मैं नहीं कह सकता हूँ, क्योंकि मैं यह मानता हूँ कि अगर गहरा विरोध हो और जनता न माने तो जनता की खोपड़ी पर यह लादना नहीं चाहिये। परन्तु यदि यह हो सके तो मुझे इस में कोई संदेह नहीं है कि यह एक बहुत सुन्दर बात होगी। और आगे के लिये हमारा मार्ग प्रदर्शित करने वाली सिद्ध होगी।

इतना कहने के पश्चात् अब मुझे कुछ बातें ऐसे प्रश्नों पर कहनी हैं जिनके बारे में राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में कुछ नहीं कहा। इन में से सब से पहले मैं हिन्दी के प्रश्न को लेता हूँ। इस विषय में उन्होंने कुछ नहीं कहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि सम्भवतः उन्होंने यह आशयक ही नहीं समझा कि वे कुछ कहें। मैंने कई बार पहले कहा है कि हमारा जो शिक्षा विभाग है उसका कार्य बहुत असंतोषजनक है। पिछले पांच वर्षों में जो कुछ भी शिक्षा विभाग को कर लेना था उसका सवा भाग भी उस ने नहीं किया है। मैं बिल्कुल नापतोल करके यह बात

कह रहा हूँ। परन्तु जो कुछ भी हो चुका है उस पर हमें श्रम रोना नहीं है, हमें चाहिये कि हम आगे के लिये चेतें। इधर शिक्षा विभाग की ओर से एक बात ऐसी की गई है जो सहायता देने वाली नहीं बल्कि बिगाड़ पैदा करने वाली है। मैं इस समय हिन्दी टाइप राइटर का हवाला दे रहा हूँ। इस के बारे में अभी गवर्नमेंट ने अपना अन्तिम मत प्रकट नहीं किया है और मैं आशा करता हूँ कि अगर इस विषय पर विचार कर के इस को संभालने की चेष्टा की गई तो भल ठीक हो जायेगी। शिक्षा विभाग द्वारा हिन्दी टाइपराइटर का जो की बोर्ड (वर्ग पट्ट) तैयार किया गया है उसमें अक्षर तो हिन्दी के रखे गये हैं, परन्तु जो अंक (न्यूमरल्स) रखे गये हैं, वे अंग्रेजी के हैं। यह बात मुझे अजीब सी लगी है कि...

**श्री त्पागी :** यह कान्स्टीट्यूशन में है।

**श्री डंडन :** मैं इसके बारे में निवेदन करता हूँ। आपने तो वही बात दुहरा दी है जो शिक्षा विभाग दुहराता आया है। मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि कान्स्टीट्यूशन, (संविधान) में ऐसा नहीं है। कान्स्टीट्यूशन में जिन शब्दों का प्रयोग किया गया है वह आप के सामने हैं। उन को कुछ ध्यान से देखें तो अच्छा हो। मैं इस को एक महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न मानता हूँ। इस लिये मुझे इस पर पांच सात मिनट लेने पड़ेंगे, टाइपराइटर जो बनता है वह देश भर के लिये बनता है। यदि उसे देश भर के लिये बनाना है तो हमें चाहिये कि हम यह भी देखें कि क्या लिखावट देश में चल रही है, हमारे देश में हिन्दी बोलने वाले कितने हैं और इन नागरी अंकों का काम मे लाने वाले कितने हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि जो लोग हिन्दी बोलने वाले ह, उन की संख्या लगभग १५ करोड़ है। यह संख्या उन प्रदेशों की है जहाँ आज हिन्दी चल रही है। परन्तु यही अंक गजरातियों के हैं जिन की संख्या लगभग ढाई करोड़ है। वहीं अंक मराठी भाषियों के हैं जिन की संख्या लगभग तीन

करोड़ की होगी। यही अंक हमारे भाई सरदार हुक्म सिंह और उनके सहयोगी भी काम में लाते हैं पंजाबी भाषा में, गुरुमुखी में, यही अंक है। इनकी संख्या भी लगभग डेढ़ करोड़ तो है ही इस तरह से इन अंकों का प्रयोग करने वाले लगभग २२ करोड़ आप को मिलेंगे। लगभग ६-७ करोड़ लोग आप ऐसे पायेंगे जो बिल्कुल यही अंक तो नहीं किन्तु इस से मिलते जुलते अंकों का प्रयोग करते हैं जैसे बंगाल, आसाम और उड़ीसा में। इन के अंकों का जो क्रम है यह कुछ भिन्न है इसलिये मैं उन को छोड़े देता हूँ। प्रश्न यह है कि आप जो टाइपराइटर बना रहे हैं यह किस के लिये बना रहे हैं। जनता के लिये ही तो यह बनेंगे।

यहाँ पर कान्स्टीट्यूशन का हवाला दिया गया है। अगर कान्स्टीट्यूशन में होता कि आपके के लिये नागरी अंकों का प्रयोग बन्द कर दिया जाता है और उन के स्थान पर अंग्रेजी अंकों का प्रयोग होगा, जिन को इन्टरनेशनल फार्म आफ इंडियन न्यूमरल्स कहा गया है, तब वह ठीक होता जो शिक्षा विभाग चाहता है। लेकिन ऐसा नहीं है। कान्स्टीट्यूशन में इस सम्बन्ध में य शब्द है :

The official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devnagri script.

उस में देवनागरी लिपि रखी गई है और लिपि में अक्षर और अंक दोनों सम्मिलित होते हैं। लिपि के दो अंग होते हैं और आप की ऐसा कहीं नहीं मिलेगा कि उन में अन्तर किया जाये। स्क्रिप्ट (लिपि) के भीतर दोनों हैं। आपने देवनागरी लिपि को माना—उस की लिखावट को माना।

फिर लिखा है :

The form of numerals to be used for the official purposes of the Union shall be the international form of Indian numerals.

अर्थात् यूनिवर्सल के आफिशियल कामों के लिये—न्यूमरल्स का यह फार्म होगा। इस के तुरन्त बाद लिखा है : (एक पैरा मने छोड़ दिया है

[श्री टंडन]

Provided that the President may, during the said period, by order authorise the use of the Hindi language in addition to the English language and of the Devnagari form of numerals in addition to the international form of Indian numerals for any of the official purposes of the Union.

यानी हिन्दी लिखने में अंग्रेजी अंकों का भी प्रयोग हो सकता है और देवनागरी अंकों का भी—दोनों का प्रयोग हो सकता है। आज वस्तुस्थिति क्या है? मैंने अभी कहा है कि इतने करोड़ आदमियों के लिये आप टाइपराइटर बना रहे हैं। कैसा टाइपराइटर आप हम को देंगे? उत्तर प्रदेश, महाराष्ट्र, बिहार, राजस्थान, ये सब राज्य किस टाइपराइटर पर काम करेंगे? जिस टाइपराइटर पर इन को काम करना है, उस का की-बोर्ड (बर्ण-पट्ट) आप को देना चाहिये। अगर आप को अपने कामों में हिन्दी के साथ अंग्रेजी अंकों का इस्तेमाल करना है—मैं इस प्रश्न में नहीं जाता कि वह कहाँ होगा—तो उस के लिये आप को बहुत थोड़े टाइपराइटर चाहिये। अगर आप यह तय करते हैं कि आफि-सियल्ल परपजिब आफ बी युनियन के लिये आप को शस्त्र मार कर अंग्रेजी अंकों का ही प्रयोग करना है—अगर गवर्नमेंट की नीति यह हो जायेगी, तो आप देखिये कि कितने टाइप-राइटर आप को चाहिये। लेकिन वास्तविकता यह है कि गवर्नमेंट की यह नीति नहीं है और इस पर मैं उसको बधाई देता हूँ। इस विषय में उन्होंने बराबर बुद्धिमानी से काम किया है। जहाँ जहाँ उन्होंने हिन्दी का प्रयोग किया है, वहाँ वहाँ उन्होंने नागरी अंकों का प्रयोग किया है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : अभी टाइपराइटर ऐसे ही हैं।

श्री टंडन : यह केवल टाइपराइटर का ही प्रश्न नहीं है। आप रेल विभाग की समय-सारणी को देखिये। वह तो केवल टाइपराइटर की बदौलत नहीं बनी होगी। उसमें नागरी अंकों

का प्रयोग बराबर होता है। अगर आप नया टाइप-राइटर बना कर इन नागरी अंकों को बदलना चाहें, अगर आप चाहें कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया जनता से जितना भी सम्पर्क करे, उस में अंग्रेजी अंकों का प्रयोग हो, तो वह कदापि उचित नहीं है। अगर मैं समझता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट की यह मंशा नहीं है।

कांस्टीट्यूशन के बाद, नई मिनिस्ट्री बनने के बाद जब गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया ने रेलवे का टाइमटेबल बनाया था, तब पहले उस में नागरी अक्षरों के साथ अंग्रेजी अंकों का प्रयोग किया गया था। उस का नाम रखा गया था समय-सूचक या समय दर्शक। वह टाइम-टेबल किस के काम का था। जो अंग्रेजी पढ़े लिखे लोग थे, वह प्रायः अंग्रेजी का टाइम-टेबल खरीदते थे और जो आदमी हिन्दी का टाइम-टेबल चाहते थे—देहात के आदमी, साधारण आदमी—उनको हिन्दी अंक चाहिये था। इस कारण वह कदाचित्त बिका भी कम। रेलवे मिनिस्ट्री से कहा भी गया कि आप ने यह क्या निकाला है, यह हमारे किस काम का है। परिणाम यह हुआ कि जो समय सारिणी कई वर्षों से निकल रही है, उस में नागरी अंकों का प्रयोग किया गया है। उस के लिये मैं गवर्नमेंट को बधाई देता हूँ। इसलिये वह दलील सही नहीं है, जिसकी त्यागी जी कल्पना कर रहे हैं। पहले उस में अंग्रेजी अंकों का प्रयोग किया गया था, लेकिन वह बन्द कर दिया गया। समय सारणी को नागरी अंकों के साथ निकालना पड़ा।

हमारे सामने जितने भी गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया के पब्लिकेशन्स हैं—पब्लिकेशन डिबीजन के और इन्फर्मेशन ऐंड ब्राडकास्टिंग मिनिस्ट्री के—उन सब में नागरी अंकों का ही प्रयोग किया गया है। वे बहुत बुद्धिमानी की बात कर रहे हैं। वे देख रहे हैं कि उन्हें उन पब्लिकेशन्स (प्रकाशनों) को २१-२२ करोड़ आदमियों के सामने भेजना है। यह क्रम सही है। और इसी को जारी रखना है। जहाँ कहीं कोई ऐसी विशेष जरूरत पड़ती है, वहाँ आप इस नीति में परिवर्तन कर सकते

हैं। आप भूलिये नहीं—मुझे याद है कि अंग्रेजी अंकों की व्यवस्था इस लिये की गई थी कि ख्याल था कि शायद एकाउंटिंग में, आडिटिंग में, एकाउंटेंट जनरल के कार्यालय में शीघ्र हिन्दी भाषा आ जाने से कुछ कठिनाई होगी। लेकिन जन-सम्पर्क के कार्यों में आप को इन्हीं नागरी अंकों का प्रयोग करना पड़ेगा। टाइप-राइटर के की-बोर्ड (वर्ण पट्ट) में आप उन अंकों को न रखें, मुझे यह बहुत गलत लगता है। इतना ही मेरा निवेदन है। कांस्टीट्यूशन के हिसाब से आप मजबूर नहीं हैं कि आप अंग्रेजी अंकों का प्रयोग करें। उस में दोनों बातें हैं। आप जो चाहें कर सकते हैं। अगर आप ने—मिनिस्ट्रों ने—नागरी को चुना, तो सही किया, बुद्धिमानी की।

एक आध बात और मैं आप से कुछ समय लेकर कहना चाहता हूँ। मेरे सामने यह बहुत बड़ा प्रश्न है। अंग्रेजी को अधिक समय तक चलाने की बात की गई है और इस विषय में हमारे मान्य नेता श्री राजा जी ने विशेषकर अपना मत प्रकट किया है। मुझे हाल में एक पुस्तक मिली है—श्री प्यारे लाल की “महात्मा गांधी—दि लास्ट फ्रेज” इस पुस्तक में राजा जी और गांधी जी के हिन्दी सम्बन्धी कुछ विचार हैं। मूह्यत के साथ उन्होंने आपस में बात की है। वह बड़ी रुचिकर है और उस को मैं आप के सामने रख देना चाहता हूँ।

उस का उल्लेख १६५ पन्ने पर है, आप उस को पढ़ लीजिये। उस में किसी फंक्शन का जिक्र है। जहां तक मालूम होता है, सन् १९४५ की बात है।

“The function itself which had taken Gandhiji to Madras occupied only a small part of his time. But its follow-up took some of his colleagues by surprise. He wrote letters to Srinivas Sastry, and Drs. Jayakar and Sapru, asking whether in future he might not correspond with them in the national language. Their cry of independence for the masses would be an insincere and hollow cry, he told all concerned if they failed to cultivate the habit of speaking and thinking in the language of the people. It had to be now or never. Rajaji with

his incorrigible love of paradox unwittingly made a *faux pas* when on receiving a scrawl in Devanagari in the Master's own hand, he let the following escape from his pen: “Your Nagari is so illegible that I have only with great difficulty gathered what you wished to tell me... It won't do to discard what we both know well and handle as medium and adopt deliberately a difficult medium except occasionally as a joke! I shall begin replying in Tamil if you write to me in illegible Nagari!”

“This brought the following from the Master: ‘If we discover a mistake, must we continue it? We begin making love in English—a mistake. Must it express itself only by repeating the initial mistake? You have the cake and eat it also. Love is love under a variety of garb—even when the lovers are dumb, probably it is fullest when it is speechless. I had thought under its gentle, unfeigned compulsion, you would easily glide into Hindustani and thus put the necessary finishing touch to your service of Hindustani. But let it be as you will, not I.’”

“Wrote the repentant sinner: “Regarding Hindustani I plead guilty and ask for mitigation. Old age (not youth) being the excuse. But don't argue further. Your very sweetness makes me feel so guilty.”

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

राजा जी ने अपने बुढ़ापे की बात कही थी। लेकिन जब उन्होंने यह बात कही थी तब से वे और अधिक बूढ़े हो गये हैं। यह हमारा सीमाव्य है कि हमारे देश में राजा जी जैसे महापुरुष हैं। मैं कह सकता हूँ कि मैं हृदय से राजा जी का पुजारी हूँ। परन्तु उन की कई बातें ऐसी होती हैं जिन में वे गहरी भूल कर जाते हैं और मुझको ऐसा लगता है कि आज जो वह कह रहे हैं उस में वे गहरी भूल कर रहे हैं। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि हिन्दी के विषय में विचार करते समय हमें इस प्रकार की बातों से चौकन्ने रहना है।

4 P.M.

मुझे एक बात और कहनी है, और मुझे बड़ी प्रसन्नता है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी भी स समय यहाँ मौजूब हैं। इस बात का थोड़ा सा सम्बन्ध परराष्ट्र नीति से है।



[श्री टंडन]

संसार में जितनी लिपियां हैं उनको जानने वाले बड़े बड़े लोगों का यह मत है कि नागरी लिपि सब से अधिक सुन्दर, पूर्ण और वैज्ञानिक है।

श्री त्यागी : यह पेचीदा बात है।

श्री टंडन : मैं समझता नहीं कि इस पेचीदान पर आप नाक-भी क्यों सिकोड़ते हैं। अगर पेचीदा है तो उसे समझिये, वह आप की अक्ल के बाहर नहीं होनी चाहिये। देखिये इस में क्या पेच आता है। अभी मैंने कहा कि इस का कुछ परराष्ट्र नीति से सम्बन्ध है। आप उस पेच को समझने की कोशिश कीजिये। मैं कहता हूँ कि यह सारे संसार का प्रश्न है, केवल भारत का ही नहीं है। संसार में जो लिपियों के जानने वाले हुए हैं, उन में से कुछ की राय में आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। सर आइजक पिटमैन, जिन्होंने फोनोग्राफी, अर्थात् शार्टहेंड (शीघ्र-लिपि) निकाली, उन्होंने देवनागरी लिपि को देखकर ही उस के आधार पर उसको निकाला था। लेकिन मैं आज उस विषय में नहीं जाना चाहता। मैं केवल आप के सामने वह बात रखना चाहता हूँ जो उन्होंने देवनागरी लिपि के बारे में कही है। वे कहते हैं :

"If in the world we have any alphabets the most perfect, it is those Hindi ones".

यह सर आइजक पिटमैन के शब्द हैं।

मैं एक राय और आप के सामने रखता हूँ। फिर मैं परराष्ट्र नीति वाली बात पर आता हूँ। प्रोफेसर मोनियर विलियम्स संस्कृत के प्रसिद्ध विद्वान् थे और अंग्रेजी और हिन्दी के भी पंडित थे। उन्होंने पुराने समय में एक पत्र "टाइम्स" में लिखा था जिस में नागरी लिपि के बारे में उन्होंने कहा है :

"This, although deficient in two important symbols (represented in the Roman by z and f), is on the whole, the most perfect and symmetrical of all known alphabets. . . . . The Hindus hold that it came directly from the gods

(whence its name), and truly its wonderful adaptation to the symmetry of the sacred Sanskrit seems almost to raise it above the level of human inventions."

यह उन की राय है नागरी लिपि के बारे में। इस लिपि में अक्षर और अंक दोनों ही सम्मिलित हैं।

अब मैं आप से परराष्ट्र नीति के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। कभी कभी हमारे सामने अंकों को बदलने की बात आती है। मेरा इस सम्बन्ध में यह कहना है कि यदि हमने यह परिवर्तन किया तो परराष्ट्र के क्षेत्र में हम अपने को कुछ छोटा कर देंगे। इस विचार से मेरे हृदय में दर्द होता है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी हज़ारों वर्ष पुरानी संस्कृत भाषा ने हम को संसार के सामने ऊंचा किया है। यह ठीक है कि आज हम और आप संस्कृत भाषा बोलते नहीं और बहुत थोड़े पढ़ते हैं। लेकिन यह वास्तविकता है कि उस समय जब दूसरी जगहों पर बहुत कम ज्ञान और विज्ञान का विकास हुआ था संस्कृत साहित्य बहुत विकसित हो चुका था, और उसी संस्कृत साहित्य ने यूरोप में हमारा सिर ऊंचा किया जब हम और आप राजनीतिक दृष्टि से दास थे। मुझे इस विषय में अधिक नहीं कहना है। जो विद्वान हैं वे संस्कृत साहित्य की और देवनागरी लिपि की श्रेष्ठता को स्वीकार करते हैं। यह सर्वविदित है कि श्री मैक्समूलर तो संस्कृत पर आधिक थे। वे अनेक भाषाओं के ज्ञाता थे। मेरा कहना यह है कि संस्कृत भाषा के साहित्य के कारण हमारा चारों ओर नाम हुआ है। लेकिन आज जब हम अंग्रेजी के स्थान पर हिन्दी को ला रहे हैं तब अक्षर तो हम देवनागरी के रखते हैं पर अंक अंग्रेजी के लें, यह मेरा निवेदन है सही नहीं है। मुझे इस विषय में कोई ज़िद नहीं है। मैं तो बहुत चीजों को बदल देने के पक्ष में हूँ। लेकिन मेरा नम्र निवेदन यह है कि जब हम संस्कृत के अक्षर लिखेंगे परन्तु अंक अंग्रेजी के लिखेंगे तो हमारी ऊंचाई में कुछ कमी आ जायेगी।

आज मैंने पढ़ा है कि चीनी लोग अपनी लिपि को, जो कि चित्रों द्वारा लिखि जाती है, बदलना चाहते हैं और अपनी भाषा के लिये कोई लिपि चाहते हैं। अंग्रेजी में इस प्रकार कहा गया है :

"They desire to alphabetise their language."

मैं अपने प्रधान मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह उन के लिये एक अवसर है। इस समय अपनी एम्बेसी (दूतावास) द्वारा इस लिपि को वे चीनी लोगों के सामने रखें। इस में कोई दबाव की तो बात नहीं है, उन का ध्यान इस ओर दिलाया जा सकता है कि हमारी संस्कृत भाषा और उस की लिपि कितनी ऊंची है और हमारा उन का कितने प्राचीन समय से सम्बन्ध रहा है। केवल संस्कृत ही नहीं हमारे देश की प्राचीन भाषाओं—प्राकृत और पाली द्वारा भी हमारे दोनों देशों में ज्ञान का आदान प्रदान हुआ है। हम उन के सामने पाली लिपि रखें। हम अपनी हिन्दी लिपि उन के सामने रखें। जब वे लोग अपने वर्तमान क्रम को छोड़ कर किसी दूसरी लिपि को अपनाना चाहते हैं तो उन का इस ओर ध्यान दिलाइये कि हमारे देश की लिपि पूर्ण है और इस को स्वीकार किया जा सकता है। सम्भव है कि उनको यह लिपि अंगीकार हो। आज स्याम में यही वर्णमाला चल रही है यह आप भूलियेगा नहीं। बर्मा में यही वर्णमाला है। लिखने में थोड़ा अन्तर है। तिब्बत में भी यही वर्णमाला है। अभी तिब्बत का बहुत सा साहित्य हिन्दुस्तान में आया है और हम उस लिपि को देख सकते हैं। यदि ये सब बातें उन के सामने रखी जायें तो सम्भव है कि चीनी लोग इस लिपि को स्वीकार करें। मैं यह कहता हूँ कि अपनी संस्कृति को आगे पहुँचाने का यह एक रास्ता है।

हम अपने यहां जरा सचेत हों। यह जो हज़ारों वर्ष पुरानी और इतनी पूर्ण लिपि हमारे देश में है यह हमारे लिये एक गौरव की बात है। अक्षर के रूप बदलते रहे हैं और उन को आप फिर भी

आवश्यकता देखकर बदल सकते हैं। नागरी लिपि को बदलने के में कुछ रास्ते बतला सकता हूँ। लेकिन आज मेरा कहना यही है कि यदि आप अक्षर रखते हैं तो अक्षर भी रखें। ऐसा करने में हमारा गौरव है। आप अपने शिक्षा विभाग की सारंगी की खूटी को जरा कसिये, जरा संभालिये, खूटी को संभाल कर स्वर मलाइये ताकि सब तारों के स्वर आपस में मिलें। आज तमाशा यह है कि अन्य सब केन्द्रीय विभाग तो नागरी अक्षरों का प्रयोग कर रहे हैं। परन्तु हमारा शिक्षा विभाग जब हिन्दी अक्षर लिखता है तब अक्षर अंग्रेजी के प्रयोग करता है। मैं अभी बर्धा गया तो मालूम हुआ कि मध्यप्रदेश को इस विभाग ने यह लिख कर भेजा है कि तुम अंग्रेजी अक्षरों का प्रयोग करो। यह कोई कांस्टी-ट्रयशन की बात नहीं है। यदि केन्द्र चाहे तो अपने आफिशियल परपोजेक्ट के लिये अंग्रेजी अक्षरों का प्रयोग कर सकता है। मेरा विश्वास है कि इस विभाग को इस विषय में एक दुराग्रह सा हो गया है। इतना दुराग्रह इस बात में करके वे हिन्दी की सहायता नहीं कर रहे हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि हम अपने घर को संभालें, अपने शिक्षा विभाग को संभालें। हमारा यह यत्न हो कि यह जो हमारी प्राचीन लिपि और अक्षर हैं, उन को हम दूसरों के सामने रखें। चीन में आज इस का अवसर है और मैं इस पर जोर देना चाहता हूँ। मैंने सोचा था कि इस के सम्बन्ध में मैं कभी प्रधान मंत्री से अलग बात करूंगा, मगर आज अवसर मिल गया है और प्रधान मंत्री जी यहां इस समय मौजूद हैं; तो मैंने मुनासिब समझा कि यहीं पर उन से अपनी बात कह दूँ। अक्षर और अधिक विस्तार में इस विषय में वे जानकारी प्राप्त करना आवश्यक समझें तो मैं फिर उन से इस सम्बन्ध में विस्तार से निवेदन कर सकता हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आज परराष्ट्रों में जो हमारे दूत मौजूद हैं, उन के सामने अपनी राष्ट्र भाषा और लिपि के गौरव की बात रखी जाये। मेरा तो विश्वास है कि भले ही आज यह चीज संभव न हो लेकिन कुछ वर्षों बाद संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में हिन्दी को एक भाषा

[श्री टंडन]

के रूप में मान्यता प्राप्त होगी। आज वहाँ पर ५ भाषाओं को मान्यता दी गई है लेकिन वह दिन दूर नहीं है जब हिन्दी को वहाँ पर माना जायगा और वह दिन हमारे लिये गौरव का दिन होगा। हिन्दी को वहाँ पर मनवाना होगा। अगर आज हम अपनी लिपि को चीन को भेंट करें और इस भेंट को वे स्वीकार कर उस पर अमल करें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि एशिया भर के लिए यह अच्छा मार्गदर्शन का काम होगा।

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it has often been my privilege to address this hon. Lok Sabha and I have gladly availed myself of the opportunity. But, I confess that at the present moment I am rather performing a duty—and with little joy in it.

We have discussed for the last four days the President's Address to the joint session of both Houses of Parliament. That Address was referred to by the hon. Member, Shri Chatterjee, as 'a third class report by an Under Secretary.' The hon. Member, with his great knowledge of affairs and of the English language, no doubt is entitled to judge all these matters, and it is for us to listen to his advice. But, it does seem to me, if I may state it—or rather, understate it—, an odd way and perhaps not a proper way to refer to the President's Address in this way. Other hon. Members complained that the Address did not deal with this or that matter. Shri Asoka Mehta and I think Sardar Hukam Singh said that it gave too much space to foreign affairs and too little to other matters. Others said that it did not refer to Kenya or some other places.

I ventured on some previous occasions to submit to the Lok Sabha as to what the Government thought the President's Address was supposed to be. We are following parliamentary procedure and to some extent—not that we are bound by it, but to some extent—we have derived this procedure from the British Parliament and from the King's Address there. I do not mean that we should adhere to that, but normally speaking, the Head of the State does not, except in America and countries with a like Constitution where the Head of the State delivers "Message to the Nation" or some such name, give a long review of foreign and internal politics and an expression of his opinion on it.

The Head of the American State is the Head of the American Government also; he occupies a special position. Now, the Head of our State is not the Head of the Government, and he occupies a different position. He is analogous to constitutional Heads of State and in his Address to Parliament, according to our thinking, there are two matters which should be dealt with principally. One is reference to foreign affairs and the other is reference to the legislation that is going to be taken up by Parliament. Naturally, he may refer to other matters too. Therefore, that is the normal approach of the President to his Address. It is not normally right that the President should enter much into controversial matters, although he is supposed to express, broadly speaking, the viewpoints of the Government of the day. Therefore, if we keep this in mind, the President's Address has to deal with foreign affairs, because it is an Address not only meant for the Parliament, not only for the country, but for other countries also. It does so briefly and broadly refers to certain incidents. Whether the reference to foreign affairs is a little longer or shorter depends upon what has happened in the realm of foreign affairs of importance during the past year or so. Therefore, I would beg the Lok Sabha to remember this when considering the President's Address.

It is right,—it is true—that in this debate that we have had during the last four days, not too much has been said about foreign affairs; a little has been said about economic policy; but, mostly the debate has been an inquisition and an indictment on the question of States reorganisation. That is right because that is an important and vital issue which has affected all of us. Nevertheless, so far as the President's Address is concerned, we can hardly expect him to go into details even about a vital issue which affects us internally; he can broadly refer to it. I shall deal, naturally, with the circumstances that have arisen in regard to the States reorganisation, but before I do so, I would like fairly briefly to refer to some other matters which have been raised in the debate. I do not wish to say much about foreign affairs or about economic policy in spite of their great importance, because I take it that so far as the economic policy and the second Five-Year Plan are concerned, they will come up before this House and this House will have full opportunity to discuss those matters. But I would beg this House to remember all the same that:

whatever happens in this country, including the important occurrences in regard to the reorganisation of States, has to be viewed in a certain context and not isolated from everything else.

It is to be viewed in the context of these great happenings in the country or in the world, whether they are good or bad. After all, the reorganisation of States, howevermuch it may please us or displease us, is a thing of this year or the next year. The other things continue. The other things are more vital and are going to have a more lasting impression on our future. We live today—if we look at the world—in perhaps an odd and strange period of the earth's history. There is this drama—almost at every step, in every country—of an ever-changing situation going on; that drama often leading to tragic happenings and almost always hovering over the brink of disaster. That is the particular background of the world in which we live.

In our own country, we face tremendous problems—economic problems, social problems and the like—problems to which references has been made, of unemployment, poverty etc. We try to face them realising that there is no magic way of suddenly solving all these problems or untying all the knots, but that it will take us time and mean hard work to do so. That again leads us to the Second Five Year Plan and all the rest of it. But, looking at India's foreign policy, India's connection with international affairs, looking at India's attempts at improving her economic lot under the First Five Year Plan or the new draft Second Five Year Plan, some things, I venture to submit, may be borne in mind. It may be that some of us may take an unduly partial view about our own accomplishments. That is a human failing. It may be that some others may take an unduly critical view of these accomplishments. But, I think I may state it without the least exaggeration that the last few years in India, looked at as a whole, are considered in the world, I am not for the moment excepting any country in the world, as a story of success and considerable achievement. Whether those countries which have considered them lie in what is called the western world of America or England or Western Europe or whether they lie in Eastern Europe and the Soviet regions or in Asia, Western Asia or Eastern Asia or Africa or South America, from everywhere comes the cry that India has made remarkable

success. Hon. Members opposite have far greater opportunities of judging it than the people in America or England or Russia; I admit it, of course, because they live in the midst of these things. But, I think this fact need not be completely ignored.

The hon. Member Acharya Kripalani mentioned,—I am quoting, I believe—that our brilliant foreign policy had not succeeded in stopping these military pacts being made. He is completely right. Our foreign policy has not succeeded in many ways in setting right the evils of the world, just as our internal policy has not succeeded in putting right all the evils of India. That is perfectly true, because nobody can claim that. The point is whether we are aiming right and whether in aiming right, the experience that we have gathered shows that we are achieving something here and there, something little, not big. I do submit that in this complicated maze of international affairs, where there is so much of bitterness and hatred, or even clash of arms, we have been a soothing influence an influence that has sometimes helped a little in improving the situation or in taking a step towards peace or in avoiding a step towards war. That is all the claim. Nothing more. If we have done that little bit, it is something. Anyhow, no one, even the great countries of the world, who have great power for good or ill, has succeeded in solving the problems of the world. It is no solution of the problem for me to say or for the hon. Members opposite to deliver a harangue as to the evils of other countries and the problems that exist elsewhere. It is no good my saying, I am very virtuous and saying that other countries have erred or are erring, and are misbehaving. We are all mixed up in virtue or lack of virtue that we possess of all countries. So, I should like this House, even when we are excited and distressed by these conditions that have arisen in this country about the reorganisation of States, to look at this broad picture of the world, and what we have done, what we stand for and the direction we are aiming at.

The hon. Member opposite, I think Shri U. M. Trivedi, made some fun and belittled the visit to this country of various Heads of States and distinguished statesmen. I do not mind what any hon. Member says about us or our Government. But, I do not think it is quite becoming for any of us to speak in that

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

way about distinguished people who come from abroad as our honoured guests.

It has been during the last year an extraordinary sight, an experience in this country for us to be honoured by the visit of so many distinguished Heads of States, Prime Ministers, Foreign Ministers and other distinguished men from all parts of the world. That is no small matter. It is not because of our Government or because we issued invitations to them that they came. It is essentially because in this larger picture of the world, India begins to count. India's opinion counts because India makes a difference sometimes whether it is in the United Nations or elsewhere in the consideration of world problems. Because India makes a difference and because India's opinion is valued, important people, distinguished people who themselves play an important part in the world affairs, have thought it worth while to come and have a look at this country which is changing, which is progressing, which is already playing an important part and which is likely to play a still more important part in the future. That is the broad context. That does not mean in the slightest that we, as a Government, have not made mistakes, have not failed here and there, and that there are not any problems in India and abroad with which we have been unable to come to grips, or where our wishes have exceeded our achievements. That is so. And hon. Members may be right to draw attention to these problems and to criticise them, but in criticising them that criticism will have value if it has a little balance, if it keeps this broad picture in view and not merely, simply recites some old slogan which has been heard often enough like some, if I may use the word with all respect, bigoted religious fanatic reciting an old *mantra* without understanding it, which has no meaning today. Our Government does not claim to succeed always, or not to err. It errs often enough. But I do claim that we want to do our utmost and that we want to be judged by our success and failures. And certainly the failures should be pointed out, but when some hon. Members offer criticisms which have little relation to facts or to this broad context of world affairs that I have ventured to place before this House, then those criticisms do not have much value.

Shri Mukerjee in the flush of his oratory says many things which I am quite

sure he does not mean. In fact, some hon. Members opposite who have bitterly criticised us even in regard to the States Reorganisation Report have privately come to me and spoken in a different way, that is to say—I am not criticising anybody—recognising the difficulties of the situation and discussing the matter—not this kind of lop-sided attack with head down and without thinking of what the facts etc., are. Shri Mukerjee did not particularly like the reference to Malaya or the Gold Coast in the President's Address, and he said: what about Kenya? Well, I should say that what is happening in the Gold Coast is one of the most promising features in the African situation today. What is happening in the Gold Coast is not something that you and I could perhaps fashion out of our heads and put down that this is the right thing. The world does not function that way. I say in the context of Africa what is happening in the Gold Coast is something not only of hope for the Gold Coast but for the whole of Africa. What will happen ultimately I do not know, but we should welcome these things in this distracted and distressing world wherever a good step is taken.

In Malaya I am not quite sure because we have not the full details of what is likely to happen there, but at any rate, there is a ray of light, something that is pulling this terrible tangle from out of the mire.

About Goa I can say nothing more than what I have said previously. There is no difference of opinion between any hon. Member here and the Government broadly speaking, on Goa. The difference does come in perhaps here and there as to the line of action to be adopted in regard to Goa. Now, it is clear that any line of action adopted in regard to Goa or any other matter which is international has to be judged not from the point of view of some local affray, but from various international aspects. One hon. Member—I forget who, Shri Syamnandan Sahaya, I think—said something about this, that the application of the doctrine of *Ahimsa* to our foreign relations does not succeed at any rate in regard to our border problems. Well, I am not aware of our Government having ever said that they adopted the doctrine of *Ahimsa* to our activities. They may respect it, they may honour that doctrine, but as a Government it is patent that we do not adopt and do not consider ourselves capable of adopting the doctrine of

*Ahimsa*. If we did, we would not keep an Army or a Navy or an Air Force. But it is quite a different matter not being able to adopt it in the circumstances of today, nevertheless not going to the other extreme of shaking about a sword or a *lathi* or whatever weapon you may have in your hand and threatening everybody and delivering a number of harangues and all that. Not only is that rather childish and rather foolish in the context of affairs today, but remember when you talk about violence, violence is only useful if it is superior violence. Inferior violence may make a fool of yourself. Violence has to be judged today in the ultimate context of the most violent things, that is, the hydrogen bomb, the atomic bomb. I do not say that every country has got it, but that is the final acme of violence today. Violence has arrived at a stage in the world today when it will either end in destroying the world, or in, well, I won't say putting an end to itself, but putting an end, at any rate, in men's minds to the age of violence. We are at the last edge of the age of violence. We may topple over into the dark pit, or we may keep back and see that violence is no longer a remedy for the world's ills. That is the broad picture. That has nothing to do with the doctrine of *Ahimsa*. It is a broad practical realisation of things as they are today. When heads of States which have the greatest methods of violence and weapons of violence at their disposal, and who have no inhibitions about violence or *Ahimsa*, have come to the conclusion that modern war with all the new weapons, must be ruled out practically speaking, something has happened in the world. It may be that everybody does not fully realise the implications of it, but something has happened, that is, violence essentially and basically is being ruled out for the solution of the world's problems. It may be that before it is completely ruled out, eruptions may occur, all kinds of things may occur. That is a different matter.

Now, if big violence means that, then you have to look at little violences in that context, more especially when the small violences are on the international sphere, because you immediately impinge on the big violence and it cannot be considered separately as something that we can indulge in whenever we feel like it. We have to consider the far-reaching consequences of this.

I should like the House to note that I am not basing my argument on any

high moral basis, although I would be right in even putting it on that basis. I would be right in saying that it is improper for us to say one thing to the wide world and act in a different way, to suggest and encourage in the world a policy of peaceful settlement of disputes and ourselves to settle a dispute that we have and in which we are right, —that is admitted— by way of violence and armed might and military measures. It does not fit in with what we say; we simply do not succeed in this or that; we fall between two stools. So, that is the broad background.

Now, may I say one or two things about Ceylon? An hon. Member referred to Ceylon and Burma and other places where he said Indians are being kicked out. He is partly right, though not wholly so; when he brought in Burma and all those places, I do not think he has right or fair. But it is true that people of Indian descent in Ceylon as well as others who are Indian nationals, who have gone there, have not had, and are not having a square deal.

I do not wish to go into this question except to say that here it is. How do we settle problems with Ceylon? Surely, the only way to settle problems with Ceylon is in a friendly way, and we shall continue to follow that. There is no other way. And I should like hon. Members to tell me any other way except delivering a brave speech, that is no way in international affairs. For instance, my hon. friend the Finance Minister, when he deals with foreign countries, when he is worried about foreign exchange while buying things, cannot pay in his own currency; he has to pay in somebody else's, he has to pay in some other coin for effecting that deal.

I shall just inform the Lok Sabha of one very small development on our side in regard to Ceylon. There was two years ago, or thereabouts, a kind of an agreement signed between the Prime Minister of Ceylon and our Government—I signed it—about certain procedures to be adopted, certain steps to be taken, which we thought would help towards the solution of this problem there.

Eversince then or soon after, there was a controversy between the two respective Governments as to the interpretation of that document. Well, we have written long letters to each other; and I wrote another long letter, about two or three weeks—may be a month ago—

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

to the Prime Minister of Ceylon. In this letter, apart from the other points I raised, I suggested to the Prime Minister of Ceylon that 'if the interpretation of that document is an issue between us, for my part and for my Government's part, I shall gladly agree to refer the interpretation of this document to any eminent authority agreeable to you and me; I shall accept that interpretation, whatever it is; let us at least find out some way of ending a dispute about interpretation.' I shall accept that interpretation. The person to interpret must be chosen by me and by him, that is, by the two Governments. Whether he is a foreigner, or whatever country he belongs to is immaterial; whoever he is, whether he is a high mature judicial officer or not is immaterial. Here is a document of three pages, let him interpret it, and we shall accept his interpretation.

We have not had any reply to that. I have had an acknowledgment of the letter, but no reply. Meanwhile, as you perhaps know, Ceylon is going to have general elections. So, perhaps, that will delay any further development.

I referred just now to the great, moving and rather tragic drama of the world. It is an exciting drama all that is happening. One sees the headlines on the newspapers, but behind them lie all kinds of things happening in different countries, our country or any other countries.

Only recently, hon. Members must have read of the proceedings in Moscow of the Communist Congress there, where it would appear that considerable changes in outlook and approach have been announced. Now, it is not for me to interpret the significance of those changes. But I do think that it is an important matter not only for the Soviet Union but for other countries in the world at large to understand these great changes that are taking place there, which are, if I may use the word, taking the Soviet Union more and more towards some kind of normalcy, which is to be welcomed in every way.

The point is that even great revolutionary countries who have passed through very tragic experiences, and who have lived on a pitch of effort and excitement become normal, vary their policies, change their outlooks. I wish in this respect their example was followed by others also, who sometimes look up to them.

Now, may I refer briefly to the States Reorganisation Commission business, which has been discussed here during the last four days, and may I say that distressed as I have been about much that has happened—and it has caused me much unhappiness and produced in me a sense of failure, which I do not often have—nevertheless, what has worried me and distressed me is not so much the actual occurrences or the actual things that have happened, bad as they are, but rather this growth and recrudescence of a spirit of violence all over the country, or in various parts of it, this attempt to settle problems by violent methods? That is, I think, something very bad for this country, regardless of the merits of any cause, because once you enter that region of trying to settle any problem by violent methods, then you go towards something that is perilously near to civil war.

Our country with all its faults, all the Government's faults and failings, has shown to the world a certain stability, a certain peace, a certain measure of progress—may be, it is not as fast as you like—and through that established that reputation which it is proud to hold today; and all that is based on certain fundamental characteristics. If we enter into the region of violent explosions, because we dislike this thing or that, well, then, we lose not only that reputation—reputations do not matter much—but something much more important than that.

Are we going to enter into that and become that type of country where every month or two, we hear about some kind of violent revolution trying to upset the government? That is not democracy, of course; that is something, which is the very reverse of democracy. But apart from that—we need not for the moment apply any technical definition of democracy—I do submit that that is a complete denial of any idea of measured or ordered progress. I can understand an attitude, and I believe that some people hold that attitude, that nothing can be achieved by these slow democratic or parliamentary methods, nothing can be achieved by peaceful methods, nothing can be achieved, in fact, step by step; we must break everything and produce some kind of a clean slate. It may be, to begin with, an anarchic condition. Let us have that clean slate and then we shall have an opportunity to build. I do not agree with that, of course. But I can understand that; then the other thing follows. Let us encourage what is

called sometimes a militant attitude, whether it is in the workers or the students or anybody. Even now poor little children of 6, 7 or 8 are exploited for this. I think it is a matter for the Lok Sabha to consider very carefully where all this is leading us to, quite apart from the States Reorganisation Report.

There are always in great cities and elsewhere anti-social elements, goondas and the like. One can deal with them if society generally disapproves of them, as it does. But, when society or certain respectable sections of society approve of violent methods, then the goonda and the disruptive element can immediately have the chance of their lifetime. They come and they are bound to come in. What is happening today? It is a cycle. Some matter is disliked or disapproved of by some group. They say, we will demonstrate, we will have a hartal and we shall take out a procession. If shops do not close, they are forcibly closed. There may be some violence. If trams or buses are functioning, they are burnt. If an order is passed that there should be no procession, that order is broken. The result is conflicts. Police are there and police fire. Some people are hit; some people die and others are wounded. Then, there is an outcry against police action and a demand for an enquiry. This is the cycle. The police might have misbehaved or not; I am not mentioning any particular place; but this is the cycle of events—a deliberate challenge on the violent level usually accompanied by violence, burning, arson molestation of people, attacks on people who do not fall into line, burning of trams, buses etc., looting of shops and defiance of other laws like section 144 and the like and then a conflict, with the police firing; unfortunate tragic deaths, sometimes of possibly innocent people, sometimes of even small children who might be roundabout and then, naturally, a reaction against that and condemnation of the Government for resorting to these things; they have exceeded the limits of legitimate action and the demand for an enquiry into police misbehaviour. What are exactly the limits of legitimate action of the police or for the Army functioning? It is rather difficult to say. Obviously, they can be exceeded. When you are dealing with a limited affair somewhere it is rather easy to understand what are the limits. When you are dealing with conditions of uproar all over a great city like Calcutta, or Bombay or Madras, then it is a bit difficult to judge these things. Either you

allow those anarchical conditions, loot, arson etc., to gain the upper hand or you do not. If they gain the upper hand, then, of course, the whole city becomes at the mercy of the hooligan element. Mind you, when such things happen, the decent elements even in the crowd are pushed out; it is the hooligan elements that take the lead. The decent elements only have given them an opportunity to take the lead. They always take the lead, and—it may be expected rightly—some political elements who believe in this kind of thing. Either you allow that kind of thing to gain the upper hand; if they do gain the upper hand, it is then hooligan raj there and Government ceases to function. Or, Government has necessarily to take steps to stop this at any cost because the cost of not stopping it is too terrible and too great for citizens as well as for everything. Surely, no government can afford to do it.

I think Prof. Hiren Mukerjee referred to a speech of mine which I delivered in Amritsar in which there was something about the challenge of the streets to be met in the streets. I was laying stress on this very point. I was venturing to lay before the Lok Sabha that if people go in for violence in the streets that violence has to be met in the streets and has to be stopped. I cannot understand how even Prof. Hiren Mukerjee could object to my statement. (*Interruption*).

In this connection, may I also correct him? He referred, I think—I had not the good fortune to be present here but I have read his speech fully in the transcript as well as other speeches delivered by hon. Members—he referred to my having called the Akali procession in Amritsar as a *tamasha*. It is not correct; it is completely incorrect. What I said—speaking from memory, of course—was, referring to large gatherings including the Congress, I said, these are difficult questions which we have to consider seriously and decide not by having big *tamashas* and delivering long speeches. I was referring to the critical questions we were considering....

**Shri Kamath:** Including the Congress!

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Yes; including the Congress? all big gatherings.

I stated, we must look at these questions not in a demonstrative spirit, *tamasha* spirit but a spirit of critical, humble approach to the problem and decide it in this way and not in a slogan-like way. It is not the way to consider problems.



[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

So, I would beg the House to remember this that, I think, the major question today before India, internally speaking, is this question of what is going to be our policy in regard to this growing violence. I am not afraid of the violence of the hooligan, but this spirit of violence. The other day, or two days ago, on the occasion of the funeral procession in Lucknow of Narendra Deva, a person beloved of all, a policeman was blinded and others were badly injured. Why should this happen? Here is a funeral procession and it should be an occasion for solemnity. There people threw stones and pushed about a poor policeman lost an eye completely, apart from some police officers being rather badly injured by stones. This is what I cannot understand.

What is happening elsewhere? We talk about the split personality of India; we speak unctuously about non-violence and about these methods and all that and about our culture and *sanskriti* and in our daily behaviour we are coming down to a level which is not a civilised level at all.

5 P.M.

**Shri S. S. More** (Sholapur): Is this applicable to Chief Ministers also speaking about non-violence and practising violence?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: It is applicable to everybody, including Shri More and me. We are all split personalities in that respect. But here I am venturing to place before the Lok Sabha this very dangerous development of associating any kind of dislike or anything, any kind of protest or anything with a violent demonstration or a demonstration which is inevitably likely to lead to violence. That is what is happening. I do not know what is going to happen. The other day in Madras at some places an organisation sponsored hartals and demonstration—an organisation which is openly committed to disruption of India, the separation of Tamil Nad from India and being an independent State. They raised various slogans and cries and anyhow there was trouble. Tomorrow I believe some kind of a hartal is being organised in Calcutta and I have no doubt you will see the whole cycle—the cycle I have just mentioned.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty** (Basirhat): How was it peaceful on the 21st January? Not a word had been said about it; not a word had been said on

the huge and tremendous success of the peaceful hartal on the 21st January. You are talking about violence (*Interruption*)

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: I did not mean to imply that people behave always at all times badly.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty**: Did you try to find out why they were behaving badly?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: It is clear to Shrimati Chakravartty, who no doubt knows a great deal more of Calcutta hartals and the like, and probably knows what is going to happen there tomorrow.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty**: Merger is responsible for it.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: Anyhow there has been an open declaration. . . .

**Shri H. N. Mukrejee** (Calcutta North-East): When your Home Minister says in Amritsar that the merger shall go through—that was what the papers reported—would you object to the people of Calcutta having a hartal to demonstrate their resentment against that?

**An Hon. Member**: Illegal hartal. (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: I will come to this merger business later. But these peaceful hartal sponsors have announced, as stated in the public press today, that they would defy section 144 and every order that is passed. I do not call that a peaceful approach.

**An Hon. Member**: Illegal hartal.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: It is true that this Parliament has to consider this question squarely and fairly. Are we going to encourage or promote this kind of spirit of violence and constant violent activity by hartals and agitations to continue?

**Some Hon. Members**: No, no.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: Is there any way out (*Interruptions*)?

**Shri V. G. Deshpande**: Are we going to allow the police to fire?

**Shri Syamnandan Sahaya** (Muzaffarpur Central): Yes, if necessary.

**Shri Sadhan Gupta** (Calcutta South-East): Check your violence. . . . .

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I should like hon. Members opposite, who seem to consider it as a kind of personal reference by me, to cite to me any example in the capitalist or communist world where such things are allowed, in any country, where this kind of activity is indulged in. I am not aware of any country.

**Shri Kamath:** There is no section 144 in England at all.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** May I ask the Prime Minister whether he will kindly enquire into one thing? I am only saying this because the Prime Minister just now said it should be stopped. Will he kindly enquire whether the Finance Minister of Madhya Pradesh, Shri Biyani had made an open speech in Akola in which he said that goondaism will be met by goondaism and that he will send goondas from Nagpur?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** If anybody, including a Minister, has made such a speech, he has said something very wrong, very foolish and very objectionable.

**Acharaya Kripalani:** May I suggest that all this arises from the fact that Congress people think that you are speaking to the Opposition while you are speaking to them also?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The hon. Member who just interrupted is completely right. And I was not referring to any particular group, although it is true that there is this difference, not among the Congress and others, but certainly some groups even in theory do not object to violence, much less in practice. In fact, they think that violence is the only way to lead to the goal which they may aim at.

**Acharya Kripalani:** They are reciprocated.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** As Acharya Kripalani just got up, may I tell him that I was pained and surprised to learn from him that some C.I.D. officials had been dogging his footsteps because I can assure him that if he will be good enough to give me some information, I would be glad to enquire into it.

**An Hon. Member:** That is a privilege to some.

**Shri Nambiar (Mayuram):** For every one of us.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** There might perhaps be some difference between

some hon. Members opposite (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Nambiar rose—**

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** What I would venture in all humility and respect to place before the Lok Sabha is the dangerous trends that are developing in this country. I am not easily upset by any occurrence however bad it may be— one survives these things—but something has happened in this country which, I believe, is poisoning the whole community, poisoning in this sense in two ways. One is of course the spirit of violence. The other is poisoning against each other which is equally bad. And I have no doubt that this will go sooner or later. But we have to work actively to that and not encourage it. Therefore, I would again submit that an act which may be quite legitimate in a certain set of circumstances may become dangerous and objectionable in another set of circumstances. A hartal which may be legitimate as an expression of opinion in a certain set of circumstances may in another set of circumstances be dangerous and harmful. And I say that at the present moment with these big tensions and bitterness prevailing in various parts of India, it is not patriotic, it is not wise, it is not reasonable to do anything which may even by the fault of the Government lead to violence because there are some steps in which the possibility of violence is inherent whoever starts it—may be a policeman's fault or somebody else's fault—but one should be wary.

May I say a few words about the States reorganisation business? Slightly less than two months ago we discussed this matter in this Lok Sabha. At that time there was a very full debate, and I ventured to give expression to my own approach to that question then. I will just repeat it. It is true that as I have watched these developments in the various parts of the country, I have been troubled not by this occurrence or that, but by the atmosphere that was being gradually created in the country—not created all on a sudden but because there was something in our hearts which came out because of the circumstances. I have been troubled by that and the main problem before me has been—not any particular problem that is dealt with separately, but—how to meet this particular challenge—this challenge of violence and bitterness that was spreading. How can we possibly check this? How can we possibly soothe it? At any

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

rate we should not encourage it in any way. This is how I have tried to approach it.

Some hon. Members have referred, rather caustically, to some kind of a dictatorial approach of four men of the Congress Committee laying down this and that. What is exactly the procedure we followed? I referred to it on the last occasion, and to the multiplicity of these problems and the fact that the problem usually was not one between the Government and a certain group or a certain state. The problems were between two. So far as the Government is concerned they had their views, no doubt, about them but it was not important for them which way a certain border lay. What they wanted obviously was—the Government or most of us wanted—a settlement which was agreeable to the largest number of people.

I will give you a straight example. Yesterday, Shri N. C. Chatterjee said: "My Chief Minister is giving 500 square miles away". With all respect, I ask: what does that indicate? How is he thinking of giving 500 square miles away? To whom is he giving them away? The SRC Report had made some recommendations and Dr. Roy had apparently magnanimously given that away.

**Shri K. K. Basu** (Diamond Harbour): On what grounds?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** That was not the point. My point is this. Here was a conflict in the opinions of the State of West Bengal and the State of Bihar—not with the Government of India, not with the Congress or anybody because you will remember in this matter what the SRC had done. It is not—at least by and large, it has not been—a party matter. Parties have been split on this. (*Interruptions*). I mean to say that in one party, there were two opinions. They may pass a resolution by a majority but the point is that there have been several opinions in the parties themselves. Possibly—I cannot say definitely—the Communist Party may or may not have had, but they have adopted the opinion that there should be not only linguistic division, but a linguistic division of every village.

**An Hon. Member:** Not of every village. By villages.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** That is so. They want to carry the process of disruption to its extreme limits. (*Interruptions*).

They want to carry this process to its extreme limit—to carry this linguistic warfare to every village.

**Shri Sadhan Gupta:** No. It is incorrect. (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I have no doubt that hon. Members opposite had the best of motives. I am only pointing out the natural consequence of what they stated or what they presumably still state. I say that the natural consequence of their policy was absolute disruption of India—every village. I do not doubt their intelligence and therefore, I presume they realise what the natural consequence of this policy, they aim at, was.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** It is the border disputes you are talking about. You are misrepresenting what we have stated. There are disputes on no other issues.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I know, obviously. Take this issue of Bengal and Bihar. Here the State of Bihar and the State of Bengal are thinking in terms of the same patch of territory or several patches. It is not a dispute of the Government of India. So far as Congress is concerned, the Congress of West Bengal is pulling one way and the Bihar Congress the other way. Presumably it is the case with other parties too. All parties or most parties, therefore, could hardly function uniformly. The provincial pull was greater; the State pull was greater in their minds than any other pull. Now, one can understand that. There is no harm in the State pull being there but it is harmful—it is very harmful—if the State pull is so strong that it leads to violence in speeches and words and deeds and then to this kind of violent demonstrations.

Take the case of Orissa. According to the SRC Report, no change has been made in Orissa—this way or that way. Orissa had claims on West Bengal, Bihar Andhra and M.P., I believe. I am not going into the merits. Those claims were not accepted in that Report nor did Government wish to go behind the Report in that matter. As I said, I am not going into the merits of the case. The Orissa Government supported those claims. Everybody did it—the Congress and the Government in Orissa. Then, there was this rioting in Orissa. Against whom? Against their own Government supporting that claim. There was no reason or logic in it. They broke into the police station and destroyed things.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

What exactly has been done by young people aged from ten to twenty years—children, boys and girls and others? This is the spirit which, I say, is deplorable.

Take another case, again. I can understand the dispute between—let us say—Kerala State and the Madras State about a small patch of territory on the border. One could understand the proposal: "Let the patch decide."—I mean, the people there. But that is not the question. Everybody wants to bring pressure. Somebody in Madras wants to bring pressure by violent activities in Madras so that a small patch of territory five hundred miles away from Madras may be attached to Madras State. I am not again going into the merits. I want you to see what it is leading to. Whether it is in Bengal and Bihar or Kerala and Madras or Madras and Andhra claiming the same area, you gradually develop a feeling which is primarily a feeling which leads to a civil war. (*Interruptions*). You cannot have a civil war in the circumstances; but that is a different matter.

Practically speaking, mentally you have a civil war between Bengal and Bihar or Bihar and Orissa. That is the kind of feeling which is aroused.

**Shri K. K. Basu:** The Pradesh Chief Minister accuse each other.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** That was what I am venturing to point out myself. That is what we have to deal with now. I can assure this Lok Sabha—it may remember—that all the innumerable problems that the SRC Report brought out—some of them were very major problems and very difficulty problems—a great majority of such problems has been settled satisfactorily. It is a thing to remember. We cannot be overwhelmed by catastrophe here and there. The problems have been settled, and I should like to congratulate those people. They have been settled by agreement even though one party did not like that settlement at all. I could give you examples. Take this proposed new Madhya Pradesh. Madhya Bharat fought against it. It was perfectly justified to do so. Ultimately they all met together and in the larger interests of the country, or, whatever you like, they came to a settlement and they are pulling through. Take Vidarbha.

**Shri V. G. Deshpande:** They have not come to an agreement. It is a tragedy.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I entirely agree that Shri Trivedi has not come to an agreement. We are talking about the others.

**Shri V. G. Deshpande:** I am saying that the majority in the Assembly in Madhya Bharat has not agreed, and the reports provided to us say that they have not agreed. But because there were no incidents, you say that they have agreed.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I venture to say that even though this was their strong view, and the Assembly said no, yet, they agreed in the larger interests of the country. There is no doubt they have agreed, because they are working together and fashioning and working out the union. They have not gone out into the streets to fight.

Take Vidarbha. They were keen on having a separate State. But, at our request, they ultimately agreed to join the Maharashtra State which we thought was right. These are instances of people not getting lost in their own rather narrower desires, but looking at the broader picture and ultimately agreeing to something even though they did not like it originally. So, I would like this House to remember that, by and large, quite a large number of very difficult problems have been solved by agreement. That was our approach throughout. Settlement by agreement could only be done informally, and in the course of these talks, we must have met not dozens or hundreds but over a thousand persons, not of the Congress only but of all groups and parties. Many hon. Members here in the Opposition and others, we have met them, and discussed this matter with them separately, because as I said, it was not a party matter. It was a matter in which we are seeking some kind of broad agreement in so far as it is possible.

**Shri S. S. More:** May I know, apart from the Congress, what parties were consulted in regard to Maharashtra? (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Reference was made to the proposal of a union of Bengal and Bihar. I can assure this House that at no time did it strike me or occur to me or to anybody. The first time this matter came up was as a result of a terrible shock to us, and others too, by the occurrences in Bombay: not the actual occurrences only, but we felt, with the occurrences in Orissa and Bombay, where we are going to. It was a shock, and we felt that in

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

this linguistic direction we will be quite lost and will continue to break each other's heads if once we give vent to the terrible bitterness and anger. So, the desire to stop this trend and make people think in a different direction came.

In this particular matter, I do not know and I cannot even say exactly who started this idea; not I. It was not to my knowledge. Anyhow it so happened that Dr. Roy and Shri Krishna Sinha and some of their colleagues were here, and they discussed it. I did not start it. Then they did not immediately do anything. They went back to their respective headquarters and then came back five or six days later, having discussed it and seen their colleagues, and it was only then that they formally broached it to us. Our answer was, "If you are willing, we are very happy". We did not take any single step about it. There was no kind of imposition. It was they who did it. Then they issued a statement. That was the second time when they came here. Obviously, a thing like this can only take place with the goodwill of all the persons concerned. There can be no impositions of these things. But what is the test?

**Shri K. K. Basu:** The test of the people.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** What is the test of the people, and why? You see the whole object of the talk about the linguistic provinces. I think Shri N. C. Chatterjee has told us about the Congress decisions and all that. Now, Shri Chatterjee is not perhaps well-acquainted with the development of the Congress outlook on this subject. Undoubtedly, in the 1920's, we were strongly in favour of it. We were strongly in favour of the work being done in the language of the area, to enable the people of the place to take their part. In so far as that point is concerned, that is, the importance of the language in doing the work is concerned, we hold to that thing. But do not mix up the two things, namely, the importance and the development of the language and these boundaries. The two are not synonymous. Later on, if you will see the resolutions of the last three or four years, the Congress resolutions, and in fact the resolutions before the appointment of this Commission and the resolutions just after it, you will find that all of them have stated quite clearly that language is an important factor but that there are other factors which are equally important, the other factors be-

ing economic, geographical and economic development. Finally, the most important factor, the over-riding factor, is the unity of India. That is what the Congress has been saying all along. Now, seeing all this happening since the publication of this Report, naturally, and even more than previously, our thoughts went towards laying a greater stress on the unifying factors and other things. That is a relatively recent development, since we have been discussing the Five-Year Plan and the rest, and recently we have been thinking more and more in economic and developmental terms.

Take Bengal and Bihar. The area between Bengal and Bihar is the richest industrial area of India, and no doubt in a few years' time it will grow to be the most heavily industrialised area. Now, we could not do things in a huff and do something there in a hurry. So, for developmental reasons, it was of very great advantage to Bihar and Bengal to work that area jointly.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** The Central Government owns those resources.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** We have enough experience, in the last five years, of small matters being delayed because of two Governments having to deal with matters and pulling in two different directions. However, I am merely pointing out that there were valid reasons for that. It is not just some kind of sentimental approach to the problem. So, in the first place, we said: "Go ahead". Everywhere you will find that this economic approach has to be considered now much more than previously, always making sure that the language approach is there, not as a boundary but for the purposes of doing the work in that language so that the cultural aspect of the language could always be encouraged. Occasionally it may be that two languages overlap. Suppose Bengal and Bihar form a union. Nothing happens to the Bengali language or to the work done in Bengali. Nothing happens to the Hindi language in Bihar. They function in their respective areas as they did, but in regard to developmental matters it will be a great help. Apart from that, personally, it is very desirable that we should have the multi-lingual areas where people automatically get to know more than one language. It does help. This kind of absolutely linguistic barriers does create a certain narrowness in approach.

**Acharya Kripalani:** In what direction is the mind of the Government working? We want to know how the Government's mind is working in this matter.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I do not quite understand Acharya Kripalani's question. I have been trying to explain not only the direction of the Government's mind but the decisions. The Acharya knows what decisions have been taken.

**Acharya Kripalani:** I do not know.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** They have been published in the public Press.

**Shri K. K. Basu:** They have been changing.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Not at all. All decisions have been taken. There is no question of change. Of course, some decisions have not been taken. About Punjab, I think that by agreement we shall arrive at some suitable solution. One or two minor things remain; other decisions have been taken. About this question of Bengal and Bihar...

**Shri K. K. Basu:** It is an imposition.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** There is no question of imposition. The proposal was made and we welcomed that proposal. Naturally, it is subject to its acceptance by the concerned people. We cannot impose it upon them, but we welcome that proposal.

**Shri Kamath:** Parliament should accept it.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Ultimately it will come before Parliament. Naturally, what the Government has got to do now is to frame a Bill which will ultimately be placed before Parliament. But before that, it should be sent to the State Assemblies concerned for their consideration and their reactions. Then Parliament decides.

**Shri K. K. Basu:** In the case of Bengal, the S.R.C. recommendation was different. Has this decision now been arrived by the high command or...

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The proposal is for the union of the two States, presumably with language regions, regional councils etc. I cannot go into these details here.

I am sorry I have taken so much time, but yet I have said

nothing about Bombay, about which I wish to say something, not much. It is quite wrong for any of us to go about censuring any community or group about it. That is a wrong approach completely. There is no doubt that what has happened in Bombay is disgraceful. There is no doubt about it.

**Shri S. S. More:** Even firing.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** About that probably I and Mr. More will differ. I was not there to see how much firing took place. But I say that for what happened in Bombay, in any other country the Army and tanks would have been used. I am quite sure about it. If in any country such arson had taken place, the Army and tanks would have come into the stage....

**Shri Kamath:** Not in democratic countries.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:**... but, in Bombay, only police force was used. Bombay has been a tragedy for all of us. It does not help much blaming anybody. I think I should just mention one thing which should be borne in mind by all of us, namely, the trend towards violence disturbs everybody, whatever be the merits of it. The most important thing now is to calm and soothe the people to get rid of this bitterness as much as possible. These are the two basic things. I do not know how some people have been saying, and Mr. Chatterjee also told me, that in my broadcast about the States re-organisation I have used the words "irrevocable decisions" and all that. I was quite surprised. I have looked through my broadcast and it is not there. I do not know wherefrom Mr. Chatterjee got it. There is nothing irrevocable. There is nothing final in this sense that if we have a democratic structure of society and a democratic Government, we can sit down and consider any matter at any time. The point is that we must have the atmosphere to do it. You cannot do it by people beating and quarrelling with each other. We must calm down. It is obvious, as Mr. Asoka Mehta said, that no decision about Bombay which is a decision which is looked upon by a large section of the people as an imposition of one or the other is a happy decision. It may be an unfortunate decision, an inevitable decision, but it is not a happy decision. If the Gujaratis feel or the Maharashtrians feel imposed upon, it is not a happy decision. They have to live together as well as others in Bombay. Now unfortunately

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

a situation has been created which makes it difficult for a cool approach to the problem. Let us cool down and become normal and then realise the fact that there is no question of one group dominating over another. I do not know, but some people say that some capitalists in Bombay wanted this to be done and that not to be done. I really do not understand it. But, for my part, I can say that in the whole of the conversation, I did not meet a single capitalist from Bombay. I know they presented a memorandum which I saw, but this is quite absurd. You can take it from me—you know it well enough—that the capitalists in Bombay or elsewhere would probably be able to function in any condition. I do not think there will be any difficulty about that. It is not that a handful of capitalists wanted this or that. But, it is a fact that today there is tremendous bitterness of feeling. Our function should be to lessen it and then we can move together and do it. There have been two types of proposals. One is about plebiscites. I cannot say that plebiscite should be ruled out in every case. I think in some cases it may be desirable. But it is a dangerous thing to say that you must apply the principle of plebiscite to all these areas, because it will produce all kinds of difficulties. In some cases it may be desirable. But we will have to think of these things not in an atmosphere of violence and extreme ill-will and bitterness and almost compulsion of the people to do this or that. That is the difficulty. There has been this proposal made about the judicial enquiry in regard to Bombay. My general reaction is that whenever there is trouble, there should be an enquiry. But I must say that my mind is rather confused when I think of an enquiry into the Bombay occurrences. It would be a tremendous enquiry which will last for ages. But apart from that, is it not obvious that this kind of enquiry will raise passions to the utmost? Every party will seek to cast the blame on the other and the result will be, that instead of that process of healing and soothing,—bitterness, charges and counter-charges. That, I think, will be terrible. Therefore, I do not see how it can serve any good purpose in that way.

I feel I have exceeded my time-limit: I am grateful to the House for its indulgence.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Does any hon. Member want his amendment to be put to vote?

**Some Hon. Members:** All of them may be put.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I shall now put all the amendments to the vote.

The question is :

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

“but regret to note the growing imbalance in the approach of the Government to the problems of the country, international and national as reflected in the Address, wherein several pressing questions of the people have received little or no attention at all.”

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

“but regret that the Address has not referred to the complete failure of Government in tackling the problem of the reorganisation of States in a democratic manner after consulting all the responsible elements, parties and individuals in the country.”

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

“but regret that there is no reference to the appointment of a National Commission to go into the question of safety measures in the mines though the exploitation of enormous mineral wealth is recognised under the Second Five Year Plan.”

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

“but regret that the Government of India have failed to accept the democratic and legitimate demand for the reorganisation of States on the basis of language.”

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

“but regret that the Address fails to refer to and express disapproval

of the proposal for the merger of the States of West Bengal and Bihar and of other States."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret to note that the Address fails to mention clearly that reorganisation of States on the basis of language will not be complicated by any attempt at merger of States by political pressure."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret to note that the Address fails to mention that—

Reorganisation of States will be taken up on linguistic basis and in particular Visalandhra, Samyuktha Maharashtra including Bombay City and Punjabi Speaking State will be formed immediately along with other linguistic States."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret that the Address—

(a) gives no indication of any proposal to modernise the defence forces with a view to anticipate an attack from outside;

(d) discloses no programme for coordinating defence with nation-building activities so as to ensure greater efficiency and economy in the two wings of the national life—civil and military; and

(c) overlooks the tremendous scope for training our vast manpower, through educational and vocational training schemes in the defence organisation, for implementing various programmes under the Second Five Year Plan."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret that the Address has not referred to the unfair and un-

just decision of the Government to take Bombay City, which is admittedly a part of Maharashtra, under the administration of the Central Government and thus leading to disturbed and disorderly conditions in that city including the police excesses."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret—

(a) the failure to enunciate a firm policy in respect of the Portuguese occupation of territories which rightfully belong to our country;

(b) the omission to oppose the Gold Coast being made a part of British Commonwealth instead of granting it complete independence;

(c) the omission to refer to and disapprove the suppression by the British of nationalist movements in Kenya, Cyprus and other countries;

(d) the welcoming of the grant of so-called independence to Malaya without disapproving the suppression of the forces of national liberation in that country which are fighting for the end of economic and political domination of British imperialism there; and

(e) the omission to refer to the suppression of struggles for liberation by the French Government in Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret—

(a) the omission to mention that the First Five Year Plan has not resulted in any appreciable improvement in the lives of the common people; and

(b) the commission to refer to shortcomings of the proposed Second Five Year Plan."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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



[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

"but regret the omission to refer to the manner in which the nationalisation of Life Insurance is being carried out to the prejudice of the employees, the State and the public and with the assistance of former insurance magnates who are hostile to nationalisation."

*The motion was negated.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret that though the Address recognises the legitimate love of one's language it fails to suggest any definite policy for—

(a) appointing impartial and judicial Boundary Commission or Commissions to settle boundary disputes arising out of the reorganisation of States; and

(b) holding plebiscite to ascertain the will of the people in the disputed areas."

*The motion was negated.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret that the Address while admitting that the reorganisation of States is an important matter fails—

(a) to recognise the linguistic principle as a basis for this reorganisation of States; and

(b) to take note of Government's attitude towards the formation of multilingual States without ascertaining the wishes of the people of such States."

*The motion was negated.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret that the Address has been complacent while referring to the revolutionary changes brought about in the rural areas by the Community Projects and National Extension Service, whereas there has been no substantial improvement in the social and economic spheres of the rural areas covered by the Community Projects and the

National Extension Service in spite of an expensive administration."

*The motion was negated.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely :—

"but regret that the Address, while recognising the importance of our village and cottage industries from employment and production point of view, overlooks to provide marketing facilities for the products so as to enable the industry to become self-sufficient."

*The motion was negated.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret that though the Address lays stress on the principle of non-violence it fails to take note of or to appreciate the legitimate, peaceful and non-violent movement conducted in certain areas for adjusting border claims arising out of the reorganisation of States."

*The motion was negated.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret the failure of Government in paying compensation to the displaced persons within a reasonable time."

*The motion was negated.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret the inability of Government in providing houses to the displaced persons."

*The motion was negated.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret the failure of Government in checknig the transfer of claims at 50% of their real worth of compensation."

*The motion was negated.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret the policy of Government in raising the valuation of the houses built in various colonies for the rehabilitation of displaced persons."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret the inability of Government in getting the agreement with Pakistan in respect of movable properties implemented properly."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret the inability of Government in securing from Pakistan proper sense of security for Hindus, which would have checked the influx of Hindus from East Bengal."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret the failure of Government in applying the Directive Principles contained in Part IV of the Constitution to its policies."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret the failure of Government in decreasing unemployment in the country."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret the inability of Government to take adequate measures for the relief of flood sufferers."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret the failure of Government in checking corruption and inefficiency in the administration."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret the inability of Government to implement its promises made in 1953 for removing distinction between Hindus and Sikhs so far as special concessions for Scheduled Castes and Backward Classes were concerned."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret the failure of Government to find a solution of the Portuguese colonies in India."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret the failure of Government in securing satisfactory solution of the citizenship issue of Indians in Ceylon."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret the inability of Government to pursue a uniform and consistent policy with regard to reorganisation of States in India."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret the failure of Government to bring about an early settlement of Portuguese enclaves in India."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret the failure of Government to hold democratic consultations with the leaders of various

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

political parties in the country with a view to arrive at common understanding in respect of the reorganisation of States on the basis of important recommendations made by the States Reorganisation Commission and further regret the unilateral move of the Government to constitute zonal states without ascertaining the wishes of the people concerned."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret that—

(a) no mention has been made about the appointment of a Parliamentary Committee for supervising the works under Community Projects and National Extension Service Schemes and Local Assistance Works where the Government is spending crores of rupees;

(b) no mention has been made about the formation of Visala Andhra and of the appointment of Boundary Commissions to demarcate boundaries on a linguistic basis;

(c) no mention has been made about the scrapping of Prohibition in the country as experience of the working of Prohibition in certain States has shown that Prohibition is a thorough failure and that illicit distillation has become a cottage industry;

(d) no mention has been made about laying new railway lines in Andhra State."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret that the Address does not refer to the failure of the Government of India to take effective steps to liberate Portuguese possessions in India".

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret that the Address has not referred to the failure of Government of India to take effective

steps to safeguard the interests of Hindus in East Pakistan so that the influx of refugees to India may be stopped."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret to note that the Address fails to mention clearly that—

(a) in reorganisation of States the aspirations of already acknowledged linguistic groups will be fulfilled;

(b) provision would be made for maximum possible autonomy by transferring control over the police and appropriate allocation of revenues to district panchayats, particularly in all such areas which have hitherto enjoyed the status of States and may in the future be integrated with other areas;

(c) in respect of disputed taluqa and village units in border areas popular will shall be ascertained by means of a plebiscite;

(d) the Government would stop going from one decision to another in respect of State and boundary disputes as this attitude has brought disruption and death to people."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret to note that the Address fails to mention the untold hardships faced by members of those castes and tribes that have not yet been included in the list of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes on account of the long delay to introduce legislation to amend the lists of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in spite of the fact that the Backward Classes Commission has submitted their report about a year back."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but deeply regret the omission in the Address of any reference to the immense hardships caused by the indiscriminate extension of the

Indian Forest Act to the tribal or hill areas whereby the tribal people are deprived of their lands and forests, the sole means of their livelihood, and remain as slaves at the mercy of the forest department and contractors."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret that the Address has failed to refer to the wrong approach of the Government of India to the problem of States Reorganization in so far as—

(a) it has decided to separate the city of Bombay from Maharashtra and make it a Centrally administered area;

(b) it is encouraging proposal for merger of Bengal and Bihar before the country is given a full opportunity to consider the consequences and implications of such a proposal;

(c) it is pursuing a vacillating policy and is devising fantastic schemes with regard to Punjab, Andhra and Telangana;

(d) it has decided to merge Madhya Bharat with Madhya Pradesh against the declared will of the Madhya Bharat Legislature."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret that there is no mention of the fresh threat to the freedom struggle of the people of Malaya from certain members of the Commonwealth posed by the intervention of Australian and New Zealand troops against the people of Malaya."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret that the Address fails to refer to and express disapproval of the proposal for the merger of West Bengal and Bihar and other States without getting the approval of the electorate."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret that there is no mention in the Address about the declaration of a National Minimum Wage in the Second Five Year Plan."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret that the Second Five Year Plan does not envisage the immediate promulgation of an ordinance to stop all evictions of peasants prior to a searching enquiry into the cause of widespread evictions resulting from the Land Reforms Bills introduced or passed in the various States and which is leading to mounting unemployment and loss of purchasing power thereby endangering the very industrialisation plans of our country."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret that the Address does not take note of the failure of the Draft Second Five Year Plan in giving sufficient emphasis on heavy and machine building industries, without which the rate of industrialisation can never progress and our country's economic independence cannot be achieved."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret that the Address does not refer to any scheme to help the people who have greatly suffered by the recent cyclonic rains in Tamilnad."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret that the Address has failed to give any assurance to make one of the South Indian languages a compulsory subject in colleges and schools of the Hindi speaking areas."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret that Government have failed to take a referendum for settling the formation of linguistic States and border adjustments."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret that Government have failed to make a specific declaration about the quick implementation of the recommendations of the Backward Classes Commission."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret that inspite of expressing feeling of anxiety at the international situation especially, in relation to Indian Union, the Address fails to indicate the steps that Government are going to take to protect the country against threats of war."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

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

"but regret that the Address fails to indicate the steps the Government are going to take to ensure the safety of Hindus and other minorities in East Pakistan."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret that the Address fails to indicate the policy of the Government to tackle the intricate problem of the States' Reorganisation to the satisfaction of the people."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely.

"but regret to note the want of appreciation towards the remarkable performance of the private sector in the First Five Year Plan and underestimation of its potential in the Second Plan as is evident from the lower allocations made to it in the Second Plan."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is: That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

"but regret to note the failure to realise the gravity of the transport situation in the country, which has impeded the pace of economic development."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** All the amendments have been negatived. Now, I will put the motion to the vote of the Lok Sabha.

The question is :

"That the Members of Lok Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address, which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on 15th February, 1956."

*The motion was adopted.*

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 24th February, 1956.*