

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

1257

LOK SABHA
Saturday, 28th July 1956

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the
Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

12.04 P.M.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

SEVENTEENTH REPORT

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay City—North): I beg to present the Seventeenth Report of the Public Accounts Committee (1955-56) on the Appropriation Accounts (Railways) 1953-54, Vol. I—Report.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): Sir, with your permission, I would like to announce the Government business for this House for the week commencing from the 30th July, 1956.

Consideration of the States Reorganisation Bill will continue during the week according to the allocation of time agreed to for the Bill. In case the consideration and passing of the Bill are completed earlier than anticipated—which is not possible—the Government propose to bring forward the following two Bills as passed by

369 L.S.D.

1258

the Rajya Sabha for consideration and passing by this House:

- (1) The River Boards Bill; and
- (2) The Inter-State Water Disputes Bill.

Shri Kamath: (Hooshangabad): Does that mean that the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill will not immediately follow the States Reorganisation Bill even if it is completed later?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: After the Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill is passed by the House, the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill will be taken up.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE PROCEEDINGS, AND SYNOPSIS THEREOF, OF COMMITTEE 'B' ON SECOND FIVE YEAR PLAN

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the proceedings together with the synopsis of proceedings of Committee 'B' on the Second Five Year Plan (Industries, Minerals, Transport and Communications). [Placed in Library. See No. S-273/56]

STATES REORGANISATION BILL— contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Pandit G. B. Pant on the 26th July, 1956:

"That the Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the States of India and for matters connected therewith, as reported by the Joint Committee be taken into consideration".

[Mr. Speaker]

As many as 20 hours were allotted for general discussion. The time so far taken is 9 hours and 6 minutes. The balance available is 10 hours and 54 minutes. A number of hon. Members have sent me chits and are anxious to participate in the general discussion. Therefore, I would urge upon the hon. Members to be as brief as possible. If whatever has already been said does not require much emphasis, they may be omitted and new points, if any, may be taken up. Shri G. H. Deshpande, who was in possession of the House yesterday, will kindly resume his speech.

Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have practically entered the last stage of the States Reorganisation Bill. During the course of the debate of the last two days, I was surprised to find a few hon. Members saying that it will be better even if, at this stage, the Bill is postponed for a number of years. There were others who said that it would have been far better if this question had not been undertaken at all. But then, how will the people agree to wait for a number of years especially when they were led to believe that their wishes would materialise in this matter? Formerly, people did not raise a cry for this reorganisation of States more vehemently because we had not achieved Independence then. After Independence, there were several questions which were to be dealt with. The cry for the reorganisation of States was an old one. When adult franchise was granted to the people, the people had a claim for redistribution of States, because, unless and until we bring about a redistribution of States in which by far the majority of the people will have an opportunity to run the State administration at least in their mother-tongue, the common man will not effectively assert himself in Indian politics. It is no use granting adult franchise and then denying the right of carrying on even provincial administration in one's own language.

Even the late Lokamanya Tilak, in the 19th century, had talked about reorganisation. Ever since the 20th century, this movement has always been there. Now, we are considering the report of the Joint Committee. I am glad to see that by and large we are going to have States which will be based on language. Of course, the Members of the States Reorganisation Commission have said that language alone cannot be the consideration and those who stood for linguistic States never said that language alone should be the consideration. We are going to have State redistributed mostly on a linguistic basis. Yesterday my friend, Mr. Saksena, from U. P. vehemently attacked the idea of unilingual States. He said he was waiting for an opportunity again to carry on a movement for bilingual States. He himself belongs to unilingual State; but, having got a unilingual State for himself, he wants others to remain in bilingual States. We have had bilingual and multilingual States in the past. At page 45 of their report, the S. R. C. have expressed their opinion about it. They have said that the experience of the multilingual States was not a very satisfactory one; the families i.e. the governments were not happy there and there was a cry from the multilingual States themselves for a redistribution of States. Now, he who wants to go back to bilingual States must realise, that he is going to make an attempt to swim against the tide, which is not possible.

Having said this, I do say that I myself am really glad to see most of the provisions in the Joint Committee's report, because that is going to give us unilingual States. But, when I come to Bombay, I strongly object to that provision which prevents the integration of Bombay with Maharashtra. When I say this, I do not want to place before this House any suggestion for a special treatment to Maharashtrians. I say that Bombay must be integrated with Maharashtra because it belongs to Maharashtra. The S. R. C. have themselves admitted in their report that there is a very

close relationship, much more closer relationship between Bombay and Maharashtra than between Bombay and Gujarat. Any fair-minded gentleman who will read the report of the S. R. C. will find that Maharashtra has better and closer relations with Bombay. That has been admitted by the S. R. C. members. Then, why is it that it is denied to Maharashtra? We cannot agree with the reason that was stated in the S. R. C. report. The remedy suggested by the S. R. C. was a bilingual State, but that has been rejected now. A man like Dr. Kunzru now says, "if you do not adopt the bilingual State suggested by us, then Bombay should be integrated with Maharashtra, if at all you are going to have a unilingual State".

Yesterday my friend, Shri Dabhi, tried to enlighten the House by saying "Bombay is an island". All of us know that Bombay is an island; the geography cannot be altered by Mr. Dabhi. If anybody looks at the map of India, he will find that after all, Bombay is part and parcel of Marathi-speaking area. Keep a map of India before you and if you carve out the Marathi-speaking area in which all contiguous Marathi-speaking areas going to be integrated, you will find that Bombay is part and parcel of it. Nobody can deny it. We went to the farthest length of accommodating the minorities in Bombay; the minorities have not come forward yet with any complaint. It is only the Gujarati people that are vocal. The Gujaratis from Ahmedabad are more vocal than the Gujaratis from Bombay. The Gujarat P. C. C. is carrying on the agitation for keeping Bombay Centrally administered. The Parsis, the Southerners and the northerners in Bombay area not so vocal as the Gujaratis.

An hon. Member: You are afraid of plebiscite.

Shri G. H. Deshpande: I am not afraid of plebiscite. But, plebiscite was not resorted to for the reorganisation of the other States. I have serious objection to having a plebiscite

in Bombay alone. Why should you single out the case of Bombay for this? Bombay is geographically part of Maharashtra; why should you not concede Bombay to Maharashtra? Why should you not have a plebiscite in Hyderabad or Bengal? Why should you deny a plebiscite to other people who demand it? I say that if you decide to have plebiscite, you will endanger the Indian security and the Indian unity. Plebiscite was not resorted to till now and it ought not to be resorted to in future. One fails to understand the special position of Bombay in this regard.

Let us take the case of Calcutta. How was it developed? The Britishers went over to Bengal. They were the first to go there and they built up that city and it came up as the capital of India, and as the capital of the combined States of Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Assam. Later on there was a redistribution of States and Calcutta became the capital of a unilingual State namely Bengal. Has that city suffered anything on that account? Is Calcutta less cosmopolitan than Bombay? As a matter of fact, Calcutta is more cosmopolitan than Bombay. It is a bigger city than Bombay, there are the Japanese and the Chinese. There are more Englishmen in Calcutta than in Bombay. If you say today that Bombay should be Centrally administered, tomorrow there will be a demand from the non-Bengalis that Calcutta also should be Centrally administered. How was Madras brought up? The Britishers went over there; the Andhras, the Malayalees and the Tamilians were there. They all built up that city and it has now become the capital of a unilingual State. If Madras and Calcutta can become capitals of unilingual States, I fail to understand why Bombay should not become the capital of a unilingual State? It shows there are some doubts about the Maharashtrians and that is the thing which touches our feelings. Maharashtra is not going to tolerate these things. We do not stand here asking for any special privileges; but, if we are suspected, if doubts are entertained against us, we

[Shri G. H. Deshpande]

will fight to the last drop of blood in us. We cannot tolerate this situation. Are we less patriotic and are we extra-provincial? If at all we are, we are not more provincial than our Gujarati friends. We have every right to have the same rights....

Shri R. D. Misra (Bulandshahr Distt.): On a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member said he is going to fight to the last drop of his blood....

Shri G. H. Deshpande: When I say that I will fight to the last drop of my blood, I mean to say that this House has made the provision that enables us to fight for our rights; I will fight according to the rights that are given to me by this very House. We have got this House and if we take certain decisions today which go against me, I am prepared to submit myself to those decisions. But, I have a right to get those decisions altered; nobody can prevent me from doing that. This House has given me a provision by which I can fulfil my dreams, and I am going to carry on my fight. We will not rest at peace unless and until we see that our goal is achieved regarding Bombay. I am not ashamed to say that. When I say that, I am not going to ask for anything special for me. I cannot understand when some people talk as if, if Maharashtra State is under obligation because it is now one united state. I was told, "What a wonderful thing has been done for you; you were given two States by S. R. C. but now you have got one State", as if that is a favour. If the same deal is given to us as to other people, is it a special favour? Is it that you want Maharashtrians to be divided? Is it your view that we should not be brought together?

A great injustice was done to us in the name of that balanced bilingual State. My friends Mr. Patil and Mr. Morarji Desai had the courage to say, "Bengal and Bihar may have a bilingual State, but not a balanced State. The Biharis may be greater in number and the Bengalis less.." etc., but when it came to Gujarat, they said,

"No; not a bilingual State. If a bilingual State is to come, then it ought to be a balanced one. Maharashtrians must adjust themselves to the convenience of the Gujaratis." This is a thing to which I object. Who rejected a bilingual State? Did Maharashtrians reject a bilingual State? Is it not a fact that they agreed to a bilingual State? Have the Gujarat P. C. C. and the Bombay P. C. C. to this day agreed to a greater bilingual State? No. They said, never, never. They said, a balanced bilingual State. All Maharashtrians must not come under one administration. That must be the special privilege of the Gujaratis in the balanced bilingual state. Having done that injustice, they want to see that that injustice is perpetuated and that is why the public opinion in Maharashtra is rather perturbed, is rather disturbed, is rather irritated. They have a legitimate grievance. Why not integrate Bombay with Maharashtra? We are prepared to agree to any concession, constitutional safeguards devised for to the minorities concerned in Bombay. My hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta said, give the Bombay Corporation special rights. We agreed. But nobody was prepared to consider that. Their sole aim is to deprive the Maharashtrians of Bombay. We have got three times the number of Maharashtrians in Bombay as we have in Poona. Our relations with Bombay are closer. We cannot live without Bombay. The greatest employment opportunity for the Maharashtrian people is there. Suppose the proposed new set up is effected without any change, what will happen to the Maharashtrians? A large number of them will have to leave the city. If Bombay is to be centrally administered today and after five years we are going to consider what will happen, there will be an attempt to reduce the Maharashtrian population in Bombay. There will be conflict every day. There will not be peace; there would not be goodwill, unless and until you assure us that this will not be there, unless and until you assure us that automatically Bom-

bay will be merged with Maharashtra. When I say automatically, I do not say it should be done now. I say, if in the interests of the country, it is necessary that Bombay should be centrally administered for 1 or 2 years, at the end of the period, Bombay should be automatically merged with Maharashtra.

Then one more point. Why should we not have our seat of Government in the new Bombay? Why should we disturb so many people? There are 20,000 government servants. How are they getting on today? If a man is in the secretariat, his wife is a teacher somewhere else. Do you want to disturb all these families in these difficult days? Why not allow the Maharashtrians to run their Government from Bombay? What harm is there? If there are constitutional difficulties, there are constitutional experts who will find a way out. We are solving international questions. Why not this question? We do not want bitterness. We do not want any fights. We want to see that the new Maharashtra State should develop well. Unless you give Bombay to us, how can that be done?

Day before yesterday, Shrimati Jayashri said that the district of Dangs must be given to Gujerat. You will find according to the census reports of 1951 that Dangs has a population of 96 per cent Marathi-speaking people. It is Government report: not mine. This small district which has a Marathi-speaking population of 96 per cent. it is said, should form part of Gujerat. There is Dharampur Taluk which is part and parcel of Gujerat. The percentage of Marathi-speaking population is 95. There is the Basda taluk with a large Marathi-speaking population which is contiguous with Maharashtra. So also Sonegarh in the Surat district. They should be integrated with Maharashtra. I only want to state the facts before the House.

My hon. friend Seth Govind Das and Shrimati Jayashri told us, if Bombay is centrally administered, it

does not go to Africa. If it goes to Maharashtra, will it go to Africa or America? I can't understand this. If it is centrally administered, we are asked to be patriotic and we are told that it does not go to Africa. But, if it goes to Maharashtra, to which it should legitimately go, will it go to America? It will not. I think the people in Bombay will be more happy. That is the thing which is going to happen. That is the legitimate thing. I have no doubt in my mind about that. Whatever decisions are going to be taken today, they are not going to be perpetual things. They are not going to remain for a long time. Sooner or later Bombay will be integrated with Maharashtra and our dream will be realised. I have no doubt, we have the sympathies of this House, and the sympathies of outsiders also. More and more people are coming to this view. I appeal to the House. This is a national question. It is not a question between Gujeratis and Maharashtrians. This is a temporary phase. I know, Gujeratis and Maharashtrians have lived together for many years. We want to remain good friends. We want to live as good neighbours. After all, there are many common problems. I cannot forget them. This is a temporary phase. We are good friends and we will be good friends. This is a national question. Every hon. Member in this House should take into consideration that not only the prosperity of Maharashtra or the prosperity of Gujerat, depends on the successful solution of this problem, but the prosperity of the whole of India depends on the successful solution of this problem.

There is a tinge of the question of capital and labour also involved in this problem. From that point of view also, I would say that all those who are interested in a socialist pattern of society should see that Bombay is not centrally administered. If Bombay is centrally administered, there will be class war. These fights will be there. Unrest will be there. The discontent in Maharashtra will

[Shri G. H. Deshpande]

grow deeper and deeper. We are, after all, one-tenth of the population. If a deliberate injustice is done to us, and if that is going to be perpetuated, it is the tradition of my race that it will not be taken lying down. Whatever the length of time, fight will be carried on and it will be carried on successfully until we will achieve our goal. When I say this, I want to make it clear that we stand by the Constitution, we stand by peaceful means. We are honest congressmen. We have followed throughout our life the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi to the best of our ability. We are not less patriotic or ultra provincial. In these words, I want to place before this House our demand for the integration of Bombay with Maharashtra.

I want to make an appeal to my Karnataka friends, and Sir I would appeal to the entire House through you. There are about 6 lakhs of Maharashtrais, who are living in the areas which are being allotted to the coming Mysore State. Amongst these six lakhs, 71 per cent are Marathi-speaking people living contiguously and only 18 per cent are Kanarese. I would humbly request the House to take into consideration this problem also somewhat seriously. If I have said anything in the course of my arguments in the heat, which has injured the feelings of any of my hon. friends in this House, I apologise. Because, I am not interested in hurting the feelings of anybody. I am interested in the solution of the problem. I am not asking for any favour. I say that it is the legitimate demand of the Maharashtrais. It cannot be denied to them. The earlier the solution is found out, the better it is for the Maharashtrais, for the Gujeratis and for the country as a whole.

Shri Asoka Mehta (Bhandara): Mr. Speaker, I refrained from participating in this discussion on the two previous occasions, because, I feel that it is very difficult to make a positive or constructive contribution. Even on this occasion, I would have maintained my silence if I had been

able to discharge my responsibility. This House was good enough and kind enough to give an opportunity to serve on the Joint Committee. But, for reasons, I was not able to give my time and make my service available to the Joint Committee. Nor was it possible for me to give in the form of a minute of dissent the points on which I disagree with the general conclusions that have been reached in the Joint Committee.

This is an issue on which we have heard speeches here with overtones of anger and overtones of antipathy. I am one of those who find that they can only speak in a tone of anguish. I have no anger, no antipathy. I feel that by ignoring the advice that was given by some people above all by my leader here, we are today confronted by a problem that has become even more difficult than it was before. This problem is being looked at as an institutional and an administrative one. And it is that undoubtedly. Administrative changes have to be made. But, in the mean time we have discovered that fundamentally it is a question of emotional adjustment, and we seem to be finding no way of reaching that emotional adjustment.

Let us look at what is happening to the Punjab. I know there are other friends here who know more about it than I do, but I was one of those who were worried and profoundly disturbed by the situation that had developed in the Punjab. When the regional formula was evolved and when I found that our Akali friends were willing to accept it, I felt at long last there was a solution which could become the basis ultimately of reconciling the two great communities in that State, but instead, the formula is being taken by one set of people to begin with, and we now find by more people, and more and more it is used as a first step towards reopening the whole controversy, and I do not know where it will end. And it is not any controversy between two

language groups, it is not any controversy between two religious communities, bad as that would be, but if my information is correct, if I have been well informed of what is happening there, slowly the rural-urban tension is being created. Some kind of conflict between the *Shahri Lals* and *Dehati Jats* is being created. That is merely the very first shadow that is emerging on the stage of India, a tragic shadow that will darken and grow bigger and bigger—the rural-urban conflict. Let us realise where we are moving, where we are drifting. If we look at this problem purely in administrative terms and are unwilling to go to the root of things, to the core of the matter, and try and bring about an emotional integration of our people, we shall be not only facing a difficult situation, but making it more and more complicated.

In the Punjab—one more word about that province, great province as it is—it is amazing to find that while a great minority community is sought to be integrated, another great community, the majority community, is not prepared even in a region to accept the position of a minority. How are we ever going to integrate a minority in the body politic of our country if everywhere, in every condition, in every position, in every State, in every circumstance the majority community insists upon being in a majority? Somewhere give-and-take has to come. The country is made up of diverse groups and diverse peoples. Every part of our country must be given an opportunity—it may be a majority or it may be a minority there. This is the position where each one of us is prepared to be because we believe that neither of these two positions can be really detrimental to the interests of an Indian.

Then I come to Bombay. I must say that this question of Bombay City has been badly and sadly mishandled. I have had very intimate relations with both: the people of Gujarat and the people of Maharashtra, profound

emotional relations with both of them I was born in Gujarat and brought up in Maharashtra, and I had all my education in Maharashtra. I represent a Marathi-speaking constituency here, and I have deep unbreakable ties with both the language groups, and I feel that the two people are complementary. You can disentangle them only at your peril, and the only wise solution, as I have said over and over again whenever I got an opportunity, the only worthwhile solution was a proper bilingual State, not a balanced bilingual State but a bilingual State, permitting all Gujarati-speaking and Marathi-speaking people to come together. It is not too late. Sooner or later you will have to come to that solution because you cannot divide what God has united, viz., the people of Maharashtra and Gujarat. I do not know about other parts of the country, I cannot speak about them with the same amount of confidence, but about Western India I can say with confidence that there is no lasting, fruitful, wise solution except to bring the two people together within the framework of a single State, but that was not done.

If linguistic States are to be created, if in Western India, States are to be created on the basis of language, by what logic, on what reasons, by what arguments has Bombay City been kept out of the State of Maharashtra? Until now no one has tried to come forward and give reasons.

We are told that Bombay City is a cosmopolitan city. I know it is a cosmopolitan city and that is the tragic part of it. The tragedy lies in the fact that nobody recognises the real character, the cosmopolitan character of the city. My Maharashtrian friends claim Bombay—not only claim Bombay, but a feeling is created in them that the City of Bombay belongs to Maharashtra. "We want Bombay, we want Bombay" the shout goes on everywhere. There is no point in getting Bombay unless you can retain the cosmopolitan character of Bombay. Bombay can never be reduced to the position of a Maharashtrian city.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): It will be.

Shri Asoka Mehta: It must never be reduced to that position.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: Not reduced. It will rise to that position.

Shri Asoka Mehta: It must remain a cosmopolitan city. But, at the same time, do those who want to keep it centrally administered realise that if 50 per cent of the people of Bombay, the backbone of Bombay, the Maharashtrians are frustrated and dissatisfied, the city will not remain a cosmopolitan city. The cosmopolitan character of the city can remain only when from both sides there is a willingness of give and take, of mutual understanding. If Bombay City is to be the city that we have known that we have cherished all these years, if it is to be the city of our hopes and our dreams, it cannot be reduced to the position of a uni-lingual city. But you cannot also keep the city out of Maharashtra because you are virtually reducing it to an emotional shambles. Therein lies the need to find a solution. It is a difficult position, but a position that could have been reconciled.

I tried to do my bit. I suggested a formula where I said "Daughter in mother's house and mistress in my own". The City could have been given a considerable amount of autonomy and could have been made a part of Maharashtra. Both the purposes would have been served. The people of Maharashtra would have felt that no discrimination had been made against them, and the citizens of Bombay, all people irrespective of the language they speak, would have felt that they would be able to maintain and enrich the cosmopolitan character of the great city. But that formula of mine was dismissed without discussion. That was the phrase used: "It was dismissed without discussion." I have nothing more to say. Many things have been dismissed, many more things may be dismissed, but there is no solution. It is necessary to

realise that by keeping Bombay out of Maharashtra, by passing a piece of legislation here howsoever important, this problem is not being solved. The City of Bombay will no longer be the city that it was if it becomes centrally administered. There will be no peace in Maharashtra.

The new State of Maharashtra is not just a State of Western India. It occupies the heartland of India too. It is no longer Poona orientated, it is also Nagpur orientated. Look at the map, you are drawing up of the new State of Maharashtra. Half a dozen major States will be around it. If there is unsettlement, if there is frustration, if there is distrust, a distrust that is fast getting institutionalised in this great State of Maharashtra, will the rest of India be able to build up an economy and a polity with hope and confidence? We are laying at the very foundations of our planned economy a kind of time bomb that will blow us up, and I do not want that.

This problem has to be faced, faced in an even manner, in an honest manner, and that is why I feel the anguish. I am not big enough to communicate that anguish to you and to the House. It needs a man of a great stature to do it, but when I heard the discussions going on, when I heard what my friend from Kolaba had to say, I could not keep quiet. Why did he say that? You can even ask that question. Why this mild-mannered man, a man who was the very epitome of culture, who used to be so balanced, who always used to weigh his words before he spoke—why is it that he had to say what he said? And what did he say? He said that he feels that there is an animus against Maharashtra. I do not think there is an animus. I have differed with the Prime Minister over and over again, and I hope it will be my good fortune to differ with him in the future also, because I do not believe that through wholesale agreements the nation grows. But I am not prepared to concede that he has any

animus against anyone. But the fact that his close colleague, a man of the eminence of Shri C. D. Deshmukh, should have felt that is a warning signal, and to ignore that warning signal is to be untrue to the realities in our country. Believe me, Sir, when I say that there are today millions of Maharashtrians who feel that justice is not being done to them. Whether they are right or whether they are wrong, here is a fact that has to be reckoned and has to be taken into consideration. But that is not being taken into consideration.

You are treating this piece of legislation just like any other legislation, as if all that is needed is to roll up the majority, and once you have rolled up the majority, and once you have the President's signature on it, the matter is over. You are dealing with profound and deepest emotions that disturb millions of our people. And that is why a different approach, a different touch, is needed.

But, what has happened? My hon. friend the Member from Kolaba is not here. He always used to call me the Member from Bhandara. And this is the first time I am getting a chance to call him as the Member from Kolaba. My hon. friend from Kolaba talked about the intimate ties that Kolaba has with the city of Bombay. My hon. friend, the Member from Kutch, is not here to bear me out, but I think Kutch has far more intimate ties with Bombay. So, let us not go into this kind of argument as to who has ties with whom.

The fact remains that here is a tremendous amount of disturbance and emotional dislocation. Either have a bilingual State, if everyone will agree, or else, let Bombay be part of Maharashtra, but let the city be given the maximum amount of autonomy that can be given to it. I am sure this question can be worked out. It was dismissed without discussion. But may I once again appeal to you that the solution does not lie in creating a barrier, an emotional barrier?

We have just heard the speech that my hon. friend Shri G. H. Deshpande has made, a kind of speech that he used to make against me and the friends on the Opposition. The kind of wrath, the kind of deep-seated antipathy that he has shown towards his colleagues sitting roundabout is not a happy augury. That is not a good sign. Therefore, may I appeal to you that this matter be looked at, and this problem be solved through a policy of mutual goodwill?

Sir, politics of distension is needed. I agree with my hon. friend Shri Gadgil, when he appeals to the leaders of satyagraha in Maharashtra to call off the satyagraha. Let there be distension. Let not the satyagraha go on, with everyone rolling up the sleeves all the time. I hope my hon. friend Shri Gadgil, when he speaks, will not roll up his sleeves against others.

I am amazed at the suggestion that has been made that the future of Bombay should be decided by the citizens of Bombay. Do you want to destroy the very fabric of my city? You can never place this question to be decided by the people through vote. If you place it before them, if you ask the people of Bombay to decide this question by vote, it will be decided only in the streets of Bombay. Therefore, let the Parliament take upon itself the responsibility of deciding it. We cannot say anywhere, on any question, that this matter, where emotions have been stirred, where passions have been roused, and where profound tensions have been created, will be resolved through a plebiscite of the people. It is the sovereign responsibility of Parliament to decide it. Do not throw away your responsibility into the streets. So, even if this matter is to be decided later on, that decision must be taken by this Parliament. Under no circumstances can it be a question to be decided by the vote of the people of Bombay. If you ask for their vote, there will be no peace in Bombay, there will be no

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

peace in Maharashtra, and therefore, there will be no peace in Gujarat, and the whole of India will be surcharged with upheavals, not with the hopes and expectations of a new economy and of a new democratic polity that we are trying to create in our country, but with these disturbances, with these conflicts, with these tensions, and mutual hatreds and antipathies.

Then, there is the boundary question. Everyone who has spoken has raised this boundary question. Here again, let us decide what it is that we are out for. Acharya Vinoba Bhave said that this picture of India is like that of a rainbow where one colour flows into the other and slowly the other colour comes out; there are patches where two colours mix and mingle together, and he would not want them to be separated. Is our picture of new India like that of a rainbow? Or, do we want to create precise linguistic States? If you want to create precise linguistic States, by all means do so. Have village-wise division. But what is it that you want? Is it purely a matter of administrative convenience? Or is it that cultural articulation can take place only when every single person speaking a particular language is in a particular State? What ultimately are the basic assumptions on which you are working? I am surprised that so philosophical a person, a man of such profound learning as the Home Minister has never come forward and told us the basic assumptions, the fundamentals on which he wants to reorganise the States.....

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): That is the trouble.

Shri Asoka Mehta:..... with the result that each one pulls in his own direction. People meet together, and it is said, 'If you agree, it will be done'. Yes, if you agree, even the whole fabric of India can be cut up. What is this kind of talk about agreement?

Sir, there are certain fundamentals that this House must accept, and I say, in all humility, that I would like to sink with Acharya Vinoba Bhave rather than sail with those who want to separate every single village from the surrounding territory, on the basis, on the assumption, of creating a linguistic State. We have been through this language controversy, as my leader has pointed out, more than once. We have tragically loosened the fabric of our country. What are the unifying forces that we are developing side by side?

There is a note appended to the Joint Committee's report, at pages 136-138, and this appendix contains the circular that the Home Ministry has issued. If we look at that, what do we find? It is not a question of giving certain rights to linguistic minorities. That is important, of course, and I shall come to that in a minute. But what is needed is that while you loosen the fabric of India on the one hand, you have, on the other hand, to take other measures to see that the fabric of India is brought together also? The two things have to be taken up simultaneously. Then alone can the forces of devolution on the one hand, and integration on the other, be properly balanced.

May I invite your attention to paras 9, 10 and 11 of this note? Para 9 is entitled 'Recruitment of at least fifty per cent. of the new entrants in All-India Services from outside a State'. What suggestion has the Home Ministry made? We find in the note:

"The question has been discussed informally with the Chief Ministers. No rigid rules are considered to be necessary, but the recommendation made by the Commission will be kept in view in making future allotments to the All-India Services."

We are going to break up our States now. Are all Gujaratis going to be sent to Gujarat, and are all Maharashtrians going to be kept in

Maharashtra? Here is a question which we have to decide. What do we find in the Punjab? I am told that already some officers have been transferred. It may be an accident, but it has created a considerable amount of fear, doubt and suspicion. The Sikhs have been transferred to one place, and the Hindus have been transferred to another. It may be just an accident. But please remember that we are living in a surcharged atmosphere. We want, in order to strengthen the unity of India, that at least fifty per cent. of the officers will be drawn from other language groups. Here, we are going to redraw the map of India on the basis that the officers are going to be allotted to different States. Do we not want to move in that direction?

Then, take the next para. There again, as far as judges are concerned, it is said:

"There may be difficulties in some cases in implementing these recommendations."

We find the same thing in regard to the constitution of Public Service Commissions also. We find only some general, vague, aspirations. These three suggestions were concretely made by the States Reorganisation Commission, because they felt that while there is to be linguistic devolution on the one side, there has got to be administrative integration on the other. The two things have to be done together. But that is not being done.

Then, take the whole question of safeguarding the rights of linguistic minorities. I cannot improve upon what has been said and written by my hon. friend, Shri Frank Anthony, on the subject. I wholeheartedly support the Minute of Dissent that he has appended. Sir, it is absolutely necessary that the Centre should have the responsibility in this matter. We have Zonal Councils. The working of the Zonal Council has been improved, particularly through the

addition of clause 24. I welcome that. It makes it more flexible and more effective. But we cannot leave the question of safeguarding the rights of the linguistic minorities to the Zonal Councils alone. It will, as he pointed out in his inimitable manner, only create, foster and feed irredentist feelings.

I do not want—and I am sure that no single Member of this House wants—that people of one language group should look beyond their borders of their state, to another State, to safeguard their rights. Where will it lead us to? Therefore, it is necessary to see that if anyone is to be entrusted with the responsibility of safeguarding the rights of linguistic minorities that way, it has got to be this august House, it has got to be the President. I will not go into the details. An appropriate amendment is being moved by my hon. friend, Shri Frank Anthony, and I hope that when the time comes for the discussion of that amendment, we shall go into the details of it.

As my hon. friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram, pointed out, there are 4 crores of people who constitute the linguistic minorities. That number will grow. I am looking forward to the day when half of India will be living outside linguistic States, because that is the meaning of social mobility, that is the meaning of people living everywhere, going forward from one place to another. Why should I be in one part of the country alone? Why should I live, marry and die in the place where I was born? I am an Indian and all the corners of India must be open to me, and will be open to me. Today it is only 4 crores. Tomorrow, it may be 14 crores. (*Interruption by Acharya Kripalani*). You were born in one part of the country, you have gone and married somewhere else. You are the ideal citizen of tomorrow.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur-cum-Purnea): Speaking about yourself?

Shri Asoka Mehta: I am too old.

Therefore, I was saying that if their rights are to be safeguarded, it is necessary that the Centre should have the requisite power. Here again, when we look at the note, what do we find? I am amazed to find that a person of the clarity of mind and translucent intellect that our Home Minister is, should write this kind of stuff. Paragraph 2 of the note says:

"The intention is that the arrangements which were generally accepted at this Conference"—the Provincial Education Ministers' Conference in August 1949—

"should be brought into force in States and areas where they have not been adopted so far".

Seven years have passed. They have not yet been adopted. Why? There must be some reason why they have not been adopted for 7 years. After 7 years, you are now going to make further efforts. And look at the note. The prize gem is paragraph 7:

"The attention of the State Governments is being drawn to the relevant provisions in the Constitution regarding freedom of trade, commerce and intercourse and the right to equality of opportunity and it is being suggested that the existing restrictions should be reviewed from this point of view".

Here are my constitutional rights and safeguards, rights that have been given to me by the sacred Constitution. And now I have to go on bended knees to these State Governments and say, 'Please'.....

Shri Ferose Gandhi (Pratapgarh Dist.—West-cum-Rae Bareilly Dist.—East): Address the Chair.

Shri Asoka Mehta: 'bring them in conformity'. I cannot understand this. That is not the meaning, that is not the scheme, of our Constitution. That is not the kind of federation that we have to build up. We have

a single citizenship unlike other countries. We are all citizens not of our States but of the Union as a whole. And this House is the supreme House. This House represents the real, the effective—and the only—democracy in our country; all other things are merely administrative convenience. No administrative convenience can be permitted to usurp the rights and privileges that have been given by the Constitution. And that is the responsibility of this House and the Supreme Court to safeguard.

Therefore, this whole approach is fundamentally wrong. It lacks a clear purpose, a clear direction, and I would beg of the Home Minister and the Prime Minister and all the Members, through you, Sir, to see that this basic question that my hon. friend, Shri Frank Anthony, has raised, should be looked into properly.

I am surprised, again, that Himachal Pradesh, which enjoyed democratic rights and representative institutions, should be deprived of them. Then there is Manipur. My hon. friend from Manipur is here. He led a powerful movement, a powerful agitation. He is a Naga. There are quite a few Nagas in Manipur. He led a powerful movement for democratic rights which the people of Manipur enjoyed before Manipur was integrated into the Indian Union. We all know about what happened there. Even today, we do not know whether the people of Manipur will have representative institutions or not. Are you going to function in this manner towards Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura and so on? These are tribal people, people whose susceptibilities have to be considered. Must you permit an issue to become as difficult, as intransigent and as intractable, as the Naga problem before you will pay attention to it? If you are serious about giving these tribal people a feeling that they have the maximum autonomy, give them help, give them assistance, treat them with the kind of attitude that we are prepared to take towards the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

We are not prepared to do that to the people of Manipur and Himachal. A piece of our territory has to become a disputed question between two countries before we shall be prepared to come forward and say, 'You have your difficulties. We give you your autonomy. We shall loosen the reins, because we know that the more autonomy we give you, the closer you will want to cling to India'. India is a land of my dreams and hopes. No one will want to go away from this country. We shall make of this country, we shall create in this country that spirit and that attraction—which will make her irresistible. One has only to go out into the world to find that no longer is the Soviet Union the land of the greatest excitement. Go to any people, wherever you like and the common people of the world over are looking forward to India. They feel that here is a land of hope, a land of adventure, a land of great pilgrimages. That is the kind of attraction, that is the kind of fascination that India exercises on the men of the world. They have seen communism, they have seen capitalism, and by now they have got accustomed to them, but they feel that something new may come out of the land that has been brought into existence by the sublime devotion, by the sublime dedication, of Mahatma Gandhi. They all look to this country. Millions and millions of people all over the world look to India as a land of hope and expectation. What answer are we going to give them except that here is a secret, here is an alchemy of unity where maximum autonomy may be the source of maximum unity?

But we will not do that. Manipur will be Centrally administered. Tripura will be Centrally administered. Wrong officers will be sent there. My hon. friends here will get up and go on complaining and every time the Treasury Benches will get up and give the usual answer, the typed answer, the cyclostyled answer. This is not the way that a nation is built.

Therefore, while we discuss this problem of States reorganisation, let us not look at it as a mere piece of legislation. Let us not look at it as a question of administrative changes and institutional devices. Let us think in terms of emotional adjustments. I have not, as I said, the stature to say all these things. But if I will not be misunderstood, may I appeal to every single Member of the House that nothing will be gained if we resort to anger and antipathy; only through sympathy, only through goodwill, only through emotional integration can this difficult problem be solved.

Lastly, I would once again beg to the Prime Minister not to treat the question of Bombay as something that can be decided by majority and minority. It is an open sore. It is the wound that will bleed and out of which the living blood of India will pour out. Therefore, do something about it, something which will not leave either side with the feeling that it has either won wholeheartedly or that it has been defeated and crushed. There has got to be a solution where all people concerned feel that it is a solution in which everyone's face has been saved, everyone's rights have been preserved. Such a solution is not beyond the wit of man. Shri Krishna Menon is known throughout the world for his ability to discover formulae and to reconcile what is not reconcilable. I am surprised to find that the great peacemaker of the world is not present in the House when this tension is growing.

✓ Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I must pay my elderly compliments to my friend, the son of Maharashtra, Shri Asoka Mehta. The friendship which started in Nasik jail has grown up and whatever may be our political differences, that friendship has not been affected at all.

1 P.M.

When the hon. Home Minister moved for the consideration of the

[Shri Gadgil]

Report of the Joint Committee, he appealed that it should be done in a calm and considerate atmosphere. That is exactly what is said on every occasion. On every occasion, most of us, at any rate, I have tried my best to respond to that. But, I am today in a position to congratulate him more than on former occasions because what happened yesterday when the satyagrahis demonstrated shows that the law and order problem is essentially a problem of human understanding and can only be successfully dealt with by tact. (Interruption). If that method, which is really the Panch Shila method, had been followed in Bombay during November and January, the history of this country would have taken a different colour altogether.

People have made appeals to us but nobody has understood the problem of Bombay and Samyukta Maharashtra so well as Shri Asoka Mehta has done. One might say that it is such a small piece of land for which we are fighting. When I heard Bengali friends waxing eloquent over this area and that, the same eloquence indulged in by my Bihari friends and practically everybody except the Prime Minister, everybody who has anything to say about his State has been, I do not say, provincial. I find whatever he has done or said he has done in exercise of his own right as he understood it. We are all called provincial, but, let me tell you that we have never said that we are Maharashtrians first. We have always said that we are Indians first and Maharashtrians next and, in order to be better Indians we want to be better Maharashtrians. It was said of Mr. Yeatts, the great Irish poet that the more Irish he became, the greater and more universal was his appeal. Similarly, when the ex-Chief Minister of U.P. says that over his dead body Uttar Pradesh can be split up, when Dr. B. C. Roy stated

the other day in the Bengal Assembly that he was a Bengali first and a Bengali last, I do not accuse either of them of narrow parochialism or provincialism. But, I say they are standing up to their rights. Will you concede me that attitude at least which has been indulged in by every section of the House? Therefore, when we consider this question, I am considering it not so much as a Maharashtrian but from an all-India point of view because we want to build India for a new order of society based on egalitarian principles, we want to create an India which will be the greatest pride not only of us but of our future generations as well and we want to make India rise to that status to that stage when it can be said *Durlabham Bharate Janma*, it is a great *Bhagya* that one is born in India. We want to bring that status. But, how is it possible? It is only possible when every section and every group in this country has received the maximum satisfaction not only in matters of individual citizenship rights but in the matter of what are called group rights also and it would be wrong to bestow an inferior status on any particular group. That is what has exactly been done by the S.R.C.

I will not go into the history in detail through the decision that is incorporated in the Bill is taken because it is alleged that some violence was indulged in Bombay by Maharashtrians. Since you have ruled something yesterday—though I do not think that ruling is correct but I must bow to it—all I can say is that if one student is killed in Patna, an enquiry is ordered; if nine people are killed in Imphal, an enquiry is ordered; if 4 people are killed in Kalka.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. As far as our rules go, they expect ordinary members to bow not only in practice but also in words to the ruling of the Speaker.

Shri Gadgil: To that extent, whatever I said may be considered as withdrawn.

The point is that it means that if the thing is done on a large scale by the police there is immunity. If you kill hundreds and shoot hundreds you are completely immune. That is the impression that has got on men all over the country. There were 400 casualties and we wanted.....

Shri Dabhi (Kaira North): On a point of order; you ruled this thing out yesterday. Is it right and proper on the part of the hon. Member to refer to it? We were not allowed to refer.

Shri Gadgil: What I want.....

Mr. Speaker: Apart from any particular order or ruling, I must say this. The hon. Member started by saying that he wants to appease feelings here. Shri Asoka Mehta spoke very feelingly but he created an impression without referring to these incidents. I think, without referring to these incidents, Shri Gadgil has surely got sufficient arguments to support the case for Samyukta Maharashtra including Bombay. Therefore, from all points of view both from the point of view of the ruling and from the point of view of having a calm atmosphere in the House, I would urge upon the hon. Member not to refer to these things.

Shri R. D. Misra: Sir, may I ask one thing? Will these words which he has said about you and the ruling go into the record or not?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has said they may be considered as withdrawn.

Shri Gadgil: The relevancy is just this and I will state it and go to the next point. When a certain statement has been made that something is not correct, I think it is in fairness to have an enquiry and if it is found correct then it would go to strengthen the decision which has been taken.

Mr. Speaker: All this was said yesterday.

Shri Gadgil: I do not want to refer to that hereafter.

The point is that when this thing was under consideration in Parliament, so many Members were kind enough to plead the cause of Maharashtra and it appeared, not to me alone but to newspapers in Delhi and elsewhere also, that the House was more or less substantially in favour of Bombay being included in Maharashtra. It is because of this the Gujerati papers wrote that their Members in Parliament have not done their work properly and their case was being lost (*Interruption*). I have cuttings from your papers, Mr. Shah. And, then they appealed to their leaders Shri Morarji Desai and Shri Dhebar that they should intervene and see that there is no change in the decision taken.

Shri C. C. Shah (Gohilwad-Sorath): This is entirely a wrong statement. He should not make allegations like this against others.

Shri Gadgil: If you will have a little patience.....

Shri C. C. Shah: Can he show anything in the papers to the effect that there was intervention by Morarji Desai and.....

Shri Gadgil: You will know things stranger than truth.

Shri C. C. Shah: Can he show anything in the newspapers? It is mud slinging on the Congress President and the Chief Minister of Bombay.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. Member refers to any statement that appears in the Press, he is entitled to do it. The other hon. Member may say that all statements in the papers are not true.

Shri C. C. Shah: Does it appear in the paper anywhere?

Shri Gadgil: My hon. friend Shri Shah, though he is a solicitor, has not yet developed the art of listening patiently before he thinks of answer-

[Shri Gadgil]

ing what I said. What I have said is that this appeal has been made. This is what has happened between April and 3rd June.

Now, in the Joint Committee Report there is a reference to the statement of the Prime Minister. And when that reference is made, it is open, I think, under the Parliamentary procedure, to analyse the circumstances in which it was made, the time when it was made, the place where it was made and why it was made. It is because that Parliament predominantly expressed the view that Bombay City should go to Maharashtra.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Some other Hon. Members: Yes, yes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am not deciding the question now.

Shri Gadgil: I do not want to go into the question whether the Prime Minister has a constitutional right or not because I am more concerned with the product. Whether you are beating me with a bamboo stick or a chandan stick or a sugarcane, the impact makes no difference. Whether the thing was properly considered by the Cabinet and then given expression to or otherwise does not concern me. All I am concerned with is the product, the statement itself. The statement, as I said, in the context of circumstances in which it was made, does lead to certain conclusions, and I leave the House to draw them.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): What are they?

Shri Gadgil: My own conclusion is that it is a direction from the Prime Minister and a direction from our leader. When we are told that Parliament is supreme and can do anything, it is very difficult for me to disobey or disregard the direction of my leader, the direction of the Prime Minister of a government belonging to my party. Just consider what mental embarrassment we are put in.

It is just like in the olden days the father fixing one girl for the boy and the boy wanting another. Now it is very difficult—not for the modern boy, but that was the position when we were young people—and the position is that Parliament's sovereignty has virtually become meaningless.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Mockery.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Some other Hon. Members: Yes, yes.

Shri Gadgil: When the leader of a majority party makes an announcement, the followers are bound to accept it and honour it. Now the position is so difficult. I was told that even in the Joint Committee meetings, the members of a particular party used to meet before and they were told that this is what their leader has said. Then I ask; what else remains for them?

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt.-South): I do not know what relevancy there is in mentioning what a particular party said (*Interruptions*).....

Shri Gadgil: Therefore, the point is not merely Bombay being given to Maharashtra, but a very great principle is involved in this. People ask me, why are you fighting for this little thing. The same question was asked of Mahatma Gandhi when he declined to go to the Round Table Conference because one Shri Rajwade was not released—he was a Martial Law prisoner, he could have been released but he was not released. This is a question of principle. The question before this honourable House is whether we are free to express our view on a question which is not a question of confidence in the Government. If that was a question of confidence, I would have voted with the Government. This is a question of organising freedom. We have won freedom and now the problem is really one of organisation of freedom, and there,

as was stated, institutional and administrative considerations ought to weigh.

What is the decision? In his speech the Prime Minister said that there may be some certainty and that after a certain period we may consider it on merits. The States Reorganisation Commission reported against Bombay City being made a separate unit, whether Centrally governed or a State. Dr. Panikkar in his speech at Calcutta in January 1956 stated—I have given extracts from his speech on the last occasion from the vernacular Press, from the *Statesman*, from the *Hindu* and the *Standard*—that at first they thought of having two States, Gujarat and Maharashtra, with Bombay going to Maharashtra, but for certain "special reasons" they suggested the present arrangement and that all along they looked upon this as a tentative proposition or as a transitional arrangement.

The same thing was said by Dr. Kunzru, that he was opposed to Bombay City being a separate unit. Either it must be in a bilingual State or, if a bilingual State is not possible, it must go in the State of Maharashtra. He said that immediately after the 16th January decision was announced in a surprise broadcast, and it was again repeated by him on the 12th June 1956, when he addressed the Annual General Meeting of the Servants of India Society and the people in Poona.

Leave aside all these things. Consider whether it is in the highest interests to have Bombay City as a separate unit—whether it is a State or whether it is Centrally administered. Take the law and order problem, the prohibition problem, the unemployment problem and see how it works out. You will be surprised to know that in Bombay, that is Greater Bombay, there is one police for 228 men, whereas just outside the limit there is one police for 250 men; even in the much-maligned Chicago, there is one police for 450 men. With the background that has

developed during the last five or six months, to which eloquent reference was made by Shri Asoka Mehta, if things drift on like this, it should be everybody's effort, including that of my humble self, that this should be stopped. We should do our best; but if this goes on, how many policemen you will keep?

I assure my Gujarati friends that their greatest safeguard is our goodwill. We have been good neighbours for 150 years, and if we say today that we want to partition and be separate—and not be in partnership—what is wrong there? We shall still have many things in common. As I said in Amritsar, let us have two States and we will have many things in common because we do not want to take undue risk. As I said then, let us have a little water in the jug and if it does not ooze, have a little more. Let us go that way. I opposed at that time the then politically great event, the proposed merger of West Bengal and Bihar. I was the only man who did it and was looked upon by everyone as a reactionary. I was not reactionary or progressive either; I was a humble realist.

The point is that we do want to have many mutual contacts. Just as Shri Asoka Mehta was educated in Maharashtra, my humble self was partly educated in Gujarat, in the Baroda College, and the two Mehta sisters one of them is here in the House were with me; Shri Shankarrao Deo was with me; Acharya Vinoba Bhave was with me. It is not that there is any hatred or bitterness in me. I am a Hindu and I believe in the philosophy that to hate anybody is the greatest sin one can do. I hate the act, but not the actor; I hate the deed, but not the doer. That is the Hindu philosophy and that is the philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi.

Let us consider the question in a dispassionate manner. This will be a police administration. The prohibition crime has increased six times during these six years and only recently a big factory has been found

[Shri Gadgil]

manufacturing 600 gallons of the prohibited masala every day and there were bottles, labels, legal advisers and all other accompaniments which a joint stock limited company usually possesses.

Take the unemployment question. In any city the unemployment problem is getting more and more frightful and it will naturally envelop the city. Can the Central Government cope with this? Consider this problem dispassionately. Apart from this, there is the possibility of increase in organised crime. Illicit distillation is an organised crime and there will be more spheres of organised crimes. What will be the impact of the pressure of the people who are poor on the rich classes? I want that pressure to go up but in a co-ordinated and orderly manner. The economic progress and march of events will be out of step and that step will altogether be different from the general run and rhythm of progress we find in the country at large. Therefore, administratively, politically, economically and from every point of view, to keep it as a separate unit is dangerous not merely for us who are round about but for the country as a whole.

What is this small piece of land called Bombay city? People ask. Till 1948, it was just 21 square miles—21 square miles, not beyond the Bandra creek. In 1948, the Greater Bombay Act was passed. We were told that there was so much of industrial congestion etc. We were compelled and we gave them seventy square miles from the Maharashtra districts, partly Thana and partly from Suburban district. What is the gratitude shown by the capitalists? At that time a fear was expressed that some such thing would happen as has happened now. A point of order was raised by my friend, Shri Patakar who is now on the Treasury Benches. I hope he will not forget Maharashtra at the time of voting. It was ruled out. We were told that no such thing would happen. We

were assured orally. Will you believe me if I say that? But that is the fact. Now, another 31 square miles are being given. Do we not realise that Bombay's life and economic existence is entirely dependent upon the hinterland—water electricity, this, that and the other. You cannot separate the head from the body. That is what is exactly happening.

This solution is proposed—they say—because Bombay has disqualified itself. What happened in 1946? In most of the cities in undivided India and in divided India, in Bihar, Calcutta, Bengal, what happened? Did it occur to anybody or the British people that because of these happenings India was disqualified to have political freedom? Did it occur to our great leadership that Calcutta was disqualified, that Kanpur was disqualified, because there were riots? Assuming that there was some violence—I cannot refer to it under your ruling, I accept that—who had done this? The total arrests in connection with violence was 1150 in Bombay. In order to punish these 1150, you are punishing three million, depriving them of their democratic right. I want, in all humility, to understand whether it is democracy.

It has been argued that there is great excitement and that excitement must cool down. I most humbly request the great Prime Minister to reconsider the whole thing. Is it going to be democratically decided by the Corporation or by a plebiscite? If it is going to be decided that way, the whole atmosphere will be that of election from now till then and at that eleventh hour riots can be ordered in Bombay by one who has got money. That can be done. Everybody, who is acquainted with public life in Bombay, knows that. Just a fortnight before that date, there will be a riot and then we will be told...

Shri Syammanna Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): Another five years.

Shri Gadgil: "Not now." No further progress. The Central control will continue from time to time.

It is said that we have not offered constructive suggestions. I am one of those who have dealt in a humble way with the integration of so many States, and may be assumed to have some little constructive talent. Why not concede that much? I agreed to Shri Asoka Mehta's formula of wider powers for the Bombay Corporation in Maharashtra State in my speech on the 16th of December. He has now suggested a bilingual State. That was suggested by us. It was turned down. I do not know in what language to describe that refusal and I will not say beyond that. Now, between that date and today, matters have so deteriorated that to bring back that idea of a bilingual State is to invite further trouble. At that time, when we made that suggestion the Marathwada opinion was: "We have been in a trilingual State, why do you take us back?" From Vidarbha, my great friend, Shri Khedkar, said: "We have already enough experience of Hindi people." I then said that it would be worked and I gave my ideas. But that proposal was rejected. Now, it is difficult to revive it. Even if you want it, keep it as an ideal and give me 10-15 years' time. But you must in all equity and fairness say: "Bombay is yours and it will be integrated here and now." Leave the job to some of us who have got intimate contact with Gujarat, who were educated in Gujarat and Maharashtra, just like Shri Asoka Mehta. Give us a chance for our constructive suggestions and constructive policy to work out certain acceptable solutions.

In my last speech in Parliament, I said to the Prime Minister that "I can understand the question of prestige but it should not weigh with you. But, if it does weigh with your colleagues, make a declaration, here and now,"—what I then called vested interest—.... "that the interest of Maharashtra in Bombay is a vested interest and by mere lapse of time,

Bombay will be automatically integrated." Keep our capital there and appoint a border commission so that all these matters can be quietly and constructively solved. He considered it and I have no doubt, he will again consider it because he is the only man who has got the real sense of fairplay and justice. I wish I could say that about other people. I am appealing to him although he is not here.

Those who say that this movement is a fight of a few office-seekers—that was the point made by my friend, Shri S. K. Patil—are saying something scandalous. Nothing is more scandalous than this. Go to any village. Peasant women, women related to Kolhapur Maharaja—they are offering satyagraha. Here, 1600 people came. Upto now, about eighty thousand offered satyagraha. There are no jails to accommodate. The police sometimes behave well and sometimes behave very badly. But this is the position. You have reduced Maharashtra to a state in which the people have felt that this is an insult to their whole race. If my friend, Shri Deshmukh, has used some strong phraseology, it gives a correct picture of the present state of affairs in Maharashtra. Go anywhere. It is not particularly confined to this class or that class or this territory or that. No one understands why it is not integrated. 34 MLAs resigned. 32 returned uncontested and two contested. The opponents lost. The Corporation has recorded its vote. What sort of public opinion do you want? Take all the principal newspapers—the Statesman, Pioneer, Amrita Bazar Patrika, Hindu. Everyone of them says: "We cannot understand what it is." All of them say this, except of course the Hindustan Times. The Hindustan Times claims to think for the Government and, in particular, for the Home Minister. In its issue of 15th January, it says that the decision to have a Centrally administered Bombay is the best and the Maharashtrians should be told that this will not be changed during the lifetime of the present leadership.

[Shri Gadgil]

For whose benefit is this decision taken? You have suggested safeguards for minorities. That is covered (An Hon. Member: Where?)... In Bombay. If they are good enough for you, they are good enough for the minorities in Bombay. Whose interests are you safeguarding? It is a clear question. The Prime Minister certainly is not a man who stands for capitalists' interests, unconsciously however this is the position.

The question before us is whether Bombay belongs to the people or the people with property who have made these properties when the British Government was there. They are the people, the merchants, who have sabotaged the policy of economic blockade of Goa. They are the persons today who are organising under the pretence of free enterprise in Bombay. When I spoke in the A.I.C.C. that the greatest danger for the planned economy was that you are giving the key industries in private sector a life of 20 years because you are not nationalising jute, banks and textile and in another 20 years they will organise and sabotage your planned economy—the first step has already been taken.

This is the whole position. I want to appeal to the Prime Minister, great as he is, to become greater, to leave aside these petty considerations of prestige and just consider what is going to happen if a particular decision is taken. He will be releasing a train of consequences that I shudder to think where our great country will land itself. Shri Asoka Mehta has given this hon. House the whole picture of the north and the south. In between this big territory with a tradition, with greater racial integrity, historical and cultural unity, will be seething with discontent. Imagine what will happen if there is unfortunately some emergency. If all these things are taken into consideration then the right decision will be reach-

ed. The only thing our people say to me is this: "Kaka Sahib: we are poor, we have nothing to offer". And that is a fact. They ask, is the country to belong to the poor proletariat majority or is it to belong to the few and faithless? It is not a question between Bombay and Maharashtra. People ask me: "Will it go to Pakistan?" Have they the sense enough to understand the implications? If it goes to Maharashtra, does it go to a State which is outside India? Shall I work out the implications? They do not know what kind of stupid thinking is indulged in. Then we are told: Why worry about this small piece. Why don't you say that to our Gujerathi friends; it does not matter to them if it goes here or there. In our mofussil in all our villages the entire trade and commerce is with them. They are joining in satyagraha. There is absolutely no ill-will between us. Why do you create this?

I, therefore, appeal to the Government, pause before you proceed, reflect before you reject. This is a most just, fair and equitable demand of the Maharashtrian people. I do not want to praise them by my own words. I will only refer to what the great Chinese traveller said. He said that they are people with heart of gold, their word is bond, their friendship is sure shield, but if they feel that they have been insulted, if they feel that some injustice has been done, then not only those who are alive will fight to the last but that legacy of struggle will be handed over from sire to son till the battle is won. But I do hope that no such thing, no such calamity will happen, because I know the principal elements of the Prime Minister's mind are truth and fair-play. I have abundant confidence in him.

If, inspite of this, his verdict is different, as far as I am concerned I have openly stated what I shall do. To suffer injustice is sin. Those who commit and those who silently witness it are equally guilty. तेषु पापपात्र

This is what dharma teaches us. It is for you who are leaders of this great country, the राष्ट्रपिता of this great country to consider whether you will vote for justice or whether you will vote otherwise because party discipline requires it. If it was a question of confidence in the Government then surely I would have voted. It is not a question of confidence in the Government. It is a question of re-arranging things in our own house. It is not a question of passing the ownership or transferring the ownership to anybody else. If over this disagreement dissociation is inevitable, I assure you, Sir, that it will be without bitterness. It will be with due respect. The personal relations of love, admiration and affection will continue. But, all the same, struggle will be carried till justice and truth triumph because that is the motto. If I do anything but struggle for the removal of injustice I will be unworthy of myself, unworthy of being a colleague and a follower of our great leader. I will be unworthy of being a Congressman because in my mind, since the formative period of my life, I have always associated Congress with high principles and high ideals though today it has become the first refuge of every opportunist. The holy temple is full of money-changer and the Prime Minister and my friend Dhebar are trying their best to change it. All my efforts are for that and will be at the service of the Prime Minister. Today his ability, our love and all the circumstances have combined to make the Prime Minister the arbiter of the destiny of this country. He has to give the word and I assure him that the whole atmosphere will change. The sense of frustration will be turned into a sense of joy of fulfilment and I assure him that no community stands for socialism more than ours because we have nothing else except our poverty to lose. We will be with him in building up this great India that we dream. Let him utter that magic word. But, if we fail, I am sorry, whatever is destined to happen

will happen and other matters connected with it will also arise I cannot compromise on this question. There cannot be a compromise of felony in jurisprudence. There cannot be compromise in the matter of faith. If I go down, I go down; but I go down with a satisfaction that I have done my best, that I have appealed to the conscience of the country as represented in this House. If it lets me down I have nothing more to say.

Mr. Speaker: Now, there are some States which have not yet been represented. Some of the States which are affected are: Madras, Andhra, Hyderabad and Travancore-Cochin. The House has heard enough on Bombay, I think. Now I will call Dr. Jaisoorya.

Dr. Jaisoorya (Medak): Mr. Speaker, let me first make my position quite clear as to what my attitude towards this whole question is. Nobody can say that I am a linguistic fanatic. My mother-tongue is supposed to be Bengali and beyond Ashua Boshun I do not know one word more. My 'father-tongue' is supposed to be Telugu and I know exactly 12½ words of that. Therefore no one can say that I am a linguistic fanatic. The only 'foster mother-tongue' I have is Urdu and for that I have got a certain amount of sympathy in my heart; but then Urdu is now a minority language.

But I was interested to know what historical facts this report of the States Reorganisation Commission had about, let us say, the previous history of India and, whether at any time in its history a linguistic division in any single part took place or not. Looking through this enormous volume, which is so learned, I did not find anything. But to my surprise, in the part I come from, namely, the Deccan, exactly 440 years ago, in the year 1526, linguistic reorganisation of the Bahmani Kingdom took place.

[Dr. Jaisoorya]

No. SRC; no boundary commissions; no long-winded arguments took place then. We should see how accurate those divisions were. I wish our SRC had looked at the map as it then existed. With what a lot of common sense have they made the linguistic divisions in 1526! Then, Elichpur was one capital. Ahmednagar was the second capital. Both these were Marathi areas. The Kannada area was demarcated separately, with its capital at Bijapur. It was so accurate right down to Shimoga. Bidar was a small area with the city of Bidar as capital. Only there were Marathi, Telugu and Kannada spoken. The big Kutub Shahi as it was called then, is the present Andhra Pradesh, without regional councils, without somebody asking for protection, without any recommendation of the States Reorganisation Commission by way of instigating or instructing the Telangana people to ask for a separate independent Telangana. They got on very well. If there were quarrels probably they went to the small cause court.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: There was no small causes court then. It was all *shahi zamana*.

Dr. Jaisoorya: They were strong and stable and is proved by the fact that they knocked the Vijayanagar empire to pieces. They were strong till the Moghuls began to intervene. When the Moghuls intervened, the old combination went to pieces. When the Moghuls came on the scene, they realised that the Deccan is the same area which I just now explained and where all this *gadbad jagda* and *golmal* is taking place and which the States Reorganisation Commission was not able to solve. The Moghuls, as a paramount power, felt that Deccan must be controlled.

The British succeeded the Moghuls and they said that there cannot be any independent Deccan. That is why they reped on the knuckles of

the Nizams when they tried to be independent. But then they all realised the significance of Deccan, and they took commonsense views about the whole matter.

Afterwards, our Government came into power. First of all, there was police action. Sardar Patel asked the Bombay Government whether they were willing to take over Marathwada. He had made up his mind to disintegrate Hyderabad. The Chief Minister of Bombay said, "Yes; we will take over Marathwada if you give us Saurashtra also". But then there was the question of the High Court of Saurashtra where, I think, there were only two judges then. And Debbharbhai refused and, the whole thing collapsed. Then the Government took a loan from the Nizam—about Rs. 18 crores—and suddenly they became cold about the question of disintegration of Hyderabad. I want to point out how unclear the attitude of our Government was in such important matters. At least those people in the earlier centuries were clear about these matters.

Then Sardar Patel came,—a man whom I have known when I was a boy, I worked under him, and I say that I have not till today met any man in India—although I differed very much with Sardar Patel—who had such a clear and realistic concept of things to come, as Sardar Patel had. I say that, because Sardar Patel said later: "Do not disintegrate Hyderabad. Do not allow Andhra and Maharashtra to be formed, because,"—at that time he had some reason for saying so—"in the event of a strong Andhra Maharashtra becoming anti-Congress, it would become dangerous". If you draw a line from Bombay city to Vizagapatam, it would cut off the whole of South India from the rest of the country. Very few people know this fact. At that time, this thesis was perhaps correct. But it is no longer valid.

The whole tragedy arose like this. Let us put this thesis aside and see what is happening today. The SRC put up all their cards and their last shirt on and made a recommendation in regard to Bombay. What is happening today? The suggestion made then for Bombay City gives the effect of a tail looking for a dog. Generally we attach a tail to a dog. But here, they wanted to attach a dog to a tail. It is not one dog but two dogs to pull in opposite directions, and that was the concept of a "balanced State" of Bombay, a bilingual or dual State of Bombay—a concept of which my friend Shri S. K. Patil is the great champion. It fell. Once the balance got unbalanced, the thing goes phut.

The next question was: "What shall we do for Bombay City?" The Maharashtrians never said that they did not want a bilingual State. But they asked, "Why do you want to truncate us?" That truncation was also a part of the pattern in order to "balance" these two wrestlers. In a bilingual State of Bombay, they wanted to keep little Vidarbha separate. It is surprising how the States Reorganisation Commission came to their conclusion about Vidarbha at pages 122 to 125 of their report. The great historians—some of them were—completely ignored or were innocent or ignorant of the fact that there was the Akola Pact long ago; that there was the Nagpur Pact in December, 1953. Yet, if we read what the Commission says, we will be surprised. They have said:

"...there has been understandably a certain degree of suspicion ever since of persons from outside the area".

That is said in somewhat insinuating way. "The Vidarbha people have got a suspicion of the Maharashtrians!" "The Maharashtrians have a suspicion of Gujeratis!" "The people of Telangana have got a suspicion of the Andhras!" Is this the way to unify

India? Why should one put up with a thesis which has gone wrong? Fine unifiers of India!

I shall give another example from the report, about Telangana. At page 107 of the report, the Commission has stated as follows:

"We have carefully gone into the details of the arrangements which may be made on these lines. It seems to us, however, that neither guarantees on the lines of the Sri Baug Pact nor constitutional devices, such as "Scottish devolution" in the United Kingdom, will prove workable or meet the requirements of Telangana during the period of transition. Anything short of supervision by the Central Government over the measures intended to meet the special needs of Telangana will be found ineffective, and we are not disposed to suggest any such arrangement in regard to Telangana".

What has happened? The Bombay thesis has gone phut. The Telangana thesis has gone phut. The Vidarbha thesis has gone phut. And the very thing which they were not prepared to recommend,—the "Scottish devolution in the United Kingdom"—and the very thing which they were not prepared to recommend, namely, something like the Sri Baug Pact, has now happened. The whole thing is unrealistic. What is the use of discussing things if your ground plan is wrong? For instance, the Ashoka Hotel project is there, but its ground plan may be wrong.

Dr. Lanks Sundaram: I hope it is not wrong. Rs. 2 crores have already been spent on it.

Dr. Jaisooriya: What is going to be the remedy now? What is the use of the Joint Committee tinkering here and tinkering there and recommending a little improvement, when the ground plan went wrong? That is the point. Once the ground plan has been accepted as something sacro-

[Dr. Jaisoorya]

sanct, why should a change be made? But then, though it was said that not a word of the report can be altered, it must be realised that it was only a recommendation. It was not mandatory. Anyway, the initial mistake lies in the ground plan.

I now come to Bombay. The point is this. On the one side, it is said that we do not want a division. On the other side, we say: "Let things die down". But things do not die down by ignoring them. Things can die down by voluntary co-operation. But what arrangements have they made for voluntary co-operation?

Take, for instance, our suggestion about boundary commission. If a man like Nijalingappa were the Chief Minister of Mysore, there would be no difficulty between me and him. With true oriental courtesy, we have already gifted away to each other vast tracts of land.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I hope a fair exchange is no robbery.

Dr. Jaisoorya: What actually happens is this. When we try to settle among ourselves some wretched district secretary says, "it is going to be settled at the higher levels", but at the higher levels, you never agree. If you have a boundary commission, all those problems will be solved. But, you do not want to have a boundary commission. You say it may be dangerous and it will maintain unrest. By not having a boundary commission. I ask, how are you going to make everything go to sleep? Are you going to give opium or what?

Take the question of minorities. As soon as Bellary was handed over, some wretched D.P.I. or someone said, "There is not going to be any Telugu school" and they had to run to the Chief Minister of Mysore to rectify it. Mr. Frank Anthony has pointed out many instances; you could have had a statutory body for that. Articles 29, 30 etc. may be there on paper in the Constitution, but the difficulty is

about the implementation and putting into practice those provisions. I say this is a fundamental blunder; that is why I am so unhappy about it. This Bill is not worth discussing. My worry is how are we going to save ourselves from the wrong thing which we have committed. I will read out to you what my former leader—unfortunately, he is no longer my leader—has said:

"It is up to a popular Government to abide by the people's will and to know what the people felt and what they suffered. Where a Government makes mistakes, they should efface those mistakes and retrace them."

This is what my former leader Jawaharlal Nehru has said. It is not as if this S.R.C. Report must be obeyed; either we should remedy it or we should scrap it. One man at least had the courage to say it. Shri Rajagopalachari, whether we agree with him or not, said, "if you have not done a thing properly, have the courage to scrap it and start afresh". Is this Parliament clear of parochial passions? If you see the inside of it, things are so disgusting.

I cannot understand all this talk about regional councils. I can understand a regional committee for a bilingual State like Punjab, but not for a unilingual State like Andhra Pradesh. The great linguistic authority on the Indian languages, Shri S. K. Patil, has said that in Andhra—Telengana they do not speak Telugu. Quite right, Sir, in Telangana we speak, not Telugu, we speak Chinese. Certainly, it is quite right that we have given development boards to Vidarbha and Maharashtra. What is wrong in giving a development board to protect the cause of Telengana? I want to do it not by these underhand ways, not by pressure tactics, but in a straightforward way. People have said, "We are not going to give way to violence." But, can you give way to political blackmail? People say

they are going to resign from their party; that is what is happening.

Delegations after delegations are coming some to meet "Chacha" Nehru and other to meet "Ammi Jan", but nothing is done. There is no decision at all. It reminds me of something. I have a niece—quite a pretty girl—but she could not get married. She was developing tempera- ture and somebody said she was suffering from tuberculosis. But I said, "no". The trouble was this in regard to her marriage. When the father said "yes", the mother said "no"; when the mother said "yes"; the father said "no"; when the girl said "yes", the boy said "no"; when both said "yes", the parents said "no". This is the sort of thing that is happening in Telangana. The High Command says one thing, the Home Ministry says another and the unholy mess goes on and on.

I want to know the terms and con- ditions of the regional councils. When I asked them, they said "I will show you tomorrow"; I said, "Give that in writing". They said, "it is left to the President". I cannot understand this. This House has the right to know what the Government is deciding. I have got full faith in Mr. Datar; but, with all the pressure tactics coming from the other side, we do not know who is governing us—whether it is the Con- gress Party or the Home Ministry. That is why I feel so disgusted. If you give permission, Sir, I will now sit down and have nothing more to do with this S.R.C. Report.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्यब (गुड़गांव) :
जनाब स्पीकर साहब, श्री हाउस ने एक तकरीर सुनी है। मेरे दोस्त जयसूर्य ने जिस चीज का जिक्र हाउस के सामने किया उसको मैं कांफ्रेंट फार्म (ठोस रूप) में आपके स्वरू रखना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने जिक्र किया तेलंगाना और आन्ध्र का, मैं आपके सामने बोड़ा सा पंजाब का जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ जिसके बारे में आप कई तकरीरें सुन चुके हैं।

श्री जयसूर्य साहब ने कहाया कि एक रीजनल काँसिल का फोरमूला बना, लेकिन आज तक उनको पता नहीं कि यह क्या चीज है। आज तक उनको यह खबर नहीं कि उसकी क्या कैरेक्टरिस्टिक्स (मुख्य बातें) हैं और उससे क्या फर्क हो जाता है, उसके सही मायने क्या हैं। फिलवाक्या रीज- नल काँसिल का एक नया खयाल है और लोगों को उसका कुछ पता नहीं, मुझे तो यह भी पता नहीं है कि बुद बर्नमेट को भी इसका पूरा पता है या नहीं कि उन्होंने क्या चीज बनाई है। मैं एक चीज जानता हूँ। पंजाब में आज लोग कहते हैं कि वहाँ बड़ा धमन व धमान है, लेकिन असलबारी के पढ़ने से पता चलता है कि फिलवाक्या पंजाब का एक हिस्सा-ऐसा है जो कि रीजनल काँसिल से खुश नहीं है। जहाँ तक अम्बाला डिवीजन का खयाल है, वहाँ के लोग धमन तौर पर इससे खुश हैं, बगैर जाने बूझे हुये कि यह क्या चीज है, सिर्फ उसके नाम से ही खुश हैं। हम लोग १०० वर्ष से इतने मजलूम हैं, जब से कि वहाँ पर सन् १८५७ की जंग में ब्रिटिश बर्नमेट के खिलाफ बगावत करने के जुर्म में इस इलाके को सजा दी गई थी कि उसको पंजाब के साथ जोड़ दिया जाय। वह सजा आज १०० वर्ष से ज्यों की त्यों बसी आती है। सिर्फ इतना ही नहीं, हम सोचते थे कि स्वराज्य आयेगा और हमारी तकलीफ दूर हो जायगी। मगर यह खयाल हमारा दुस्त नहीं सामिल हुआ। हम घाट बरसों से देख रहे हैं कि वहाँ पर बही पुराना इन्तजाम, पुरानी खयाल, बही सजा जो कि हमको दी गई थी, आज तक कायम है। मैंने पिछली बफा हाउस में फिर्मल (आंकड़े) दिये थे और आने चल कर मैं आपकी इजाजत से हाउस की एजुकेशन के वास्ते उन फिर्मल (आंकड़े) को दोहराऊँगा, सिर्फ यह दिखाने के लिये कि वहाँ पर आशिर ट्रबल (कठिनाइयाँ) क्या हैं। लेकिन बसत कम है। फिर भी वह बात मैं निहायत अदब से धर्म कर सकता हूँ कि बाबजूद इस इन्स के

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

कि हमारे सीढरान ने हर एक वक्त को पूरा भौका दिया कि वह उन तक ऐशेष (पहुंच) करे, जिस तरीके से पंजाब का फार्मुला तय किया गया उसके अन्दर कुछ लोगों को शिकायत बाकी रह गई। जिस वक्त वहां के लोग यहां पर आते थे और उन से जिन के कि हाथ में पंजाब की किस्मत है पूछते थे कि क्या फैसला हुआ, क्या टर्म्स (शर्तों) सैटल (फैसला) हुई हैं तो उनको कोई भी चीज नहीं बताई जाती थी। यहां तक कि अब इस हाउस में इस बारे में तकाजा हुआ तो उस वक्त मैंने होम मिनिस्टर (गृह मंत्री) साहब से पूछा कि खुदा के लिये हमें बताइये कि क्या फैसला हुआ है उस वक्त उन्होंने एक कागज हमारे सामने रखा। मुझे यह शिकायत नहीं है कि आपने क्या फैसला किया। इसके बारे में मैं आगे चल कर शर्ज करूंगा। मुझे शिकायत यह है कि आपने क्लोज्ड सीक्रिट (अत्यन्त गुप्त) रख कर इसका फैसला किया जिसका कि इल्म हमको नहीं होने दिया। क्या किसी को मिला है और क्या नहीं मिला है इसको तो अभी तक जाने दीजिये। लेकिन यह जो तरीका आपने प्रस्तियार किया यह गलत था और इससे साइकोलोजिकल फ्रस्ट्रेशन (मनो-बैज्ञानिक निराशा) लोगों में फैला और साइकोलोजिकल डिफिकलटीज (मनोबैज्ञानिक कठिनाइयां) उठीं और मैं आपको बकीन दिलाता हूं कि आज पंजाब में अगर इस रीजनल फार्मुले (प्रादेशिक सूत्र) को लोग समझ जाते तो शायद इतनी दिक्कत पैदा न होती जितनी कि आपके इस चीज को दबावे रखने और किसी को भी इसका पता न होने देने की बजह से पैदा हुई है। मैं आपको यह भी बतलाना चाहता हूं कि इन टर्म्स को मालूम करने के लिये एक वक्त की मूख हड़ताल करनी पड़ी और तब जाकर बताया गया कि यह फार्मुला क्या है।

2 P.M.

स्टेट्स रिऑर्गेनाइजेशन बिल (राज्य पुन गठन विधेयक) में इस रीजनल फार्मुले का कतई भी कहीं जिक्र नहीं है। मैंने सारी रिपोर्ट (प्रतिवेदन) पढ़ी है लेकिन मुझे इस रीजनल फार्मुले का कहीं जिक्र नहीं मिला है। इसके बाद मैंने कांस्टीट्यूशन (संविधान) नवां एमेंडमेंट (संशोधन) बिल पढ़ा और उसकी दफा २२ में वा किसी और दफा में मुझे इसकी तफसील का जिक्र तक नहीं मिला। इस बिल के आखिर में जा कर इसके एपेंडिक्स 'ए' (परिशिष्ट क) में यह लिखा हुआ है

Outline of the regional scheme in the Punjab State

अब आप ही बताइये कि किसी दफा पर अगर मैं कोई एमेंडमेंट भेजना चाहता हूं तो उस एमेंडमेंट को कैसे भेजूं और किस तरह से अगर मैं चाहूं कि कोई एमेंडमेंट इस फार्मुले में हो तो उसको मैं कराऊं। आपने जो एपेंडिक्स (परिशिष्ट) लिख दिया और उसमें आउटलाइन लिख दिया, इस एपेंडिक्स और इस आउटलाइन (रूप रेखा) पर कोई एमेंडमेंट नहीं हो सकती। अब मैं अगर चाहूं कि कोई एमेंडमेंट हो तो वह मंजूर नहीं हो सकती। मैं तो यही समझता हूं कि आप ये चाहते हैं कि पंजाब के बारे में कोई एमेंडमेंट न पेश हो सके और महज एक एग्जिक्यूटिव आर्डर (कार्यपालिका के आदेश) के जरिये ही यह सारा काम हो जाए। मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूं कि एक बार माइनोरिटी कमिटी (अल्प संख्यक समिति) की एक मीटिंग हो रही थी और उसमें सरदार पटेल ने कहा था कि हमने यह फैसला कर लिया है और आप इस पर कोई नुकताचीनी (आलोचना) न करें। अगर आप चाहते हैं कि हम कोई नुकताचीनी न करें तो आप भी हमें बता दीजिये कि यह है फैसला जो हमने कर लिया है और आप इस पर कोई नुकताचीनी न कीजिये। इस चीज को मैं ज्यादा पतन्व करूंगा। बजाय इस इनकारिक्ट तरीके

के। मैं चाहता हूँ कि पंजाब के अन्दर कोई भी तबका ऐसा न हो जिसको कोई दुःख हो या गवर्नमेंट के खिलाफ कोई शिकायत हो। मैं सुख हूँ कि आपने जो फैसला किया उससे हमारे सिल भाई सुख हैं और उन्होंने उसको पसन्द किया है और अपने फैसले पर बे कायम हैं। जिस तरह से भी पंजाब का झगड़ा खत्म होता है उससे मैं सुख हूँ। मैं इसकी परवाह नहीं करता कि कौनसी माइनोरिटी (अल्प संख्यक) ज्यादा हो जाती है या कौनसी कम होती है। मैं जानता हूँ कि पंजाब में कहीं पर हिन्दू माइनोरिटी में हैं और कहीं पर मैजोरिटी में और कहीं पर सिख मैजोरिटी में हो गये हैं और कहीं पर माइनोरिटी में। इसकी मुझे कोई परवाह नहीं है। यह चीज मुझे खटकती नहीं है कि क्यों कोई मैजोरिटी में हो गया है और क्यों कोई माइनोरिटी में हो गया है। जो मैं चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि पंजाब के लोग सुख और शांति से रहें, मिल जुल कर रहें, भाई भाई की तरह रहें। कोई भी एथीमेंट (करार) जो इस चीज को लाने में मदद देता है उसका मैं स्वागत करता हूँ और उसको मैं पसन्द करता हूँ। लेकिन इसके साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी चाहता हूँ कि इन्सान के जो फंडामेंटल राइट्स हैं या इंडिविजुअल राइट्स (व्यक्तिगत) अधिकार हैं। उन पर किसी तरह से भी आपके फैसले से चोट नहीं आनी चाहिये। तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि मेरी शिकायत यह है कि जो तरीका फैसला करने का अस्तित्व किया गया और जिस तरह से इसको पुट (प्रस्तुत) किया गया था और जिस तरह से आउटलाइन को एग्जिक्यूटिव इंस्ट्रक्शन (कार्यपालिका अनुदेश) बना दिया गया उस पर मुझे सख्त ऐतराज है। आपने हमें इस काबिल नहीं रखा कि हम इसको कन्ट्रिब्यूट (आलोचना) कर सकें। मैं अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यह तरीका ठीक नहीं है। अगर आप डेबोन्ट्रिक तरीका बरतना चाहते हैं और मुझे आप इजाजत देना चाहते हैं कि मैं अगर चाहूँ तो कोई तरकीब पेश करूँ

और उसके माने जाने के लिए आग्रह करूँ तो आप मुझे पुरा मौका उस तरकीब को पेश करने का दीजिये। लेकिन इस वक़्त आप दिल्लीना चाहते हैं कि इजाजत दी गई और आप वह भी चाहते हैं कि मैं इससे फायदा न उठाऊँ।

मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो रिजलन फार्मुला आपने बनाया है क्या यह हम लोगों को तसल्ली दे सकता है? मैं इस झगड़े में नहीं पड़ूँगा कि आया यह फार्मुला जो कि पंजाब को दो हिस्सों में तकसीम करता है यह वाजिब है या नहीं। मैं जब झगड़े में पड़ना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि आभे रिजलन फार्मुला तीन जगहों पर बनाये। एक तो आपने आन्ध्र तेलंगाना में इसे बनाया। एक इसे महाराष्ट्र में बनाया और तीसरे पंजाब में। तेलंगाना और आन्ध्र के बारे में तो यह हुआ है कि वहाँ के सीडर आपस में मिले हैं और उन्होंने एथीमेंट (सहमत होना) कर लिया है और उस एथीमेंट के मुताबिक काम होगा जिसमें सर्बिसिड वर्ग के बटवारे का जिक्र है। मैं इससे बढ़ कर कोई आच्छी चीज नहीं देखता। अगर कहीं के लोग मिल जुल कर कोई फैसला कर लेते तो इससे बढ़ कर कोई और स्वागत योग्य चीज नहीं हो सकती है। मैं उनको इसके लिये मुबारकबाद देता हूँ और साथ ही साथ आपको भी कि आपने उनको फैसला करने में मदद दी। जहाँ तक महाराष्ट्र का सवाल है उसको आपने तीन टुकड़ों में तकसीम किया है। पहले तो आपने यह कहा है कि

there will be equitable allocation of money for development purposes दूसरे बोकेसनस ट्रेनिंग (व्यवसायिक प्रशिक्षण) का जिक्र किया है और तीसरे आपने टेक्निकल ट्रेनिंग (टेक्निकल प्रशिक्षण) का जिक्र किया है। इन तीनों बातों के आधार पर आपने उनका फैसला कर दिया है। और साथ ही सर्बिसेस के बारे में जिक्र किया है लेकिन मैं बड़े अदब के साथ पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस बँकबँट इलाके

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भागंब]

के लिये जिसको मैं ही बैकवर्ड नहीं कहता हूँ बल्कि सारा पंजाब बैकवर्ड (पिछड़ा हिस्सा) कहता है और हर राइटफुल थिंकिंग (ठीक विचार करने वाला) आदमी मानने को तैयार है, आपने क्या किया है। पिछली बार हमारे डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब ने जब तकरीर की तो उस तकरीर के दौरान मैं उन्होंने यह कहा कि अम्बाला डिवीजन के साथ, यानी हमारे साथ, इंसफ नहीं हो रहा। सर्बिसिस (सेवायें) में, इंडस्ट्री (उद्योग) के लिहाज से, कम्युनिकेशन (संचार) की दृष्टि से, इरीगेशन (सिंचाई) की दृष्टि से और हर तरह से हमारा इलाका जो है वह पसमादा (पददलित) है। इस चीज का उन्होंने तसलीम किया। मेरे पास फिमर्स मौजूद हैं जिनको कि मैं धागं चल कर आपको पढ़कर सुनाऊंगा जो कि आपके लिये एक आईप्रोपनर (आंस खोलने वाली) सिद्ध होंगी। मैं बड़े अदब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आपने इन शिकायतों को दूर करने के लिये क्या चीज इस बिल में रखी है? अब आपका जो बिल है इससे अम्बाला डिवीजन सही मानों में एक लिम्बिस्टिक माइनोरिटी (अल्पसंख्यक भाषा भाषी) बन जाती है क्योंकि जसन्वर और अम्बाला के बीच में हिन्दी बोलने वालों की तादाद दूसरों की निसबत आपको से कम है और वह सायद ६० या ७० लाख होगी। पिछले सौ सालों से इनके साथ केइन्ताफी होती आई है और पिछले आठ सालों से, जब से कि भारत आजाद हुआ है, आपको मबनमेंट ने उनके प्रति ऐसा रूत अपना रखा है जैसा कि एक कौनकरर (विजेता) एक कानकर्ड (विजित) के साथ अपनाता है। ऐसी सूरत में मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि यह सवाल बहुत अहम है और इसकी तरफ ध्यान दिया जाये। यही सवाल हमारे फ्रैंक एन्वरी साहब ने उठाया है और मैं इसको बहुत ज्यादा महत्व देता हूँ। आप, वह जो लिम्बिस्टिक माइनोरिटीय (अल्प संख्यक भाषा भाषी) को सेफगार्ड्स (परिचाय)

देने का मामला है, आपको साइटली न में १ यह सब से जरूरी सवाल है।

आप हमने बम्बई के बारे में तकरीरें सुनीं। सारे देश के बारे में भी लोगों ने अपने विचार प्रकट किये हैं। चार करोड़ आदमी जो लिम्बिस्टिक माइनोरिटी में हैं, मल्टी-लिम्बिस्टिक स्टेट्स में ही नहीं हैं, बार्ड-लिम्बिल स्टेट्स में भी हैं और यूनो-लिम्बिल स्टेट्स (वह भाषा भाषी राज्य) में भी वे हो सकते हैं, उनके बारे में आपने क्या सोचा है? मैं अदब से अर्ब करता हूँ कि आप चाहे बम्बई का फैसला कर दें, सारे हिन्दुस्तान का फैसला कर दें, लेकिन जब तक आप लिम्बिस्टिक माइनोरिटीय का जो सवाल है उसको हल नहीं करते तब तक जो आप बेलफेयर स्टेट (कल्याणकारी राज्य) माना चाहते हैं और जिस चीज का नक्शा हमारे सामने अशोक मेहता साहब ने खींचा है, उसको नहीं ला सकते। इसको साने का तरीका क्या है? किस तरह से वह चीज आ सकती है? पेक्टर इसके कि मैं इस चीज पर आऊँ, पहले मैं आपके सामने, आपको इजाजत से अम्बाला डिवीजन के बारे में मेरे पास जो फिमर्स (आंकड़े) हैं, उनको रखना चाहता हूँ। पहले यह बैकवर्ड एरिया (पिछड़ा हुआ क्षेत्र) हुआ करता था और अब यह लिम्बिस्टिक माइनोरिटी होगा। इस चीज के बारे में आप किसी से पूछ सकते हैं, लेकिन कोई दो ओपिनियंस (राय) नहीं हो सकतीं। हर एक आपको यही कहेगा कि यह जो हालत है वह दूर होनी चाहिये। अब मैं जो फिमर्स हैं उनको आपके सामने पेश करता हूँ। पंजाब के सेंटर में दो मिनिस्टर हैं और दोनों ही जसन्वर डिवीजन के हैं। पंजाब में आठ मिनिस्टर हैं जिन में से सात जसन्वर डिवीजन के हैं और एक अम्बाला डिवीजन का। पंजाब असेम्बली के स्पीकर (अध्यक्ष) और कान्सिल (परिषद्) के चैयरमैन (समापति) दोनों के दोनों जसन्वर डिवीजन

के हैं पंजाब हाईकोर्ट के अतः जब हैं और सातों के सातों जालन्धर डिविजन के हैं। पंजाब पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन (पंजाब के लोक सेवा आयोग) के तीन मੈम्बर हैं, और तीनों ही जालन्धर डिविजन के हैं। पंजाब सर्वाडिनेट सर्विसिस सिलैक्शन बोर्ड (अधीन सेवा चुनाव बोर्ड) के तीन मੈम्बर हैं और तीनों ही जालन्धर डिविजन के हैं। जो वहाँ का चीफ पार्लियामेंटरी सेक्रेटरी (मुख्य संसदीय सचिव) है, वह भी जालन्धर डिविजन का है। कन्स्टिचुशनल ग्राम स्टेट (राज्य परिषद्) में पंजाब के आठ मੈम्बर हैं और आठों के आठों जालन्धर डिविजन के हैं।

इसके आगे और देखिये। पंजाब लेजिस्लेटिव काउंसिल (विधान परिषद्) में गवर्नर (राज्यपाल) और असैम्बली (विधान सभा) द्वारा नामिनेटेड (नामनिश्चित) १८ मੈम्बरों में से सिर्फ २ अम्बाला के हैं। लोक सभा की ६ सीटों में से सिर्फ ३ हरियाणा प्रान्त को दी गई हैं। कमेटी मेम्बरों मिलिटिड बाई दि विधान सभा (विधान सभा द्वारा चुने गये समिति के सदस्य) की तादाद १६ है और उन में से सिर्फ ४ अम्बाला के हैं। आफिसियल कमेटीज (सरकारी समितियाँ) में गवर्नमेंट के द्वारा नामिनेटेड २ मेम्बर हैं और उन में से कोई भी हरियाणा का नहीं है।

अब जरा सर्विसिज की हालत देखिये। आई० सी० एस० (भारतीय असेनिक सेवा) और आई० ए० एस० (भारतीय प्रशासन सेवा) के २४ मੈम्बरों में से हरियाणा का कोई भी नहीं है। सेक्रेटरीज (सचिव), डिप्टी सेक्रेटरीज (उपसचिव) अंडर, सेक्रेटरीज (अवर सचिव) और प्रसिस्टेंट सेक्रेटरीज (सह सचिव) की तादाद १५ है, लेकिन उन में से कोई भी हरियाणा का नहीं है। २० इंडिपेंडेंट डिपार्टमेंट्स (विभागों के प्रमुख अधिकारी) में से सिर्फ २ हरियाणा के हैं। १३ डिप्टी कमिश्नर (उप आयुक्त) में से अम्बाला का कोई भी नहीं है। सुपरिन्टिन्डेन्ट आफ पुलिस (पुलिस अधीक्षक) की तादाद २० है, लेकिन उन में से अम्बाला

का कोई भी नहीं है। नुबेरिड आफिसर की तादाद ३५८ है और उन में से सिर्फ ४० अम्बाला के हैं।

अभी मैंने सर्विसिज (सेवा) और लेजिस्लेचज (विधान मण्डल) और पार्लियामेंट (संसद) में अम्बाला के रिप्रेजेन्टेशन (प्रतिनिधित्व) का जिक्र किया है। अगर मैं एग्जिक्यूटिव (कृषि) और इरिगेशन (सिंचाई) का जिक्र करूँगा, तो आप हैरान रह जायेंगे। भाखरा डैम (बांध) प्रोजेक्ट (परियोजना) से पहले सारे पंजाब में ४२ लाख एकड़ जमीन सैलाब होती थी, जिस में से अम्बाला की सिर्फ ८ लाख एकड़ जमीन सैलाब (सिंचाई) होती थी। भाखरा डैम प्रोजेक्ट से हम लोग बहुत खुश हैं और इसके लिये पंजाब गवर्नमेंट और गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया के मक्कूर हैं। इस प्रोजेक्ट (परियोजना) से उन्होंने हमारे इलाके को परनिट कहत (स्थायी दुमिल) से बचा लिया है। लेकिन मैं यह अर्थ करना चाहता हूँ कि भाखरा डैम प्रोजेक्ट के बाद हरयाणा को २६ लाख एकड़ जमीन को इरिगेट करने के लिये पानी मिलेगा, जब कि जालन्धर को १३ लाख एकड़ जमीन इरिगेट करने के लिये पानी मिलेगा। जालन्धर को जितना भी पानी मिले, उससे मुझे खुशी ही होगी, क्योंकि जालन्धर आसिर हमारे प्रदेश का एक हिस्सा है। मेरी शिकायत सिर्फ यह है कि एक कुनवे में एक छोटे आई की भी कुछ तो हैसियत होती ही है। उसे इस तरह exploit (शोषित) करना दुस्त नहीं है। पिछली बफर मैंने कहा था कि हम सिखों और जालन्धर के हिन्दुओं को बचा और ताक मानते हैं। उसके बाद हमारी पोलीसन बड़ कर इस अररूने से छोटे आई की हो गई है। चूंकि हमारे इलाके को पानी कम मिलता है, इसलिए हमारी पैदावार पंजाब की पैदावार के एक तिहाई से भी कम है, हालांकि अभी से ज्यादा जमीन हम काप्य करते हैं। हमको पानी उस बिकदार में नहीं मिलता है, जिस बिकदार में जालन्धर

[पंडित ठाकुर दास चार्ल्स]

को मिलता है। यानी पानी में भी तमीच (मेदभाव) है। घाफके यहां फैक्टरी मजदूर २८५ रुपया कमा लेता है, लेकिन हमारे यहां लीड सेक्टर को १०४ रुपया मिलता है। जालन्धर के मुकाबले में हमारा स्टैंडर्ड घाफ लिबिंग (जीवन स्तर) घाफा भी नहीं है। हमारे लोगों की ताकत, जिस्म, खाने-पीने की चीजें देखिये, हम सबसे बहुत पीछे हैं।

अब जरा इन्डस्ट्रीज (उद्योग) को भी देखिये। सारे पंजाब में इन्डस्ट्रीज हैं, लेकिन हमारे इलाके में कोई इन्डस्ट्री नहीं है। हां, जगाधरी में, जो कि यू० पी० के ऐन किनारे पर है, इन्डस्ट्रीज का जाल बिछा हुआ है। उसको छोड़ कर हमारा इलाका इन्डस्ट्रीज से भी बंछित है।

यही हाल एजुकेशन (शिक्षा) का है। पंजाब में ४५०० प्राइमरी और मिडिल स्कूल हैं, जिन में से हमारे यहां सिर्फ १४०० हैं। हाई स्कूलों की तादाद ५०० है, लेकिन हमारे इलाके में सिर्फ १७० हैं। पंजाब के ४२ कॉलेजों में से सिर्फ १६ अम्बाला में हैं। हमको गवर्नमेंट की जो ग्रांट मिलती है, वह भी बीस फी सदी से ज्यादा नहीं है।

मेडिकल फैसिलिटीज (चिकित्सा सम्बन्धी सुविधायें) के मामले में भी हमारे साथ वही सलूक किया जा रहा है। जो कम-जोर है, उसकी तो ज्यादा मदद की जानी चाहिये, लेकिन हासत यह है कि कुल ७००० बेडज (बीमारों के लिये जगहें) में सिर्फ २३०० हमारे यहां हैं।

पंजाब में १४३ माडल विजेजिज (घाफचं संघ) हैं, जिन में से हरियाणा प्रांज को पांच फी सदी से भी कम मिले हैं।

2-15 P.M.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

हमारे यहां २६५० विजेज हैं, जिन में पीने के पानी की तकनीफ है। हमारे इलाके में पानी की सक्त कमी है। लोग दस दस मील से पीने के लिये पानी लेने जाते हैं। वे सुबह से शाम तक पानी ढोते रहते हैं। पानी की कमी को दूर करने के लिये हम को छः लाख रुपया दिया गया जब कि इतके मुकाबले में जालन्धर के ६० विजेजिज के लिये १७ लाख रुपया दिया गया। Communications (संचार) के बारे में हासत ना गुफता बेह है—ज्यादा तकसील में जाने की जरूरत नहीं

अभी तक मैंने यह जाहिर करने की कोशिश की है कि गवर्नमेंट ने हमारे साथ क्या सलूक रखा है। अब मैं बताना चाहता हूं कि कांग्रेस ने हमारे साथ क्या सलूक किया है। कांग्रेस हाई कमांड ने पंजाब का सिर्फ एक ही आदमी है और वह जालन्धर का है—हरियाणा का कोई नहीं है। ए० आर्इ० सी० सी० के (प्रखिल भारतीय कांग्रेस समिति) के १६ डेप्युटीज में से हमारे यहां के सिर्फ ४ डेप्युटीज (प्रतिनिधि) हैं।

Pandit K. C. Sharma: This House has no control over the Congress organization.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य अगर इस बात को रहने ही दें, तो अच्छा है। कांग्रेस ने हरियाणा के साथ क्या सलूक किया, इस बारे में यह हाउस क्या करेगा ?

पंडित ठाकुर दास चार्ल्स : जनाब, यहां पर इस बारे में विकामत की गई है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने बम्बई में ए० आर्इ० सी० सी० की मीटिंग में क्या कहा। ऐसा नहीं है कि गवर्नमेंट का काब्रज से कोई बल्लज नहीं है।

Pandit K. C. Sharma: That was wrong.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Please do not interfere.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: One wrong does not justify another wrong.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

बंधित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : जनाब, यह बात कहने की जरूरत इसलिये है कि कांग्रेस ही यहां की मैजोरिटी पार्टी है—रुलिंग (शासक) पार्टी. (दल) है। उसका ही यहां पर रुस है। मैं बताना चाहता हूं कि उसने हमारे इलाके के साथ कैसा सलूक किया है। फिर भी मैं आपके हुकम की तामील करके याने नहीं पहुंचना।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप भी तो उसी पार्टी में हैं।

बंधित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : न सिर्फ मैं पार्टी में हूं, मैं गवर्नमेंट का भी उतना ही हिस्सा हूं, जितना कि दूसरे हैं। जो कुछ हो रहा है, उसके लिये जितने आप जिम्मेदार हैं, उतना ही मैं भी जिम्मेदार हूं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं मैं सारा ही जिम्मेदार हूं।

बंधित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : दोनों ही जिम्मेदार हैं।

मैं अर्थ करना चाहता हूं कि मुझे जालन्धर के लोग भी उतने ही प्यारे हैं, जितने कि अपने इलाके के। मुझे उनसे कोई शिकायत नहीं है और न ही मुझे यह शिकायत है कि उनके साथ अच्छा सलूक क्यों हो रहा है। यहां सबाल तो सिर्फ इन्साफ का है।

यहां पर लिग्विस्टिक माइनोरिटीज का खिन्न किया गया है। यह सारे हिन्दुस्तान का खयाल है। आप उसको कैसे हल करना चाहते हैं? श्री कैक एम्बनी का मिन्ट ब्राफ डिसेन्ट (किरोधी टिप्पण) मैंने पढ़ा है। मुझे मान्य है कि कांस्टीच्यूशन (संविधान)

में क्या कमी है। एस्. आर. सी. (राज्य पुनर्गठन समिति) रिपोर्ट (प्रतिवेदन) में पैराग्राफ ८३५ से लेकर पैराग्राफ ८४१ तक का हैडिंग है—रिजनल ग्रीबन्सेज (प्रादेशिक शिकायतें) और इसमें कई तजवीज दी गई हैं। कहा गया है कि स्पेशल डेवेलपमेंट बोर्ड (विशेष विकास बोर्ड) बनाये जाये और बोर्ड टू लुक इन्टू इकनामिक ग्रीबन्सेज (आर्थिक शिकायतें देखने के लिये) बनाये जायें, लेकिन मैं देखता हूं कि इन विल में उनका कोई खिन्न नहीं है। इसमें कुछ भी बनाने का प्राविधान (उपबन्ध) नहीं है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि लिग्विस्टिक माइनोरिटीज को क्या सेफगाइज (परिचाय) दिये गये हैं। मैं तो यह महसूस करता हूं कि इस किस्म की ग्रीबन्सेज को दूसरा कोई नहीं जान सकता है। सिवाय उसके जो हेरो के नीचे हों जिनको वे विच करती हैं, वही जानते हैं।

जाके पैर न फटे बिवाई,

सो क्या जाने पीठ पराई।

मैं जानता हूं कि लिग्विस्टिक माइनोरिटीज के साथ किस किस्म का सलूक है। इस सिलसिले में क्या किया जाना चाहिये, यह तो कमीशन से ज्यादा अच्छी तरह मैं बता सकता हूं। कांस्टीच्यूशन में दफा २९ में माइनोरिटीज को अपनी अपनी लैंग्वेज, (भाषा), लिफ्ट (लिपि) और कल्चर (संस्कृति) को कन्जर्व (सुरक्षित) करने का राइट (अधिकार) दिया गया है। उसमें गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से कोई कमिटेमेंट (बचन बद्धता) नहीं है कि हम उनके लिये कुछ करेंगे। अंग्रेजी और उर्दू वाले जब यह डिमांड करते हैं कि उनको इस बात का भी हक दिया जाये कि वे अपने प्रदेश में अपनी सबानों में इम्प्लिहान ले सकें, तो मेरे खयाल में उनकी यह डिमांड विस्तुल बजा और जायज है। लेकिन मैं यह भी अर्थ कर दूं कि कोई लैंग्वेज सिर्फ स्कूल खोलने से कन्जर्व नहीं हो सकती

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भांबव]

है। उसको गवर्नमेंट की इमदाद की भी जरूरत है। दफा ३४७ में प्रेजिडेंट (राष्ट्र-पति) को यह अस्तिभार दिया गया है कि वह किसी भी स्टेट में किसी लैंग्वेज की रेकगनीशन (मान्यता) के बारे में हुक्म दे सकता है, लेकिन मेरी गुजारिश यह है कि रीजनल फामूले में तो स्क्रिप्ट (लिपि) का जिक्र है, जो कि बिल्कुल अनकांस्टीट्यूशनल (अवैधानिक) है। मैं पिछली दफा भी अर्ज किया था कि आप लैंग्वेज का मामला तय कर सकते हैं—स्पोकन लैंग्वेज (बोनी) (Spoken language) का, There are the words of the section—as opposed to written language. स्क्रिप्ट के बारे में न प्रेजिडेंट को, न गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया को और न लोकल गवर्नमेंट को अस्तिभार है कि वह किसी कम्युनिटी पर कोई स्क्रिप्ट ठूस सके। मैं पंजाबी बोलने वाला नहीं हूँ, लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ कि दफा १४ की रू से भेरेठ और हिसार के आदमी में तकरीक नहीं की जा सकती है। मैं जानता हूँ कि साउथ ने हिन्दी को पढ़ना स्वीकार किया है। मुझे वह भी पता है कि अगर इंडिया को एक दूसरी जवान सीसन के लिये हमारे देश के लीडर कहते हैं जिसको कि मैं खुशी से कबूल करता हूँ। आपने पंजाबी रली है इससे मुझे कोई शिकायत नहीं है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे बच्चे पंजाबी पढ़ें। हम पंजाब की हर एक बीज को प्रेम की निगाह से देखते हैं, हमें पंजाबी से कोई मुखातिफ नहीं है। लेकिन यह प्रलय बीज है कि मैं पंजाबी को पढ़ूँ या गुरुमुखी को सीखूँ। पंजाब में सिख लोग एक तरह से गुरुओं की मोनोपली (एकाधिकार) बनाये हुये बैठे हैं, लेकिन पंजाब में हिन्दुओं के बिलों में गुरुओं का जलना ही मान है चितना कि बिलों के बिलों में। मैं गुरुमुखी का हेटर (पूजा करने वाला) नहीं हूँ। लेकिन अगर आप उसको मेरे ऊपर बबरबस्ती ठूसना चाहें तो मैं इसकी मुखातिफत करूँगा। आपको कांस्टीट्यूशन

की दफा ३४७ के अनमार ऐसा करने का अस्तिभार नहीं है। इमानियें मैं अर्ज करूँगा कि आपको यह नहीं करना चाहिये।

आप कहते हैं कि इकानामिक इन-ईक्वालिटी (आर्थिक असमानता) को दूर करने के लिये आप डॉमिनिलियरी (अविवास सम्बन्धी) रूल्स को हटावेंगे। ये रूल्स अगर एक इलाके के लिये बन सकते हैं तो दूसरे इलाके के लिये भी बन सकते हैं। मैं नहीं चाहता कि ऐसे रूल्स बनाये जायें जो कि कांस्टीट्यूशन के खिलाफ हों। मैं अर्ज करूँगा कि रीजनल माइनारिटीज पर भी फंडामेंटल हक्क लाहक हैं।

आज आपका ३५०ए बना हुआ है। उसके मुताबिक आप डाइरेक्टिव प्रिंसिपल (निदेशक तत्व) रखना चाहते हैं तो रखिये। लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ कि उनको प्रमल में लाना कितना मुश्किल है। आप इसको डाइरेक्टिव प्रिंसिपल में रखिये। क्यों आप इसको फंडामेंटल ग्रांटिकल्स में रख कर कांस्टीट्यूशन की बेहुमंती (अप्रमान) कराना चाहते हैं। सन् १९४९ में जो आपने पास किया था उस पर कितना प्रमल हुआ। यह बेसूद बीज है। जो बीज इम्पीरेंट (महत्वपूर्ण) है वह यह है कि हर एक आदमी को, हर एक छोटे ग्रुप को, हर एक लिगिस्टिक माइनारिटी (प्रत्य संस्कृत भाषाभाषी) को बराबर के इकानामिक (आर्थिक) राइट (अधिकार) दिये जायें। यह न हो कि एक इलाके में कुछ लोग सुखहाल रहें और आप स्टेट के दूसरे हिस्से की परवाह न करें। मैं ने महाराष्ट्र में यह देखा, रायलसीमा में यह देखा कि अगर एक राज्य में एक इलाके के लोग सुखहाल हों और दूसरे के दूरे हाल में हों तो वहाँ झगड़ा हुये बरैर नहीं रह सकता। गवर्नमेंट जैसे दूसरे इलाकों को सुखहाल करेगी। गवर्नमेंट को ऐसा करने के लिये सब से पहले वह बीज रखनी चाहिये कि सब बरत तक पिछड़े

हमें इलाकों के लोगों को बंटोज मिलेगा और उनको दूसरों के बराबर लाने की कोशिश की जायेगी। जब तक लोग बराबर के दर्जे में नहीं होंगे तब तक अनरेस्ट रहेगा। मैं भ्रदब से भ्रज कम्बा कि आइन्दा के लिये फाननेशल ऐलो-केशन (वित्त वितरण) करने से यह बात दूर नहीं हो सकती। इसलिये जो मैंने कहा है वह सब से पहले कीजिये और बाद को आइन्दा के लिये भी सेफगार्ड (परिचाय) कीजिये। मेरे इलाके में और पंजाब में लोग समझते हैं कि आपका फार्मूला बहुत अच्छा है। वे समझते हैं कि इसकी वजह से वे आइन्दा सारे एक्सप्लायटेशन (शोषण) से बच जायेंगे। जालन्धर के इलाके वाले बहुत एडवान्स्ड (प्रगतिशील) हैं। वे हमसे सोशली (सामाजिक रूप से) एजुकेशनली (शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में) और इकानामीकली (आर्थिक दृष्टि से) बहुत धार्म हैं। पिछड़े इलाके वाले मामूली तीर से उनके बराबर नहीं आ सकते। जो लोग इस फार्मूले को अच्छा समझते हैं उनका ख्याल गलत है जब तक दोनों इलाकों को बराबरी पर नहीं लाया जाता। जो मैंने कहा है जब तक आप वह नहीं करेंगे तब तक इस इलाके में सेटिस-फेक्शन नहीं हो सकेगा।

हमारा जालन्धर और अम्बाला वालों से कोई अग्रह नहीं। जब तक आप इस इलाके के लिये अलहदा डेवेलपमेंट बोर्ड नहीं बनाते, इसका इकानामिक डेवेलपमेंट (आर्थिक विकास) नहीं करते, और यहां के लोगों का लेवेलिंग (स्तर) अप नहीं करते, तब तक जो कुछ आप देते हैं उसमें पूरा फायदा नहीं हो सकता।

मैं आपकी इजाजत से एक चीज और भ्रज करना चाहता हूं। वह यह है कि इन सेफगार्ड्स के अन्दर सेंटर अपनी कोई भी जिम्मेवारी महसूस नहीं करता। मैं जनाब की तबज्जह (ध्यान) कांस्टीट्यूशन की आर्टिकल्स (बनुच्छेद) ३५५ और ३६५ की तरफ दिसा- चाहता हूं। आर्टिकल ३६५ में लिखा

है कि अगर सेंटर कोई आइरेक्टिव (निर्देश) दे और स्टेट गवर्नमेंट उस आइरेक्टिव को न माने तो उसे अस्तित्थार है कि फौरन करार दे कि स्टेट गवर्नमेंट (राज्य सरकार) का एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन (प्रशासन) कांस्टीट्यूशन की प्रावीजन (उपबन्ध) के मुताबिक नहीं चल रहा है और सेंटर उसी वक्त चाहे तो स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के अस्तित्थार सत्त्व कर सकता है और अपना रुत कर सकता है। तो मेरा कहना यह है कि इन दफात में इतनी ताकत सेंटर को दी हुई है कि वह स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स को होश में ला सकता है।

आपने प्रावीजन किया है कि अगर लेजिस्लेचर और रीजनल काउंसिल में अग्रह हो तो गवर्नर उसका फैसला करेगा। मैं भ्रज करना चाहता हूं कि कांस्टीट्यूशन मेकिंग बाडी के सामने भी यह बात धायी थी कि गवर्नर को इलेक्टेड होना चाहिए, लेकिन इस चीज को नहीं रखा गया। मैं भ्रदब से भ्रज करना चाहता हूं कि एक म्यान में दो तलवारें नहीं समा सकतीं। अगर आप गवर्नर को यह अस्तित्थार देंगे तो उसकी मौजूदा कांस्टीट्यूशनल पोजीशन नहीं रह सकेगी और उसको आप एक्टिव पालिटिक्स (राजनैतिक कार्य) में ले धावेंगे और वह ठीक तरह से इन्तिजाम नहीं कर सकेगा। उस हालत में गवर्नर और स्टेट के चीफ मिनिस्टर एक दूसरे का गला पकड़ेंगे और सारा मामला दरहम दरहम हो जायेगा। मिस्टर एंथनी ने जो तजवीज पेश की है कि एक कमीशन मुकरर किया जाये, उसकी रिक्मेंडेशनों (सिफारिशों) पर पार्लियामेंट में बहुस हो, और उनका इन्प्लीमेंटेशन (लागू) गवर्नर करे। यह सेफगार्ड आप दे सकते हैं और इससे फायदा होगा, और बाकी सेफगार्ड तो इल्ल्यूजरी (अभ्रपूर्ण) साबित होंगे। गवर्नर के डिस्पीसन (निर्णय) पर जो कि नहीं रहता है वह कानफिडेंस (विश्वास) नहीं होगा। अगर गवर्नर कमजोर हुआ तो वह अपने मिनिस्टरों के खिलाफ आइन्टिग्रीटीज को रिलीफ नहीं दिसवा सकेगा। अगर गवर्नर

[पंडित ठाकर दास भागवत]

स्ट्रॉंग हुआ तो वह जरूर अपने मिनिस्ट्रों से सड़गा और नतीजा कनफ्यूजन (गड़बड़) होगा। इसलिए मैं अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप ऐसा प्रावोजन नहीं करते कि माइनारिटीज को पूरा पूरा रिलीफ मिल सके, तो आपको चाहिए कि आप इस स्टेट रिआर्गनाइजेशन और कांस्टीट्यूशन अमेंटमेंट बिल को बांध कर रख दें और वापिस ले लें। अगर आप इनको पास करना चाहते हैं तो मुझे एक ही तर्जवीब नजर आती है जो कि मैं ने आपकी खिदमत में पेश कर दी है।

Shri C. C. Shah: I wish to congratulate the Joint Committee on the very expeditious and admirable way in which it has dealt with this very complicated and delicate problem. And no small measure of that credit goes to the Chairman of the Committee to whom both my friend Shri Asoka Mehta and Shri Anthony paid a deservedly high tribute.

This is the fourth occasion on which we are discussing this problem of reorganisation, because the debate on the President's Address was also almost a debate on reorganisation, and every argument that can be canvassed for or against one or the other of the views on one or the other of the problems involved in this complicated question has been canvassed more than once on the floor of the House. Therefore, a certain degree of repetition on this occasion is inevitable, and in fact, there is not much room for new arguments. All one can do is to repeat what one has said before or in other contexts.

The Joint Committee went into this problem as the Home Minister told us in great detail, from cover to cover, with the greatest care and with the greatest anxiety. And as he rightly pointed out, while the collective wisdom of the House may make a few changes here and there, on the whole, there is little room for any major change in the Bill that has emerged.

The Bill that has emerged is undoubtedly an improvement upon the one that we sent to the Joint Committee, in several respects. The Joint Committee have done their utmost to take into consideration the views expressed in this House while we sent the Bill to them.

Our mind has been so preoccupied with Part II of the Bill which relates to territorial reorganisation, that to the other provisions in the Bill, equally important, unfortunately, we have not been able to give that degree of attention which they deserve. Considering the limited time at my disposal, and considering that I have to deal with the problem of Bombay, however briefly I may, it will not be possible for me to deal with the other matters with which I should have liked to deal at a little greater length, but I hope in the course of the debate I shall have an opportunity to do so. But in particular, there are one or two matters to which I should like to refer, before I deal with the problem of Bombay.

The Joint Committee, I am glad, have retained the provision for a common High Court for Maharashtra, Gujarat and Bombay. I know there is a minute of dissent on that, by my hon. friends Shri Altekar and Shri Deogirikar. But I hope that while we have to part company in several other things, at least this great institution will survive the ravages of linguistic fury, and the great traditions which it has built up will remain at least the one unifying force between the three units. I am very glad that the Joint Committee have very wisely retained that provision, and I hope this House also will retain it.

My hon. friend Shri Frank Anthony spoke very eloquently and very well about the protection to linguistic minorities, which proposal was so ably supported by my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta. I think there is much force in what they said, and we can

make, and we should make, some better provision, constitutional provision, which can be enforced in a court of law, in order that the fears which have been raised in the minds of linguistic minorities can be set at rest.

Having said this, I now come to the problem of Bombay. We are, in a way, in the last stage of our journey over this matter. This is a problem which undoubtedly is difficult, is complicated and is delicate. And passions have been roused in both parts of the country and elsewhere, and one almost feels as if it has gone beyond the range of rational discussion or any reasoned argument, and only passionate appeals one way or the other seem to prevail.

And yet, one cannot neglect the history of this problem, in order to understand the solution at which we have arrived, because it is my submission that the solution which is now embodied in this Bill is a result of the history of this problem, and at present, and under the circumstances in which we are, no other solution is possible.

Even when the Congress formed its own constitution, it was Mr. N. C. Kelkar himself, than whom there few greater Maharashtrians, who provided a separate provincial Congress committee for Bombay, and there was very good reason for that. Then, so late as 1948, during the days of the Constituent Assembly, when the Dar Commission was appointed, or rather, was about to be appointed, the representatives of those States who were interested in the formation of linguistic units met under the chairmanship of Dr. Rajendra Prasad, at which meeting Shri Shankar Rao Deo was also present; and all of them agreed to a formula. The formula was that the States should be reorganised on the lines of the Congress constitution. I referred to it on the day when I spoke on the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission, and I have put on record that Shri Shankar Rao

Deo agreed to that as late as 1948. At that time, nobody ever thought that Bombay should be part of Maharashtra and that it cannot be anything else.

It was only for the first time when the Dar Commission came in, that that demand was made. I know that demand has developed volume, and a great deal of volume at that. But after all, in a problem of this nature, it cannot be that what I say is the truth, and the only truth and the whole truth, and nothing else is true. Now, what is it that we appoint independent commissions for, commissions consisting of people who are totally disinterested in the problem and who have nothing to do with it? Yet, they have come to conclusions,—the Dar Commission, the JVP Committee, and the States Reorganisation Commission—I do not want to go into all that, because the House is well aware of that. And there are two things to which they have agreed. One of them is that Bombay cannot under any circumstances be part of a unilingual State. That is the conclusion arrived at unanimously by every commission, by people who had nothing to do with this problem. Today, passions have run high, demands are being made, agitation is resorted to, and all kinds of coercion and intimidation are being practised. I shall deal with them shortly. My hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta also agreed very rightly that Bombay cannot just be allowed to be reduced to a Maharashtra city. He has a formula, and he has his complaint that it was summarily rejected. Well, he may consider why it was summarily rejected, if it had any merit in it, or if it were workable. But that is a different proposition. He undoubtedly agrees that Bombay city ought not to be allowed to be reduced, and cannot be reduced to the state of being merely a Maharashtra city. If it is made part of a unilingual State, inevitably it must be reduced to a Maharashtra city, and it cannot be anything else. That is the reason why its being part of a unilingual State is being resisted. I am not speaking as

[Shri C. C. Shah]

a Gujarati only. I am not interested in that. I have lived in Bombay all the fifty-four years of my life, and I am more a Bombay man than a Gujarati. I have lived in Bombay since my birth, I was brought up in Bombay, I was educated in Bombay, and I have passed my whole life in Bombay. So, if I speak, I speak out of love for the city of Bombay, more than for Gujarat or Saurashtra. No doubt, as a representative of Saurashtra, I am interested in it, but it is because of the love of Bombay that I say this.

Even the Working Committee of the Congress, consisting of people like the Prime Minister or the Home Minister or Maulana Azad, who look to nothing but the interests of the country, have come to this conclusion. Finally, at the Amritsar session of the Congress, the Congress unanimously accepted the resolution of the three-State formula. But now we are told today—however strongly it may be said, and however passionately and with threats it may be said—that this is unjust, that we are doing a grave injustice, and that we are committing a grave blunder economically and politically, if we do not make Bombay part of Maharashtra. Even the States Reorganisation Commission came to this conclusion that special treatment should be given and a special case has been made out for Bombay as for no other city. They considered the case of Calcutta. They considered the case of Madras, and they considered the case of every other big city. Having done that, they have come to this conclusion. Undoubtedly, it is open to us as a sovereign body to reject all those decisions and say they were all wrong.

What I wish to say is that the decision which Government have taken today is not a sudden decision, is not a hasty decision and is not a wrong decision. It is a decision which is consistent with the policy of the Congress, ever since the Congress constitution on linguistic basis was form-

ed in 1919. It is consistent with the finding of every committee and commission which we have appointed.

The ex-Finance Minister told us in his statement:

'I can find no single valid argument in justification of this decision'.

Mark the words 'no single valid argument'. They make it appear as if all those commissions and committees were fools, and that in spite of all that was urged before them, there was not a single valid argument to be advanced in favour of keeping Bombay separate from Maharashtra. They have all come to this conclusion. The Congress came to this conclusion. Government have come to that conclusion. The committees and commissions have come to that conclusion. I can understand a fair-minded man to say that there are arguments on both sides, valid forceful arguments on both sides. Any fair-minded man would have said, 'I realise the force of your arguments, but kindly realise the force of my arguments also'. That is what every commission has done. They have set out the case fairly on both sides. Having done that, they have said, 'Having balanced all the factors which can be urged on this, we have come to the conclusion that in the national interest, it is best that Bombay is not made part of any unlingual State. If the ex-Finance Minister, with his great intellectual eminence, had preserved that degree of fairness which we have attributed to him, he would not have made the statement which undoubtedly betrays that he is carried away by passion and prejudice. It is unfortunate that a man of his intellectual eminence has permitted himself expressions of views which have done immense harm both internally and internationally to the cause of this country. He carries a certain reputation....

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Certain!

Shri C. C. Shah: deservedly, both inside and outside the country and his words are weighed by everybody. His words carry a certain weight, and there was a greater responsibility upon him than upon anybody else to weigh every word that he said before he uttered them.

My hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, tried to put a very charitable interpretation upon it. He said, 'You must realise the strength of his feelings, when a man like him is driven to say that'. Undoubtedly. But the greatness consists in this that even when the strength of your feelings drives you to say things, you are modest, you are moderate, you do not allow your judgment to be clouded by passion and prejudice. Otherwise, where is greatness left? Otherwise, where is intellectual pre-eminence left, if men like him go and say that the ruling party has 'animus against Maharashtra? Mark these words, He condemns the whole Congress, not an individual—either the Prime Minister or the Home Minister. The ruling party has animus against Maharashtra, against the people of Maharashtra! Well, if Congress is the enemy of Maharashtra, Congress does not deserve to live for a day, in my opinion, and it must die its natural death.

He has said that the Prime Minister and the Home Minister are false to their principles of protecting civil liberties of the people. Well, he may be a great champion of the civil liberties of the people. But while we have learnt the value of civil liberty while in jail, he was serving the British.

Shri S. S. More: Why did you appoint him Finance Minister?

Shri C. C. Shah: That was an error which was committed.

Shri S. S. More: It suited your purpose.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This need not be made an issue for discussion.

Shri C. C. Shah: He said that this country is not civilised because it did

not hold a judicial inquiry into the firings in Bombay. I am not referring to the firings in Bombay in view of the Speakers' Ruling. I am only referring to the statement of the ex-Finance Minister. If we are not civilised, we are not civilised; we cannot help it. But I would permit myself this observation. Whether a judicial inquiry into the firings in Bombay should be appointed or not can be a matter of honest difference of opinion. The Prime Minister has given his reasons, that in the best interest of the public it was not wise to keep that wound running for a long time to come.

My hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, opposed very strongly on the floor of this House appointment of a judicial enquiry in reply to Shri Gadgil. Does he bear animus towards Maharashtra? He opposed the appointment of a judicial inquiry into the firings in Bombay. Has he ceased to be civilised because he opposed the appointment of a judicial inquiry into the firings in Bombay? (*Interruptions*). Shri Gadgil told us that he is the 'adopted son' of Maharashtra.

All that I wish to say is this. I referred to it only for this reason, that if the statement were made by any other individual, it would not matter; I would not have cared. He knows that Shri N. C. Chatterjee and Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy have tried to exploit that statement in their own way. Of course, they have every right to do so. That statement will be exploited more subtly and in more diverse ways than we can ever know of, both internally and internationally. He knows the immense harm that can flow from it. We in the country who know the true facts may not be misguided by it and may not be carried away by it. But it is not all people who know all correct facts. There are many things in that statement, but there is not one redeeming feature, I should say, in that statement. I say this only because it harms the whole country. I am not concerned with what happens to Bombay or what does

[Shri C. C. Shah]

not happen to Bombay; Bombay may become part of Maharashtra or may not become part of Maharashtra. But out of heat and passion, something is said which no other man would have dared to say.

To say that the Prime Minister bears animus is something incomprehensible. Not even the worst enemy of the Prime Minister would say that he has animus. My hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, very rightly said that not even the worst enemy of the Prime Minister would say that the Prime Minister ever bore malice against anyone. He may commit an error of judgment. That is a different thing. Even the leaders of Maharashtra—and very rightly, Shri Gadgil also said—have said that they have full faith in the Prime Minister. Even they have said that. Now, Shri C. D. Deshmukh has no faith in the Prime Minister—I believe he said that.

But, I come to this question of Bombay. He says that a grave injustice is being done. What is justice? Is it justice what you say?

Shri S. S. More: No, what Shri C. C. Shah says!

Shri C. C. Shah: No. I say, what an independent, disinterested person says. In matters like this, what are we going to do? Have arbitration. Now, Shri Shankarrao Deo says: 'As regards arbitration, I will have arbitration on anything and every thing, but I will not have arbitration, even of the Prime Minister, on this issue of Bombay'. He said that. He would trust the Prime Minister for everything, but so far as Bombay is concerned, no. 'What I say is truth, what I say is justice'. Not even the Prime Minister is to be trusted.

If arbitration is ruled out, if the Prime Minister and disinterested people are ruled out, then consult the people of Bombay. After all, there

is a democratic process left. You want automatic merger. Why automatic merger? Are not the 4 million people of Bombay entitled to have a voice in their future? Are they chattering who can be transferred at the will and whim of anybody? It is said that the people of Bombay are the most democratically minded and the most politically-advanced people. And yet there are the people whom you want to deny even a voice in their future.

What has the Prime Minister done? What has the Prime Minister said? At the end of five years, we will consult the people of Bombay. I say this is, in a way, the utmost limit to which the Government can go consistently with the policy of the Congress for all these years, consistently with the findings of commissions and committees. In the face of these findings of all these impartial commissions and committees, what has happened in order to make Government change its policy, which has been the policy of Congress since 1920? All that has happened is agitation, all that has happened is riots, all that has happened is force and intimidation on a large scale in Bombay and elsewhere. Is this the thing to which we are going to surrender, by saying that because this has happened, therefore, we will agree to what you say? Undoubtedly, passions have been roused; I know they hold strongly on this matter; there is a great sense of frustration in the matter and it should be our effort as far as possible to remove this sense of frustration of 3 crores of people. It is said that they are frustrated and we should do all that is possible to do in order that that sense of frustration may go. But can we, therefore, surrender? Is it that that sense of frustration can go only if we concede their point of view 100 per cent?

“बेलावाच मितना ही चाहिये, होना ही चाहिये।”

“बाम्बे मितना ही चाहिये, होना ही चाहिये।”

Everything belongs to Maharashtra (Interruptions).

Shri Raghunath Singh (Banaras Dist.—Central): He also belongs to Maharashtra. Why Maharashtra only?

Shri C. C. Shah: I therefore submit that people who reject arbitration, people who reject the democratic process of ascertaining the wishes of these people have no right to complain of injustice.

All these arguments have been advanced now. It was said both by Shri Gadgil and the ex-Finance Minister—and it is a serious charge—that the announcement made by the Prime Minister at the AICC gravely prejudiced the deliberations of the Joint Committee and of this House. I say this is less than just. It is an insult to the intelligence of the Members of the Joint Committee and of this House to say that because the Prime Minister makes an announcement, therefore the whole case is lost.

What did the Prime Minister say? We have now the authoritative text of what he said. He has only said that the provisions embodied in the States Reorganisation Bill are the Government policy, which, of course, the Home Minister had said in the House when the matter was referred to the Joint Committee. Of course, you can say this, that his followers accepted his advice. But what are we here as followers for if not to accept his advice? Undoubtedly, it is our duty to tell him what our views are. Undoubtedly, we have the freedom to choose our leader. Undoubtedly, we have the freedom even to throw off the leader if we feel that he has forfeited our confidence. But if we have voluntarily chosen a leader then we owe allegiance to him, and that allegiance is to accept that advice. I say that is true democracy. A leader is not one who is led away. A leader is one who leads and gives

advice. What is he a leader for? He is a leader because he has a vision of things which you and I do not have. He is a leader because he sees far ahead, because he looks to the whole of India; he is a leader because he looks to the world; he knows many things, understands many things which you and I do not. Is it a novel thing in this House that frequently we had expressed views which are contrary to his views and having expressed them, when he comes and makes a speech, we accept his advice? Undoubtedly, I say, we have a right to throw him off he forfeits our confidence. True leadership and true democracy consist in this that a leader is entitled to say, "These are my views; if you do not accept them, you have a right to reject me and throw me off. I hold this view; but you do not expect me to carry out your wishes only." Therefore, I say that the Prime Minister was perfectly right, constitutionally and morally right, in this matter....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member must conclude.

Shri C. C. Shah: I may be given some more time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes; five minutes more.

Shri C. C. Shah: Therefore I submit that the Prime Minister was right. Shri Deshmukh said that he was not consulted. I do not know whether he was consulted or not. The Prime Minister has told us that there were frequent consultations in the Cabinet and we accept the words of the Prime Minister fully and completely. I do not know whether he was consulted or not. But people more competent than him to represent Maharashtra were consulted innumerable times.

Shri S. S. Mase: Who were they? May I know the list of persons who are more competent than our ex-Finance Minister?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has been telling us.... (Interruption).

Shri C. C. Shah: The Prime Minister consulted many. In fact, it is his weakness that there have been so many consultations. It is this weakness which is the greatest quality in him; it is precisely this which makes him the greatest living democrat. He consulted everybody. Anybody may feel that because of his status or position he was entitled to be consulted more deeply and more adequately. Probably, he may attach to himself so much importance that he says he has not been consulted adequately, and if he had been adequately consulted things would have been different. I do not know how he is entitled to say that he was not consulted and therefore it is unconstitutional, it is cavalier-like. This is something, unfortunately, which we cannot understand. I am not raising constitutional issues. This is not the occasion to go into constitutional pendants. This is a very serious occasion. The consultations have been endless and it is after these consultations that this decision has been arrived at.

It will be futile for me to go into the arguments which are advanced again and again to say that Bombay should become part of Maharashtra. Each one has been answered on the floor of this House, before Committees and Commissions. Yet, I will very briefly deal with one or two.

The geographical argument is the foremost argument put forward for its being included in Maharashtra. We are forming linguistic States. For linguistic States, the greatest argument must be the linguistic argument, namely, that this is an area which is inhabited by people, majority of whom speak one language. But that argument does not avail them. Therefore, it is mentioned in the minutes of dissent that it is immaterial whether they are in a minority there. They say, 'This land is our territory and therefore we shall take it'. I say that geography is an argument which is both

irrelevant and dangerous. It is irrelevant because if we form linguistic States this argument of geography has no meaning. The Dar Commission has said that only those areas which have got 70 per cent. of the people speaking a particular language can be included in a unilingual State. It is irrelevant for this reason that each State in India has not any specific demarcation geographically. To do this would be ruin. We are forming the Madhya Pradesh. Is it for any geographical reason that Vindhya Pradesh, Madhya Bharat and Madhya Pradesh are being brought together into one Madhya Pradesh? Is it that Nagpur is geographically part of Maharashtra that it is being brought into Madhya Pradesh? Is it that Kutch is a part of Gujerat geographically? It is an entirely different unit. The argument of geography is only one factor. The Prime Minister in his broadcast speech referred to has stated that geographically Bombay may be considered to be a part of Maharashtra; but he also said that it will remain a Centrally administered unit. If geography is the only argument, the final argument, the conclusive argument, then, the Prime Minister would not have said that it will remain a Centrally administered area. That is why I say it is irrelevant.

It is also dangerous. It proceeds on the theory of inviolability of territories: 'This is my land; you shall not set your foot here; if you come here you are a foreigner; you are a stranger and you come by sufferance; you are a non-Maharashtrian'. This is their attitude. On the last occasion, when I spoke, I had read extracts from the speech of D. R. Gadgil. He said, 'If you do not concede this, we will take it. Bombay will be divided street by street'. He gave the analogy of the Muslim League and Pakistan. That is the theory on which the whole idea of 'my land, my territory and, therefore, it shall be mine' proceeds. I say it is destructive of the unity of India; it is destructive of that social mobility of which my friend Shri Asoka Mehta spoke and which makes

everyone a citizen of India. Bombay is the one place in this country where every man feels that it is his home. I do not feel that I am a Gujerati thereon does a Maharashtrian feel that way.

Then the next argument is the economic argument; that economically they are a deficit area. Therefore, unless Bombay is granted to them, theirs will be a deficit State. Who asked for a unilingual and separate State? The composite State was there. In our memorandum to the States Reorganisation Commission, Gujerat said that we are willing to continue this composite State. But the Maharashtrians said: 'We want a separate State'. Already having asked for a separate State, they now say, 'Provide us with the resources for the separate State. We are poor and we want assistance and therefore give us something which does not belong to us and which belongs to the nation'. Every State which we are forming is, in a way, a deficit State and that is the greatest argument against linguistic States. Gujerat is a deficit State and only for this reason, the State Reorganisation Commission stated, if not for anything else, that they would not like to separate Gujerat and Maharashtra as both areas depend upon Bombay. But the argument is that this joint property, and the resources built by the endeavours of all communities are wanted by the Maharashtrians for themselves because they have no resources. They want to deny to everybody else the economic resources which belong to the whole nation. The economic argument has no validity in that sense.

The last argument is, 'we are frustrated'.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This last argument should not take long.

Shri C. C. Shah: I will try my very best to be brief.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is no more trying his best. He should conclude within a minute. It is the maximum amount of time that could be given.

Shri C. C. Shah: It is argued that for the misdeeds of a few, Bombay is being denied to Maharashtra. That is entirely untrue. The decision to keep Bombay separate was taken long before the riots in Bombay. This decision to keep Bombay separate was not because of the riots or misdeeds but on its merits. It is the only decision that can be come to. The riots have confirmed that it is a right decision and the Prime Minister said that if prior to the riots there were reasons for keeping Bombay separate, now, there are a million reasons to keep it separate.

They talk of peace and goodwill and my friend, Shri Asoka Mehta appealed to us. I entirely agree. After all, we are part and parcel of the same country. I have already said that all my life I have lived in Bombay and that 50 per cent. of my staff is Maharashtrian for more than 30 years. I am on the best of terms with them. Now, there is a poisoned atmosphere in Bombay. If you want peace, if you want a calm atmosphere to be created in order that we may consider this problem, agitation is not the way. To talk of peace and at the same time to keep up agitation are two contradictory things. The Prime Minister has often told us that we cannot talk of peace internationally and prepare for war.

My friend Shri Deshpande said, 'we will fight to the last drop of our blood here'. That is not going to keep the peace. For some time you have got to have patience. This is precisely what the Prime Minister said. I say that a speech like that of the ex-Finance Minister is incitement to great violence on the part of those who are resorting to violence. His words carry weight. If he says that this is a grave injustice, this is a grave blunder that the Prime Minister has committed, that he is doing things in a cavalier and unconstitutional manner, what will be the effect on the masses; on Maharashtrians? It behoves us to have some patience.

[Shri C. C. Shah]

3 P.M.

The Prime Minister has said that after five years we will reconsider it. What is going to happen? As my hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta very rightly said, Kutch is more dependent on Bombay than even Kolaba is dependent on Bombay. Same is the case with Saurashtra and Gujerat. I have also a constituency from which about 50,000 people are in Bombay and whose economy depends on Bombay, whose bread depends upon Bombay. This is not the conspiracy of vested interests. It may be said for the sake of a slogan, but actually, 95 per cent. of the Gujeratis in Bombay are people who belong to the lower middle class group living in pitiable conditions and whose income is even less than that of a mill employee. These are the people who depend upon Bombay, whose economy depends on Bombay. Others, the Maharashtrians also, depend on Bombay. My constituency also depends upon Bombay for its existence. It does not behove anyone to say "My constituency wants a particular thing and so I shall have it or otherwise I shall fight it out."

Therefore, I would appeal to my Maharashtrian friends that agitation of this character will not bring any good and so they should remain patient. Let passions cool down. The Prime Minister has said and has gone to the length of saying that the issue will be reconsidered. In fact, it might be a grievance for us that in a decision which was certain, an uncertainty is introduced by the pronouncement of the Prime Minister. If any people have a cause for complaint, it is ourselves, not the ex-Finance Minister.

The three-State formula was agreed to by the Gujeratis, by the Maharashtrians and by the Government. The Prime Minister has said something which is in favour of Maharashtrians, that is, that after five years, he will consider this question.

I, therefore, respectfully submit that in view of the passions which

have been aroused, it is the duty of the leaders of Maharashtra to tell their people that in the national interest, the decision arrived at by the Government, by the Congress, should be considered as just and reasonable. We are all entangled in this problem. Whether we like it or not, we are involved in this problem, and it is impossible to find a solution which will satisfy everybody. We can try to go to the utmost length to satisfy everybody, but ultimately we must rest somewhere, and that place is this Bill.

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): I am very grateful for the chance given for me to speak on this subject.

This subject of reorganising the States has been discussed in this House many times, and I regret to say that this is the first time that I got an opportunity. The reorganisation of State is not a new idea, nor a recent one. It is as old as the world and moulding of political ideas. India is not the first country, nor is it the first time that a scheme like this has been envisaged. It is the outcome of the urge of the people. It is the result of the exigencies of the time and administration. It is a suitable convenience for future progress.

If I remember correct, the idea of linguistic division of India, though given birth to by the Congress, had been in the minds of the people for long. As early as 1946, I myself, as a representative of Travancore Congress, presented a memorandum to the Cabinet Delegation and to Prime Minister Attlee, who visited India in March 1946. Their one objection was whether the Princes would agree to this. I sent a memorandum for a Kerala Province in January 1946 to the Parliamentary Delegation, long before Congress administration had come into being. In those days it was a problem to deal with all the Princes and also to have democracy in the country. The idea lingered, and people fought for it. This Report is not initiated by Government; it is a Report which is the

result of the urge of the people from time to time.

To do honour to my own State, the linguistic idea was pushed to the forefront, to the forum like the Tamil Nad Congress there. I heard the hon. Member from Kolaba referring to the 'shooting to kill' ideology. I must admit that it was in operation in the Tamil Nad area in South Travancore long before Bombay could dream of it. Not once or twice, but many times they had to stand shooting and many died as a result of this agitation.

If you start reorganising India from South onwards, the first reorganisation takes place in my constituency, though I had never before a chance to speak on the subject. The scheme starts in my constituency first, and part of my constituency is going to Madras. On the whole, it is a welcome scheme, well thought out, and it has been agreed to in several cases, but that is not all. The leaders of the ruling party have tried their best to please the people and in doing so, they have committed grave blunders, which by any amount of telling, will not enter their heads. It is not very easy to please 37 crores of people and to organise a scheme which touches vitally their politics, their economics, their social problem, their boundaries; in fact, every activity in life is covered by this scheme. Therefore, it has to be handled very cautiously and in consonance with the will of the people, and that is where the leader of the party opposite has blundered.

We are not fit for democracy till we rise to that sublime height where with courage of conviction we can call a spade a spade. Not to cry down the scheme of a leader and then at the conclusion call him great and say that we are much in love with him is our defect. Democracy does not mean decrying devotion; democracy does not mean that you should sacrifice your principle or personality; democracy means due respect to leadership and on the part of leadership due respect to the will of the people. Unless these two reconcile, there is no

democracy, no leadership, no will of the people.

An Hon. Member: What about the S.R.C.?

Kumari Annie Mascarene: The S.R.C. is the result of democracy, now distorted.

With regard to linguistic division, the scheme has done justice to a good number of States, but I must say they have done injustice to Bombay. I call Bombay my home because during my sojourn all over India, I could not find a place where I felt homely except Bombay. I call it the heart of political configuration, because I have found that all good, constructive, political schemes have been welcomed, financed and helped in Bombay. That is my own personal experience. It is a cosmopolitan city as many have voiced it. Even the British Government which had gone on reorganising the States to suit their convenience never thought of separating Bombay and taking it under their own administration. It is in the nature of an operation in the body politic of the Bombay State and any such operation should be handled very carefully, without rousing deep and grave emotions.

The speaker on the opposite side referred to the discourtesy or want of respect on the part of the Member from Kolaba in expressing his grievance. When one is shot to death and still survives, you cannot expect sweet things to come from him. If he is true and conscientious, he will express his grievance in strong language. If you feel that justice has been done to him, he will feel just the opposite. You cannot blame him for that. It is only when it touches his heart, he begins to express strongly, especially one who has been rather silent and serious all these years.

I have been reading the extracts referring to the Central administration of Bombay. There, the Prime Minister says:

"I said that the provision in the Bill before Parliament providing for the Central administration of

[Kumari Annie Mascarene]

Bombay represents Government's point of view and the Congress agreed to it."

I cannot see how the Congress Members opposite can attack it. That shows that they are not in agreement with it. I could not understand how the Member from Kolaba attacked it because it was the Government's point of view. Then, it was clear that this was said before this attack and the attack came after he said it.

With regard to the linguistic minorities, Government should consider the position of the linguistic minorities in the States to be formed under the new scheme. In Tamil Nad, this will bring in a twenty per cent. minority of Malayalees. The Commission recognised that facilities should be given to such minorities for education and even official recognition and patronage. It is a necessary provision. The Constitution does not provide for a twenty per cent. minority. It provides for a thirty per cent. minority in a unilingual State with a seventy per cent. majority. Here you have got only twenty per cent. It is in a taluk, not in the State. As such, it is necessary that some provision should be made for the education of their children in the primary schools, so that there may not be difficulty in the new scheme. Such provisions will be necessary in all the States that are going to be formed. In every State, there is going to be a linguistic minority. India is a vast sub-continent with many languages and it is very difficult to form a State without a linguistic minority. Though the Constitution has made a provision. I do not see any provision in this scheme for a minority of twenty or twenty-five per cent. They have made representations to the Commission and it gave them due consideration when the whole thing was considered. So, when the whole scheme is put into practice or before it takes shape, I hope the linguistic minorities in all the States will not find any grievance in their new political surroundings.

The new scheme will bring in a change in the location of High Courts. I believe that the judiciary is for the convenience of the litigating public and not for the convenience of the Judges or advocates. The High Court is in Ernakulam but a bench is located in Travancore so that the litigants need not go all the way to Ernakulam. I do not know where the High Court will be hereafter. If it will continue to be there, the addition of Malabar will have to be taken into consideration and a decision as to where it should be located will have to be taken. I have received a memorandum from the judges and the advocates urging that centralisation of judiciary in every State is necessary. The litigants are poor people and they cannot afford to go to the High Court, and wait there for days and days. Judiciary, executive and legislature exist for the convenience of the public. So, if justice has to be done without much expenditure, it is necessary that benches should be established in every district.

The new scheme for Kerala is not very agreeable because Kerala stands to lose rather than gain by the new scheme. We are losing the Tamil taluks in which we have invested large sums of money, where we have got the longest concrete road in the whole of India. They are taluks with major schemes of construction. They are all going to Madras. We are getting, in return, the district of Malabar which will not be in any way an asset to us. We have to start from the very beginning to construct Malabar. Yet, we have no complaints. If the Tamilians who are going away from the Travancore-Cochin State are going to be happier in Madras, we are only very happy to part with them. But, I hope hereafter they will have no grievance to say that they were better treated in Travancore-Cochin than in Madras. Such educational, medical and other facilities for civilised life as exist in Travancore-Cochin do not exist anywhere in India. If anyone had the best advantage of such facilities, it was the Tamilian

people. Anyway, I wish them all good-luck and when they go to Madras, I hope they will be happier there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members will perhaps observe that almost all the arguments have been advanced. There is more or less a repetition. If they confine themselves to the remarks which they want to convey, and that too very briefly, we may be able to accommodate more hon. Members. There is a large number anxious to speak. Therefore, I would request the hon. Members to be very brief in giving their points.

Shri S. S. More: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I quite accept what you have stated and will try my level best to abide by your direction.

Sir, unfortunately, this country, immediately after we achieved our political independence, is passing through a phase of emotional upheaval and the immediate objective before us, and particularly this House, is the emotional rehabilitation of the country. Political problems may invite some suggestions, informations and some easy solutions. Economic problems also may yield to some treatment here and there. But when people are emotionally agitated, when the whole race is shaken to its roots and takes up a particular attitude, a different treatment is necessary if we are out to prevent that emotional upsurge erupting itself into something which may be treated as a violent thing.

Now, my friends on the other side, who were the devoted followers of the economic and financial policies of the ex-Finance Minister, have turned round and have begun to attack him.

Some Hon. Members: Politically, not financially.

Shri S. S. More: That shows, Sir, the futility of power in this world. As long as you are installed in power people will be at your shrine standing in a queue, but the moment power has deserted you or you have deserted the seats of power those who were at your doors with a beggar's bowl, become suddenly very fearless critics.

And this is not a strange performance. Take, for instance, Russia. As long as Stalin was installed in a mighty seat of power, people were falling prostrate at his feet, but the moment he departed, people said: "Well, he established a personality cult and we want to develop a collective leadership". Unfortunately in this country we are not taking any lessons from foreign countries, and particularly the experience of Russia and other countries who are demolishing their Gods. We have already a large population of Gods and we are now even adding to that number.

The ex-Finance Minister, with whom I have always the misfortune to disagree and exchange hard blows, what did they say? He said that there is a sort of political animus, a deep-rooted animus in the ruling party against Maharashtra. We have to analyse that statement. As my friend Shri Asoka Mehta stated, the Finance Minister is not a person who is given to sudden or unsteady emotions; he is a man who weighs his words; as much as he weighs gold as the Finance Minister. "Why did he go to make that sort of statement?" will be a question which we will have to ask ourselves and we should find out whether there is any proof to support it. We feel—I support on this occasion at least the ex-Finance Minister—and report to you, Sir, and through you to the House and to the whole country outside, that, the ruling party is not giving us a fair, a just deal; thorn rankling in the Maharashtrian mind is the bitter feeling that we are being discriminated against. This feeling was the motivating force of the yesterday's satyagraha at the doors of this House. Sir, you were kind enough to go out and see the demonstrators yesterday, the youths, the flower of Maharashtra. Their forefathers invaded Delhi and broke the ground and silver lining of the Moghul Emperors. These people have come here in their thousands to offer satyagraha. They were the source of the greatest military power, now they became the

[Shri S. S. More]

great demonstrators of peaceful agitation and their magnificent performance was a lesson to us. The Maharashtrians as long as they tried to excel in violence met their superiors and were defeated, but if Maharashtra take to non-violence—they have tried to cultivate it—they will make it a finished product and it will be hardly difficult to find anyone who can defeat them at that game. I was there. I was very much emotionally agitated, but at the same time I thought that here is the flower of Maharashtra going on the right road. Because, if democracy has to be preserved, what have we to do? Are we to fall ourselves prostrate at the feet of some mighty leader and offer him nothing but flattery as *navedya*? What are we to do? Democracy, if it has to be secured, has to be secured on solid foundations and fighting for one's right is the very basis, the very soul of democratic struggle.

Therefore, I do say that we have a right to fight, if we have a grievance, if we feel that we are discriminated against and if we feel that somebody is doing injustice to us. It is our soul which is in revolt against the wrongdoers. What is the soul of a man? Why was it given to him by God? It is to rise on occasion in revolt against tyranny, against injustice and the Maharashtrian soul is trying to rise, to do its proper function.

We do feel that we are discriminated against. Do we really believe that there is animus on the part of the ruling party against Maharashtra? We do feel. I request the non-Maharashtrian and non-Gujerathi friends not to look at it from a party point of view, because revolutions do not run on party lines. Revolutions run on something more higher. Therefore, I would request them not to treat this issue in a cavalier fashion—if I have to borrow the word from the ex-Finance Minister.

We do feel all that, Sir, I am going to give you one or two instances. Take Punjab and take Maharashtra. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, you have the good fortune to belong to a party

which represents the majority of Sikhs, who are standing solidly and unitedly behind a certain leader. What happened at Amritsar? When the Congress session was held the Sikh leaders also gave a grand demonstration of their might. With what result? In Maharashtra, because the leadership was divided, because the leadership was not united, nobody else was consulted. No non-Congressman was consulted. And, are we poor in eminent non-Congressmen? Dr. Jayakar, Dr. Paranjape, Dr. Ambedkar and a host of others are there. The stars on the sky will be smaller in number if I go on to enumerate the eminent persons in Maharashtra. None of them was consulted. Why not? All the Congress people were supposed to represent the will, ambition, honesty and integrity of Maharashtra and Panditji, I am sorry to say, was not prepared to look beyond the Congress. Panditji is rightly condemning casteism, Panditji is rightly condemning provincialism, Panditji is rightly condemning so many other 'isms'; but this 'Nehruism' has to be condemned by someone. Nehruism is not prepared to look beyond the Congressmen. Jinnah used to say, one Muslim is worth so many hundreds of Hindus. Now a new philosophy, a new cult is being developed in the country that a Congressman, on merit however worthless and rank opportunist—as Shri Gadgil himself stated—he may be, is nobler, more sacred and sits on a higher pedestal than persons not belonging to the Congress who have devoted their whole lives for the service of the nation. These partisan scales, if held by the party in power, create a sense of injustice in the minds of those who are slighted. We feel it. And you know, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am not given so much to emotion as to reason, but as an objective student of the attitude of the leaders of the Congress for the last four years I have come to this conclusion that the Government sitting there is out to insult Maharashtra, that the Government sitting there is out to humiliate

Maharashtra, that the Government sitting there is out to keep down the soul of Maharashtra which has fought all tyrannies and all dictators who have come to this country. That is our feeling. It may be right, it may be wrong; I am prepared to concede it. But you have to take note of my feeling. We are human beings and are a citizen of this country. You are governing not only with the consent of the Congress people but you are supposed to govern with our consent. Are you caring to see whether our willing consent is there or not?

Again, I come to Punjab. The Government wanted to appease the Sikhs, Shri Bhimsen Sachar was the Chief Minister. He was made to resign and Kairon was appointed as Chief Minister. Why? Because, the Sikhs had to be appeased. But in Maharashtra, no appeasement is required. For Maharashtra, only bullets are required! For Maharashtra, something more strong, for killing men, women and children, is required, because the soul of Maharashtra, if pampered, may become a menace to the whole country! My submission is that these are some of the reasons why we feel that there is an animus, a positive animus, against Maharashtra.

Take the seats in the Cabinet. Take the Congress Working Committee. Who has the greatest domination? The Gujaratis have the greatest domination, not only in the Working Committee but even in the Cabinet. The big business is there. Panditji is talking about the socialist pattern of society, but his lieutenants come from a particular community which is supposed to be reputed for amassing capital. My friend Shri Asoka Mehta said, "The Maharashtrians and the Gujaratis are complementary to each other." In what sense was it said? It was in the sense in which the British and the Indian people were complementary. The Britishers were industrialists, manufacturers of goods. Great Britain, the imperial country, and India the colony, were complementary to each other. Similarly

Maharashtrians and Gujaratis are complementary to each other. The Gujaratis are financiers and money-lenders; the Maharashtrians are toilers and debtors. The exploiters and the exploited are indeed complementary to each other!

My friend Shri Asoka Mehta said, "Bombay is a cosmopolitan city" and that it need not remain part of Maharashtra.

Shri Asoka Mehta: I never said that. I never said that Bombay should not become part of Maharashtra.

Shri S. S. More: You were profusely quoted by Shri C. C. Shah in this context.

Shri Asoka Mehta: Also by Shri Gadgil in this respect.

Shri S. S. More: My submission is that in an industrially developing country, the urban areas will be developing. Where the urban areas are developing from the point of view of industry, when machines are coming to the cities, when people are coming from different communities and from different parts of the country for earning their bread, to the cities, when all sorts of machines are springing up in cities, naturally capital is also attracted to that area. So, every big city which has industries will march and progress in a country and it becomes cosmopolitan. It is only agricultural economy which prevents a city or a place from becoming cosmopolitan. But in an industrially developing country—which is the modern trend of development in a country—an industrial town or a metropolitan city is the order of the day, and it is not given to any community, Maharashtrians, Gujaratis or any other community, to stop this rising tide of growing industrialisation. Therefore, even if Bombay is given to Maharashtrians, the fears of those who feel that Bombay will cease to be a cosmopolitan city are unscientific fears and those fears are not based on proper data or proper theory. Nobody can stop an industrialised city from developing its cosmopolitan character, just as nobody

[Shri S. S. More]

can stop the sun rising in the east every morning. I need not take a brief for the ex-Finance Minister, because, he came from the tradition of the civil service and I came from the opposite direction. I have been one of the fighters for the national cause and that fight was to some extent against the members of the British bureaucracy.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They are meeting today!

Shri S. S. More: The east and west do occasionally meet. My submission is this is our feeling. What are they going to do to allay this feeling? This Government is becoming a Government of concessions and repressions—concessions for the capitalists and repression for the poor. For the expansion of this country and for the economic development of the country, one requires capital. As far as labour is concerned, the biological process is there at the disposal of the Government and they can get it in any number. Therefore, they are out to appease capital. What happens? History repeats itself.

Take, for instance, the partition of Bengal. In 1902, when Lord Curzon took up the partition of Bengal, what was the reason for his doing so? The Mussalmans were a growing community and they were of some use to the Government and they felt that in the whole of Bengal they were a minority. They wanted some place where they could say that they were masters of the situation. In order to appease that particular section, flouting the ambitions, flouting the cries, flouting the protests of the Bengali brothers, Bengal was partitioned. But people went on agitating. Why, because it went against the very soul of their nature. They went on agitating and the Britisher in 1911, in the despatch to the Delhi Durbar, admitted that the Bengalis were fighting for annulling the partition out of sentiment. That sentiment has to be taken note of. The Britishers further admitted that sentiment was a substantial ground for annulling the partition.

Shri C. C. Shah was saying that because Bombay forms part, physically and geographically, of Maharashtra, it is no reason for giving it to Maharashtra. I feel otherwise. I have the greatest respect for the legal acumen of Shri C. C. Shah, but when passions are roused and when emotions are at the top, even the best intellect gets clouded and they advance arguments which will not stand any test of even a man of ordinary intelligence. His arguments were very original and entertaining. He said: "The Prime Minister might have said that Bombay forms, physically or geographically, a part of Maharashtra, but that is wrong". Then, how are we to judge the issue? Nature has made it so. In courts, we find many witnesses giving false testimony. But the documents do not lie. If we have to decide the boundaries of territories, provinces, States, countries, etc., the physical boundaries created by Nature are taken into account and they stand as guiding forces or stars till eternity. A man-made thing can undergo a change; economic interests may undergo a change; other interests set up by man may undergo a change; but the things made by God himself do not and cannot change and they have to be accepted. Possibly Shri C. C. Shah might say that the Himalayas are not Himalayas, geographically, and so he might say that Maharashtra is not Maharashtra, geographically. He is a clever and resourceful lawyer. My submission is, that the greatest argument that stands in favour of Bombay becoming part of Maharashtra is that Bombay is geographically a part of Maharashtra and that argument ought to be given weight by the Government.

The essence of a stable Government is that all those who are under the massive wing of the Government should feel that Government is just to everybody. If any section of the people feels that it does not want to go with another section, though belonging to the same country, that section has every right, of

course, to go away. I now quote from the despatch of 1911, when Bengal, Bihar, Assam and Orissa formed part of one Province or State. This is what has been stated in the Coronation Durbar of 1911:

"These people"—

that is, Biharis—

"have hitherto been unequally yoked with Bengal and have never therefore had a fair opportunity for development. The cry of "Bihar for the Biharis" has frequently been raised in connection with the confirmation of appointments and excessive number of offices in Bihar having been held by Bengalis. The Biharis are sturdy, loyal people"—

the same description can apply to the Maharashtrians—

"and it is a matter of common knowledge that although they have long desired separation from Bengal, they refrained at the time of partition from asking for it, because they did not wish to join the Bangalis in opposition to Government. There has, however, been a very marked awakening in Bihar now and a strong belief has grown up among Biharis that Bihar will never develop until it is dissociated from Bengal".

Many arguments were advanced that Maharashtrians and the Gujaratis have remained together for 150 years and so it has been asked, "What harm is there if they still play a complementary role to each other?". Rightly or wrongly, the Maharashtrians feel that they belong to the exploited classes; they feel that the yoking of Maharashtra with Gujarat will not be to their advantage. They feel that they will be made a colonial country supplying raw material and labour to the imperial race who are in the industry. This perpetual exploitation by one section of the people of another section will continue and they will not get that opportunity for their further development. It may be a wrong sentiment; it may be due to the

past experience, but that sentiment has sprouted from seeds planted and has developed into a sturdy shrub. You have to deal with it; you cannot go about pulling it out, because the soil which supports it is likely to be disturbed and it may lead to something. Therefore, taking into consideration the time that will be allotted to me, I feel I can again make an appeal to the Treasury Benches. If you want peace and prosperity and if you have committed a mistake, do not be a victim to your own sense of prestige and persist in folly. The British empire came to nought in this country not because we were superior in might to the Britisher, not because we were solidly united, as we ought to have been against the Britisher, but because the Britishers every time succumbed to their false sense of prestige, giving greater force and momentum to the popular wrath and to the movement based on that popular wrath. Do not be a victim to your sense of prestige, particularly when Mahatma Gandhi is supposed to be your political leader and the inspiring prophet of your administration. Mahatmaji has stated that the admission of mistake is like a broom which cleanses the ground, if you have committed a mistake. We, Maharashtrians, are a strong and sturdy people; but, at the same time, we are sufficiently tolerant people. Though I sit on this bench, I can say that if the Five Year Plan has to be unfolded, if some prosperity has to be taken to the door of the poorest peasant in Maharashtra, then we must build up a fellow feeling among the Maharashtrians and the trust of Maharashtrians in the Congress Government. If that is not done, frustration will be writ large on the face of Maharashtra; and, they are a peculiar sort of fellows. If they go nursing their frustration, it means that before Maharashtra there is nothing but a black period, a tortuous period of struggle. I do not think the country can afford that struggle. When Panditji is particularly going like an angel with a soothing balm to every foreign country to pour it, on their fostering

[Shri G. S. More]

sores, I think that precious bottle of balm "peace" must be turned to the use of Maharashtrians.

I am prepared to say that some of the Government Members are not above territorial feeling, as they ought to be. Particularly, I feel that when the Home Minister carries his stick, physically it is for his support; but in another sense, it is also a support for the Government. Theodore Roosevelt used to say in 1902, "Speak soft, but carry a big stick. It will carry you far". Speak soft to the people, but at the same time, if you have certain convictions, if you have certain prejudged notions, carry a big stick against the people for the purpose of suppressing them, if you can.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Speaking soft to the people, the hon. Member should not refer to sticks.

Shri S. S. More: I have no attraction for sticks, but if anybody is out to brandish a stick in my face, I am not made of a stuff which will take it lying down. That is my only submission.

With your permission, Sir, I would again make a final appeal. This is practically the last stage we are reaching as far as this question is concerned. Let the Congress people take the matter in their own hands. I have many friends in the Congress who have been kind enough to tell me, "Mr. More, we are morally convinced that Bombay ought to go to Maharashtra. If you want to function as a democracy, let the party in power take certain decisions; let the party in power meet outside. Leave aside the Gujarati and the Maharashtrian Members. I am prepared to surrender my view to the goodwill and candid opinion of the other Members coming from other provinces. Let them come to a justifiable conclusion. My submission is that the statement which the Prime Minister has made on the 3rd June has gone a long way to prejudice and fetter the judgment of many Congress people. I would like to quote from page 92 of the report of the Joint

Committee. Mr. Deogirikar and Mr. Altekar, who were members of the Joint Committee, had tabled certain amendments for the immediate inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra, and yet, this statement of the Prime Minister came in their way. You will permit me to read only a few lines from the report:

"At this stage Shri T. R. Deogirikar informed the Committee that he withdrew his opposition to Clause 8 for reasons stated in his letter to the Chairman which was read out by him to the Committee. The reasons as given by him were as follows:

"After this Bill was introduced in Parliament, our Prime Minister made a statement in Bombay on 3rd June, 1956 conveying his views about the future of Bombay. This statement has an important bearing on the provisions contained in clauses 8 and 9 of the Bill. The Chairman has kindly promised to make a suitable reference to this statement of the Prime Minister in the report of the Select Committee.

I realise the desirability of making suitable amendments in the provisions of these clauses not in the absence of our Prime Minister but press for them at a later stage when the Prime Minister will be here."

What does it show? It shows that at least majority of the Members were influenced by that statement. They feel that our Prime Minister has been committed to this, and, therefore, as loyal party men, they have no freedom to depart from it. I say with due respect that the announcement of the statement from Bombay—particularly from Bombay—was a great provocative and indiscreet act on the part of the Prime Minister; it also constitutes to some extent a breach of the privilege of the House, the sovereignty of the House and of the Joint Committee which the House appoints. These bodies

must be given, technically and academically at least, full freedom to come to their own conclusions. When the leader, who is respected so much by his party men and even by non-party men makes such a categorical declaration against Bombay, we are perfectly justified in coming to the conclusion that he too, along with the other Members of the Treasury Benches, bears some animus in his mind against the Maharashtrians, against which we are bound to protest.

Shri Birendra Dutt (Tripura West): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, so long we have been hearing about Bombay. As far as this Bill is concerned, I feel that in spite of the many glaring defects, this Bill nevertheless represents a victory of the people's movement. It has drawn attention particularly to Bombay, because of the glaring faults it has committed in regard to Maharashtra. I do not know whether I will be able to draw the attention of this House at this stage to some other matters also.

Looking at the Bill, as it has emerged out of the Joint Committee, I have been going through the provisions made in regard to Union territories. The original Bill recommended the keeping of the territories directly under the Chief Commissioners. But, this Bill has recommended that for some of the territories, the law-making body will be the Parliament. Ever since we have come to this Parliament, we have been raising the question about the introduction of Legislative Assemblies for Manipur and Tripura. We were told that we were not undemocratically governed, because this Parliament itself was the law-making body for Tripura and Manipur. I cannot understand what new change has been brought about. No reason has been given why in all these territories there should not be any democratic set-up. It is very difficult to convince by arguments in respect of the grant of a democratic set-up for these territories. Only two Members of the Joint Committee have rightly observed that these territories must have some democratic set up. From

our own experience of the rule by this Parliament, we can refer to some facts. In Tripura, the last four-and-a-half years of rule by this Parliament has not helped us by bringing any reform in the land laws. In Tripura, there is a land law which was enacted by the Maharaja 75 years ago. This law is still prevailing in the State of Tripura. There were no panchayats during the Maharaja's regime. Nor has this Parliament given us any panchayat. No district board, no elected municipality. All these were demanded by the people again and again. After we came to this Parliament, we submitted memoranda, put questions, gave notice of cut motions. What has happened? It has not been possible for the Members of this Parliament to deal with the matters of such States. I do not blame the Members of this Parliament. But, how can this state of affairs be allowed to continue if Parliament does not consider the position there? These are going to continue there for a long time; for ever. Because, in the proposed amendment of the Constitution, we find that articles 239 and 240 are to be amended in such a way that these territories will never have any Legislative Assembly. The provision for Legislative Assemblies in Part C States occurs only in these articles. These are going to be amended. Even in the future, these territories will not have any Legislative Assembly or democratic set-up.

In Tripura, practically, the judiciary is not functioning. There is no court which would defend the rights of the people. Some graduates are appointed as magistrates in subdivisional courts and they do whatever they like. There is one Judicial Commissioner for Tripura and Manipur. He comes in rotation. Very few cases can be taken up by him. There is no machinery for the association of the people in making the law and in the judiciary. We asked for the introduction of panchayats. In the papers, in the Five Year Plan reports, in the Community Project reports, we find it is stated that the people must be associated and we find panchayats, municipali-

[Shri Biren Dutt]

ties and other bodies being set up. But, we have not got these institutions. When we ask for these things, we are told that the Chief Commissioner is formulating laws, these will be brought before this House and we will get all these things. We have not got anything during the last 4½ years. Tripura needs communications. Government have allotted sums. During the First Plan period, in respect of the development of internal and external communications, not more than 40 per cent of the amount allotted has been spent. Out of whatever has been spent,—I do not remember—may be about 71 per cent has been under the head 'pay and allowances', etc. A big sum was stolen. The Engineer has been punished on account of corruption charges. This is what has been going on during the rule by the centre. Government have supplied some information regarding community projects. During the last five years, in the community project areas, the pay and allowances come to Rs. one lakh. For other purposes, the expenditure is Rs. 25,000. The sum allotted is about Rs. 7 lakhs. That amount is not spent there. No development activity is carried on there.

In a Delhi paper, *Hindustan Standard*, of the 20th of July, there is a report which says:

"It is gathered that during the month ending July 18 last, eight bodies were sent to the local hospital for post-mortem examination. All of these were cases of suicide and were from the Sadar sub-division. Most of the bodies were of women of whom three were below 22 years. All of them were refugees."

When we ask a question whether the Government verify any report in the press, it is not even contradicted. Wherever we go, we see that people are dying in the roads for want of food, clothing and shelter. No remedy can be had from the Centre. Rule in the name of Parliament is seen to seal the crimes of the administration

in these areas. Representatives from Manipur and Tripura have always been crying for some change, for some form of responsible Government. For a very long time we have been fighting through the State's People's Organisation. I had the opportunity of being a member of the States Peoples Organisation which was led by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. From that time, we were told that the aspirations of the people of these States will be met. When this Parliament met, we came forward with a Private Member's Bill. When we tried to introduce this Bill, the Home Minister told us that he will himself bring a Bill and give us some form of democracy. Only the report of the S.R.C. is awaited. When the Manipur people began their struggle for responsible government, we were asked to wait till the report of the S.R.C. comes. Now, the report has come. When this Bill was introduced, the Home Minister said that Tripura has got one representative in the Council of States. This is the contribution of the S.R.C. in relation to Tripura and Manipur. We do not know whether the House will understand our position. I request the Members of this House to think over this issue. I only request that some form of democratic set-up be given to us. If anyone has experience of the Part C States of Manipur and Tripura administered by the Chief Commissioner, if anybody has gone there, he must have felt how badly the people are treated there. As I said at the beginning, this Bill represents the victory of the people's movement. I was expecting that the Members of the Joint Committee and the Government would at least concede the demand of the Part C States for having some democratic set-up in the internal administration. In this connection, I wish to refer to one thing. On the 22nd of this month, I asked a question here as to how many houses have been destroyed by the floods at Agartala. I was clearly told: "No, not a single house was destroyed." Yesterday when the Minister of Irrigation and Power gave a report about the floods, there

It is mentioned that almost all the small huts of Agartala town have been destroyed. This is how Minister in Parliament behaves in relation to Tripura. If you are going to continue this sort of rule of Parliament over these Part C States, it is sure to react very badly. We do not visualise that during the Second Five Year Plan period the people are going to react badly or should react badly, but you are forcing us through hunger, privation and the denial of democratic and human rights into a situation which is not palatable for any one of us. So, before this Bill is finally passed, I request every Member of this House and Members of the Government to reconsider about the status of the territories.

4 P.M.

I do not object to the term "territory", but even if the term "territory" is maintained as it is, I should urge upon the Government to think and to declare plainly how they are intending to administer these territories.

Now, Delhi and Himachal Pradesh have Legislative Assemblies. Even these States are also going to be administered by an Administrator and there should not be, according to this Bill, any Legislative Assembly. How this retrograde step can be proposed at this stage, I cannot understand. I see in the press all other areas, where you are going to introduce this Administrator's regime anew, all the people along with those of Tripura and Manipur are very much agitated. If you do not do anything, if you do not declare clearly in this House before passing this Bill how you are going to introduce a democratic set-up, I do not know how the people will react. I demand that there should be the set-up of a Legislative Assembly. It may be smaller than in other States, but it will guarantee the association of the people of those States in the day-to-day administration.

We should not trust only those persons who are sent from the Centre as God-sent people. We are finding that

they are not faultless. All the more, as you have given them unlimited power to rule over us, they are doing so much crime. Practically, our feeling is this that the people of these areas will never accept such a sort of arrangement even if it is accepted by the House.

We are facing death. It is not any propaganda. You have yourself given the report. I have got so many death reports. We write to the Chief Commissioner, to the Home Minister, to every authority, and what do we get? From the Central Government we get a reply conveying their sympathies, and they say that something will be done. When we write to them, they say: "You go to the local authorities. We have written to them." When we go to them they do not even see us, neither the Chief Commissioner, nor even the advisers. You have appointed Congressmen as advisers. They are also not giving thought to the problem of our State.

Yesterday I had a report that at Kamalpur, an area where the tribal people live, rice is selling at Rs. 60 and so hundreds of people are pouring into Agartala town. The policy will be there to beat them and send them into the jungle. In Amarpur rice is selling at Rs. 50. When we ask a question they say rice is selling there at Rs. 18 but the people are not really getting even at Rs. 60. This is the sort of thing we are getting from this Parliament.

So, we demand, we urge upon the Government to enquire about the administration there if they like and verify whether the statements made by us here are correct or not, whether these things are happening in that State or not, whether the people of Tripura will be satisfied with this sort of arrangement. I think they have no ground to be satisfied. Even the Government knows it. The Home Minister gave an assurance at Agartala. When a deputation met him, the Prime Minister said: "I am thinking of evolving some formula by which the people of the State can be associated in this zone", but in the

[Shri Biren Dutt]

Bill there is no such provision. So, I hope before passing this Bill some provision will be made for a Legislative Assembly for all the territories that you are now going to create by this Bill.

श्री चांडक (बैतूल) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने जो मुझे बोलने का अवसर दिया उसके लिए मैं आपका हृदय से आभारी हूँ।

जो यह बिल हाउस के सामने आया है मैं उसका स्वागत तो नहीं कर सकता लेकिन मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ। स्वागत इसलिए नहीं कर सकता कि मैं शुरू से ही इस विचार का था कि आज इस मौके पर जब कि हम अन्य बड़े बड़े कामों में लगे हुए हैं और जब कि हमारे मुल्क में आर्थिक स्वराज्य अभी आने को है, हमें देश का विभाजन भाषा के आधार पर नहीं करना चाहिए। लेकिन जो कुछ आन्ध्र में हुआ वह हमने देखा, आन्ध्र का निर्माण हुआ। परिस्थिति बदलती गयी, लोगों का काफी प्रेसर (अनुरोध) रहा। इस कारण कमीशन (आयोग) बिठाना आवश्यक हो गया और कमीशन बैठा। कमीशन की रिपोर्ट आयी और उसके बाद भी मुल्क में जो वाकयात हुए उन सब को हमने देखा। ऐसा मालूम होने लगा कि जो असंतोष इस कमीशन को बिठाने के पहले या कमीशन की रिपोर्ट आने के पहले हमारे मुल्क में था उससे कुछ ज्यादा ही असंतोष बढ़ गया और आज हम देखते हैं कि देश में किसी भी जगह संतोष नजर नहीं आता। आज सब जगह असंतोष ही असंतोष नजर आता है। चाहे हम किसी भी प्रान्त की तरफ नजर डालें हमको असंतोष ही नजर आता है।

4-07 P. M.

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava in the Chair]

चाहे आप बम्बई की ओर देखें, चाहे गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र की ओर देखें, चाहे बंगाल और बिहार की ओर देखें, आप किसी भी प्रान्त की तरफ नजर डालें, हर जगह यह

असंतोष है कि जो पहले नहीं था। इस प्रश्न को लेकर जो जो हुआ उसको हमने देखा और सुना। हमने यह भी देखा कि इस भाषा के विवाद को लेकर जिनसे हमारे सदियों के पुराने प्रेम, सम्भाव और सहकार्य के सम्बन्ध थे उनसे वे सम्बन्ध क्षण भर में टूट गये और टूटते जाते हैं। हम जिनके साथ सदियों से रहते आये हैं आज इस प्रश्न के कारण हम उनसे बोलना भी नहीं चाहते। आज हम एक दूसरे को अभिश्वास की निगाह से देखते हैं। यह परिस्थिति पैदा हो गयी है। इसलिए मैं इस बिल का स्वागत नहीं कर सकता। लेकिन मैं इसका समर्थन अवश्य करता हूँ क्योंकि यह हमारे देश के लोगों के विचार मंचन के परिणामस्वरूप अस्तित्व में आया है जिस प्रकार कि समुद्र मंचन से बहुत से तल निकले थे और साथ साथ अमृत और विष भी निकले थे। इस बिल का परिणाम अमृत में होता है या विष में यह तो भविष्य ही बता सकता है।

अब जो चीज हमारे सामने आई है उसको मैं इस निगाह से देखता हूँ कि या तो इसे स्वगित कर दिया जाये या इसे स्वीकार कर लिया जाये। मेरे स्थान से दोनों में कुछ न कुछ बुराईयाँ हैं, तब उनमें से जो कम बुराई की चीज है उसे स्वीकार करना चाहिए, यह मेरा दिल कहता है। इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि जब इतने विचार मंचन के बाद यह बिल हमारे हाउस के सामने आया है तब इसे आज की परिस्थिति में स्वीकार कर लेना चाहिए और इसलिए मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ।

समापति महोदय, इस स्पष्टीकरण के बाद कुछ दूसरी बातों की तरफ मुझे आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना है। प्रान्तों का विभाजन हुआ उसमें नागपुर प्रदेश के चार जिले नागपुर, गंडारा, चांदा और बर्बा, यह चार जिले मध्यप्रदेश ४ अलग कर दिये गये और महाराष्ट्र के साथ जोड़ दिये गये। वस्तुतः

इसका इतिहास यह है कि इन चार जिलों का सम्बन्ध कभी भी महाराष्ट्र के साथ नहीं रहा था और जोड़ते समय एस० धार० सी० कमिश्नर ने उसकी धार कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया और यह कहा गया कि इसको हम विदर्भ से अलग नहीं रख सकते। वास्तव में यह गोंडवाना प्रदेश था उनमें हर जगह गोंडों का राज्य था और सदियों से महाराष्ट्र के साथ कोई सम्बन्ध किसी प्रकार का नहीं था। लेकिन जब जोड़ दिया गया तो हम उसे मंजूर करते हैं। वास्तव में वहां न भाषा का झगड़ा था और न किसी धार बात का झगड़ा था। १५०-२०० वर्षों से पूरा मध्य प्रदेश एक साथ में रहता था या धार कोई किसी प्रकार का झगड़ा नहीं था लेकिन महाराष्ट्र के साथ यह हमारे चार जिले जोड़ दिये गये। केवल महाराष्ट्र वालों को चुस करने के लिये। मेरे खयाल से यह उचित नहीं हुआ, उसकी तरफ ज्यादा ध्यान देना चाहिए था। लेकिन अब जो कुछ हो गया है मैं उसे स्वीकार कर लेना चाहता हूं। अब यहां इतने सारे विचार मंचन के बाद, एक कमिश्नर, दूसरा कमिश्नर और तीसरा कमिश्नर, तीन बार कमिश्नर बैठे और चौथी बार उसके ऊपर कई बार विचार विमर्श होने के पश्चात् यह बिल आया है, सेलेक्ट कमेटी ने भी इसे स्वीकार किया लेकिन मैं इस हाउस में देखता हूं, कि बम्बई के प्रश्न को लेकर हमारे महाराष्ट्र के कुछ दोस्तों के दिल में काफी उग्रता है। मैं भी उसी एरिया (क्षेत्र) से आता हूं। नागपुर अब महाराष्ट्र में शामिल कर दिया गया है इसलिए नागपुर महाराष्ट्र का अंग है। मैं महाराष्ट्र का रहने वाला हूं और लगभग १५०-१७५ वर्षों से हमारा धार हमारे पूर्वजों का सम्बन्ध महाराष्ट्र के साथ यानी नागपुर के साथ रहा और मेरा यह ३६ वर्षों का सार्वजनिक जीवन महाराष्ट्र के इन दोस्तों के साथ बीता है लेकिन आज हाउस में जो बात मैं देखता हूं और हर तरफ से एक भावाच्च आती है और मैं इस बात को मानता हूं कि महाराष्ट्र के दोस्तों के दिलों में बम्बई के प्रति एक तीव्र भावना है और होना स्वाभाविक है। जैसा कि

इस हाउस में कहा गया है कि बम्बई के महाराष्ट्र का बनना बम्बई के चार जिलों के बनने के सवाल होगा और मुझे उससे इंकार नहीं है। लेकिन यदि बम्बई के इतिहास और बम्बई की सब चीजों को यदि हम अपनी गजबों के सामने रखें तो ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि बम्बई, महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात दोनों के लिए सिर का काम करता है, यह नहीं कि अकेले महाराष्ट्र के लिए ही ऐसा हो और इसीलिए यह एक बड़ा पेचीदा सवाल रहा, हमें एक उलझन का सवाल रहा और यही बम्बई है कि तीनों बार तीनों कमिश्नरों ने और आखिरी बार सेलेक्ट कमेटी ने भी बम्बई के बारे में एक निर्णय दिया। तीनों कमिश्नरों का निर्णय था कि बम्बई कभी मुनिसिपल (एक भाषा भाषी) प्रान्त में नहीं जोड़ना चाहिए और इसी तरह से हमें बम्बई का फायदा गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र दोनों को मिलता रहे, इसीलिए बाइलिसिपल प्रान्त की रचना की। अब जो कुछ बम्बई के सम्बन्ध में निर्णय हुआ है, मेरी अपनी निजी सम्मति में आज की परिस्थिति में इससे बाहर दूसरा कोई निर्णय नहीं हो सकता था और इसीलिए इस तरह का निर्णय किया गया।

यह कहा जाता है कि तीनों कमिश्नरों ने अन्याय किया, सेलेक्ट कमेटी ने अन्याय किया और पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने भी अन्याय किया कि बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र के साथ नहीं मिलाया। मैं इस बात को मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं। मेरा विश्वास है कि इस मुल्क के अन्दर सब से बड़ा डेमोक्रेट (लोकतन्त्रवादी) यदि कोई हो सकता है, जिसका कि डेमोक्रेटी (लोकतन्त्र) पर सबसे अधिक विश्वास हो या डेमोक्रेटिक तरीके से जो अधिक से अधिक चलना चाहते हों, तो वे व्यक्ति हमारे पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू हैं और यह कहना कि सब लोगों ने अन्याय किया, यह चीज मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है। हो सकता है कि वह चीज अक्षरही हो लेकिन अन्याय और भाव की परिभाषा करना बड़ी मुश्किल बात है। सवाल एंजोन्सट जस्टिस (अनन्य न्याय) का नहीं है

(श्री चांडक)

बल्कि यह सवाल कम्पैरेटिव जस्टिस (गुलना-त्यक न्याय) का है। एक के साथ हम न्याय करें तो कम से कम दूसरे के साथ अन्याय तो नहीं करना चाहिए और जब बम्बई में रहने वाले महाराष्ट्रीयन मित्र या महाराष्ट्र के लोग और बम्बई के दूसरे लोग जिनका कि सम्बन्ध है, गुजराती और महाराष्ट्री यदि दोनों आपस में एक दूसरे से मिल कर नहीं रहना चाहते तो मैं समझता हूँ कि घर के बुजुर्ग का यही फर्क होता है कि जो इस्टेट इस तरह बांटी नहीं जा सकती उसको अपने पास रखे और दोनों को उसका फायदा मिले। मैं नहीं सोचता कि इसमें किस प्रकार का अन्याय हुआ है। आखिर बम्बई महाराष्ट्र में यदि नहीं है तो किसी दूसरे प्रान्त को भी तो उसे नहीं दिया गया है और आज भी गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र दोनों उससे फायदा उठा सकते हैं। और फिर सवाल क्या है? सवाल यह है कि पांच साल के लिए वह मेंट्री एडमिनिस्ट्रेंड (केन्द्र द्वारा प्रशासित) रखा गया है तो इसमें क्या बुराई हो गई, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। यहां मैंने बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र में मिलाने के लिए बड़े जोरशोर के साथ रखे गये थार्गुमेंट्स (तर्क) सुनें, काका साहब के थार्गुमेंट्स (तर्क) सुने। उन पर मुझे अढ़ा है और वह हमारे नेता हैं और इसी तरह देशपांडे को भी सुना, उन्होंने भी बहुत काफी जोर से बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र में मिलाने की मांग को रखा लेकिन मैं उनकी दलीलों को नहीं समझ सका। बात चाहे जोर से कही जाये या धीरे से कही जाये उससे कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता है। जो थार्गुमेंट्स पेश किये गये उनमें कोई नवीनता की बात नहीं थी और अधिक जोर से कहने से लोगों के दिलों पर कुछ ज्यादा असर होता है, कम से कम वह मैं नहीं मानता। बात जब ठीक होती, योग्य होती और समबानुकूल होगी तभी लोगों के दिलों पर उसका असर हो सकता है और पांच साल के बाद मैं भी लोकसभात्मक पद्धति के जरिए ही बम्बई का निर्णय होने वाला है फिर उसमें क्या आपत्ति है, यह मेरी समझ

में नहीं आता है। महाराष्ट्र में भी मुझे लागू है कि हमारी विषय प्रवेश कांग्रेस कमेटी और नागपुर प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी ने कहा कि ७६ लाख की आबादी है, वहां पंडित नेहरू के निर्णय को सर्वसम्मति से स्वीकार किया है और उसका स्वागत किया है.....

श्री कामाचंडे पाटिल (अहमदनगर उत्तर):
सब ने नहीं किया है।

श्री चांडक : दोनों कांग्रेस कमेटियों ने सर्वसम्मति से स्वीकार किया है, यह मैं जानता हूँ और अधिकृत रूप से जानता हूँ क्योंकि मैं नागपुर की मीटिंग में हाजिर था। मैंने यह भी छहबार में देखा कि जो बम्बई के नेता हैं, श्री हिरे, उनका स्टेटमेंट अभी हाल में निकला है, उन हिरे साहब ने भी पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के निर्णय को मान्य किया है और जो कुछ निर्णय है वह आज की परिस्थिति में योग्य निर्णय है, ऐसा उन्होंने कहा है। ऐसी हालत में मेरी महाराष्ट्र के मिलों से बहुत नम्रतापूर्वक अपील है कि जो निर्णय हो गया है उस को वे मान लें। यदि वह यही कहते रहेंगे कि उन के ऊपर अन्याय ही अन्याय होता रहा, तो इस का सीधा मतलब यह होता है कि जब तक उन लोगों के न्याय की परिभाषा को न मान लिया जाये, जब तक उन की इच्छानुसार न्याय नहीं होता है तब तक उन के लिये सब जगह अन्याय ही होता है। इस चीज का मान लेना कोई उचित बात नहीं है। इसलिये मेरी नम्रतापूर्वक अपील है कि कम से कम पांच साल के लिये वे इस निर्णय को मान लें और बम्बई में सद्भाव पैदा करें। हमें विश्वास है कि यदि इस प्रकार का सद्भाव पैदा किया गया तो पांच साल के बाद बम्बई महाराष्ट्र में अवश्य आयेगा। आज सब से बड़ी आवश्यकता बम्बई के लिये यह है कि वहां सद्भाव पैदा किया जाये।

इस विषय पर चर्चा होने क समय हमारे कुछ मित्रों ने, मैंने कि हमारे आलाकर साहब

हैं, कुछ एमेंडमेंट (संशोधन) दिये हैं। उसी प्रकार से श्री के० जी० देवमुख भी बोले और उन्होंने बार्डर एरिया के बारे में बताया और फिसहाल नागपुर और बिदम से लगी हुई मध्य प्रदेश की सीमा की दो तीन तहसीलों का जिक्र किया, मुल्ताई, सौसर, भैसदेई आदि। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो फिगर्स उन के सम्बन्ध में दिये गये हैं, वे भ्रम फैलाने वाले हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इन तहसीलों में मराठी भाषियों की संख्या काफी है तथापि उतनी नहीं कि जिसका जिक्र इन लोगों ने किया है। मैं भी उन्हीं तहसीलों से घाता हूँ, सौसर और मुल्ताई मेरी कांस्टीट्यूंसी की तहसीलें हैं। मेरे पास एक किताब है जिस में से कुछ फिगर्स (आंकड़े) मैं आप के सामने रख रहा हूँ, और वह फिगर्स संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति की ओर से ही सप्लाई किये गये हैं। आप देखेंगे कि जिस तहसील सौसर का जिक्र किया गया है वहां मराठी भाषियों की संख्या ४८ परसेंट है, वैसे ही भैसदेई में मराठी वालों की संख्या २२ परसेंट है और मुल्ताई में कुल १९ परसेंट है। मुल्ताई तहसील में एक भी मराठी स्कूल नहीं है, बरसों से मुल्ताई और सौसर दोनों तहसीलें मध्य प्रदेश के साथ रहीं और वहां का सारा कामकाज हिन्दी में या पुरानी उर्दू भाषा में होता रहा है। मेरी भर्ज यह है कि इन तहसीलों के बारे में सारा मामला तय हो चुका है, अब उसको फिर से उठाना उचित नहीं है। जिस प्रकार से इंदौर और ग्वालियर बगैरह में महाराष्ट्री लोग हैं और लाखों की संख्या में हैं, वे आपस में घुल मिल गये हैं, उसी प्रकार से यहां क लोग भी उनक साथ घुल मिल गये हैं। वहां की जनपद सभाओं और ग्राम पंचायतों ने सर्वसम्मति से यह प्रस्ताव किया कि वे वहां पर ही रहना चाहती हैं। उन की किसी प्रकार की कोई डिमांड नहीं है, अब इस डिमांड (मांग) को सड़ा कर के एक नया प्रमेसा पैदा करना और कटुता पैदा करना कोई उचित बात नहीं

यहां माइनारिटीज (अल्प संख्यक) और सेफगार्ड्स (परिचाय) के बारे में बहुत सी

बातें कही गईं, मैं उन को सुनता रहा। हमारा वह मुल्क जहां कि सैकड़ों जातियां हवारीं बोलियां और सैकड़ों पंच हैं। मेरे अवास से तो हमारा यह मुल्क ही माइनारिटीज का मुल्क है आज तक कई प्रकार की माइनारिटीज रहीं। अब एम० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट के पश्चात् भाषा की माइनारिटी एक नई चीज पैदा होने वाली है। मैं इसके बारे में ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता क्योंकि हर प्रान्त में, हर जगह दो भाषाओं के लोग रहते हैं। आज किसी भी प्रकार से प्रांत की रचना हो, हम इस बात को नहीं मान सकते कि कोई प्रान्त एक ही भाषा का प्रान्त हो सकता है। वहां पर दो भाषाओं या तीन भाषाओं के लोग रहने वाले हैं। लेकिन माइनारिटीज के सम्बन्ध में, जो कुछ हमारी संयुक्त समिति ने कहा है, जो कुछ एम० आर० सी० ने अपनी सिफारिस की है, उन से आगे बढ़कर कोई सास बात बाकी रह जाती है ऐसा मैं नहीं मानता। कोई भी प्रदेश अपनी माइनारिटीज को नाकस कर के वहां ठीक तरह से अपना कारबार नहीं चला सकता। इस लिये जो कुछ सेफगार्ड्स (परिचाय) एम० आर० सी० (राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग) ने रिफॉर्म किये हैं और जो कुछ संयुक्त समिति की रिपोर्ट में रिफॉर्म (सिफारिस) किया गया है वह काफी योग्य और उचित है, उसे और ज्यादा तुल देना और हर जगह कटुता पैदा करना कोई अच्छी बात नहीं होगी। इस के लिये इस विधेयक में काफी प्राविजन (उपबन्ध) है और और ज्यादा किमी बात की आवश्यकता नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय—कहना तो काफी था लेकिन—अब चूंकि मेरा समय समाप्त हो गया है, इस लिये मैं अपना भाषण यहीं खत्म करता हूँ।

Pandit M. B. Bhargava (Ajmer South): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have been discussing the S.R.C. Report for a pretty long time in the country, and in spite of what has been argued with

[Pandit M. B. Bhargava]

eloquent advocacy by the protagonists of these linguistic States, I must say—and I have no doubt in my mind—that the verdict of history will be that they are the greatest disruptors of the security and unity of India.

An Hon. Member: Question.

Pandit M. B. Bhargava: Whatever may be the views of old Congress leaders in respect of the formation of linguistic provinces at the time when the country was involved in a life and death struggle for the emancipation of the country from thralldom and slavery under foreign rule, the views of Congress leaders after the attainment of freedom were bound to undergo, and have in fact, undergone, a change for the better. The Dar Commission Report and the J.V.P. Report clearly indicated that reorganisation of States purely and absolutely on the linguistic basis is only a medieval slogan and a medieval conception.

The formation of Andhra, which, I respectfully submit, was formed under the shadow of the great tragedy of a patriot—it emerged suddenly not as the deliberate result of the consideration of this question on a national level but under the shadow of a tragedy—was the precursor of this linguistic fanaticism which we are seeing for some time in the country, and the exuberance of which has come to the forefront after the publication of the S.R.C. Report. But if we analyse this Report, we find that even the distinguished personnel of this distinguished body refused to accept the theory of one State, one language. In fact, though the argument was refuted, the irony of fate is that their ultimate recommendations are mainly based upon the formation of States on a purely linguistic basis. The only exception made is in the case of the bilingual composite State of Bombay and Punjab. We have seen that the present Bill, as it has emerged out of the Joint Committee, has gone back upon those recommendations of the

S.R.C.—whatever may be the reasons, that is a different matter—with the result that the composite State of Bombay is now to be replaced by a bleak Maharashtra, by a Mahagujarat and a tiny city State of Bombay. The recommendation as to Punjab has also not been accepted by the Joint Committee and whatever is envisaged by this Bill is a truncated Punjab.

It has been argued by the advocates and protagonists of these linguistic States that everything will cool down after these passions have died down. We have seen—and there have been arguments about it—that the logical consequence of the formation of States on a linguistic basis is the question of the protection and safeguards to the linguistic minorities. Whatever may be said in favour of the linguistic States, any dissentient voice, at this stage, will be but a cry in the wilderness. But, still, it is my honest conviction that the virus of communalism injected into the body politic of the country, by the acceptance by our leaders of the Congress in the 1916 session, of the communal electorates, ultimately caused the vivisection of the motherland and the formation of two sovereign States of Pakistan and India. This poison of linguistic fanaticism which is now being injected and which, as a result of the acceptance of this Bill, will permeate the entire body politic of the country, I have no doubt, will create a great trouble for us in the future. I know it is difficult to stay out and to cry halt at this stage. But it requires the indomitable will and the dauntless courage of the Mahatma to say halt to this linguistic fanaticism. If this cannot be done and if it is said that it is too late, it is never too late to mend a blunder. But, if that cannot be done, how can we protect the security and unity of India and what is the guarantee that this cry of protection of the rights of minorities, as a result of the creation of these linguistic States, will not lead to the same results as past experience of communal minorities has proved? The

cry of safeguards for the minorities on a cultural and educational level will be extended to the representation of the minorities in the Legislature and the services. The cry, though it may be subdued in tone, is already there and nobody who has the interest of the country at heart and whole is an ardent nationalist can look with equanimity at this. We did attain freedom after a struggle for 60 years and that struggle is not yet over. Our struggle against a foreign power has come to an end: but the struggle against poverty, the struggle against squalor, the struggle against disease and our struggle against the disparity in income is still there. Having accepted the goal of the establishment of a socialist pattern of society, we have to pool all our energies and this question of the formation of linguistic States is most untimely and inopportune. It has already diverted the energies of the nation to the extremely low level of linguistic fanaticism with the result that a new problem is confronting us and we have to question seriously, 'Are we really a nation?'. The claim has been advanced in a bitter tone, with passion and on a mean level that this patch of territory must be included in the State of Bihar or this must go to the State of Bengal or that Bombay is the city belonging to the State of Maharashtra or to the State of Gujerat. But the preeminent question that must be before every nationalist is whether it be a territory here in the State of Bihar or in the State of Bengal or in the city of Bombay, it is preeminently of India and not at all of the linguistic State or group and it is on this national level that we have to consider these questions.

Our common allegiance to the magnificent Constitution guarantees common citizenship and common rights to every individual whether he belongs to any linguistic State or resides in a particular State. A man residing in the southernmost corner of India has a right to seek election to Parliament from any part of India. Is this conception that a particular

territory must belong to a particular State consistent with this right of common citizenship which is guaranteed to every citizen of India under our splendid Constitution? Therefore, my submission is that the entire debate that has taken place in this august House, which is supposed to represent choicest of intellects of the country, must be an eye-opener to every person who has the best of the country at heart. The debates in this House, on the three occasions when the question of State reorganisation was discussed, are reminiscent of a time when a part of this House was occupied by the Muslim League members of Mr. Jinnah. Consequently, it is time for us to take stock of the situation and to accept, if it is inevitable, the recommendations of the Joint Committee which represents the collective and deliberate wisdom of a large number of the distinguished Members of this House.

After these general observations, I have to make some remarks about the integration of the State of Ajmer with Rajasthan. I have, on previous occasions, drawn the attention of the House as also of the hon. Minister of Home Affairs that the integration of Ajmer with Rajasthan has to be made only if the interests and the importance of the State of Ajmer are safeguarded in the future set-up of the reorganised Rajasthan. The State of Ajmer has been kept apart from its natural moorings for centuries, not because the people of Ajmer wanted it but because it suited the interests of the Government at the Centre. For a time the last Indian Emperor Prithvi Raj made Ajmer the capital of his empire in preference to Delhi, and thereafter during the Moghul, the Mahratta and the British period, Ajmer has been occupying a preeminent position and determining and shaping the course of events in all the neighbouring and surrounding areas of Rajasthan. It is not because of any favouritism to Ajmer but because of its natural, elevated position that it has been responsible for

[Pandit M. B. Bhargava]

the decisive role it has played throughout its history. During the period 1948-49, the union of Rajasthan was in the process of formation and then we, the people of Ajmer, from the top of our voice raised this cry, namely that the integration of Ajmer with Rajasthan should be simultaneous with the other States of Rajasthan and it should be made, on account of its central and elevated position, the capital of the new Rajasthan. That was not the cry of Ajmer only. The view of the people of Rajasthan was expressed in the then Rajasthan Provincial Congress Committee that there might be a simultaneous integration of Ajmer, with Ajmer as the capital of the new Rajasthan. At that time, the hon. Home Minister and the Government of India on grounds of political expediency turned down this request, with the result that the State of Rajasthan was formed leaving Ajmer as an enclave of bureaucratic regime. Thereafter we fought for the democratisation of its set-up and got it after struggle, but now has come question of merger.

At this stage we are asked to approach the Rajasthan leaders in respect of the location of the capital. The Rajasthan leaders have shown their adamant and unsympathetic attitude. At the last conference which the representatives of Ajmer had with the leaders of Rajasthan, those leaders refused to consider the question on its merits and turned down our request even for the appointment of an impartial commission to examine the question of capital. Our claim is that if from every point of view, from the point of view of suitability, easy accessibility, from every part of Rajasthan, its central and elevated position, its salubrious climate, it deserves to be the capital of Rajasthan then and then only it should be located there. But they have turned down our request and are not prepared to reopen or reexamine the question. Our request that the matter may be left to the decision of the High Command has also been

turned down. Then what remains? The Central Government's political expediency suited it not to integrate it with Rajasthan with the result that it has been deprived of its rightful and honoured place which it deserved in the State of Rajasthan. Why should not the Central Government step in, exert its influence and persuade the leaders of Rajasthan to accept the justice of the case?

There is clause 52, which I welcome in the new Bill. Under this clause it will be open to the President to decide the suitable place for the location of the seat of the High Court. If for certain reasons the question of the capital cannot be immediately decided and has to be deferred for some time, our demand was that, on account of its central position, historical, geographical, cultural, national and even international importance, the High Court of Rajasthan should be located there. But even that request has fallen on deaf ears. I can only press upon the hon. Minister to do justice to Ajmer, because it was on account of the attitude of the Central Government that it was not integrated in 1948-49, with the result that it was deprived of its rightful and honoured place. If that was so, at least, while determining the question of the location of the seat of the judiciary or the High Court, Ajmer has a claim and that claim has to be recognised. There is no reason why this moderate demand should not be sympathetically considered and steps be taken to implement it.

Shri Sarangdhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack): I am very much surprised and even pained to hear so much about linguistic fanaticism and linguistic fury. Those from Bombay have used these phrases and others have imitated them. May I remind them that in Bombay City there may be a gathering of a Bengali, a Tamilian, a Telugu-speaking man, a Punjabi and a Gujarati-speaking man and they will be talking in English, in very good English. But when another Gujarati-speaking man appears there, will Shri

Shah assure me that he will talk to his friend in English or will he say—

Kernchho Muljeebhai ghane barasche?

I do not blame the Gujaratis for this. It so happens that with our 14 official languages it is a fact that in a cosmopolitan assembly, when we find another man speaking our language, we revert to our mother-tongue. That is where the two hearts commune with each other. A time will come when Hindi will become popular all over India and we may forget to speak in our own mother-tongue when we are in a cosmopolitan company. That is the custom in polished Euro-American societies.

So, it is futile for anyone to say that there is language fanaticism or language fury. If this linguistic business has come, we must see how it came. There was a time somewhere about 1949-50 when everyone thought that perhaps for ten to fifteen years this linguistic redistribution of provinces will not come, that the Prime Minister himself was adamant and was not going to yield to the linguistic demands. But something happened in Andhra. One of their leaders fasted upto death. Even the day before his death, the Prime Minister did not want to yield. But, after his death and after some civil commotion, the Prime Minister himself surrendered to linguistic demands and created the Andhra State and appointed the S.R.C. It is natural that those, who had been thinking of linguistic provinces speaking the same language, for the last 30-35 years, should take this up. The Congress Party itself created linguistic units even in one administrative province and there were two or three Congress committees as there were two or three languages. The desires and the emotions of the people of the different States were heightened, and there were enthused over the establishment of the Commission and they gave their memoranda. Enquiries were made. In some cases, according to the report of the Commission and the Bill that is before us, some new

States have been carved out with one language as far as possible. To go back and say that bilingual and trilingual States are necessary is absolutely going backwards. I want to remind the House that in the 19th century there was such a province—Bengal, Bihar, Assam and Orissa and parts of Bhonsale's Nagpur. It was one but their hearts did not become one. Then, they were bifurcated once in the 19th century, again in the second decade of this century and again in the third decade of this century. Four different States came out of that area.

It is wrong to think that we stand for unilingual States simply because of language. It so happens that of people belonging to particular languages or States, the majority is more dominating while the minority or less-advanced people do not get any chance of advancement. This had happened in the 19th century when Bengal monopolised everything in Calcutta. Patna and Cuttack were neglected. Then, again when Bihar and Orissa were combined in one province, Bihar dominated. Every development that was done, was done in Bihar and not in Orissa. These are things of the past. When we separated from Bihar or from old Bengal, we had no ill-will against the Bengalis or Biharis. As a matter of fact, many of the people in Orissa speak the Bengali language and admire and love it. Similarly, we also love Biharis. I have lived in Bihar many times myself. When Orissa wants something from Bihar or Madhya Pradesh or Bengal wants something from Bihar, certain factors should be taken into consideration. We should see the past history; how those areas came to be attached to different provinces, how the people speak Bengali or Oriya language, how they happened to become a minority in that province, etc. The moment we speak about certain parts of Bihar, our Bihari friends get excited and say that somebody is going to take something away.

From this point of view, the S.R.C. failed to do justice to certain areas and Orissa's claim is one of them. The Orissa Government and other public bodies and individuals submitted

[Shri Saranghar Das]

memoranda to the Commission—volumes of them. But, I do not believe that the Commission had the time to read them because they dismissed the case of Orissa in a cavalier fashion saying that such and such areas have been given to Bengal if any part of Seraikella sub-division is given to Orissa, then, Dhalbhum will become separated and there will be no physical connection between Bihar and Dhalbhum. Therefore, Orissa's case cannot be considered.

When I speak about Singhbhum district Sadr and Seraikella sub-divisions, I speak not only for the Oriya-speaking people who are the biggest majority among the non-adviasis, but mainly for the Hos. They are a tribe who have been migrating during the last half century or so from Chhota Nagour Plateau into the Singhbhum district. Lately, land is not available there and with the increase in their population, they have been migrating to districts in Orissa. During the last decade they have gone into the interior of Orissa. Why do they go to Orissa and not to the interior parts of Bihar? In Singhbhum itself, you will find that in a village where the House are living, there are some Oriya people—carpenters, blacksmiths, weavers, etc. They speak Oriya language as there is affinity between the two although one belongs to a tract while the other belongs to a tribe. That is why they go to Orissa. They are welcomed there. Lands are available and they get lands and live happily there. They have their representatives in the Bihar Assembly and out of twelve members, seven have expressed their desire to go to Orissa. Many of their mankis, mums and headman have sent in petitions to the Prime Minister, Home Minister and the S.R.C. but these had never been considered simply because the Prime Minister is afraid of certain things. If any more territory is disturbed in Bihar there will be trouble. He is afraid of the trouble. The Chief Minister of Bihar says that he will let

go not an inch of soil out of Bihar. Somebody else said that if any body dared to take any bit of land, rivers of blood will flow. I am thoroughly convinced that the S.R.C. and the Government are afraid of this intimidation.

5 P.M.

I would appeal to the Members from Bihar who are here against whom I have no ill-will and never will have any ill-will, whether this portion goes to Orissa or not, to look at these things dispassionately. I appeal to them to look at it dispassionately. The two ex-States of Seraikella and Kharsawan, against the Rajahs of which I myself fought in 1946-47, were under the Chhota-Nagpur Agency upto about 1916 because of administrative convenience. Then they were taken to Orissa Agency and at that time the Lieutenant-Governor, another English gentleman who was a Councillor and also a Bihari gentleman—I forget his name now—all agreed that they should go to Orissa. For years, for about a quarter of a century, the Political Department's annual memorandum had been listing these two States along with other States as Orissa States. Something happened when they were merged into Orissa. The Bihari leaders, not only in Bihar but here in Delhi also, hatched a conspiracy to make it hot for Orissa Government to stay there. A time came when, although the Bavdekar Tribunal was appointed to determine the wishes of the people, before he came to make his enquiries the situation became so tense that the Prime Minister and Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel at that time thought that it was very unseemly for two Congress Governments to fight against each other. They found one thing, that there was no contiguity of these two States with Orissa, because Mayurbhanj had not been merged into Orissa and it had remained independent during that year, 1948. Thereafter, when Mayurbhanj did integrate into Orissa there was no reason for these two States at least to remain away from Orissa. The people in Seraikella and Kharsawan have been agitat-

ing over it and have been demanding the amalgamation of the States with Orissa.

But the case of Orissa has gone by default, because both the Government of Orissa and we ourselves who represent Orissa here have a very weak voice. We cannot intimidate. We cannot do anything to apply pressure.

An Hon. Member: What about Puri?

Shri Sarangdhar Das: My friend wants to know about Puri. If the Government would initiate a judicial enquiry they would find what was at the bottom of Puri. It was not the people who went mad, it was because the officials and the police fired and then ran away. The people then took the law into their own hands. That is human nature; you and I would do it. That apart, I know all about the movement that was started in Orissa. I was not myself connected with it. I know from the outside that it was started by the students and it was a spontaneous outburst against injustice done to Orissa. Later on, when the Orissa Government yielded to pressure from Delhi, the movement was against both the Government of India and the Government of Orissa.

Therefore, it is wrong to say that because something happened in Puri, injustice must be done to the whole of Orissa, to 1½ crores of people. It is not the right way of tackling this thing and unless the border dispute, wherever there is some injustice, are rectified and settled, then you will have frustration and resentment in different parts of the country. That would be brewing for a long time and I do not believe the Five-Year Plan that you are launching will have the co-operation that it deserves.

Sir, I find you do not want to allow me any more time. I simply want to say that I endorse the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra. From what I saw yesterday I know the Maharashtra people, who are the sons and daughters of the descendants of Shivaji and Bal Gangadhar Tilak, will not take this insult lying down. If you do not

include Bombay in Maharashtra forthwith, you are storing trouble for the future.

Last of all, Sir, I want to say that the interests of minorities must be statutorily safeguarded either by a Board or by a Commissioner who will be responsible to the President and whose report will come to the Parliament.

Shri N. E. Munniswamy (Wandiwash): Mr. Chairman, I have to sing a different tune altogether. The reason is on question of principle I am opposed to this reorganisation of States. The reorganisation of States has been in a way agitated over for a very long time, but for various reasons the Prime Minister was not for carving out any State on the basis of linguism. Sir, I should say that this States Reorganisation Bill is an unfortunate Bill in the sense that it has created tremors in one State, earthquakes in other States and, as a matter of fact, indifference in some other States. I say 'tremors' in the sense that so far as border areas are concerned some people want that they should be included in one area while others have been agitating for their inclusion in some other area. I say 'earthquakes' in the sense that we have altogether liquidated the multilingual State of Hyderabad. I say 'indifference' because so far as U.P. is concerned, it is not affected and so it is safe.

Sir, I visualise some gloomy things so far as for India is concerned in case this Bill is implemented. We have gone through a good deal of our journey in pushing this Bill to a stage from where it is not possible to retrace, but I can insist, Sir, that this Bill should be deferred for some time, say for a period of 10 or 15 years, because we have got the Five-Year Plan ahead and we have to seek the assistance and co-operation of the people of all areas. We have got to get the mandate of the people so that they may give proper thought whether the States have to be reorganised in the fashion in which it has been done.

Sir, with a view to push this Bill through, certain other stages in some

[Shri N. R. Muniswamy]

other aspects have also to be gone through. With a view to make this Bill easily passable we have to seek the amendment of article 3 of the Constitution. I am narrating these things only with a view to justify my reason that this Bill should be deferred and you all will be pleased to listen to me about some of the incidents which I would like to bring before you so that you may see with what force I am insisting upon this postponement.

When this article 3 was sought to be amended by a separate Constitution (Amendment) Bill it was thrown out—everybody is aware of it—for want of majority. Again in the same session after a period of 10 or 15 days another Bill of the same type with slight variations was sought to be introduced and then objections were taken. The then Speaker—since deceased—wanted a day more for giving his ruling on that aspect. The next day, you all will remember, an hon. Member moved a motion with a view to suspend certain rules of the Rules of Procedure with a view to allow this Bill to be passed. So, that was the second stage when that Bill was passed to allow this Bill to be pushed through all the stages without hindrance.

The third stage is this. One might perhaps laugh at me when I say it. This Bill was introduced by the Home Minister when there was a solar eclipse. Ordinarily, for the Hindus, a thing that is done on the day when a solar eclipse occurs is bound to result in disaster later on, though not on the same day. So, that is the third obstacle in the way of the Bill.

There is also another aspect—the fourth aspect. When the Prime Minister wanted to intervene and when he suggested the formation of the zones and the zonal councils, unfortunately, electricity failed and he had to raise his voice, say, for about ten

minutes, and thereafter the supply of electricity was restored. These are the signs which I believe are not good, and I believe these are not good omens for the successful termination of this Bill. Thus, there is some gloom hanging over us and we have to imagine what is going to happen when this Bill is implemented. That is why I say that though we have discussed this Bill half-way through, this Bill should be postponed for a certain period and be taken up again when emotions would have calmed down and a better atmosphere might prevail. In view of these four reasons, rather the four incidents which I have cited, I would request the Home Minister to think thrice before he implements this Bill. I have no objection to postpone the Bill though the Bill has passed through very many stages, in this House and the other House. I want that the President should suspend his assent to this Bill for some time, for the good reasons that I have given.

Now, let me come to the provisions of the Bill. I find that the zones and zonal councils have been mentioned in Part III of the Bill. I should say that Part III need not have been put in at all, because I find that article 263 of the Constitution provides for co-ordination between States through such councils. I may be permitted to read article 263 of the Constitution which runs as follows:

“263. If at any time it appears to the President that the public interests would be served by the establishment of a Council charged with the duty of—

(a) inquiring into and advising upon disputes which may have arisen between States:

(b) investigating and discussing subjects in which some or all of the States, or the Union and one or more of the States, have a common interest; or

(c) making recommendations upon any such subject and, in particular, recommendations for the better coordination of policy and action with respect to that subject, it shall be lawful for the President by order to establish such a Council, and to define the nature of the duties to be performed by it and its organisation and procedure".

So, I respectfully say that we have already got a provision in the Constitution. As regards the co-ordination of the States with regard to certain policies, economic or industrial we have got provision for a council in the Constitution. But yet I find that detailed provisions have been put in this Bill. Certain procedures have also been prescribed and they have to be followed at the time of arriving at a decision. I would submit that in view of a separate provision in article 263 of the Constitution, there is no need to have a separate chapter such as Part III, in this Bill. It may be that the Prime Minister, while he wanted to push in these zonal councils, did not think of the existing provision in the Constitution. I would say that he never, for a moment, would have thought of article 263 of the Constitution. I find from the Bill that Part III provides for zonal councils, the procedure for the meetings of the zonal councils, the advisers, and above all, for inter-State zonals also. In view of the provision which already exists in article 263 of the Constitution, Part III could be eliminated from this Bill. When a council is appointed by the President, under the provisions of article 263 of the Constitution, further procedure could be prescribed and orders issued in due course. Therefore, Part III may be eliminated from the Bill.

Regarding Part II, I find that clause 14 enumerates the number of States in the new set-up. The clause says:

"As from the appointed day, in the First Schedule to the Constitution, for Part A, Part B and Part C, the following Parts shall be substituted, namely:—

Then the names of the new States have been given. The States have been classified into Part A, Part B and Part C. But in the First Schedule to the Constitution, we find a Part D State also—Andaman and Nicobar Islands. I would like to know whether Part D is being retained, for, I find that only three classifications of States have been given in the Bill. The Bill does not mention Andaman and Nicobar Islands. In Part C, the following States are mentioned in the Bill, namely, Bombay, Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura and the Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands. I do not find Andaman and Nicobar Islands in Part C. Evidently there is an error or probably there will be a seventh or eighth Part C State.

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): It is a part D State.

Shri N. R. Muniswamy: I know it is so mentioned in the Constitution, but I do not know why it has been given a clean go-by in this Bill. In the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill, which we will be discussing in this House later, Part D State has been mentioned. So, I want to know the reasons why the Part D State has been omitted in this Bill.

Shri Venkataraman: It becomes a Union territory.

Shri N. R. Muniswamy: But there must be some provision for it in the Bill. Otherwise, there is some incongruity. That is what I wanted to say.

As regards Pondicherry, there is no mention at all about it in this Bill. I am speaking subject to correction. What is the future of Pondicherry? Is it to go to Madras or is it to have a separate status? I do not find any provision in this Bill or in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill.

Shri Venkataraman: I do not want to interrupt but I may point out that the French settlements including Pondicherry have not yet become part

of India. The *de jure* transfer has not yet taken place. Only an agreement for *de jure* transfer has been signed.

Shri N. E. Muniswamy: I think there is some slight misunderstanding on the part of my friend. *De jure* transfer is already over and it has been effected, at the time of introducing this Bill.

Shri Venkataraman: *De facto* transfer is over. An agreement for *de jure* transfer has been signed. *De jure* transfer has not been effected.

Shri N. E. Muniswamy: I do not agree, with both of them. It may be a mistake of fact, but I find from the earlier speech of the hon. Prime Minister that *de jure* transfer has also been effected. If that is correct, then my argument is correct.

In the Bill, 21 States have been mentioned—14 in Part A, one in Part B and six in Part C. Including Andaman and Nicobar Islands, we will be having in all 22 States. Originally, we had 28 States—9 Part A States, 8 Part B States—10 Part C States, and Part D State. We wanted to eliminate as many States as possible. But we now have 22 States according to the Bill. So, only six States have been eliminated. Those six States happen to be merged or they have been enlarged along with other States. As against the balance, we have got six zones, including one zone which is not catalogued in the Bill. The five zones mentioned in the Bill will have as much power as the States themselves. When the inter-zonal council is formed—that is, when two zones meet for common purposes—it becomes the sixth zone. Adding the sixth zone, we get in all 28 States, considering each zone a State by itself. The zonal councils will have as much power as the States, and that is why I am considering them as States.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): They have got police force also.

Shri N. E. Muniswamy: Yes; even when we are discussing this Bill, the police force is round about us. The police force is everywhere. The police force is behind you and before you. I have been persuaded now to say that there is no need to go into details, because they may be taken up during the clause-by-clause consideration. I will just say one small thing before I close.

So far as the High Courts are concerned, it is not clear whether the advocates who have been given recognition to practise in a particular territory will automatically be given recognition to practise in the new corresponding territory after the reorganisation of the States. If they are not automatically given recognition, there will be certain difficulties. They will have to pay the enrolment fee again. I say that the moment a territory is transferred from one State to another State, the advocates who have been practising in the old territory must be automatically allowed to practise in that High Court to whose jurisdiction the territory has been transferred, because they reside there and they cannot be asked to pay the enrolment fee again. Also, a time-limit must be fixed within which they can choose to remain in the same State or go to the transferred State. That provision is missing in this Bill. Therefore, I would respectfully submit that hon. Minister may bring forward a Government amendment, enabling the advocates to have their practice in the new area.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Tek Chand (Ambala-Simla): Before I say anything in support of the Bill, which I do, I wish to pay my sincere tribute to the statesmanship, patience, and wisdom of the Chairman of the Joint Committee. He was most patient and he gave everybody full scope to offer his views, with which he may or may not agree.

With respect to the States reorganisation itself, my reaction has been rather varried. I do not find fault with the Bill as it is; but, the Bill has succeeded in unmasking some of our national weaknesses. It has brought to the forefront some of our foibles and failings; and, if they go unchecked, they may have very serious consequences on the future of this nation. It seems that we, as a nation, have been suffering from certain fostering sores. Platitudes, pious utterances and wishful thinking seem to have covered them up. But, the moment this Bill was on the anvil, we discovered ourselves and we saw ourselves in true perspective. Have we been thinking unitedly as one nation and as inheritors of one culture? What has happened? Our actions have belied our professions. Whether it is Punjab or Bombay, fissiparous tendencies have painfully manifested themselves everywhere. It appears that our attachment is either to the race, or to the community, or to the small territory or to the linguistic group. Our attachment may be for Punjab, Maharashtra or Bengal; but, it seems to exclude loyalty to the nation and loyalty to the country. (*An Hon. Member: Question*). We have developed and we have displayed centrifugal tendencies; we are inclined to be centrifugal. Instead of uniting India, knitting India, into an integrated whole, we want to carve out India. There should be a Maharashtra, a Punjabi India, a Gujarati India and so on. Learned speakers, known for their circumspection and wisdom, have been using expressions like "my community", "my race", "my linguistic minority" and so on. I wonder if that would be a correct approach on the part of those people who believe in the oneness of the country and who believe in the unity and integration of every part and parcel of this country into one unified whole.

This Bill is not the cause of bringing about fissiparous tendencies; but, this Bill seems to have removed the

curtain and laid bare what is across the window for us to see and for us to mend. It has exposed our weaknesses; it has highlighted our shortcomings. The question is, are we wedded to parochialism? Do we owe allegiance to linguism, communalism, racialism or any other ism or do we stand by the oneness of the country? The object of the Bill was to unify the country, to integrate India; and, we should really have steered clear of the claims of regions on lingual, racial or any other basis. I feel that language is both a blessing as well as a curse. It is a blessing when people who speak the same language are very often kept together by language. It is a curse where a person speaking one language treats another person speaking a different language as if he were a foreigner, an alien. That being so, one principle that should have been borne in mind was that there should have been no State created in India which was not at least bilingual. If it were possible to have multilingual units, that would have gone a long way to weld the different language-speaking groups. I would have welcomed this measure a lot more if, instead of having so many States, India were divided into five States—North, East, West, South and Central. What has been brought on the surface as a result of the tumults, disturbances and blood-shed in the various parts of the country? What has been brought up on the surface is perhaps that this nation, in order to stand together, must be completely and absolutely unitary and not divided into federal units. In order to keep us together, a time may come when we may have to abolish all the States, and there should be one central administration. The myth of the part sovereignty of the States must be exploded, and the earlier the better.

Everybody has been telling of his particular ills, of his particular difficulties. I feel that the place I come from, like some other places, has also been on the edge of a volcano. Fissi-

[Shri Tek Chand]

parous tendencies are very much in evidence and curiously enough, there are fissiparous tendencies between people speaking the same language, between people among whom inter-marriage is common, between people who belong to the same caste, and between people who profess the same religion and observe the same religious worship. I am glad, as a result of contacts between senior statesmen, at least one community feels satisfied. I am very happy indeed that the Sikhs feel that their grievances have come to an end. They feel that their just claims have been conceded. I congratulate them on that. There is, on the other hand, the majority community that appears to be dissatisfied according to the expressions of particular leaders in the public press. Some of their fears may not be well-founded—probably they are not—and some other grievances may be fully justified, and therefore, require careful and sympathetic consideration.

It is a great satisfaction, whether a person's grievance is redressed or not redressed, if he has a feeling that his point of view has been heard with patience, has been examined and considered though the result turns out to be against him. It is a matter of great satisfaction if a person is permitted to let off steam and thereby ease his chest. Then he feels soothed. Even if his case is not accepted, he nurses no grudge, he entertains no grievance. There is a considerable pent up emotion, pent up feeling that he has not been permitted to have his say. Perhaps it may not be too late even now and perhaps the little gulf, that there is, may still be bridged if the point of view of the majority community is examined with their leaders, and if it is possible with the consent of both the communities to arrive at a certain amicable settlement. It is only a small adjustment here or a trivial concession there that may cement the relationship between the two communities for all time to come.

I come from Punjab. Though I come from the Hindi-speaking zone, I

happen to be Punjabi-speaking myself. I do endorse every point of view submitted to the House by the hon. Member Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava. I endorse his words. But, I do feel this much that on the question of script, an understanding can be arrived at if there is a certain via media. It does hurt the people, at least the majority community who have been using as a vehicle of their expression the Urdu script or the Hindi script that the Gurmukhi script is being rammed down their throats. Perhaps, it would be better if the matter were left to the parents to select whether Punjabi is going to be taught in the schools in the Hindi script or the Gurmukhi script, to their children. If the choice is left to the parents, that would, for all time to come, close all the differences. Even if for any reason my Sikh brethren have a feeling that that would result in a stepmotherly treatment of Gurmukhi script, my suggestion to the Government is that it may be provided that every citizen of Punjab shall have to learn Punjabi in Gurmukhi script and at the same time, Hindi in Devnagri script. There will be no objection that Hindi and Gurmukhi are started together in the schools. At the same time, the Sikhs will have a feeling that non-Sikh children start their education with Gurmukhi and the Hindus will have a feeling that Hindi is not being neglected. According to what is described as the Sachar formula, for the first five years, education will be imparted in Gurmukhi script to the exclusion of the Hindi script, unless of course, there are ten such children for every class and 40 students in a school who insist upon the Hindi script. This would remove the difficulties and it will pave the way for understanding if in the Punjabi region Gurmukhi and Hindi were to be taught as compulsory languages from the first class. Again a similar option may be given that up to the district level, the language must be Gurmukhi and as an optional language, Hindi may be used too. Hindi should not be given up, it being

the Rashtrabhasha for the whole country.

✓ Shri Syamañdan Sakaya: Will that be so in both the regions?

Shri Tek Chand: Hindi must be all over. The question of region does not arise.

There is one matter. So far as the regional formula is concerned, it is today couched in a language that is nebulous. It would be better if the regional formula of Punjab were modelled on the formula for Maharashtra. That is to say, the new article 371 of our Constitution should not have clause (1); but, for the purposes of Punjab and Andhra Pradesh, it should be modelled on clause (2), whereby the procedure, rights, powers and obligations should be defined in a piece of legislation and should not be left to imagination or left to rules which are necessarily flexible, which are necessarily elastic.

With respect to Himachal Pradesh, I wish to say one word. This region's importance from a strategic point of view is bound to increase. It forms an international boundary and, unfortunately, an international boundary which is not clearly demarcated. That being the position of Himachal Pradesh, we feel that it should form part of a bigger unit whereby the international boundary can be watched carefully and projects regarding roads, dak bungalows and other measures of development may be taken in hand. If, in the wisdom of our statesmen, it is considered that, for some time, Himachal Pradesh should stay away—I wish they could be persuaded not to do that—at least the period may be made known now. My feelings are that for parochial reasons, leaders of Himachal Pradesh will all the time be fanning the flame of dissatisfaction to avoid joining with the contiguous region of Punjab. That being so, the period should be mentioned now so that Himachal Pradesh, by a certain appointed date may form part of Punjab.

One word more and I have done. I welcome the provision as to Zonal Councils. At least here will be a little bridge between the different States and the different zones whereby they can come together and make contacts, in conferences and in consultations with one another. Thereby, they will avoid thinking on separatist lines.

With regard to High Courts, I wish to say this much that we should have large High Courts and Judicial Commissioners' courts must be abolished. Now there happen to be three Judicial Commissioners' courts, one for Himachal Pradesh, one for Tripura and another for Manipur. The Judicial Commissioners' courts for Tripura and Manipur can be brought under the jurisdiction of the Assam High Court, and so far as the Himachal Pradesh Judicial Commissioners' court is concerned, that should immediately be brought under the jurisdiction of the Punjab. That will be in the interests of the people of Himachal Pradesh themselves.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I had the privilege of serving on the Joint Committee, but I regret that, at the time the report was being finalised, I had to go to my constituency with the result that I could not submit my Minute of Dissent. Had I done that it would not have been so necessary for me to participate in this debate at this stage.

As you know, I have already stated more than once on the floor of the House that I am totally opposed—I have been always, it is nothing new in my life—to the re-distribution or reorganisation of States on a purely lingual basis. I have always taken the stand that it should be on administrative grounds. Let economic, geographic, linguistic, cultural and other factors come into the picture and harmonise with the supreme necessity of the administration. My honourable friend who has just spoken may call it the necessity of the defence of the realm. You may call it anything you like, but if you do it on the purely linguistic principle, you just remain

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

where you are. You do not solve any problem.

I may just indicate the problem from the tribal point of view. I know there are only 14 languages that have been officially recognised in the Constitution. There are many more languages, some of them much better developed than some of the 14 languages that are in the inventory of the Constitution. Take my own language, Mundari. There is not one single Member here who knows it. Not one of them knows that my language has a 14 volume dictionary. I do not think Dr. Katju who was Governor of Orissa has ever heard of that. (Interruption) If you like, I can speak it for the edification of my friend Shri Feroz Gandhi. I hope he will come every morning and take lessons from me and improve his own language in consequence.

The point is this and it is a fact that there are more people who speak the Mundari language than Kashmiri or even Oriya or some of the other languages. Supposing that had been one of the recognised languages, how are you going to solve this problem of the reorganisation of States on a linguistic basis for the Mundari-speaking people? You just cannot do it. You will have to disrupt several States all over the place. Therefore I oppose this question of reorganisation on a purely linguistic basis.

I have a very serious grievance against the Government over this Bill and the next Bill that is to come. I feel that the task of reorganisation should have been done under one Bill only. The other day I raised a point of order. Unfortunately, the Speaker could not understand my point of order. So, I take this opportunity to explain what exactly I meant and I hope the Secretary will convey what I meant to submit at that time. There were Members from the States of Orissa and Bihar....

Shri A. M. Thomas: On a point of order. Is it open to any hon. Member to appeal in the way he has done on

the floor of the House to the Secretary to convey anything to the Speaker?

Shri Jaipal Singh: I submit it is very much in order.

Mr. Chairman: Even if this appeal was not made, the proceedings would be looked into by the Speaker if he said it should be brought to his notice. There is nothing wrong about that.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Thank you.

There were some hon. Members from the States of Orissa and Bihar who were very much interested in bringing forward certain amendments during the Joint Committee stage of this first part of the States Reorganisation Bill. In other words, my friends from Orissa wanted certain chunks from Madhya Pradesh and from Bihar. Similarly, I wanted a nice chunk from Uttar Pradesh, from Bengal, from Orissa and from Madhya Pradesh and so on. There might be many other amendments also. Now, the Chairman ruled that as the scope of the Bill as it was drafted then did not include the taking up of anything from Bihar or Bengal, the amendments of my friends, the hon. Members from Orissa, were out of order. Similarly, I was also ruled out of court, and we were given the hope that at a later stage we might bring in these amendments. Now, we have had the Bengal and Bihar (Transfer of Territories) Bill. When I come to that I will be told that Orissa is not mentioned there. You can do nothing there either. In other words, I may, with all humility, say that we have been cheated out of it. That is why it would have been very much better if the total task of reorganisation had been under one Bill, because just now there is no constitutional way, there is no legal way of enforcing our amendments. It would mean that we have to come into power on the other side and bring another amendment, the eleventh amendment of the Constitution. That is the only way we can make our wishes known to the country. My honourable friends from Orissa have

to way now of airing their grievances, whether they are right or wrong, but I think they should have had that opportunity. I think Parliament should have given them an opportunity to say what they had to say in regard to their claims, whether they are claims on Bengal, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh or may be Uttar Pradesh. That is a very serious point, because, as far as we are concerned in that part of the country, even after both the Bills have gone through, you are going to leave behind a sense of bitterness. I have said I think we have been done out of it. Very unfair.

Having said that, I think I better go on to the other point, the point that was stressed by Shri Frank Anthony and by my honourable friend Shri Asoka Mehta in regard to some mechanism that must be devised whereby linguistic minorities may feel really satisfied. I, as an Adivasi, had to put to the test the guarantees in regard to Adivasis in the Constitution. There we have definite directives which were to be given by the President, certain things that States have to do. When the Constitution came into operation, what happened? Take my own State of Bihar. We have in the Constitution such a thing as the Tribes Advisory Council. For 18 months the Council was not appointed because the Congress Party did not get the majority of tribal seats in that State. Eighteen months it took them. Similarly, take the annual debates we have on the report of the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and other backward classes. What has happened? The first three years, he told us, none of the States would reply to his correspondence. They took no notice of it. Therefore, when my hon. friend the Home Minister tells us, as he did in the Joint Committee, that he would appoint a Commissioner for Languages, I begin to have the same doubts. Here in the Constitution there is in black and white something that is justiciable, enforceable, which is defied by the States. What protection have we in the word of even a revered person like the

hon. Home Minister? I feel we must have it in the Constitution itself. Let the States defy it. We cannot leave this matter to their good sense, to their sense of democratic justice as we call it. It has already been abundantly stressed. So, I need not dilate on that any more. But I do support what has been already said by my hon. friends Shri Frank Anthony and Shri Asoka Mehta and also supported by Shri Sarangdhar Das.

I know it is rather difficult for those of us who are far removed from Western India to give our opinions about Maharashtra or Gujarat or Bombay or Punjab or the like. As I have already said earlier on, as I do not believe in purely linguistic States, may I venture to suggest that to my mind, there seems to be only one solution, for the time being,—until such time as better wisdom and better temper obtain in this country,—namely the Maharashtra-cum-Gujarat-cum-Bombay solution, not on the so-called balanced bilingual State basis, but on the basis of the Maha-maha-Maharashtra, the Maha-maha-Gujarat and the Maha-Bombay put together. It is impossible to find a line of demarcation beyond which there is no Maharashtra, or beyond which there is no Gujarat and so on? To my mind, that seems to be the best solution.

We have the same problem in the eastern sector, in the dispute we have, a very unfortunate one, between Bengal and Bihar. We shall be discussing it later on. There, we have exactly the same problem.

My hon. friends have stressed that thousands of Hos have been going to Orissa from the district of Singbhum. I happen to belong to that tribe, the Mundari tribe, and Hos is only a subsection of it, and, I think I am more competent to talk of the routes these various tribes have taken.

It is with great regret that I have to take to task hon. Members from Orissa, because, again and again, I find they are repeating the same falsehoods, patent falsehoods. I have tried

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

to repudiate them outside, elsewhere, and here also, but I find that they think that they can get the better of us in the State of Bihar, by detailing out to this House what is not too well known to the hon. Members of this House, and it is as you find it in the minute of dissent by one of the hon. Members. Six of the Members from the district of Singbhum have said that they want to go to Orissa. Now, who are those six?

May I just point out to my friends from Orissa, my hon. friends from Orissa, my very hon. friends from Orissa, that they were all elected on the Jharkand Party ticket? Was it there in the election manifesto that they should go to Orissa?

Shri E. N. S. Deo (Kalahandi—Bolangir): They have given their reply.

Shri Jaipal Singh: They have, I know. But I do not know why they do not resign and seek a bye-election. If they do that, we shall be very happy. But I know they do not, they dare not. But they are very happy to get jeeps and trucks and the like and these are very great attractions. They got elected on a specific manifesto, but when it suits them financially and otherwise, when they get jeeps and the like, they just act against the manifesto, because there is nothing in the law to compel a man who betrays the manifesto, a particular electorate to resign his seat and seek a bye-election. I do hope my hon. friends from Orissa will not provoke me to divulge anything more.

Everyone of those MLA's has been expelled from the Party. In the minute of dissent also, one particular gentleman is called the ex-leader of the Opposition. What is the Opposition in the State of Bihar? It is the Jharkand Party. Now, why was that particular gentleman expelled? My hon. friends do not explain that. There is nothing more that I would like to say on this matter.

But I would make one appeal, if my humble voice can carry any weight, and it is this that this matter of reorganisation of States, to my mind, has been ill-timed, and I think, even our leaders have to be more sane than we are. Much is being said, many vitriolic statements have been made on the floor of this House, statements which are not going to help our leaders to mend matters. It is for them now to take the initiative. They have to see not only the sense that has impelled all the elected representatives of the people, but they ought to have their eyes wide open to see what is happening outside, whether it is in the matter of the Punjab, Maharashtra, or Orissa, or whatever else it may be. They should be courageous enough to read things properly, and not try to run away from facts, because by having temporary solutions, I submit, we are not going to solve problems. It is very much better that we remain where we were, than to have these temporary solutions which will only go to aggravate the situation, something for which we have already paid dearly; it is not such a cheap price for reorganisation, as was attempted to be made out, but it was a very heavy price. If we are going to set about it this way, it seems to me that what we are trying to build overnight by enacting a Bill of this sort, we shall be demolishing completely. So, I would appeal to our leaders to be big enough.

If they have made a mistake, there is nothing wrong in saying, 'Well, we worked on the wrong premises'. Here is public feeling. Let them be brave enough, and great enough to admit the mistake. Greatness lies in acknowledging a mistake. There is nothing wrong in acknowledging it. They are not infallible people. Is the Congress Party infallible? Is Congress leadership infallible? We are not infallible either.

But it seems to me that, from day to day, we are beginning to see things

that are most undesirable for the healthy development of this great country. I appeal to our leadership on the other side to take stock of the situation, not from the overwhelming things, or superficial things of people marching hundreds of miles and so on. I am not thinking of those things—There are other ways of feeling the pulse of the people.

But it is definite, I think, that we are making some serious blunders, if we accept the Bill as it is. I appeal to the leaders to rise to the occasion and do the right thing by the people.

शाला धरिषित राम (हिसार): सभापति महोदय, मैं आपका बहुत मशकूर हूँ कि आपने इतना कम वक्त होते हुए भी मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया। पंत जी ने अपनी स्पीच करते हुए एक बात कही थी कि हम ने इस बिल के तैयार करने में बहुत मेहनत की है और सलेक्ट कमेटी ने बहुत मेहनत की है, इस बास्ते इसको मंजूर कर लेना चाहिये लेकिन साथ ही उन्होंने यह भी आशा दिलाई थी कि अगर उसमें कोई अमेंडमेंट की गुंजाइश महसूस होगी तो वह उसको करने के लिये तैयार रहेंगे। हमारे लिए इससे बड़ कर और ब्या खुशी हो सकती है कि हम पंत जी जिन्होंने देश की इतनी सेवा की और लाख तीर से इतनी मेहनत कर रहे हैं, उनके साथ इतिफाक करें और अगर कोई अमेंडमेंट इसमें करना जरूरी मालूम हुआ तो मैं समझता हूँ कि जैसा कि उन्होंने वायदा किया है, उस पर अमल करने में उनको कोई दिक्कत पेश नहीं आयेगी।

अब मैं उरा पंजाब की बाबत कुछ बातें हाउस के सामने रख करना चाहता हूँ। पंजाब की हिस्ट्री अगर आप मुलाहिजा करमायेंगे तो आपको पता चलेगा कि पंजाब का पार्टीशन होने के बाद से अकाली पार्टी की तरफ से लगातार एक एजिटेशन (आन्दोलन) होता रहा कि उन को संतोष नहीं है। अकालियों को

सिकायत रही है कि सर्विसेज (सेवाओं) के अन्दर उनके साथ इसाफ नहीं होता है। जबान के मामले में उनके साथ इसाफ नहीं होता और मजहबी मामलात में उनके साथ इसाफ नहीं होता है, इस बास्ते सिक्कों को एक अलग पंजाबी सूबा चाहिये। यह एजिटेशन लगातार पांच साल तक चलता रहा। इन तमाम दिक्कों को देख कर जब एस० आर० सी० (राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग) बैठा तो उसने इस मांग को देखा कि यह कहाँ तक ठीक है और कहाँ तक गलत है और जिन्होंने कमिशन की रिपोर्ट को पढ़ा है वे सब जानते हैं कि कमिशन ने उन तमाम पहलुओं पर गौर किया और यह राय फायम की कि वहाँ पर सिक्कों को मजहबी दिक्कत कोई खाल नहीं है, सर्विसेज (सेवाओं) के अन्दर कोई दिक्कत नहीं है और किसी भी तरह की अलपरली (सांस्कृतिक), पोलि टिकली (राजनैतिक) सामाजिक या धार्मिक दिक्कत नहीं है और कोई बैकवर्डनेस (पिछड़ा हुआ) नहीं है और इस बास्ते उन्होंने कहा कि एक अलहिदा पंजाबी सूबे के निर्माण की जरूरत नहीं है। कमिशन की रिपोर्ट निकलने के बाद फिर उनकी तरफ से एजिटेशन किया गया और बड़े बड़े जलूस निकाले जाने लये और मीटिंग्स की जाने लयीं और गवर्नमेंट ने ऐसा महसूस किया कि अब हमें इनसे बातचीत करनी चाहिए.....

Mr. Chairman: I think the hon. Member is likely to take some more time?

Lala Achint Ram: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may speak on the next day.

6 P.M.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 30th July, 1956.