

of this problem of Naga land. The statement, which we have just now heard, is, of course, a valuable document, but we feel that there are many people in the House, who would very much like to have a discussion of the ways and means which ought to be adopted for the solution of this very serious problem.

I would, therefore, beseech you to fix some time for a discussion of this point, because I feel that particularly Members from near that area are perturbed and we also feel that a discussion in this House should be very useful, and Government should agree to that.

Shri Rishang Keishing (Outer Manipur—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): May I know whether this House will have an occasion to discuss the Naga situation?

Mr. Speaker: I shall consider this matter. The matter will be considered certainly.

—
STATES REORGANISATION BILL—
contd.

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

“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.”

Hon. Members are aware that the sub-committee of the Business Advisory Committee has made certain recommendations regarding the allocation of time for the clauses of the States Reorganisation Bill. The report of the sub-committee was circulated to hon. Members last night, to give them advance information about it. Subject to the wishes of the House, I propose to follow the timings recommended by the sub-committee for

the consideration of the clauses and schedules of the Bill.

I would, however, like to inform the House that to the 25 hours originally allotted for the discussion of the clauses, the sub-committee has recommended an increase by five hours. So, in all, there will be 30 hours, and I think that will be enough.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): Subject to your further discretion to increase the limit.

Mr. Speaker: Of course; certainly. This is an important matter.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Shri B. S. Murthy, who was in possession of the House, may resume his speech.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Before Shri B. S. Murthy is called, may I know whether we are having the general discussion till the end of this evening, as was suggested yesterday morning?

Mr. Speaker: I found yesterday that there were not many people anxious to speak....

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): No.

Mr. Speaker:...but a number of them came to me. I suggested to them that in view of the fact that there are a number of clauses relating to the separate States, hon. Members who are interested in particular States would be given, certainly, an opportunity to speak on those States.

Therefore, I propose calling upon Shri B. S. Murthy, and after him, Shri R. N. S. Deo, and after him, I shall call upon the Home Minister to reply.

Hon. Members who have not had an occasion to take part in the general discussion will certainly be given, to the best of my ability and time permitting it, opportunity to speak on the various clauses, wherever they fit in.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): Yesterday, towards the end of the sitting, I was making a humble appeal to my Maharashtrian friends, that there must be tolerance and goodwill so that passions may not be roused and the States' reorganisation may have a smooth sail. In this connection, I also pointed out to them that the Andhras have also suffered. When Madras was not given, they did not quarrel. When Bellary was denied to them, they did not agitate. When Kolar was not given to them, they did not make any demonstrations. Again, even when Sirivancha, a place where more than 50 per cent of the people are Andhras, was not included in Andhra, the Andhras did not bother, because they had placed national unity above all other considerations.

I think I have a special right to make this appeal to the Maharashtrians. If they consider that their case....

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Is it the suggestion of the hon. Member that Bombay should not go to Maharashtra?

Shri B. S. Murthy: I am not suggesting any thing. I am only making an appeal. If my hon. friend, Shri Veeraswamy is patient, he will understand the implications of my appeal.

I was saying that I had a special right to make this appeal to my Maharashtrian friends. All of you know that I belong to a community which has for centuries been suppressed and oppressed. What did the Harijans do all along? Did they revolt? Did they take their daggers and kill each other? They have waited patiently, and perhaps, they have been praying to God, and as a result of their prayers....

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): Pray to these gods opposite.

Shri B. S. Murthy:....Gandhiji came and delivered them of their bondage. In the same manner, all injustices shall have an end. If it is

an injustice done to the Maharashtrians namely that the Bombay city should not go to them, that injustice will have an end. But they should have a peaceful method of approach. Merely agitating and trying to jeopardise national unity and the country's security will be a very harmful action on the part of any linguistic unit in this country. Therefore, I have to make a special appeal to Shri Gadgil and Shri C. D. Deshmukh that they should now take up the duty of going to the masses of Maharashtra and telling them that national unity is paramount and supreme and, therefore, for the time being they should accept the decision of the Central Government. After all, what is the Central Government? Is it an alien body? It is a Government established by vote. Today if this Government does not do justice, the people will teach it a lesson. Why don't they wait until such time as the people themselves will throw out the Government....

An Hon. Member: When? After five years?

Shri B. S. Murthy:....instead of trying to rouse passions?

Therefore, I was telling them that it was high time that they should, instead of trying to tell us what they wanted, go and say to the masses of Maharashtra, 'We are fighting on your behalf. Be calm, be patient, be tolerant and wait until such time when circumstances will get us Bombay into our hands'.

Dr. Rama Rao: We never waited for Andhra.

An Hon. Member: What about unemployment?

Shri B. S. Murthy: As both Shri Gadgil and Shri C. D. Deshmukh are Sanskrit scholars, I think I should also recite to them a sloka.

त्वजेत् एकं कुलस्थार्थं दामस्थार्थं कलं त्वजेत्

Shri Veeraswamy: Is it written in Sanskrit or in Telugu?

Shri B. S. Murthy: If he does not know Sanskrit, let him come and sit at my feet, and I shall teach him Sanskrit.

ग्रामं जनपदस्यार्थे आत्मार्थे पृथ्वीं त्यजेत् ।

This is a sloka that has been handed over to us by Hindu tradition. Therefore, I want to tell my Maharashtrian friends: 'You have agitated. You have showed your resentment. You have tried to tell us what amount of passion is there in your hearts because Bombay has not come into your group here and now. But that is enough. Please stop here and see that national unity is not jeopardised'.

Dr. Rama Rao: We, Andhras, fought for our State.

Shri B. S. Murthy: I know what I have done and what Dr. Rama Rao has been doing all along.

In this connection again, I would recite another poem, by Ommar Khayyam.

"The moving hand writes and have writ Moves on—

Not all thy piety and wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half
a line

Nor all thy tears shall wash a
word of it."

Maharashtrians have been famous in history. They were responsible for stopping the onslaught of Muslim rule. They were responsible for making Hindu culture thrive. Again, coming to later stages, we know how Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak has been a revolutionary, first and foremost, to lay the foundation of free India. In these days of Tilak's centenary and the Buddha's parinirvana, I do not think Maharashtrians are entitled to have passion roused because they want Bombay city. What is going to happen to Bombay city? Is it going to travel across the Arabian Sea to Suez Canal to see the dramatic developments there after the historic action of Col. Nasser? It shall be there. It will be there.

An Hon. Member: If it is given to Maharashtra, will it go to America?

Shri B. S. Murthy: It will come to them in course of time. If there is real agitation, agitation of the type which has been talked to the nation by the Father of the Nation, I think Bombay will come to them. In the same manner Andhras are hoping to get Bellary, Kolar and other portions. But today, we do not want to fight. I do not think Andhras are in any way inferior to Maharashtrians. Andhras have established empires. They have taken the culture of India to the eastern countries where they have built temples. Even Buddhism was spread in China, in Indonesia and in Cambodia by Andhra navigators and princes and princesses.

Therefore, I am not counselling my Maharashtrian friends an advice of humility. I am only saying, let us give the elders the opportunity to go on with this Bill. Then in course of time, we shall have our rights. The old order will give place to the new. Therefore, let us wait until changes come. Let there be a better atmosphere, and Maharashtrians will have not only Bombay City but every other part which they rightly claim their own.

Mr. Speaker: Shri R.N.S. Deo. After he concludes, I shall give opportunity to some other hon. Members also. I will call upon the hon. Minister at 4 P.M.

Shri R. N. S. Deo (Kalahandi-Bolangir): The proposals of the States Reorganisation Commission created a maelstrom of trouble and turmoil throughout the country. Then the modifications and revision of those proposals and the manner in which the modifications were brought about, instead of soothing passion, increased and roused further passion and created trouble in different parts of the country, resulting in destruction, repression and suffering.

From the debate that has taken place on this Bill so far and also from the proceedings of the Bihar and West Bengal legislatures as well as from

[Shri R. N. S. Deo]

the debate on the Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill in this House, it is quite apparent that still many problems remain unsolved. The Home Minister expressed the hope that after the passage of this Bill and the reorganisation of States, controversies would end and reconstruction would begin. But it is quite clear from the large number of amendments that has been tabled to this Bill that many problems will still remain unsolved even after the passage of this Bill.

Apart from the question of Bombay, which, it is quite clear, is not going to be solved by the proposals contained in this Bill, there are disputes regarding the borders, not only the existing disputes but new disputes. New claims are arising as a result of the proposals for reorganisation, and a large number of amendments has been tabled in regard to such border areas. Now, it is quite apparent that it will not be possible to arrive at decisions in regard to those claims in the course of this debate. Still many hopes and aspirations will remain unfulfilled and many legitimate demands will also remain unresolved. Therefore it is imperative that some machinery has to be created to go into all these questions and to decide these disputes once and for all. If the States reorganisation is not going to be a stop-gap arrangement or a temporary expedient, it is absolutely necessary that these border disputes should be settled amicably. It is not possible to be settled as we have seen and, therefore, they must be settled on some principle by an impartial body. A large section of this House has expressed an opinion in favour of the appointment of a Boundary Commission. I have also tabled an amendment and when the time comes for discussion of the clauses, I would speak in detail in regard to this matter. But, at this stage, I would just draw the attention of the House to a news item which appeared in the *Times of India* dated the 28th of this month. In that news item, with

regard to the reported speech of the Prime Minister at a party meeting referring to border disputes, it is said:

"He was sorry that the formula they had devised for settling the issues had fallen through. According to the formula, members from the contesting States were to sit across a table and come to an agreed solution. In the event of failure, these Members were to accept arbitration from a third party. He saw no reason why this approach could not be revived for settling minor controversial border disputes."

Sir, this is a welcome suggestion. But, there is also another report bearing on the same subject appearing in the *Statesman*. It is said:

"Mr. Nehru is understood to have said that where the parties to the dispute fail to reach agreement they should refer the matter for arbitration to a mutually acceptable agency which could be the executive of the Congress Parliamentary party."

Now, with all respect, I beg to point out that however eminent the members of the Congress Parliamentary Party or the High Command may be, the settlement of border disputes is not a party matter and it is a matter in which all parties and all States and all the people of India, irrespective of party, are interested. Therefore, I suggest that this matter should not be treated as a party matter. It is our complaint and it is the complaint in many quarters that these decisions are vitiated by extraneous considerations and party feelings. Therefore, in order to restore the faith of the people, it is essential that Government should keep aloof from being involved in party disputes and the settlement of these disputes should be referred to an impartial body. That, in my opinion, can be no other than a Boundary Commission.

At this stage, I won't go into further details regarding this question. The

only thing that I would urge upon the hon. Minister at this stage is that he should keep an open mind on this subject.

Sir, you are aware of the border claims of Orissa and you are also aware of the fact that the S.R.C. Completely ignored consideration of Orissa's claims on their merits. In addition to the injustice that was meted out to Orissa by the S.R.C., the Government of India also maintained that injustice. And, now, this Bill, by completely ignoring Orissa's case, is going to perpetrate that injustice. Though you do not find any mention of Orissa in the reorganisation proposals in this Bill, yet Orissa is the State that is most concerned with this Bill because it has been completely ignored. We are not only concerned; there is grave discontent and there is a sense of injustice. Ours is a federal type of Union where every unit, whether big or small, and all people, in whatever State they may live, should have this assurance that they will get equal treatment from the Union.

I am glad that the Prime Minister yesterday made it clear that in regard to these disputes, the Government of India's attitude was one of neutrality. As the Prime Minister pointed out, it mattered very little to the Government of India whether one bit of territory is in this State or in that State. But, while we appreciate the argument that a bit of territory is not running out of India and not going into Pakistan or to any other foreign territory if it is not conceded to a particular State, the reason why there is discontent is that this argument is applied against only one particular State. There cannot be a double standard, one for Bihar and one for Orissa, for example.

When Seraikela and Kharswan were merged in Orissa in 1948, there was this dispute from Bihar side. At that time, if Bihar had been told that these States were not going to run out of India and that it was unseemly to raise this controversy, it would have been appreciated. But, Bihar raised this dispute and these States were transferred there temporarily because

there was no geographical contiguity with Orissa. Now, when the circumstances have changed, when the people have expressed again and again their verdict in favour of coming back to Orissa, if this argument is put forward against the people of Orissa, it is natural that it is going to be resented. That is our objection.

Further I would say that, so far as Singbhum Sadar and Seraikella Sub-Division are concerned, now that the controversy has been narrowed down and our approach to the problem has practically come to converge on one point, the differences having been narrowed to the point of vanishing, if I may say so, there is all the more reason for the people of Orissa to expect justice even at this late stage from the Government of India. From the debates in the Bihar Legislature on the Transfer of Territories to West Bengal Bill as well as the previous statements of the Government spokesman of Bihar and also from the debates in this House, it is now quite clear that the Bihar Government, Bihar Legislature and Members of Parliament from Bihar would now take the stand on the wishes of the people. That is exactly what has been our stand all along. From Orissa's side we have always urged that the wishes of the people should be given due consideration. We had been prepared for a judicial tribunal; we had been prepared for a Boundary Commission. We were prepared for any of the alternatives, but leaving aside the other things, the Boundary Commission can go into the question of Singbhum Sadar Sub-Division. So far as Seraikella Sub-Division is concerned, however, the wishes of the people had already been proved.

The other day Members from Bihar in this House were prepared to suggest that even if 40 per cent of the people of Manbhum voted in favour of West Bengal and 25 per cent voted in Kishanganj in favour of West Bengal, they were prepared to concede it. In today morning's paper I saw that in the Council of States, another Member from Bihar has suggested 51 per cent.

[Shri R. N. S. Deo]

We are prepared to accept even 51 per cent. In the last general elections the members from Seraikella stood on this specification issue of re-merger with Orissa and he scored over 51 per cent of votes—51·46 per cent—defeating his four rivals, and the Bihar Congress rival candidate forfeited his deposit. That verdict was quite clear. Then the municipal elections for Seraikella in 1950 were fought on this issue. All the eight members of the eight wards were elected on this issue. If you ignore even that, in 1956, only last April again, there was a re-election in the municipality and the election was fought on this issue. All the eight candidates were returned unopposed. This clearly proves, so far as Seraikella is concerned, the verdict of the people and the wishes of the people. Under these circumstances, when the Members from Bihar, the Government of Bihar and the Ministers of Bihar, and also the Bihar Legislature are all unanimous that the wishes of the people should be respected, is it wrong on my part to make this claim.....

Shri Veeraswamy: On a point of submission, Sir, When there is an important Bill like this being discussed and an hon. Member is arguing out his case, I am sorry to say that neither the Home Minister nor even the Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs is present in the House.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: There is only a Parliamentary Secretary on the Treasury Benches.

The Minister of Legal Affairs (Shri Pataskar): I am in the House but sitting behind.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, Shri Pataskar is coming to the front.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: It is suggested by the Bihar Government, that any transfer except on the basis of the consent of the people concerned will leave behind a feeling of bitterness and a sense of injustice which will poison the relations of the two States.

May I respectfully point out that this attitude was absent when this dispute

about Seraikella Kharswan was raised in 1948? Because the wishes of the people were not ascertained as had been declared by the Government of India,—they appointed the Bavdekar Tribunal to go into the dispute, whose first term of reference was the wishes of the people. Unfortunately the Bavdekar Tribunal never functioned and the matter was decided by the States Ministry on only one ground, that is, administrative convenience. Since then, the people of Seraikella and Kharswan have been agitating and they have demonstrated again and again their desire to go back to Orissa because at that time the wishes of the people were not ascertained. That is why today you have left behind a trail of bitterness and a sense of injustice.

Even at this stage I would appeal to the Prime Minister and the Home Minister of India on behalf of the 15 million people of Orissa and also on behalf of the 2 lakhs of people of Seraikella and Kharswan that in the changed context, when the wishes of the people are clearly known, when the Bihar Government and the Bihar representatives have agreed to decide this issue on this basis, there is no reason why the re-transfer of Seraikella and Kharswan should be delayed.

I, therefore, most humbly suggest that a separate Bill should be brought for the transfer of Seraikella Sub-Division to Orissa immediately. As regards our claim on Singhbhum Sadar Sub-division, we are prepared to accept the suggestion put forward by our friends from Bihar that the matter should be decided according to the wishes of the people.

So far as my friend, Shri Jaipal Singh, is concerned, he was at one time opposed to this idea of the wishes of the people, but I was glad to find the other day that he also admits that the wishes of the people should be given first preference. Of course he suggested that we should, instead of having a plebiscite or referendum, wait for the general elections. But I would very respectfully point out that waiting for the general elections does

not solve the problem. As a matter of fact, the verdict at a general election is meaningless unless the Government first declare unequivocally that they will abide by the decision of the people, that they will accept the verdict of the people. In the last general elections we made it an issue for Seraikella and our candidate won. In the municipal election we have proved it. But what has it achieved? Where has it landed us? Therefore, I say that the decision arrived at a general election would be meaningless unless as a pre-condition the Government first declare their willingness to accept that verdict.

Now that there is practically agreement on this point, I suggest that this question of Orissa should be re-examined and a separate Bill brought to meet out justice to Orissa.

1 P.M.

श्री राधा रमण (दिल्ली नगर) : सब से पहले मैं अपने गृह मंत्री और उन साधियों को बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि जिनके सुपुत्र यह राज्य पुनर्गठन विधेयक किण्व गया था और जिन्होंने बहुत परिश्रम करके ऐसी शक्ति में उसको सदन के सामने रखा जिससे कि जो बहुत सारे मतभेद सदन में व्यक्त किये गये थे वह दूर हो गये हैं। सब से बड़ी बात इस सम्बन्ध में यह देखने में आई कि जो एक धारा यूनिजन टैग्टरीज (संघीय क्षेत्र) के बारे में थी, जिसके अनुसार पालिया-मेंट (संसद) को यह फैसला करने का अधिकार दिया गया था कि वहाँ पर किम प्रकार का शासन हो, और जिसको विधेयक में से हटा दिया गया था, उसको हमारे गृह मंत्री और प्रवर समिति ने फिर से वहाँ पर रख दिया है। अब इस सदन का पूर्ण अधिकार होगा कि वह निश्चय करे कि यूनिजन टैग्टरीज में किम प्रकार का शासन रहे। इसको देख कर हमको बड़ा सन्तोष होता है।

सदन के सामने विधेयक के सम्बन्ध में कुछ विषय इस प्रकार के रखे गये हैं, जिनको लेकर आपस में गहरा मतभेद दीखता

है। और हम में से बहुत से लोग उन मतभेदों और समस्याओं को सामने रखते हुये यह सोचने लगे हैं कि क्यों न यह सारा विधेयक वापस ले लिया जाये, और ऐसा समय सामने आने दिया जाये, जब कि सब लोग और ज्यादा शान्ति और गम्भीरता से इस पर विचार करके फैसला कर सकें। मुझे बड़ी खुशी होती अगर यह विधेयक सदन के सामने बिल्कुल न आया होता, देश में रक्खा ही न गया होता और हम इस सम्बन्ध में कोई कदम न उठा कर कुछ असें तक अपने देशवासियों को तरक्की की तरफ ले चलते, और भारत की जो मोटी मोटी समस्याएँ हैं उनको हल करने के बाद तब इस विषय को सामने लाते। लेकिन जब छः, सात महीने तक बराबर इस सदन में अधिक से अधिक जितनी गरमी दिखाई जा सकती थी वह दिखाई जा चुकी, जब इस पर पूरी तरह वाद विवाद हो चुका और लोगों की भावनाएँ उभर चुकीं, तब इस प्रकार का विचार करना कि इस विधेयक को वापस ले लिया जाये यह बात मेरी मसज्ज में नहीं आती। अगर हम आज इस विधेयक को वापस ले लेंते हैं और नाल दो साल के बाद फिर लाते हैं तो जो गर्मी हम आज देख रहे हैं, उससे कहीं ज्यादा गर्मी फिर देखने में आयेगी। हिन्दुस्तान इतना बड़ा देश है, उसके अन्दर इतने प्रदेश हैं कि जब कभी उनके पुनर्गठन का विचार किया जायेगा तो मतभेद सामने अवश्य आयेंगे और हमें बड़ी ही गम्भीरता के साथ, और शान्ति के साथ, उन्हें सुलझाना होगा। जब से यह विधेयक हमारे सामने आया है तब से अब तक जितनी भी उलझनें थीं, वह करीब करीब खत्म हो चुकी हैं। अगर कुछ जगहों पर कोई झंझट बाकी भी रही है तो उसको सुलझाने का सतत प्रयत्न किया गया है और भविष्य में भी किया जायेगा। इनमें से एक बम्बई की समस्या है, दूसरा बंगाल बिहार का मामला है, कुछ और भी छोटे छोटे मामले हैं, मेरा विश्वास है कि वह भी शीघ्र ही सुलझ जायेंगे।

[श्री राधा रमण]

कल हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने सरकार की ओर से इस बात को हम लोगों के सामने रखा कि उन्होंने इन मामलों को एक तरह से या दूसरे तरह से सुलझाने का प्रयत्न किया, लेकिन जितनी ही वह कोशिश करते गये उतने ही वे उलझन में पड़ते गये। मेरा विश्वास है कि समय आने पर यह उलझनें भी दूर हो जायेंगी और जिस प्रकार से हम देश का पुनर्गठन चाहते हैं, और प्रवर कमेटी ने सामूहिक रूप से विचार करके जो फैसले हमारे सामने रखे हैं वह देश को काबिले कबूल होंगे, और हमारे देश में गवर्नमेंट ही क्या, सभी लोग अपने देश को नव निर्माण की तरफ ले चलेंगे। मुझे इस बात का दुःख है कि मैंने यहां पर जितनी भी तकरीरें सुनी हैं, उन में ज्यादातर मैं यही देखने में आया, कि बहुत कम लोग इस बात पर विचार करते रहे हैं कि हमें अपने को पहले भी हिन्दुस्तानी कहना है। और बाद में भी हिन्दुस्तानी कहना है। अगर हम समस्त हिन्दुस्तान की दृष्टि से इस विषय को देखें और उसी तराजू में नापें तो हमको हर एक मवाल का सही जवाब मिल सकता है। इसे ध्यान में रखते हुये मैं कह सकता हूं कि यह विधेयक हमारे सामने इतने विचार विनिमय के बाद रक्खा गया है कि वह हमको स्वीकार होना चाहिये। अगर कहीं पर थोड़े बहुत मतभेद की गुंजाइश भी है तो संजीदगी में उस पर विचार करके ऐसा निर्णय मिल सकेगा जो हम लोगों को स्वीकार्य हो। मुझे इस बात का भी आश्चर्य है कि जो हमारे देश के बड़े बड़े नेता हैं, जो हिन्दुस्तान का एकीकरण करना चाहते हैं, तमाम देश में ऐसा बातावरण पैदा करना चाहते हैं जिस में कि हमारा देश तरक्की कर सके और फाइव इयार प्लान (पंचवर्षीय योजना) की तरफ बहुत तेजी से बढ़ सके, वह भी जब इस विधेयक पर विचार करते हैं तो जो उनका बजान है वह एक ही विषय पर पड़ता है, वह सब बरक नहीं देखते। कोई तो जबान पर जोर

देते हैं, कोई जाग्रती पर जोर देते हैं, कोई शासन पद्धति पर जोर देते हैं। नतीजा यह होता है कि हम सही रास्ते से विचलित हो जाते हैं और जो फैसला हमें करना चाहिये वह नहीं कर पाते हैं। हमारे मत भेद यहां तक बढ़ जाते हैं कि हम बजाय आपस में सद्भाव बढ़ाने के एक दूसरे का विरोध करने लगते हैं। यह सब बातें सोचते हुये मैं समझता हूं कि जो लोग कहते हैं कि इस समय इस बात की चर्चा ही न की जाये और यह विधेयक वापस ले लिया जाय, यह मुनासिब नहीं है। अब तो हम भाग में पड़ चुके हैं और काफी भागे निकल गये हैं, हमें इस भाग से निकलना ही है। इमनिये भेग विचार है कि इस विधेयक को जल्द से जल्द इस सदन द्वारा पास करा कर सारे देश पर लागू करना चाहिये, जिस से जो कुछ भी फायदे नुकमान हो सकते हैं, वह हमारे सामने आ जायें और हम उनका सामना कर सकें।

मैं इस बात को भी देख रहा हूं कि जहां सरकार ने कुछ इलाकों के ऊपर काफी गौर किया है और इस बात को माना है कि हर एक हिन्दुस्तानी का हक है कि वह चहे कहीं भी हो, हिन्दुस्तान के किसी हिस्से में भी, वह ऐसे राज्य शासन का उपभोग करे जिसमें उसको पूर्ण रूप से प्रजातन्त्री या लोकतन्त्री शासन मिल सके, वहां बड़े आश्चर्य की बात है कि जब हमने यूनिनन टेरिटरीज के बारे में गौर किया तो इस उमूल को अपने दिमाग से निकाल दिया और उन टेरिटरीज को मर्कजी (केन्द्रीय) सरकार के मातहत रखने का इरादा किया और उनको लोकतन्त्री राज्य का हक नहीं दिया।

आपको मालूम है कि इस विधेयक में पांच इलाके केन्द्रीय सरकार के मातहत रखे गये हैं जिन में ये तीन दिल्ली, हिमाचल प्रदेश और बम्बई हैं और दो हैं मणिपुर और त्रिपुरा। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं कहना

चाहता हूँ कि मैंने इस बात पर बहुत विचार किया कि क्या कारण है कि हमको या इन टेरिटरीज (क्षेत्रों) को वह हक नहीं दिया जाता जो दूसरे राज्यों को दिया गया है।

इससे पहले जो हमारी पार्लियामेंट (संसद) थी, उसमें इस विषय पर बहुत बहस के बाद यह निश्चय किया गया था और यह कहा गया था कि हिन्दुस्तान का कोई भी हिस्सा ऐसा नहीं होगा कि जिसमें कोई लोकप्रिय सरकार न हो। जब इस संसद में ऐसा फैसला किया गया था तो उस वक्त हर बड़े और छोटे आदमी ने बहस में भाग लिया था और अपने विचार प्रकट किये थे। सरकार ने भी इस सम्बन्ध में सारे प्रास और कांस रखे और अन्त में यह फैसला किया कि इन यूनियन टेरिटरीज की भी लोकप्रिय सरकार कायम हो जो कि लोगों की मांग के मुताबिक हो। इसी की बिना पर इन तमाम इलाकों के अन्दर सरकारें कायम की गईं हालांकि वे सरकारें ऐसी नहीं थीं जैसी कि दूसरे प्रान्तों में बनी थीं लेकिन फिर भी इन तमाम इलाकों के अन्दर अंदर ऐसी सरकारें बनाई गईं थीं जिन में लोक सत्ता का अंश था और वह लोकप्रिय हुईं। और वे लोकमत पर आधारित थीं। हालांकि यह चीज जो दी गई थी इन इलाकों के रहने वालों को पूरी तरह से कबूल नहीं थी, लेकिन फिर भी वह कबूल की गई और उसके मुताबिक शासन चलता रहा। आज जब कि हम अपना कदम आगे बढ़ा रहे हैं और मुक्त की तरफकी की ओर ले जा रहे हैं तथा जनता को संतोष देना चाहते हैं, तो मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि जो उसूल पहले मान लिये गये थे, उनसे आज क्यों हटा जा रहा है और लोकप्रिय सरकारें दिल्ली और हिमाचल और अन्य इलाकों को देने से क्यों इन्कार किया जा रहा है।

श्री श्रीरोज गांधी (जिला प्रतापगढ़-पश्चिम व जिला रायबरेली-पूर्व) : बिल को ड्राप (बापस लेना) कर दीजिये, वे सरकारें बच जायेंगी।

श्री राधा रत्नलः यह बात कि बिल को ड्राप कर दिया जाये तो सरकारें बच जायेंगी, किसी के हक में नहीं है क्योंकि मैं समझता हूँ कि जब कभी भी ड्राप इस बिल को लायेंगे, तो इन सरकारों का प्रश्न ड्रापके सामने आ जायेगा।

दलील दी जाती है कि दिल्ली चूक भारत की राजधानी है, इसलिये यहां पर लोकप्रिय सरकार नहीं हो सकती। यह भी दलील दी जाती है कि चूक यहां पर केन्द्रीय सरकार है, इस कारण कोई दूसरी सरकार कायम नहीं की जा सकती। मैं, अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि जब ऐसी दलीलें दी जाती हैं तो ये मेरी समझ में नहीं आतीं। मुझे पता नहीं लगता कि वह कौन सी ऐसी नई दलीलें हैं कि जिनके कारण अड़चन पैदा हो गई हो और हम यह कहें कि दिल्ली में तथा दूसरी यूनियन टेरिटरीज में लोकमत के मुताबिक लोकप्रिय सरकारें कायम नहीं हो सकतीं। कुछ अर्सा हुआ जब हमें यह कहा गया था कि हम इन इलाकों में ऐसी सरकारें कायम करना चाहते हैं जो कि लोकप्रिय हों और उनका आधार लोकमत पर हो परन्तु आज तक हमें यह नहीं बताया गया है कि ऐसा दूसरा तरीका कौनसा है जिससे कि वह लोकमत लिया जायेगा और यहां पर उसी के आधार पर सरकारें बनेंगी। हम बराबर इंतजार करते जा रहे हैं और वक्त गुजरता जाता है। लोग सस्पेंस में हैं। यहां की तथा अन्य यूनियन टेरिटरीज की जो सरकारें हैं उनका जो इन्तिजाम है वह भी दिन-ब-दिन बिगड़ता जा रहा है। लोगों की तकलीफें बढ़ती जा रही हैं लेकिन केन्द्रीय सरकार की तरफ से या हाईकमांड की तरफ से कोई इस प्रकार की घोषणा नहीं होती है। हमें यह क्यों नहीं बताया जाता कि कौन से वे तरीके होंगे कि जिन तरीकों से आम लोगों की राय ली जायेगी और किस शकल का शासन यहां पर होगा। मैं यह भी नहीं समझ पाया हूँ कि कबसी अक्षरबद्ध या उसके बाद जब यह

[श्री राधा रमण]

घोषणा होगी कि इस विधेयक के अनुसार तमाम देश में नये राज्य बनेंगे, दिल्ली राज्य का या इन राज्यों का क्या होगा, किस प्रकार इनका शासन चलेगा, या जो यहां की विधान सभायें हैं, उनका क्या होगा और साथ में यह कि जब तक नए चुनाव होकर नए शासन कायम होंगे तब तक किस तरह की राजसत्ता यहां पर कायम रहेगी, किस प्रकार का शासन कायम रहेगा। बार बार पूछने पर भी हमें यह तो कह दिया जाता है कि हम यहां के लोगों के लोकमत के अनुसार कोई न कोई शासन कायम करेंगे, लेकिन कोई शकल, कोई स्वरूप उस शासन का हमारे सामने नहीं रखा जाता है। वक्त करीब आ गया है और मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस पर अपनी घोषणा कर दे, और कुछ अपना डरादा जाहिर कर दे। दिल्ली के चीफ़ मिनिस्टर साहब ने एक स्कीम निकाली थी और उसको लोगों के सामने पेश किया था लेकिन उसका किसी भी पोलिटिकल पार्टी (राजनैतिक दल) ने स्वागत नहीं किया और उसको कबूल नहीं किया। उसमें बहुत सारी दिक्कतें नजर आती हैं और वह काफी पेचीदा दिखाई देती है। इसके अलावा भी कई दूसरी स्कीमें (योजनायें) भी वक्तन-फवक्तन केन्द्रीय सरकार के सामने रखी गई हैं, लेकिन अभी तक कोई साफ नक्शा हमारे सामने नहीं आया है। आप के द्वारा, अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं चाहता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह बता दू कि दिल्ली की २० या २१ लाख जनता उनके उचित अधिकारों से वंचित नहीं की जा सकेगी इसलिये केन्द्रीय सरकार के विचार इस सम्बन्ध में जल्दी से जल्दी मालूम हो जाने चाहियें और उन्हें घोषित कर दिया जाना चाहिये।

मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि मिलैकट कमेटी (प्रवर समिति) ने और हमारे होम मिनिस्टर (गृह मंत्री) साहब ने यह ख्याल रखते हुये कि शायद उसी प्रकार का शासन इन बूनियन टैरिटरीज में न हो सके जिस

प्रकार का कि और सूबों में होगा। पार्लियामेंट को ही इन इलाकों के लिये एक लैजिस्लेचर (विधान मण्डल) का स्वरूप देने की कोशिश की है और इन इलाकों के नुमाइन्दे (प्रतिनिधि) बढ़ाये हैं। यह एक बड़ी खुशी की बात है, मैं इसे बेलकम (स्वागत) करता हूँ। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि पार्लियामेंट को इन टैरिटरीज के लिये एक लैजिस्लेचर का स्वरूप देना मुनासिब न होगा। मुझे बड़ी शंका है कि पार्लियामेंट जिस तरह से काम करती है और जितने बड़े बड़े काम हमारे सामने आते हैं उन सब को देखते हुये इन इलाकों के लिये बिल आदि पास करने के लिये इसके पास आवश्यक समय नहीं होगा। और मुझे यह भी आशंका है कि पार्लियामेंट (संसद्) वहां की रोज़ाना की जो दिक्कतें हैं, वहां स्थानीय कानून हैं और जिन्हें बनाया जाना आवश्यक है उनके लिये पूरा समय न निकाल सकेगी। अगर इस तरफ पूरा ध्यान नहीं दिया जायेगा तो इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि यहां पर जो चीजें आयेंगी उन पर विचार न हो सकेगा और इस कारण लोगों में असंतोष बढ़ेगा और बाद में जाकर हमें तकलीफों का सामना करना पड़ेगा। इसलिये जहां तक सीट्स बढ़ाने का मवाल है, मैं यह समझता हूँ, कि चूंकि पूर्ण रूप से "ए" (क) प्रकार के राज्य इन टैरिटरीज में कायम रकना संभव नहीं मालूम होता, या हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार या यह सदन नहीं चाहता और मिलैकट कमेटी (प्रवर समिति) की भी यह राय नहीं है, इन इलाकों में सीटें बढ़नी चाहिये थीं परन्तु इतने से ही यहां की जनता को संतोष नहीं हो सकता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इन इलाकों के लिये जैसे कि पहली दफा पार्लियामेंट में "सी" पार्ट स्टेट्स ऐक्ट ('ग' भाग राज्य अधिनियम) आया था, इन केन्द्र के मातहत रहने वाली सरकारों के लिये अब भी एक खास ऐक्ट बने और उसकी ऐसी शकल हो कि जो सबको स्वीकार हो लेकिन उसके

साथ यह सीटें बढ़ाने का जो सवाल है इसको मिलाया न जाये क्योंकि यदि वे "ए" श्रेणी के राज्य नहीं रहते तो आपको सीटें बढ़ानी ही होंगी। जो सीटें बढ़ाई गई हैं, मैं समझता हूँ, इस बात को ध्यान में रख कर बढ़ाई गई हैं कि इन इलाकों का अपना इतिहास है और ये भास ग्रहमियत रखते हैं, जैसे कि दिल्ली, हिमाचल प्रदेश और बम्बई। ये तीनों इलाके विशेषकर अपने अपने स्थान पर एक खास ग्रहमियत अथवा खसूसियत रखते हैं। और इसलिये उनको बेटेज (महत्व) देना एक निहायत ही मुनासिब बात है। लेकिन यह बेटेज लोकप्रिय सरकारों का सबस्टीट्यूट (स्थानापन्न) नहीं होना चाहिये। इस वास्ते मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि यह सदन इस बात पर विचार करे कि जो हरू हम बहुत अर्से से सन् १९१८ से लेकर आज तक मांगते आये हैं और जो कुछ हदतक हमें प्राप्त भी हो चुके हैं, वे हम से न छीने जायें।

दिल्ली का अलग सूबा रहने पर भी प्रजातन्त्रीय सरकारें यहां पर कायम करने के लिये काफी जद्दोजहद (संघर्ष) यहां के लोगों ने की और इसी प्रकार से दूसरे इलाकों के लोगों ने भी की और यह उसी जद्दोजहद का नतीजा था कि एक पार्ट "सी" स्टेट्स एक्ट (भाग 'ग' राज्य अधिनियम) यहां पर पास किया गया और इन इलाकों की अलग अलग सरकारें बनीं और उनकी जरूरतों के मुताबिक इन सरकारों को अधिकार भी दिये गये। आज हम सारे देश में "ए" श्रेणी के राज्य बनाने जा रहे हैं लेकिन यह बात समझ में नहीं आती है कि क्यों इन राज्यों को वैसी सरकारें भी न मिलें जैसी कि इस समय वहां पर स्थापित हैं। जो अधिकार इस समय उन सरकारों को प्राप्त हैं, उससे हम संतुष्ट नहीं हैं और न ये और हम चाहते हैं और इसकी मांग भी करते रहे हैं कि जो कमियां हैं उनको दुरुस्त किया जाये और वहां के लोगों के लिये

भी वही चीज मुनासिब है जो कि सारे हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों के लिये मुनासिब है। लेकिन यहां की हकूमतों को हटाया जाये और एक ऐसी सक्ल उन एरियाज को दे दी जाये कि जिसमें कोई लोकतन्त्र सरकार कायम न हो सके मैं इसे बहुत ही गैरवाजिब (अनुपयुक्त), गैरमुनासिब (अनुचित), इकतलफी (अधिकार छीनना) और बेइसाफी (अन्याय) की बात मानता हूँ।

इसलिये मैं इस बात की दरखास्त करता हूँ कि यह सदन इस बात पर जोर दे कि उन टेरिटरीज को जो हकूक पहले मिले हुये हैं, वे तो कायम रहने ही चाहिये, इसके साथ ही उन में मुनासिब संशोधन भी किये जायें, ताकि यहां की जनता संतुष्ट हो और अपने काम को अपने तरीके पर चला सके। जैसा कि मैंने अभी कहा है, पार्लियामेंट को इनकी रोजाना की दिक्कतों में पढ़ने का न मौका मिलता है और न मिल ही सकता है। न ही वह इन इलाकों की समस्याओं का इलाज ज्यादा गहराई से गौर करके कर सकती है, जिस तरह कि यहां की स्थानीय जनता अपने शासन द्वारा कर सकती है।

इसलिये आखिर में मैं फिर यह प्रार्थना करूंगा कि इन इलाकों को प्रजातन्त्रीय शासन से वंचित न किया जाये और इस की तरफ सारा सदन और हमारी सरकार ध्यान दे और इनकी जायज मांगों को स्वीकार करे।

श्री २० २० मिश्र (जिला बुलन्दशहर) : स्टेट्स री-आर्गनाइजेशन (राज्य पुनर्गठन) के सम्बन्ध में पहली दिसम्बर में एस० आर० सी० (राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग) रिपोर्ट पर बहुत लम्बी चौड़ी बहस हुई थी। फिर जब यह बिल सिलेक्ट कमेटी (प्रवर समिति) को रेफर (भेजा) किया गया था, उस वक्त भी इस पर बहस हुई थी और वही बहस आज फिर चल रही है। इन तमाम बहसों को

[श्री २० द० मिश्र]

सुनने के बाद मैं इस नतीजे पर पहुंचा हूँ कि जितनी बहस हुई है, वह या तो बोर्डर डिस्प्यूट (सोमा विवाद) के बारे में और या बम्बई के बारे में हुई है। इन बहसों के दौरान मैं यह भी जोर दिया गया था कि जिन स्टेट्स (राज्यों) के बारे में खास झगड़ा है, वहाँ के मेम्बरान ही बोलें। इस सिलसिले में हमने देखा कि बम्बई के विषय में दोनों पक्षों की ओर से बड़ी बड़ी दलीलें दी गईं और बहुत गर्मागर्म तकरीरे की गईं। रिपोर्ट पर बहम करते वक्त और फिर इस बिल को सिलकट कमेटी को रफर करते वक्त बम्बई के बारे में जो दलीलें और तजावीज वगैरह दी गईं, वे तो ठीक थीं, लेकिन मुझे यह देख कर बड़ी हैरानी होती है कि हालांकि गवर्नमेंट (सरकार) ने बड़े सोच विचार के बाद इस बारे में फैसला कर लिया है, लेकिन फिर भी हर तरफ से बम्बई का ही जिक्र हो रहा है। जो बोलता है वह बम्बई की ही बात करता है मानो री-आर्गनाइजेशन (पुनर्गठन) में बम्बई के अलावा और कोई समस्या है ही नहीं। मैं यह भी देख रहा हूँ कि बम्बई के बारे में बड़ी बदमजगगी पैदा कर दी गई है। मुझे सब से ज्यादा अफसोस इस बात का है कि जिन लोगों ने एक साथ मिल कर आजादी की लड़ाई में भाग लिया, आज वे आपस में ही लड़-झगड़ रहे हैं। समझ में नहीं आता कि भारतवर्ष को क्या हो गया है।

जब मैं बाहर निकलता हूँ तो मेरे कुछ भाई कहते हैं कि आप महाराष्ट्र के खिलाफ क्यों हैं, उड़ीसा के खिलाफ क्यों हैं। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मुझे महाराष्ट्र और उड़ीसा से क्या दुश्मनी हो सकती है। वहाँ के रहने वाले मेरे भाई के समान हैं। गुजरातियों के साथ भी मेरी हमदर्दी है। मैं तो सबको अपना भाई समझता हूँ—कन्याकुमारी से ले कर हिमालय तक रहने वाले सब लोग मेरे भाई हैं। हम सब को मिल कर रहना चाहिये।

श्री ह० व० बेंबल्ल (अम्बड़) : तो फिर मध्य भारत को यू० पी० का हिस्सा दे दीजिये। क्या उस वक्त भी आप उसी उबान से बात करेंगे ?

श्री २० द० मिश्र : अगर मेरे अस्तित्कार में हो, तो आपको यू० पी० में से जितना भी हिस्सा चाहिये, वह मैं आपको देने के लिये तैयार हूँ। आप जितना चाहें ले लें।

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

Shri R. D. Misra: Yes, Sir. I will address the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: If any hon. Member wants to make an interruption or at any rate intervene and put a question or elucidate a particular thing, he must kindly get up and then put the question. If he does not want to get up, he must keep quiet and wait for his chance. Otherwise, I will have to adjourn the House and go out, while the hon. Member may carry on the cross talks.

श्री २० द० मिश्र : मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश भारतवर्ष को कुदरत ने इस प्रकार बनाया है कि वह दुनिया में सब से अलग खड़ा दिखाई देता है। आजादी हासिल करने के बाद हमने इस देश का जो नाम भारत—दिया है, वह कोई नया नहीं है। टाइम्स इमेमोरियल (अनादिकाल) से—वैदिक काल से—वह चला आ रहा है। समय समय पर चाहे हम लोगों में झगड़े हुये हों, लड़ाइयां हुई हों, मतभेद उत्पन्न हुये हों, लेकिन फिर भी हम सब में यह भावना वर्तमान रही है कि हम सब भारतीय हैं, भारत हम सब का देश है, वह एक है और एक ही रहे। एक समय आया कि हम लोग गुलामी के नीचे दब गए, लेकिन ईश्वर की कृपा से और अपने महान नेताओं की रोह-नुमाई में हमारी जिदगी में भारत स्वतन्त्र हुआ। अगर हम कुछ देखने का प्रयत्न

करें, तो हम को मालम होगा कि हमारे इस देश—भारत—के विषय में कितनी सुन्दर भाषा में, कितने सुन्दर शब्दों में चित्र किया गया है— उस की महानता, उस की सुन्दरता, उस की एकता, उस की सीमाओं और उस की भूमि का वर्णन किया गया है। लेकिन कठिनाई यह है कि हम लोगों ने अंग्रेजी द्वारा—विदेशियों द्वारा—लिखी हिस्ट्री (इतिहास) को पढ़ कर यह समझ लिया है कि प्राचीन काल में भारत में कोई रहता ही नहीं था, यहां केवल जंगल ही जंगल थे, यहां पर सभ्यता का कोई चिन्ह नहीं था और यहां के निवासी बिल्कुल असभ्य थे। तथ्य यह है कि यहां के रहने वाले अत्यन्त सभ्य और सिविलाइज्ड (सभ्य) थे, लेकिन विदेशियों ने जो किताबें हमारे सिरों पर लाद दीं, उन से हमारे दिमाग इतना पलटा खा गये हैं कि आज हम को इस बात का यकीन नहीं आता कि हमारे पूर्वज सभ्य थे या नहीं, उन को प्रजातंत्र का ज्ञान था या नहीं। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं आपके सामने कुछ ऐसी बातों का जिक्र करना चाहता हूं जिनसे आप को अपनी पुरानी बातों का कुछ ध्यान आ जाय।

भारत के विषय में हमारे पुराणों में कहा गया है :

उत्तरम् यत् समुद्रस्य हिमाद्रिश्यचैव दक्षिणम्,
वर्षम् तद् भारतम् नाम भारतं यत्र संततिः ।

यह विष्णु पुराण का श्लोक है। इसका अर्थ यह है कि समुद्र के उत्तर में और हिमालय के दक्षिण में जो भूमि है, उस का नाम भारत है और जो इस भूमि में पैदा हुये हैं, उन का नाम भारतीय है।

इस के बाद मैं वेदों के कुछ मंत्रों का उल्लेख करना चाहता हूं जिन को आज भी आर्योडाकस्य (पुराणपंथी) हिन्दू सुबह शाम मध्या में पढ़ते हैं। उन मंत्रों

को हमारे प्रचीन ऋषियों ने हम को दे दिया, ताकि हम को ज्ञात हो कि हमारा देश कंसा है, क्या उसकी सीमार्यें हैं और उसके प्रति हमारी क्या द्यूटीज हैं। यह मंत्र ऋग्वेद के हैं :

यस्येमे हिमवन्तो महित्वा
यस्य समुद्रं रसया सहाहुः
यस्येमाः प्रदिशो यस्य बाहु
कस्मै देवाय हविषा विषेम ॥
येन द्योश्चापृथिवी च दृङ्
येन स्वःस्तमितं यननाकः
यो अन्तरिक्षे रजसो विमानः
कस्मै देवाय हविषा विषेम ।

इस में सवाल-जबाब के रूप में कहा गया कि कौन सी अचारिटी है, जिस की हम उपासना करें, जिस की भक्ति करें, जिसके लिये प्रेम और श्रद्धा हो। उत्तर यह दिया गया है कि जिसकी महत्ता को, जिसकी शान को, जिस की मैग्नीफ्रिसिएन्स (गौरव) को, हिमालय पर्वत और समुद्र बता रहा है, जिसकी बाहु उत्तर-पश्चिम और उत्तर-पूर्व की हिमालय की पहाड़ियां हैं—जिस की भूमि की बाउंडरी (सीमा) बने हुए हैं आसमान तक ऊंचे, फारमिडेवल (भयंकर) और इम्पासेवल (अगम्य)—जिनको कोई पार न कर सके—पहाड़, उस की उपासना करो। जिनसे इसकी अर्थात् भारत की अपनी एंटिटी या स्वत्व बना है। इन समुद्र और पहाड़ों की वजह से यह देश स्वर्ग बन गया है। अगर यह समुद्र न होता, ये पहाड़ न होते और मोनसून न होती तो यह देश स्वर्ग नहीं बन सकता था। मैक्समूलर ने अपने लेख में इस देश को पैराडाइज (स्वर्ग) लिखा है। पर उससे बहुत पहले हमारे वेदों ने बतला दिया था कि यह स्वर्ग है। वेद में बतला दिया गया है कि हमारे देश की क्या सीमा है। वेद में कहा गया है कि

[श्री २० द० मिश्र]

अरे किसको पूजते हो, तुम इस भूमि को ही पूजो, यही भारत माता है। लेकिन आप कहेंगे कि इसमें भारत का नाम नहीं आया। पर यह तो इस्क्रिप्शन (चित्रण) है। वेद में कहा गया है :

य इमे रोदसी उभे ब्रह्मिन्द्रम् तुष्टवम्,
विश्वामित्रस्य रक्षति ब्रह्मोदम् भारतम्
जनम्।

तो यहां पर भारत का शब्द आया है। यह शब्द आज का नहीं है। इसमें बतलाया गया है कि हमारी क्या नीति होनी चाहिये। इन्द्र उस समय राज्य का प्रधान होता था। आज भी इन्द्र नाम से हमारे राजेन्द्र बाबू हमारे देश के प्रधान हैं। इस मंत्र में बतलाया गया है कि हम किस नीति से इन्द्र को संतुष्ट करें। इसमें कहा गया है कि वह सारे संसार से मित्रता की नीति है। इसमें यह भी बतलाया गया है कि वह नीति राष्ट्रीय और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में दोनों जगह होनी चाहिये और यही नीति भारत की जनता की रक्षा करेगी। स्पष्ट है कि जब सारा संसार हमारा मित्र होगा तो किसी से युद्ध नहीं होगा और इस प्रकार जनता की रक्षा होगी। हमारे देश में भिन्न भिन्न प्रकार के लोग रहते हैं, कोई बंगला बोलता है, कोई मराठी बोलता है, कोई गुजराती बोलता है, कोई उड़िया बोलता है, लेकिन अगर हम आपस में प्रेम से रहते हैं तो हम सब एक हैं। यह नीति कोई आज की नहीं है। इसी नीति को वेद ने बताया है। आज हमारे नेता पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू इसी नीति का दुनिया भर में प्रचार कर रहे हैं। उन्होंने भारतीय संस्कृति का अध्ययन करके इस नीति को अपनाया है। यही पंचशील की नीति है। हमने सब ने मिल कर आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी, लेकिन यह जो एक रिआर्गेनाइजेशन (पुनर्गठन) का मामला आ गया इसमें हम चक्कर खा

गये और आपस में लड़ने लगे। आज हम आपस में एक दूसरे को शुबह की निगाह से देखते हैं। मैं सोचता हूँ कि यह गलत बात कैसे पैदा हो गयी। मेरी समझ में इसका एक कारण है। हमारे देश के नेता पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने नारा लगाया कि देश की एकता को तोड़ने वाली शक्तियाँ जो कि आज सामने आ गयी हैं वे हैं कम्युनलिज्म (साम्यप्रदायिता) कास्टीज्म, (जातिभाव), कम्युनिज्म, (साम्यवाद), प्रजासोशलिज्म (प्रजा समाजवाद) आर० एस० पीज्म आदि। इन सब ने मिल कर एक संयुक्त मोर्चा बना लिया है और ये लोग नेशलिज्म (राष्ट्रवाद) के विरुद्ध हैं। हम कांग्रेस वाले नेशनिस्ट हैं। ये फोर्सेज (शक्तियाँ) हमारे खिलाफ एकत्र हो गयी हैं। यह पार्लियामेंट इस समय धर्मक्षेत्र 'कानून बनाने का क्षेत्र' और यही कर्मक्षेत्र है जहां हमें अपने कर्तव्य निर्णय करना है।

धर्मक्षेत्रे कुरुक्षेत्रे समवेता यत्सवः

आज ऐसा मालूम होता है कि एक तरफ कौरवों की फौज खड़ी है और दूसरी तरफ पांडवों की फौज खड़ी है। आज धर्म के क्षेत्र में और ला के क्षेत्र में इन दो शक्तियों का संघर्ष हो रहा है। महाभारत के युद्ध में जब दोनों सेनायें एकत्र हुईं तो अर्जुन ने श्रीकृष्ण से कहा था कि हमको बतला तो दो कि हमको लड़ना किस से है। श्रीकृष्ण ने उसको बीच में लाकर खड़ा कर दिया, तो उसने देखा कि उसके दादा, ताऊ, गुरु आदि उससे युद्ध करने के लिये खड़े हैं। यह सब देख कर वह घबरा गया। वही हाल आज हमारे यहां हमारे महाराष्ट्रीय और दसरे भाइयों का हो रहा है। श्रीकृष्ण रूपी जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने इनको लाकर दिखला दिया कि तुमको किन से लड़ना है। यह देख कर ये गाडगिल आदि रूपी अर्जुन घबरा गये और उन्होंने अपने गांडीव को रख दिया और कहते हैं कि हम किससे लड़े

ये तो हमारे रिश्तेदार हैं। इस प्रकार इनको मोह पैदा हो गया है और ये अपना कर्तव्य निश्चित नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। जिस गांधीव से इन लोगों ने भ्रष्टों को हराया क्युनिस्टों को हराया उसको अब ये छोड़ रहे हैं और चक्कर में पड़ गये हैं कि क्या करें। ये कहते हैं कि इस युद्ध में तो हमको बहुत पाप लगेगा।

Mr. Speaker: I am going to call the hon. Minister at 4 o'clock and the hon. Member knows the number of hon. Members who want to speak before that.

Shri R. D. Mishra: I will take five more minutes.

Mr. Speaker: I will give him one more minute.

Shri R. D. Mishra: That will be too little. I am not saying anything against anybody or any State. I only want to pacify the feelings which have been roused by a long discussion here for so many days and convince those....

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. Member has not been able to convince them in 15 minutes, he is not going to do it hereafter. He has taken 20 minutes. He can resume his seat now. I will call another hon. Member, Shri Veeraswamy.

Shri R. D. Mishra: I will finish in two minutes.

मैं यह कह रहा था कि मोह को हटाने के लिये आखिर में श्रीकृष्ण ने कह दिया कि वहस से काम नहीं चल सकता। उन्होंने कहा :

मन्मना भव मद्भक्तो मद्याजी मां नमस्कुरु,
मामेवैष्यसि सत्यं ते प्रति जाने प्रियोसि मे ।
सर्वं धर्मान् परित्यज्य मामेकं शरणं व्रज,
अहं त्वा सर्वं पापेभ्यो मोक्षयिष्यामि माशुचः ।

तो यहां पर इन लोगों से हमारे जवाहर-लाल जी ने कह दिया कि जैसे मैं सोचता हूँ वैसे ही तुम भी सोचो, जो मेरे प्रिंसिपल

(सिद्धांत) हैं उन पर तुम भी चलो, मेरे प्रिंसिपलस के भक्त बन जाओ, और अपने हगो को दूर करदो। उन्होंने कह दिया कि अगर तुम ऐसा करोगे तो मैं तुमको सब पापों से मुक्त कर दूंगा, यानी सब संघर्षों से मुक्त कर दूंगा जिनमें तुम फंस गये हो। अब दलीलों से काम नहीं चल सकता। यहां पर ऐसी दलीलें और बहस हुई कि लोग चक्कर में पड़ गये। दोनों तरफ की दलीलें मानने लायक मालूम होती हैं। उनसे हमको मतिभ्रम हो गया कि किस बहस को माना जाये कहा है :—

तर्कोऽप्रतिष्ठः श्रुतियोविभिन्नः
नैको ऋषियस्य मत्तं प्रमाणं
धर्मस्य तलं निहितं गुहायां
महाजनो येन गतः सपन्था ॥

यह विषय तर्क से सिद्ध नहीं होता तर्कोऽप्रतिष्ठः। जब ऐसी हालत हो तो हमको श्रुतियों पर चलना चाहिये। इस सम्बन्ध में किसी ने कहा कि यह जोग्रफी (भूगोल) से सिद्ध होता है, किसी ने कहा यह हिस्ट्री (इतिहास) से सिद्ध होता है।

कोई कहता है कमिशन (आयोग) ने ऐसा लिखा है तां कोई कहता है कि कमिशन ने वैसा लिखा है।

There are inconsistencies between the reports of the various commissions, between History and Geography. इस प्रकार श्रुतिओं या शास्त्रों से भी यह निर्णय करना कठिन हो रहा है। श्रुतियों विभिन्न :

अब इन एथारिटीज से भी और दूसरे तर्कों से भी इतना सब कुछ सुनने के बाद भी जब मामला साफ होता है तो हमारे सामने यह सवाल खड़ा होता है कि आखिर कौन सी बात मानें। हिस्ट्री पर चलें या श्रुतियों पर चलें जब इन दोनों बातों से काम न चले तब कहा है कि किसी ऋषि या बड़े के मत को मानो कोई ऐसा ऋषि भी

[श्री २० द० मिश्र]

नहीं कि जिसके पीछे हम चर्चें। हम लोग देख रहे हैं :—

“न एको ऋषियस्य मतं प्रमाणम्”

एक भी तो ऐसा बड़ा आदमी नहीं है जिसकी कि बात को मानें। मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू हमारे देश में एक ऐसे व्यक्ति हैं जिनके कि पीछे देश का विशाल बहुमत है और जिनको कि प्रांतों के विधान मंडलों और संसद के सदस्यों के भारो बहुमत का समर्थन प्राप्त है और जो उनके पीछे चलते हैं और सिर्फ इस देश के अन्दर ही नहीं बल्कि दुनिया के बाहरी देशों में भी लोग उनकी राय को कद्र करते हैं और उसको मानते हैं लेकिन यह बड़े खेद और दुःख का विषय है कि कुछ लोग उनके ऊपर भी शुभहा करने लगते हैं। अब हमारे सामने सवाल पेश है कि जब हमारे देश में कोई ऐसा ऋषि अर्थात् महान व्यक्ति नहीं कि जिसके बतलाये रास्ते पर हम चर्चें तब क्या करना चाहिये और यह सवाल ऐसा है कि न शास्त्र इसको सीधा कर पाता है और न लाजिक (तर्क) ही हेल्पफुल (सहायक) साबित होती है कहा है—

धर्मस्य तत्त्वं निहितं गुहायां,

महाजनो येन गतः स पन्थाः”,

धर्म का तत्व इन सब बातों से छिप गया है। मामला पेचीदा (complicated) हो गया है। अब हमारो ड्यूटी क्या है और हमें क्या करना चाहिये ? यहां पर इतनी ज्यादा दलीलें किस्म-किस्म की दी गई हैं कि असल मसला छिप गया है और यह स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन (राज्य पुनर्गठन) की प्राबलम (समस्या) बजाये हल होने के और ज्यादा कम्प्लीकेटिड (पेचीदा) और कम्प्लैक्स हो गई है और यह समझ में नहीं आ रहा है कि हमें किस रास्ते पर चलना चाहिये तो ऐसी सूरत में हमें “महाजनो येन गतः स पन्थाः”, के रास्ते

को अपनाना चाहिये, अर्थात् जिस रास्ते पर बड़े आदमी चलते हैं और चलते आये हैं उसी रास्ते पर हम भी चर्चें। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देशवासी और हम सब लोग उसी रास्ते के अनुयायी बनें जिस रास्ते को हमें बालगंगाधर तिलक ने दिखाया, जिस रास्ते पर सन् १९२० में हम चले, महात्मा गांधी चले पंडित मोतीलाल नेहरू, श्री सो० आर० दास और लाला लाजपतराय आदि महानुभाव चले और भारत की स्वतन्त्रता को नजदीक लाने के लिये प्रयत्न किया और यह आज उन्हीं के प्रयासों का परिणाम है कि भारत स्वतन्त्र है। उन्होंने अपने अपने समय में भारत में राष्ट्रीयता की भावना को उभारा और देशवासियों को भारत स्वाधीन करने के लिये ललकारा। जो रास्ता लोकमान्य तिलक ने हमें दिखाया और जिस रास्ते पर महात्मा गांधी ने हमें चलाया उसी रास्ते पर चल कर हमने देखा कि पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू, पंडित गोविन्द वल्लभ पंत और मौलाना आजाद ने इतना नाम और यश कमाया और इतने बड़े आदमी बने। They were all great men; they became great because they were nationalists. हमारा कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि हम उन अपने सर्वमान्य नेताओं के पीछे चलें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप अपनी स्पीच खत्म करें।

श्री २० द० मिश्र : मुझे इस बिल के कानूनी पहलू के सम्बन्ध में भी हाउस को बतलाना था लेकिन चूंकि अब आपकी इजाजत नहीं है कि मैं और आगे बोलूं, इसलिये मैं अपनी बात यहीं पर खत्म किये देता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि जब हाउस में अमेंडमेंट्स (संशोधन) पेश होंगे और उन पर बहस चलेगी तब मुझे इस बिल के सम्बन्ध में अपने कानूनी नुक्ते को पेश करने का मौका बिया जायेगा।

Shri Veeraswamy: We the people of Tamil Nad are a peace-loving people. We do not believe in violent agitation. We believe in non-violence. We also believe in the constitutional way of agitation. From the moment the question of reorganisation of States was taken up, that is, when Andhra was separated from Tamil Nad, we the people of Tamil Nad have been demanding certain areas in other adjoining States for inclusion in Tamil Nad. That agitation has been conducted in a very peaceful and constitutional manner. As I said, we do not believe in violence. We have been agitating peacefully for the inclusion of these areas in the Madras State. But, the Government have not paid any heed to our constitutional way of demanding. But, I am so sorry to tell the House that if the Tamilians constitutionally agitate for certain things, our Prime Minister called them scoundrels, stupid, nonsense and so on. It is very unfair on the part of the Prime Minister to say so. Therefore, I respectfully submit to the Government to pay their attention to the demands of the Tamil people.

After the submission of the S.R.C. report to the House, the people of Tamil Nad and all the parties in that State have been demanding the change of the name of that State from Madras to Tamil Nad. This is, after all, a small demand and the Government will not lose anything, they will not suffer any discredit, if they conceded this demand. This will go a long way to earn the goodwill and co-operation of the people of Madras State for the implementation not only of the States Reorganisation Bill, but also of the Second Five-Year Plan.

I know that today our country is passing through a very critical period and the atmosphere is surcharged with suspicion, tension, confusion, disunity and illwill. All over the country a situation is obtaining which portends danger to our future. I am also afraid that if the Government do not come forward to respect the wishes of the people and disregard

the interests of the vested interests, a danger will develop and that would destroy our hard won freedom and demolish the unity existing among the people in various parts of the country. Why all this? The greatest blunder that the Congress Party ever committed in pre-Independence days was the pledge given to the people of this country that the country would be divided into linguistic states on the birth of Independence. The next greatest and Himalayan blunder committed by the party in power was the announcement of the Prime Minister on the floor of the House to the effect that the Andhra State would be separated from Madras. The third blunder that the party has committed is the appointment of the Commission with terms of reference that States would be reorganised mainly on the basis of languages. Having committed all these blunders, I wonder how the Government have not given any serious thought and attention to the wishes of the people at large. Had the Congress party been sincere and honest in their pledges and promises given to the people, the Congress leaders should have taken up this question of the reorganisation of the States soon after Independence was obtained. Had they been otherwise, that is, had they felt that a linguistic division of the country would jeopardise the progress of the country and disrupt the unity of the people, they should have taken courage in both their hands and declared to the people that a linguistic division of the country would be against the larger interests of the people and, therefore, the Congress had given up the policy of re-drawing the boundaries on States on a linguistic basis. They must have said that. But, instead of doing that, they took up this question and after having taken up this question, they should not go back on their words to the people.

We the people of Tamil Nad have been demanding the inclusion of Tamil Nad of Devikulam, Peeramede and Neyyatinkara in Travancore-Cochin State. These three taluks have

[Shri Veeraswamy]

a large Tamil population. The majority of the people are Tamil speaking. I have got a lot of points to put forward in support of this demand. But I am sorry I do not have much time to go into all those details and show to the House how Devikulam, Peermade and Neyyatinkara taluks ought to be included in Madras State. Even from 1816 up to 1941 the census figures show that the majority of the people living in those areas are not Malayalees but Tamilians, but now these taluks have been included in Kerala State. Even Shencottah taluk which was given to Madras State by the States Reorganisation Commission has been cut into two and the major portion has gone to Kerala. They say that would be very convenient for drawing a boundary between Kerala State and Madras State. If that be so, Devikulam, Peermade and Neyyatinkara should also be included in Madras State.

As I pointed out first, I urge upon the Government to give the new State of Madras the name of Tamil Nad, and I do hope the Government will consider this suggestion which I am making on behalf of the people of Tamil Nad. The Congress Members of Tamil Nad may not have expressed this view on the floor of the House with regard to this because they stand by some decision, and if any advice comes from Madras they would say, otherwise they would not say. Therefore, I speak on behalf of the people of Tamil Nad and I urge upon the Government once again with all the emphasis and force at my command that the existing Madras State should be given the name of Tamil Nad.

Then I come to the question of Maharashtra.

Mr. Speaker: Far away from Madras!

Shri Veeraswamy: Culturally, geographically and historically Bombay belongs to Maharashtra. To take Bombay away from Maharashtra is to deny the people of Maharashtra their rightful claim over that city. The

resignation of our Finance Minister is not a small event in the history of our Parliament and in the history of India after independence. It is a unique event. He has done the greatest service for a great cause, and therefore to ignore his resignation and attach any motive to his resignation is to invite danger not only to the people of Gujarat but also to the people of India. I hope that the hon. Members from Gujarat sitting here and elsewhere will come forward not to disrupt the unity of the people by standing in the way of inclusion of Bombay.

I have stayed in Bombay City just for two or three days, and when I was staying and going about in that city I felt that it was a Maharashtrian city because everywhere the Maharashtrians influenced the lives of the other people there. And their population is also about 41 per cent. If we exclude the floating population which comes there for labour and goes back to their home towns and villages the majority of the people living there are Maharashtrians. You might have noticed this significant difference in Bombay City. Therefore, instead of deciding the future of Bombay City after one or two years, or three or four years, we may decide that issue here and now and see that the States are reorganised in our country without any enmity or animosity being developed and without disrupting the unity of our country. If we take into consideration the wishes of the people, we will make a great success of the great and Himalayan task of reorganisation of the States and we can go forward implementing not only the Second Five Year Plan with success but also other plans to come.

Shri B. C. Das (Ganjam—South): Certain friends, when they find controversy and conflict following the introduction of the States Reorganisation Bill, advise us to postpone implementation or passing of this Bill. I am afraid these friends are following the advice or the footsteps of that

learned doctor who advised a patient to cut off his head when he was suffering from headache. The cause of the conflict or confusion or difference is not sought to be understood, but these friends advise us to postpone the evil day and ignore the malady. By ignoring the malady, one cannot cure the malady.

What is the cause of this conflict? The cause is that the ruling party today has forgotten its pledge; it has forgotten history and tradition, it has forgotten that India is not a monolithic nation like England, France or Germany but that India is a multicultural, multi-lingual country. Our nationalism is federal in character. We are not monolithic. Every one knows that we have different cultures, we have different languages, we have different traditions. We are proud of our own languages, our own historical developments, our own literatures, our own heroes, our own fables, our own mode of living and all that. In spite of the differences it is also a fact that we love India, we have a feeling of one common Indian nationhood. When I love my mother tongue, Oriya, I love India. When I learnt to love Orissa, I learnt to love India. I know that by making India prosperous, I shall make Orissa prosperous. Every one of us who thinks that he is an Indian does not forget that he is a Maharashtrian, an Oriya or Bengali or Tamilian. You cannot forget that you are so-and-so when you think you are an Indian. One cannot forget the individual also when one thinks of the nation. Many individuals make a nation. While thinking of the nation, one who advises the sacrifice of the individual is not a nationalist. One who thinks of India, talks big about India and advises in the same breath not to think of the particular regions where national cultures have flowered, where national influences have flourished, where people have developed national outlooks, is not an Indian. I am sorry he is really an enemy of India. Those people who swear by Indian nationalism and at the same

time deny the national heritage of the different regions are the real enemies of India.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

1-59 P.M.

I am sorry our friends of the Hindi-speaking area do not understand the national growth of the regions such as Bengal, Assam, Orissa, Andhra or Tamil Nad. They forget it because Hindi-speaking areas have a different course of development. I know people have adopted Hindi culture or Urdu culture or Hindustani culture, but at the same time they speak different dialects, different languages at home. So, their national development has not developed with the languages. So, they cannot understand that with the development of languages, certain national cultures have also developed in different parts of India. This factor our friends forget and by denying this essential truth they are striking at the root of Indian nationalism. But our nationalism is federal in character and we can develop India into a strong country if we realise this.

Why this trouble in Bombay? There is trouble in Bombay because you are not accepting some essential principles. There is trouble somewhere not because you have accepted the linguistic principle, but because you have denied the linguistic principle. There is trouble somewhere when you apply one yardstick in the case of one particular area and you refuse to apply that same yardstick to another area. When you become unjust, when you become unethical, when you become anti-national, when you become partial, when you become timid, then alone trouble arises. Our earnest hope is that the national standard will be applied for every region. Then there would be no trouble.

2 P.M.

In my State of Orissa there was some trouble, there was some conflict. The House knows what took place some months back. Why did it happen? The Prime Minister said

[Shri B. C. Das]

that for a small bit of territory to create trouble was unnecessary; when frontiers are collapsing, when the entire world is being knit into an international society, to think of small boundaries is bad and indicates small-mindedness. But he forgot at the same time that if one does not think of ones nation and if one does not think of ones own home, one cannot think of the world also. One who does not know how to love his home cannot love the world; one who does not know how to love man cannot love the world.

Why was there trouble in Orissa? The trouble in Orissa was that the present Government failed to realise that the Oriya people in the course of their development have met with rebuffs, have met with set-backs, have been ill-treated, maltreated, neglected by the British and today when India has achieved independence, Orissa has not got her proper due. You will be surprised to know that the Oriyas who took an active part in the independence movement in the 19th century broke away from the Congress in 1902 on the question of linguistic provinces. Then the leader of Orissa, the late M. S. Das wanted an assurance from the Congress that when India got freedom, the map of India would be redrawn on linguistic basis. He broke away from the Congress on this issue. Gandhiji, that great visionary, that great genius of political movement understood that to appeal to the Indian masses, to make the Congress a real mass movement, a mass organisation, the linguistic principle should be accepted. When he accepted that, Orissa also under the leadership of the late Gopabandhu Das joined the rest of the country and her sacrifice in the cause of national movement is not insignificant. It was because Oriyas knew that they would have a home of their own, that in the larger politic of India, in the large State of India, Orissa will have a place and will be allowed to develop her individuality and culture, and enabled to contribute her best to the growth of India

nationalism. Then Orissa took part in the national movement.

I am sure the House may be aware that Orissa during the British rule was dismembered, was put under different regions, different provinces; everywhere the Oriyas were a small entity, a negligible minority. They were not ruled by the British directly; they were ruled by intermediaries who belonged to the majority communities and acquired vested interests in those regions. They all treated the Oriyas as an inferior race and that was the reason for the discontent of the Oriyas. The Oriyas thought that after independence, they would be brought under one administration, when they would become full-fledged Indians by developing their culture and when they would not feel that they were suppressed by other Indian nationals. This important factor has not been understood by the Centre even now, because Orissa is still being neglected. We all know how Saraikeella and Kharsawan were snatched away from Orissa. It was done very arbitrarily. When Orissa placed her case before the Commission, the Commission had not the patience to go into the issue of Saraikeella, Kharsawan and other boundaries. It summarily disposed of Orissa's case. That was a tragedy. They should have known that in 1932 when the O'Donnell Commission was appointed Orissa had not a Government of its own; Orissa was under several administrations. Her case was not fully gone into by the Commission, because Oriyas were nowhere in dominant position, and the provincial Governments whose areas were claimed by Oriyas put every spoke in the wheel. That was why Orissa's claims could not be properly considered by the Commission.

Now when the States Reorganisation Commission was appointed Orissa wanted her case to be fully gone into. But unfortunately that was not done. The Central Government also treated the claims of the Oriya people in a

cavalier fashion. That was why there was resentment. It was not for a small territory that people clamoured. It was because of the cavalier fashion, or the rude way in which the Oriya people were treated. Had the people been sympathetically approached, had the Oriya people felt that this Government is treating them fairly and that they are applying the same yardstick in every case, that injustice is not being done to the Oriya people, they would have been even prepared to surrender a part of Orissa; they would not have cared for it. That is why I appeal to this Government to accept certain norms, certain standards, certain principles and apply those principles uniformly, in every case. I am sure the patriotism of our people is so strong that they will abide by those decisions based on principles whether they get a bit of territory or not. If that is done all agitation will die down. But if people have a feeling that injustice is being done to them, that you are doing things in an arbitrary fashion, to please one interest or another, then there is going to be trouble. The trouble following the S.R.C. is due to the fact that the Central Government has not followed sound or scientific principles. And unfortunately today the leadership at the Centre is in the hands of people who do not understand the national or cultural development of the different regions of India. It is very unfortunate. The people of the United Provinces do not know the national or cultural aspirations of the people of Maharashtra, Orissa, Bengal or Tamil Nad. They sit in judgment over the destinies of others and boast of Indian patriotism. They do not know that a good Maharashtrian is also a good Indian, a good Oriya is a good Indian and so also a good Bengali is a good Indian. As one who displays narrow Bengali nationalism or Oriya nationalism cannot claim that he is an Indian first and Indian last, so also one who boasts of Indian nationalism and disclaims his origin as Oriya is not a good Indian. I doubt his patriotic bonafides.

I say that in this Bill you have not made any provision to satisfy the Oriya people, I would, therefore, urge upon the Government to make a provision for setting up of a Boundary Commission with precise instructions. It should be made clear that boundary disputes should be settled on the principle of language and contiguity and that village should be the unit. In that case I am sure all will abide by the decisions of the Boundary Commission. Let a Boundary Commission be appointed and much of our trouble will disappear.

Then in the case of Bombay, do not fear, do not be timid, do not be weak-hearted. Apply the principle of language and contiguity. If you know the principle you have enunciated is correct, apply it and the right thing to remember is that India is a multi-national State. That rainbow of Indian nationalism is beautiful because it is composed of so many different cultures, so many nationalities.

Shri Khardekar (Kolhapur cum Satara): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this opportunity to participate in the general discussion is an unexpected pleasure and because unexpected, is greater. This question of reorganisation of States is important to all States, but it is a question of life and death for us, the poor Maharashtrians. I am not able to understand how and why Bombay has been excluded from Maharashtra, in spite of all these discussions, and how the Central administration is going to work in practice. Does it mean a few wise men here are going to rule Bombay over the telephone? Or does it mean two or three less wise men from here are going to Bombay to rule there? If they go there, they will be perambulating between Bombay and Delhi; coming to Delhi for guidance and instructions, inspiration and blessings and going back to Bombay to act on the advice of the two great men in Bombay—I need not mention the names. Every evil has some blessing

[Shri Khardekar]

in it. I am sure the general policy that this Government has of increasing the number of Ministers will further be helped, as the rate of increase of Ministers is even more rapid than the rate of increase in Indian population. A good deal has been said on this question.

I want mainly and particularly to examine rather carefully the declaration of the Prime Minister on the 3rd of June, in Bombay. The Prime Minister said that it was a declaration of policy. In my humble opinion, it was not a declaration of policy, but it was a declaration of a decision. When a Bill is pending before the House, Government may make certain proposals, and even lay down broad policies, but it is this sovereign body, this Parliament, that has to take decisions, and Government has to implement them. To appoint a Joint Committee and bring the Bill for discussion here, when its fate is more or less sealed, is waste of time, money and energy.

Now, we have not only one-man party and one-man government, but Mr. Nehru is something more than that. I want to explain as to how his opinion influences the views of others. I have no particular liking for the Congress Party. I find that the Government has many defects; I have no love for it. But in spite of certain defects, or in spite of the wrong, which, I feel, Mr. Nehru has done to Maharashtra, I cannot help loving him and liking him. He may have gone wrong in one respect, but he has done a hundred good things to the country, and I cannot be ungrateful. When I, a person from the Opposition, and a really unattached Independent, who can take—I think so—entirely an objective view, feel that my opinion is likely to be influenced by the Prime Minister's views or opinions, how much more would his views or his opinions influence those who are members of his party, who have been his colleagues, and who have been working with him for

several years in the national struggle and so on?

Therefore, Mr. Nehru is not only a Prime Minister. He is more than that, and he is even more than the Government. Yesterday, he said rather too loudly—I think that a man should not speak so loudly—that he has studied and known the democracies throughout the world, and the Indian democracy also. That is quite true. But there is a lack of perspective, in that he does not know the difference, I think, between our infant democracy and a mature democracy like that of England.

I could just give an example. You know that at the time of the war, when Chamberlain was thrown out, Churchill was requested to form a coalition government, and through his wisdom and words, Churchill steered clear the State out of dangers, and probably saved democracy from being trampled upon by dictators like Hitler and Mussolini. But Churchill, who proved such a successful Prime Minister, was thrown out, when the war was over. The English people thought that he was not the right type of man, or he was not a man for peace, and therefore they threw him out, not that the English people were ungrateful to Churchill; not at all, they had appreciation of his abilities. But there the people are educated, their political consciousness has grown, and people could think independently and properly. Here, personality cult prevails with a vengeance. It is good for some times otherwise, the people would not be galvanised in any great effort in a country like ours where there is so much of illiteracy and so on. But as regards Parliament, I think it would have been good if the Prime Minister had not led the Members of the Joint Committee and the Members of the House to a certain conclusion, before they themselves had arrived at it.

But what really hurt me, and more than surprised me, and shocked me,

was that a person like the Prime Minister should have tried to wriggle out of his speech by saying that the Joint Committee and Parliament are free to do what they like. As a follower of Gandhiji, and as a successor of Gandhiji, it would have been very dignified and grand on the part of the Prime Minister to have admitted the mistake, I am prepared to say, even blunder. Everybody makes mistakes. It is human to err. Infallibility is only in the nature of the gods. If you do not make mistakes, you make nothing. But if you do not learn from your mistakes, you learn from nothing. Unfortunately, the Prime Minister has been sticking to his saying, by saying that the Joint Committee and the Parliament can change it as they like. That is really being clever. It would be a great misfortune if a great leader degenerates into a politician. The Joint Committee has bowed down to the dictation of the Prime Minister. I hope that Parliament, if it is a sovereign body, will try its best to retain its sovereign character.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-
bagh West): 'No.

Shri Khardekar: I think it will follow the dictators of its conscience rather than the dictations of any person. If this Parliament loses its sovereignty, then it becomes something like an ineffective debating union....

Shri Khardekar: ...and not only that, but a dictated debating union, servile and even slavish. If Members do not rise on such an important occasion as this, I do not know what sort of democracy we would be having; it will be a democracy which is not only infant, but fictitious, even farcical, and our dictatorship we have seen what sort of it we have weak and vascillating, even pusillanimous, as we have seen, in dealing with the problem of Goa.

I do not know whether you remember that just two years ago, while

speaking on foreign affairs—I do not think people would bother to remember what I said—I threw a suggestion to the Prime Minister—because I am very much interested in world peace, human brotherhood and so on—that instead of wasting a good deal of his time here, he should go round the world and preach for peace. Not in a direct reply, but indirectly, the Prime Minister said that he disagreed with me and said what is important is what we do here. Now, in some measure, the position seems to have been reversed. He has been going round the world, talking about *Panch Shila* and other things. But to us, Maharashtrians he has been doing injustice.

Of course, yesterday, there was a good deal of toning down in his speech, and there is a hand of friendship offered, but still there is some obstinacy lingering behind. I am definitely certain that there is no animus. It is impossible. Mr. Nehru as a man is almost childlike with childlike innocence. But the trouble is he is impressionable. He is always surrounded, as *The Times of India* has very often been writing, by flatterers and courtiers, and like a child, he is obstinate. That is the whole trouble.

Now, I want to say a few words to the Congress. It is a great organisation, based on the ideals of Mahatma Gandhi, namely non-violence and truth. Is it not the duty of the Congress Party and the Congress Government here and elsewhere to find out the truth about the disturbances in Bombay? People have been asking for an enquiry. And the Congress, particularly, should find out the truth, because healing of wounds, some of us feel, means merely adding insult to injury.

I shall just draw your attention to one or two sentences from Mr. M. R. Jayakar, which will make you aware of the gravity of the situation.

"Some of these incidents reminded me of the days when I served on the

[Shri Khardekar]

Congress Committee, appointed in the year 1919, to consider the affairs relating to the Jallianwalla Bagh. I then worked in close association with Gandhiji, Motilal Nehru, C. R. Dass and Malaviya".

Then he has made an appeal to the Prime Minister.

"I have, however, no doubt that, if the facts alleged as authentically established as stated above, are brought to the notice of our Prime Minister, he will, in his usual fair-mindedness desire an impartial inquiry. If for no better purpose than to clear the administration concerned of what might otherwise remain as a dark blot on its fair name".

I want this administration to enjoy the reputation of being fair. I have no doubt the Prime Minister's mind is very fair. But, I do not know, somehow clouds seem to gather somewhere, and unfortunately, the feeling of the people is not understood.

Then I have all along been an admirer of Morarji Desai. I must say this, being an independent person. I thought of him always as a good administrator. Pandit G. B. Pant also paid him a great tribute by saying that he is the purest of men, and if I were to use the words of Tennyson while describing Sir Galahead of King Arthur's Knights of the Round Table.

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): If you cannot criticise a person while he is not here, can you compliment him?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We take objection to making comments against a person if he is not here, because he is not able to answer. But if something is said in his favour, that is all right.

Shri Khardekar: "My strength is as the strength of ten because my heart is pure". In support of that, I will read two or three sentences, to show his fairness. While introducing

the S. R. Bill on the 27th March 1956, he said:

"I have served all parts of this State as impartially as it can be given to a man to do it. I am prepared to be judged in any impartial manner by any impartial person in this matter. Let that happen, and I am prepared to put my case. Let them also put their case. If any impartial judge says that there is something partial which I have done, I am prepared to pay any penalty that may be demanded of me".

Maharashtrians in Bombay accuse Shri Morarji of being responsible for the murder of Maharashtrians. Why does he not order an inquiry?

Coming to the last point—because I did not expect that I would be called—that is, about border areas like Belgaum from my part, Nepani, Khanapur and so on, for these things, as has been suggested by several hon. Members, a Boundary Commission, with suitable terms of reference, should be appointed so that all these minor bickerings will come to an end.

Finally, I want to say a word about the solution. I am, and I have always been, for a bilingual Bombay State of all Maharashtrians and all Gujaratis. I have lived with Gujaratis. Shri C. C. Shah is a friend of mine. We were students together. I am always surprised why he sits on the fourth row when he is far better than those on the first row.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): The hon. Member is also a back-bencher.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Comparisons may not be liked.

Shri Khardekar: But the first thing for a bilingual State is that an inquiry should be held, because people must know who has done the wrong, and what has been done. So without an inquiry, the atmosphere will not be cleared up.

Shri Kanavade Patil (Ahmednagar—North): It has been said by some hon.

Members that while we are trying to reorganise States on the linguistic basis, ill-blood against each other has been created and bad feelings have been aroused by certain circumstances; some of us have, losing our temper, made rather hot speeches and instead of considering ourselves as brothers and sons of the same common soil, we have, so far as this issue is concerned, been acting as strangers towards each other. I do not think such a charge is correct. I humbly submit that all that is needed is a broader outlook towards the solution of these difficult problems.

It has been accepted by all our politicians and leading statesmen that by establishing linguistic States, we shall be able to further the general welfare and progress of this country, and on the basis of that, our country has decided to reorganise our States, mainly on the linguistic basis, though some other factors have been suggested by some friends. From this point of view, I am quite sure that when we have re-established our States on the basis of language, a great asset would have accrued to the Union. It is not going to weaken the Union at all.

Some of my hon. friends from U.P. who have nothing to bother about bilingual or multilingual States, have come forward and tried to give us lessons on patriotism. I am very sorry to say that that sort of attitude is not correct. I wish to look at this problem as one of readjustment of our own affairs with the consent of each other.

I come to the question of the reorganisation of the proposed Maharashtra State and the integration of Bombay with it. I would like to submit that it would have been better if Bombay had been integrated with Maharashtra State. There is not a single, cogent, valid or convincing reason advanced up till now to show why Bombay has not been included within the proposed State of Maharashtra, when it has been very clearly admitted even by our Prime Minister

that geographically Bombay is part and parcel of Maharashtra. I may add here that even culturally and otherwise, there are thousands and thousands of links which connect Bombay with Maharashtra. The argument of some of my friends from Gujarat that it is an island, has been sufficiently answered and it needs no further answer. Bombay is apparently, and on the very face of it, part and parcel of Maharashtra. The nearest point of the Gujarat border is more than 90 miles to the north of Bombay city. It is very surprising, when Bombay is connected with Maharashtra in so many other ways and when the very prosperity of the city depends on its cordial and close relationship with Maharashtra, that such arguments against the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra should be advanced.

Let us look at the facts. For its daily supply of water, for its electricity, for its daily supply of food, fruits, vegetables and several other essential items including milk, Bombay city depends on Maharashtra. More than all, who supplies manual labour in the city of Bombay? On the sweat of millions of Maharashtrians during the last one century, Bombay has been built up.

May I know who is coming in the way of Bombay's inclusion in Maharashtra?

An Hon. Member: Money-bags.

Shri Kanavade Patil: A small section of influential—I do not call them money-bags—vested interests, some of the non-Maharashtrian commercial community, not all. I know some of the Gujaratis are also supporting the case of Maharashtra for Bombay. But some of them are coming in the way. It is very unfortunate that the persons in authority, who can solve this problem, should have been swayed by the influence of this small, negligible section of vested interests living in Bombay today. Therefore, I submit that it is really an unfortunate thing that the claims of the Maharashtrians which have been accepted should be

[Shri Kanavade Fatil]

overlooked. I may say very humbly that if you look into the statement of our beloved Prime Minister which he made yesterday, you will see he was rather inclined to think that the time has come for Bombay to be given to Maharashtra. Excepting the question of Bombay, all other linguistic issues have been solved. We are debating the issue of Bombay. That unfortunate city has been the subject of such vast and bitter controversy in the country and on the floor of this House that I would appeal to all the hon. Members and to the conscience of India through this House and especially to my friends from Gujerat that they should reconsider the whole position and should consent to the inclusion of the city of Bombay in Maharashtra. (*Interruption*).

We are claiming that we are having a socialist pattern of society; that our aim is social democracy. It is our duty to see that the citizens of Bombay get their rightful place in the future set-up of this country. The city of Bombay was foremost, at the helm of India's struggle for freedom, and these citizens have now been denied, under the present circumstances, the right of exercising their franchise. I do submit that it would be good in the larger interests of India and Maharashtra to hand over the city to Maharashtra of which it would be natural capital.

I would like to answer a few points which have been raised during this debate by some of our friends. Some of our friends, including my friend Shri Tulsidas Kilachand and others, have gone to the extent of advising the Prime Minister that this linguistic affair should altogether be cancelled because they feel that this issue of Bombay has become a headache to most of them and they are afraid that in course of time Bombay will be handed over to Maharashtra. We do not understand this attitude. What Calcutta is to the Bengalis, what Madras is to Tamil Nad, what Hyderabad is to Andhra Telengana, that

Bombay is to Maharashtra. Others may be in a minority. All these cities are cosmopolitan cities. Bombay is not the only cosmopolitan city in the country where all the peoples of India are mixed. You go to Calcutta; you go to Madras; you go to Delhi, you will find all these cities the same. To say that Bombay is the only cosmopolitan city is wrong. So, at this stage, after we have spent so much of money and wasted so much of time, our precious time, your advice to the Prime Minister and Government to postpone or cancell this issue of reorganisation of States is not proper.

One point has been suggested here,—especially by my worthy friend Shri S. K. Patil—that it is high time, even according to him, to think in terms of a bilingual—a larger Bilingual State of Bombay and Gujerat. It may not be out of place here if I deal in a minute or two with the history of this bilingual State. After the S.R.C. Report was published, wherein the so-called balanced State of Gujerat and Maharashtra was mentioned, the Maharashtra Provincial Congress Committee held its meeting. With the co-operation of all other parties in Maharashtra a resolution was adopted under the inspiration and guidance of Shri Shankar Rao Deo, whose patriotism is unquestionable and whose sacrifice is also unquestionable, that Maharashtra and Gujerat should have a large bilingual State including Vidarbha. It was also suggested in that resolution that if Gujerat, after the end of 5 years, did not find it convenient to remain in that bilingual State, it should be free to go out of that State and to have the Maha Gujerat State. There was nothing wrong in that. After that resolution, the Gujerat Provincial Congress Committee immediately held a meeting and passed a resolution in haste not only rejecting our very honest and clear offer but also imputing designs and motives to our sincere and genuine efforts for a bilingual State. I had long talks with some of my friends here, including our worthy friend,

Shri C. C. Shah, on this point. In my opinion, they thought that the Maharashtrians would be in a majority in that State and therefore they would suffer. I may humbly submit that in my opinion—I am a very small man—that resolution of the B.P.C.C. would be giving a lead to the whole of India. Even the High Command and our Government did not pay the slightest attention to that resolution. They did not even say a word of thanks or a word of appreciation about the strenuous efforts of Shri Shankar Rao Deo and Shri Bhausaheb Hiray, Shri Deogrikar and Shri Chavhan, our leading Congressmen in Maharashtra. Instead of that, look at the Bihar-Bengal merger proposal. When the Bihar-Bengal merger proposal came, our leaders said that they were showing us the way, that they were giving us a lead and they were leading us to a happy condition. It was still-born proposal. Instead of laughing at that proposal, the leaders were highly admiring it though the result was nil. We do not know what sins the Maharashtrians had committed. That is the ill-luck of the whole affair. This is the history of the bilingual State.

There are so many people in Maharashtra who would have been very glad to have a bilingual State on the basis of the resolution of October 21, 1955, passed by the M.P.C.C. They would have been glad if it had been accepted with cordiality and friendship by the G. P. C. C. Instead of that, the G.P.C.C. thought that they would get the help of some section of the Maharashtrians and with its support they may overpower the persons who were for the larger bilingual State. With that expectation, probably, the G.P.C.C. committed an error of judgment. That is my view of this bilingual State.

One more point. What really pricks us is not so much the non-integration of Bombay with Maharashtra but, as Shri G. H. Deshpande stated the

other day, the mistrust or suspicion that has been shown about us as a race. Therein lies the crux of the whole trouble. Every Maharashtrian feels that he has been looked upon by some section of this country as not sufficiently patriotic; a suspicion has been expressed about his honesty. Therefore, every Maharashtrian feels that it is a challenge to his racial character and has accepted it as such, for which I also feel very much sorry. We, the Maharashtrians, are proud of India as much as any body from U.P. is. We are proud of India's tradition; we are proud of its glory. We have played our role as eminently as we can and we have sacrificed as much as we are capable of. We have done it during the last 500 years. Maharashtra has stood for the preservation of the highest culture and the traditions and the ancient institutions of this country. We gave Shivaji; we are proud of Shivaji and Ramdas as much as we are proud of Guru Govind Singh and Guru Teg Bahadur, Rana Pratap of Rajasthan and thousands and thousands of heroes and heroines of Rajasthan, Punjab and all other parts of India—people who have sacrificed for the preservation of the independence and greatness of this country. We are proud of Bengal, of its emotional race that gave us Swami Rama Krishna Paramahansa, Swami Vivekananda and Chaitanya Mahaprabhu. * * * * We are proud of Shivaji, of everybody. We are proud of India and proud of the heritage and greatness of India. To charge the Maharashtrians with being provincial is wrong. I very much regret..... (Interruption). Please do not divert the attention of this debate. We are proud of Mahatma Gandhi and Sardar Patel, who brought together 500 Princes and integrated their States with India in a day. We are proud of India's common heritage.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, the hon. Member has gone to a very elevated position. He should not come down, but should conclude.

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair.
271 I.S.P.

Shri Kanavade Patil: I would humbly request the House to think about it and judge the mental attitude of Maharashtrais. Why should such an attitude have been created? I appeal to my friends on this side of the House to understand and appreciate the critical condition in which we in Maharashtra are placed today. I told some of my friends what kind of difficulties we are passing through.

When our racial character is challenged by some unjustifiable remarks, very unworthy remarks, we naturally are placed in a very critical condition. I may humbly submit that more than 54,000 Maharashtrais have offered satyagraha. Do you mean to say that they are all Socialist and Communist Party people? Socialists and communists are negligible in Maharashtra, and the Congress people are still very strong there and the Congress has a very big following there. But unfortunately during the last six months every day we are finding that we have been singled out. On the one side there is discipline; on the other side there is the pressure from the people. The most pitiable figures today in Maharashtra are the leading Congressmen.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should conclude now; otherwise I shall have to call the next speaker.

Shri Kanavade Patil: I would request the House to take the situation into account and would appeal to you in the name of justice and fair-play that Bombay's case should be considered on a proper and just basis, and as a bigger bilingual State is not likely to come into being, it is in the interest of the nation to give Bombay to Maharashtra and settle this case once and for all.

श्री रा० स० तिवारी (छत्तरपुर-दतिया-टीकमगढ़) : आज राज्य पुनर्गठन विधेयक को उपस्थित किये हुये छः सात दिन हो चुके हैं और उस पर बराबर काफ़ी गरमा गरम बहस हुई है। यह विधेयक कुछ

दिनों बाद कानून की शकल में लेगा और उस के आधार पर हम आप सब को काम करना पड़ेगा। जहाँ तक मैंने आपस के मतभेदों को सुना, ज्यादातर पंजाब और बम्बई के झगड़े ज्यादा दिखाई दिये।

एक माननीय सदस्य : पंजाब का कोई झगड़ा नहीं। धन्यवाद ?

श्री रा० स० तिवारी : चर्चा जो चली उस में पंजाब और बम्बई का ही झगड़ा ज्यादा दिखाई दिया : लेकिन जब पंत जी ने बिल पेश किया था उस समय उन्होंने कहा था कि राज्य पुनर्गठन के मसले को इस पार्लियामेंट (संसद) को ही तय करना है, और पार्लियामेंट जो निर्णय करेगा उसी के आधार पर हम निश्चित करेंगे कि आग कैसे क्या किया जाय। हम ने अपना इस समय सब वक्त लड़ने में ही गुजारा, यहाँ बैठ कर कोई निश्चयात्मक कदम हमने नहीं उठाया कि आखिर जो झगड़े हैं उसको निपटारा कैसे जाय। हम एक दूसरे पर आक्षेप कर के लड़ने रहे पर कोई रचनात्मक निर्णय—सुझाव नहीं दे सके। अब थोड़ी देर के बाद इस विधेयक की धाराओं पर विचार होने वाला है, इसलिये मेरा निवेदन यह है कि अगर हम बैठकर आपस में विचार विनिमय कर के कोई संशोधन या कोई सुधार रख सकते तो ज्यादा अच्छा होता। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर (प्रधान मंत्री) ने भी कद कहा था और हम को उनकी यह बात माननी ही पड़ेगी, कि अगर हम लोग उन के सामने कोई अच्छे सुझाव रख सकते तो उत्तम होता। हमें प्राइम मिनिस्टर के इन वचनों पर जरूर चलना चाहिए कि महाराष्ट्रीयों को उन पर विश्वास कर के शांति के साथ बम्बई के प्रश्न को निपटाने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये।

कुछ सदस्यों द्वारा यहाँ पंडित नेहरू भी के लिये कहा गया है कि वे डिक्लेटर (एका -

धिकारी) हैं। आज घाट नौ महीने इस विधेयक पर विचार करते हो गये हैं, और हर प्रकार से एक दूसरे के विचार जानने की कोशिश की जा रही है, परन्तु कोई हल उस का नहीं निकल रहा है, फिर भी पंडित नेहरू जी को डिक्टेटर को उपाधि देना मैं समझता हूँ कि बिल्कुल गलत है। उन्होंने ने सबका विचार जानने के लिये काफी समय लोगों को दिया है। इस विषय में अधिक न कह कर मैं थोड़ी सी बात अपने प्रदेश के बारे में कहूँगा क्योंकि पार्लियामेंट का समय कीमती है।

मैं विध्य प्रदेश मे आया हूँ। विध्य प्रदेश नये मध्य प्रदेश में विलीन होने जा रहा है। हम लोगों को शुरू से ही एक दूसरे राज्यों में विलीन होना पड़ रहा है। पहले हम अलाहदा छोटे राज्यों में थे, उस के बाद छोटे राज्यों का विलीनीकरण बड़े राज्यों में हुआ, फिर उस का विलीनीकरण एक बड़े राज्य बुधेलखंड रीवा में हुआ। उस के बाद मध्य प्रदेश में हमको मिला कर एक बड़ा यूनिट बनाया गया। इस तरह मे एक साल के बाद दूसरे और दूसरे साल के बाद तीसरे साल हम इधर उधर के राज्यों में मिलते रहे हैं। अब जब हमारा विलीनीकरण नये मध्य प्रदेश में हो रहा है तो हमारे यहां के कर्मचारियों तथा जनता को हर तरह की परेशानी है, इंसाफ की परेशानी है, जब हम छोटी रियासतों में थे तो चालीस पचास मील पर हाई कोर्ट और सुप्रीम कोर्ट थे, अब हमको हजारों मील चल कर जाना पड़ता है। छोटे बड़े कर्मचारियों का भविष्य उज्वल रहे। मैं निवेदन यह कर रहा हूँ कि कृषक जनता के कार्य मार्ग में बाधा न हो आर्थिक सामाजिक सहूलियतें प्रदान की जानी चाहिये। यह जो नया मध्य प्रदेश बना है वह क्षेत्रफल के हिसाब से देखा जाय तो भारत देश में सब से बड़ा है। और जन संख्या के हिसाब से वह छठे दर्जे पर आता है। इतने बड़े प्रदेश के लिये माननीय मंत्री जी ने जब ड्राफ्ट

बिल (प्राथम विधेयक) पेश किया था पार्लियामेंट (संसद्) में तो उस में यह कहा गया था, यह पृष्ठ ३२ में है :

"As from such date as the President may by order appoint, there shall be a Legislative Council for the new State of Maharashtra

दूसरे में कहा है :

In the said Council there shall be 72 seats....

यानी उस में ७२ सीट्स कौंसिल के लिये दी गई थीं, लेकिन जब यह बिल ज्वार्येंट कमेटी (संयुक्त समिति) के मुपुर्द किया गया तो उसने इन शब्दों को हटा कर एक नई धारा जोड़ दी, जो कि मैं समझता हूँ कि उस के लिये उचित नहीं है।

Clause 35 (Original clause 31)—The Committee considered the question whether Legislative Councils should be provided in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra.

इन तीनों राज्यों के लिये फिर क्या कहा है ?

As regards Andhra Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh, the Committee consider that, since there is no Legislative Council in any part of the territories of these two States, it would be preferable to leave it to these States to take the necessary steps under the Constitution after they come into existence.

इतने बड़े प्रदेश के लिये पहले तो यह निश्चय किया गया, लेकिन उस के बाद विधान परिषद् वाली जो ७२ आदमियों वाली बात थी उस को भी उड़ा दिया गया है।

[श्री रा० स० तिवारी]

महाराष्ट्र को उसी-में दे दिया गया। आंध्र और मध्य प्रदेश को नहीं दिया गया। इतना बड़ा प्रदेश जो है, जहां का क्षेत्रफल १ लाख ७१ हजार बर्ग मील से अधिक है, उसमें से आप ने कौंसिल को निकाल दिया है। हमारे विधि मंत्री जी सामने बैठे हुये हैं, वे अगर इस पर कुछ विचार करें तो अच्छा होगा।

आप ने एक प्रदेश को तो लैजिस्लेटिव कौंसिल दे दी लेकिन दूसरों को नहीं दी। यह ठीक बात नहीं है। या तो आप उसको भी न देते, और यदि आपने उसको दी है तो आपको हमें भी देनी चाहिये। वे लोग झगड़ा करने वाले हैं और उन्होंने झगड़ा किया और आपने डर कर, इस चीज को मान लिया। हम लोग झगड़ा नहीं करते, आपके हुक्म का पालन करते हैं, क्या यही वजह है कि हमको लैजिस्लेटिव कौंसिल नहीं दी गई है। इस वास्ते मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि आप इस ओर ध्यान देंगे और इतने बड़े प्रदेश के लिये एक विधान परिषद् की व्यवस्था अवश्य करेंगे।

दूसरा निवेदन जो मैं करना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि सीमा आयोग की नियुक्ति की जाकर द्वीपवन ग्रामों को यथा उचित स्थानों में मिलाये जाने के लिये व्यवस्था की जानी चाहिये। मिनेटर्स कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में जो यह कहा है कि जो विधान सभा चुनी जायेगी अगर उस की यह इच्छा होगी कि वहां पर लैजिस्लेटिव कौंसिल हो तो इसकी व्यवस्था उस समय की जा सकती है। श्रीमान् यह तो बरसों का झगड़ा है और यह काम जल्दी होने वाला नहीं है। तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि इतनी अधिक लम्बाई और आवादी वाले प्रदेश के लिये आप अभी एक विधान परिषद् देने की कृपा करें।

Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur):
Sir, we have been discussing this question for a long time and as I was

sitting here listening to the speeches from all sides of the House, I have asked myself one question. Have all these discussions produced any change in our outlook, in our temper, in our policy? The answer to this question has been that, though the outlook has been slightly modified, though the policy has changed very occasionally, there has been a distinct improvement in the temper with which we have faced this problem. I think it is not a slight gain which has come out of the democratic process of discussing a very vital and controversial problem in this country.

I will be failing in my duty if I do not tell you that I am an advocate and votary, confirmed, unrepentant and unabashed votary, of bilingual States. I think the solution of India's problem lies in the creation of bilingual States. If we have created some unilingual States, I think it is only a transitional stage and the day is not far off when we will be in a position to merge some of these units into a bigger unit. I think it will be the next stage in our onward journey to progress and prosperity.

I find that this principle of bilingual States has been given the go-by in this Bill but there is one exception. I am glad that we have that exception and that exception is Punjab. In Punjab we are going to try the experiment of a bilingual State and though the name of Punjab spells, at this time, controversy—controversy not on that big scale as the name of some other States denote—still, I think we are going to make—I say this with a due sense of responsibility—a success of this bilingual State in Punjab.

The name of Punjab has been very much in the news for some time. I know that, I also know that it has not been very happily in the news for some time. I confess that. As an Indian and not as a Punjabi, I do not feel very happy about it. But, I must submit that the trouble in

Punjab—of whatever kind, intensity or duration—has been due, not so much to the circumstances that are prevailing in that State now, but due to the hang over from the days of undivided Punjab. We have brought certain things from undivided Punjab and we have not forgotten those things. Unfortunately, they have been revived and resurrected during the recent times and they have caused a lot of harm.

What did undivided Punjab mean? It meant communalism—three communities, Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs. It meant: city versus village, agriculturist versus non-agriculturist. It meant one caste against another caste. It also meant linguism. In the undivided Punjab there used to be trouble between Hindi, Urdu and Punjabi. But, may I tell you, Sir, and appeal to you, not as Deputy-Speaker of this House but as one coming from that area, to consider this: In the undivided Punjab, it was left to any person who professed Punjabi as his or her mother tongue or who thought Punjab as one of the languages of his own, to write Punjabi in Punjabi or Gurmukhi script or in the Hindi script or the Urdu script. I must say that that privilege is not given these days. But, that is a different thing.

What I mean to say is this. There was this linguistic battle going on in the undivided Punjab and we are carrying on that battle even now. The biggest thing that we found in the undivided Punjab was denominationalism. That was there in various institutions. They say that human beings forget nothing and learn nothing. For sometime, Punjab was moving along the path of prosperity and unity. Unfortunately, as a result of certain factors, into which I will very briefly go just now, all these controversies have now been revived. We find that Punjab is not as happy a place as it used to be.

You were quite right when you said yesterday that there was fear in the

minds of one community or the other. If I am not quoting you, I am at least giving the substance of your argument. You have said that the majority community does not want to find itself in a subordinate position in any linguistic division of India. I do not think so. I think this talk about the majority community and the minority community has not been very much to the fore in the battle of the life of Punjab for some time but unfortunately, there have been certain communal forces at work which have created that fear in the minds of the members of one community and in the minds of the members of the other community. Therefore, the condition of Punjab has been rather unhappy all these days.

3 P.M.

But, what I was going to say is this: Though there is trouble I can say that the trouble is, temporary. Things will settle down and the Hindus and the Sikhs will learn to live side by side as fellow brethren. In this connection I must say, Sir, that I appreciated your gesture very much when you said that if there are any troubles between the Hindus and the Sikhs they should settle them sitting across a table. Sir, you were very gracious to make that gesture. And, if the members of any community did not respond to your gesture, I can assure you that it was not because they did not want to come to an agreement or solve the problem in Punjab but because what you said was whittled away or taken away by other leaders and therefore the trouble arose.

All the same, I think that I welcome the new State of Punjab, a bilingual State. While I am saying so, I must pay a compliment to the inhabitants of PEPSU, the people living in PEUSU and the administration of PEPSU for they have not placed any obstacle in the way of the union of Punjab and PEPSU and they have welcomed it. I wish the attitude of my friends from Himachal Pradesh had been the same and they should

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

have also come in. Even if they have not come in now, I know that they would come into this bigger Punjab sooner or later because, I believe, the economic development of Punjab, the cultural development of Punjab, the defence potential of Punjab, all these things demand that the Punjab State should be as big as possible. I know that this thing is going to work.

Now, what have we done in order to bring about the dovetailing of the two units into one unit? That is the regional formula. I know there has been a great deal of controversy about this regional formula. But the regional formula has been with us all these years. Formerly it was given one name and now it is being called by the name of regional formula. I think this regional formula does not work against the development of any language. On the other hand, it makes for the development of both the languages, Hindi and Punjabi. If a man says that this regional formula is going to be a thorn in the flesh of a Hindu or a thorn in the flesh of a Sikh, I think he is not speaking from any academic, cultural or even political motive, but he is speaking only with a motive to stir the waters and create trouble. There is nothing in the regional formula which is revolutionary or difficult.

There was one thing in the Punjab and it is this. In the United Punjab the West Punjab was developed at the expense of East Punjab. Now the people of Haryana say that their development has been retarded because they have not been able to keep pace with the people who come from the non-Haryana province or Jullundur Division. In order to make provision for the balanced development of the Punjab, there is one guarantee and that guarantee is given by the Regional Committee. I am sure that the future of the Punjab lies in balanced development and, if these Regional Committees function properly, all parts of the Punjab will be at par economically and otherwise.

Now I come to the Punjab of the future. When I look at the Punjab of the future, I think Himachal Pradesh will also form a part of it. But when I consider the views of my friends here I have to say one thing. The debates or the discussions in this House are not confined to the four walls of this House.

Shri Raghavachari: That is the only hope.

Shri D. C. Sharma: That is your only hope, but that is not my only hope. Every word that falls from our lips here is diffused all over this country, not only in this country but in other parts of the world also. Therefore, I would say that, while we are discussing very controversial matters, we should not let any word drop from our mouths which would make the tempers already excited more excited, which would make passions already excited more difficult to control, which would make the outlook already embittered in some ways more difficult to manipulate. Nothing should happen like that.

Sir, there has been controversy about Bombay. I think we should agree to what our Prime Minister has said. As he said yesterday, he made a statement in Bombay after consulting the Maharashtrian leaders. Therefore, I think the voice of controversy should cease. I would also say that the voice of controversy should cease so far as the new Punjab is concerned. I would again appeal to you, Sir, and through you—because you are a leader in Punjab—to the people outside, that the voice of controversy should cease so far as Punjab also is concerned and that all of us should now march together to build up this Punjab in which there should be as much room for a Hindu as for a Sikh, in which there should be as much room for Hindi as for Punjabi, in which there should be as much room for the development of our joint culture—Hindu-Sikh culture—as for the

development of Indian culture. I would say, it is up to us to say that the Punjab, which is a border State and on which depends the defence of our country, will be one, united and undivided, and that, though it may be speaking different languages or different tongues and inhabited by different kinds of persons, it will be Indian in spirit and will be loyal to the Indian Constitution and to the country of India. That is the appeal I want to make, Sir, to you and through you to this House as well as to the people of our country outside this House.

श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी (कुष्टगी) :
 उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, तकरीबन दस मास से हम स्टेट्स री-आर्गनाइजेशन प्राबलम (राज्य पुनर्गठन समस्या) पर बहस कर रहे हैं, लेकिन ताज्जुब इस बात का है कि इस विषय में हम बार-बार अपने ख्यालात इस सदन के सामने या बाहर लोगों के सामने पेश करते हैं, लेकिन सरकार की तरफ से कोई तवज्जह नहीं की जाती है। यही वजह है कि आज नौ दस महीने के बाद भी हम उमी स्थान पर हैं, जहां पर हम पहले थे और आज भी हम वही पुरानी मुश्किलमत और जद्दोजहद (संघर्ष) को देख रहे हैं— वे चाहे बाउंडरी (सीमा) के बारे में हों, बम्बई के बारे में हों या दूसरे स्थानों के बारे में हों। इसकी वजह यही हो सकती है कि इस हाउस (सभा) में हम जो चर्चा करते हैं वह सिर्फ नाम की होती है। जो कुछ स्टेट्स (राज्यों) के मेम्बर कहते हैं उसकी तरफ तवज्जह नहीं दी जाती। कहने में तो यह बात आसान होती है कि हम सब भाई भाई की तरह हैं, हम सब एक नेशन (राष्ट्र) के पुर्जे हैं, लेकिन भाई को उसके झुकूक देना मुश्किल होता है। सिर्फ जबान से भाई कहने से किसी को तसल्ली नहीं हो सकती।

आज बाउंडरीज (सीमाओं) को लेकर बड़ी मुश्किलमत पैदा हो रही है। चाहे

आप बंगाल और बिहार को लीजिये, चाहे कर्नाटक और महाराष्ट्र को लीजिये, सब जगह मुश्किलमत दिखाई देती हैं। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि इनमें से बहुत सी मुश्किलमत तो केन्द्र की पैदा की हुई हैं। आप केन्द्र में बैठे हुए हैं और जो ताल्लुका कर्नाटक में मिलना चाहता है उसको उसमें नहीं मिलने देते, इसी तरह से जो प्रदेश महाराष्ट्र में मिलना चाहता है उसको आप नहीं मिलने देते। इसी वजह से मुश्किलमत पैदा होती है। तो मैं समझता हूँ कि जो बहुत सी मुश्किलमत पेश आ रही हैं उनकी वजह यह है कि केन्द्र लोगों के नुकतेनजर को नहीं मानता। यह ठीक है कि इन्सान इन्सान सब एक हैं, लेकिन फितरी तौर पर जबान अलग होने की वजह से वे अलग भी हैं। यह ठीक है कि भारतवर्ष एक मुल्क है लेकिन इसके खंड भी हैं और अलग-अलग जवानों के बोलने वाले इस देश में फंडरल (संघीय) तरीके से रहते हैं। इस मुल्क में बहुत से मजहब हैं। खैर मजहब को हम छोड़ भी दें। लेकिन जबान को तो हम नहीं छोड़ सकते। उसके वगैर तो हम प्रजातंत्रात्मक ढंग से अपना काम नहीं चला सकते। मैं हैदराबाद से आता हूँ। मेरे यहां तीन भाषायें बोली जाती थीं, कन्नड़, तेलगू और मराठी। मुझे आलूम है कि इन अनेक भाषाओं के कारण क्या कठिनाई पेश आती है। हमारे यहां असेम्बली में जब एक कन्नड़भाषी अपनी बात कहता था तो तेलगू और मराठी भाषी जो कि मैजारिटी में थे उसको नहीं समझते थे। इसी तरह अगर कोई मिनिस्टर मराठी में बोलता था तो दूसरे उसे नहीं समझते थे। इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि यदि हम प्रजातंत्र को ठीक तरह से चलाना चाहते हैं तो कोई वजह नहीं है कि बाई लिग्वल (द्वि भाषी) या ट्राई लिग्वल (त्रय भाषी) प्रदेशों की बाह्र करें। जो लोग ऐसी बातें करते हैं वे एंटी नेशनल (राष्ट्र विरोधी) हैं।

(श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी)

मैं मानता हूँ कि प्रदेशों की तकसीम में मुश्किलता आवेगी। कुछ लोग दूसरे राज्य में माइनारिटी (अल्प संख्या) में रह जावेंगे और उनको सेफगार्ड (संरक्षण) देना जरूरी हो जायेगा। लेकिन आपके तकसीम करने में एक यूनिट (इकाई) को तै कर लेना चाहिये, चाहे वह जिला हो, या ताल्लुका हो या फिर्का हो या गांव हो। कभी आप कहते हैं कि हम जिले को यूनिट मानते हैं, लेकिन दूसरी जगह हम देखते हैं कि आप उस यूनिट को तोड़ते हैं। कभी आप कहते हैं कि हम ताल्लुका को यूनिट मानते हैं, लेकिन फिर दूसरी जगह आप ताल्लुका को भी तोड़ देते हैं। क्या वजह है कि जो उमूल आप एक जगह एप्लाई करते हैं उसे दूसरी जगह नहीं करते। हमारे यहां जब बांचू कमेटी बनी थी तो उसने कहा था कि फिर्का बुनियादी यूनिट माना जायेगा। हम तो कहते हैं कि आप गांव को बुनियादी यूनिट मानें और अगर किसी गांव के ५१ पर सेंट (प्रति शत) आदमी किसी इलाके में जाना चाहें तो उनको उस इलाके में जाने की इजाजत होनी चाहिये। आपको उस विवेक के डिस्मिशन के खिलाफ नहीं जाना चाहिये क्योंकि आप स्टेट्स के रिप्रेजेंटेटिव (प्रतिनिधि) हैं। लेकिन आपके सामने रिजोल्यूशन (संकल्प) आते हैं, एजिटेशन (आन्दोलन) किया जाता है, पर आप ध्यान नहीं देने। आप समझते हैं कि ये लोग हमारा विरोध कर रहे हैं। आपको सोचना चाहिये कि ये लोग ऐसा क्यों कर रहे हैं। अगर कोई सत्याग्रह करता है तो आपको सोचना चाहिये कि यह इतना सेन्सिफाइस (बलिदान) क्यों कर रहा है। इसके भी घरबार है। यह जेल क्यों जाना चाहता है, यह आपको सोचना चाहिये। लोगों के ऐसा करने का मतलब यह है कि वे चाहते हैं कि किसी न किसी तरह से उनके फ्रीलिंग (भावना) हमारे नेतागण के कानों तक पहुंच जायें

और न्याय हो सके। आपके सिर पर लिखा है "धर्म चक्र प्रवर्तनाय"। यह धर्म चक्र प्रवर्तन तभी हो सकता है जबकि लोगों के साथ न्याय हो और इसके लिए जरूरी है कि आप बाउंडरी कमीशन (सीमाआयोग) नियुक्त करें जो कि सारे मुल्क की मुश्किलता को दूर करे। यह बहुत जरूरी है।

इसके बाद मैं अपनी स्टेट की तरफ आता हूँ। मैं हैदराबाद से आता हूँ लेकिन मेरा प्रदेश मैसूर में मर्ज (संमिलन) होने वाला है। हजारों साल से हम पढ़ते आये हैं कि कर्नाटक राज्य २२ कूलर्स में विभक्त हो गया था, अब भी वह ५ या ६ राज्यों में विभक्त है, और हम समझते थे कि हलांकि हम हैदराबाद में रह रहे हैं लेकिन हम कर्नाटक के हैं। हम चाहते थे कि इन पांच छः राज्यों में से कर्नाटक के हिस्से को निकालकर एक अलग कर्नाटक राज्य बनाया जाये। लेकिन वह चीज पूरी नहीं हो रही है। हमारे प्रदेश का नाम कर्नाटक हजारों बरसों से चला आ रहा है। अगर आप वास्तव में प्रजातंत्र के सिद्धान्त पर चलना चाहते हैं तो आपको हमारे प्रदेश का नाम कर्नाटक रखना चाहिये। हमारे प्रदेश के कोई ३० सदस्य हैं। इनमें से तीन चार को छोड़कर कोई नहीं चाहता कि कर्नाटक नाम न रहे। न सिर्फ कर्नाटक के लोगों की तरफ से बल्कि दूसरे राज्यों के सदस्यों की तरफ से भी ५० या ५१ दस्तखतों से एक रिप्रेजेंटेशन (अभ्यावेदन) आपको दिया गया लेकिन आपने उसका लिहाज नहीं किया। कर्नाटक में जितने पंचायत बोर्ड हैं उनकी तरफ से हजारों रिजोल्यूशन आपको भेजे गये कि इस प्रदेश का नाम कर्नाटक ही रखा जाये, लेकिन कहा जाता है कि हम मैसूर को बचन दे चुके हैं। आप बचन उस हनुमंतैया को दे चुके हैं जोकि नो कानफिडेंस से उतारा जाने वाला है। ऐसे व्यक्ति को बचन देने के कारण आप दो करोड़ जनता की राय

का सिद्धान्त नहीं कर रहे। मैं समझता हूँ कि श्री पंत ने भी कहा है कि उनको कर्नाटक का नाम पसन्द है लेकिन चूँकि मैसूर को बचन दे चुके हैं इसलिये वह नाम नहीं रख रहे हैं। आप हम लोगों की इच्छा के विरुद्ध यह बचन दे चुके हैं और इस कारण भागे फिर कंट्रोवर्सी (विवाद) पैदा होगी। पहले बिल में आपने बाउंडरी कमीशन (सीमा आयोग) के लिये प्रावीजन (उपबन्ध) रखा था, पर सिलेक्ट कमेटी (प्रवर समिति) में उसको निकाल दिया। मैं समझता हूँ कि इन मसलों को सुलझाने के लिये उसका रखा जाना जरूरी है। ताकि भागे मुश्किलता पेश न आयें। आप अभी कांस्टीट्यूशन (संविधान) को अमेंड (संशोधन) कर रहे हैं। अगर आप कर्नाटक नाम अभी नहीं रखेंगे तो आपको फिर यह नाम रखने के लिये कांस्टीट्यूशन को अमेंड करने में मुश्किल उठानी पड़ेगी। मैं यहाँ पर यह माफ़ कह देना चाहता हूँ कि कर्नाटक की जो असेम्बली आवेंगी उसमें सेंट पर सेंट सदस्य कर्नाटक नाम रखने के हक में होंगे और जब वह इस बारे में रिजोल्यूशन पास कर देंगे तो आपको उस पर जरूर गौर करना पड़ेगा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : हर मेम्बर को अब दस दस मिनट ही मिल रहे हैं।

श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी : मैं दो मिनट और लूंगा। जनाबवाला, अब इसके बाद मैं कर्नाटक की कंट्रोवर्शियल बाउंडरीज (विवादास्पद सीमायें) की बाबत थोड़े में जिक्र करूंगा और यह बदलाउंगा कि किस तरीके से यह मुश्किल सवाल हल किया जा सकता है। मैं ज्यादा न कहते हुए सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आंध्र का जब स्टेट बन रहा था और जो बिल यहाँ पर उसके सम्बन्ध में लाया गया था उसमें भी इस बात का जिक्र किया गया था कि वहाँ पर जो कर्नाटक के हिस्से हैं वह स्टेट लैबिल (राज्यस्तर) पर एक बाउंडरी कमेटी ऐपॉयन्ट करके दोनों कर्नाटक

और आंध्र के चीफ़ मिनिस्टर्स (मुख्य मंत्री) की कंसेंट (स्वीकृति) से ट्रान्सफर (हस्तान्तरित) किये जायेंगे। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि यह अदानी, धालुर, रायदुर्ग और मणिकसिरा के ताल्लुके कर्नाटक में शामिल किये जाने चाहियें। मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि इसके साथ ही कर्नाटक में जो आंध्र मैजारिटी ऐरियाज है उनको आंध्र को सौंप दिया जाय और यह जाहिर बात है कि उन ऐरियाज के आंध्र में मिलने से कलचरल और हर तरह का डेवलपमेंट (विकास) अच्छी तरह हो सकता है और कोई बजह नहीं है कि उनको आंध्र को क्यों न दिया जाय। उनका एकोनामिक डेवलपमेंट (आर्थिक विकास) भी आंध्र में शामिल होने से ठीक तरह से होगा।

बिल्लारी के बारे में पहले भी बहुत कुछ कहा जा चुका है। मैं यह मानने का तैयार हूँ कि बिल्लारी के नगर में आंध्र के लोगों की कुछ मेजारिटी (बहु संख्या) है लेकिन हमें यह नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि उसके चारों तरफ कर्नाटक लगा हुआ है और वह कर्नाटक का एक हिस्सा है और उसका एक आइडेंटिटी सा बन जाता है जिसको कि आंध्र को नहीं दिया जा सकता और वह कर्नाटक में ही रहना चाहिये। अभी हाल में ही इस कर्नाटक और आंध्र के ईश्यु (प्रश्न) पर एक उपचुनाव हुआ जिसमें कि मृगगापी आंध्र के कैंडिडेट (उम्मीदवार) और कर्नाटक के कैंडिडेट का मुकाबला हुआ और उसमें कर्नाटक कैंडिडेट ३ हजार वोटों से जीता और इस उपचुनाव से यह चीज साफ़ जाहिर हो जाती है कि जनता किस के साथ है

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : यह तो आप तफ़्तील में जा रहें हैं और यह सब अगर आप क्लोज़ बाई क्लोज़ डिस्कशन पर करें तो अच्छा होगा।

श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी : बहुत अच्छा। अब मैं सिर्फ़ एक बात कह करके अपनी बात खत्म कर देता हूँ।

[श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी]

मैं समझता हूँ कि अकलकोट, साउथ गोलापुर और गोलापुर सीटी यह कर्नाटक में आने चाहिये और इसको महाराष्ट्र के लोग भी मानते हैं कि यह कर्नाटक के हिस्से हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि एक वाउंडरी कमीशन ऐपायंट (निर्भुक्त) करके जो हिस्से मैंने अभी बताये उनको कर्नाटक में ले आना चाहिये और अगर कर्नाटक में ऐसे हिस्से हों जो कि महाराष्ट्र में जाने चाहिये तो बेशक उनको वाउंडरी कमीशन महाराष्ट्र में ट्रांसफर कर दे और मैं समझता हूँ कि कर्नाटक के आम लोग इसका कभी विरोध नहीं करेंगे, तो इस तरह का एक्सचेंज वाउंडरी कमीशन (सीमा विनियम आयोग) के जरिये किया जाना चाहिये।

हैदराबाद स्टेट के राय चूर ज़िले के राजलंबडा प्रोजेक्ट (परियोजना) के जो हिस्से आंध्र स्टेट वाले लोग मांग रहे हैं, वहाँ के लोग बिलकुल इसके फेवर में नहीं हैं और वह पूरा कर्नाटक का हिस्सा है और आंध्र को नहीं देना चाहिये।

Shri R. S. Diwan (Osmanabad): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, in this session and in the previous sessions also, in the discussion on the reorganisation of the States, much of the time of the House has been taken by the Bombay problem. Speeches after speeches were made and the opponents to Bombay being included in Maharashtra could not enlighten or convince us about what is going to happen, if Bombay is included in Maharashtra. Yesterday, the Leader of the House, our Prime Minister, also said that there were forceful arguments on behalf of the Maharashtra who demanded the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra; but, there were equally forceful arguments on the other side also. But, he never gave us any details about those arguments, namely, what is going to happen if Bombay is included in Maharashtra. Other hon.

Members spoke about national interest. I fail to understand how national interest is going to be affected by the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra. They do not look to the other side also. Do they not think that, if 3½ crores of Maharashtra are kept dissatisfied and disappointed, the national interest will be affected? How can they say that for the sake of the nation, Bombay should not be included in Maharashtra, without giving any reasons and without showing what harm is going to come? The only reason for Bombay not being given to Maharashtra that a man like myself can guess is the sin of one man, whose name, I think, you will not permit me to mention here. That is the punishment given to the Maharashtra for the sin of one man. If this attitude, which is being repeatedly taken by some Members murmuring now and then, is also taken by the Government, it is very unfortunate not only for Maharashtra, but for the whole nation. So many Members have spoken on the Bombay problem and I do not want to enter into the merits and demerits of that issue.

I come to border questions. I come from the Marathi-speaking area of the Hyderabad State. There are so many border problems and difficulties regarding the redistribution of the districts and taluks. Yesterday we were told, "Are we going to forget national borders, while thinking of State borders?" We are prepared to follow that method, but why do you not decide on one principle? Take either the village or the taluk or the district or the firka as the unit and stick to it. The Commission took up the district as unit, but that principle has been violated in many places and the taluk or the firka had been taken as the unit. The same mistake has been committed by our Government also. They should lay down one standard principle or formula for deciding the borders and stick to it.

whether justice or injustice is done to one district or taluk. But, they do not do that. Suppose you fix the firka or the taluk as the unit and if some Marathi-speaking villages go to Karnatak or Andhra, I will not be sorry, because I will be satisfied that it has been done on some principle. On the basis of some principle, I should not be sorry even if I lose something. So, let the Government decide this thing.

If you do not want to appoint a boundary commission because you are satisfied that there will be controversy going on, let us agree to have some arbitrator. At least we shall be deciding our own problems without enhancing the trouble of the Governments and the people. Unless you decide these things, there would not be any settlement of the boundary problems also.

If I were to repeat again what I have said, you appoint a boundary commission or let the States who have border problems come to a settlement as decided by an arbitrator. Let a unit be fixed and according to that unit, let the boundaries be fixed. Whether it is satisfaction or dissatisfaction, decide always according to a formula.

सरदार इकबाल सिंह (फाजिल्का सिरसा) : जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करने के लिये और खास तौर पर उस हिस्से की ताईद करने के लिये जो कि बिल में पंजाब की बाबत है, खड़ा हुआ हूँ। पंजाब का मसला हाउस में और हाउस के बाहर भी बहुत जगहों पर डिस्कस हुआ है और आज भी इस मसले की बाबत मैं समझता हूँ कि गलत फहमियाँ बाकी हैं। इस लिये मैं चन्द बातों की तरफ इस हाउस का और इस हाउस के जरिये खास तौर पर उन आदमियों का ध्यान जो कि पंजाब के बाहर रहते हैं, और पंजाब के मसलों को नहीं समझते हैं, दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

पंजाब का मसला हल होने से पहले पंजाब में तीन चार तरह की आवाजें थीं। हरियाणा प्रांत के लोग किन्हीं बज्जहात से, भले ही उन में सब से बड़ी बज्जह यह रही हो कि पिछले सालों में उन के साथ अच्छा सुलूक नहीं हुआ, यह समझते थे कि उन को पंजाब के साथ नहीं रहना चाहिये। पंजाब के पंजाबी हिस्से के लोग बहुत से यह कहते थे कि हमें पंजाबी सूबा मिलना चाहिये। इस के अलावा हिमाचल प्रदेश भी पंजाब के साथ नहीं मिलना चाहता था। इन तमाम चीजों का कांग्रेस ने, कांग्रेस हार्ड कमांड (कांग्रेस उच्चकमान) ने और कैबिनेट सब-कमेटी ने मिल कर, तमाम पंजाब के लीडरों के साथ बैठकर तय किया और पंजाब के लिये एक हल निकाला, और वह हल पंजाब की बड़ी अक्सरियत को, जो कि पंजाब को तकसीम करना चाहते थे, मंजूर है। लेकिन अफसोस की बात यह है कि जो लोग पंजाब को इकट्ठा रखना चाहते थे, बड़ा देखना चाहते थे, आज वही इस हल के खिलाफ हैं, हलांकि पंजाब इकट्ठा भी रहा है और बड़ा भी बना है। आज हरियाणा वाले भी इस रीजनल स्कीम (प्रादेशिक योजना) पर सारे पंजाब के साथ रहने के लिये रजामन्द हैं। मैं तो यहां तक कहने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि आज हरियाणा का एक एक बच्चा इस स्कीम पर खुश है। आज पंजाब का रीजन बन रहा है, उस के हक में बहुत बड़ी अक्सरियत है लेकिन कुछ फिर्कापरस्त लोग हैं जो कि एलेक्शन सामने होने की बज्जह से समझते हैं कि कहीं ऐसा न हो कि उन को वोट न मिलें। इसलिये जिस मसले के लिये आज से तीन महीने पहले सब लोग समझते थे कि हल हो गया, उस में आज वह लोग चिनगारी लगाने लगे हैं ताकि उस चिनगारी के साथ भाग बने और भाग बन कर पंजाब में लगे, और उन को उस से ताकत मिले। मैं आज वाज्जह करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर इस मसले को, जिस के बारे में अलाहदा अलाहदा बयालात हैं, अलाहदा

[सरदार इकबाल सिंह]

अलाहदा धाराजें हैं, किसी आदमी को जज बना कर उस के सामने पेश कर लिया जाय तो उस का फसला बही होगा जो कि दम्यान का फसला होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि पंजाब का यह रीजनल फार्मूला इस लिये बेहतरीन हल है कि वह मिडलकोर्स (मध्यवर्ग) है। आज बम्बई को छोड़ कर कोई ऐसा सूबा नहीं है जिस को वार्डलिंग्वल (द्विभाषी) बनाने की कोशिश की गई हो, लेकिन पंजाब के लिये कोई ऐसा नहीं कह सकता। पंजाब में पंजाबी और हिन्दी बोलने वालों ने मुत्तफिका तौर पर यह फैसला किया है कि जो हिन्दी जवान का हिस्सा है वहां के लोग पंजाबी जवान भी सोखेंगे और जो पंजाबी जवान का हिस्सा है वहां के लोग हिन्दी भी सोखेंगे और पंजाब के तमाम आदमी इस को पसन्द करते हैं इसलिये जो वार्डलिंग्वल फार्मूला है जिस को कि कांग्रेस हाई कमांड ने या कॅबिनेट-सब कमेटी ने बनाया या जो कि इस बिल में रखा गया है, वह बेहतरीन है क्योंकि वह एक मिडल कोर्स है। न वह उन लोगों के हक में है जो कि पंजाब को तकसीम करना चाहते थे और न उन लोगों के हक में जो कि शहरों में बैठ कर पंजाब की हालत का फायदा उठाना चाहते थे। उन की मंशा भी पूरी नहीं हुई। जवान के नाम पर जो पंजाब को तकसीम करना चाहते थे अगर उन की बात पर चला जाता तो पंजाब बर्बाद हो जाता। जो फार्मूला जवान के बारे में तय किया गया वह कोई आज का फार्मूला नहीं है वह आज से छः साल पहले का फार्मूला है, जिसका नाम सच्चर फार्मूला है। जहां सच्चर फार्मूला ठीक था वहां उस को लगाया और जहां पर पेप्सू का फार्मूला ठीक साबित हुआ वहां उस को लगाया गया और जवान का मामला तय हो गया। आज पंजाब के हिन्दू और सिख तो अपने जवान के मसले को तय करने जा रहे हैं, लेकिन आज कुछ लोग ऐसे भी हैं जो कि इस

चीज को मंबाटेज करना चाहते हैं। वह चाहते हैं कि यह फैसला इस लिये दूर कर दिया जाय कि इस पर ज्यादा लोग मुत्तफिक हैं। शायद वह एलेक्शन के नुक्ते-नजर से चलना चाहते हैं।

सच्चर फार्मूले के बारे में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि पंजाब की जवान का जो मसला है उस को पंजाब की कांग्रेस पार्टी ने मुत्तफिका तौर पर तय किया है। पेप्सू का जो जवान का मसला था छः साल तक, उसको पेप्सू की कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट ने पेप्सू के लोगों की राय और महयोग के साथ हल किया। और जब तक यह रिपोर्ट नहीं आई थी, एक आदमी भी ऐसा नहीं था जिम ने जवान के मामले में कोई गिला किया हो। हां, गिला इस बात का है कि यहां पर हमारे बहुत से मेम्बर बोले, चेटर्जी माह्व बोले, जो कि अपने प्रांत को बिहार के साथ इकट्ठा करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं, वह बंगाल में तो एक जवान की बात कहते हैं, बंगाल में वह एक जवान से बोलते हैं और जब पंजाब में प्रांते हैं तो दूसरी जवान से बोलते हैं, हमारे भाई देशपांडे जी जो बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र के साथ इकट्ठा करना चाहते हैं और कहते हैं कि वह महाराष्ट्र का हिस्सा है, वही जब पंजाब में आते हैं, तो दूसरी जवान बोलते हैं। हमें यह गिला है कि पंजाब में जो लोग जवान का मसला उठाते हैं वह इसलिये नहीं कि पंजाब के लोगों के साथ उनकी हमदर्दी है, इसलिये नहीं कि वह हिन्दुओं और सिखों को इकट्ठा करना चाहते हैं, बल्कि इसलिये कि उन को साथ लेकर अपनी ताकत बनाना चाहते हैं। वहां पर कांग्रेस सरकार दो लहरों के बीच में है। एक तरफ वह लहरें हैं जो हमें पार्टीपालिटिक्स (दल बंदी) में बहा ले जाना चाहती हैं, दूसरी तरफ वह लहरें हैं जो कि फिरकापरस्ती में बहा ले जाना चाहती हैं। कांग्रेस है जो कि दोनों लहरों

का मामला करती है और दम्यान में रहती है। इसलिये भी मैं इस हल को सपोर्ट करता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुओं और सिखों को इकट्ठा रहना है, और ऐसा फैसला किया गया है जिस से दोनों को एक साथ रहने में मदद मिले। जो लोग इस फैसले को कम-जोर करना चाहते हैं वह पंजाब के सहायक नहीं हो सकते। यह ठीक है कि चन्द शहरों में इस हल की मुश्किलफत है, उस के खिलाफ गिला है, लेकिन वह गिला इसलिये नहीं है कि वह लोग रीजनल फार्मूले के खिलाफ हैं, बल्कि इसलिये है कि जिन आदमियों के वेस्टेड इन्टरेस्ट (विहित स्वार्थ) हैं वह सारी गड़बड़ी पैदा करते हैं। वह सोचते हैं कि यह अमृतसर का रहने वाला है, यह लुधियाने का रहने वाला है, यह जलन्धर का रहने वाला है, इस लिये यह हमारे यहां के डिप्टी कमिश्नर को नहीं रक्षेगा।

लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर किमी आदमी को कोई गिला होगा तो हम उनके साथ इमाफ करेंगे, उस की बातों को सुनेंगे। जिस वक्त कांग्रेस ने फैसला किया, पंडित जी ने फैसला किया पंजाब के बारे में, उस वक्त भी उन्होंने लोगों से मुलाकात की, उन की एक एक बात सुनी और तब फैसला किया।

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो हल है पंजाब का वह एक बेहतरीन हल है, यह पंजाब में एक दम्यान का रास्ता है, वहां पर लोगों को एक तरफ शिकायतें हैं, उन के गिले हैं, एक तरफ लोग अलग अलग जाना चाहते हैं अगर उन को इकट्ठा रखना है तो वही रास्ता हो सकता है जो कि इस बिल में है। वह रीजनल फार्मूले का रास्ता है। बाज लोगों ने तकरीरों के जरिये से, नारों के जरिये से, इस हल को बुरा बतलाया है। यह वही लोग हैं जो कि गलत बातें कह कर, अखबारों में और खास तौर से पंजाब के अखबारों में गलत बातें निकाल कर पंजाब के लोगों को, पंजाब के सिखों और हिन्दुओं को लड़वाना चाहते हैं। अगर ऐसे लोगों और

अखबारबारों की तारीफ होती है तो वह उन्हीं लोगों के जरिये से होती है, उन्हीं अखबारों में होती है, जिन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान को तकसीम कराया।

मुझे आशंका है कि कहीं यह तबारीख फिर दोहराई न जाय। मैं समझता हूँ ये जो अखबार हैं ये गलत बातें छाप कर हिन्दुओं और सिखों में फर्क डालने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। वे यह चाहते हैं कि इन के हामियों को अगली इलेक्शन में चन्द सीटें मिल जायें और इनको लोगों के वोट प्राप्त हों। इन अखबारों को जो कि हिन्दी और पंजाबी की बात करते हैं, मैं समझता हूँ, न तो हिन्दी से प्यार है और न ही पंजाबी से। निकलते तो ये उर्दू में हैं और बातें हिन्दी और पंजाबी की करने हैं।

अन्त में, आपके जरिये डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं यही प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि पंजाब का मसला जो कि हल हो चुका है और जिस हल के पीछे लोगों की अकर्मियत है, इस हाउस को काबिने-कबल होगा और जो कुछ पंजाब के बारे में इस बिल में दिया गया है उसको मान लिया जाएगा।

Shri Raghavachari: After so much debate for so many days, I do not wish to repeat what has been said. I shall only state what I feel about certain broad things that concern my State.

First and foremost I would like to congratulate the Government for bringing together Andhra and Telengana into one State though the States Reorganisation Commission said it will have to wait for five years. But now, looking to the statements that are being published by responsible people and protagonists on the side of Telengana, it looks almost impossible for the Andhras to conceive what the shape of things is going to be. It almost looks as if we do not know whether we have got a State, a united

[Shri Raghavachari]

Andhra or whether it is going to be like an animal, with two mouths and one stomach or two stomachs and one tail. It has become practically impossible, to conceive it. I have been reading statement after statement, and we do not know what those statements and those commitments are. The House has not been taken into confidence and we do not know what arrangement or agreement has been entered into, seeing that these arrangements and agreements are only between Congress Chief Ministers and the Government. The other people also have a right to know what it is that these people are doing before they can agree or not agree. That is one thing which I wanted to say about Andhra.

Unfortunately, the Andhra leadership was only anxious to have a State. When it was formed, they did not care to think of including all the people who really are Andhras. And now also in their anxiety for Vishalandhra the same thing is happening. It is most unfortunate.

I only wish to say one thing. In the whole bargain of this game, the Kannadigas seem to be most profiting.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Beneficiaries.

Shri Raghavachari: I am also one of the Kannadigas, but I only put one question: How many lakhs of Andhras are included in the Karnatak area and how many Kannadigas are included in Andhra? If you make a comparison of these two you will find that the Kannadigas have been most benefited and the Telugus have been least benefited.

I only wish, therefore, to suggest one solution, and that is a solution that must really allay not only the differences between Karnataka and Andhra, but between many other States in many parts of India. Unfortunately, it is the question of the

boundaries that is agitating the minds of all people everywhere, including Bombay. The most correct, acceptable and reasonable solution to this question—fortunately there are only about 10 or 12 boundary disputes of a serious kind—is the appointment of a boundary commission or commissions, and the whole thing can be resolved very quietly. In thinking of a boundary commission certain principles are necessary. Many friends have pointed out while in certain cases the district has been taken as the unit by the States Reorganisation Commission, in others it has been broken up. Linguistic States are being formed for quite some time, to my mind they are not going to be formed and re-formed and re-altered every day, though legally it is possible. When a dispute arises, government might say: "Whoever has said this is final. No finality in anything." But, as practical people we must realise that once this thing is done, it is not likely to be altered soon. Therefore, the present linguistic States will be a fairly permanent solution of the problem in India. When you are going to do that, you must have certain principles.

What are those principles? One, it is rightly conceded, is the percentage of a particular language speaking population. What is a unit? Why do you take a district? People did not settle in districts. They settled in villages. As somebody has already pointed out, these language areas are like the rainbow. They become thicker and thicker and then fade out into another. That is how it happens. The last census result was there on a linguistic basis, but there was a lot of manipulation. Therefore, the best thing would be to take the contiguous areas and have the village as the unit. And then in the village, do not be guided by 50 or 49 per cent and create quarrels. Go to 60 or 70 per cent as the deciding factor, and when it is on a margin line, certainly consult the people and take into consi-

deration the economic conveniences and other factors. These are the things that should have guided us. Even today it is not too late to apply them, because as I said there are only ten or 12 places where serious border disputes have arisen. The best thing is to have one or more boundary commissions to apply these principles and settle the questions locally. Then, all this agitation, bitterness and consequent unpopularity—all these things will be avoided. That is how, I respectfully submit, it can be done.

The only thing is: where is the time today? Well, there are two ways. As my leader Acharya Kripalani said, put it off for a few months and settle this matter once for all. The whole hurry seems to be because of the impending elections. That itself might be put off for a few months and all this may be done. Or, it may be done after elections, it does not matter. I am not anxious it must be done this way or that way, but the thing should be done carefully and in a way that a satisfactory solution is found.

As regards certain observations which Shri Sivamurthi Swami was submitting, I shall make my observations when the amendments are moved, but this much I can submit now. My own feeling is that the present Mysore leadership whom they consulted has been more stiff so far as the claims of the Andhras are concerned, but I expect that the leadership of the united Karnataka when it comes into being will be more reasonable and realistic, and not obstinate to stand on their prestige.

One word about Bellary. I wish to say only this much. I am surprised that after the publication of the States Reorganisation Commission Report, man after man, Congress leader after Congress leader went on praising the three gentlemen constituting the Commission and said that

where there was a unanimous recommendation of the Commission it should be accepted and it could be changed only if there was mutual agreement among the parties concerned. All the encomiums, all the regard and certificates were given to these three people. They did unanimously recommend that Bellary should go to Andhra for economic reasons. After going into the decisions and awards that had already been given, and after examining the whole thing carefully, they said it is absolutely necessary that in the economic interests, some portions of that district where the Tungabhadra project is situated—and this is necessary as the life-line for Rayalaseema, should go to Andhra. That was the unanimous recommendation. What was done? The Home Minister one day here answering a question, said: "The Andhra Government have agreed. They do not want to say openly that they have agreed. They have agreed before us. They have whispered in our ears". Is this the way in which the Andhra Ministers should behave? Are they Ministers with a sense of responsibility? Why should they be ashamed or afraid of saying publicly that they have accepted? Can the Central Government accept the words of such Ministers who merely whisper into their ears but do not say things publicly? I am afraid that is not a correct thing at all.

My contention is that even today on economic grounds, especially when three such eminent men have recommended unanimously that it should go to Andhra, certainly it should have been given to Andhra, unless there was a mutual agreement to the contrary.

Shri Rishang Keishing (Outer Manipur—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): To be the last in everything seems to be the lot of mine and the people whom I represent.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Though you are last, you are first for Manipur.

Shri Rishang Keishing: We sincerely and honestly feel that the States Reorganisation Commission did injustice to those of us who are living in Part C States, especially, to the people of Manipur. Both the hills and the plains peoples have been agitating ever since 1949 for a democratic and responsible Govt. in Manipur. But that has been denied to us all along. We had expected that the Joint Select Committee at least would do something for us, but that expectation also has not been fulfilled. So, we are now appealing to this House and to Government for the last time that something should be done, so that the people of Manipur might have a democratic and responsible Government in their State as well as the people in other Part C States like Tripura and all may have the opportunity to shape their own future just like those in the other Part A States of India.

In the name of national unity, do not try to kill every interest of minorities. Do not try to pocket all the minorities into the bigger territories. That will be injurious and harmful to the best interests of the nation. You should remember that we Manipuris are living in strategic frontier areas. So, whatever you do to the people of Manipur, will have an effect on those people who are living in areas where there is an anti-national agitation going on—I mean the Naga Hills.

The people of Manipur, both the hills people and the plains people, have been agitating in a peaceful, democratic and constitutional way to assert their democratic right. But what have you done to us so far? Have you listened to us? Have you taken our case into proper consideration? You have not. In the Naga Hills, the people have taken to violent, undemocratic and unconstitutional methods in order to assert their rights. You have meted out to us the same ruthless treatment that you are now meting out to the Naga Hills people. When the agitation was carried on in Manipur for a democratic set-up, the police

dragged our people for three hundred or four hundred yards, by pulling their legs, hair, and so on, and they even threw our womenfolk into the ditches; and they beat our people. Thousands of them were sent to jail, for no other fault of theirs, but simply because they chose to assert their right for a democratic set-up in the state.

What you did in Manipur has an effect on the Naga Hills also. This is how the Nagas in the Naga Hills are teasing us now. "You say that you will adopt peaceful and constitutional methods. But what have you got? Where is the Assembly in Manipur? Where is the democratic set-up in Manipur?" Those of us who have been following peaceful, democratic and constitutional way have been badly put to shame. I request this House and the Government of India to consider our case favourably.

We want to be democratic. We want to be constitutional. We want to be good citizens of this country. When we act in a constitutional and democratic way, you should also reciprocate it in the proper manner. But you have failed to do so.

Now, the Commission and the Select Committee have increased the number of territories. Formerly, it was only Tripura and Manipur which were called territories. Now, you have raised the number to five. But do you think that if you merely increase the number of territories, we shall feel happy, and our grievances will be redressed? Not at all. You have increased also the number of Members who will be returned to the Lok Sabha as well as the Rajya Sabha. But that would not help us, judging by the experience of the past.

I would ask the other territories to take a lesson from Manipur. Manipur is Centrally administered territory. It is just hell, it is hell on earth. I can give you one or two instances of what Central administration has meant in Manipur. In Tamenglong, about 33 persons died of starvation. When I tried to raise this matter here by way of a question,

what was the reply I got? I was told that there was no scarcity of rice, and nobody had died of starvation. I had recently been to Manipur, and I am told that the officer in charge of the Manipur administration has sent two officers to Tamenglong, they went round and told the people 'If you do not put your signature to the statement saying that these people died only a natural death, you will not get any rice hereafter'. Some of the poor people put their signatures on to that statement, when they were promised dal, milk and rice etc. Soon after that, the tribal leaders sent a representation to the Government of India and to the Home Minister, bringing the objectionable activities of this officer to their notice. I hope the Home Minister has taken proper action against the Govt. and officers concerned. The administration in Centrally administered Manipur is run by those who have been telling lies, who have been starving people to death and who have been sending false reports all the time to the higher authorities.

Let me give you another instance to show how Central administration has been going on in Manipur. A sum of Rs. 15 lakhs was allotted for the development of the tribal people last year. But what happened, was that only a sum of Rs. 3 lakhs was utilised, and nearly Rs. 12 lakhs got lapsed. When I put a question here in this House, the evasive answer I got was that Rs. 7 lakhs worth of work had been done. That is the way in which the tribal people are progressing in the Centrally administered State of Manipur.

I shall now tell you one more thing. You know, Sir, Manipur is a land of dances, Dramas and songs. Some persons were having a mike and loud-speaker, and they were singing and dancing in the night one day. The Chief Commissioner sent a police officer, I am told to arrest those people and to seize the mike and loudspeaker. And those persons were arrested because they were dancing and sing-

371 L.S.D.

ing late at night, and the Chief Commissioner's sleep had been disturbed.

This is the way in which Central administration is going on in Manipur. The status of territory which you have awarded us is quite humiliating and this is the status that will be accorded to my hon. friends from Delhi, Himachal Pradesh and Bombay, and this is the administration that those places will be enjoying.

I would request the Home Minister to remember that we are also Indians. We want our democratic rights, as much as other people want them. Please consider us also as Indians, and give us the right to which we are entitled. I hope the Home Minister will look at this question from this point of view. Then only, India will have a peaceful frontier, and there will be progress everywhere. Otherwise, all progress would be retarded. I have no time to go into the other matters, but I would again appeal to the Government of India and to this House to consider our case once again and give us a democratic set-up, so that the people there may not grumble, and they may also progress just like those in other parts of India.

In regard to Bombay, I would like to say that I do not profess to know very much about Bombay. But I am aware of one fact that Bombay belongs to that part of the country which is known as Maharashtra. Therefore, to deny Bombay to Maharashtra is an injustice. There is no logic in that; in fact, it is illogical to deny them Bombay. I feel that Bombay should go at once to the Maharashtra people. Their demand for the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra is right. I said on a prior occasion, many thousands of people are prepared to go to jail on this issue. I understand that hitherto, as many as 50,000 persons have courted arrest in pursuance of this demand. I want the Government of India to take democratic attitude.

[Shri Rishang Keishing]

I congratulate the ex-Finance Minister, because here is an ex-bureacrat, who has shown a better sense of democracy than his colleagues. He has understood the democratic aspiration of the people better than his colleagues. I hope Government and this House will learn a lesson from him.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry that in spite of my best efforts, there are about half a dozen names which could not be reached. I know those hon. Members must be feeling disappointed, but I can assure them that I shall ask the office to have a list prepared of those names, and when particular States are taken up, they will have preference in being called. Now, I am calling upon the Home Minister.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Before you call the Home Minister, may I draw your attention and that of the House to a matter of great importance....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No intervention could be allowed unless it relates to the subject which is being discussed.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: It is a matter of great substance affecting the progress of this Bill which is half way through the entire gamut of procedure.

A little while ago, a P.T.I. message was flashed in the Central Hall; it reads as follows:

"A proposal to refer certain border disputes arising out of re-organisation of States to the Vice-President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, for arbitration is being actively considered by the Congress Parliamentary Party.

"It is learnt the disputes concern the Maharashtra—Gujarat, Maharashtra—Karnatak and Karnatak—Kerala borders".

4 P. M.

I skip over the details—

"Although a formal decision has not yet been taken by the

executive on the suggestion. It is stated that Mr. Nehru, Maulana Azad and Pandit Pant are in favour of it."

"The proposal may be considered by the Cabinet soon. If ultimately Dr. Radhakrishnan is appointed arbitrator, the consideration of the relevant clauses of the States Reorganisation Bill by the Lok Sabha may be deferred for some time".

The point I am raising is that we are now going to the second stage of the Bill. Clause 3 of the Bill relates to Andhra borders. Some of us here are in great difficulty as to what to do. We want to know whether this report is correct, and if so, why only these three particular borders and not the whole of border disputes are included.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will advise the hon. Member not to depend upon that report alone. It is being considered in the Congress Committee; we are not concerned with it. As to what comes out, that would be known afterwards.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, since I moved the Motion for the consideration of the amended Bill on States Reorganisation, as it has been returned by the Joint Committee, an interesting discussion has taken place for nearly 24 hours. I regret that I have not been able to attend the House regularly throughout the debate and for that I apologise to the hon. Members. I had the opportunity of listening to some of the speeches and I have acquainted myself with the views and sentiments that were expressed when I was absent.

Problems connected with the re-organisation of States are varied and multifarious. They have engaged the attention not only of Parliament and the local legislatures, but almost of the entire country for many months

in succession. During the discussion in the House, emphasis has been laid on certain matters over which there is a certain amount of difference of opinion. Hon. Members and people outside are apt to draw an erroneous inference from the trend of the discussion here. There are, no doubt, certain questions still outstanding which have to be given further thought. But we should not forget that the States Reorganisation Bill deals with matters of considerable variety. It has as many as 131 clauses and perhaps 6 schedules. The area of agreement is much greater, wider and larger than that which still remains to be tackled. It is a matter of relief, I think, that so many ticklish issues have been settled. There is sometimes a tendency to draw the picture blacker than it actually is. We must have a correct appreciation and assessment of the situation and of the results that have been achieved.

If we take account of the agreed decisions that have been reached, of the schemes that had been accepted and with regard to which there has been no objection and no protest in this House, then we will find that as many as 90 per cent. of the proposals have been already accepted. That is a matter which has to be borne in mind, and we have also to bear, along with that, the other fact too in mind, that all this has been attained in a typically democratic way. I wonder if any other country had dealt with any question of such character or of a different nature in such a manner.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

4.06 P.M.

In this very House, we had occasions to discuss the proposals made by the States Reorganisation Commission. We had a marathon debate over that. Then we had another discussion again for a number of days when the States Reorganisation Bill was referred to the Joint Committee. We are having now this discussion for the third time.

So taking into account the time of Parliament that has been given to the consideration of this Bill, we find that hardly any other measure has received as much of attention as this Bill. Not only here, but also in the local legislatures which are directly or indirectly affected by the Bill, discussions have taken place at least twice. After all that, we had the Bill, as it was introduced, considered by the Joint Committee. The labours of the Joint Committee resulted in considerable improvement of the Bill, and the discussion here has, more or less, centred round the Report of the Committee. The points of difference have been indicated in the Minutes of Dissent and have themselves been stressed in the course of the discussion here.

It is regrettable that in spite of all the thought that has been given to the matter and the efforts that have been made to secure the advice and guidance of every shade of opinion, there should be still some doubt about the method that has been followed. It has neither been cavalier, nor has it been unconstitutional. If anything, the democratic process has been overdone. Not only here but also in the Cabinet, we gave considerable thought to this question. I think the Cabinet considered the proposals on about 14 occasions, and there too, the problem of Bombay figured prominently. Those interested in Bombay naturally gave expression to their views and they did so fully and in a manner which indicated their feelings and convictions over that matter. That is what happened in the Cabinet. The Cabinet also appointed a Sub-Committee and that Sub-Committee was occasionally also attended by other members of the Cabinet. So the Sub-Committee had the benefit also of their advice. Ultimately, the decisions taken by the Cabinet from time to time tentatively were placed before the Cabinet in the form of the Bill and the Bill was considered by the Cabinet, I think, more than once; it was approved and adopted.

[Pandit G. B. Pant.]

And, every provision in the Bill was naturally accepted by the Cabinet with a due sense of responsibility collectively and, by every member, separately. That is how this Bill ultimately took shape and came here. In the circumstances, I think, there should be no lurking doubt or suspicion that any attempt has been made to hustle through these matters. The very process that has been followed outside would have stood in the way of any such course being adopted. I regret that the decisions of the Cabinet with regard to certain matters have not appealed and commended themselves to those who took part in the discussions. But, that is a regrettable matter. Still, we feel that in a democratic set-up we have to agree to disagree without rancour and, so far as possible, without leaving any trace of bitterness or anger behind.

I was sorry to find a suggestion made that there was animus against Maharashtra. I would submit that that is not correct and, if I will just relate the facts about this, there can be no doubt, I am convinced, that this feeling will be completely eradicated.

Hon. Members are aware that the States Reorganisation Commission had recommended a bilingual State for Bombay. The State was to consist of the Marathwada districts, the Maharashtra districts of the existing State of Bombay, Bombay itself, Gujerat districts and Saurashtra. It had also recommended that Vidarbha should be a separate independent State not for any limited time but, so far as the Commission was concerned, for an indefinite period. This recommendation of the Commission did not commend itself to our fellow-countrymen in Maharashtra. In fact, they were repelled by it. They condemned it and they would not touch it with a pair of tongs or of bamboos either. They had very strong feelings. They simply hated it. So, in spite of our own views about this proposal, though

we would have liked Bombay to form part of a bigger State, we dropped the idea of giving effect to the recommendation of the Commission in this regard. Hon. Members are aware that it has been our effort to adopt the recommendations of the Commission except where there has been a formal or informal sort of agreement between the States concerned. So, we rejected that recommendation; and, in consultation with our Maharashtrian colleagues, we then suggested that there should be three States, one consisting of the Maharashtrian districts of Bombay and Marathwada and Vidarbha, another Bombay and the third, Gujerat.

Shri S. S. More: May I know whether there was any written communication by these leaders or was all this only oral talk?

Pandit G. B. Pant: There have been communications to some; but there was no formal communication addressed to Government as such. I do not know if Shri More has any doubts about the correctness of the statement that I have made.

Shri S. S. More: Because some of the leaders are challenging this statement.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I do not know; there may be some leaders who were not associated with it. I do not deny that there may be some; but, those with whom we have been closely associated, they seemed to be agreeable and they were parties to it. I do not blame them. We agreed as much as they agreed and we felt that....

Shri C. D. Deshmukh (Kolaba): I think by colleagues, the hon. Minister means the members of the Working Committee of the Congress; by colleagues, he does not mean colleagues of his in Government. This particular decision that he has referred to is the decision of the Working Committee of the Congress.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I was certainly not suggesting in any way that Shri Deshmukh was a party to it. I think that is what he wanted to know.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): What was the resolution of the M.P.C.C.?

Pandit G. B. Pant: I am coming to that.

Anyway, this proposal had the merit of bringing about the unification of Vidarbha and the Maharashtra. In the case of Telengana and Andhra, the Commission had recommended that Telengana should remain separate for 5 years and then, by a two-third majority, it may join Andhra. In the case of Vidarbha, there was no such recommendation. But, we felt that it was desirable that Maharashtra should have a unified State, it should have a big State and we thought that it was but proper that we should use our influence to the extent we could with the leaders of Vidarbha in order to persuade them to join the rest of Maharashtra. Vidarbha has quite a big chunk of territory and lakhs of people reside in Vidarbha. If Vidarbha had remained out, Maharashtra would have been somewhat truncated. So, it was our efforts to ensure the unification of Vidarbha and the rest of Maharashtra at the outset. I think that does not indicate any animus. That should, if a charitable view be taken, be regarded as an earnest of our desire to help Maharashtra in the realisation of its aspirations. It was with that object that we took that step and we had the three-States formula. Unfortunately, this three-States formula did not meet with the approval of several people in Maharashtra. And, our own friends who had already been party to it found it difficult to press it and to push it. Shri Deshmukh also did not like it so much so, I think, that he tendered his resignation after the publication of that proposal. So, we found that even that formula did not really meet the

needs of the situation. We had always been anxious to explore all possibilities which would result in the satisfaction of the people of Maharashtra.

So we continued our search and friends were consulted. We were told by them that a Centrally administered Bombay along with Maharashtra, that is, the whole of Maharashtra including Vidarbha, and Gujarat including Saurashtra, would be acceptable. We proceeded on those lines. We had discussed the question not only with the leaders of Maharashtra in the Congress but also with some others who had devoted their lives to the service of the country and are even now working every minute in the midst of peasants and toilers. They all suggested that Central administration would be better.

While this talk was going on and we had almost reached the conclusion that Bombay should be Centrally administered, we were told by Shri Deshmukh that he had been authorised to state that the leaders of Maharashtra would now prefer to have a State for Bombay instead of Bombay being Centrally administered. In the light of what he said, we did not close the question then, but requested him to invite those members to Delhi. We took upon ourselves also to invite the leaders of Vidarbha so that the remaining question about the unification of Vidarbha and Maharashtra might also be satisfactorily settled.

When, however, the leaders of Maharashtra who had given Shri Deshmukh to understand that they would like to have Bombay as a State arrived, they had changed their opinion in the meantime; they thought and they told me that they would like to have a Centrally administered Bombay. The feeling was that Bombay once a State would always be a State, so that the chances of merger would be remote. They

[Pandit G. B. Pant.]

felt that administration from the Centre would make it much more feasible to merge Bombay later in Maharashtra. So, out of regard for those wishes, out of regard for the feelings expressed by them, we agreed to the proposal for Central administration of Bombay.

Shri Deshmukh had talks with them; he was embarrassed because of what they had told him. But after all he could only persuade them and did not succeed in that effort. He had himself at one time rejected the Bombay State formula, but later he felt that it could well be accepted. But in the circumstances, as they were not agreeable, we had to accept the Central administration proposal about Bombay.

Even after we had done so, there were some murmurings here and there that Bombay is going to be Centrally administered, there is no provision in it that the question will be reconsidered later, and that means that Bombay will remain under Central administration for ever and for good, and that, therefore, something should be done to remove this misapprehension. In order to remove such misapprehension, and in consultation with some friends, the Prime Minister made a statement in Bombay. It was but appropriate and natural that the Prime Minister should have done so. I feel that people would have regarded it as a deplorable omission if the head of the State in the executive side, who is leading the country today and who bears the onerous burdens not only in this land but also when he goes outside, having visited Bombay, had refrained from saying words which tended to reassure those whose minds were kept in suspense. He made that statement and I think he did it rightly and properly and in the fitness of things. Any other course would have been in every way open to objection, and it would not have even been regarded as proper. So, he did it and now we have that proposal.

When the question was discussed in the Joint Committee, the objection was again raised that Centrally administered Bombay is all right, the Prime Minister had said that the matter will be reviewed in five years, but what about it? After five years we may review, but there is no mention anywhere about it. So we were asked to introduce in the Report that the problem of Bombay would be subject to review in five years. That again was done to leave no room for any doubt in this regard.

At the very beginning the Prime Minister had said that Bombay formed geographically a part of Maharashtra. Then it was said that Bombay would be Centrally administered. Then it has been said that the decision would be subject to review in five years, and while the wishes of the people of Bombay would be taken into account, there would be no rigid form of plebiscite or anything like that, but the consensus or the general trend of opinion would be taken into account. Above all, the mutual relations, the disturbances that have stood in the way of a calm consideration of the problem having left some scars and these scars having disappeared, the matter would be considered in a way which would lead to the fostering of a spirit of goodwill, fellowship and neighbourly accommodation. It was thus that the final decisions were reached. The Cabinet was continuously in touch with all these, and when the Cabinet had decided almost that Bombay had to be Centrally administered, that decision was postponed in a way out of regard for certain suggestions that were then made. When those intervening proposals collapsed, naturally the only course left was to adopt the decision that had been virtually already reached. That is what happened.

I think in these circumstances there would be hardly any ground for feeling that there has been any

animus against Maharashtra. It is a matter of pain to us that we have not yet been able to give complete satisfaction to every Maharashtrian. It is equally painful to us that we should have to part with a great financial expert and a man of culture Shri Deshmukh. But we have done the utmost that we could. To say that we have been actuated by animus is, I feel, very unkind, if not harsh, and to some extent even untrue. So, that idea has to be dropped.

Is there anything so monstrous about this proposal for Bombay being Centrally administered for a limited period? Well, Mr. Deshmukh himself felt, and he has suggested it, that the best solution for Bombay would be a bigger bilingual State; with his strong view in the matter that the hinterland of Bombay should go with Bombay and also the feeling that Bombay should not be treated in a manner different than Madras or Calcutta, the exigencies and the inexorable demands of the situation have driven him to the conclusion that, considering the unique position of Bombay, Bombay should not be merged in a unilingual State, if any other solution of having a bigger bilingual State is feasible and possible in the circumstances. If he felt that this was a problem which called for further consideration, regardless of any other unsavoury development that might have taken place in Bombay in recent months, I do not think our judgment can be taken to task or considered to be blameworthy on that account.

If, in spite of the fact that there is the hinterland, Shri Deshmukh should have thought that Bombay could be a separate State and, as such, separate from the hinterland the fact of its being centrally administered does not prejudice the hinterland any more, because the Centre is interested in Bombay, it is interested in the hinterland, it is interested in the welfare of India which is inextricably bound up with the progress and prosperity of Bombay and it cannot possibly be a party to any thing that

would lead to the deterioration of Bombay. In the circumstances, I do not know why he should have thought that the Central administration is altogether condemnable.

He went even further and he has said that this provision, that after five years it should be reviewed, makes the situation worse. Well, that is beyond my comprehension. Because, if the provision were there that it is to continue to be centrally administered without any provision as to its being reviewable within a reasonable period, then the opportunity of having the decision reconsidered and, perhaps, of getting Bombay merged either in the bigger bilingual or possibly in the Maharashtra State would have been somewhat more remote. So, whatever has been done, has been done with the best of intentions and I think the charge of animus will now be considered, at least by all dispassionate persons, as having been wiped out.

There has been, in this connection, some unnecessary controversy as to what the Cabinet did and what the Cabinet did not. The Cabinet did everything that would enable it to reach an agreed decision and the Cabinet said so. It naturally tried to have the benefit of the advice of the Members and it reached final decisions after having explored every possibility. All previous stages were formulated and the final stage was when the draft of the Bill was considered. But even before that, there had been as I said, fourteen occasions perhaps on which the proposals relating to reorganisation were considered. Not only the question of Bombay being centrally administered or being part of a State was considered but also the border disputes relating to Belgaum, Supa, Hall, etc. were discussed, if I am right, in the presence of Shri Deshmukh. He wanted a uniform principle to be applied to all and that was but right. Decisions were taken in regard to that uniform principle which had been laid down by the SRC. It was said that the

[Pandit G. B. Pant.]

Cabinet was sometimes disregarded and ignored. A reference was made to certain replies given by the Prime Minister when Tamil Nad was separated from Andhra or Andhra was separated from Tamil Nad. The decision had been taken, perhaps in 1949, by the Cabinet. The principle had been accepted before the question was put. On the basis of the decision previously taken, the Prime Minister gave a reply and after having given that reply, he made a detailed announcement the next day in the terms which had been approved by the Cabinet itself. I do not see what more he could have done or what any other essentially predominantly democratic body could have attempted. So, any doubt in this regard must now be held as having dispelled.

In the course of the discussion, certain remarks were made by Shri Deshmukh. I regret that some of the observations made by him will, instead of helping the cause he has in his heart, tend to retard the process. What we want in Bombay is the emotional integration of the people living in Bombay and for that we have to apply the healing process and not to do or to say words unwarily, much less in a calculated and deliberate manner, which would lead to further alienation of the different communities from each other. I am afraid that the speech that he made might well be pressed into service by those who do not want good relations to be restored between the different communities in Bombay. He does not seem to have much regard for the Congress leaders of Bombay or even for the Ministers there. He said that so far as the masses go, there was enough goodwill among them but the politicians at the top were creating all the trouble. I wonder to which class he would himself belong if his speech were read and the test that he prescribed were to be applied to it.

Sir, in the course of the speech that Shri Deshmukh made, he referred to

certain remarks that I had occasion to make earlier. He said that I characterised the Maharashtrian community as unsagacious. I denied that I had done so but still he was not satisfied. In the circumstances, I crave the permission of the House just to read out what I then said: I said:

"So far as Bombay is concerned, I think this House devoted the major portion of its time to the discussion of problems connected with Bombay. It is but natural, Bombay holds a place of pride in our country. It is worthy of all the attention that can be bestowed on this great city, and the people who are concerned with it are also people to whom every citizen of India has reason to be grateful. Maharashtra gave us Lokmanya Tilak, Gopal Krishna Gokhale and several other leaders who not only in the present but in the past led our country from step to step to this goal of independence. Gujarat will ever remain enshrined not only in the annals of our land but those of the world for having produced a Gandhi. So far as Gujarat and Maharashtra are concerned, we would have to do all that we can to see that a solution that is acceptable to all is devised and evolved. We are determined to do that and we are determined to succeed in that. And if we fail, it will not be the failure of Gujaratis or of Maharashtrians, but of us all, because we must be able to serve them, to assure them that what we wish is the greatness of this country, to which they can contribute more than anybody else. To that end, we will do all we can. We will labour hard. The Gujaratis and the Maharashtrians complement and supplement each others qualities. One has more of valour and, perhaps, the other more of discretion. But all have to go

together. One may serve as an engine and the other as a brake. But this is how the train will march on and march faster and faster as it goes on. So we have to find a solution, and we shall find it."

I ask the House if there is anything unfriendly in this that could give any cause for umbrage or offence to any Maharashtrian whether here in the House or outside. I have nothing but the greatest reverence and respect for the great leaders that Maharashtra has produced and, even today it would be a matter of immense gratification to me if I could, in my own humble way, be of any little insignificant service to that community.

He said that it is possible that there may be more of valour in one and more of sagacity in another. But I did not use the word 'sagacity'. I used the word 'discretion' and I myself said that one has more of valour and the other more of discretion, but both qualities are shared by both; in one section there may be more of one and in the other more of the other. What can be the objection to this, I fail to understand. I should say that, if any other man had used that expression, I would have said that he had been guilty of deliberate distortion.

But Shri Deshmukh was not satisfied with this. He went further and he reminded me of my connection with Maharashtra from where my ancestors migrated nearly 250 years ago. I am grateful to him that he has told this House there is some little strain of the Maharashtrian blood in me too. So they should not suspect. I am one of them and he has reminded them....

Shri Gadgil: Be with us.

Pandit G. B. Pant:....of the ancestral tie. I am with you and I convert you to the right.

Shri Gadgil: I await.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Well, in the circumstances, I am really thankful to him, for I have myself refrained

from making mention of this fact as I thought that it would look as though I am making use of a sacred and precious heritage which should be preserved in all its sacredness. But as he has announced this fact I hope I will not be regarded as a man having contacts only with one State but as one who has every ancient bonds binding him with Maharashtra.

Sir, not only was this that Shri Deshmukh said; there were some other statements which showed the angle from which he had examined this entire problem. He said that Bombay was not made a State but it was centrally administered so that its surplus may be taken up by others. He knows as a financier that the central administration will be in the interest of the country. The Finance Commission will be sitting shortly. So far as the current budget is concerned allotments have already been made. Whatever share, or the whole of it if that be the demand of equity, was given to Maharashtra will be allotted, I hope, by the Finance Commission, to Maharashtra, because all dispositions that have been made so far will be reviewed by the Finance Commission. So there is no design behind it and, if there is any, it is only one that can be helpful to Maharashtra and not come in the way of its advancement.

Then he further made another statement. He said that the Industrial Finance Corporation of Bombay had not been transferred to Maharashtra but it had been retained in the Bombay, centrally administered area. Well, I think he either slipped over the facts or he did not appreciate their significance. This Industrial Finance Corporation has advanced loans mostly to people and concerns and firms working in Bombay. So when the matter was considered in the Joint Committee, it was felt—and the Members from Maharashtra particularly appreciated this difficulty—that all these loans will have to be realised in Bombay.

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

Bombay not being a part of Maharashtra, if this Industrial Finance Corporation was now to be transferred to Maharashtra State, it would have dead stones on its neck from the very start. It won't be able to realise its debts while its liability would be there for the loans and deposits that had been made through and in favour of the Industrial Finance Corporation. So, in order to safeguard the interests of Maharashtra, in order to see that it was not burdened with these liabilities, which it would be difficult for it to collect, it was considered equitable that the Industrial Finance Corporation of Bombay should remain in Bombay. And, along with that, it was decided that whatever contribution had been made by the Bombay State today towards the funds of this Industrial Finance Corporation, the share of those funds, the capital investment that was allottable to Maharashtra would be given to Maharashtra in cash. I do not see how one could be more generous to Maharashtra so far as this Industrial Finance Corporation is concerned. How could there be any objection to it? All these things indicate that matters were not viewed from the right but from an acute angle! I am not at all surprised. Experts often examine things very closely, but they are greatly embarrassed if they get off the rails. The engine carries big loads so long as it moves on the rails. Once it gets off the rails it gets upset and the whole of the train goes down the *khud*. So I am not surprised. Such things do happen at times. So, I am sorry that there should be such an approach towards problems of such great moment on the part of great and decent men. I will say no more about Bombay, except this. Let us all apply ourselves in a constructive way, with all humility of which we are capable, in order to restore goodwill and fellowship among the citizens of Bombay. Bombay is great and its greatness has to be preserved.

I have never said a word against Bombay going to Maharashtra. I have taken a long time in this House in expressing my views, but not a word have I uttered, not an argument have I advanced against Bombay's going to Maharashtra. I have always been anxious to bring about an arrangement that would satisfy all sections. But wherever Bombay goes, let Bombay remain a precious asset. Let not the vitality of Bombay be sapped. Whether Bombay remains a city State or whether Bombay is Centrally administered or whether Bombay is merged in Maharashtra, none can have the benefit unless Bombay continues to be as great and still becomes greater than it is today. Let us all bend our energies towards that. Let us all think that in India, Maharashtra and every other State is after all an integral part of India and let every man, whether in Punjab or in any other place, remember that if Bombay is healthy, strong, prosperous, goes to Maharashtra and continues to progress and to advance further, it will be for the benefit and advantage of India. So, let us do all that is necessary.

Some doubts and fears were expressed that people may be turned out of Bombay; that insidious methods may be adopted towards that end. Well, I think it will be the duty of the Centre to see that no foul play is tolerated and that nothing is allowed to be done in that way, that everyone has ample opportunity, necessary security and all the safeguards that are needed to enable one to have a full, free and happy life in Bombay. So, let there be no apprehensions. Let us not be deterred by imaginary phantoms. The future has no doubt its problems but we can solve them only if we face them boldly today. It is not by hiding our head under the bush and indulging in such speculative dreams—these can only depress us—that we can proceed towards the big ends which our country has to achieve.

So, I submit, let us not work on imaginary fears and apprehensions. I wonder if anything more in this regard has to be said, after what the Prime Minister had authoritatively stated yesterday.

There had been references to a few other matters in the course of this discussion. Some Members also referred to Punjab. My friend Shri N. C. Chatterjee is not here. He has found fault with the regional formula. If my impression is right, he was once for the federation of two sub-States in the Punjab. I would enquire from him as to which of the two was really in the interests of preservation of the integrity and unity of the Punjab and whether we do or do not wish that all people in this country should live in a spirit of comradeship and that every citizen should have sufficient opportunity for constructive work, and that no man should feel handicapped on account of any majority roundabout.

Punjab has great traditions. The people living in Punjab are inheritors of those traditions and they should readily have accepted, all of them, the regional formula. It provides that there will be one Punjab, one legislature, one Cabinet, one High Court and one Public Service Commission and only two regions which will function not on any communal but on a regional basis. Why then should there be any quarrel about it? Do we not want every citizen to have full scope for the blossoming of his own genius? Will the country benefit if any one is routed and suppressed? So, let us take a view of things that will redound to our benefit and to the credit of our country. Petty squabbles cannot raise any citizen or any State, and it is a matter of pain, sorrow, to us that controversies have centred around such—if I may venture to use the expression—a fine scheme which has been evolved for the Punjab. It would have healed the wounds; it would have cured the unhealthy elements in the body politic and it would have restored that

cohesion and solidarity without which no State can advance. Better late than later, better early than too late. So, I hope that even now, the people of the Punjab will accept this scheme and join hands in working together for the uplift of the people of the Punjab.

Our revered leader, Acharya Kripalani, spoke with his usual earnestness. He is one of the foremost patriots in our country. He felt that in the interests of smooth progress, and with the faith that he has in the healing power of time, it would be better to suspend further progress of this Bill or to keep these proposals in abeyance. Well, I have great regard for his opinion and for his disinterested approach towards all problems. But it seems to me to be the counsel of desperation.

5 P.M.

I think as I stated at the outset, that we have already solved most of the problems and I think the little that is still outstanding will also be resolved in a satisfactory way. But, to leave a festering sore is not in the interest of all of us. Once we start, we must reach the goal; to leave it half way is not the manly way of handling things. It is not even the prudent way, because ultimately it costs more than facing the difficulties today. If we suspend the further consideration of this Bill, then the Democles' sword will be hanging over the fate not of any particular State, but of every State and of everyone of us. So, I feel that unless this House—all sections, of course—resolves that this should be done, nothing else can possibly be done, because we advance in matters like this only with the co-operation and goodwill of all sections. Unless all feel that we should adopt such a course, I would find it difficult to appreciate the force of the remarks to the extent as to how there will be greater good if we postpone things, than we can achieve if we continue and even accelerate it. But, if all Members of this House feel otherwise, we are just in their hands.

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

I have stated what I feel and what I think; and I can only hope that many will agree. Why should we not be able to resolve our differences? Even if we cannot, why should we not reconcile ourselves to decisions that have been taken after prolonged discussions, after the most careful consideration and after consultation with all possible groups, interests and opinions in the country? So, I hope that all will now enter this task in a constructive spirit with a view to get over the remaining difficulties and so ensure the common objective which has, after all, influenced us in going in for this reorganisation of States.

Sir, a suggestion was also made with regard to the establishment of a boundary commission. I must say that I am not enamoured of the idea. We have zonal councils now and the scope of the zonal councils has been enlarged; not only the States within the zone but also other States can meet together and discuss problems of common interest. There are two things which have been specifically mentioned for the consideration of the zonal councils—boundary disputes and safeguards for linguistic minorities. So, I should like to give a little quiet, a little sense of comfort, relief and rest to the country. To have this sort of wrangling continuously does not seem to me to be in the interest of the tranquility that we need or the emotional integration which we all desire. So, let us hope that when the new States are formed, the boundary disputes will be settled by them. I appealed to my friends in the Joint Committee belonging to different States to meet together and to settle their problems. When that did not result in any concrete thing being done, then I suggested that they might meet together and appoint common arbitrators. But, even there we did not succeed. In the circumstances, I did not like to continue this process....

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: The question of an arbitrator was never brought up before the Joint Committee."

Pandit G. B. Pant: I appealed to the Members perhaps informally.

Shri S. S. More: To Congress Members.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Yes; you must be right. I might have done it informally.

I would even now appeal to the Members belonging to different States in Parliament to meet together and to settle the disputes and the differences. After all, as the Prime Minister has reminded us, we are all here as representatives of India though the doors through which we have entered this magnificent hall may be spread all over the country. So, let us apply our minds in that spirit; and there is no reason why we should not settle these petty differences among ourselves. But, left to myself, would not like to continue this period of friction, wrangling, and in a way, fight against each other, to be prolonged. Whether the issues are big or small, if the tournament continues, then the spirit that we need will not be achieved or maintained. It is because of that that I am submitting this for the consideration of the House.

Mr. Frank Anthony here and in the Joint Committee drew the attention of the Members to the need for providing safeguards for linguistic minorities. We have throughout been of the view that adequate safeguards will be provided and that every citizen, whatever be his language, should feel that he has ample and unrestricted scope for growth and development. So, there is no difference between him and us. Dr. Lanka Sundaram has suggested in his minute of dissent that it will be desirable to have an officer like the Commissioner of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes for looking after the interests of the linguistic minorities and also that the report should be placed on the Table of the House. Well, these suggestions are worthy of consideration and I hope the House will accept them.

Shri Boovaraghasamy (Perambalur): Why the Madras State is not named as "Tamil Nad" according to the wishes of Tamilians?

Pandit G. B. Pant: You will have ample time to put that question later.

I have dealt with some of the salient points that were raised in the course of the debate. I have already perhaps exceeded the time allotted to me. I can only appeal to the hon. Members of this House to view this problem with that large-heartedness which alone can raise our country to a status higher than the one which it has already achieved. This morning, we had the privilege of listening to the account of his travels in foreign countries that the Prime Minister gave us. I felt proud and I was elated for a moment. Let us then remember how high he has lifted our country and ourselves; and, let us also remember that if we have to maintain those standards, then we have to be guided not by petty considerations, but by something big befitting our great heritage, the great traditions that we have inherited and the great ancestors from whom we claim our descent.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"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."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 15

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the States Reorganisation Bill. First of all, clauses 2 to 15 of the Bill be taken up for which 12 hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members who wish to move their amendments to this group of clauses consisting of clauses 2 to 15 may hand over the numbers of their amendments, specifying the clauses to which they relate, to the Secretary at the Table within 15 minutes.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannalore): Just now it has been said that even now there is time to settle as regards border disputes, and that Members may discuss about them and try to see whether some understanding can be reached. If these clauses are now taken up, there will be no opportunity for the Members to come to agreement.

Pandit G. B. Pant: If any settlement is reached with regard to any matter, we can amend the clause later with the permission of the Speaker. But, the proceedings need not be held up.

Shri S. S. More: I have not been able to understand the Chair's direction. Have we to give the numbers of our amendments regarding clause 2 to 15?

Mr. Speaker: Yes; both inclusive.

Shri Gadlingana Gowd (Kurnool): On a point of clarification, the hon. Home Minister said that the representatives of the States which have border disputes can sit together and settle. What about the views of the States concerned?

Mr. Speaker: The views of the States are already before the Government. If the hon. Members have any doubts, they may clear them up later on with the hon. Minister.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: May I draw your attention, Sir, and the attention of the House to one point? Though the time allocation is for the group of clauses, I am sure it is your intention and the intention of the House to take up each clause by itself and dispose of it. Otherwise, there will be interminable wrangles. Clause 3 relates to Andhra and nothing else.

Mr. Speaker: What I would say is, in accordance with previous practice, the clauses have been put together in groups so that they may all be discussed together. I shall put to the House the amendments

[Mr. Speaker]

relating to any particular clause separately and each clause separately. That is assured. I am not going to put all the clauses together to the vote of the House. So far as discussion is concerned, an hon. Member will have only one opportunity to speak. Whatever he wants to say, he may say, with respect to all or any of the clauses or amendments.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: With the greatest respect to your ruling, Sir, I still wish to draw your attention and the attention of the House to one fact. Each State is sought to be laid out in terms of the clauses here. It is better—I am submitting for your consideration or reconsideration—that each State is taken separately as regards the boundaries go and things of that kind, so that the discussion can be directed to a point.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members will kindly see that all Members are not interested in each State. Am I to ask those hon. Members who come from Andhra to get up?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: No, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: What shall I do? The other Members will not have any interest. If I have to take up one clause, dispose of it and then take up the next clause, why should we group them? I need not group clauses 2 to 15 at all. Not that I am standing by any grouping. If that is the desire of the House, I will not group the clauses. I understand, except with respect to one or two items here and there—they are not many—there is larger agreement than disagreement upon these matters. With respect to Bombay, I do not know what more is to be said by the one side or the other. The House will consider the amendments.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: There are amendments.

Mr. Speaker: Let them consider every one of the amendments. Hon. members will have one opportunity to speak. Incidentally they may

emphasise certain things and generally refer to some other questions. This is the course that we have been following all along. This course may be usefully adopted. Of course, if an hon. Member who is making a good point wants some more time, I do not think he will be prevented merely because all the clauses are clubbed. Each clause and each amendment will be put separately normally, unless it is the desire of the House with respect to any particular clause that a group of amendments may be put together.

Shri Tukidas (Mehsana West): May I submit, with regard to this allocation of time for the groups of different clauses, it was only received this morning. Certain amendments were sent today. They may be coming up tomorrow. Can we move them?

Mr. Speaker: We have allotted 12 hours. Naturally even if we sit all the six hours each day, they will go upto tomorrow also. At any rate, if the amendments are tabled sufficiently early, they can be taken notice of by the House.

Shri R. D. Misra: I want to speak on a point of law before taking up the clauses.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am not able to follow. Point of law?

Shri R. D. Misra: Law. I want to speak about.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member, evidently, is new to the procedure. A point of law is not necessarily a point of order. I will not allow any point of law merely to obstruct the proceedings in this House. If he wants to speak, he will have time.

Shri R. D. Misra: I will speak on my amendments and I shall speak on the points of law.

Mr. Speaker: Let him speak on his amendments and the clauses, oppose or support the amendments. I will not allow him to speak now.

Shri Raghavachari: I wish to clearly understand what the Home Minister meant when he said that no clause need be held up and if agreements are reached, they may be subsequently considered. There was one statement like that. I wish to know what is meant by that.

Mr. Speaker: As I understood it, if from today negotiations start, and by the time the clauses are put to vote, there is something tangible which is likely to ensure out of them we can say, so far as this clause is concerned, it may stand over till tomorrow or the voting will stand over till some other day. That is how I understand it.

Shri Raghavachari: What he said was, no clause need be held over and if agreements are reached; it may be reopened.

Mr. Speaker: This is what I have said. Once it is disposed of, it cannot be reopened. That is how it ought to be understood.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: This group of clauses is, to my mind, the most important part of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Let me also fix the time. We have fixed 12 hours for all the clauses. An hon. Member will take not more than 15 or 20 minutes.

Some Hon. Members: Fifteen minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Yes; according to the length of the debate.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I was saying that this group of clauses under discussion is perhaps the most important group of all the clauses of the Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Committee. Leaving aside clause 2, which only deals with definitions, the entire group of clauses now under discussion relates to Part II, namely, territorial changes and formation of new States, with the result that I consider that today as this debate on

this group of clauses continues and is disposed of, as far as this House is concerned the redrawing of the administrative map of India on a predominantly linguistic basis will have been completed.

I have listened with great interest to the impassioned speech made by the hon. Home Minister. I regret to say I was not happy when he announced, not for the first time I am sure because he has said so repeatedly in the Joint Committee, that he is not for a statutory boundary commission. I do not wish to labour the point because this point has been discussed times out of number in the Joint Committee. I made reference to it in my Minute of Dissent. I have also drawn attention to it generally a few days ago when I spoke on the first reading of this Bill.

You, Sir, in your ruling just now said that all these clauses may be taken together, that Members might discuss them together and only one opportunity is given. I have no difficulty on that point. The point at issue is that this part, i.e., Part II of the Bill deals with the boundaries of the new States, and I regret to say that not all of us are satisfied that the boundaries as have been mentioned in the Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Committee will be acceptable to every one of us. In fact, I would like, with your permission, to move amendment 217 as a token amendment with reference to Bellary. I repeat the word "token". I hope the House will appreciate that I mean it sincerely when I say it is a token amendment, because we from Andhra could have given 200 amendments if not more to deal with the boundaries which are going to be brought into existence as a result of the formation of Andhra Pradesh as embodied in this Bill. I have said so before in the Joint Committee and also on a previous occasion here in this House that unless and until you dispose of these boundary problems, the process of States reorganisation cannot by any stretch of the imagination even be considered complete.

(Dr. Lanka Sundaram)

A little while ago, Mr. Speaker, when you were in the Chamber, when the hon. Deputy-Speaker was here, I brought to the attention of the House, a news item hung up in the Central Hall regarding arbitration. It was stated that the Cabinet may consider this proposal very soon. The Vice President of India will be proposed as the arbitrator for disposal of the border disputes between Maharashtra and Gujrat, Maharashtra and Karnataka, and Karnataka and Kerala. I posed the question, and I hoped the hon. Home Minister would have thought it fit to clear my doubts and the doubts of several Members in this House: Why these three or four sets of border disputes alone are taken up for arbitration purposes? What about the rest of the country? Where will people in other parts of the country go to? I would very sincerely request the Home Minister to enlighten us at least when he replies to the debate on this group of clauses.

Shri Raghavachari: Are they taken at all?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Are they taken at all? That is my first question.

Pandit G. B. Pant: You need not attach any importance to it.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I wish you had said so. I am prepared to accept arbitration from any individual of eminence, but for the country as a whole. You cannot deal with this problem of boundary disputes....

Pandit G. B. Pant: You better forget it.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Thank you.

All the same I come back to the starting point because I will not have an opportunity again to request the Home Minister, for this will be the last time, to reconsider his views

and make sure of the point that States reorganisation without the solution of the boundary disputes, and more so without making a provision statutorily for the solution of boundary disputes, will not solve the problem of the India of tomorrow.

The Home Minister, a few minutes ago, referred to the possibility of agreed amendments being moved. The Home Minister will concede the point that even in the Joint Committee it is I who on a number of occasions asked for adjournment of the discussion so that the amendments may be grouped together. Here I am prepared to make two statements about amendments which after group discussions among the Members of the Joint Committee could not be incorporated in the Bill.

First about Servancha in Madhya Pradesh. We had a group discussion in the Joint Committee and I am prepared to give the names of some of the Members present: Shri Deogirikar, Shri R. M. Deshmukh, Dr. Khedkar, myself, Shri Dhage, Dr. Jaisoorya and so many others. We could not find a formula available for incorporation into the text of the Bill all because the Government's consent was also sought to be taken and the Government's consent was not available. That was one of my difficulties in the Joint Committee. I put it before the House and particularly draw the attention of the Home Minister as to the implication of his suggestion that combined or unanimous amendments may be brought together by agreement among Members of the House. None of us in this House is authorised to negotiate and sign a deed, so to speak, as regards a border dispute in a particular part of the country. In all certainty we represent the whole of India as the Prime Minister said. I share that view, but we have no contractual rights, so to speak, to be able to do it. In any case, our Governments are very much in the picture.

The other question, a question which I brought up in the Joint Committee, a question which I am ventilating here not for gaining a small point for Andhra but to show the difficulties, is this. There was complete and unanimous agreement among the Members from Andhra and Karnataka in the Joint Committee—I am sure my statement will not be disputed by anybody who happened to be on the Joint Committee from both the areas—regarding Rajulabanda in Raichur District, a small project in an area which has got to come to Andhra in exchange for certain other things. Straightaway the letter of the Chief Minister of Mysore was brought in, and the letter of the Chief Minister of Hyderabad was brought in. There were differences between the Chief Ministers, with the result that the so-called agreement among the Members in the Joint Committee as regards the disposal of the particular dispute had to be dropped.

Shri Raghavachari: Why did you agree?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I have got the amendments here, and I have moved one as a token amendment.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): Why was it dropped?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: All because the Governments' agreement was made a condition precedent for incorporation in the Bill. That was my difficulty with the hon. Home Minister and the Chairman of the Joint Committee, and I am not saying that in any passion or rancour. I say procedurally it is absolutely necessary for this House to dispose of amendments on their merits, and the House cannot be fettered by the two conditions laid down by the Home Minister, namely that there must be complete unanimity of agreement among the parties concerned in regard to the dispute, and secondly there must be the concurrent agreement between the Governments of the areas concerned which are parties to the dispute. I still hope that as this debate continues and the clause by clause discus-

sion goes forward something can be done and will be done to ensure that this sovereign Parliament is not fettered in its right and obligation to dispose of amendments as they are brought forward. And here I make an appeal that the party in power should not issue a whip, but leave it to the free vote of the House as to what should be done in regard to the fixation of the boundaries of the various States which are involved in Part II of this Bill.

Speaking of Andhra in particular, I would like to say in brief that our boundaries have not been properly fixed for the future Andhra Pradesh State. We have got boundary disputes with Orissa and Orissa has got boundary disputes with Andhra on the same token. We have got boundary disputes with Madhya Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh naturally will throw in its caveat as far as Andhra goes. We have disputes with Madras State and Madras has got certain claims on Andhra. And again, Andhra and Karnataka have got difficulties, worse difficulties. That is why I put in, as I said, my amendment 217 with reference to Bellary as a token amendment, because I know I would not be able to bring all the amendments regarding the disputes between Andhra and the rest of the country.

Finally, only yesterday I received a number of representations from certain areas of Marathwada which are now sought to be given to the future Maharashtra State. The rights and wrongs of this dispute have got to be disposed of at a competent level on the basis of an honourable and enduring settlement for all time, on the basis of suasion on the basis of discussion, on the basis of agreement, but merely to come and say here "You come to an agreement over it. I will put it in the text" will not solve the problem not only for Andhra but for every other part of the country also. I know, the case of Kasargod is one example. Belgaum is another example. Abu is a third example. I can go on multiplying examples all over the country. Since

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

I happened to be for four years the president of the Linguistic States Conference, I have been fairly familiar with some of these border disputes. Each one has to be looked into. Each one has got to be solved before this Bill is allowed to go on the statute book. Otherwise, I claim, and I repeat for the last time, because I know I may not have a further opportunity of saying this and putting forward this argument, that this Bill will become incomplete, and will leave a number of unsolved problems, which will continue to assume vitriolic positions, even if the President gives his assent to this Bill as it emerges from this House and the other House. In other words, now, for the first time, in five thousand years of our unrecorded and recorded history, when we are attempting what we might call the task of reorganisation of India on a predominantly linguistic basis, let us not fail to make provision for this. Without fettering the discretion of the Government of today or tomorrow, without in any way complicating the procedure, I made a request to the Chairman of the Joint Committee, and I repeat that request here, to make one single provision available in the Constitution, for the automatic ceasing of these border disputes and border problems by the appointment of a boundary Commission. I have argued that point in the Joint Committee, I have argued it in my minute of dissent, and I would like to repeat it here for the last time. Articles 3 and 4 are there for the *ad hoc* appointment of boundary commissions. There is also another special provision in the Constitution for the President to appoint an *ad hoc* enquiry committee, so to speak.

But as I ventured to say on the last occasion, I would repeat it to the hon. Members of this House that for three years, the Andhra and Madras Governments, belonging to the same Congress Party sat together, to solve the problems of border disputes between the two States, and even today,

they have no decision. They could not arrive at a decision, and both of them have demanded the appointment of a boundary commission. Since I spoke last, the Mysore Government also have demanded, officially, so to speak, for the appointment of a boundary commission. I am aware of similar demands from other parts of the country also. So, if we make a provision for that here, we will be removing this question once and for all from the ambit of the politicians, so to speak, and lift it to a higher plane, and make a procedure available whereby judicial decisions on a statutory basis would become available to the people of every part of the country which is involved in these boundary disputes.

I hope that this last appeal will not go in vain. I am sure the Home Minister, who is known for his attitude of sweet reasonableness and quick comprehension of points made, will not possibly neglect to concede this demand, which I am sure, everyone of us in this House, irrespective of party affiliations, is supporting. Here, I would like to say that there are any number of amendments tabled by the Congress Members on the Joint Committee on this point. Even here, we find that eighteen to nineteen lists of amendments have been circulated, which clearly show that all of us are agreed in principle on this point. I hope that even at this late stage, the Home Minister would not reject out of hand a demand, which, I am convinced, has the unanimous support of almost every Member of this House, so that when the problem of reorganisation of States is disposed of once and for all, there may not be festering sores left, relating to boundary disputes.

Having said this, I would like to briefly touch one or two other points relating to the other clauses in Part II of the Bill. On the question of Bombay, I have not spoken so far either in the Joint Committee or here. I happened to be, in 1952, the person, who, as president of the Linguistic States

Conference, developed this theory of city-States for multilingual States. Today, with the passage of time, and after the speeches made in this House during the last few days, stage has come when the present passions must be exhausted before the question of the city of Bombay is disposed of one way or the other. I am entirely in agreement with the Prime Minister and the Home Minister on this point. I am saying it here for the first time in this long controversy on the future of the Bombay city, because I feel that once the healing balm is applied, there will be a certain positive solution, which will be capable of satisfying the honour and self respect of Maharashtrians, the interests of Bombay city, and more so, the well-being of this country.

Part II of this Bill, and particularly, clause 23 of the Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Committee deals with.....

Mr. Speaker: We are not dealing with Part II.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): We are dealing only with clause up to clause 15.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: We are dealing with clause up to those relating to the zonal councils.

Mr. Speaker: But the hon. Member was referring to the zonal councils..

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I am dealing with the clauses that come before that.

Until and unless these boundary problems are properly mapped out in this debate, and properly sought to be disposed of through a boundary commission, I regret to say that the problem of the reorganisation of States on a predominantly linguistic basis will not have been solved.

One final word, and I have done. I would like to pay a tribute to the Home Minister personally on this point. There was a time when the name of the Andhra State was sought to be substituted by the name of

Hyderabad. There was a time when 20th of February this year, when a sort of agreement was sought to be reached by Congress leaders from Andhra and Telangana to name Andhra as Hyderabad. The House would recall that the day after the supposed agreement, I stood here and said that let not Government deny the Andhras their birth-right to be called Andhras. I am here to say that but for the personal intervention of the Home Minister, you, Sir, if you would permit me to say so with respect, would have been called a Hyderabad, and I am glad that such a disaster has been averted. This Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Committee does not give an Andhra the imprimature of a Hyderabad, nor for that matter the imprimature of an Andhra-Telangana. I am once again free to confess that I was very happy that the Home Minister stood four square to all the pressure which was brought to bear upon him and averted this disaster.

Shri Raghavachari rose—

Mr. Speaker: May I make one suggestion to the House? Hon. Members who have not taken part, for want of time, in the general discussion may kindly pass on chits, indicating the States with respect to which they would like to speak, at the Table. The office will tabulate the whole thing and then give it to me, and I shall try to accommodate them and give them opportunities.

Shri S. S. More: I believe all the amendments regarding which chits have been forwarded will be taken to have been moved?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. I shall get them tabulated and then circulate them to hon. Members in the Bulletin, or I shall announce them tomorrow.

Shri Raghavachari: I wish to speak on amendments Nos....

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members will try to give opportunities to those who have not taken so far.

Shri Raghavachari: But I did not say a word about the details of these amendments in the ten minutes that I had. I shall confine myself only to the details of the amendments.

I intend moving amendments Nos. 66, 70, 85 and 217. Amendments Nos. 217 and 66 are alternate amendments to clause 3. Amendment No. 70 is to clause 7 and amendment No. 85 is to clause 14.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I have already sought permission to move amendment No. 217.

Shri Raghavachari: In that case I am supporting it.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point in all these amendments? What are they intended for?

Shri Raghavachari: I shall read them out.

Mr. Speaker: They need not be read out, but the hon. Member may give their substance.

Shri Raghavachari: The substance of amendment No. 66 is that the three *firkas* of Bellary, Rupanagudi and Moka be taken out of the Mysore State and added on to Andhra. Amendment No. 217 seeks in the alternative to provide for the transfer of three and odd taluks when Tungabhadra is from Mysore to the Andhra Pradesh. In amendment No. 70, I am seeking to exclude the territories referred to in the previous amendment from the Mysore State.

Mr. Speaker: It is consequential.

Shri Raghavachari: By amendment No. 85, I seek to add these territories within the Andhra Pradesh territories mentioned in Part A of the First Schedule to the Constitution, contemplated in clause 14.

Before I go on to say something in detail about these amendments, I would like to submit one thing, and that is in regard to the way in which this matter appears to have been approached in the Joint Committee. Generally, we have been prohibited from referring to the procedure followed in the Joint Committee. In so

far as Dr. Lanka Sundaram has referred to it and even the Home Minister has referred to it, I want to make my humble submission about that matter. The procedure that they adopted in the Joint Committee was that people belonging to the separate adjoining States might come together and agree. But in fact, the Members of the Joint Committee were not chosen on behalf of the States at all. It may be that there were more people from one State and no people or less people from another State. How could these people come together and have any agreement?

Shri Gadgil: They were chosen on party lines.

Shri Raghavachari: They have not adopted any special procedure in selecting the Members of the Committee. The usual practice is that parties are asked to send a few names, and often the names are of those who were not on other Committees. Therefore, the attempt made in the Joint Committee that these people may come together and then decide this matter is not likely to be effective. Naturally it resulted in no particular decision.

However, Dr. Lanka Sundaram was just now mentioning that when these people came together agreed even unanimously, some letter from the State Government came in the way and the agreement had to be withdrawn. Then I asked Dr. Lanka Sundaram, "Why did you agree?". He said, "All that I could do was to have appended a Minute of Dissent, which I have done". Of course, naturally it goes on like that. Even now the Home Minister was kind enough to make another offer, that all Members of this House belonging to a particular State and the neighbouring States might agree about the boundaries. That is an offer he has very kindly made. I would welcome it and I would thank him for it. But even there there is this difficulty, that unless he offers some more assistance and details, we cannot go into it. We have not

got all the details of population village-wise or *firka*-wise. I think most of the Members are inclined not to have a taluk or a district as unit but contiguity and some percentage of the language of the adjoining areas. On this basis, certainly we can all come together. I feel very hopeful that the Karnatak Members as well as the Andhra Members here are more reasonable and they would certainly be able to agree on the basis of contiguity and then some percentage, say, 60 or 65 per cent.

Dr. Rama Rao: 51 per cent.

Shri Raghavachari: Not 51 per cent. It is difficult. On the borders people can talk this language or that. Then in the recent census when the question of States reorganisation was in the air for the last ten years, a lot of manipulation has taken place, and so marginal percentage is not at all safe. That is why I say that a higher percentage is required.

On the basis I have indicated, we can all agree. But the real difficulty, as I said, would be that the Government will have to provide us with more details about these matters. If that is done, we will certainly make our best efforts to arrive at some agreement.

As far as the boundary between Andhra and Karnataka (the present Mysore) is concerned, there is a difficulty. Manifestly Telugu areas have not been included in Andhra on the ground that there has been no local agitation. We are now deciding the boundaries of States on linguistic basis, not on the basis of agitation in this or that place. Surely, has this Government attached any value to agitation? In Bombay, there has been agitation, a war of agitation. Have they done anything? There has been a lot of agitation going on in Bellary for the last four years.

Shri Basappa (Tumkur): What about the result of the recent bye-election?

Shri Raghavachari: I will come to that. Please have some patience.

The point is that agitation and *satyagraha* has been going on in Bellary for the last many years—it is not a few months. And yet has any notice been taken of that agitation? On the ground that there has been no local agitation, you do not want to add to Andhra the Kolar district. There is the Pavgada taluk. The greater part of its east is inhabited by Telugu-speaking people. Then there is Madaksira. But one is Mysore State and another in Andhra. Both taluks have Telugu-speaking as well as Kannada-speaking people. I for one, both as a Kannadiga as well as an Andhra, would very much like that the Kannada portions of these two taluks must be in Karnatak and the Telugu portions should be in Andhra. That is the best solution. To say that on the ground of there being no local agitation a thing is not done, is not the correct thing to do.

The unfortunate thing there is—and I do not wish to be misunderstood—as I have already said in my general remarks, that Karnataka is the most fortunate in this scheme of reorganisation and Andhra is the most unfortunate. See how many lakhs of Andhras are there in the present proposed Karnataka State and how many lakhs of Kannadigas are thrown into the Andhra? You will find that the statement that I made that Karnataka is the most fortunate after this reorganisation is correct.

The old Mysore leaders have a prejudice against Andhra. Whatever we suggest, they want to stand against it.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): No prejudice.

Shri Raghavachari: There was a lot which we have suffered from our Tungabhadra project could not go on smoothly and the Centre had to intervene. The Mysore leaders

[Shri Raghavachari]

were uncooperative. So any proposal that we made was obstructed. I am happy that the new Karnataka is coming into existence. Of course, the leaders of the new Karnataka too are passionate about their language and I am a bit afraid on that score. Nevertheless, they have adopted a saner and sensible rule that if there is a contiguous area with a majority population, that portion should be given over to the respective neighbouring State speaking the same language. Therefore, there is a little more hope, though not immediately. As the Home Minister said, we have to await the report of the Zonal Council or something else. I suppose my grandchildren may possibly hope of seeing that fructified, not I in this generation.

My hon. friend was asking: what about the recent bye-election? I ask, did the Congress set up a candidate on that issue? No. It dared not. And now it has turned out to be a recent election! Did you give any challenge? It is true our Minister did that. I think it was the most indiscreet statement that our Minister could make when he had not taken any part or any interest in the bye-election, saying, "Here is a bye-election. We shall now see its result". Did you do it? Did the Government challenge us? Therefore, to refer to the recent bye-election is nothing but talking of something that has come from the air when you have nothing to stand on earth. Even if you take the recent elections, the three *firkas* had a very big Andhra majority....

Shri Shivamurthi Swami: Except in Bellary, there was no majority at all in any *firka*.

Shri Raghavachari: They had a majority. I shall give figures. There is no use simply saying like that.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): Let not neighbourly relations be disturbed.

Shri Raghavachari: In the three *firkas*, Rupanagudi, Moka and Bellary, they got a majority for Andhra; the Andhra candidate got a majority over the other candidate. Therefore, even on that basis, it must go to Andhra.

There is another project, called Rajulabanda project, which was referred to. You know that this is a project below the Tungabhadra project. The Hyderabad Government is taking water there. I had occasion to mention long ago that from Rajulabanda a channel can be laid and there is plenty of water from the catchment area below the Tungabhadra bund and above Rajulabanda, enough to irrigate about 63,000 acres which are now under the low-level channel of Tungabhadra. The point is that the villages through which this Rajulabanda channel is to run the majority of the population is Andhra. If that portion is given, the construction of the channel becomes smooth and there will be no trouble and 63,000 acres which are now included under the lower Tungabhadra channel can be irrigated. The quantity of water assigned for these 63,000 acres can well be taken from the Tungabhadra dam itself through the high level channel to irrigate portions of the arid and dreary taluks in district from which I come, Anantapur. Therefore, all these adjustments can well be made.

I wish to say that apart from the amendments we are more concerned with the attitude adopted by the hon. Home Minister, if not today, at least another day, I hope these representatives will meet together and come to a decision which is very helpful to economic interests as well as the interests of the linguistic States that we are trying to make. I, therefore, submit my amendments for the acceptance of this House,—the three amendments that I have moved.

Mr. Speaker: I will make one more suggestion. There are as many as 131 clauses in the Bill. We are now dealing with the most contentious

ones, clauses 2 to 15. With respect to other clauses, the Zonal Councils etc. there may not be so much of controversy. If hon. Members want me to call them in order of States, I may call them one for and one against. The Members of one State may come together and decide among themselves....

Dr. Rama Rao: How is that possible?

Mr. Speaker: I am only suggesting one thing. Members of one State may join together and sit at one place and have discussions and, if they want, they can invite Members of other States also. Dr. Lanka Sundaram was suggesting that the Vice-President may be invited to settle these disputes. There are 499 Members here out of whom there may be many in whom both sides may have confidence. Wherever there is a difference such persons who may take a dispassionate view of things may be asked to settle. After that, they may go to the Home Minister and try to get those agreements endorsed. It is only a suggestion that I am making; and it is for hon. Members to take it.

Shri Gadgil: There is some such thing with respect to Maharashtra. We have not only trouble, in right in the heart of our territory, namely Bombay, but in the southern border, the northern border and the north-western border also there are disputes. Whether you would like them to discuss Bombay and Maharashtra together or not, I would like to suggest that such groups may be made so that all boundary disputes may be 'rationalised' in a sense for purposes of discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Any hon. Member may speak with respect to any of the amendments, not only on all four sides but on all the eight sides.

Shri Gadgil: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Let them group themselves as they like where they sit together for discussion. Some may

be interested in the north, some in the east and so on.

Dr. Rama Rao: Sir, I want to speak on my amendments, Nos. 1, 5 and 429. First, I will refer to 429 which speaks about the Boundary Commission. Today the Home Minister has been pleased to suggest that Members of Parliament of the various States can meet together and decide about the boundaries and that decision will be incorporated. It is a good thing but a most impracticable and impossible thing to happen as it is. So, I would suggest the Home Minister to nominate a non-controversial Member, that is, a Member from any non-controversial State to be in charge of each dispute.

Fandit G. B. Pant: That will not serve any useful purpose.

Dr. Rama Rao: Who is to convene the meeting and call these members? Who are to decide the question? My suggestion here is the only practical thing, namely, the establishment of a Boundary Commission, details of which I shall read out. Let me give an instance to the hon. Home Minister. Sironsa in Chanda District, it is stated, must go to Andhra and this has been accepted by the Maharashtrian members of the Hyderabad State. Unfortunately this area is in Madhya Pradesh and there has been some procedural trouble about it. The Maharashtrians in that area are very few, probably 9 or 10 per cent. Therefore, it is practically a non-controversial thing, but technically it has become impossible. Therefore, this is a sort of challenge to the Home Minister. Let the concerned Maharashtrian members come and set about it and give their opinion. I am sure there will be absolutely no objection from the Maharashtrian members as far as Sironsa taluk is concerned. The population is overwhelmingly Telugu-speaking, and the Maharashtrians have no objection to it because they are only 9 or 10 per cent. of the population there.

Then there is another important consideration. In the Hyderabad

[Dr. Rama Rao]

Assembly it was agreed that this should be included in the new Andhra State.

Then, the Home Minister knows about the trouble that there has been about the Tungabhadra headworks. If not in the present Five Year Plan, at least in the near future, we must have a huge project from Godavari to Ichampalli, but at present this has been included in the Madhya Pradesh Area. Let him call the Maharashtra members and settle the question. This is the least controversial of the areas in dispute, but technically the procedure has become so difficult that its achievement has become almost impossible just because there is no Boundary Commission.

I request that my amendment may be accepted. It reads like this:

"15A. (1) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this Part, one or more Boundary Commissions shall be appointed by the Central Government to go into various disputes about boundaries and their inclusions and exclusions from the various States.

(2) The Boundary Commission or Commissions shall decide on the basis of the principles of—

(i) linguistic majority;

(By linguistic majority, I mean 51 per cent majority, and not 65 or 75 or 85 per cent. according to the fancies of any individual. You are here marking the new boundaries. Why should you not take a simple majority? It is absurd to have 65 or 75 per cent majority. It must be decided on simple majority and 51 per cent. will do.)

(ii) village as a unit;

(there is no sanctity about a district or a taluk).

(iii) contiguity of area.

(3) Regarding tribal areas people belonging to the same tribes should not as far as possible be arbitrarily divided but attached to those States where it is most conducive for their speedy economic, social and cultural progress.

(4) Decision of the Boundary Commission shall be binding on the States concerned and will have effect as if included in this Part."

Therefore, I do not see any practical procedure to settle these boundary disputes without the establishment of one or more Boundary Commissions.

As far as the Home Minister is concerned, his mind is open. Now, what is the practical procedure to settle this boundary issue? Our friend, Shri Raghavachari, has mentioned about Madagasera and Pavada. Then there is Kolar, Bellary, and then it goes on to Raichur—then there is dispute about it between Karnataka and Andhra. Then again there is a dispute in Chittoor District. These are all small things and a Boundary Commission consisting of judicial officers should be able to decide such things taking into account these broad factors. These things cannot be settled by a few members here. If it is possible, let the Home Minister call for a meeting of Maharashtrian Members and decide about Sironsa and other areas.

I support what Shri Raghavachari said about Rajulabanda area. The Kannadiga friends have no objection to that. The purpose of the project is to irrigate Telugu area and that must be conceded. Anyway, for all these things, I insist that a boundary commission is essential. One of the greatest failures of this Bill is the omission of such a boundary commission as there are many disputes. For instance, the Maharaja of Patna this morning made a *prima facie* good case. I am not going into the

details of these things. It is for a judicial officer to go into these details of each boundary dispute and settle it.

Take Bengal and Bihar. It is a separate Bill. But there should be a boundary commission to decide every issue.

Mr. Speaker: How long will the hon. Member take—five minutes?

Dr. Rama Rao: A few minutes more, Sir. You may kindly call me tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Then, he may continue tomorrow.

6.02 P.M.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 1st August, 1956.