

Mr. Speaker: He need not go into the amendments in detail, now.

Shri Nanda: I wanted to point out what the intention was. The clause to which that amendment refers does not admit of this amendment. This does not deal with conflicts as such. This Bill deals with methods of co-ordination, which will indirectly resolve the disputes and conflicts. So, it is not necessary.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the establishment of River Boards for the regulation and development of inter-State rivers and river valleys as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: Further clause-by-clause consideration will be held over.

Shri L. N. Mishra (Darbhanga cum Bhagalpur): There are not many clauses nor many amendments. Would it not be possible to finish this Bill in a few minutes time?

Mr. Speaker: If it is only a question of five or ten minutes it is all right. There are certain amendments.

Shri Tekur Subrahmanyam is not in his seat and so not moving. **Shri R. D. Misra.**

Shri E. D. Misra (Bulandshahr Distt.): I am not moving.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I am moving my amendments.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): Those who have given notice of amendments were under the impression that they would be needed at a particular stage and propriety requires that whatever has been put down in the Order Paper should be scrupulously followed.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: The persons may be under the impression that what is put in in the agenda will be followed and so they may not turn up here.

Mr. Speaker: In view of this objection, we will take up the third reading of the States Reorganisation Bill. It is now 12-30. We will go till 3-30.

STATES REORGANISATION BILL.
—conclid.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore): I suggest that four hours may be allotted. In the second reading so many big changes had been brought forward. So, in the third reading we must be allowed to say some thing.

Mr. Speaker: I agreed to allot three hours; four hours were asked for. We will finish the discussion at about 3-30. We may take four or five minutes more.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): May I request that those hon. Members who did not get a chance to speak at the earlier stages of the Bill or at the time of the discussion of the SRC Report may be given a chance now?

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members must also bear in mind that those hon. Members who did not take part or take any interest in this matter need not be called. Several hon. Members applied their minds to all these various stages of the Bill. Nobody prevents hon. Members coming earlier but hon. Members come only at the time of the general discussion or the third-reading. In between, there is a lot to be done and it falls to the lot of a few hon. Members to worry themselves to look into all these clauses. Therefore, I must not also ignore them. I only want to say that I cannot ignore the hon. Members who have shaped this Bill. Should we ignore those who took a lot of interest and bring in those who have not taken any part in shaping this Bill? If they have not taken any interest they won't take any interest at all.

Now, the hon. Minister has got some formal amendments. He may move them.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): Sir, I beg to move: **Clause 4.**—(Transfer of territory from Travancore-Cochin to Madras)

Page 4—

for lines 1 and 2 substitute:

“(b) shall form a separate district to be known as Kanyakumari District in the State of Madras.”

Clause 11.—(Formation of a new Madhya Pradesh State)

Pandit G. B. Pant: I beg to move:

Page 6, line 20—

for “x” substitute “8”

Clause 102.—(Provision as to certain State Financial Corporations)

Pandit G. B. Pant: I beg to move:

Page 44, line 23—

for “Maharashtra” substitute “Bombay”

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): Sir, we do not hear anything. There seems to be something wrong with the loud-speaker.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I do not think you will lose much if you do not hear.

Mr. Speaker: It is also necessary to re-number all the clauses in view of clauses 8 and 9. That will be done by me. I will now put these amendments to the vote of the House. I will first put 607.

Shri Thann Pillai (Tirunelveli): May I point out, Sir, that with the alterations that have now been made, Shencotah taluk is not contiguous to Kanyakumari? That is also apart from Travancore-Cochin. How is that to be fitted in?

Pandit G. B. Pant: Shencotah may be left out and the other four taluks may form Kanyakumari.

Mr. Speaker: Let me then put the other two amendments.

The question is:

Page 6, line 20—

for “9” substitute “8”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

Page 44, line 23—

for “Maharashtra” substitute “Bombay”

The motion was adopted.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): Mr. Speaker, the third reading tradition is to exchange bouquets and not brickbats. This occasion calls to my mind what Mr. Churchill, as he then was, said when the Government of India Bill of 1935 was moved for third reading. Mr. Churchill spoke on that Bill on 400 occasions and his speeches occupy hundreds of pages of Hansard. But when he rose to speak on the last occasion and at the last stage of the Bill, he said that the Bill is now to become an Act, it is the law of the land and the Parliament in its collective wisdom in the current context had given its verdict and it is the duty of every citizen to accept it as the law of the land. In that spirit I accept it and will continue to accept it till it is amended, altered or abolished by constitutional and democratic methods as a result of dynamic forces of progress and politics.

In a democracy it is my ~~conviction~~ view that there is no place for mass civil disobedience and for the individual it is permissible on the ground of conscience. In democracy it is open to any citizen, or group, or organised party to convert the electorate, gain its franchise and dislodge the Government of the day.

The verdict of this hon. House is not entirely to my liking, but as our great Santh Ramdass, Guru of Shri Shivaji, has said that it is not for man to command success universally and uniformly, but it is his privilege to

work continuously for the success of his ideal—

“सदा सर्वदा सजै । मग धवषेच हाती राजै,
काहीं सजै काहीं न सजै । ऐसे ब्राहे ।”

in that spirit I have to bow to the verdict of this hon. House.

The utmost need today is to restore normalcy and to create an atmosphere of goodwill and amity. This is the duty of every responsible citizen. The least I owe to myself, to the great party which I serve and, perhaps, may serve in future and this great country, is to help in this task the Government, whatever may be its colour or character.

Substantially, the present proposal was discussed between me and other Gujarathi leaders in 1950 when the great Sardar was alive. But I could not agree then as it was contrary to the current trend and tendency of politics in this respect. At the same time I promised to discuss the same with my colleagues in Maharashtra Congress. I had some discussion but, unfortunately, the Sardar died and matters were not pursued.

When the States Reorganisation Commission was appointed and when we met to consider what sort of memorandum we should submit, I suggested to my colleagues in the Maharashtra Congress that a joint State of Gujarathi and Marathi-speaking people as an intermediate arrangement may be tried by way of an experiment and if we succeeded it would be all to our glory. But my colleagues did not want an intermediate arrangement and, therefore, we decided to ask for our ultimate ideal, namely, Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay.

On the 18th of October last, when Shri Jhedar invited me to have some talk with him, the proposal that now has emerged was put by me before him except that it was to be for a period of 5 years. This period was a safeguard more for the Gujarathi minority. This proposal was put before the High Command through Shri Shankar Rao Deo. This was moved

by me in the Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee meeting on the 21st October. But it is a matter of deep regret that it was rejected, even ridiculed by other parties concerned. Now it has been revised and has now been accepted by this hon. House. My feelings are like that of a rejected suitor who is approached again, not of elation but of caution.

This has been accepted by the parties concerned. Had this been accepted by the parties concerned then in October, the history of this country would have been differently written and the tragedies which took place would have been avoided. Politics, however, is a matter of trial and error but let us have as little as possible of either; at any rate, let us not commit the same mistake twice.

The present solution was not a welcome to me, because I thought and think—that the psychological background necessary for a successful working is not there today and, therefore, I said on the 28th July that a bilingual State in the present context would create an explosive situation. I do not say how far I am correct, in view of what is happening. Now that the Parliament has approved of this all efforts should be made to make this experiment a great success and I am sure Maharashtrians, whatever may be their political affiliations, will work without mental reservations.

For me it is a matter of conscience, for I feel the injustice in this arrangement is still there though greatly reduced and, therefore, I voted against the proposal. Administration is not a mere mechanism for arrangement of things and territories. It is a great instrument for promotion of desirable relations between men and men, groups and groups and regulate their relation with respect to production, distribution and consumption of commodities and services. Consent, therefore, of the people is its moral justification and the active co-operation of theirs is its driving force. The present proposal is not complete in itself. Some outstanding problems are still there such as the border

[Shri Gadgil]

disputes. I hope that with Pantji who is in charge of them, there is every hope of having a very satisfactory solution acceptable to all. He has given his word and with me it is a bond. I am, therefore, advising the parties concerned to review the position and to restore goodwill and amity wherever it is lacking at present.

In politics, there is no finality. It is the process which can only produce current solutions and some by-product by way of jobs. If the whole problem is solved finally, then politicians will have no occupation, and their occupation will have gone. Verily it is said in *Mahabharat*:

‘अर्थात् शक्यते भोक्तुम कृतकार्यो वमन्यते
उस्मात् सर्वाणि कार्यानि सो विशेषणि कारयेत् ।

So, the work never finishes. It is like the Arabian tale without an end. But I do hope that to the extent of what is permanent and enduring in politics, this arrangement should be there unless somebody is dissatisfied with it. All I can say is that I shall watch this experiment with sympathy and with an open mind and shall extend such help and service as I am capable of. With the greatest goodwill and understanding, it is possible to build up something which will be to the glory of us all. I do hope that in that spirit this is accepted by the people of Maharashtra and by the people of Gujarat. The Maharashtrais' success will be measured by the measure of confidence and trust they are able to secure from the people in Gujarat region. I have no doubt that they will succeed.

Lastly, I may add:

सुधारणं सन्तु पथानः

Mr. Speaker: Fifteen minutes will be allowed for each hon. Member.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): The House knows that I have not the suavity or the discretion of my hon. friend Shri Gadgil, and even more, I do not labour under his party political obligation and that is

why I would speak rather differently. I wish, at this late stage of the proceedings, to raise my voice along with that of the people—the voice of disappointment—and, at the same time, of indignation at the mess which the Government has made of States reorganisation.

This Bill had roused great expectations, for, the appointment of the States Reorganisation Commission had been itself the sequel to demonstrations all over the country, which showed what the people really wanted. But over a large and important area, those expectations have been dashed. Behind the mask of patriotism which the Home Minister so impressively wears, I see every time the Treasury Benches indicate their mind, I see a fear of the people, sheer, insensate fear of the democratic aspirations of the people. It is this fear which vitiates the Bill, which distorts the Bill in essential particulars, and in the setting up, above all, of the polyglot State of Bombay, in the face of every canon of democracy and political propriety.

We have been witnesses in this House to what I consider a dangerous spectacle, the streamrolling of genuine public opinion in Maharashtra and in Gujarat, by an unprecedented campaign of signature collecting. Members of Parliament, most of them far away from the scene and insensitive to the agony of the people affected and to their deep-rooted aspirations, traded so to speak, in the name of national unity and furnished Government with an excuse, an excuse for imposing a solution—if it is at all a solution—namely, the bilingual State of Bombay. If the Government was not so bloated with a sense of its own authority, it would have known that this was no solution at all; and so, Government is trying to thrust down the throats of Gujaratis and Maharashtrais, a State set-up which is very like the one which they had in the British times and which they

wanted deeply and fundamentally to change, because now we are supposed to be the architects of our own destiny.

It has been said in this House, and I repeat it, that this is an act of political criminality and it has been motivated by no other desire than of appeasing the big money interests of Bombay. This expression, perhaps since my hon. friend the former Finance Minister used it, has become respectable, and we have said it over and over again, but it did not seem to hit the head-lines. Incidentally, I must say that I am unhappy over the former Finance Minister's recent political perambulations, because, in spite of his having made one or two good statements, he has acted in a manner which has produced a sort of Dead Sea fruit and he has done no good either to Maharashtra or to the rest of the country.

What Maharashtra wanted has been said over and over again in this House and in the country, and it does not need retelling. What Gujarat really wants, however, was long sought astutely, and with discretion, to be kept away from the House and from the country. But that discretion has been thrown to the winds by the valour and the patriotism of the people of Gujarat and that is why we see that they are demonstrating today. Whether we like it or not, they are demonstrating in defiance of the bullets which the Home Minister has in abundance. They are demonstrating for a Gujarati State of their own. That State is warranted by history, by common sense, by social, economic, political, cultural and by other considerations. In Ahmedabad, the town of Gandhiji, the town of my friend the Labour Minister, we are told, the writ of the Congress runs as nowhere else in the country. Gujarat was supposed to be a willing party and perhaps even an enthusiastic party to this bilingual formula which was canvassed by my friends like Shri C. C. Shah, but now, like murder, the

truth is out. It is not only that students who are emotionally disturbed and are carrying on the demonstrations in the streets, have got out of hand, but we hear of the Ahmedabad Bar Association and even the Millowners' Association and the entire general public coming out against the bilingual scheme. The blood of our citizens has been spilt on the streets of Ahmedabad. Curfew darkens towns like Ahmedabad and Baroda and other places. Let us pay homage to those who could not meekly stomach injustice to Gujarat and let us remember, as Members of Parliament that, to our shame, we could not repair that injustice.

I know it will be said, and it has been said in the lobbies of this House, that a handful of mischief makers—generally the expression they are very much fond of is “anti-social elements”—are doing all the damage. They said the same thing in regard to Bombay. But when challenged by Maharashtra which felt that its self-respect was being outraged by that suggestion, Government did not have the guts or the elementary political decency to have an official enquiry into that matter.

There is no hypocrisy more exasperating than the attitude of mind which condemns the idea of linguistic provinces as being contrary to that of national unity. How the Prime Minister who has made a serious study of history has reached this puerile conclusion is one of the minor mysteries of our time. To the citizens of the Union of States which India is, a most valuable privilege is to live an autonomous life in his own lesser unit, with an intrinsic life and purpose of its own. That is a fundamental right which nothing can take away, and that right, that privilege, has been denied, with a vulgar fanfare of patriotism, to the people of Maharashtra and to the people of Gujarat. And if those people raise their hands in protest, of course, they are given a dose of that “aggressive non-

(Shri H. N. Mukerjee)

violence" to which reference was made by Shri Deshmukh, shooting to kill and all that being part of the game.

1 P.M.

This is not the way to build national unity; it is to provoke national chaos. If the 200 and odd signatories who offered a spurious excuse to Government for a bilingual Bombay could have their way, they could, with the jubilant blessings of the Home Minister, go forward and have a merger of West Bengal and Bihar, a union of Karnataka and Kerala and so on and so forth. But, they have not succeeded for the present in doing so, because the people have told them that there is a limit to their patience. But I fear that this Government and its camp followers learn nothing and forget nothing. Maybe they have schemes up their sleeve of which the people are at the moment unaware. I have very great respect for my friend, the Home Minister. But since he has appeared on the scene, in this House, I must confess I cannot read his mind: "देवाः न जानन्ति कुतो मनुष्यः." That seems to be applicable to the way in which his mind works. All the other weakness of this Bill stem from this basic disregard for the people, the refusal, for instance, to have a boundary commission properly constituted—without such a provision, there will be fostering sores in our body politic, which it is our bounden duty to remove. But, Government has other plans and does not care.

There is again the case of Orissa. The case of Orissa was brought up over and over again, but the Home Minister said, "It is a big problem which cannot be tackled by a boundary commission". If such a big thing as polygeot Bombay could be pushed through in this Parliament, why was not the case of Orissa not taken into consideration? Then, for tribal peoples also, this Bill is a cruel disappointment. There is not a syllable in it which suggests that their problems even exist, though some of us

have been shouting ourselves hoarse about radical changes in the Sixth Schedule of the Constitution and for special safeguards for their social, economic and cultural progress. It is a pity that one of the principal spokesmen of the tribal peoples in this House—Shri Jaipal Singh—I am sorry not to see him in this House at the present moment—chose to leave his people in the lurch and with the air of an elder statesman went about collecting signatures for one thing or the other. We are always delighted by the inanities which his charming accent sugar-coats, but we are not prepared to take lessons in high politics from him. I say very seriously, the question of the tribal people has been ignored and we have not heard one syllable from Government in regard to this matter and this at a time when the Naga agitation is going on an agitation which we have to tackle in an understanding fashion.

Perhaps I have said enough, and over and over again; the idea of linguistic States as the rock-like foundation of national unity has been emphasised in this House and in the country. When this Bill was in preparation, I knew that I would get a chance—you would be good enough to give me a chance—to speak. I knew also that you would have liked me to say:

संगच्छ्वं, संवद्वं संवो मनसि जानताम

"Let us walk together; let us speak together; let us attune our minds together."

But the Home Minister has done a job of work which disables me from saying that in the context of this particular Bill. I wish we could say:

संगच्छ्वं, संवद्वं संवो मनसि जानताम

But we cannot do so on this occasion. Government has behaved in an arrogant manner and in a short-sighted manner. Therefore, I accuse the Government of deliberately refusing a permanent and national solution of a national question. I accuse the Government of provoking disunity where unity prevailed. I

accuse the Government of posing in this House and in this country controversies where controversies would have been eliminated by the joint co-operative endeavour of us all. Government has not done it and I cannot even say in regard to this Bill:

एको ही दोषो, गुणसन्निपाते निमज्जतीन्दोः
किरण्णिकाः

It is not like that; it is not that a very minor error has crept in. It is not that only a very few bad things are here, but the generality of the Bill is very good. On the contrary, something has happened which has vitiated the entire atmosphere of the Bill. This Bill bristles with instances of injustice and inequality. For the small mercies vouchsafed certain areas in the country, we cannot oppose it outright. I repeat, we cannot oppose it outright, but we are acutely unhappy, I repeat, we are acutely unhappy, that Government has made such a very sorry mess of the problem of States reorganisation.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): Both my friends, Mr. Gadgil, and my comrade, Mr. Mukerjee, have quoted the scriptures. When we are in the third reading of this Bill, we must remember what is happening in India, Ahmedabad is on fire; troops have been called out. The Congress House has been attacked. There is a good deal of violence and disturbance in this great city. These are things which we ought to remember.

Today I am afraid the fundamental objective of States' reorganisation is being clouded. The paramount objective is to strengthen India's unity, to strengthen India's integrity and to further the cohesion of our great nation. I am sorry that from that perspective, we have not achieved our fundamental objective and we have not been able to transcend all parochial and regional passions for the purpose of building up a new and glorious India, which we want to build up. I have been a sponsor of linguistic States, but I have not

been a linguistic fanatic. I say that in regard to a federal republic like India, what the Commission has said is quite correct:

"The constituent States in a federal republic must each possess a minimum degree of homogeneity to ensure the emotional response which is necessary for the working of democratic institutions."

As Chairman of the Bal Gangadhar Tilak's Centenary Celebrations Committee, I witnessed the wonderful rally. But, I was distressed to find that Maharashtra was unhappy, that the people of Maharashtra which produced Ranade, Gokhale and Tilak were thoroughly unhappy when this bilingual State business came. I sent for Tilak's grandson; I had discussions with them and they were still unhappy. My view is this. If you honestly feel that a bilingual State is very desirable for India's good, for Maharashtra's good and for the welfare of Gujarat, you should have consulted the people. You should have given them a chance to express their views. When I was taking objection on the constitutional ground, I was not merely making a legalistic, narrow, technical and juristic approach. I was putting my case on a broader basis. The Constitution-makers of India were rooted to democracy. They thought that nothing should be done without consulting the people or the people's representatives. We failed to do it and hence this emotional upsurge. There is so much of violence and hooliganism. I happened to visit some of the districts in Punjab and I have found that disharmony and discord are still there. Thank God, with the co-operation of the Home Minister and Maulana Azad, we temporarily passed over a very acute stage. But still there is heat and lot of tension and discord. In trying to solve the problems of the reorganisation of States, I am afraid we have deviated from maxims, principles and ideals. What is the great ideal which Gandhiji had placed before the

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

country? What is the great ideal by which the Congress was strengthened? In the year 1920, Gandhiji wanted to make the Congress an instrument for fighting British imperialism and he said: "If you want to make the Congress a dynamic organisation for the purpose of achieving independence, you must fashion your own constitution and the future constitution of India on linguistic principle."

Because by that principle you will regulate the emotional response for the purpose of having unity among the divergent linguistic and cultural units which make up India. After all, we want to build up the strength of the Indian Union. But what is the strength of the Indian Union? The strength of the Indian Union is the sum total of the strength of each of its own constituent units which make up the Indian Republic. Therefore, we have to build up the constituent units on some principle. I have begun by saying I am not a fanatic. I do not say that there shall be no deviation from linguistic principles. Certainly, considerations of safety and security are vital. Certainly that should predominate over every other view. If for the purpose of defending our frontiers, if for the purpose of making the India-China border strong or Bengal-Pakistan border strong we have got to do something, then even these linguistic principles will have to be sacrificed.

I am afraid the Government was not consistent. This Parliament has not been consistent. Certainly, Pandit Hridaya Nath Kunzru was not a communalist. Certainly, Sardar Panikker was not a communalist. They wanted to build up a bigger Punjab, a stronger Punjab because they thought India's defence demanded it, India's security demanded it. They pointed out that if Himachal Pradesh was a small Indian unit it cannot possibly withstand the infl-

tration which is going on on the India-China border. Therefore, they said there should be bigger integration and not merely Punjab and Pepsu, but Punjab, Pepsu and Himachal Pradesh should form one State. You have turned it down. Why? You have no principle. You are standing on no principle. You are not standing on any intelligible maxim or ideal which is acceptable to the people. You are trying to appease some sections, communalists or others. You are trying to come to some kind of agreement for party purposes. But that kind of thing won't work. Why was it that in the case of Punjab the recommendation of the Reorganisation Commission was not accepted? These men visited the areas, talked to the people and came to the conclusion that although technically the Centre is in charge of the defence of India, still they cannot possibly look after the defence of the frontiers unless the provincial unit is also made resilient, also made strong and also made stable. They pointed out that it cannot be done if the present Himachal Pradesh, a small unit, is kept like that. Therefore, they demanded and recommended the strong integration of all the States, and the merger of all the States, as that would lead to greater cohesion, as that would obliterate the artificial distinctions between the plains and the hills. That will also neutralise the forces of communalism, which are now operating in that area with official connivance. Unfortunately, that was not accepted.

Sir, I was blaming my Gujarati friends that although Gujaratis have only one-third of the population in bilingual Bombay they did not ask for any safeguards, any constitutional provision, and not even a regional committee. I was amazed that the Gujarati M.Ps. did not ask for it. Mr. Tulsidas Kilachand said: we do not want it. The Congress M.Ps. said that they do not want it. I am afraid, these Congress M. Ps., with

great respect to them, were out of touch with the masses, and they did reflect the will of the people. I am sorry it had been so. Today the biggest Congress paper in Delhi has stated that the P. S. P. party misbehaved and the P. S. P. organised some meeting and thereafter there took place the attack on the Congress House. I do not believe that the P. S. P. leadership is so foolish and so fool-hardy that they would ask anybody to attack the Congress House. I want the Congress House to be attacked, but not in that way. The Congress House should collapse, but by democratic and constitutional means; not by these means. There was a procession, a big rally of over 100 thousand people at Shanwarwara in Poona which Mr. Gopalan, Mr. Kamath and myself had the privilege of addressing. It was a very big meeting. I told them that their cause was not furthered in any way by the unfortunate happenings which took place in Bombay. Violence will never pay. Hooliganism will never pay. I would not repeat the language like "misbehaviour" or anything and we do not want to go into the unfortunate incidents which took place or try to apportion blame between Mr. Morarji's Government and the people of the area. I will not say that anybody deliberately misbehaved. But what is happening today is really breaking our hearts. I think that if the Gujarati Members of Parliament really wanted to reflect the mind of Gujarat, they ought to have consulted their people and there would have been some accord between them and their people. I am disappointed to find that it was not so. I am disappointed to find that the State, with which is associated the great name of Mahatma Gandhi, has not been able to live up to its high traditions. The fundamental unity of India must be placed on sound footing and the one patent fact of our civilization and the cardinal factor of our social organisation is that India is built on diverse and distinct linguistic and cultural units and you have got to give them free and fair play.

I do not believe in political somersault. That is why I was trying to deplore the sudden somersault in favour of bilingual Bombay. I am happy to find that Kaka Sahib Gadgil has somewhat reconciled himself to it and has pledged his word of co-operation. That is hopeful. That is helpful. I do not know how far he represents the mind of young Maharashtra, the rising generation of Maharashtra. I have my own doubts, grave doubts.

So far as Gujarat Members of Parliament are concerned, I am disappointed to find that it was a thing which was not settled or planned or anything of that sort. At one time, just after the ugly incidents took place in Bombay, there was a distinct attempt, a distinct desire, on the part of both Gujaratis and the Maharashtrians to bridge the cleavage and somehow to come to some kind of understanding. But that was not done. The proposal was not acceptable and really the men of Gujarat rebelled against it. If the better mind of Gujarat does not accept it, there is no reason for the Government to tolerate the plunging of the State into this kind of hooliganism or anti-social activities which could easily be avoided. I do protest against this sudden somersault, this sudden brain-wave on the part of some politicians who are thinking of some speedy remedy, which is just like the propylactic—just like that of merger of Bengal and Bihar,—the brain-wave on the part of the Chief Minister of one State and that of the contiguous State. Unfortunately, it did not work. There was no preparation for it. There was no consultation with the people. Don't think that it is only a Congress affair. The great mistake that you are making is that you are substituting the Congress for the country. Dr. Roy, unfortunately did not consult anybody. When the States reorganisation problem was being discussed here with the Government and the Prime Minister, we were in close touch with the Chief Minister. But when the Chief Minister thought of this question of merger or union, nobody was consult-

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

ed. Nobody was asked anything. This kind of political somersault really mystifies people and creates a good deal of misunderstanding. That is why I was very much doubtful of the utility of this kind of bilingual formula being ushered at this stage. After the Prime Minister's categorical assurance in the Poona meeting and elsewhere that Bombay belonged to Maharashtra and is geographically a part of Maharashtra, there was absolutely no reason why Maharashtra should not be given to Bombay. But what I am pointing out is that we are deeply distressed that things are done in this way. For four decades, since the time Mahatma Gandhi assumed the leadership of the Congress right up to the last election they were saying that polyglot areas are not workable. That was Pandit Motilal Nehru's report that polyglot areas are not conducive to the working of the democratic system of Government and they are not conducive to social justice. That is why for the purpose of building up some kind of system which would lead to social justice, which would lead to the satisfaction of the real creative urge of the people, which would enable the gulf between the classes and the masses to be bridged if not eliminated, we thought of linguistic States. Certain essential safeguards, economic, administrative and for defence purposes are paramount, and can never be withheld. But you have sacrificed that defence argument put forward by the States Reorganisation Commission, and you have put forward no tangible, no logical, no cogent argument as to why you refuse to build up a greater Punjab in order to build up a powerful frontier State, when our neighbouring State is being armed by imperialists and they are getting millions and millions of dollars for the purpose of building up their armed strength—against whom? Against what? Against India, against Kashmir. We are not children. We know what is happening. A persistent campaign is being made against our Prime Minister in the foreign

press, and that is being done by Pakistan. What for?—for creating an artificial animus. When they attack Nehru on the Kashmir issue, they attack India. We all stand united on that issue. Therefore, we ought to remember that in the interests of India's safety, in the interests of India's security, in the interests of India's integrity, in the interests of protecting India's frontiers against possible aggression from an unfriendly neighbour which is unfortunately being egged on by foreign powers, thoroughly equipped and made resourceful, we ought to have accepted the recommendation of the States Reorganisation Commission and we ought not to have weakened that State of Punjab and not kept up a ridiculous State, a small State under a Judicial Commissioner, under a Lt.-Governor like this which is not capable of defending the frontier. The States Reorganisation Commission has pointedly stated: what can the Centre do? The Centre must function through the State unit. Therefore, the State unit must be made strong. Otherwise, however good the defence arrangements may be, according to the constitutional set-up it will not be effective. That is the main point which I am making.

I am not going so far as to say that the Bill is deliberately brought forward for the purpose of destroying democracy in India, but I am saying the way you have proceeded, the haphazard mosaic which you are setting up, is not conducive to the pattern which you have been contemplating all this time. For five decades you have preached that the administrative units are the result of British imperialistic design or the haphazard growth of British imperialism and therefore when the time comes, when India becomes independent and you get power and get into office, you will proceed rationally according to principle. You have not proceeded rationally according to principle. That is a matter of regret. You have not proceeded in a democratic manner and when you have deviated, you have not deviated after consultation with the wishes of the people. The

sovereignty of the people is really a mere dogma, a mere maxim which you have preached but which you have not consistently followed it in working out this difficult and colossal task of redrawing the political map of India. That is my charge, and that is my regret.

I hope that with regard to the Punjab and also with regard to Bombay and Gujarat some further steps will be taken which will assuage the feelings, which will bring the communities together, which will dispel misunderstandings. There is still a lot of goodwill for the Prime Minister and if he takes this up and gets out of the party rut, he can do something. Do not send for Deogirkar or Shankar Rao Deo and even Kaka-saheb Gadgil. Do not think they represent everybody in that sector of India. The fact is they do not really represent the people of Maharashtra. You must send for others too. You know thousands and thousands of people have gone to jail and thousands of people are still willing to undergo sacrifices. It is not for pleasure that they do that against a national government or against the Parliament democratically elected, but they feel that they are frustrated. This sense of frustration can be and ought to be removed and that can be removed if the Prime Minister as the head of the Government takes courage in both hands and sends for people representing different sections, different interests and takes them into confidence and tries to hammer out something acceptable to all concerned for the good of the region, and for the good of India. Regional consciousness should not be carried to excess. That is the danger. This has been the great lesson of Indian history. It has been detrimental to India's unity and that we must remember. Therefore, there must be a synthesis, a harmony and a balance between national unity or Indian nationalism and this concept of regional patriotism. And that is a difficult task, but you have got to solve it and we are here to solve it and our services will be always at the disposal of anybody

who is trying to bring about that unity, that synthesis, that balance and that reconciliation.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Finance (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): We are at the last stage of the long journey. I have, like other Members of this House, closely followed the career of this Bill and what has gone before it. Perhaps, I have spoken less here on this particular subject than many of my colleagues, many other Members of this House. That was not because I was not deeply interested. I followed much that was said, and there was much that was good sense and much that was not sense at all, and I did not think that I could add very much to this debate, but now that we have arrived at the last stage of this particular measure which is of so great importance. I should like to say something more really to associate myself fully with it, than to throw any additional light on this problem which we have had for this long time.

The hon. Member who has just spoken referred to what the Congress policy has been. May I respectfully inform him that I know more about the Congress than he does? May I respectfully inform him that what he has said has not been the Congress policy for the last several years? And may I tell him that when it was the Congress policy to begin with, it was under entirely different circumstances? And may I tell him that today Congress policies are opposed to that completely? Let us be clear about it. We do not stand for this principle of uni-linguism. We may have a uni-lingual State, we may, but basically we stand for something different from that. That is the Congress policy. Naturally, no such policy can be rigidly applied this way or that way. It depends on so many factors, but when we are reminded and told repeatedly that in 1922 or earlier we spoke about linguistic provinces and therefore we are betraying that cause, I am really surprised that people, without knowing the circumstances, the context of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

particular statement at a particular time and further not knowing what has happened subsequently, should make that remark. Repeatedly this matter has been considered by the Congress, by its highest organisation, and we have repeatedly laid stress that the most important thing is not this uni-lingual province, that there are far more important factors than the linguistic formation of a province.

Language is important, but I should like to ask this House to consider that there is a difference between the importance of a language, the encouragement of a language and all that, and the boundaries of a State. Language should not be confused with the boundaries of a State. It may be that sometimes the boundaries may be linguistic. We have no objection. It is a good thing. But to think that it is a vital issue, that a State should be bounded by a certain linguistic area is, I think, a basically wrong approach, and I should like to say that in so far as I have any influence with the Congress I have put it the other way, and I am glad to say that the Congress over the last few years, if you look at its resolution, has clearly accepted that. So, that, let there be no mistake as to what the Congress stands for. I cannot, of course, speak for what others may stand for, for other views, but we have seen in the last few months many things happening in this country in the name of language, in the name of linguistic provinces which I take it every Member of this House considers absolutely deplorable. It does not matter very much, in my humble opinion, where the boundary of a State is. It is a matter for careful consideration. There are sentiments about it. Let us consider sentiments. Let us consider the question, the economic aspect of it, the strategic aspect of it, the cultural aspect or whatever you like. But it is not a question which one should say should be decided in the streets by fighting, by destruction, by arson or by firing, whoever may be right about it.

And the misfortune has been that the authority of this Parliament has been challenged often enough. And sometimes, hon. Members of this House have encouraged that challenge of the authority of this House, even outside here near the gates or farther afield. I do submit this raises a very vital issue for this House and for Parliament. Where are we? If anything that we decide is challenged, then where are we? It is not that it should not be challenged, but the point is the manner of the challenge, and the manner it is encouraged. It is becoming almost a habit; when something is done, it is disapproved of, and therefore, people should attack the police, commit arson, roam about breaking things then, the police comes in, the police stops them, the police fires. The police may be at fault, or the others may be at fault. I cannot speak of any particular instance. But this is a curious and vicious circle that we are getting into.

Then, of course, we have motions for adjournment saying it is a terrible thing, that the police has fired, there is ruthless oppression and all that. I really would like this House to consider, where are we. Where are we going to in this world, with this encouragement of this kind of public violence, challenging decisions taken in this House or being discussed in this House? It is not the normal habit in any country, whether it is a communist country or a non-communist country. Where are we? I should like to know. In a communist country, there would be trouble if anybody raised his head against a decision of government. Hon. Members know that very well. Nobody dare raise his head there. If he raise his head, the head disappears too. That is all. There is no motion of adjournment anywhere, and no discussion about a subject

Shri A. K. Gopalan: So, you are also following it or beginning to follow it?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member's head is perfectly safe here, if the hon. Member wants me to reply to that. Is it the hon. Member's argument that people should go, commit arson, break people's heads, and no action should be taken? Is that the argument?

Shri K. K. Basu: Nobody has said so.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am glad nobody said so. But it is repeatedly said that the police is always bad. The police might have committed mistakes. Nobody said that the police is right. But the most extraordinary thing which the hon. Member said this morning was that these troubles in Ahmedabad have been provoked by the police. I say this is fantastic nonsense, if anybody were to tell me like that.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Provoked by the decision of Government.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May be; provoked by the decision of Government, and provoked by them, by the hon. Member's colleagues there, whose chief purpose is to create disturbances and troubles elsewhere. (Interruptions). It is not the hon. Members' right only to speak on the floor of this House. I say and challenge this that hon. Members, some hon. Members sitting in this House, provoked these troubles and encouraged those people who provoked troubles. (Interruptions). I am not giving way. (Interruptions). I am glad that some words of truth have hit home. I am glad that some gentle reminders of some obvious facts have found an echo in the minds and hearts of hon. Members opposite.

Shri Kamath: They have gone home to you also. You have lost your temper.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I would beg this House to consider this. Has a word been said condemning violence? I have condemned the

police often enough, where they have been wrong. But has the hon. Member opposite ever condemned an act of violence?

An Hon. Member: Not once.

Shri Kamath: Of course, every time.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am glad. I was waiting to hear them condemn these acts of violence.....

Shri Kamath: You are deaf. You do not hear. You should have heard them already.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:..... committed by those whom they encourage. This is the major question for this House to consider, and not motions for adjournment, repeatedly brought in, without realising who does this, why all this happens....

Shri Kamath: On a point of order. It is within your powers to decide whether a motion for adjournment is admissible or not. It is not for the Prime Minister to question the right of a Member to table the motion. It is, not for the Prime Minister to decide the admissibility.

Mr. Speaker: I have already decided the point of order. I have rejected it. There is no point of order in this. I have already disallowed the adjournment motion. The Prime Minister is entitled to say that this adjournment motion has been disallowed rightly; also, he is entitled to condemn what has happened there.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I would not presume to refer to any particular adjournment motion. I was referring to a procedure which has become almost the monopoly of hon. Members opposite. In this world, I venture to remind this House, of strife and trouble and huge problems arising here, we sit down here and all we can do is to go on repeating the same thing in the same exuberant language, that the police is bad, the firing is wrong, there is ruthless

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

oppression and so on; I really am amazed at the lack of intelligence of some people, who have found no novel idea.

Shri Kumath: Hold up the mirror to you and to your own party.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: On a point of privilege.....

Shri Kamath: On a point of order. (Interruptions).

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): It is not fair that all this simultaneous shouting by many members of the opposition should go on. When a Member speaks, other hon. Members should not interrupt him.

Mr. Speaker: I would request the Prime Minister to resume his seat for a minute. We heard Shri H. N. Mukerjee use language which was very strong, and condemn Government. Is not the spokesman of Government entitled to say—when Government are condemned—who are responsible for this? Also, when he says that intelligence is wanting, or what the hon. Member said is no intelligent, why should there be any objection? (Interruptions).

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): If he says like that, we are entitled to interrupt.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Hon. Members ought not to interject. When they give, they must equally be prepared to take. It is not an one-way traffic. Each hon. Member may have an opportunity to speak.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry; if by any mistake, I committed the error of using an unparliamentary expression. I am sure you, Sir, would call me to order, and I will express my regret. But if I say that loud shouting does not take the place of intelligence, that, I hope, is not unparliamentary. If I say that the cheap business of eloquence of hands and voice, and waving about of

hands is not a logical argument, that, I hope, is not unparliamentary. We have had enough of this loud shouting and waving of hands and this kind of exuberant eloquence.

We are dealing with hard facts and hard situations. We are dealing with the world, and I say so with all gravity, which is in a very dangerous state; it may be in a more dangerous state, for what you and I know, in the future. Here it is, and we are playing about with these things, without realising where we are; whether it is the international situation, or whether it is our Second Five Year Plan, everything must go before these petty objections and petty reasons and petty shoutings. Let us consider matters in a reasonable way. What does it matter to this Government or to me—I would not say, any hon. Member of this House; it may—whether the Bihar-Bengal boundary is here or there, whether the border of this province is here or there. It is not a political question for me. Obviously, it is not an economic question. It may be a question of high sentiment and high importance for people who live there. I agree. But so far as this Government is concerned, it makes no difference to us whether the boundary is shifted this way or that way. We may make a mistake. We have made mistakes, but it was of no consequence to us, that is what I am wishing to submit, what the State boundaries should be.

Therefore, as the House very well knows, we went all out to get as great a measure of support as possible from the people by agreement. Let us say we did succeed in a very large measure—90 per cent. We did not succeed in some measure. We had to come to some decision. We came to some decision according to our judgment of what we considered best.

Now, for the hon. Member, Shri N. C. Chatterjee to say that we did not consult this man or that man and this group or that group, I do

submit, is not completely accurate. Obviously, we did not consult everybody. But I do submit that we consulted people outside the Congress ranks, outside groups, many a time, as he himself happens to say. I had the privilege of talking to him on these subjects on more than one occasion. So that it is not that there was no consultation.

Let us consider this matter apart from all the excitement that it has caused. Here was a simple matter, not as simple in that sense, but in the sense of its being non-political and non-economic. The country is concerned with major political and major economic issues. This was neither a major political nor a major economic issue. It was a major issue of high sentiment which often rouses passion. We admit that. Let us try to satisfy that sentiment. But where two sentiments come into conflict, difficulty arises and we have had to face these conflicts between sentiments.

Now, the other point is about the basic policy which we must pursue in regard to that matter. It has always been said, right from the beginning, by the Congress and more recently in the last four, five or six years—and I take it that the House certainly agrees with it—that the first, and absolutely first, consideration is the unity of India and the homogeneity of India. If that is so, we must judge every other argument from that point of view. The second point would be the economic advantage to India or to that particular place. These are two basic things; other things follow.

Now, we have seen in the last few months how much this question rouses passion, how one neighbour attacks one's neighbour, how one linguistic area gets worked up against another linguistic area. All of us are guilty of that; nobody is free from it. We have seen that. It is a dangerous thing that we have seen; it is a bad thing that we have seen. It is a thing which, I hope, nobody

has liked. Far from encouraging it, everything should be done to discourage this kind of thing.

Speaking for myself, I have come to the firm conclusion that this linguistic States idea takes us into a dangerous direction. I do not mean to say that we upset it; it is not that. But this talk of purely linguistic provinces and 'clean' boundaries is something which tends towards lessening the idea of the unity of India. I am told that that makes a group homogenous socially. I agree, and therefore, I attach importance to the language. But I distinguish between importance to the language and the culture of the place, and the physical boundary of a State. I think the two ought to be kept apart.

Therefore, what we have seen has made us doubt about the basic conception of unity in India, how easily it is broken up and how easily people forget the first and second issues and go to the third and fourth issues. Therefore, I had ventured to become, even more than ever before, opposed to this idea of small States, each thinking in its own way and forgetting the larger issue. Therefore, although originally—not today, but 20 years ago—I was in favour of a large number of small States in India, I have completely changed my mind and I believe in big States now.

There are various other things; it is immaterial whether I believe in them or I do not believe in them. But I do wish this House to consider that everything should be judged at anytime, more especially today, in the context of the world, in the context of India, in the context of our industrial development and Five Year Plan, from these basic points of view, that is, the unity of India, the harmonious working of our Five Year Plan etc. Everything else is secondary. It just does not matter where our boundaries are. If we do not make any real progress in our industrial development, the boundaries won't make, or bring about, that

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

industrial development. And if we are too excited to do that work, and if we merely argue with each other and fight each other in the streets or outside about these matters, it is obvious that we shall neither have any reputation in the country or outside the country nor indeed in our minds or hearts.

Therefore, the primary thing is for us to cultivate this atmosphere in the country of having the freest discussion, having the freest expression of opinion, debate of every type and argument, but that must be on the peaceful level—not this kind of thing. It is, after all, degrading, very degrading, that this kind of thing is happening in our country. Whatever the merits of the question, whatever the disagreement on this, it is a wrong thing. I want this House to consider this. This idea that is thrust about, that it is a continuation of our national movement, is completely wrong. It is one thing to fight an imperialist Power, and even that fight we did by peaceful methods. But this is another thing—the word 'satyagraha' that is bandied about today, something which is millions of miles away from any idea of satyagraha that Mahatmaji had.

We have here persons going to prison. It is a joke—a thousand men arrested and released one hour later. Everybody knows that it is a complete joke—this business of going out in the course of the afternoon or, may be, becoming martyrs. Where are we? Are we becoming an opera-bouffe—this country—for the world to laugh at? This kind of thing, people coming with flags from the Punjab and forcibly sticking them on the engine and threatening the driver—what is this happening? Is it some kind of a theatrical performance for the edification of others or is it a serious work?

The hon. Member Shri N. C. Chatterjee, referred to my coming down somewhere and dealing with

this Bombay province and Punjab province. I can assure him—this is my uttermost conviction—that so far as the Punjab is concerned, I have never come across a more mischievous, a more misconceived and foolish thing, without any basis, than the Hindu Mahasabha agitation. I venture to express my opinion. I can see the reasons for other people in the rest of India, whether it is Gujaratis or Maharashtrians or Kannadigas, agreeing or disagreeing. But there is not an atom of reason, except sheer mischief, so far as the Punjab agitation is concerned.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: That is for the full implementation of the SRC's scheme. Is that foolish, is that mischievous, is that anti-national? What is this nonsense?

An Hon. Member: Nonsense?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I say that this agitation, the manner it is carried out the object of it, everything behind it, can mean only one of two things: either those who carry it on have not understood what this formula is or having understood it, they nevertheless want to do something that, I think, is completely wrong.

However, here it is. We have arrived, as I said, at the conclusion of this journey. I cannot say—nobody can say—that this has been the ideal solution of every problem in India. Of course, not; no problem has an ideal solution. But how do you deal with these matters? You arrive at a conclusion; after long and interminable delay, you arrive at a conclusion, and Parliament puts its seal upon it. When Parliament has decided—and I take it, it will decide—the matter becomes the law of the land.

What happens to this country if we go on fighting everyday? Is that the way civilised a nation carries on? Is that the way any kind of decent politics are carried on? Immediately if you lose in Parliament—anybody

loses in Parliament—you take the issue to the streets and—demonstration. This is a big country. A demonstration does not mean—I would beg the House to remember—that people are against it. Every minority can have a demonstration when the majority does something. It does not mean that the people are against it. The only way to ascertain the views of the people is, after all, by the vote at the general elections or other elections or some other way. There may be some other way of generally guessing it. We may have some kind of polls.

But this business of challenging the decisions of Parliament in the streets and in a violent way—I am not talking about peaceful expressions of opinion—is something which is basically opposed to the whole democratic conception and method.

The hon. Member opposite talks about democracy being crushed by this Government. I really do not know what his idea of democracy is. It must be obviously something radically and absolutely different from the normal idea of democracy. Certainly, I never associated democracy with the workings of Rashtriya Swayam Sewak Sangh or the Hindu Mahasabha organisations.

We have arrived at a stage and we shall soon pass this stage to come to another stage. It is for this House to be clear, it is for this Government to be clear and for every Member of this House to be clear that, having decided after long debate something, we should accept it. I understand—I was not here—that my colleague Shri Gadgil said, he has been a stout fighter; he has fought and has fought to the bitter end and he gave his vote against this. But, nevertheless, he said: if that is done, and accepted, well, he accepts it. In the normal course of things he has to say something and has said it in the normal way. He accepts it. I submit that is the only way to deal with any matter. If Parliament decides something, accept it and work it. If it is

a matter of deep conscience for somebody—I do not perceive a conscience concerned about a boundary and I hope conscience concerns itself with deeper matters than the boundaries of districts and States etc.—if it is a matter of conscience with that person—well I cannot say—let him, then, serve his conscience as he thinks fit. But how this conscience leads one to commit violence, it is beyond me. Therefore this must be accepted. What is happening in Ahmedabad? Really I do not know how to understand this kind of mob violence. Let us admit that those people who did it did not like the decision we came to.

First of all, after months of debate and argument and personal discussion and trying to throw light on the question, on every aspect of it, we here come to a decision.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: This decision was taken within 24-hours.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The decision was not a 24-hour decision.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Yes; it was.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I may remind my hon. friend that it was always talked about. He is strictly right when he says that a certain intermediate decision was changed. Certainly, that is not the point. We came to a decision. And now, these gentlemen in Ahmedabad, or Calcutta or Madras or Allahabad, wherever you like, come out into the streets without, of course, having had the benefit of any discussion, that long, long discussion—probably they have not read anything about it—but simply because of sentiment they feel it is wrong. I say it is a reversal of the process of democracy or reasonable process of approaching anything. Parliament will cease to be. Let us say the Police did not stop the demonstrators outside here; they will simply come here and act next to you and threaten you. How will Parliament function? Indeed the police stopped them and in stopping them, the Police pushed too hard. No objection could be taken to Police

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

misbehaving or repressing the natural instincts of those who were taken in custody. That is not a reasonable approach. I say, with respect to the House, not as Prime Minister or a Member of the Congress Party—although it is my high privilege to have been in the Congress for the last 40 or 45 years—but as a Member of this House, wishing to preserve the dignity of this House, the dignity of Parliament, the dignity of democratic procedure, the dignity of India and this nation,—all these things, I take it, are dear to everyone here and to everyone in India. We may make mistakes—we make so many mistakes—but you do not correct a mistake by wrong procedure, wrong means and by going the wrong way. You have to build up this country and that requires the effort of everyone. It requires, I believe, free speech, free expression, free opposition and all that. But, it does not require—in fact, far from requiring, it cannot exist, free speech cannot exist, free expression of opinion cannot exist if you have violence in the streets. That is not free speech. What was happening in the Punjab? A man was to go and address a meeting. Ten, twenty or thirty rowdies prevented him from speaking. That is suppression of free speech; that is wrong. Government suppression is bad and so is popular suppression of free speech equally bad. They are both suppressions of free speech and they are both bad. A Government can be regulated; but popular expression cannot be regulated. It is worse, therefore, when nobody is responsible.

Therefore, I would appeal to this House—this House is wise enough to act rightly—and to the wider public that these ways of violence should be given up not only because they are too bad but because they come in the way of future co-operation. We can never function in this country unless we co-operate with each other, unless the Tamil co-operates with the Telugu and the Kannada, the Malayalee and the Marathi and the Gujarati and the Bengali and the Punjabi and

so on. All this trouble has somehow made it difficult for people to co-operate with each other. It has created an atmosphere. Now, having finished this, let us be done with it, right or wrong and try to produce the atmosphere of co-operation.

Shri Kelappan (Ponnani): Let me thank you for giving me this opportunity. Let me at the outset say that I am only speaking for myself and not for my party. It is a happy augury that the Government have solved what appeared to be an insoluble problem, the problem of Bombay. I congratulate the Government on the courage they have shown in retracing their wrong steps. The greatest blunder that Government committed was to appoint the States Reorganisation Commission to divide the country on a linguistic basis. One wrong step led to another which, in its turn, led to others. Certain farsighted persons suggested to put off the reorganisation of States for some time. That would, probably, have given us time to think and enabled us to see things in their true perspective. Linguistic States, it is now admitted, would lead to the disruption of the unity of this country.

India is one State with a common culture, with a common philosophy and a common conception of life, we have a common literature and a common language—Sanskrit, not Hindi is that common language. The Indian philosopher, whether he is a Maharashtrian, Bengali or a Tamilian will quote from the same Sanskrit texts in propounding Indian philosophy of life. My friends here from Maharashtra and Bengal were also quoting texts from the same language. Ancient knowledge, whether of medicine, science or philosophy is treasured up in that language. *Vyasa*, *Valmiki*, *Lord Buddha*, and *Shri Sankaracharya* are our Gurus. You do not see another country in the world which, in spite of its vastness, retains unity which is so unique. Those bonds began to weaken be-

cause of Western impact. The unilingual States would have completed that process. We did not hesitate to cut the throats of each other in the name of linguism. Sense has dawned on us. You have cried halt. I am hoping that bilingual or multilingual States would take the place of unilingual States and the unity of the country would be maintained.

Sir, we are one nation and one State in spite of the many languages we speak. The "One language,—one nation" theory of Stalin, I thought, had been exploded with several of his other pet theories; but, our communist friends still hold on to that. Let me hope that the Prime Minister will put his firm foot on this tendency and stop this process of disintegration and continue his efforts to usher in more bilingual and multi-lingual States in the country. A Southern State, consisting of Kannada, Telugu, Tamil and Malayalam speaking people is the ideal I cherish. I hope the immediate formation of a State consisting of Mysore and Kerala will pave the way for that larger unit.

2 P.M.

I want to draw the attention of this House and the Government to another ominous and disturbing factor which the country cannot afford to ignore. This Parliament is the sovereign legislature of India and represents the highest form of democracy. The five hundred Members who assemble in this House are elected by the nation on adult suffrage. The way to alter the decisions of such a body is not stone-throwing, incendiarism and destruction of national property. There is the constitutional method and that is the only method. An appeal to the nation, to the voters, is the way to get the decision of Parliament altered. It is not only dangerous but destructive of all democracy to appeal to the streets of Bombay and Ahmedabad to unsettle the decisions arrived at by Government after prolonged consultations with the leaders of the nation.

The way our students are behaving must arrest the attention of the leaders who have the interest of the country as well as the well-being of the students themselves at heart. The parents and the governments must meet together and find a solution. It is true that throughout our fight for the freedom of the country students have been used for political propaganda and action. That was when we were slaves kept down by the might of the sword. In free India under a democratic set-up students must leave active politics to their elders and confine themselves to their studies, to their colleges and their hostels. For them to try to unsettle the decisions of Government by resort to violence and destruction no Government can countenance. Their conduct in the colleges is, even more reprehensible. For students to go to examination hall with revolvers and other deadly weapons in their pockets to threaten the lives of superintendents who dare to interfere with their malpractices is something which persons like me cannot understand. Our educational institutions which should produce noble sons and daughters, fearless, upright and just, wedded to non-violence cannot be allowed to degenerate to their present level. These happenings must make us pause and think.

I am one with this Government in all that they do to strengthen the unity of this country. Let me hope that the formation of the bilingual State of Bombay is only the beginning of what the Government propose to do in the future. I do not, therefore, say anything now about the injustice done to Kerala, one of the smallest—perhaps the smallest—State in area with the highest density of population.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh (Kolaba):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am now well-satisfied with the Bill as it has emerged from the consideration stage especially on account of the amendment which led to the creation of the new Bombay State. I must confess that I do not expect wonders from

[Shri C. D. Deshmukh]

the zonal councils which seems to me only to give a certain amount of legislative rigidity to a procedure which is well-known and which is already resorted to whenever disputes are to be settled between two States. The present practice, in my opinion, is more flexible. I referred to an instance the other day: the solution of the difficulties in regard to the Tungbhadra project which were settled through the intervention of the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission. Any way I have no great quarrel with the legislative machinery that has now been created except perhaps in the matter of the provision in regard to voting.

If one studies the composition of the zonal councils, he will find that usually the two parties will be well matched; ordinarily they will be three Ministers on the one side and three on the other and the scales will have to be held even by the Union Minister who is to preside, again ordinarily to preside. Now in a sense that converts him perhaps inconveniently into an arbiter and since the recommendations of the zonal councils are to go in many cases to the Central Government I fear that he will find himself in a somewhat awkward situation having already come to a decision. Nevertheless, I hope that this machinery will work well with the goodwill of all concerned.

I feel greatly troubled by the uncertain state in which all these border disputes have been left, although now we have put the seal of our approval on the, in my opinion, necessarily provisional arrangements that are contained in the Bill as it has emerged from the consideration stage. I have no doubt whatsoever that these disputes will be brought up again before the zonal councils concerned. I have no doubt that the two sides in the absence of any formula will take positions and postures and the matter will be more or less decided by the vote, or the casting vote of the Chairman.

Now if one had reason to believe that the Chairman was likely to act on a deep consideration of the principles involved, one might not even object to his arrangement. But I see no evidence that these principles have been well considered. Nor do I find that there will be readiness to refer every dispute to the Central Government for its final decision. The hon. the Home Minister said: "I hope the zonal councils will be able to show better results. And if everything fails and if the problem is really of special significance and there are special circumstances, the Government will take stock of the situation and see how it can be helped." These are words which are hedged in with so many 'ifs' and 'buts' that I fear that the large majority of border disputes will remain unsettled. As I pointed out yesterday during the course of my intervention, my information is that about 4 crores of people are affected all over. That is a very large number, and I am confident that if one were to revise this present principle that has been applied, one could reduce the number of people involved very considerably. Naturally it is not possible for me to say to what extent that number will be reduced. In the course of his observations, the hon. Home Minister said also—I quote again—

"My request was not for a formula because my own feeling is this. So far as those feelings are concerned, they can be settled better if we have no rigid formula than by sticking to a particular formula. Otherwise we have a formula already, a formula that was proposed by the Dar Commission that has been approved by the States Reorganisation Commission and we cannot lightly tamper with that."

In other words, the attitude of the hon. Home Minister appears to be that this is by and large the best formula that one could think of and

that unless the two parties thought it fit to agree, matters will be left where they are today.

On a factual aspect of this situation I am not quite certain if by his reference to the Dar Commission the hon. Home Minister intended to refer to paragraph 63 at page 12, because as far I can find, that is the only reference to this 50 to 70 per cent formula. With your permission, because this is an important point, I shall read this out:

"All the evidence before us is agreed that it would not be proper to call any area a unilingual area unless the majority of the one language spoken in that area reaches at least 70 per cent and any area below that should be considered as bilingual or multilingual, as the case may be. On this principle, it is claimed by all the advocates of linguistic provinces that all border districts where the majority language is 50 to 70 per cent may be treated as bilingual and broken up into bits up to villages and their population appropriated to contiguous linguistic areas. This is the way in which equities are proposed to be adjusted in bilingual areas between rival linguistic groups who reside there."

Then they go on to say:

"If border districts, which are bilingual and which have developed an organism and an economic life of their own, are to be broken up...."

Then they go on to argue that the same logic might be applied to cities.

From this I infer that they accepted this kind of principle, but it would be noticed that they use this 50 to 70 per cent in the first place to determine which large unit can be regarded as a bilingual unit, as I understand it. Taking the case of Belgaum again.....

Shri Venkataraman: I rise on a point of order, Sir, Under rule 132, the scope of discussion of a Bill in the Third Reading is as follows:

"The discussion on a motion that the Bill be passed shall be confined to the submission of arguments either in support of the Bill or for the rejection of the Bill. In making his speech a member shall not refer to the details of the Bill further than is necessary for the purpose of his arguments which shall be of a general character."

The hon. Member, when he opened his remarks, said that he is in favour of the Bill as it has emerged, but now he is going on with the details of the various clauses. I wish to draw your attention that such a discussion now is out of order.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: May I make my position clear? I said that the Bill provides for the Zonal Councils to determine the border disputes. Then I went on to say that although I am in favour of the Bill, I am somewhat apprehensive of the effectiveness of these provisions because of the fact that proper principles have not been indicated beforehand as might have been done had we accepted that amendment, I think amendment No. 490, in regard to the Boundary Commission. I am only pointing out factually for future use by these same Zonal Councils in implementing this scope of ours that the Zonal Councils will be able to deal with the matter. I am pointing out that the Dar Commission....

Mr. Speaker: So far as these details are concerned, this matter was discussed at length. I was also waiting to see how far the hon. Member wanted to go. For these details there were appropriate occasions and the hon. Member had also an opportunity to speak about them. All that he can say now is that the Zonal Councils in the opinion of the hon. Member do not meet the purpose. He has said that the hon. Home Minister's reply

[Mr. Speaker]

is hedged in with this and that. All that is appropriate. Further to support as to why he feels that the Boundary Commission is necessary and going to the Dar Commission Report in detail is not appropriate in the Third Reading stage.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I am not supporting the Boundary Commission now, I am saying that the principle which was approved by the Dar Commission should be applied to villages.

Mr. Speaker: We are not going into the villages now....

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I am only drawing the attention of the hon. Home Minister....

Mr. Speaker: That may be but not here.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: But I have done it anyway.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot go and scratch it, but he need not proceed with it further. Let it be definitely understood that the Third Reading stage is meant for general discussion and hon. Members may refer to some points and general matters about the Bill as a whole. The details with respect to the various provisions or what is important or what is not important ought not to be gone into now.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): While submitting to the rules as they are, should they not be elastic enough to blow out the fears one may have?

Mr. Speaker: I am not here to give a general opinion on general subjects.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The other point in regard to which I wish to make a few observations is the question of unilingual and bilingual States. Would that be in order?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is supporting it and there is no need to once again go into it. What I am saying is that a general discussion on

whether a unilingual or bilingual State is good or bad is not appropriate here. There is a sense of satisfaction with a bilingual State. The hon. Member knows that well and he need not wait for enlightenment from me, but he must confine his remarks to general issues.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I was only seeing if I would be able to convince those who are not taking kindly to this arrangement about Bombay that it is in the best interests of everyone. But if you feel that no observations are called for from me, I am content with having said this much....

Mr. Speaker: I thought the hon. Member wanted to ascertain from me whether he could speak on the question whether a unilingual State is preferable to a bilingual State or a bilingual State is preferable to a unilingual State, and I said that a general discussion of that kind is not appropriate at this stage. If he thinks that what is decided by this House is quite good so far as bilingual State is concerned, he can certainly say that.

Shri Kamath: You, Sir, allowed the Prime Minister to say all sorts of things in this House.

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister had not said all sorts of things. He said that: once a decision has been taken in this House, this is not the method in which the decision ought to be revoked. He is entitled to say that. Every hon. Member who is here whether he was a party or not a party to this decision, must try to implement it. At any rate they are all representatives of various groups, not groups of territorial constituencies and the Prime Minister is entitled to make an appeal and he made an appeal to every hon. Member. If he feels that whatever that is going on outside is wrong, he is entitled to do so. After all, when a Bill is passed for the purpose of implementation, no hon. Member can say "We are not going to implement it".

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The implementation of this would be easier if people who are objecting understood that their objections were not very well-founded. According to my humble intellect, I think that is relevant especially as it is my view that these questions as to whether a State should be unilingual or bilingual are not influenced by sentiment or passion but by calculation of which arrangement is likely to promote the economic interests of a certain region. It happens sometimes that that region is identical with a language group. Sometimes it may happen that that region might have two language groups or three. Therefore, I am going to say that one should not attach too much importance to this business of unilingual or bilingual State; one should direct one's attention to finding out whether a particular arrangement approved by Parliament is likely to subserve their interests.

In the light of this criterion, I am quite convinced—and I have some little right to say so with authority—that the arrangement in regard to the new Bombay State is likely to subserve the interest of all parts or sections of the State. It was with a recognition of this that I was among those who suggested to the Commission that we should have at least one good and leading example of a bilingual State in India.

I have thought it necessary to refer to this small bit of autobiography because Shri Mukerjee has referred to my perambulations. My perambulations are like *pradakshana* and I have come to the very point from which I started. (*Interruptions*)

An Hon. Member: Don't resign.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The reactions of the people have been communicated to me. Because of recent events, a great many people have been sending telegrams and letters to me. Shoals of telegrams have been showered on me. Generally, I find that the reactions are favourable to this new bilingual State of Bombay. It is true that there is a minority—and I am

quite convinced it is only a minority—in both Maharashtra and Gujarat, who are somewhat fearful and diffident but, in my opinion, the apprehensions and dissatisfactions of these minorities cancel each other.

I hold that no solution can be good which is hailed as a singular triumph for one party or one side alone. Indeed, in my opinion, in the affairs of the world a little generosity, just when hopes look likely to be fulfilled, is the path of wisdom and the interests of any particular group cannot be the sole criterion of the success of any arrangement. The promotion of national interest, as a whole, must be equally important and a right solution must reconcile both these categories of interests. I have been satisfied that the bilingual Bombay, approved by Parliament, is such a solution. Bombay city can now very well throw open its doors to all, as it has always done in the past and let us resolve never to think in terms of partition again. It is only thus that not only Bombay, but all the cities of India will truly belong to India without worrying about the population percentages and so on and they will not regard themselves as belonging to any particular territorial unit. The instruments of Governments have necessarily to be determined by geography but all Governments have to subserve local as well as national interests.

I am confident that this partnership is bound to succeed if the partners studied the laws about the formation of partnerships and not the laws governing dissolution.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Sir, I am not at all surprised at the outburst of the Prime Minister. He said that he did not like certain things which were happening in certain parts of the country. At least at this time, we thought that he would have understood the position and tried to remedy it. Instead, he came out, as usual, and talked about countries where persons were not allowed to talk and where their heads were taken and so on. If there are such

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

countries, let the persons there fight against it.

It is not the first time that, when we are discussing certain things and there is a difference of opinion, instead of explaining and convincing us whether we are right or wrong, has said such things. I am glad that he has admitted one thing. He has said that the Congress Party today was different from what it was before 1947, and that the reorganisation of the States is not on the basis of linguistic considerations. So, he has said that they have gone back. I am glad that the people have understood this position. It is they who taught the people that the reorganisation of the States will be on linguistic basis and people have understood that it is not so now. That is why we see certain things in Gujarat and other places.

I do not know whether the Government would say that the members of the SRC were anti-social elements. They were not anti-social elements. When I looked into its report, I found that they had said certain things definitely. They said:

"The urge for linguistic States has now gone so deeply into the minds of the masses that a refusal to create such a State at this stage would lead to a widespread sense of frustration which may have very grave consequences."

What is happening today? There is a sense of frustration in the country. Why? They thought that the reorganisation of the States would be on a linguistic basis. They were convinced of it. For the last forty years, the Congress Party accepted that principle. Even after 1947, it did not say that its policy was not reorganisation of the States on a linguistic basis. It did not say that it has thrown away that policy. That is why the SRC said that the urge was very deep. If it went back on its declared policy of having linguistic States, the Commission said that there

would be a sense of widespread frustration. That frustration means certain calamities.

It is said that this is done for the welfare of the country. Members are sorry instead of being happy. They do not feel glad or feel that they have done a good thing. At this time when we are about to pass this Bill, we do not know how many people would have been killed in Gujarat and other places. Thousands of people in the country feel it. Have they all become anti-social? Are they anti-social because there are agitations? How is it that the country has created so many anti-social elements? Is it suggested that the people of Gujarat are all anti-social? Eighty thousand students in Bombay and several thousand workers and also other sections of the people cannot all become anti-social.

Kerala State is being formed. They are not rejoicing today. Wherever States are formed, there is frustration today. For years together, people wanted Kerala State. But, when Kerala State is formed, the Assembly members there are thrown away. When the President's Emergency Proclamation was there, we pointed out that the Assembly need not be dissolved but that it might be suspended under the provisions of the Constitution. It was then said that it should not be done and it was dissolved. Now, when the Kerala State is formed, they say that, as the Assembly has been dissolved nothing could be done. What about Tamil Nad? What about Karnataka? People are not glad even there. The boundary disputes are not settled and there are no boundary commissions either, to decide these disputes on some basic principles. So, wherever a particular section of the people think that they did not get a portion which actually belonged to them, there is certainly quarrel and frustration. Even where States have been formed more or less on a linguistic basis, though they are truncated States, people are not glad because the principle that had been advocated

for the last so many years has not been implemented. If the Congress wanted to change its policy,—it has changed its policy—if they wanted to say that what they had been saying all along was not correct and was not to the interests of the country, they should have done the reorganisation of the States after convincing the people. At least they should have done it after convincing those who are in the Congress ranks. I can understand Shri Gadgil today saying that injustice is done. Till yesterday he was fighting for Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay and was saying that if that is not given there is injustice. Today he says, I agree with the injustice done and so I will support the injustice from tomorrow onwards.

Sir, we have always said that we would not support it. The Prime Minister challenged the Parliament. It is no question of challenging the Parliament, it is a question of challenging the Government. Everyday we point out that the Factory Act and other Acts are being flouted. Those Acts have been passed by the Parliament. But nothing is being done in respect of them. Today we have a right. When the majority passes a thing and when we say that certainly we do not agree with the principle and that we are opposed to it, we have a right to see that it is changed by organising the people and by constitutional methods. We have a right to agitate for it and change it. To say that when the majority have passed a thing, which we think is not correct, we must abide by it and implement it is not correct. When something is done, which we think is injustice and with the principle of which we do not agree, to say that we must also support it is I think not democracy. Democracy has to see that even the minority has got a right to influence the people, to organise the people, to convince them that a thing done is wrong and see that whatever action has been taken is changed. But here it is said that it is a challenge.

What is the result of this? There are very important things which are going to create trouble. There is the question of Boundary Commission. The majority of the sections of Members here feel that a Boundary Commission must be there and that power should not be given to the Zonal Council. Sir, trouble is coming on that point.

As far as linguistic minorities are concerned, it was very strongly stated that whatever practice was there, not only in respect of linguistic minorities but also with regard to religious minorities, there must be some statutory safeguards. That has not been done.

Not only that. In Maharashtra the people wanted Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay. What the people understood was that on the principle which had been advocated to them, they would get that. The next day when the announcement was made that they are going to have a bilingual State, whatever it is, it is not as if that one morning some anti-social elements came up. Were all these anti-social elements in Gujerat keeping quiet. It may be sentimental or it may be due to their firm conviction, whatever it is, thousands of people—students, workers and others—from all sections came out and said that they only wanted Maha Gujerat and not a bilingual State. That is what we also said. We said, that the wishes of the people should be considered. Does the Prime Minister today say, we are opposed to the principle of linguistic States? The second important thing which we had said before is that the wishes of the people should be considered. That is what we had been saying all along. Unless and until the wishes of the people are considered, no good solution can be reached. If you think that the wishes of the people are against your proposal, at least make an attempt and try to see that they are convinced that the best thing in the circumstances obtaining today is a bilingual State. That was not done.

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

Then again, look at the way in which it was done. Those Members of the Parliament, my friends here, who spoke very violently that they will never allow such a thing to come and who said: "what is this bilingual State; it is a balanced bilingual" and all that, those Members who spoke such things today, at four o'clock the next day morning say that they want a bilingual State. How is it? How is it within six hours such a change has come? Certainly it is not any change. Certainly, those who opposed it, suddenly when the wave of mass signature campaign came and were told that they must sign it agreed to do so. Therefore, why not at least give some time to the people to say that they are convinced about it and that they want it. Instead of that there is a challenge and there is threat.

We have said that we are opposed to it and tomorrow whenever any question of resistance is there it will be said that there is violence. Nobody has said a word about it. The Prime Minister said that 25 people came to tell us something. Who says it is correct? If the report in the paper is correct, I have read that the students, when they understood that some people were about to loot a shop, went and drove away the people. Do you call it anti-social? When somebody wanted to do something the students stopped it. The students who were demonstrating drove the people away and prevented them from looting the shop. Without understanding what the mistakes are, without understanding where we have gone wrong, without understanding whether the policy of the Government is correct, whether this policy will satisfy the people and whether this policy does anything good to the people, if anything happens in the country to shoot the people involved and then say that they are anti-social elements, to say that there are anti-social elements everywhere is wrong. I say, if everywhere in this country anti-social elements everyday are increasing, it is time for

the Government to say that for the last eight years their rule has created only anti-social elements in the country and so they will go out of office and will not remain. It is not good for the Government to everyday come and say: "What can we do? There are thousands of anti-social elements in Gujerat, there are lakhs of anti-social elements in Maharashtra, there are anti-social elements everywhere". Where were these anti-social elements? Does the Government say that before 1947 all the students and others were with the British Imperialism and only when they went away they have come out to do something against the country? Does the Government say that everybody who agitates today are unpatriotic and they do not love the country? Can you say that all those who say that there must be linguistic States are anti-social and unpatriotic? They are those who fought for the country. They are the Gujerathis, Maharashtrians, Tamilians, the Punjabis and the Bengalis who stood together and fought for the freedom of the country. When they have fought together, when they have worked together, when they have stood together fighting against British Imperialism, can you say the next day they have become separated, chauvinistic and against the Government? If that is the answer that is being given every time, I am sorry the Government is jumping from one error to another error and the only solution they find to the problems is to say that the people are becoming anti-social and violent and there is nothing wrong as far as the policy of the Government is concerned.

Therefore, as far as this Bill is concerned, for the last one year we had been discussing about it. For the whole time it was under consideration there had been troubles in this country. It is only because of the principle which the Congress organisation itself had propagated among the people and which had gone deep

in the minds of the people. They had been convinced that it is good to have reorganisation on the linguistic basis. They even today feel that it is correct. As far as the question of safeguards to minorities and boundary questions are concerned, troubles are going to come. The only way in which all these things can be solved is not by lathis, bullets and Section 144. From the time we pass this will let the Government think out what are the defects and where we have gone against the people. If they do not do that and say something here about the Opposition parties and abuse them and be satisfied that they have done something, the people outside will not tolerate it.

The moment Members of Parliament here agreed to it and the Government announced it, the people in Gujerat reacted against it. Therefore, the people will react, because there are certain convictions in the minds of the people. When something is done against that, they are going to react and considering every reaction as something done by anti-social elements is not good. If you disregard the feelings of the people, the moment we pass this States Reorganisation Bill, instead of doing good to the country it will only do harm. If the defects are not understood, if the wishes of the people are not known, the protection to linguistic minorities is not given and the solution to boundary question is not found out, trouble is bound to come. After passing it may start in smaller conflicts in boundaries. If these things are not taken note of, some basic principles are not evolved and the people are not educated on them, certainly this Bill is not going to do any good to the country. It will only create confusion and whatever the intentions of the Government may be, certainly it will be defeated. We will learn a great lesson by that. We have already understood that in Gujerat. Therefore, I say, as far as the States Reorganisation Bill is concerned, which we have worked out for the last so many months, certainly it is

the duty of the Government to think carefully about this thing. It is the duty of the country to see that the Government understand the reactions of the people, and the Government should either try to convince the people of their correct policy or the country should see that the Government themselves change the policy on the ground that the people want to change. If this is done, certainly, trouble will be created.

श्रीमती मरिबेन पटेल (कैरा दक्षिण) :
 आज मेरा बोलने का बिल्कुल ही कोई विचार नहीं था लेकिन जब मैं ने देखा कि गुजरात के बारे में कुछ गलतफहमी इस सदन में फैल रही है, तो मैं ने अपना धर्म समझा कि मैं स्थिति को साफ कर दूँ। पिछले दो तीन दिनों से हम ने गुजरात के साथ बराबर सम्पर्क रखा है और वहाँ क्या हो रहा है, इस को जानने का बराबर प्रयत्न किया है। हम दिन में दो चार बार टेलिफोन कर के स्थिति को मालूम करने की कोशिश करते रहे हैं। मुझे कहना पड़ता है कि इन दिनों वहाँ पर जो भी कुछ हुआ है, उस से हमें बहुत शोक है, बहुत धर्म है, बहुत दुःख है। परन्तु मैं यह बात इस सदन को साफ साफ बतला देना चाहती हूँ कि इस का नेतृत्व साम्यवादी पार्टी (Communist) और पी० एस० पी० (प्रजा समाजवादी दल) कर रही है। उनके झूठे ले कर ही ये लोग उधर उधर घूम रहे हैं। मैं इस बात को भी इस सदन को बतलाना अपना फर्ज समझती हूँ कि जो मैमोरेण्डम (जापन) हम ने कमिशन को दिया था उस में साफ साफ यह लिखा था कि हम बाई-लिंग्वल स्टेट (द्विभाषा भाषी राज्य) के हक में हैं इस मैमोरेण्डम पर दस्तखत करने वाले केवल कांग्रेसी ही नहीं थे बल्कि और दूसरे लोग भी थे और वे भी इस किस्म की मांग करने में हमारे साथ शरीक हुए थे। उस के बाद बड़ी बड़ी आशायें और बड़ी बड़ी उम्मीदें थीं। अब जो परिवर्तन किया गया है, कुछ लोगों

[श्रीमति मणिबेन पटेल]

को उन से थोड़ा बहुत धक्का लग सकता है और यह बात समझ में आ सकती है। परन्तु जो तरीका विरोध जाहिर करने का अपनाया गया है, उस को देख कर हमें शर्म आती है और साथ ही साथ दुःख भी होता है। इस बिल का जो अब स्वरूप है, उस को हम ने देश के विशाल हिस्सों को सामने रख कर ही स्वीकार किया है और यही कारण है कि न हम ने किसी प्रकार के एश्योरेंसिस (आश्वासन) मांगे हैं और न ही किन्हीं सेफ्टाईंस (संरक्षणों) की मांग की है। हम यह समझते हैं कि हम में उदार दृष्टि वाले सेवा भाव कार्य करने वाले होंगे। जो देश को आगे बढ़ाने में अपना योग दे सकेंगे। यदि हम ने इस भावना से कार्य न किया तो हम समझते हैं कुछ भी नहीं हो सकेगा। इस वास्ते इस समय गुजरात में जो कुछ हो रहा है, उस से हमें दुःख पहुंचना स्वाभाविक है। यह कहना कि वे लोग केवल रोष ही प्रकट करते हैं और कुछ नहीं करते मैं समझती हूँ ठीक नहीं है। मैं आप को यह भी बतलाना चाहती हूँ कि प्रदर्शनकारियों ने कांग्रेस हाउस में जा कर वहां से हमारे चीफ मिनिस्टर (मुख्य मंत्री) की तस्वीर उतार कर जलाई। भला रोष प्रकट करने का यह कौन सा तरीका है। जब हम ने गुजरात के साथ सम्पर्क स्थापित किया तो हमें बतलाया गया कि इस तरह के कार्य करने वाले कुछ एक लोग ही हैं और बाकी तो जलूस ही निकालते हैं। भ्रष्टचारों में यह छपा है कि =०,००० स्टूडेंट्स (छात्र) अहमदाबाद में स्ट्राइक (हड़ताल) पर हैं। हमें अब यह देखना है कि अमली पोलीशन (स्थिति) क्या है। बाल मन्दिर से ले कर कालेज तक के विद्यार्थी बनासिस में नहीं गये हैं। अब आप ही बतलाइये कि बाल मन्दिर के या मानटेसरी के जो बच्चे हैं वे क्या इस चीज को समझते हैं? ऐसे मौके पर जो मां बाप हैं वे डर कर तथा मोच विचार कर के अपने बच्चों को घर पर ही रख लेते हैं और समझते हैं कि

इन को स्कूल भेजना ठीक नहीं है। इस वास्ते बच्चे घर पर ही रहें हैं। मैं ने आज बड़ौदा टेलिकॉम किया था। भूषे बतलाया गया है कि बड़ौदा यनिवर्सिटी (विश्वविद्यालय) ने तीन दिन के लिये कालेज बन्द कर दिये हैं और आदेश दे दिये हैं कि स्कूलों तथा कालेजों के लड़के न तो कोई जलूस निकालें और न कोई समा ही करें तथा अपने घरों में ही रहे।

इस वास्ते मैं तो केवल इतना ही बतलाने के लिये खड़ी हुई थी कि गुजरात के बारे में जो गलतफहमी पैदा हो गई है कि वहां के लोगों में बड़ा रोष है, यह बिल्कुल गलत है। हां यह बात जरूर है कि जब कोई निर्णय किसी की आशाओं के विरुद्ध कर लिया जाता है तो उस से उसे धक्का अवश्य लगता है। यह बात समझ में आ सकती है। परन्तु सारे गुजरात से सम्पर्क स्थापित कर के उन को हम ने समझाया है और वे समझ गये हैं कि जो चीज तय की गई है वह देश के विशाल हित में है और हमें इस को हिम्मत के साथ स्वीकार कर लेना चाहिये।

Shri Venkataraman: Before I offer my remarks on the Bill, I desire to move an amendment in substitution of the amendment moved by Pandit G. B. Pant this morning.

Mr. Speaker: Is it regarding Kanya Kumari?

Shri Venkataraman: Yes, Sir. The areas which are transferred to Madras State consist of five taluks—Agastheeswaram, Thovala, Kalkulam and Vilavancode, and also Shencottah. The first four taluks form one contiguous area and therefore they could form a separate district. The other taluk, namely, Shencottah, is not contiguous and it is separated from the other four taluks. Therefore, it should be added on to the Tirunelveli district, as part of that district. This is my amendment which I move.

I beg to move:

That for the amendment moved by Pandit G. B. Pant, printed as No. 607 in List No. 50 of amendments, the following be substituted:

Page 4, for lines 1 and 2, substitute:

“(b) the territories comprised in the Agastheeswaram, Thovala, Kalkulam and Vilavancode taluks shall form a separate district to be known as Kanya Kumari district in the State of Madras; and

(c) the territories comprised in the Shencottah taluk shall be included in and become part of Tirunelveli district in the State of Madras.”

This is in accordance with the wishes of the people who are being transferred, as it were, to the Madras State. They wanted to have a separate district and a separate district administration for them, and the Government of India have been good enough to accept their demand.

Coming to the general provisions of the Bill, I desire to support the Bill wholeheartedly for the very able manner in which the Government have solved what appeared at one time to be an insoluble problem. In fact, if we look at the general feeling in the country, apart from a few stray incidents, the reports that appear in the newspapers show that the country is satisfied with the Bill as it has emerged from second reading.

It is no doubt true that the States Reorganisation Commission literally opened a Pandora's box. It created in the minds of various people a desire for conquest, a primordial instinct of man to extend his territory and to gather more territory for himself, and this desire manifested itself by way of presentation of claims and counter-claims over various parts of the State. It almost threatened to engulf the country in chaos. It is really a tribute to the national leadership that ultimately solved this great

problem, and it has been solved to the satisfaction of the majority of the people of this country.

It was said that this is a Bill which confers multi-lingual, bilingual and unilingual States. It is not so. True to our principles of a composite economy, we have also tried to remember the principle of a composite political theory. We have some States which are unilingual, some States which are bilingual. All these States will be put on their mettle, on trial, and if the States which are bilingual in character show greater progress and better results, it will be an inducement to other States which are unilingual to emulate the example of the bilingual States and then become bilingual States themselves. If the experiment does not succeed, possibly, it is likely that the people may think of going back to unilingual States. Therefore, it is now for the country and for the people to give this Bill the best trial that is possible under the circumstances and to show also their utmost goodwill. Whatever little difficulties or whatever little disappointments that we may have, it is time that we forget them and put our shoulders to the wheel to make a success of this great experiment.

When I was listening to Shri A. K. Gopalan, it struck me that of all people on earth, it is Shri Gopalan and the people of the Kerala State that have absolutely no cause for complaint or grievance. I desire to make this very clear. On the principle that a taluk should not be divided, the Kerala State got the whole of Kasargod taluk much to the disappointment of my friends from Mysore and Karnataka. At the same time, even though a taluk should not be divided, a portion of the Shencottah taluk was divided and the hill portion was given to Kerala on the ground that it was contiguous to them. The other principle enunciated by the Commission is that if more than 70 per cent of the people speak one language, it should be declared as unilingual. It was found by the Commission that the Devikulam taluk

[Shri Venkataraman]

had more than 72 per cent of Tamil-speaking people and still it was not given to Madras, because they said it was a migratory population. Therefore, on all issues they have scored a tremendous success. I wish them well; let them not, of all people on the earth, complain that they have any cause for grievance.

Shri Gadilingana Gowd (Kurnool): The complaint applies not only to Kerala, but to the whole of India.

Shri Venkataraman: He said, "the people of Kerala are thoroughly disappointed". I want the people of Kerala to know that they have succeeded on all grounds.

The other point to which I would like to refer is the settlement of the various border disputes. It is a matter of great importance to all of us that the border disputes should be settled. Before the S.R.C. was appointed and before this Bill was presented, attempts were made by the Madras Government to settle their differences in respect of the border with the Andhra Government. Even in 1953, when the Andhra Act was passed, it was agreed between the parties that border areas could be settled by mutual discussion. They had made fairly good progress in the course of the discussion. It is only when the Bill came and when it was found that border disputes related not only to Andhra and Madras but to other areas as well that the Andhra Government withdrew from the conversations and said, "let it be decided on the basis of the principle to be enunciated for all border disputes". That itself shows that if you do not have any authority to settle the dispute, it does not follow that the dispute will not be settled at all. On the contrary, if there is no authority, they would come together and try to settle the disputes and the differences will be narrowed further and further. After the zonal councils come into existence, it will be possible to settle the various border disputes wherever parties can meet together and come

to an agreement. In this connection, I desire to mention that a small mistake has occurred in a border in respect of the Shencottah taluk. I have a letter from the Chief Minister of Madras where it is said:

"It has since been brought to my notice that not only the areas in Puliwara village but also parts of Shencottah and Achambathur villages have also been arbitrarily treated as Puliwara Hill Pakuthy. I, therefore, suggest that the Travancore-Cochin Government may be moved to cancel their notification reconstituting the Shencottah taluk and the question may be taken up afresh and the line of demarcation drawn up after a joint inspection by the officials of the two Governments."

I mention this as an instance in point to show that wherever there are such differences, the approach should be for the respective Governments to meet and try to settle them between themselves; then only they should think of some other authority. We, lawyers, never stop with the court of original jurisdiction where we have appellate courts. The more we increase the appellate jurisdiction, the greater is the litigation. It is not good to have more and more litigation in respect of border disputes.

There is one other small matter. Yesterday an amendment was introduced by Shri Datar with regard to the representation in the Council of States. In the Joint Committee the principle was accepted that where a Member was enrolled as a voter in a particular State, he should be allocated to that State. One Member, out of the 18 Members representing Madras, is enrolled as a voter in South Kanara and he was, in accordance with the Joint Committee's report, allocated to the State of Mysore. But yesterday the Government suddenly moved an amendment and removed that particular clause. The result is that the Member, who is enrolled as a voter in South Kanara, will be representing

the Madras State. As far as that particular Member is concerned, we have the highest regard for him and we have no objection. But this is a matter of principle and I desire that the Government should look into it and see how a Member enrolled as a voter in one State could be asked to represent in the Council of States the other State.

The final result of this reorganisation of States is that the number of States is being reduced; now we will have only 13 States and 4 Centrally administered areas. That itself is a great step towards the greater unification of the country. If, by virtue of the experience people gain by the bilingual State of Bombay, larger States come into existence, then the number of States will be reduced further. We are really proceeding in the right direction and I would like to say that the experiment should receive the utmost co-operation of every section of this House.

Lastly, I have to say that even though during the progress of the Bill there was considerable heat and a great deal of conflict, now towards the end, we find that apart from a few stray instances of dissatisfied people, it has commanded the confidence of not only Members of this House, but the country at large. I support whole-heartedly the Bill before this House.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to know the views of the House. We allotted three hours for the third reading and, therefore, I will have to call upon the hon. Minister to reply at 3 o'clock, so that we may conclude this debate by 3-30 when the House will take up the non-official business. If on the other hand, the House is inclined to sit for half an hour more till 6-30.....

Several Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Then, I call upon the hon. Minister to reply.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I have no intention of inflicting any speech on the House in the course of this final stage. I have already taken up a lot of the time of the House; I had only one intention that I wanted to carry out and I propose to do so now. I am grateful to the House for the way in which it has co-operated with the Government in improving this Bill. In fact, while we were applying our minds to the clauses of this Bill, whether in the Joint Committee or in this House, for some time all party differences were eliminated, and it appeared that all Members were inclined to look at the problems which arose out of this Bill in a rational way on their merits without any prejudice and uninfluenced by extraneous considerations. I value that spirit and I cannot but appreciate the assistance which I have received from the Members of various parties in the Joint Committee and here in this House.

I regret to find that still in some minds there is a feeling of frustration about this Bill. The Members opposite have been oppressed either by the sense of our success or their failure. But whatever it be, when I review the situation, I find that we have achieved much more than anyone could have expected from us ten months ago, when the report of the States Reorganisation Commission was published. As hon. Members might be remembering, it was exactly on the 10th October last year that the report saw the light of day and it is just on the 10th August this year that we are reaching almost the end of the journey, so far as this august House is concerned.

Look at the picture and see really if the proposals that we have made do not satisfy the people of the country or the inhabitants of the States concerned. Let us start from the South. Someone mentioned Tamil Nad. Is there any sense of dissatisfaction anywhere in Tamil Nad?

3. P.M.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Pandit G. B. Pant: So far as I am aware, Tamil Nad is fully satisfied with the proposals contained in the Bill.

Take again the big State of Karnataka which will consist of Mysore and so many districts which have been amalgamated with Mysore from Hyderabad and from Bombay. I am really happy to feel that this State is going to be launched with the unanimous approval, support and blessing of the people living in Karnataka. Is there any indication of failure or any sense of resentment or dissatisfaction?

Let us then go further and see Kerala itself.

Shri Gopalan, I think, is interested in Kerala.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Certainly.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Has it not been the desire of Kerala that it should be carved into a separate State and has it ever wished to have more than what is assigned to Kerala?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I only referred to the President's rule.

Pandit G. B. Pant: The dissatisfaction is not about the reorganisation but about the President's rule. For that the responsibility is not mine. It is that of the people of Kerala.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: No. It is not the responsibility of the people of Malabar. But you are punishing them.

Pandit G. B. Pant: If the majority of the members of the Kerala Legislature were in agreement, we would have been able to run the State in a democratic way. But they have been quarrelling; they have been squabbling in a way which has resulted in the Kerala Legislature being split up into groups, none being in a majority....

Shri A. K. Gopalan: And the Congress is fighting each other.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Well, groups opposed to the Congress occasionally succeed even in invading the Congress with their disruptive tendencies.

But I am not concerned here with the reorganisation part of the State, so far as that goes, Mr. Gopalan is satisfied.

Now, let us go further. There has been a battle royal over the reorganisation of the Bombay State. The question of Bombay has been really the centre of controversies during these many months. We have not been able to find a satisfactory solution. Ultimately, a solution was found, a solution for which this House in particular deserves hearty congratulations, a solution which I had the privilege of regarding not as a party but as a national solution. That solution is there. Many congratulatory messages have been received by Shri Deshmukh, as he said, though he had not voted for that clause himself; and we had also the privilege of getting a number of telegrams from many quarters.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: We have also got so many telegrams against it.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I think you are always judging things against. What I am saying is this: there had been a tense atmosphere even in this House while this Bombay problem was proving almost intractable and insoluble. That tension has disappeared. There is a general feeling of goodwill, an earnest desire to accommodate each other, to wipe away the sad memory of the evil day and to settle down to business in a neighbourly, friendly and comradely manner. The zeal and spirit which are inspiring the people today were blessed by my friend Mr. Gadgil. So, that too is a solution over which we can congratulate ourselves.

Go further and approach Rajasthan. Has there been any dissatisfaction in Rajasthan because of the reorganisation proposals?

About Punjab, leaving aside Maha Punjab which is not even little Punjab and the Hindu Mahasabha, which has hardly any credit left now if it had ever any, is there anyone in Pun-

jab who is opposed to the proposals that were evolved for ensuring the co-operation of the two great communities living in the Punjab? Mr. Chatterjee is not here. He had suggested at a time that there should be two sub-federations in the Punjab and a common federation binding the two. Would that have been better than the regional formula? I would earnestly ask him to reconsider the position and then to tell us whether what we have evolved is not hundred times better than what he was himself going to propose.

Then he has been speaking about democracy. At the same time he wanted Himachal Pradesh to be merged in the Punjab. He was also referring to the S. R. C. Report. Does he not know that the Chairman of the Commission was opposed to the merger of Himachal Pradesh? Does he not know that there is not a single man in Himachal Pradesh who is in favour of its merger with Punjab? Then, would it have been a really democratic act? Would we have acted in accordance with the wishes of the people of Himachal Pradesh if we had pushed it into Punjab against the wishes of the people of Himachal Pradesh? These democratic instincts are hardly compatible with the tenets of Hindu Mahasabha. About Punjab we have found a solution which is certainly satisfying to by far the majority of the people living in the Punjab.

Then we come to the big State of Madhya Pradesh. This is going to be formed for the first time and it will have within its borders now the territories of four States—Madhya Bharat, Vindhya Pradesh, Bhopal and Mahakoshal. Has there been any word of murmur against it anywhere? Has there been any resentment or dissatisfaction?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: What about Gujarat?

Pandit G. B. Pant: Well, you have now shifted your ground from Bombay to Gujrat. We will see the results that will ensue. We thought you had greater interest in Bombay.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: We have even now interest in Bombay.

Pandit G. B. Pant: So far as Gujarat goes, the leaders of Gujarat, every member representing Gujarat in this House, has supported this proposal. Would Mr. Gopalan say that he is a member for his constituency but that he does not represent his constituency and that he should like to offer other people for serving as mouth pieces for the territories which he represents? What is the position of the member of Parliament?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: What is a bilingual State? If the U. P. members can sign a memorandum about Bombay I can also speak about them.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I do not say that you have no right to speak. But don't go beyond the speech. So far as that goes I submit that every member of this House has the right to express his opinion about every matter. But Mr. Gopalan said that the opinion of the people of Gujarat should not prevail where Gujarat is concerned. So I say then: should we be guided by the opinion of the Members of Parliament who represent Gujarat or by his opinion?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I only want to know whether there is any resentment among the people of Gujarat.

Pandit G. B. Pant: So far as the opinion of the people of Gujarat is concerned, I am satisfied that it is in favour of the bilingual State of Bombay. It is merely because the majority of the People are in favour of this proposal that the small, insignificant minority, if any, exploits the immature youths and resorts to other methods in order to over-awe the majority and to prevent it from enjoying the privileges to which it is entitled as a majority. Otherwise, one

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

would not go beyond constitutional methods. If one has a majority, one would not have recourse to violence. It is only because that one has not a majority in a place that one then takes recourse to methods which are unconstitutional, undemocratic and violent. So, that indicates that the people of Gujarat are in favour of the proposal that is contained in the Bill.

Then there is Andhra which is going to be big now and which had been small so far. Telengana is being merged with Andhra and we will have an Andhra Pradesh. Is anybody in Andhra dissatisfied with this arrangement, even any of the Members sitting opposite belonging to Andhra? Then where is the dissatisfaction? What have we done to create such a furore on the other side?

Shri Gadilingana Gowd: Only about the boundary commission.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I want to learn some of the very savoury epithets used by Professor Mukerjee, but I will have to sit at his feet, I think, for many, many years before I can swallow even one of them. So far as I am concerned, my vocabulary is, I think, defective as well as mild, but I listened to him with the respect that a professor deserves. And with the knowledge that he has of the language, it is not surprising if he is as familiar with words which we do not know as with words which we happen to know. Shri Chatterjee once said that he had quoted the scripture. I do not know if Shri Mukerjee remembers the adage. He did quote the scripture today, not once, not twice, but a number of times. In which capacity he was doing it he alone knows.

So far as Shri Chatterjee goes, he claims to be a better Congressman than we poor people who have been associated with the Congress for more than 55 years of our life. He claims to know more about the Congress ideology, the Congress policy and

the Congress creed than any of us can pretend to know. I am not surprised to see the alliance between Professor Mukerjee and Shri Chatterjee. Opposites attract each other, but when they contact each other, conflagration follows. So, so long as there is some distance between the two still, we should not be afraid of any grave disaster, but if they come closer still, then I am afraid the conflagration may cause disaster not only to others but to themselves because when a conflagration follows, the thing which creates the conflagration is itself reduced to ashes. So, I am not surprised at their coming nearer. Only they must beware of the future and of the danger that lies ahead.

Some remarks were made by Shri Deshmukh. I would not like to reply to his arguments in detail because this is not the stage meant for that, but he referred to zonal councils and said they are not flexible. Can anything be more flexible than a council, the decisions of which are not binding on anybody and are only of an advisory character? What is rigid about it I cannot see. Then he said that the principles that have been laid down in the States Reorganisation Commission report for the guidance of those who may have to deal with such problems hereafter are not very sound. They may not be. I do not claim to be an expert in these matters, but I know that Shri Deshmukh himself was in favour of a uniform application of those principles, and it was in accordance with his advice that these principles were applied to Belgaum, Karwar, Supa, Halyal and every other place. So, if we have not changed overnight, we are not very much to blame. We still continue to sit where we were and so our mind continues to work as it did. So, there might be, I think, some difficulty in our undergoing a metamorphosis so speedily.

Some friends also raised some sort of objection—a gentle and mild

word—to our having settled down to this bi-lingual formula for Bombay in the course of one or two or three days. We are ever in the quest of the right and the true. Whenever we can grasp it we are prepared to avail ourselves of the benefits that can accrue from it. That has been our policy and it will continue to be our policy. We do not wait to condemn a man till he is dead. We like to criticise a man if he goes wrong while he is alive and not after he has been buried and has been in the grave for some years. Similarly, we are prepared to revise our decisions if we find that better substitutes can be found in a day, in two days, in ten days, in twenty days. We are not Fascists in our methods. Our Prime Minister ever keeps an open mind and I do not think any other statesman can be found with such a rational attitude towards problems. I myself do not enjoy that privilege I must confess, but whenever in the case of this reorganisation problem we found that a better substitute could be found we have accepted it readily. Ultimately we are guided by one principle and that is this. We have to serve our people. We cannot afford to perpetuate a wrong if we become conscious of having done a wrong. It is not a question of our prestige. What is our prestige? What is the prestige of an individual or of a dozen individuals? We are here to serve 380 million people. Our prestige lies in our success in however small a degree it may be in serving them satisfactorily and in achieving some little success in removing the many hardships and difficulties from which they have been suffering for ages. It is only that which guides us, and it is only that ideal which we place before ourselves for the regulation of our own conduct and we will continue to do so.

Some other remarks have also been made here and there, but I do not think it necessary at this stage to reply to every small point. In fact, this is the stage when we have to take a wide sweep of the whole pano-

rama before us that has been unfolding during the last seven or eight months.

We have had many difficult days. We were surrounded by gloom on many an occasion. Light was not visible not only near us but even far away. The sun of reason was clouded. There were mists all round. Luckily, we have got over all that. They have been dispelled and today we start our new career with hope and faith.

We do not suggest, and we are not vain enough to think that what we have done is perfect. There is no perfection in affairs of life, but we can claim that we have made every effort to reduce imperfection to the minimum degree. And I respectfully and humbly submit that we have succeeded in that effort.

I will only appeal to the people of Gujarat. I will only appeal to the young friends, who are the hope not only of the future but also of tomorrow. After all, the labours of the Prime Minister cannot be of abiding benefit to the country, unless the youth who will follow him are worthy of the mantle that they have to carry, and can carry the torch of light forward so that this country may have enlightenment as well as prosperity. So, our hope rests on those youths. It is extremely disappointing, it makes one really sad that they should be easily led away. The young men are by nature emotional. They respond to an appeal for sacrifice. Courage and bravery are their usual characteristics. So, I appeal to them not to allow themselves to be led away like that. It is a matter of immense sorrow to us that the credit of Gujarat, the good name and reputation of Gujarat should have been besmirched by the happenings of the last two or three days. Nobody could have ever dreamt that people in Gujarat could be carried away by their sentiments to such an extent as to have recourse to arson, to assaults, to the burning of public property, to the smashing of street lights and all that. It is a

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

matter of great sorrow to us. We can only hope that the memory of this evil day will not linger, and that there will be no repetition of this orgy of violence again in that great State, to which we have always looked for inspiration, and especially for the preservation of a truly non-violent generous and friendly spirit in the entire country.

I appeal to hon. Members now to welcome this Bill with friendliness, with generosity, and with a determination to make it a success. A statute that has been passed by Parliament, that carries with it not only the support of many Members of a particular party, but virtually of the entire House, deserves still greater respect than an ordinary Act that may be passed now and then. This States Reorganisation Bill, which, I hope, will soon become an Act, can claim that it has behind it, the goodwill, the support and the blessings of the entire House and also of the great leaders outside.

So, let us pledge ourselves to apply ourselves constructively to the implementation of this Bill. And in order that we may succeed in that effort, let us create the proper atmosphere, an atmosphere of charity, of goodwill, of generosity, of friendliness, and of comradeship in the country.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put Shri Venkataraman's amendment to vote.

The question is:

That for the amendment moved by Pandit G. B. Pant, printed as No. 607 in List No. 50 of amendments, the following be substituted:

Page 4, for lines 1 and 2 substitute:

“(b) the territories comprised in the Agastheeswaram, Thovala Kalkulam and Vilavancode taluks shall form a separate district to be known as Kanya Kumari district in the State of Madras; and

(c) the territories comprised in the Shencottah taluk shall be included in and become part of Tirunelveli district in the State of Madras.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

“That the Bill, as amended, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: There are about five minutes more to 3-30 p.m. Shall we dispose of the River Boards Bill in five minutes?

Shri K. K. Basu: Let us adjourn for five minutes, and then take up Private Members' Bills.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Why not we adjourn for five minutes and re-assemble at 3-30 p.m.

3-27 P.M.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Half Past Three of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled at Half Past Three of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE
(AMENDMENT) BILL*

श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी (जिला हमीरपुर):
मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि सिविल प्रोसीज्योर कोड, १९०८ में और प्रागे संशोधन करने वाले बिल को पेश करने की अनुमति दी जाय ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

“That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908”.

The motion was adopted.

श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी : मैं बिल को पेश करता हूँ ।