

[Shri Karmarkar]

- (iii) Resolution passed by the Water Supply and Sewage Disposal Committee of the Municipal Corporation of Delhi.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-2059/60].

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

OBSTRUCTION TO SCHEDULED CASTE PEOPLE

Shri B. K. Gaikwad (Nasik): Sir, under Rule 197, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

"The reported obstruction to the Scheduled Caste people in drawing water from a public well in village Hartal, Delhi."

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): Enquiries made from the Delhi Administration show that the matter pertains to village "Hasthsal" and not "Hartal". It is reported that in this village there is a well located in land belonging to one, Shri Jai Narain Saini, and that this well has been in use by the members of Scheduled Castes for drinking water purposes. There was a dispute in regard to the ownership of the well and the matter became the subject-matter of litigation in civil courts. The Harijans, who had objected to the use of the well by the owner of the land for irrigation purposes, lost the suit and so lost in appeal.

On the 28th March, 1960 a deputation on behalf of the Harijans and others of the village saw the Deputy Commissioner, Delhi, and complained that Shri Jai Narain had constructed a wall and obstructed access to the well. In view of the decisions of the

civil courts, the district authorities can only make an attempt to find an amicable solution and they are doing so.

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: On a point of information, Sir, I want to know whether it is a fact that that well was repaired by the local board ten years back by spending Rs. 900 on it and if it is so, how is that it is not a public well?

Shri Datar: I am not aware of this. But it was being used by the members of the scheduled castes. I may add that there is another public well also in the village.

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO STARRED QUESTION NO. 348

The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon): In reply to supplementary question by Shri Hem Barua arising out of Starred Question No. 348 I stated ".....a very reputable, high level officer, the Scientific Adviser, held one inquiry and held one view". This statement suggests that the Scientific Adviser held one of the two enquiries. That is not factually correct. Therefore, I would like the reply to be corrected as follows:—

".....a very reputable, high level officer, the Scientific Adviser, supporting one of the reports held one view."

12.05 hrs.

BOMBAY REORGANISATION BILL— Contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Govind Ballabh Pant on the 31st March, 1960, namely:

"That the Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the State of Bombay and for matters connected therewith be referred to a Joint

Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 members; 30 from this House, namely, Shri Shripad Amrit Dange, Shri B. N. Datar, Shri Bhauroo Krishnarao Gaikwad, Shri Maneklal Maganlal Gandhi, Shri Narayan Ganesh Goray, Shri Arun Chandra Guha, Shri R. M. Hajarnavis, Shri H. C. Heda, Shri Ajit Prasad Jain, Shri Gulabrao Keshavrao Jedhe, Dr. Gopalrao Khedkar, Shri Bhawanji A. Khimji, Shri Balvantray Gopaljee Mehta, Shri Narendrabhai Nathwani, Shri Ghanshyamlal Oza, Shri Shamrao Vishnu Parulekar, Kumari Maniben Vallabhbhai Patel, Shri Nanubhai Nichhabhai Patel, Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel, Shri Uttamrao L. Patil, Shri Shivram Rango Rane, Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi, Shri M. Shankaraiya, Shri Vidya Charan Shukla, Shri Digvijaya Narain Singh, Shri M. S. Sugandhi, Shri N. R. M. Swamy, Swami Ramnanda Tirtha, Shri Balkrishna Wasmik and Shri Indulal Kanaiyalal Yajnik

and 15 members from Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the 14th April, 1960;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

Dr. M. S. Aney may kindly continue his speech. He has already taken 26 minutes.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): No time has been fixed for this Bill. May I therefore request you to take the opinion of the House? This may go on till 3.30 and we must finish it, because it is a reference to a Joint Committee.

Mr. Speaker: I agree. Should it go on till 3.30?

Hon. Members: Yes.

An Hon. Member: More than that.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): All of us should be allowed to have our say.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: At 2.30 or so you may call the Home Minister.

Mr. Speaker: At 2.30 I will call the hon. Home Minister, and it will conclude by 3.30 when we have to take up Private Members' Business.

Dr. Aney may sit and speak if he likes.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Yesterday I concluded on the note that the Vidarbha people would not like to be stopped, and I on their behalf stated and supported their right to have a separate State of Vidarbha.

Today I am going to put forward one or two arguments in support of this demand. Before that, I would like to refer to article 3 of the Constitution. I am not raising a point of order, but I am going to put the matter before the House with a view to show that though technically the requirements of article 3 are fulfilled, in my opinion, so far as Vidarbha is concerned, morally the requirements of the article are not fulfilled. That is what I want to show, and for that purpose, I shall first read the article.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): May I advise the Home Minister not to surrender his seat!

Dr. M. S. Aney: Article 3 says that in the case of Bills for the separation of territory etc., certain conditions are to be fulfilled, and those conditions are mentioned in the proviso to the article. The proviso is this:

"Provided that no Bill for the purpose shall be introduced in either House of Parliament except on the recommendation of the President and unless, where the proposal contained in the Bill affects the area, boundaries or name of any of the States, the Bill has been referred by the President to the Legislature of that State for expressing its views thereon within such period as may be specified in the reference or within such further period as the President may allow and the period so specified or allowed has expired."

In this case, these two things have been done. The matter was recommended by the President, and the President has also referred the matter for the consideration of the Bombay State Legislature, and the Members of the House have got the reports of the debate of that legislature before them.

What was the object of the framers of the Constitution in imposing these two conditions? The object was that Parliament or Members of this House will be competent to consider a measure of this kind only when they have got information about the views of the people or their representatives who are most vitally affected by the proposals of the measure. So, we have to see whether in the present case the views of the people of Vidarbha could be said to have been in the possession or in the hands of the House by having the report of the debate in the Bombay legislature. That is the point.

You know, Sir, that the present Members of the Bombay Legislature from Vidarbha were elected after the States Reorganisation Bill had been passed, and the election was fought on the issue of the bilingual State versus samyukta Maharashtra. That was the issue on which the elections in Vidarbha particularly were fought, and Vidarbha was congratulated that the Congress had succeeded in that section of Bombay State. The largest number of seats was won there by the Congress which mainly stood for the continuance and support of the bilingual State as against Samyukta Maharashtra for which a demand was being made by the people who opposed the Congress candidates. So, the present Members of the Bombay Legislature from Vidarbha had a mandate so to say from their constituencies to support the bilingual State of Bombay; probably it was also mentioned in the manifesto issued at that time. That was their position.

I shall not go into other matters. Later on, the question of the formation of unilingual States was referred to the Congress for investigation and report, and it so happened that the Congress Working Committee, on the advice of the nine member committee of which the hon. Home Minister was himself the chairman, recommended that the bilingual State should go. The proposals which are now mooted in this Bill are mainly based upon the recommendations made by that nine-man committee to the Working Committee and by the Working Committee to the Government of India. That is the position.

A sudden change was created, particularly for those who had been returned on the Congress ticket. The mandate on which the Members of the Bombay legislature from Vidarbha had been returned was different from the new situation that was created on account of the stand that was taken by the Government of India. I do not want to blame anybody in the matter; I am only putting the facts as they are.

So, there were Members in the Bombay legislature who thought that they must either accept the new decision or resign. There were certain Members who were strongly in favour of the formation of a separate State of Vidarbha and against Samyukta Maharashtra, and they explained their position. Some of them even tendered their resignation.

I do not blame anybody as I have already said. Somehow or other, when the Congress Working Committee adopted this resolution after considering the pros and cons of the question and came to the conclusion that the proposals recommended by the nine-man committee should be accepted, and made a recommendation to that effect to the Government of India, it became a new order of the Congress Working Committee to the Congress Members, and in the name of discipline they had to obey it. I do not know whether they agreed with the decision or not, I was not present there, but as loyal Congressmen they had to abide by the decision. We have always been loyal Congressmen, and we have been previously congratulated by everybody. The Congress Members of the legislature from Vidarbha were told that they had done their duty by putting forth their point of view, but that as Congressmen, their first duty was to the Congress Working Committee. So, it became a conflict between their duty to the Congress and their duty to the constituencies which they represented and the mandate they had received at the time of the elections.

Ultimately they agreed to abide by the decision of the Working Committee and the threatened resignations were not given, and I think that matter is closed now. But the point remains that those Members say that they saw that the decision was wrong, and not in the interests of the people of Vidarbha, but they had to accept it because it came from a body to which they were loyal. Whether it is so or not,

it is for those to decide who know the matters more intimately than I. They have stated something like that. The position is that those Members of the Legislature who had to consider this view or the proposals sent to them by the President were in this peculiar difficulty, so far as Vidarbha was concerned. They were thinking that Pantji was right, and they were thinking that their duty to the Congress required them not to express that opinion but to abide by what has come down from the Working Committee, either a suggestion or a mandate or whatever else you may like to call that.

The opinions expressed in the debates that you have got before you, so far as the Vidarbha Members are concerned, are opinions of people who were already divided in their minds about this matter. I put it very mildly. They were members with a divided mind in this matter.

What was the object of the Constitution-framers in putting this article in the Constitution and insisting on this condition? It was not a formal condition. Because the Constitution-framers wanted that when you are making a change in the area of a State or creating a new State, you are affecting the destiny of a large number of people, and, therefore, you must ascertain their views. Their opinion may or may not be binding upon you, but it is necessary and proper and just that the Members of Parliament should at least have authentic and correct information about the views of the people whose destinies are going to be affected in this manner.

It is generally agreed that the accredited representatives are supposed, and rightly supposed, to represent the will of the people of their constituencies. But, in the particular case here, and under the circumstances which I have narrated to you,

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

I ask you, the hon. Members of this House, and I appeal to the Leader of my Party and also the Leader of the House and my hon. friend the Home Minister, whether the Members would be justified in saying that they have got before them the authentic views of the people of Vidarbha under these circumstances. If they have not got them, then, though you have fulfilled the requirements of this Constitution technically, yet, in spirit it is not so. Morally, those recommendations are wanting in giving you correct information about this matter. I do not say there is any point of order, and I do not say that anything is done which is going to make anything invalid here, but the fact remains there. Is it not due to the people of Vidarbha, even according to the spirit of the Constitution itself, I would say, that you should find some other way to ascertain the views of the people of Vidarbha, whose views—you must admit the possibility—were possibly not correctly represented by those, who, under the ordinary circumstances, would have been their accredited representatives. That is the position. I shall leave it there. That was one of the grounds on which I think....

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh): The views have been more than properly assessed, and the opinion is known.

Dr. M. S. Aney: My hon. friend is entitled to say that. I do not want to say anything against him. He is my friend, and we have worked together; we respect each other; we know it. He will at least give me the credit that I shall not make a statement of fact which to my knowledge is not correct, or is incorrect or inaccurate. I am sure that he will give me at least that much credit.

Under these circumstances, I ask: Am I not within my rights, within the

bounds of reason, to ask the Parliament, and particularly, the leaders from the parties, to find out some *via media* and to find out some way to ascertain, and make some attempt to ascertain, the opinion of the people of Vidarbha under certain circumstances their members in the Legislatures cannot be said in the particular matter to really represent the people of Vidarbha, or at least the whole lot of the people of Vidarbha? I can say that much. This is one reason why I am insisting upon that point.

Then, there is another point which is rather ticklish, in respect of which it would be a failure on my part in the discharge of my duty, if I do not make a reference. The hon. Home Member....

An Hon. Member: Home Minister.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. B. Pant): That does not matter.

Dr. M. S. Aney: He may not take it amiss, but it is wrong on my part to call him by a wrong designation, and a designation which is not a desirable one in these days of responsible government, particularly.

I want my hon. friend the Home Minister to consider this point. In the course of his speech, he made a reference to the satyagraha that is going on. I do not say that he made that reference in any contemptuous way. 'Some people have taken it' it is something like that. But I would only say this. Satyagraha is going on there. And why is it going on there? I must say that also. It is going on there because they found that all their attempts to attract the attention of the Government of India made in a constitutional way were not getting any response anywhere. That was the position. Deputations were sent, and they were patiently heard; representations were sent; sometimes, they were acknowledged, and sometimes they were not. There, the press also has been gagged. It is interested in suppressing the voice of the people of Vidarbha as against

the voice of Samyukta Maharashtra. This is the position in that part of that State on account of certain circumstances to which I do not want to refer. Under these circumstances, the persons are carrying on satyagraha there. Reports are coming before you about the satyagraha, and you have to rely upon those reports, no doubt, in these matters. You are justified in forming your own opinion and calling them as some people. I say they are responsible public men who have taken up this cause. Some of them have been your own Congressmen, and who have been members of the Indian National Congress for several years, and who have served the Congress for forty years and more, and you have been taking them as the accredited representatives of the people of Vidarbha whenever you wanted. Are those people not to be consulted now? It may be that certain events might have happened. But I would only say this. It may be that you may feel some indignation about it on the ground that they are departing from the principle of non-violence. But when they have found all constitutional means not sufficient to attract properly the attention of the authorities, what is the remedy left for those people who call themselves the followers of Mahatma Gandhi, except the last weapon which he has left in their armoury, namely to take recourse to satyagraha? They have taken to satyagraha. If they had done any mistake in carrying it on, you are justified in condemning it. Here, I am not going to defend any particular incident, or this and that. But I would only point out this, that satyagraha has been resorted to mainly as the last resort by the people there. I may say one thing here. If the course or the procedure that the alien Government, followed in the British days whenever satyagraha was made, would have been followed by you, by arresting the people and sending them to jail, nothing untoward could have happened anywhere. But your determination to ignore the fact that satyagraha is going on and to treat it as if it is nothing, and not even to keep your officers present there to see that the forests which are

there are protected, and the way in which the whole thing has led to an atmosphere of contempt and indifference have created a feeling of indignation and resentment there. And if in that course, something has happened, the responsibility, no doubt, is on those who have done it, but it is also a responsibility which lies very heavily upon the Department of Forests and the other Departments of the Government of the Bombay State. The notice was given that today forest satyagraha is to be had there, and we are going to ask not only those who are volunteers and who have come here to make satyagraha but also other people to join, if they want to do so; the notice was given, and it was in your hands, and you found hundreds of thousands going to the forests, but there was not a single forest officer or police officer present anywhere. I was present there....

Shri Mahagaonkar (Kolhapur): How were the forests burnt then?

Dr. M. S. Aney: I have not heard what the hon. Member has said, and he will excuse me if I do not reply to his interruption.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. B. Pant): The hon. Member may ignore the interruption.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I am rather serious, and I want to finish my speech as early as possible, so that other Members may get a chance.

Under these circumstances, if something untoward has happened, I would say that you will have to ask your officers to account for them, before you proceed against the other persons who have offered satyagraha or anybody who has entered there as a satyagrahi. What you do is this matter is a thing of more than local importance. So far as satyagraha is concerned, the satyagrahi is prepared to suffer the consequences of anything that is done, and if that had happened, I would have made no complaint at all in this House. I may tell you this very frankly. But

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

the thing is this. Leave aside the excesses that may have taken place as to why the people have taken to satyagraha. The matter has been put before you, and you know the whole thing. The response and the support which they are getting are not to be judged by the laconic reports which are sent by the P.T.I. or the D.T.I. and so on, but by the report of the people who are stationed there. Thousands and thousands come from distant villages to cheer them up, to send them into the forests and promise them 'If you are sent to jail, here we are following you'. Ladies are coming and joining them. Ladies of persons belonging to noble families are doing satyagraha. This is the beginning of the movement, and it is for you to see whether that movement should disappear or it should grow in strength hereafter. It will all depend on the attitude which the Government of India take in considering the demand of the people of Vidarbha that some attempt should be made to ascertain the opinion of the people of Vidarbha either by a referendum or by some kind of plebiscite. Let there be a promise that this thing would be done either at the end of this session or at the end of two or three years. Let there be some period fixed to revise the whole position and bring it in line with the opinion of the people ascertained in this way.

If the people come and decide that they want to merge with Maharashtra by a majority, I shall be the first to say 'yes'; now you have no ground to complain about the matter. If there is such a procedure followed, I am prepared to accept it. But if Government want that the present experiment should be carried on for some time, that matter also can be considered. But somehow or other, there must be a date, a time fixed, so that the people of Vidarbha have the hope that their opinion is going to be ascertained and they are going to be consulted before this becomes final. So let the present arrangement be provisional. If such hope is there, you will be giving the people of Vidarbha a chance to be with

you as your loyal followers, which they have been all these years, in the future also. If you do not do that, I leave it to fate. They will go in wilderness and anything may happen. The responsibility for this will be equally on Government as well as on the people. A man like me is just consulted and I give whatever advice I think proper. But the main responsibility is on Government. Be not satisfied with the opinion of people who are sitting behind you and are prepared to say 'yes'. Do not go by the assumption that things are all right. Our friends are there. You thought like that in 1956 also. If you again think like this, in 1960 you will again be wrong. I hope Government will avoid the bitter experience of being drawn into a repetition of all that happened these three years.

We are discussing this Bill on the auspicious day of Ram Navratri. This continues for 9 days in Chaitra.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati) It is also All Fools' Day.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I did not hear my hon. friend. So, his interruption is useless to me.

Shri Hem Barua: I said today is also All Fools' Day.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I shall finish my speech with relating a story from Ramayan. I think my hon. friends should have the benefit of listening to the story. In the days of their exile, Ram and Lakshman had gone to see the south and they went to the side of a lake called Pampa. By the sight of the placid waters of the Pampa lake, Ram was enchanted by the natural scenery. He found that some ducks were swimming across the surface of the lake. Ram said to Lakshman: 'Lakshman, do you see how careful and cautious the duck is. He moves very slowly so that his claws do not injure the fish which are in the water. To avoid harming the fish, he is swimming so slowly'.

वकोऽयं परमधार्मिकः

These are the words used in Ramayan. He said that the duck was so pious. Fortunately, the fish was hearing what Ram said and he was given the gift of replying in human speech. The fish said:

किम्बकम् क्षंस राम ये नाऽहम् निष्कृतीकृतः

'This duck has destroyed all my family and all my progeny.' Oh Ram, why do you praise him?

सहवासी विजानाति सहवासि विचेष्टितम्

The neighbour knows the actions of the man. My reply to the hon. Home Minister is this. He praised the Government of Bombay and said that in three years they have achieved so many things. It is the people of Vidarbha who can say about that. Ask the people of Vidarbha, and not the representatives who are sitting behind. Then you will know whether it is a good Government or a bad Government or any other Government.

With this I conclude. I thank you for the indulgence you have given to me.

Shri Mahagaonkar: He cannot accuse the representatives of Vidarbha like this.

Shri B. G. Mehta (Gohilwad): I would like the House to recall the days when we were debating another measure sometime back. That measure was also sent to a Joint Committee. The Joint Committee had almost finished its deliberations. At that time, some of the Members of this House as well as some Members from the other House felt it their duty to bring to the notice of the leader of the House the great and intense dissatisfaction that was prevalent in sections of the Houses of Parliament as well as among the public outside. We saw a situation which was not edifying, which was not pleasant and which was fraught with danger. There was a sort of linguistic fanaticism in the air, and from every

quarter there was a demand for separation and disintegration. The poison—the virus—had gone so deep that the leaders of the nation considered the situation from day to day and tried to reach a solution, if it were possible, which would satisfy most sections of the people, if not all.

It was from that point of view that several formulae were placed before this House from time to time—in order to solve a really difficult and complicated problem. Even though the Joint Committee had endorsed the recommendations in the Bill at the time for a three-unit formula, the Members of both Houses not being satisfied and knowing fully that it was not going to be to the satisfaction of the people and was not going to be abiding and lasting, represented to the leader that it was necessary to reconsider the whole thing and find some other solution.

There were certain solutions that were not acceptable to one side; there were others which were not accepted by the other side. In that predicament, the Members of both the Houses in a friendly spirit suggested that we should hit upon what was called the device of a bilingual State. At the Amritsar session, the Congress had endorsed this idea and there were hopes that there would be a few bilingual States in this country in order to combat the poison of extreme linguism that was in the air in those days. It was accepted by the country, but when it came to implementation, they found certain difficulties and, therefore, they could not implement it. If there was a bilingual State on the eastern side, as was then supposed to be coming into being, or if there had been another such bilingual State, say, in the south, the experiment of the bilingual State in the west also would have endured. When the representation was made in the light of the Amritsar Congress resolution, it was supposed that it was not going to be an exception but was going to be followed up by a few more such States.

[Shri B. G. Mehta]

This was considered to be a remedy to a disease which was eating into the vitals of our national life. As such, it was proposed by many of us here and it was accepted by the Parliament and also by the country. Those groups which were more or less holding contradictory views on certain special matters came together on this formula of a bilingual State of Bombay; and we thought that we had done a good job in combating the evil tendency and made it safe for the future prosperity of this country by adopting a formula which would keep together people who had been there for a long time working together, acting more or less as supplementary to each other and pooling their resources, not only material, but also of intellect and various other things.

This pooling of resources and continuing to work together for building up this great nation and making all efforts to bring about peace and plenty to the people of this country was the great and noble objective for which we accepted at that time the formula of the bilingual State. Not that everybody was very accommodating, not that everybody was overjoyed with it, but it was accepted as a formula, as I said before, in order to combat a particular evil tendency that was then prevailing in the country.

It was also accepted, whether it was liked or not, because it was thought that this will make an end of a very unpleasant chapter and open out possibly an era of co-operation. It was because of this that it was accepted by the leaders, both in Gujarat and in Maharashtra.

An Hon. Member: No.

Shri B. G. Mehta: But there were large sections in Bombay-Maharashtra which were not satisfied; and it was proved in the general elections when they had registered their protest by voting against the Congress. In Gujarat also, a section was very much dissatisfied and there were very unplea-

sant happenings about which we cannot take any pride.

All this happened in spite of the earnest efforts of the leaders who took an objective and dispassionate view in order to find a solution which would be acceptable to all people. But in spite of the best support being given by all the influential people to the experiment of a bilingual State, no less a person than the Chief Minister of the State, after his own experience of the administration for some time, came to the conclusion that this cannot continue because it has not facilitated the emotional integration of the two units that were mainly there in this bilingual State. Though, as the Chief Minister has publicly acknowledged, full support and co-operation were forthcoming from the Gujarat Members of the Legislature, even then he felt that there were certain doubts, misgivings and misunderstandings and that there was something which kept apart the two sides and could not bring the two together in order to make them one. So, he, because of his experience and wisdom, came to the conclusion that the matter should be reviewed. And, it was with that view that the Congress Working Committee took up this question and invited the leaders of opinion in the various units of Bombay and tried to find a solution which may not aggravate matters but which would pacify, soothe and harmonise the various conflicting claims.

We have just heard our esteemed friend, Dr. Aney, speaking for Vidarbha. That was a big problem. It was not as if we just discard this bilingual formula and get something which is acceptable to all. The problem was bristling with difficulties and complications which could not be easily brushed aside. But under the able guidance of our Home Minister, the Nine-Man Committee which went into this problem hammered out a solution. That solution also may not be appealing to all people. But I can claim that the solution has been acclaimed by a large majority of the people. The bulk of

public opinion has accepted it. Therefore, while it is fortunate that there are still people who have certain misgivings and who are not prepared to lend their whole-hearted support, I can say so far as I can see or read the signs of the times, that this latest decision, first of the Congress and then of the Government, has appealed to many sections of the people. A large and predominant volume of public opinion has accorded its welcome to this proposal; and, therefore, it is up to us now to accept what has come out as an agreement from the Nine-Man Committee and which has been endorsed by the Government and which is now embodied in the present Bill. Therefore, I am here to support the motion for referring this Bill to the Joint Committee where all points of view could be placed and further agreement sought if there is any ticklish point which has not yet received sufficient attention or which has not satisfied any important section of the people.

It is with this background that we have to view the present Bill. There have been a few issues, say, regarding the border between the two States that are now proposed, or the financial settlement, of certain claims for Gujarat being a deficit State and a few other questions. Some of the hon. Members have drawn attention to some of the points.

There has been a complaint that we have not accepted a certain set of principles; we have not put in motion a specific machinery in order to go into these various conflicting claims and in order to hammer out a certain acceptable solution. I do not think that that complaint is correct because the Bhat-tacharya Committee, and, later on, Shri Rangachari here, people who cannot be accused of being partisan one way or the other, have gone into this question and have suggested solutions which have been accepted by the leaders of the two units. So, we cannot say that there has been no principle behind the arrangement and that it has been a completely *ad hoc* arrangement. We might say that there

is a great principle behind this and that principle is that the leaders on both sides accept the agreement, and that the agreement has been arrived at after study, after mature thought and after discussions with all parties concerned. It has not taken months or years; it may have taken only a few days; but, that does not mean that full thought was not given to the various problems. Various conflicting claims were considered in their entirety. This was done. Though there might have been certain differences between the two sides, they were prepared to accept the advice of an elder statesman, one of our nation-builders. His advice was accepted. So, here was the principle, that of an agreement between the different sides who were staking different claims. That agreement was arrived at after prior consultation, discussion and study. It was placed before our national leaders. Therefore, it is not merely an *ad hoc* arrangement, without any principle or based on any arbitrary method but it was fully gone into and the agreement was arrived at. So, we in this House should endorse that agreement because that means unity, cohesion and solidarity that we so much want in this country and because it is going to permit these two States to grow into a higher stature with complete amity and co-operation between themselves. It is, therefore, that I commend this method of arriving at solutions, rather than having committees and commissions which will take months and years and all the time the bitterness will continue and there will be a festering sore which will eat at the vitals of the nation. It is, therefore, that this method is more to be commended whether one may feel satisfied completely or not. That has not been possible on many other issues; that may not be possible on all issues but we ought to accept something which has been accepted by the leaders of public opinion on both sides. That is why I would recommend strongly the acceptance of the arrangement that has been arrived at by the leader and the deputy leader of the Bombay Legislature.

[Shri B. G. Mehta]

I am told that somebody in this House—if I am not wrong, my hon. friend, Shri Goray—has suggested that the deficit of Saurashtra and Kutch are being imposed on the State of Bombay, that is, the State of Maharashtra. That is an incorrect understanding of the situation because both Saurashtra and Kutch have, under an agreement with the Government of India, certain financial assistance to be given to them in lieu of certain rights that they had surrendered to the Government of India, the rights of customs and excise, income-tax and so on and that arrangement subsisted till yesterday, if I am not mistaken. So, it is not as if any deficit on account of Saurashtra or Kutch was being imposed upon the State of Maharashtra. Nothing of the kind. As the Finance Minister of Bombay has pointed out in his speech in the Bombay Council, here is a partnership of long-standing, about 150 years or so old. The partnership is being dissolved by accommodation, arrangement and agreement. It is up to the partners to see that none of them is put at a disadvantage in the new life initially. All these years, both Maharashtra and Gujarat profited from the surplus of the city of Bombay. It would have continued for a long time to come if we had not agreed to divide the State of Bombay into two units. It is nothing as if something new is being imposed. Here was an advantage which was being taken not by one unit but by both, Maharashtra and Gujarat, in more or less the proportion of the population—two-thirds and one-third. Now, that advantage would immediately terminate on the division of the State of Bombay into two units. You know the strong feelings Gujarat held regarding Bombay city's status. They wanted that there should be three units and a separate structure or administration for Bombay. But in deference to the cause of unity and nationalism, in spite of the strongly held views of Gujarat, they came to the conclusion that if it was going to

satisfy the people of Maharashtra, end the bad and unpleasant chapter once for all and open out a new era of peace and prosperity, Gujarat should agree to what Maharashtra has come to believe so strongly, even vehemently. They agreed in spite of themselves to the solution that Bombay would go to Maharashtra. But the consequence of Bombay going to Maharashtra is that on the morrow of division there will be a deficit of Rs. 9 crores, according to certain calculations and Rs. 4-5 crores, according to others. That was a problem that had to be tackled not only by Gujarat but by those who took the decision regarding the bifurcation of Bombay. A solution had to come not only from Gujarat and Maharashtra but from all of us. We had to devise some ways and means so that Gujarat was not called upon from the day it was established to impose taxation on the people of Gujarat to the extent of a few crores of rupees. If we look to the incidence of taxation per head of population in Gujarat it is something like Rs. 12.5 or so while for Maharashtra it is about Rs. 10

Shri Tyagi: Gujaratis are richer.

Shri B. G. Mehta: That is a fallacy which has been very much prevalent but has very little substance. I would like to point out that Gujarat is not Bombay. Now, the Bombay Gujaratis will go. They will be in Maharashtra now. Ahmedabad is not Gujarat. Apart from the textile industry of Ahmedabad, if our esteemed friend, Tyagiji, could point out to me other areas in Gujarat which are rich, I would be too glad to correct myself; I am prepared to withdraw my words also. Possibly Tyagiji does not remember that Gujarat means Kutch which was from very early days being ruled by anti-delunian methods for a long time and Saurashtra which was a congeries of 200 Indian States and in Gujarat apart from Saurashtra and Kutch, there

were something like 150 or so small States. Because of this there was no right development in Gujarat. There were boundaries and jurisdictions at every stage and claims from all sides. Therefore, it was not possible to develop Gujarat in every possible way. Only the five districts of Gujarat that were there in Bombay in the old days had the benefit of constitutional rule or the rule of law and certain guarantees of citizenship rights and so on and then a few were institutions of public life, of local-self-government and voluntary agencies. There could be some progress seen in those former areas of British Gujarat of those days. Now Gujarat is 17 districts and not 5 and Kutch could not be said to be really an advanced part of Gujarat nor could we say the same thing with regard to Saurashtra which, though it has bravely and gallantly put up an effort to come into line with the rest of the country, has not reached that stage..... (An Hon. Member: Adivasis). You may also know that the population of Adivasis is considerable in Gujarat, so also is the population of Harijans. There are various sections. Go to North Gujarat—Banaskantha. It is completely backward. Go to Central Gujarat or go to Cambay. There are places in Gujarat which have not had the benefit of rule of law or constitutional rule, which have not seen something like a Gujarat unit where you can have roads, irrigation schemes, mineral development and so on. All this is in its infancy in Gujarat. I am glad my hon. friend Tyagiji gave me an opportunity to explode a myth which has been sedulously spread throughout the country. It is all wrong. Gujarat is not Ahmedabad. I am glad we have decided to establish the capital not in Ahmedabad but near Sabarmati which has a noble tradition and association of ideas in the history of Gujarat and this country.

So, really speaking, neither Saurashtra nor Kutch has imposed any

burden on the State of Maharashtra. But it is understood, and I thought it was understood by the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti as well, that there has to be at the time of bifurcation a certain arrangement which will make it possible for the State of Gujarat, which was not asked for, but which has been, say, forced upon Gujarat, to carry on its work.

Now, here is the State of Gujarat. Do we want it to prosper or not? How could it be expected to impose taxation to the tune of Rs. 5 crores or Rs. 9 crores immediately after its establishment? It was accepted on all sides, by the nine-man committee, by the Government of India and all sections of public opinion including the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti—I know of certain discussions that took place.....

An Hon. Member: The Bombay Legislature also.

Shri B. G. Mehta: You can see the debates that took place in the Bombay Legislature. The Bombay Legislature unanimously endorsed this Bill. Though there have been certain differences expressed there, replies also have been given—you can refer to the debates if you like. So some arrangement had to be arrived at. Ordinarily, it would be something like one-third of the surplus of Bombay City. It would be then Rs. 8 crores to Rs. 9 crores. But Gujarat has accepted whatever has been suggested from here, either by Shri Rangachari or by Pantji, and it has been accepted with willingness though they know what it is going to cost them by way of making two ends meet. Even then they have accepted. So I would wish our friends of Maharashtra also would take it in that spirit and in that light.

Now, there is the status of Bombay. Many friends have expressed their anxiety on that score. I do not think there should be any misgivings. I do feel that the recommendation of the nine-man committee will be carried

[Shri B. G. Mehta]

out. That has been the declaration made by the Chief Minister of Bombay on the floor of the House, that has been what our Home Minister also has said. I do not know whether we cannot allay the fears and misgivings by making some mention of this desire on the part of all of us to retain the present cosmopolitan character of the city of Bombay and, for that purpose, whether we cannot devise by some ingenuity some measure which could give satisfaction to the people of the city of Bombay. I only wanted to refer to that point.

13 hrs.

Regarding the problem of Vidarbha, I know there are two strongly held contradictory views in that area, but I would appeal to my friends of Vidarbha that in spite of what they might feel, even though they may be holding strong views, they may give this decision a chance. After all, here is a great opportunity. All the Marathi-speaking areas are brought together at one place. Here is the huge surplus of Bombay which is going to be available for the development of the backward parts of the State of Maharashtra. Why not give it a trial, a trial with a view to help with every possible means to see that it succeeds. Such a trial ought to be given to this experiment, and in spite of certain strongly held views this experiment may be accepted. I think after some time they might feel as, I hope, the people of Telangana feel today, that it is good to be in the whole of Andhra, that it is good to be in the whole of Maharashtra so that they will have an opportunity to develop together.

An Hon. Member: They are already feeling.

Shri B. G. Mehta: They may so feel, but there are two views. We just now heard one of our leaders speaking about that. But I would appeal to all friends who differ from us to give it a trial and a handsome trial.

I am told our friends from Kutch have made a representation to the Home Minister regarding the problem of Kutch. That problem has been considered on its own merit, on a different footing. It was considered by the SRC where they maintained that Kutch is a Central responsibility, and the Centre while placing it in Bombay cannot divest itself of its responsibility to the people of Kutch because it is a border State, because it is a State which has remained in chronic backwardness for a very very long time. This fact was recognised by the SRC and they recommended that not only—then it was Bombay State—Bombay State but also the Centre will have to continue discharging certain responsibilities to the people of Kutch. Again, the Planning Commission had considered the same and endorsed the view of the SRC with regard to the interests of Kutch being taken care of by the Centre. The same thing was considered in the previous Joint Committee, where both Shri Bhawanji-bhai and myself had the honour to be members, where also it was recognised, on the merit of the case of Kutch, that there shall be a continuing responsibility on the part of the Centre so that the people of Kutch may not feel as if they are not duly considered in any reorganisation. I would place the case of Kutch before this House and before the Government. The same may be considered with regard to several backward parts. As I said, there are Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes a goodly number, and other backward classes in Gujarat which is going to be. Again, that is a problem not just belonging to one State or one set of people. It is a national problem, to bring people into line with other advanced sections, so that nobody feels as if he has no future in this country, and from that point of view we will have to consider the claims of Gujarat whenever they are placed before this Government.

Sir, I have done. I hope we shall be able unanimously to accept this motion, not only now but after the report is submitted later on, and that we will be able, as patriotic citizens of this country, to give it complete support and co-operation so that we might end this chapter of reorganisation once for all and open out a new era of peace and prosperity in this country.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Khadilkar:

Shri Khadilkar: (Ahmednagar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, my hon. friend who spoke just now has given a resume..
.....

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members will now confine their remarks to 15 minutes.

Shri Khadilkar: Sir, I shall try. Sir, I was saying that the hon. Member who preceded me has referred to the history of the bilingual State and how the Government has now come to the conclusion that it should sponsor a Bill revising the decision taken by this august House concerning the bilingual State. But, unfortunately, he has forgotten to mention one factor which has led to all the controversy. We on our side, when the Members of this House never had even thought about it, made an offer to the leaders of Gujarat, all parties united including the Communists, that let us give a trial for a bigger bilingual. That offer made in all confidence and hope was spurned aside by Gujarat leadership saying that there was something fishy about it.

An Hon. Member: It proved to be so.

Shri Khadilkar: All the trouble and all the later solutions which baffled the High Command were really due to this initial spurning of the offer, rejecting the hand of friendship and eternal partnership in the Indian Union. He ought to have mentioned that fact. Let me be very

plain and let me say why it so happened, before I come to the Bill proper.

In the Gujarat leadership today there is a tendency to equate the interests of Gujarat with the interests of India. This is a tendency which is not in keeping with Gandhian tradition and it has affected in many ways the whole pattern of Indian politics. There is a certain amount of paternalism in Gujarat politics in the democratic era of today, and we do not understand what are the vital urges of the people. Therefore, even now, when a decision has been taken, when people in Maharashtra and Gujarat have agitated for the reversal of the decision previously taken because they felt that certain things were being imposed by this House without taking into consideration the will and the wishes of the people, the prospective Chief Minister of Gujarat would say in Gujarat today that, left to themselves, Gujarat would have preferred to remain in the bilingual State! Because of this paternal attitude in politics, they do not understand the democratic feelings of the people and fail to adjust themselves to the democratic processes.

After saying this by way of preliminary remarks, I would like to touch the main problem. I feel that we have reached the final stage of the process of States reorganisation. Unfortunately, those who were entrusted with the destinies of this country did not give enough thought to this problem; they did not lay down the principles nor did they make a plan as to how this thing should be brought about. When the issue was discussed, in the Constituent Assembly, the then leadership thought it should be shelved for the time being. Then, the first decision was taken concerning Andhra Pradesh, and it was taken under certain emotional and impulsive impact and not by giving due consideration as to how it would affect the whole of India and other

[**Shri Khadilkar**]

language regions, because, when I plead for a language State, I do consider what are its drawbacks in the Indian Union and what are its pitfalls and shortcomings also. Language is a force of social integration and in the Indian Union, with different levels of language development, if it takes a certain amount of chauvinistic turn with an exclusive nationalistic spirit behind it, it is likely to prove detrimental to the unity of India. Therefore, while taking measures to satisfy the aspirations of the language regions, and legitimate aspirations at that, we who are sitting here as representatives of the people should also take care to see that the sense of Indian unity which keeps all States together is in no way touched or undermined. This point is absolutely necessary at this hour.

I said that the High Command never gave a thought to this problem and never had any principle. I will give you one small instance. My hon. friend referred to the border area. I would like to ask, "What did you do regarding Abu?" Abu legitimately belongs to Rajasthan. But in the ruling hierarchy, where only a few States have a dominant voice and others have none.....

Shri P. R. Patel (Mehsana): May I submit that my hon. friend knows little of Abu, but he is talking about it!

Shri Khadilkar: I know everything. I shall place all records before him if he wants. Ultimately, because of this dominant voice and because of a desire, a most unhealthy desire, that one State must have a port, must have a hill station, must have rich forests, etc.....

Mr. Speaker: We have enough trouble between two States and so why should other States also be brought in here? If a number of other instances are brought in, it will lead to a diversion from the present subject. The hon. Minister will have

certainly to explain the reasons if such charges are made against something else which is not the subject-matter before us. Generally, when the hon. Member said that there is a pull this way and that way, I allowed those remarks. But he need not pursue the topic all round.

Shri Khadilkar: I just mentioned it because they take a certain decision in their wisdom because of certain influences and later on they have got to reverse it. Therefore, I mentioned it. I have no desire to pursue that point. Unfortunately, the bilingual State was established in distrust because some people wanted to exercise a veto on the future of Bombay. I am using the expression, if I remember correctly, from one of the private communications of the Prime Minister to one of the magnates of Gujarat. Therefore, the controversy really stirred the emotions of the people and the people felt that "here is a blatant injustice done by the High Command."

I have read through the Bill. Let me be very frank before this House and tell the hon. Home Minister, who has taken this bold step of carving out two States for which I really congratulate him, that there is a string of distrust in several provisions of the present measure also. I will just refer to a few provisions. Take the question of the border between Gujarat and Maharashtra. About Umbergaon *ad hoc* decisions are taken. There is no principle. False information sometimes is made use of. All the Gram Panchayats—there are eight of them—are nominated. Out of the eight, only four have opted out for Gujarat. The hon. Minister has got the information in his possession. As regards Dangs, it has been decided that it should form part of Gujarat. I do not want to labour this point, but I would like to point out one aspect. It is basically a tribal area and the interests of those people must be of vital concern to everybody. It is a ticklish problem.

For the time being, if there is no agreement, why not keep this disputed area, in the interests of the tribals also, in charge of the Centre? Later on, you can decide upon the issue.

An Hon. Member: Why not Bombay also?

Shri Khadilkar: It is a tribal belt. I have gone there. The people there feel that they have any value. There are rich forests there and the exploitation of the forests is going on from year to year. Why not these forests, which is national property, and those who live there for ages, be in charge of the Centre? For example, my hon. friend's name, Dange, comes from those areas. He comes from those areas. I may tell you for your information. Therefore, so as the Dangs are concerned, you should not take a hasty decision.

An Hon. Member: It must be given to Shri Dange then!

Shri Khadilkar: If certain spots of discontent are kept alive, let me warn you of this. As you have found regarding the bilingual State, you will find later on that those spots develop a sort of ulcers and these ulcers will take a malignant turn and you will have to find out some solution and some sort of remedy to remove that malignancy. So, between two States, when you demarcate the border, whether it is Gujarat and Maharashtra or Mysore and Bombay, the decisions are not taken with that objectivity, and with a plan that we will educate the people and tell them that we are carving out the map of new India; here are the areas; boundaries will be decided on this basis and the areas will comprise these territories. If you had done that, educated the people and then reorganised the States after five or seven years, instead of taking a decision on the spur of the moment, because some esteemed comrade in Andhra died and there was a disturbance, it would have been proper. You take decision

when there is a disturbance; you take decision when somebody dies, but you never take a decision if people argue and prove with all reasonableness their claims. Here is a case regarding Mysore-Bombay border or Gujarat-Bombay border. Therefore, I would appeal, take a decision on some principles.

Mr. Speaker: Some hon. Members from Mysore have written to me and I may refer to that. I do not think the border dispute between Mysore and Maharashtra is relevant here. This is only between Maharashtra and Gujarat.

An Hon. Member: But references have been made.

Mr. Speaker: If they are made, it is not right.

Shri Mahagaonkar: When this problem of the new State coming up is discussed, why not we suggest that certain areas that are in Mysore State should be taken into consideration by the Home Minister and the Government and by this House? Is it a folly on our part to bring in that?

Shri Basappa (Tiptur): That issue was finally settled in this Parliament. It cannot be opened, unless there is agreement..... (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: The point is this. Hon. Members are aware that Gujarat State is carved out of the Bombay State and the balance remains. If a portion which has gone to Mysore has to come here, that is not part of the Bombay State. Gujarat is carved only from the present Bombay State. This is an independent issue where the legislature of the Bombay State has also looked into this matter. Likewise, the legislature of the Mysore State also has to look into this matter, if that is brought in. Many things may be good, but they are not relevant to this issue. Even if some references might have been made, hon. Members may ignore those references so far as that dispute is concerned.

[Mr. Speaker]

The House will not accept any such one-sided references. Therefore, I am not going to allow any reference to the dispute between Mysore and Bombay, merely because some hon. Member from Maharashtra or from Mysore wants to talk about it.

श्री खादीबाला (इन्दौर) : अध्यक्ष जी, जब कि बम्बई के प्रश्न पर चर्चा हो रही तभी तो समय है कि जहाँ जहाँ नये प्रदेश बने हैं वहाँ के सदस्य अपने राज्यों के बारे में भी कुछ कह सकें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं जी। इस समय हम गुजरात और बम्बई के प्रश्न पर विचार कर रहे हैं किमी और प्रश्न पर नहीं। इसलिये यह अलग बात है। इस पर और राज्यों की बात करना अनुचित होगा।

Sardar A. S. Salgal (Janjgir) : My learned friend has raised the point that the question of other States also may be taken up. May I humbly submit that this question relates only to Bombay and other States will not be dragged in?

Mr. Speaker : I have said so.

Shri Khadilkar : So far as Ukai is concerned, out of 156 villages, 97 villages are such which would not be submerged under water. I want to point out to the Home Minister that this decision is against the very spirit of the Constitution. I would like to appeal to him that if he is going to decide the question of villages that are not submerged under water under a particular project in this manner, he is laying down a very bad precedent. I will just mention one or two instances in this regard, because it is said agreement is a principle. For the first time I have heard it. The hon. Member who spoke before me said it. Whatever has been agreed upon, must be examined by this House very thoroughly. A certain principle is laid down in the Constitution and therefore we are sitting here.

So far the Ukai arrangement is concerned, it is detrimental to the future development, because it will lay down a very bad precedent. For instance, the Ukai project was first conceived as an irrigation project. Now it is talked of as a power project. If it becomes a power project, water will be wasted in an area where it is of no use, because the experience of Kakrapara is such that because of 40 to 50 inches of rainfall there, water is not being utilised. Therefore, I would appeal to the Home Minister: Let the matter be referred to an irrigation and power commission, to some new committee, and let it be examined. Otherwise, the same principle will be demanded in the case of Rihand and other projects that are to come up. So, you should not lay down a bad principle.

Coming to financial arrangement, so far as the arrangement for the first two years is concerned, I do not take any exception, nor the Samiti, when it agreed upon some formula, had taken any exception. There is no serious objection about making some provision for the building up of a capital also. But another question is involved regarding the financial arrangement after two years. How can you predict the long-term prospective deficit of a State and make some provision? That is one aspect. Apart from it, under our Constitution, after five years, you have got a Finance Commission to go into all the details and lay down a principle of disbursement or grants-in-aid from the Centre. We have before us the reports of the Finance Commission.

I would like to point out, as a matter of principle, that here also you are contravening the spirit of the Constitution in order to bring about this agreement, which is, as I said, based more on distrust and a certain spirit of bargain. There is no spirit of partnership. I wish that Gujarat should have shown a little generosity and should have shown greater respect

to the basic principles of the Constitution, while coming to some sort of agreement. It is not there. (Inter-ruption). I will not take a long time on this issue. There is a precedent of Andhra and Madras. When they were separated, a certain principle was followed."

13.24 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

I will just read out one small paragraph from what the Finance Commission (1957) has said about it:

"The gap between the ordinary revenue of a State and its normal inescapable expenditure should, as far as possible, be met by sharing of taxes. Grants-in-aid should be largely a residuary form of assistance given in the form of general and unconditional grants."

Regarding Andhra, it has said:

"Andhra Pradesh has special problems arising out of reorganisation."

This principle ought to have been followed; that is why I am quoting it.

"It has also inherited the difficulties of the former Andhra State consequent on its separation from Madras. We recommend a grants in aid of Rs. 4 crores a year to this State."

I would like to appeal to the hon. Members, those who are parties to this agreement, because, after all, when we endorse this agreement here, as the bi-lingual formula was endorsed by us, without taking the wishes of the people, if you endorse an agreement which does not meet with the wishes of the people, contrary to the basic fundamentals of the Constitution, it will be challenged by the people. That danger is there. Therefore, the responsibility of the Finance Commission that will be appointed after two years should not be brushed aside. I do not say that there would not be any deficit. Let Gujarat also become equally prosperous. They are

already prosperous than what we are. We do not envy them. Because, they have that knack, a certain amount of business acumen, industrial ability and all that. But this principle should not be laid down.

One more word and I shall finish. There was a reference to Bombay and what they are losing in this separation. I must confess that I was rather disappointed when my old friend, Shri Balwantrai Mehta, talked about Bombay. When you are separating you do not realise one aspect, or you do not bring to the notice of the House one aspect. 95 per cent. of the commercial and industrial capital that is in Maharashtra belongs to non-Maharashtrians and a major portion of it belongs to Gujarat. Yesterday, my hon. friend, Shri Yajnik said "We have invested Rs. 200 crores in Bombay". Why only Rs. 200 crores. Every grocery shop, every cloth shop, every factory, every mill, every big or small enterprise belongs to them. Certainly they have enterprise, they have ability. (Interruptions). I am paying tribute to their ability. Nobody is going to confiscate their property or drive them out. Therefore, in their own interest, they should not bring in the argument "We are losing something, we are giving away Bombay". No. I would appeal to them, there is scope for you, you come again and have more industries.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Scope for me as well?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Punjab setting up industries in Bombay?

Shri Khadilkar: There is scope for them, for our development. Let it be a joint development. Do not enter with a spirit as if we are belonging to two sovereign States. That feeling should not be generated. One word more.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has already taken too much time.

Shri Khadilkar: I will end in one minute. Yesterday, a reference was

[Shri Khadiolkar]

made to the Samiti. I am also a constituent party to the Samiti and, therefore, it would not be proper for me not to refer to it. The Samiti and the Maha Gujarat Parishad, both these organisations came into being and showed their strength in a particular moment of history. They came through a process of struggle. When the basic issue is solved, it is very natural that the basis on which this unity was forged will have to be reconsidered. It cannot be continued in the same old fashion. All the parties in Maharashtra as well as Gujarat will have to give serious thought whether in order to bring about a healthy democratic life in this area they should reconsider the whole position and find out a new basis of unity. That time has come.

श्रीमती जयाबेन शाह (गिरनार) :

माननीय उपाध्यक्ष जी, इस सदन में इस विषय पर चार साल के बाद फिर भी चर्चा हो रही है। हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने इस बिल के बारे में ठीक तरह से कह दिया है और माननीय बलवन्त भाई जी ने भी इसके बारे में बहुत कुछ कहा है। तो मुझे इसके बारे में कुछ खाम कहने की जरूरत नहीं थी। लेकिन हमारे दिल में ऐसा हो रहा है कि जब हमारी सटेट्स का सेपेरेशन हो रहा है तो हम प्रेम से अलग हों। लेकिन हमारे बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने जो कुछ कहा है उसमें मालूम होता है कि वह अभी तक सही रास्ते पर नहीं आये हैं और सही रास्ते पर नहीं चलना चाहते हैं। जो बात है उसको यहां पर उलट कर बताया जाता है और सारे सदन को खबर में डालने का प्रयत्न किया जाता है।

कल माननीय डांगे साहब ने बताया कि गत समय जो निर्णय इस सदन ने लिया था उसमें कुछ कमिशनल और कंपीटलिसट इंटररेस्ट ने विजय पायी। यह जाहिर बात है कि वह निर्णय किसने किया था। यह निर्णय तो सारे सदन के अगुए सदस्यों ने और पार्टी लीडर्स

ने मिलकर किया था, तो वहां पर कंपीटलिसट और कमिशनल इंटररेस्ट कहाँ से आ गये, उनको तो पता भी नहीं था जबकि यहां पर वह निर्णय स्वीकार किया गया। गुजरात वाले तो सोये हुये थे और यहां पर वह निर्णय रातों रात पलट दिया गया था। तो मैं समझती हूँ कि इस प्रकार बातों को ट्विस्ट करने से कोई फायदा नहीं है।

गंगे साहब ने बतलाया कि हमको तो पहले से ही मंजूर नहीं था। लेकिन मैं बताना चाहती हूँ कि उसका सदन को कैसा पता चल सकता। माननीय अशोक मेहता जो उनके लीडर थे उन्होंने इनीशिएटिव लेकर सारे सदन के सदस्यों का मिगनेचर लेकर माननीय पंडित जी को दिया था। जब उनके लीडर ने यह किया तो उसका वरडिक्ट उनके फालोअपमें पर वाइडिंग था। लेकिन अब पता चला कि वह तो लीडर विदाउट फालोअप है महाराष्ट्र में।

जब यहां चर्चा हो रही थी तो हम मौराष्ट्र के लोग भी अपने यहां बैठ कर इस पर चर्चा करते थे और जब यहां से संदेश गया कि निर्णय पलट दिया गया है तो हमारे बीच ऐसी चर्चा हुई कि यह बहुत बड़ा स्टेट होने से हमको एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव डिफीकल्टी होगी, तो ऐसा होना अच्छा नहीं है। मगर बतलाया गया कि यह देश की सालीडेरिटी के लिये है, यूनिटी के लिये है, नेशनलिज्म के लिये है, जैसा कि श्री बलवन्त भाई जी ने बतलाया, इसलिये हमने कुछ नहीं कहा। इस निर्णय पर गुजरात के कुछ लोग नागज हुये और भाई भाई में इस विषय पर झगड़ा चल पड़ा। फिर भी हमने इस निर्णय को स्वीकार कर लिया। यह हमारा कुसूर है या किसी और का, यह तो तवारीख को तय करना पड़ेगा। मैं तो समझती हूँ कि जो निर्णय यह सदन करता है या इसके सदस्य करते हैं उसकी पूरी प्रतिष्ठा होनी चाहिये, उसको पूरा गौरव

दिया जाना चाहिये। हम गुजरात वालों ने यह निर्णय होने के बाद उसका विरोध नहीं किया, उसके प्रति इनडिमिप्लिन नहीं दिखाया और हम चले और वह स्टेट कैसे आगे बढ़े और कैसे सफल हो इसके तरीके हम ढूँढ़ने लगे। मगर मुझे कहने में थोड़ा संकोच भी होता है और दुःख भी होता है कि जो निर्णय इस पार्लियामेंट ने लिया उस को पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों ने लिया और जिसमें हमारे लीडर शामिल थे, कायम करने की सब ने पूरी कोशिश नहीं की किसी ने तो ऐसा कहा कि Nothing is final in Democracy और ऐसा भी कहा गया Bombay is geographical part of Maharashtra सही है। यह कोई नई बात नहीं है। मगर एक और हम चाहते थे कि बार्डलिंगवेल स्टेट चले। और दूसरी ओर ऐसा बोलते रहे जिससे जनता के दिल में पूरा विश्वास नहीं हुआ। जब हमारे देश में गिग्विस्टिक फनेटिनिज्म चल रहा है तो इस मामले में सहयोग होना जरूरी था। तो हमने इस बात को समझते हुये इसको मंजूर किया। उन्होंने भी उस निर्णय को स्वीकार किया था, वह तो नेशनल इश्यू बन गया था। उसमें सभी शामिल थे। अब वह उसमें से अलग नहीं हो सकते।

यहां पर कुछ पैसे की ओर बाउंडरी की बात कही गयी है। मैं कहना चाहती थी कि ऐसे मौके पर जबकि हम अलग हो रहें, अगर हम इन झगड़ों में न पड़ते तो अच्छा होता। मगर ऐसा होता है कि अगर कोई नहीं बोलता तो उसकी बात का किसी को पता ही नहीं लगता। मैं गॉरे साहब का बहुत आदर करती हूँ। मैं चाहती थी कि वह इन छोटी बातों को न उठाये। मगर उन्होंने डांग की ओर उमरगांव की छोटी मोटी बातें लेकर खड़ी कीं। उन दिनों में जब वह फैसला करना चाहते थे और चाहते थे कि बम्बई और गुजरात में कम्प्रोमाइज हो जाये और हम बम्बई को छोड़ दें, उस समय तो जो आज हालत है उसमें भी वह आगे जाना चाहते थे, आज तो ४५ करोड़ में

भी नाराज हैं और जहां तक बाउंडरी का सवाल है उस समय वह खोनादेश के जो ६ ताल्लुक हैं उनके बारे में भी वह सोचना चाहते थे। पर उनके बारे में मुझे ज्यादा पता नहीं है। मगर हमारे याजनिक साहब के साथ इस बारे में वह बातें कर रहे थे, उनको ज्यादा पता होगा लेकिन Now he can conveniently afford to forget such things. तो मैं उनसे पूछना चाहती हूँ कि ये बातें कहाँ तक सही हैं।

मैं आपसे कहना चाहती हूँ कि बम्बई में किसी ने यहां तक कहा कि गुजरात के लोग तो शाईनाक हैं। मैं पूछना चाहती हूँ कि कौन शाईनाक है। हम तो चाहते थे कि जो कुछ हो.....

Shri Mahagaonkar: Who has called Gujaratis as shy and all that?

Shri Goray (Poona): Not shy, but Shylock.

Shri M. B. Thakore (Patan): Deshpande.

Shri Mahagaonkar: It was used in the Assembly and not in this House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then also she has reason to say like that.

धीलती जयाबेन शाह: अब प्रिमिपल की बात कर रहे हैं। उनके लिये जब फायदा होता है तो कहते हैं कि वह प्रिमिपल की बात है, और जब फायदा नहीं होता तो उसमें प्रिमिपल नहीं होता। मैं समझती हूँ कि ये सारी बातें गलत हैं और इस तरह सदन को भ्रम में डालना ठीक नहीं है। माननीय डांगे जी कह रहे हैं कि हम तो प्रिमिपल पर चल रहे हैं। बाउंडरी के लिये उनके दिल में भी दुःख हो रहा है और न जाने क्या क्या वह छोटे मोटे गांवों की बातें कर रहे हैं। उसकी उनके मन में बड़ी चिन्ता है। मैं उनसे पूछना चाहती हूँ कि खीन ने हमारे देश के इतने बड़े भाग पर कब्जा कर लिया है पर उसके बारे में उनके मन में इतनी चिन्ता नहीं

[श्रीमती जयाबेन शाह]

है जितनी कि उमरगांव के लिये होती है।
ना मैं समझती हूँ कि....

Shri P. S. Daulta (Jhajjar): I want to know whether China is in Gujarat or in Bombay. We are not allowed to talk.....(Interruption).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri P. S. Daulta:about Punjabi suba and Hariana prant because we are allowed to talk only about Maharashtra.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri P. S. Daulta: But China can be talked of. I want to speak about Punjabi suba. I want to speak about Hariana prant.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now in spite of my interruption he has spoken. I was asking the hon. Member to resume his seat but even then he continued. How can he complain then against others?

Now the hon. Member must confine herself to the issues that are before the House.

श्रीमती जयाबेन शाह : यहां पर उकाई ईम का जिक्र किया गया। मैं तो इस झगड़े की बात भी नहीं करना चाहती लेकिन कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने यहां ये बातें की। उन्होंने जान-बूझ कर ये बातें यहां उठायीं मगर घमेल में बात यह है कि जो गांव डूबने वाले हैं उनका कैसे रिहैबिलिटेशन हो, उसके एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का प्रोग्राम्योर कैसे जल्दी से तै हूं। उनके लिये दो मान की पट्टी मांगी गयी है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं मननीय होम मिनिस्टर साहब को बतलाना चाहती हूँ कि जब दो माइल की पट्टी देने के बारे में तय किया गया था, तो उस में जितने गांव आते हैं, उन में से कई गांव निकाल दिये गये हैं यह बहुत छोटी बातें हैं, इसलिए मैं इन के बारे में कुछ अधिक

नहीं कहना चाहती हूँ। लेकिन जब कुछ माननीय सदस्य इन का जिक्र करने पर तुल गये हैं, तो ऐसी स्थिति में मेरा यह फ़र्ज है कि मैं भी अपना दृष्टिकोण यहां पर रखूं।

जहां तक स्टेट के नाम का सम्बन्ध है, मैं पहले से कह दूं कि महाराष्ट्र नाम से मेरा कोई झगड़ा नहीं है, कोई एतराज नहीं है, लेकिन यदि इस विषय पर आबजक्तिव तौर पर विचार किया जाय, तो प्रश्न उठता है कि क्या हम हर एक प्राविन्स को राष्ट्र-नेशन—कहना चाहते हैं। नेशन तो एक ही है और वह है भारत देश हमारा। यदि महाराष्ट्र बने, गुजरात राष्ट्र बने—जैसा कि पहले गुजरात को कहा जाता था—बंग राष्ट्र बने, कर्लिंग राष्ट्र बने, तो फिर बाकी क्या रह जाता है? यदि इन फ़ीलिन्ग को हम छोड़ने नहीं हैं और पास्ट हिस्ट्री की ऐसी बातों को हम अपने दिमाग से निकालते नहीं हैं, तो फिर हमारे देश की एकता कैसे कायम रह सकती है? लेकिन इस नाम पर मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है और मैं इस को फुल्ली एनडॉर्स करती हूँ। इस के साथ ही साथ हमें यह देखना चाहिए कि पहले हमारा देश है और फिर प्रदेश आता है।

जहां तक फ़िनान्शियल एडजस्टमेंट्स का सम्बन्ध है, आप चाहते हैं कि हम बम्बई प्रेसिडेंसी की डीबट्स पर न बोलें। इस बारे में मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि अगर हम ने उन का जिक्र नहीं करना है, तो फिर बे डिबेट्स हम लोगों में क्यों बांटी गई हैं। उन दिनों मैं बम्बई में थी और मैं ने उन डीबेट्स को बहुत गौर से सुना। इस सम्बन्ध में बहुत बड़े बड़े लोगों, लीडर्ज, की बातें सुनने के बाद मैं तो यह समझती हूँ कि बे चाहते हैं कि हम नंगे पैर बम्बई में चले जायें, तो उन को बहुत खुशी होगी।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्या उन को सलाह दे रही है कि बे सब कुछ भूल

जायें, तो फिर वह खुद ऐसी बात क्यों कहती है ?

श्रीमती जयाबेन शाह : ठीक है । वे यह कहना चाहते हैं कि बम्बई पर हमारा कोई हक ही नहीं है । यह बात तो इतिहास की है, हमारी अपनी नहीं है । ऐसी बातें करने से क्या होने वाला है कि इतना नहीं देना, उतना नहीं देना । चाहे हमें वह भी न दिया जाय । जो कुछ हमें दिया गया है, वह हमारा हक है । अगर हमारा हक नहीं होता है, तो जो कुछ हमें दिया गया है, चाहे उसे भी वापस ले लिया जाय । जो हम मांगते हैं, वह अपना हक मांगते हैं और हम कोई डोनेशन या भिक्षा नहीं मांग रहे हैं ।

बाहिर में, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि अब जब कि बम्बई राज्य का विभाजन हो रहा है, तो मैं चाहती हूँ कि हम सब बातें भूल जायें । ऐसी कई बातें भूल जाने से फायदा होता है । मैं भी उन को भूलना चाहती हूँ । आज हमारे दिक्की में ऐसी बातें नहीं हैं । जो बातें यहाँ पर कही गई हैं, मैं तो उन का जबाब देना चाहती हूँ, क्योंकि सदन में कहीं यह न समझ लिया जाय कि उन का जबाब देने वाला कोई नहीं है और इस लिए वे सही हैं । इसी लिए मैं ने उन का जिक्र किया है । अब यही उचित है कि हम भाई भाई और अच्छे पड़ोसी बन कर रहें और भविष्य में एक दूसरे की मदद करें ।

माननीय त्यागी जी श्री बलवंतराय जी ने बताया है कि गुजरात की क्या स्थिति है । बहुत से लोग हम को कहते हैं कि गुजरात तो खनी है, वह पिछड़ा हुआ नहीं है, इसलिए उस में सहायता की क्या जरूरत है । यह भी कहा जाना है कि वहाँ पर चीनी मिलों बाने हैं । ऐसे कुछ लोग हमारे यहाँ हैं । यह नहीं कि नहीं है । वे बड़े देश-प्रेमी और माहिर भी हैं । उन का कांटीव्यशन रहा है, है और प्राग भी रहेगा । मगर उन को देख कर यह तय न कर लिया जाय कि

गुजरात खनी है । मैं आप को बताना चाहती हूँ कि हमारे यहाँ २६ लाख तो प्रादिवासी हैं और १५ लाख हरिजन हैं, जिन का परसेंटज प्राबादी में सारे देश में सब से अधिक है । तब भी कहा जाता है कि वे खनी हैं, उन को पैसा देने की क्या जरूरत है । मैं तो यह कहती हूँ कि उन का शुभाशिष हो और वे खनी हो जायें, तो फिर हम को पैसों की जरूरत नहीं रहेगी । हमारे दिल में तो यही कामनायें हैं कि हम उन का कल्याण करें, जो हमारे पिछड़े हुए लोग हैं । जैसा कि बापू ने बतलाया था, हमारे सामने कौन है । दरिद्र-नारायण ही हमारा इष्टदेव है । गुजरात में बापू पैदा हुए थे । इसलिए हम समझते हैं कि उन की ओर हमारा खास ध्यान है । हम चाहते हैं कि हमारी जो स्टेट बने वह गरीबों, पिछड़े हुए प्रादिवासियों और हरिजनों की ओर निगाह रखे ।

श्री क० उ० परमार : (महमदाबाद—रजित—अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : गुजरात में हरिजनों की जो दशा है, वह सारे भारत में नहीं है । उन के लिए आप ने क्या कदम उठाया है ? मैं गुजरात से आता हूँ और मैं यह जानता हूँ ।

I am the only Member here and I know it.

श्रीमती जयाबेन शाह : इसीलिए तो हम यह कर रहे हैं ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : वह यही तो चाह रहे हैं कि स्टेट होगी, तो वे कदम उठावेंगे । यही तो वे कह रहे हैं ।

श्रीमती जयाबेन शाह : दरिद्र-नारायण हमारा इष्टदेव हैं उस की याद हम मौके पर गुजरात के दिन में भर आती है । हम चाहते हैं और हम प्रार्थना करते हैं कि इन उस के कारिबन हों और हम उस की निदमन कर सकें, इनकी ताकत और शक्ति हम को ईश्वर दे । आज हमारे दिन में कोई और बात नहीं है । हम

[श्रीमती जयाबन शाह]

सब भूल रहे हैं। हम एक्स्पेंशनिस्ट भी नहीं हैं कि हम औरों का मुल्क ले लेना चाहते हैं। हम अपनी आबादी आर्टिफिशियली बढ़ाना भी नहीं चाहते हैं। जो कुछ हमारा हो, उसी से हमें काफी संतोष है। इतना ही मैं कहना चाहती हूँ और आप ने मुझे जो समय दिया है, उस के लिए आप को धन्यवाद देती हूँ।

Shri Tyagi: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I heartily welcome the proposal that this Bill may be considered by the Joint Committee. This is a question which has been a matter of hot controversy in the whole of India. For some time past this question has been discussed not only in this forum but elsewhere as well. No doubt there has been some bitterness on this question but the whole nation will now be pleased to know that ultimately a solution has been found out.

Both these States are very potential ones and their politicians are good—astute politicians. I am quite sure that both these States will prove to be a model for the other old States, although they are new. They have a nice personnel to control and run the administration. They will prove to the whole of the nation that they are ideal States particularly in the matter of economy, etc. I am quite sure Gujarat will lead the whole country in the field of administration. They are new States but they have had the experience of all the pit-falls and the progress made by other States. They have learnt lessons from them. Both of them will surely be model States.

However, there is one thing which I would like to say and which I cannot omit. Since the time the S.R.C. was going to be appointed—and even in the Constituent Assembly—I have been opposing this idea of linguistic States. I have not been in agreement even with the so called Congress High Command in this matter, and I always have been feeling—though lonely—

that there should not be linguistic States. In the days of Gandhiji there was a trend towards consolidation of the nation—not only communities and religions but others also were all united, for all practical purposes one united India—and we actually won for ourselves a united India. The British left us in two pieces. I am reminded of the great personality, Sardar Patel, who completed within a short time the integration of the whole of India, bringing together all the 500 and odd States. He made it one united India. But it was unfortunate that Potti Sri Ramulu went on a hunger strike and we were just led into this issue of carving States on the basis of language, etc. It was unfortunate indeed.

Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada): I should like to give information about the Andhra State. It had an history of 45 years behind this agitation.

Shri Tyagi: That is true. But the crucial moment came when such a great patriot gave his life for it. That was a crucial moment which could not be resisted. That is why I am referring to it. I pray not only to the hon. the Home Minister but to the whole nation to now cry a halt to this process of disintegration. I hope the Government will take a little stiffer attitude in this matter from now onwards. I am quite sure if we had resisted the demand for S.R.C., perhaps things would not have come to such a pass. If we do not cry a halt now, my fears are the nation will get further divided. If the door is kept open, my fears are that perhaps Vidarbha will become one State. If the so-called popular Government goes on yielding to popular voice of a group of people—if that logic continues to be applied to our policies on matters like this, not only Vidarbha but Punjabi suba also must come into being. Nobody would be able to resist it.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kerdrapara): And U.P. will be divided.

Shri Tyagi: And perhaps U.P. will be divided. Saurashtra might in due course become a separate State. I do not know—there might be a tribal State as well. This process will go on and my fears are that the nation's progress—we are having so many development schemes—will be hampered to a great extent.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I think that my hon. friend does not put Vidarbha on the same footing as the tribal people.

Shri Tyagi: Now the Constitution makes it very easy. At the time of making the Constitution also this question was thoroughly discussed. Now the question of two-thirds majority, the taking of views of all the States, the absolute majority of this House, etc.—all those restrictive clauses which restrict the amendment of the Constitution do not apply in the matter of creating new States. It is not the present Government in power, many Governments might come in future—every Government might like to be a little more popular. I think, perhaps, the time has come, after the hon. the Home Minister and the Government are satisfied that the States have been fairly carved out, to change that Article of the Constitution and not allow an easy amendment to the Constitution with regard to the creating of new States. Otherwise, if it is left to the vagaries of the majority in power, my fears are that more new States have to be carved out. It is a pity that the politicians as a whole—I include all the politicians of India comprising all the parties—have not just proved their merit. I mean the whole generation of today has just failed to face the situation and we have yielded to all types of popular slogans and the result is that India is getting divided.

Shri D. R. Chavan (Karad): It is not division; it is a process of integration.

Shri Tyagi: The historians will write that the politicians of this generation have not been able to rise to the occasion, that they have not been able to resist the popular voice. The politicians do no doubt get elected

popular vote, they must resist whenever there is an occasion to do so. They must be able enough to resist the popular voice, the so-called popular voice not only in the interest of the country but also in the interest of the unity of the country. The slogans of language, etc. are quite good logically, but if you look at it from the emotional point of view, one does not like the idea of one part of India being recognised by means of one language and another part of India by means of another language. We are one people. We should not stand divided, even by religion and other things like caste and community.

There is another point. Perhaps the tendency will go on so long as the States are enjoying the powers that they do at present. Today the politicians in the States have got the balance of power. It is the States who directly deal with the people. Therefore, with a view to stopping this process of bifurcations and disintegration it may perhaps also be necessary to see that the powers of the States—since their number is increasing—are reduced to some extent just to make the Centre stronger enough not to ultimately allow these States to go astray. In due course of time, because of the popular demands, it may become difficult to settle the differences between one State and its neighbouring State or between the State and the Centre. There might come a time in this process when the States might like to be independent of the Union. I am drawing a very dark picture, but that is what my fears are. I suggest that the time has come, after this reorganisation is completed, to amend the Constitution in a manner so that no such contingency may be allowed to sway the judgement of Parliament.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Are you suggesting a unitary system as a solution?

Shri Tyagi: A system whereby States may enjoy local powers. I do not want to deprive the States of the power of doing real service to

[Shri Tyagi]

the people. They would be doing that. But there must be some such relationship finally established as to see that all the States look forward to the unity.

Shri P. R. Patel: Yes, so far as the projects are concerned.

Shri Tyagi: Coming to the Bill it has been fairly well considered. It was a controversial question, that is another matter, and even now there may be some people who might accuse the Home Minister or the Government of not having been quite fair, because people will look at the Bill from their own angle. Nobody can produce a Bill which will be unanimously accepted. It will be criticised from many angles, but on the whole I feel it is a balanced judgment, and since it has been arrived at with the consent of the people, the representatives of the people, I hope it will be well-received by the people there.

There is no doubt that my friends who come from Gujarat might feel a little about having to lose Bombay from the sentimental point of view because their centre of business has been there. One likes to have one's centre of business in one's own State. If I belong to U.P., I would very much like my centre of activity, of business etc., to be mostly in U.P., so that I might seek protection whenever I need it from my own representatives. That is very natural. That may be so, but I am quite sure the situation is not quite so bad yet that Gujaratis should in any way feel insecure in Bombay, because, after all, there are Punjabis, Bengalis and others spread all over the country engaged in their own industry or commercial activity. That has been the fashion for a long time past in India that we have been freely running our trade or business anywhere irrespective of the territories of a State. On that basis, I am quite sure that the commercial or industrial activities of the Gujaratis in Bombay would not in the least be adversely

affected. I hope the Bill will be passed with the agreement of the Members of this House also, as the people will read the speeches made in this House. I hope we will give them our best wishes and pass the Bill as far as possible unanimously. I support this Bill.

Shri Siva Raj (Chingleput—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I rise to support this motion to refer the Bill to a Joint Committee, I wish to assure you that I do not want to take part in the wordy warfare on what I call very minor issues between the virile Maharashtrians and the fragile Gujaratis.

I know that with the good offices of the Home Minister, all these issues can be settled, or straightened out, in the Joint Committee itself where representations can be made on behalf of every point of view.

So far as our party is concerned, we have taken the view that the best approach to this problem is the feeling expressed by the good old saying that all is well that ends well. Secondly, we are also actuated in discussions like this by a desire to follow what we call the middle path which the hon. Home Minister seems to have employed very successfully in the solution of this question.

My congratulations, in the first place, go to the people of Bombay, of the two units, Maharashtra and Gujarat, for their heroic fight and sacrifice which they have gone through in order to obtain their objective. In the second place, my congratulations go to the ruling party which is dominated by what they call the High Command, in that wisdom has dawned on them, though late, in that they have got the courage of conviction to revise their opinions and grant what is really the desire of the people in any part of the country. That seems to be a happy augury for the running of democracy in our country.

My third, and not the least, is my congratulations to the Home Minister. This Bill expresses the moderation and the ability with which he has brought about this settlement. In fact, this Bill records a settlement that has been arrived at with his intervention between the two sections of the population of Bombay.

14 hrs.

We, may have differences with the Home Minister, in fact I too have on one or two vital issues, but that does not stand in the way of paying my tribute both on my own behalf and on behalf of the Republican Party for the ability and the tact, the care and the caution and what is more, the sincerity of purpose which he has brought to bear upon the settlement of this issue which was causing a lot of unhappiness to the people of bilingual Bombay.

Such issues as have been raised by our friends, the Maharashtrians as also the Gujaratis, can best be left to be decided by the Joint Committee, and I hope there also wisdom will dawn and people will grapple with the realities of the situation and come to a settlement.

I was listening very intently to the speech of my old and esteemed friend Dr. Aney and his advocacy of the cause of Vidarbha. There is no doubt whatsoever that Dr. Aney is one of the ablest and most patriotic citizens of India, and that he, in his own way, has contributed his mite to the advancement and progress of our country. He has himself said that he has lived in an age which is gone by, and with all the sympathy that I have for him, for the cause that he has so vehemently put forward and for the appeal which he so fervently made to this House, I think the time has come when we have got to take things as they come and abide by what I call the decision of events or the logic of events. In a fast-changing world like ours, ideas change quickly, people also change very quickly, and, as has been said by somebody, the orthodoxy of yesterday becomes the heterodoxy of today. With these

remarks I still want to express my sympathy for the demand made by my hon. friend Dr. Aney.

With reference to the remarks made by my hon. friend Shri Tyagi, it is no doubt true that this question of linguism has taken a very ugly turn in our country, but once we sow the wind of linguism, it is very difficult not to reap the whirlwind of distintegration. Who is responsible for this sort of thing we do not know, but even if it is true that linguism is a feature of our political tendencies in India today, I join Shri Tyagi in appealing to all concerned, not merely the hon. Members of this House but also people outside who take part in the public life of the country, not to make linguism the main feature of their politics or the main feature of their political contribution.

There is one other matter which I should like to refer to in this connection. I have read some speeches made in the Bombay Legislative Assembly with regard to certain areas like Umbergaon and Dangs. I have also heard the speeches of my hon. friends from Gujarat, like Shri Yajnik and others. There is only one test that I would suggest to the hon. Home Minister and to the Members of the Joint Committee, that if it comes to a question of a review of the allocation of these areas between these two units, so far as the backward areas, if such there are, in those parts are concerned, they must be handed over to an administration which can have—of course, all administration is impersonal—on its body, like the State Governments, persons who will have the interests of the poor people and the down-trodden people and backward people at heart.

In taking that point of view, I may be wrong, but I feel, knowing as I do to a little extent the people of these two units, that the welfare of the backward areas is safer in the hands of the Maharashtrians than in the hands of the business-minded Gujarati friends.

With these words, I support the motion for reference of this Bill to a Joint Committee.

Shri Tyagi: The last remark was the bitterest.

Shri Valvi (West Khandesh—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak on the Bill for the bifurcation of the Bombay State. However, I shall confine my views to the Adivasi areas.

I have gone through the Bill carefully, and I find it most detrimental to the Adivasi areas. I am sorry to say that no principles have been adopted for the inclusion of the Adivasi areas in the proposed new States, nor do I find in the Bill mention of rehabilitation of the persons who are likely to be displaced by the Ukai project. Three-fourths of the area of about 156 villages are populated by the Adivasis to the extent of 85 to 95 per cent. On account of this Bill, one-third of the area will be in Gujarat and one-third of the area will be in Maharashtra, and the remaining one-third will be submerged in the Ukai dam.

Again, the area in the hills will be separated by the proposed Narmada project. The two-mile strip on each side of the river Tapi is going to create more complicated problems. The administrative, communicative, social and economic life of the taluks of Nandurbar, Nawapur, Akkalkuwa and Taloda will be shattered by these two-mile strips. Therefore, the case of the Adivasi people deserves special care and consideration.

I would like to bring to the notice of the House the fact that the Adivasi people are the weakest link in the national chain. Their problem should be approached in a missionary spirit. The problem should not be considered from a narrow point of view. Nothing should be taken for granted, and nothing should be imposed on them, and nothing should be done without consulting the people. If they are to be assimilated, that should be with their own consent and of their own will.

I am of the opinion that the Adivasi area should not be divided because of political reasons. If divided, there will be a political death of the Adivasi people.

In conclusion, I would like to make one suggestion, and that is that the disputed areas of the Adivasis should be governed by the Central Government, and a plebiscite should be taken at a later stage.

Shri Mahagaonkar: While speaking on this Bill, my first duty is to salute those who have sacrificed for Gujarat and Maharashtra. That is also a proud thing for me as one of the Members of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti that fought for this cause.

In this House, on a prior occasion, I had requested the House to reconsider this issue of the bifurcation of Bombay, and I am very happy that this issue has been taken up, and it has now come to its final stage. But, as regards the Bill that is before us, I would like to say that I firmly stand to oppose certain provisions in this Bill. As regards the name 'Maharashtra' for the new State, I am very happy that the amendment suggested by the Bombay Assembly has been accepted, and the hon. Home Minister has suggested to the House and to the Joint Committee to consider it. But there are two things which I firmly oppose, namely the inclusion of certain Marathi areas in the new State of Gujarat and the tribute of Rs. 50 crores that has to be paid by Maharashtra. I oppose these two provisions in this Bill. While doing so, I would say this that no principle in this respect has been followed, and it is a clear injustice, I would like to say, as many hon. Members have already pointed out. Some hon. Members have criticised us; many have said that we are parting like brothers. But as one hon. Member said, there is some kind of bargaining attitude that we find while we part as brothers.

In this Bill, in a proviso in the Tenth Schedule you will find that even

typewriters, duplicators, clocks and vehicles are to be divided between the States of Bombay and Gujarat according to the population ratio. If this is the attitude, you can see whether it is a parting like brothers or it is something like a bargaining that is going on between the two brothers.

Other things are also there. No principle has been followed while including the Marathi areas in Guparat. Much is talked about elections and about the voting. Let me tell you that those sarpanches who have voted for inclusion of Umbergaon and other places in Gujarat were nominated. They were not elected. This is not a question of a border dispute only between Maharashtra and Gujarat. There are so many border disputes throughout the country.

I know many people have talked about safeguards to the minority community in Bombay. But so far as we, the Marathi people, are concerned, we are struggling hard in certain areas in certain States of this country. Are we not Indians? There is a big minority in certain States where we are humiliated and treated with the shoes of police rule. Is it not worthwhile to consider this problem when we are told: 'You put up those problems in a most provincial manner'? Those who have got their linguistic States are quite happy. But when we demand the same, they say that this sort of demand will lead to the accentuation of provincialism everywhere. This is just like a well-fed man telling a hungry man: 'You may drink a glass of milk; I am sorry if you are so hungry'. He cannot afford to drink milk. They have got their linguistic States all right.

Shri P. S. Daulta: The Punjabis have not got it so far.

Shri Mahagaonkar: There may be a few exceptions. But others have got their linguistic States. When we put our demand for the same, why are we singled out for this accusation?

We were told that the bilingual experiment was going on and it would give a lead to the nation. Why was this not tried in other States? Why was the idea of a Bengal-Bihar State discarded? Only Maharashtra and Gujarat were put together. My hon. friend, Shri Tyagi, said that there should be no more demands. I cannot understand this when we talk of a socialist pattern of society in the country. If there is a demand from the people, should it not be satisfied according to the wishes of the people? I do not know how Government are going to keep quiet on such issues.

There should be some principle that should be adopted for the demarcation of boundaries. The Bombay Assembly itself passed a resolution recently, with reference to the question of the border dispute Bombay has with Mysore, to the effect that in the demarcation of the boundary between the State of Bombay and the State of Mysore, the guiding principle must be that of linguistic homogeneity. I should like to ask why the Pataskar formula was not followed with respect to Dangs and Umbergaon. The whole thing was done in a hurried way. They say that it is a matter of give and take. On the part of Maharashtra, it is all 'give' and there is no 'take'. On the southern border, we have given—it has gone rather—against our wishes. On the northern border, now Dangs and the other portion are going away.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Still we have to sit together in the Joint Committee and discuss.

Shri Mahagaonkar: Yes. But I am stating that these are the things that are happening today. I do not know whether the hon. the Home Minister has taken cognisance of the way we are treated in certain areas. He may differ with the movement that is started by the Marathi people in certain places, but certainly under democracy, he cannot say from the way the police *culum* is going on there and the people are struggling, that it is all

[Shri Mahagaonkar]

imagination. Even the other day somebody said that this episode was similar to the episode in South Africa.

Many people talk about Vidarbha. With due apologies and respect to the hon. Member, Dr. M. S. Aney, I must say that when he spoke about Vidarbha, he said a lot of things against other people. He said that those Members who are sitting behind him are not representative of the people of Vidarbha and his is the only voice of Vidarbha. Let me remind my hon. friend, Dr. M. S. Aney, what memorandum he submitted to the SRC. There he has particularly criticised the people of my constituency in Maharashtra, that is, Kolhapur and Satara. He has made a remark that communalism is on the increase. Who looks at it from this communal point of view? I put it to my hon. friend that he is looking at it from that point of view. Why is he afraid of Samyukta Maharashtra that the Marathi people asked for? He says that majority community rule will come. According to him, the Maharashtra of intellectuals like Tilak and others was a different Maharashtra. Why is he afraid, if the majority leadership comes forward to rule their own State? He looks at it from a different point of view and then comes forward and says that that provincialism and casteism are on the increase.

The way Dr. M. S. Aney himself played politics is known to us. What did he do in 1934? He fought against Shri Abhyankar and supported the Hindu Mahasabha candidate, Dr. Moonjee. Then again he broke with the Congress Party. . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He need not go into all that here.

Dr. M. S. Aney: He is referring to old incidents about which he has no full knowledge. Dr. Moonjee was contesting on behalf of the responsive Cooperative Party and not of Hindu Mahasabha.

Shri Mahagaonkar: His ideology is based on the same thing.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. When I rise, the hon. Member must resume his seat. Dr. Aney's conduct—his speeches and other things—so far as other issues are concerned is not relevant here. So far as this issue is concerned, if he has expressed any opinion, that may be referred to—not other things.

Shri Mahagaonkar: No, Sir. He said that provincialism and casteism are on the increase.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has dealt with it.

Shri Mahagaonkar: I want to point out that when people look at others from their own angle, they find that those people are also like that. That is the only point which I want to bring to the notice of the House.

With some mixed feelings, I welcome the move on the part of Government. To some extent, if not to the full, the goal of the members of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti who have been struggling for the welfare of the Marathi people has been achieved. The entire area of Marathi-speaking people has come under the rule of one Government, though I am sorry there are certain places still remaining outside. I do not know in what light and when the House will consider that. But while parting with our Gujarati friends, let me tell them that we do not want an inch of a Gujarati village in Maharashtra. If there is any village in Maharashtra which has a Gujarati-speaking majority of people, I would request the hon. Home Minister and the Joint Committee to consider the matter thoroughly and give it to the new Gujarat State. Similarly, if there are Marathi-speaking areas not only in Gujarat but in other States, they should be transferred to Maharashtra.

While we are creating the Maharashtra State, let me say that it has a

heritage of the great Shivaji. I would like to point out on this occasion that in certain places even the much-revered and much-respected Shivaji was insulted.

Shri Basappa: On a point of order. The hon. Member is trying to bring in the question of the law and order situation again. It was prevented from being referred to in this House. He is also raising the issue of the border between Mysore and Bombay, and he is indirectly accusing the Mysore Government.

Shri Mahagaonkar: I have not referred to Mysore. I just mentioned what happened.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has not said that. It has already been ruled by the Speaker that other disputes should not be referred to here. I did not hear the hon. Member refer to it. Perhaps the hon. Member on the other side only anticipated that he was going to refer to it.

So far as the other incident—about Shivaji—is concerned, I have already said that it may not be mentioned again and again here.

Shri Mahagaonkar: I am only saying that we are happy that we have that history and that heritage.

Shri Achar: We have the greatest respect for Shivaji. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. That heritage is there; nobody doubts that.

Shri Mahagaonkar: Why should there be doubts when we say that safeguards for the minority community in Bombay should be given? We say proudly that we are successors of that great man. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let there not be so much impatience about it.

Shri Mahagaonkar: So, with these words I resume my seat.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Naldurgkar.

Shri Basappa rose—

Mr Deputy-Speaker: I have no objection to giving time to Shri Basappa. But I must be sure he would not refer to other matters. He has been feeling restless about other questions and surely he would refer to them. I cannot allow that (*Interruptions*).

An Hon. Member: Shri Naldurgkar is not here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Swami Ramnanda Tirtha.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha (Aurangabad): Sir, within the five minutes at my disposal I will only refer to a few matters. I heartily support this Bill as it satisfies the wishes of vast sections of the people of what is now a bilingual State of Bombay. On this occasion, it is our duty to thank all those who have worked in a constructive way to bring about the emergence of the two new unilingual States of Maharashtra and Gujara.

I also take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the Chief Minister and the Deputy Leader of the present Bombay State for the statesmanship they have shown and for the manner in which they have agreed to usher in the two new States. The Chief Minister, who, in his own convictions always supported or held the idea of a unilingual State, agreed to work sincerely the decision which this august Parliament took in its own wisdom and also advised the Government of India to revise the decision when he felt that it could no more bring about the emotional integration of the constituent units of that State.

It is our duty also to thank and pay a tribute to the Finance Minister of Bombay who has placed the finances of that State on a sound basis. We all wish well of the Gujarat and Maharashtra States that in future

[Swami Ramananda Tirtha]

they may grow and help the prosperity and growth of India.

Sir, this Bill has to be looked at as a whole. If you look at it in parts, there is bound to be some dissatisfaction, something which we may complain against because that part may not be liked by some, this section or that section. Looked at as a whole, it will appear to be one of the best solutions that anybody could have brought about in a constructive way.

The Home Minister who has solved many knotty problems has gain come to the rescue of the people of Maharashtra and Gujarat and given us a solution. That has to be accepted in all good faith and with a desire that we part as friends and would continue to live as good neighbours.

On this occasion, I would like to mention only one point. It has been somewhat complained by some hon. friends that Gujarat is being paid something which is not its due. I am not thinking in terms of what is due and what is not due. But, in the heart of my hearts, I do feel that Gujaratis, the people of Gujarat, have had their own contribution to make Bombay city what it is today. Morally, we are bound to be of some use, in future, to them when they are really in need. Therefore, let us not talk in terms of Khandani and tribute and this and that. Let us forget that. Let Gujarat grow, if at all it is so, even at some sacrifice on the part of the Maharashtrians. Let it grow and grow in a way that would set a good example before the nation. After all, Gujarat and Maharashtra have produced great leaders and they have made what India is today. Gujarat has given us the greatest and the noblest son who has raised humanity's hopes and aspirations.

Sir, on this occasion, I would only plead for greater sanity and sobriety. Let us forget now all the bitterness.

of what happened in Bombay, what happened in Ahmedabad, what happened two years before and what was happening and all that. Let us forget all the past bitterness and, in all good faith, part as friends. Let Shri Yajnik, Shri Goray and all of us work for the new States of Maharashtra and Gujarat as constituent units of this great Republic of India and make this a truly socialist country in our own way by working for the most downtrodden and the fallen people of society.

श्री नजराम सिंह (फिरोजाबाद)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस विधेयक का स्वागत करता हूँ और इस अवसर पर महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात के लिए शहीद हुए लोगों के प्रति अपनी तुच्छ श्रद्धांजलि प्रेषित करता हूँ जिन्हें सरकार की गलत नीतियों के कारण इस बड़े उद्देश्य के लिए शहीद हो जाना पड़ा। इस विधेयक में कुछ व्यवस्थाओं के बारे में हमारे महाराष्ट्री भाइयों को कुछ शिकायतें हैं। ये शिकायतें हमेशा रह सकती हैं जब हम भाषावार प्रान्तों का निर्माण करते हैं। भाषावार प्रान्तों का निर्माण जहाँ कुछ उद्देश्यों को ले कर शुरू किया गया था जोकि एक सही कदम था, वहाँ आज अपने गल्ट में उसने कुछ ऐसी प्रवृत्ति भी अव्यवस्था की है जिससे के बड़े हितों को हानि पहुँच सकती है। लेकिन क्योंकि हम ने इस सिद्धान्त को मान लिया इसलिए देर आराम दुर्लभ आराम वाली बात यहाँ पर लागू होती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि शुरू में ही अगर सरकार ने इस चीज को मान लिया होता तो इस तरह की जो गलतवर्ती हुई हैं, लोगों को शहीद होना पड़ा है, वह न होता पड़ता। मैं इस अवसर पर चाहता हूँ कि अगर देश में इस तरह की और भी कोई समस्याएँ हों तो गवर्नमेंट को तथा देश की जनता को और कम से कम उन लोगों को जोकि देश के प्रबन्ध के लिए जिम्मेदार है, बिना ऐसी परिस्थितियों को निमंत्रण दिये हुए जिन में कि कभी भी शान्ति और व्यवस्था

कायम करने के नाम पर नर-हत्या करनी पड़े, पहले ही से विचार कर लेना चाहिए। मैं मानता हूँ कि इस तरह के कार्य के लिए, भाषावार प्रान्तों के निर्माण के लिए, कोई इस तरह का भ्रन्दोलन नहीं चलाया जाना चाहिए जिस से इस तरह की कोई समस्या पैदा हो, ना एंड्र आईर की समस्या पैदा हो। मैं यह भी मानता हूँ कि जब भी इस समस्या को आगे रखा जाता है तो उससे हमारी दूसरी समस्यायें, हमारी रोटी कपड़े की समस्या, हमेशा पीछे हट जाया करती है और जनता का दिमाग, जनता से सम्बन्ध रखने वाली मुख्य समस्याओं से पीछे हट जाता है और यही एक समस्या उसके सामने रहती है। इसलिए मैं निवेदन करता हूँ कि देश के दूसरे हिस्सों में भी यदि कहीं पर इस तरह की बात उठ रही हो तो हमें, इस बात का इतिहास किये बिना कि जिस तरह कहीं पर एक व्यक्ति शहीद हुआ और उसकी वजह से आंध्र प्रदेश का निर्माण हुआ और मैकडों लोग महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात में शहीद हुए, इसलिए महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात का निर्माण होने जा रहा है, उन समस्याओं पर भी शान्तिपूर्वक ढंग से विचार कर लेना चाहिए।

मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि देश के जिन हिस्सों में भाषायी प्रश्न को ले कर नये प्रदेशों के निर्माण की कोई मांगें उठ रही हैं उन लोगों को जो कि इस तरह की मांगें उठा रहे हैं, कोई ऐसा भ्रन्दोलन खड़ा नहीं करना चाहिये जिस से शांति और व्यवस्था कायम रखने का प्रश्न उठे या इस तरह का प्रश्न उठे जिस में किसी को शहीद होना पड़े। कारण और कार्य को देश की जनता के सामने रख कर हम उन समस्याओं को हल कर सकते हैं। इस वास्ते मैं दोनों पक्षों से, एक पक्ष तो वह है जिस के ऊपर जिम्मेदारी आती है देश के शासन को चलाने की और दूसरा पक्ष वह है जो कि इस तरह की मांग को उठाता है, नभ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वे कोई ऐसा

कार्य न करें जिस से देश की जनता का ध्यान मुख्य समस्याओं से पीछे हटे। इस लिये यदि कोई इस तरह का प्रश्न है तो उस प्रश्न का समाधान किया जा सकता है, शांतिपूर्ण तरीकों से मिल बैठ कर किया जा सकता है, एक दूसरे से बातचीत करके किया जा सकता है, आपस में आगू करके, दलीलें दे कर किया जा सकता है और भ्रन्दोलन खड़ा करने की या धमकियाँ देने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं होती चाहिये और जब इस किस्म की बातें होती हैं तो देश को नुकसान पहुंचता है। देश को नुकसान पहुंचाने का कोई प्रश्न नहीं उठना चाहिये।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा मन्तव्य किसी एक सूबे से नहीं है। अगर कोई भाषावार प्रांत है के निर्माण को मांग करता है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उसमें उसकी देश-भक्ति पर कोई आंच नहीं आती है, उस पर अविश्वास करने का प्रश्न नहीं उठता है। इस देश के रहने वाले सभी लोगों का यह परम कर्तव्य है कि वे इस देश के प्रति वफादार हों, वे सभी देश की रक्षा करना चाहते हैं देश को उठाना चाहते हैं और इस लिये इस प्रश्न को अगर कोई लां उठाते हैं तो हमें यह नहीं देखना चाहिये कि कोई खास वर्ग के लोग इसे उठा रहे हैं, इस लिये हम उस पर विचार न करें। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं और कुछ विशेष कहना नहीं चाहता हूँ और मैं यही आशा करता हूँ कि भविष्य में कोई भी पक्ष, चाहे वह जनता का पक्ष हो, भले ही वह वक्त की सरकार का विरोधी रहा हो या हो, या सरकारी पक्ष हो, कोई ऐसा कदम नहीं उठायेगा जिसमें शांति और व्यवस्था भंग हो और सरकार को यह कहने का मौका मिले, यह बहाना बनाने का मौका मिले कि उसे शांति तथा व्यवस्था के नाम पर गांधी चलानी पड़ रही है, हत्याओं की करनी पड़ रही है। हत्यायें सरकार को भी नहीं करनी चाहियें। इस तरह की परिस्थितियाँ जब पैदा हो जाती हैं तो दूसरे प्रश्न जो हैं, जो

[श्री बजराम सिंह]

मुख्य प्रश्न है, उन पर से उनका ध्यान हट जाता है, रोटी कपड़ा, शिक्षा इत्यादि जो कि मुख्य प्रश्न हैं, उनसे ध्यान हट जाता है और जनता दूसरी तरफ वह जाती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार भी इस से शिक्षा लेगी और व लोग भी लेंगे जिन के ऊपर जन-जीवन को आगे बढ़ाने की, जनता की राजनीति को चलाने की जिम्मेदारी है। कभी भी कोई ऐसा मवाल नहीं उठना चाहिये, चाहे वह भाषावार प्रांत की रचना का सवाल हो या दूसरे किसी प्रांत के निर्माण का सवाल हो, जिस में कोई अन्दालन खड़ा करने की बात उठे क्यों कि इससे आपस में कटुता उत्पन्न होती है। अगर कोई प्रश्न है तो उसको हल किया जा सकता है आपस में बैठ कर, विचार विमर्श करके, गोष्ठी करके और एक दूसरे को दलीलें दे कर, समझा बुझा कर। एक बार फिर मैं महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात के निर्माण पर वहां की जनता को, जिसने कि यह महसूस किया कि कुछ गलती हो गई थी और उस गलती को दुरुस्त कराने के लिये कुर्बानियां की और उसकी वजह से कुछ लोगों को शहीद होना पड़ा, बघाई देता हूँ और जो शहीद हुये हैं उनके प्रति अपनी श्रद्धांजली अर्पित करता हूँ। मैं इस विधेयक का स्वागत करता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात में एक ऐसे जीवन का पदार्पण इससे होगा जिससे वहां की जनता सुखी और समृद्धिशाली हो सकेगी।

अंत में मैं एक चेतावनी देना चाहूंगा कि केवल भाषावार प्रांतों के निर्माण से ही जनता की जो समस्याएँ हैं वे हल नहीं होती हैं। हो सकता है कि इससे उसमें कुछ मदद मिले क्यों कि जब एक भाषा हो जाती है तो वहां के प्रशासन को चलाने में उससे कुछ मदद मिलती है। लेकिन एक विदेशी भाषा को हम प्रशासन की भाषा बनायें गये तो उस से कोई विशेष फायदा नहीं होता है। इस लिये मैं आशा करता

हूँ कि जो दो नये प्रांत बन रहे हैं, वे भी हिन्दुस्तान के अन्य भाषावार प्रांतों की तरह ऐसे नहीं बन जायेंगे जिसमें जनता की समस्याओं का समाधान न हो सके बल्कि ऐसे कार्य करेंगे जिनसे वहां की जनता की समस्याओं का, दूसरे प्रदेशों से अधिक अग्रणी तरह समाधान हो सके।

Shri Basappa: Sir.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should speak only on this.

Shri Basappa: I have been asked to ignore some of the remarks made by the other side and I am going to obey your ruling. Member after Member as you all know, spoke about the Mysore border.... (Interruptions)

Mh. Deputy-Speaker: He should be allowed to complete the sentence.

Shri Basappa: and though others expected that would also refer to major border. I will not do that except that I have this much to say that I refute some of the statements made by them (Interruptions.) Particularly one friend referred to Shri Datar and said that he would be the first man afterwards to come and say that Belgaum belonged to Maharashtra. I strongly refute that. He would be the last man to do that..... (Interruptions.)

Shri Goray: That is exactly what I said, He will be the last man to do so.

Shri Basappa: I do not want to say that the feelings of this House are aroused to a great extent. From the emotional and excited speeches we have heard, we have come towards the end of this debate when a little calmness prevails and I would welcome this atmosphere and I do not want to vitiate it. There had been mixed feelings of joy and sorrow

when I heard Dr. Aney. He was sorry and grieved. When I heard Shri Goray and Dange, there was joy and pride. I do not know why. But when I heard the hon. Home Minister, there were mixed feelings of joy and sorrow—joy because in a friendly atmosphere the two States are separating and sorrow because we are reopening a question which we have decided very recently in this very House.

Everyone of us knows the hon. Home Minister. Shri Chavan also expressed the view that it was a very complicated and intricate problem; whether it is a border question or the splitting up of the bilingual State, it is a complicated one. It should be looked with sympathy and not with pride. Therefore, we all look forward to the hon. Home Minister who has piloted the Reorganisation Bill and who is piloting this Bill. We all wish him God-speed. May I humbly say this? I know myself that we are inflicting a little cruelty on him and making him sit for longer hours. But may I ask him humbly: if these big questions are not solved by him, who else can do this in this country? In that spirit, I would certainly welcome his speech. What, after all, has he said? With regard to the controversial question of the border, he has been doing his very best and he has been finding a solution to these problems. My friends are asking about principles involved in these things. What better principle can there be than the wishes of the people and the consent of the people, of a large majority of the people there as ascertained by the leaders of both Maharashtra and Gujarat? As against this my hon. friends, Shri Dange and Shri Goray want to bring in the village unit. I am speaking only of the border of Gujarat and Maharashtra.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would allow him only that much.

Shri Basappa: In this principle—the village is the unit, that is, the Pataskar formula as it is called—the wishes of the people are ignored com-

pletely. Whether it is the Dangs question or it is the Umbergaon question, the wishes of the people had been ascertained as depicted by some hon. Members and therefore, what they have done is to a very great extent right and the Joint Committee will go into the whole question. I may say here that I am not claiming Umbergaon to Karnataka when I say that Chalukya kings of the Karnataka had suzerainty over Umebergaon.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker He is creating apprehensions now.

Shri Basappa: Nobody would do that. It may be interesting to know that the first Address given by the Governor of Bombay was written in Kannada language and if they wanted, they can go and see it. On that account, I am not claiming Bombay to Karnataka.

Sir, the Pataskar Formula, as it is known, is no formula at all. It is a misnomer to call it Pataskar Formula. It is a formula based on agreement between Shri Kamaraja Nadar and Shri Sanjiva Reddi, and it should be rather called "Chief Ministers' Formula", and not Pataskar Formula. We could not apply it even in the case of the Andhra-Madras Bill because all the relevant maps could not be produced here, and we were guided there more by the agreement of Shri Kamaraja Nadar and Shri Sanjiva Reddi than by the Pataskar Formula. Even when Shri Pataskar himself was asked to apply his formula to Mysore and Madras he could not apply it because Madras could not agree to it—I am referring to Hosur. It was also not applied here in the case of Maharashtra and Gujarat. From this, Sir, you can see the feelings of the people there.

I do not know whether I am right in referring to one of the statements made by Shri Chavan in the State Assembly. When questions were put to him pointing out that he was applying one formula in one case and another formula in another case, he

[*Shri Basappa*]

seems to have given an impression that between Gujarat and Bombay the whole question of splitting up of a bilingual State has to be taken into consideration whereas in other cases only a border question is taken up.

An Hon. Member: Again Mysore question.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member made an enquiry from me. He was doubtful whether he was right or wrong. I may tell him that he was wrong in referring to that.

Shri Basappa: It was a statement made in the Assembly—I leave it at that.

Now, I have great respect for Dr. Aney. He speaks of linguism, how it has entered into our vitals and spoiled us; but it is too late in the day either for *Shri Tyagi* or for *Dr. Aney* to come and say that the whole States reorganisation is wrong. We have to make the best of a bad bargain. After all, only linguistic principles have not been considered in the creation of linguistic provinces, other principles have been taken into consideration. In the past States were classified as Part A, Part B and Part C States. The least we can do was to bring about a certain form of uniformity among all the States, and the backward areas are being developed after we passed the States Reorganisation Bill.

In the end, Sir, we have been asked to forgive and forget. Unless we do that there is no salvation for us. My hon. friends on the other side, spoiling the whole atmosphere, wanted to refer to firing and all that. That is very bad. They were feeling as if they were the victors and the others were the vanquished. Our Indian philosophy is something great. Who is the victor and who is the vanquished?

An hon. Member: Why don't you practise it?

Shri Basappa: After all, we have to consider what posterity is going to judge of us. Posterity is going to judge us not from the point of view of who is the victor and who is the vanquished, but from the point of view whether we have played the game well or not. Therefore, I would request hon. Members on the opposite side to play this game well, and as responsible Members of this Parliament, which is the sovereign body in this vast country, see that development of this country takes place step by step and progress is made in all States.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: *Shri Khadiwala*—if he does not refer to *Madhya Pradesh*.

श्री खादीवाला : उपध्यक्ष महोदय, तीन वर्षों के बाद हम यह विचार कर रहे हैं कि एक प्रदेश के दो प्रदेश बनाये जायें। सोचना यह है कि जितने भी नये प्रदेश बने उन प्रदेशों में और जो प्रदेश पहले से चल रहे थे उन में, उनकी चाल में, कितनी गति आई है और जनता के हित की दृष्टि से वे कितने ज्यादा अच्छे चल रहे हैं। यह मुख्य बात है। जो बम्बई का एक प्रदेश बना था वहां के रहने वाले गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र के लोगों ने पिछले समय में क्या उन्नति की, और क्या इसी लिये आज यह विचार करना पड़ा कि उस प्रदेश को दो प्रदेशों में बांटा जाये कि वे दोनों एक साथ नहीं चल सकते थे? मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो मध्य प्रदेश बना उस मध्य प्रदेश में तो कई प्रदेश मिलाये गये और वह प्रदेश ज्यादातर देशी रियासतों से ही बना। जब आज यह सवाल हमारे सामने विचार के लिये आया तो मुझे कहना पड़ता है कि कई इस प्रकार की डिफिकल्टीज शासन के चलाने में जिस प्रदेश में भी आती हों, हमारे लिये उन पर विचार करना बहुत जरूरी है।

क्योंकि सबाल हमारे सामने यह है कि जो भी प्रदेश बने उसके बनने के बाद वहां पर एक सूत्रता, एकता, एक कायदे और कानून का रूप अभी तक नहीं आ सका है इस लिये वहां पर हर बात में कई मुश्किलात आती हैं ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब मेम्बर साहब दूसरे सबाल पर चले जा रहे हैं । मैंने उनकी रोका भी था, स्पीकर साहब ने भी कह दिया है कि दूसरे सूबों का झगड़ा नहीं उठाया जायेगा । इसलिये मेम्बर साहब के लिये और मेरे लिये भी यह पाबन्दी आती है । और वे इस में न जायें ।

सरदार भ० सि० सहगल : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य अगर कुछ बोलना चाहते हैं तो मुझको भी उसकी इजाजत दी जाये ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. What is this interference? If one Member is being allowed, he wants to know whether he would be allowed or not.

श्री खादीबाला : मैं यह बात मानता हूँ कि यह सबाल बम्बई प्रदेश का है । लेकिन जो सबाल आज हमारे सामने आ खड़ा हुआ है वह एक बहुत बड़ा सबाल है और इसी लिये मैंने यहां पर अपने प्रदेश की बात कही । लेकिन जब आपने हुक्म दे दिया है तो मैं ज्यादा न कहते हुये यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो कुछ बम्बई प्रदेश में हुआ वह मुरत किसी और प्रदेश में न आये । इसीलिये मैंने यह

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : इस लिये क्या बम्बई को तकसीम न किया जाये ?

श्री खादीबाला : नहीं, जरूर किया जाये । मैं तो कहता हूँ कि जहां के भी लोग जो कुछ कहें उसके ऊपर जरूर विचार किया जाये । मेरा वह कहना नहीं कि बम्बई का विभाजन न किया जाये । जो निर्णय किया गया है मैं

उसका स्वागत करता हूँ । छोटे छोटे प्रदेश जितने अच्छे चल सकते हैं उतने अच्छे बड़े प्रदेश नहीं चल सकते । जो बड़े प्रदेश चल रहे थे उनके सम्बन्ध में यह अनुभव हुआ है कि बड़े प्रदेश के बनने के बाद कई मुसीबतें हमारे सामने प्रदेश को चलाने में आई हैं, और उन्हीं का नतीजा है कि आज एक बम्बई प्रदेश के दो प्रदेश बनाये जा रहे हैं । आप ने जब मुझे मना कर दिया है तब मुझे और कुछ नहीं कहना है । आप से केवल इतना ही कहना है कि यदि इस पर विचार किया जा रहा है तो दूसरे प्रदेशों में ऐसी नीबट आये, इसके पहले ही हमें दूसरे प्रदेशों के लिये सोचना चाहिये ।

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Ch. Ranbir Singh—not about Punjab.

श्री० रणबीर सिंह (रोहतक) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बम्बई की ही बात करूंगा । मैं दूसरे सूबे का प्रश्न, पंजाब सूबे का या हरियाणा का बीच में नहीं लाऊंगा ।

मैं इस विधेयक को पार मंमति के सुपुर्द करने की ताईद करता हूँ, लेकिन ऐसा कहते हुये यह कहे बगैर नहीं रह सकता कि अभी जो कुछ भी बजराम सिंह जी ने कहा, वह एक सबक हमारे सीखने के लायक है कि जिस देश के अन्दर प्रजातंत्रवाद की हुकमत हो और प्रजातंत्र की पद्धति मानी गई हो वहां पर बड़े बड़े मत्याग्रह या बड़े बड़े लड़ाई झगड़े करना सही नहीं है, चाहे वह महागुजरान मंमति हो । या महाराष्ट्र मंमति हो और कुछ भाइयों ने कहा कि यहां इस देश के अन्दर कुछ दोस्तों ने बम्बई सूबे को बनाने के लिये कुर्बानियां कीं । मैं उन लोगों के साथ हमदर्दी रखता हूँ जिनकी इस देश में किसी वजह से, कुछ लोगों के बहकावे में घाने से, इस बीच के किये जायें गई ।

श्री प्र० सिंह बीलता (भज्जर) : वह आप की गोलियों में गई ।

श्री० रणवीर सिंह : वही मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ । मेरे साथी के नेता ने जो बात कही थी वह उसे भूल गये । मैं वही बात दोहरा रहा हूँ । यों तो सद्भावना के साथ एक फार्मूला तय हुआ था और उस में उस वक्त कम से कम इस सदन के जितने सदस्य थे वे शामिल थे । यह बद किस्मती हो सकती है कि डांगे साहब पिछले एलेक्शन में हार गये और वे यहाँ पर अपनी राय न दे सके लेकिन इसमें तो उनके एलेक्टोरेट का ही कुसूर हो सकता है, इस सदन का तो कोई कुसूर नहीं था ।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मझे खशी है कि श्री बजराल सिंह जी की तरफ से, जो कि हमारी खिलाफ पार्टी के मेम्बर है, यह सुझाव आया । मैं खुद भी वही बात कहना चाहता था जो कि उन्होंने सही तौर पर यहाँ कहा । लेकिन मुझे ताज्जुब है कि जब खांड या गन्ने की कीमत का सवाल आता है तो वे भूल जाते हैं इस चीज को कि सत्याग्रह को इस चीज के लिये भी चलाना आवश्यक नहीं है क्योंकि इस सदन के अन्दर जब वक्त आया तो गन्ने की कीमत बढ़ी भी और घटी भी और जैसा भी वक्त आये उसके मुताबिक फैसला हो सकता है । फैसलों को बदलने के लिये सत्याग्रह करना या गोली चलवाना, लोगों में जोश पैदा करना ठीक नहीं है । जब मेरे साथी यह कहते हैं कि बम्बई में जो दूसरे भाई बसते हैं उनके संरक्षण का सवाल क्यों पैदा हो, तो वे इस चीज को भूल जाते हैं । कौन नहीं जानता कि बम्बई के अन्दर कुछ साल पहले क्या हालत हुई थी और जिन भाईयों के हाथों में राजतंत्र को चलाने की जिम्मेदारी है वे कैसे इन बातों को भूल सकते हैं ।

गोरे साहब ने कहा कि जहाँ तक गुजरात के घाटे का ताल्लुक है, उन्हें कोई गिला नहीं

अगर सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट वह घाटा पूरा करे । लेकिन वे भूल जाते हैं कि बम्बई शहर में, जिसको पहले एक अलाहदा रियासत बनाने का फैसला इस सदन ने तकरीबन कर लिया था, २५ करोड़ रुपये का सर्प्लस पाया जाता है ।

श्री पु० र० पटेल (मेहसाना) : २७ करोड़ का ।

श्री० रणवीर सिंह : जैसा कि पटेल साहब कहते हैं २७ करोड़ रुपये का सर्प्लस पाया जाता है । अगर उस सर्प्लस को बम्बई वाले और महाराष्ट्र वाले भाई रखना चाहते हैं तो उनको मुबारक हो, लेकिन गुजरात वाले भाईयों को जो घाटा है उस को देश के दूसरे हिस्से क्यों बर्दाश्त करे ? अगर वे बम्बई को सेंट्रली ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेंट एरिया बनाना चाहें, केन्द्रीय सरकार के नीचे लाना चाहें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि पन्त जी को इस में कोई एतराज नहीं होगा कि गुजरात का घाटा सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट पूरा करे ।

इस के अलावा त्यागी जी ने एक बात कही थी और मैं उसकी तरफ आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि भाषावार सूबों के नाम से इस देश की एकता में बाधा पड़ने का डर है, और यह बात सही है । अगर इस डर का हमें मुकाबला करना है तो मैं चाहता था कि इस के लिये त्यागी जी कोई सुझाव रखते, लेकिन उन्होंने तो उल्टा दूसरी तरह से कुछ "न" कह कर पंजाबी सूबे और हरियाणा बनाने की तरफ इशारा किया । मैं सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे कुछ हो, इस देश के अन्दर लोगों को इकट्ठा रखने के लिये अगर किसी चीज की आवश्यकता है, जिसको हमें बढ़ावा देना चाहिये, तो वह हमारी राष्ट्र भाषा हिन्दी है ।

हिन्दी के सरकारी प्रशासन में अधिक-धिक प्रयोग व व्यवहार के लिये होम मिनिस्ट्री को ज्यादा से ज्यादा रुपया खर्च

करना चाहिये। हिन्दी रूपी मंत्र को अपना कर हम अपने देश की एकता को बनाये रख सकते हैं। यह हिन्दी ही देश को एकता के सूत्र में जकड़े हुये रख सकती है और इस लिये सरकार का यह कर्तव्य हो जाना है कि हिन्दी को हर तरह से बढ़ावा दे। आज भी हमारे प्रशासन में ऐसे भाई० नी० एस० और भाई० ए० एस० के भ्रफसरान और हम में से सदस्य हैं जो कि हिन्दी भाषा नहीं जानते हैं और यह खेद का विषय है कि वह उसकी प्रगति के रास्ते में रोड़ा बनना चाहते हैं। इस लिये उनको हिन्दी पढ़ाने के लिये अगर होम मिनिस्ट्री ३ या ४ करोड़ रुपया खर्च करेगी तो वह देश की एकता को बनाये रखेगी। और एकता की जंजीर को मजबूत करेगा।

15 hrs.

Shri G. B. Pant: Sir, I have listened to the speeches that have been made since I commended this Bill to the House for its consideration with undivided attention. I do not think it is necessary for me to deal with the points on which some sort of controversy had developed during this debate. I only wish that those points had been put forward with greater restraint and sobriety. I had appealed to the House for approaching this question in the spirit in which a settlement had been reached between the leaders of Maharashtra and Gujarat.

This Bill, as I had also stated at the outset, was based on the settlement and the agreement between these leaders and as such it deserves the courtesy of a favourable reception from the Members of this House. Still, some of the hon. Members cannot agree with the agreed terms of this arrangement. The Bill was however not only based on the agreed settlement but it had also been virtually accepted by the entire legislature of Bombay, by both the Houses.

There had been some amendments, but two of the amendments which

were of a major character have been left for the advice of the Joint Committee and that is for the House to accept. The other amendments are of a minor character. They do not at all affect or touch any of those issues which had been the subject of controversy in this House. So, when the Bill, whether in the lower House or in the upper House of the Bombay legislature, was put to vote, my information is that it was passed without any dissentient voice. I do not say that it should debar any Member of this House from the expression of his views about this Bill, but when we are told that we do not follow any principle, that we do not pay any heed to the tenets of democracy, I am somewhat amazed, because we have tried to keep our eyes and our ears and our windows open throughout. We have never refrained from doing what according to our humble lights appeared to us to be desirable in the interests of the millions of people living in the country. There is no question of prestige. This Government does not stand on prestige, and it would never hesitate to own a mistake and to revise an opinion if it found that the opinion was not or has not been proved to be as sound as expected. I had stated when this bilingual scheme was placed before this House that I am happy that this solution has been found. The proceedings are there and they can testify to what I then said. But even then I said, I am not so much interested in an ideal solution as in an agreed solution. I had even then emphasised that I myself thought that however satisfactory in theory an arrangement may be, if it was not acceptable to the parties concerned or if it did not satisfy them or did not prove acceptable to them, then I personally would not be satisfied myself. I would depend more on the goodwill of the people, on the development of the spirit of emotional integration and fellowship, on their treating each other as brothers and fellow citizens of a great country than on anyone getting a few more villages on this

[Shri G. B. Pant]

side or on that side. That is not what I am saying today. That is what I had said then.

I am in a way gratified that this Bill has been placed before this House. In fact, it is an embodiment, as I said yesterday, of the spirit of accommodation, goodwill and desire to help each other and to maintain the best standards of family-life. It is these principles which had been embodied in the Bill.

So far as the minor points of difference are concerned, the question is whether there is any principle involved in them. Shri Dange, for example, agreed that the deficit of Gujarat should be made good; but for how long, about that he said, there has been no arrangement. According to him that it had been agreed that the deficit would be made good, but other details had not been settled. When they did not settle the details, the burden fell on us of giving effect to the principle which had been accepted by them. He also said that part of the Umbergaon should go to Gujarat, but some more villages had gone to Gujarat than he thinks was Gujarat's due. I do not know if that is a question of principle. If there are more villages, it is open to the two to examine the position and to see whether one village can be shifted from one side to the other.

Then about the Ukai project, he said, the project has not yet come into existence, but that if it does come into existence, then the areas that are to be submerged should go to Gujarat. Again, the principle stands accepted. The project had been accepted, and we are told that already a start has been made. So, the condition has been fulfilled to a large extent. So, I do not see where on principle, we have deviated from the high pedestal from which he has been preaching to us.

There were one or two remarks which he made and which seemed to

me to be rather unfortunate. He said that Parliament had been dictated by money bags, or something like that, in making this arrangement of a bilingual State. The Deputy-Speaker thought that that was not perhaps a very appropriate expression. Then he said, the policy-makers had been dictated. Who were the policy-makers in this case? The proposal for this was made, for a bilingual State of Bombay exclusive of Vidarbha, by the States Reorganisation Commission, by three independent impartial people, by a body of independent and eminent men, presided over by a Judge of the Supreme Court. I do not know if money dictated them in their decisions.

Then I also said, and everybody in this House knows, as I reminded them yesterday, that a letter was sent to the Prime Minister by 180 Members of this House, asking him to agree to the formation of a bilingual State. The motion was made here by independent Members, not belonging to the Congress Party, but belonging perhaps, some, to the parties which were in alliance with Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti or some others. That proposal was accepted virtually unanimously by the House. I do not know how money dictated those who sent that letter to the Prime Minister or those who made the motion in this House or those four hundred and odd Members—I do not remember exact the number—who supported this motion. So, I think he was rather a bit harsh. I cannot use very strong language. So, harsh is the limit to which I can go.

Then, he reminded us that we must remember that we are not infallible. When did we claim that? That has been the claim of his and his party, that they are infallible and that they stand by principles, that they stand by democracy and that we others are the disruptive force in this country, who want to break up democracy and who want to do things will harm the cause of the country.

Not only that. He referred to the tragic incidents that happened in Bombay and Ahmedabad and said that he wanted people to forget them. The best way, according to him, to forget is to remind people about it. That is the method of burying the hatchet by applying it to the neck. Not only that. He went further in that connection and he made two other remarks. He said—I would not like to repeat it here and I do not like anybody to repeat it here or outside the House—that the Home Minister had killed a number of persons in Ahmedabad and Bombay. He knows, I think, that in the course of a few weeks there were ten occasions when the Kerala police had to have recourse to firing when 17 persons were killed, a number of persons were injured, there were about 200 lathi charges and a very large number were hurt. Would I say that the Home Minister and the Chief Minister there had killed and injured these people? Would it be fair for me to say so?

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City—Central): You can.

Shri G. B. Pant: Well, I would not even, if you give me that lesson.

Shri S. A. Dange: You have already said that. The Congress President has also said it.

Shri G. B. Pant: Well, the Communist Government appointed a committee presided over by Shri N. C. Chatterjee, and that committee practically disapproved of the policy that the Communist Government had followed there. I think, so far as this question goes, this answer should satisfy.

Then, what was particularly, I think, somewhat.....

Shri S. A. Dange: Do you justify the massacre in Bombay by pointing to firing in Kerala?

Shri G. B. Pant: I will go into the details of what happened in Bombay. I have got them with me.

Shri S. A. Dange: There was no enquiry.

Shri G. B. Pant: Well, I want people to forget those things and I do not want to remind them.

Shri S. A. Dange: Kerala had an enquiry committee.

Shri G. B. Pant: Kerala had never an enquiry. Kerala said: we will not have an enquiry. Kerala even said that an enquiry is not needed; that when in a peoples' movement men are killed, there is no need for any enquiry.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): They never said it.

Shri G. B. Pant: They refused to have an enquiry. They did not hold an enquiry, so far as the people killed in the course of that movement are concerned.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): Why do you not have an enquiry in Bombay?

Shri G. B. Pant: Once there was an idea that there should be no firings. There was once a claim like that by the Communist Party that once any policeman fires in a State then the Government and the party in power should resign. Well, they have had some lessons on that. Then they said there should be a judicial enquiry always. But when it came to a firing in their own State, they said, "No judicial enquiry".

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: There was an enquiry.

Shri S. A. Dange: We never said "No judicial enquiry".

Shri G. B. Pant: Well, if the members from Kerala State did not say it, I can only regret that their memories are so short. It is true in one or two cases in which, I think the workmen were fired upon, who belonged to the Communist Party, or who belonged to a union which was under the

[Shri G. B. Pant]

influence of the Communist Party, an enquiry was held, and the judge among many other things in that but he said that the firing was justified. Even the Government and their members, some of them, had stated in advance that the firing was wrong and they even transferred some of the policemen there, because they thought it was a peoples' movement and when people do anything then the police should not move its finger. But what happened later on? They said they will not have any enquiry.

But there is one thing more that I should say. While referring to Bombay and Ahmedabad, about the incidents that happened there shall not refer to those incidents, as I said—he referred to South Africa and said that in South Africa these things are mentioned. We had a resolution on that the other day. There the men that were killed belonged to a different colour and race, but here those who were killed belonged to the same race and the same colour, and, therefore, in his view, it was an internal problem to which he would extend his indulgence and not take it further.

Shri S. A. Dange: Will you please allow me to offer a personal explanation? I myself never raised the question of South Africa. Somebody else referred to it....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes, Shri S. M. Banerjee interjected.

Shri S. A. Dange: And in fact I said these firings cannot be compared with those in South Africa and that Government of South Africa is not justified in referring to these incidents and comparing them with theirs. I do not know how the Home Minister got the impression.....

Shri G. B. Pant: I think there are clever ways of saying things.

Shri Tangamani: You are trying to be too clever. (Interruptions).

Shri G. B. Pant: I want to deal with things plainly. There was a reference to South Africa and it was with reference to these things. So, I would not like to say much on this. In South Africa all this was done because some people have refused to show their passes. Here, I do not know if I should at all recall what happened in 1942, or thereafter at Telengana and other places, when 1,100 persons were killed in cold blood.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: How many people were killed?

Shri G. B. Pant: There are books published by the Government of India covering 1949 to 1951. In South Africa all this was done because passes were not shown and here our democratic spirit is developed to such an extent that we have the pleasure of having Shri Dange and his colleagues here.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: What a grace it is!

Shri G. B. Pant: We are grateful to them for their taking part in the proceedings of this House. We want their assistance, as of everybody else, but let us be a little charitable and not think that we are incapable of doing right things. While we are anxious to have the co-operation of everyone here, we have been standing steadfast on certain principles, and it is because we have been adhering to certain principles that we have been able to succeed so far, though the main brunt has throughout been borne by our leader, the Prime Minister. But if there were no principles to guide him, even he would not have succeeded. But the party to which Shri Dange belongs has never erred on such things and stuck always to one principle. Well, it is for him to read the history of the last twenty years, of the Communist Party in this country or any other countries, and then say whether we have stood by certain principles or they.

Then he also stated that it is just possible that we are afraid that the next Government in Maharashtra may not belong to the Congress, but that it may belong to some other party. I have my sympathies with him because there is hardly any chance of his getting control of the Government in Maharashtra. Even those who had been together with him did not agree. I saw yesterday that, of Shri Dange, Shri Goray and Shri Indulal Yajnik. Shri Indulal Yajnik contradicted everything that came from Shri Dange. And they had been friends in this struggle against us! Then Shri Goray said, "We have had enough of this experience and now we cannot get on together." So those who have tried their company have reached the conclusions already.... (Interruption) and that the net can be cast further is, I think, a view hope.

Shri S. A. Dange: Take the Muslim League also.

Shri G. B. Pant: But I have rather taken too long over this. There was some statement made by Shri Valvi—whether he is here or he has gone I do not know.....

An hon. Member: He has gone.

Another Hon. Member: He is here.

Shri G. B. Pant: He is here. Shri Valvi gave a representation to the nine-man committee in which it was suggested by him and several other people that all these six talukas of Khandesh—not only the little land that was there—Shahada, Akrani, Akkaikuwa, Taloda, Nawapur and Nandurkar should be transferred to Gujarat, and that they should not remain in Maharashtra.

Shri Valvi: You did not allow me to lead evidence before the nine-man committee and that proposal was rejected.

Shri G. B. Pant: I do not know that oral evidence is of greater weight than written one. I have got his represen-

tation here. It bears his signature along with that of others. But I can tell him that I am interested in the Adivasis more than he himself is. I quite agree with him that their interests should be safeguarded, to whichever State they may be allotted. Also, if any land of theirs is acquired for the Ukai project or for anything else, then that land may be acquired but they should be rehabilitated and all their needs and requirements should be fully attended to. That should be the first condition of acquisition of land from the Adivasis or from anybody else.

So far as other minor things go, they can be discussed later and they will all be going to the Joint Committee. Even so far as the controversial issue go, I have not attempted to make any remarks about them for it will be for the Joint Committee to consider them and the House will have another opportunity also of looking into them. But some reference was made to the Finance Commission and also to the separation of Madras from Andhra. Madras and Andhra were both deficit States. Madras had deficit of more than Rs. 5 crores, I think, when it separated and Andhra had a deficit of about Rs. 3 crores. Of course, beggars cannot give charities to others. They had to be fed by the Centre and the Centre advanced loans to them, when they separated. So that analogy would not apply here. I only wanted to remove the misapprehension.

There was also a reference made to the Finance Commission. The Finance Commission will take into account the condition as it will be existing at that time and after taking that into account it will make such arrangements as it considers necessary. We are not tying the hands of the Finance Commission. The arrangements that we have made have been reached with the consent of the parties and the principles—at least some—have been accepted by even the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti and the Maha Gujarat Parishad. We have based

[Shri G. B. Pant]

these details on accepted and agreed principles. However unprincipled we might be thought of, I think they were principled enough to have evolved principles on which we can act. So we have been guided by their principles.

I do not think I should say more about it. I only wish that these matters may be examined in the Joint Committee with due regard to what has happened and also with due regard to what the legislature of Bombay has itself decided.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the State of Bombay and for matters connected therewith be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 members; 30 from this House, namely, Shri Shripad Amrit Dange, Shri B. N. Datar, Shri Bhaurao Krishnarao Gaikwad, Shri Maneklal Maganlal Gandhi, Shri Narayan Ganesh Goray, Shri Arun Chandra Guha, Shri R. M. Hajarnavis, Shri H. C. Heda, Shri Ajit Prasad Jain, Shri Gulabrao Keshavrao Jedhe, Dr. Gopalrao Khedkar, Shri Bhawanji A. Khimji, Shri Balvantray Gopaljee Mehta, Shri Narendrabhai Na'hwani, Shri Ghanshyamlal Oza, Shri Shamrao Vishnu Parulekar, Kumari Maniben Vallabhbhai Patel, Shri Nanubhai Nichhabhai Patel, Shri Purushotamdass R. Patel, Shri Uttamrao L. Patil, Shri Shivram Rango Rane, Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi, Shri M. Shankaraiya, Shri Vidya Charan Shukla, Shri Digvijaya Narain Singh, Shri M. S. Sugandhi, Shri N. R. M. Swamy, Swami Ramananda Tirtha, Shri Balkrishna Wansik and Shri Indulal Kanaiyalal Yajnik.

and 15 members from Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the

quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the 14th April, 1960;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

The motion was adopted.

15-32 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

SIXTY-FIRST REPORT

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Janjgir): Sir, I beg to move:

That this House agrees with the Sixty-first Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 30th March, 1960.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Sixty-first Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 30th March, 1960."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now Bills to be introduced. Shri Pocker Sahib. Absent. Shri B. Das Gupta.