

## ANNOUNCEMENT RE GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, with your permission, I rise to announce that Government Business in this House during the week commencing from 18th August, 1969, will consist of :—

(1) Consideration of Statutory Resolution by Shri Pitambar Das and others regarding disapproval of the Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Ordinance, 1969, and consideration and passing of the Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Bill, 1969.

(2) Consideration of Statutory Resolution by Shri Sunder Singh Bhandari and others regarding disapproval of the Central Sales Tax (Amendment) Ordinance, 1969 and consideration and return of the Central Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1969, as passed by Lok Sabha.

(3) Consideration of Statutory Resolution by Shri Pitambar Das regarding disapproval of the Gold (Control) Amendment Ordinance, 1969 and consideration and passing of the Gold (Control) Amendment Bill, 1969, as passed by Lok Sabha.

(4) Discussion on the Resolution to be moved by the Minister of Home Affairs seeking approval of the Proclamation in relation to the State of Bihar.

(5) Consideration and passing of the following Bills, as passed by Lok Sabha :—

(i) The Criminal and Election Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1969.

(ii) The Delhi High Court (Amendment) Bill, 1969.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh) : I would like to draw the attention of the House to the two Reports of the Industrial Licensing Committee. They are matters of urgent public importance and I would have expected that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs would have provided some time for their discussion. But I am sorry to find that it is not there. Now, we are in the penultimate week of the session. In the last week it will be impossible to find time for a discussion of these Reports. Therefore,

I want to press through you, Sir, that time may be found for discussion of these two Reports of the Industrial Licensing Committee.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I would like the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to take note of it.

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH : The Ministry concerned is examining these two Reports and perhaps the discussion could be arranged after that examination is over.

## RESOLUTION RE DIVISION OF INDIA INTO FIVE ECONOMICALLY AND ADMINISTRATIVELY VIABLE ZONES—contd.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, to continue and take up the thread from where I left, I would like to dwell in brief on the controversy that has arisen in the course of the discussion on this Resolution as to whether we should change the basic pattern of governmental administration that we are having in the federal set-up schemed by the Constitution and have a unitary pattern. Doubts have been expressed by some hon. Members as to whether the difficulties in regard to the seeds of disintegration that have been discovered in the system in which we find ourselves are not on account of the federal set-up. That again, according to me, is a wrong conclusion. In a country like India with a large area, with a number of languages, with different sorts of cultures based on those languages, it will be impossible for any unitary system to succeed unless we envisage absolute dictatorship. That would mean the complete destruction of the democratic system to which we are wedded. Therefore, the main scheme that is found in the Constitution of this country with the Central Government and the State Governments working within a federal set-up is undoubtedly a scheme best suited to the conditions in this country.

It is not correct to state that it is on account of the federal set-up that the difficulties that we are experiencing today have grown. As I have already stated, it is also not correct to state that these difficulties are on any account due to the linguistic reorganisation of the States that we had in 1956. One of the main

reasons as to why the disputes and differences have grown in this country is that the persons who are in charge of the administration have not grown themselves tall enough to meet the situation and see that there is a solution. The persons in charge of the administration have always avoided the issues, they have always tried to bring in solutions of expediency for the moment, and when that moment is past, we find that there are greater troubles, greater differences and more serious disputes. We had the difficulty in Assam from the very day of the Constitution. That was the reason why probably the Constitution itself provided for certain different sort of administration in regard to the hill areas of Assam. The hill people of Assam were not satisfied with the scheme adumbrated in the Constitution and the disputes grew as time passed, and in a state of compulsion, Parliament had to pass legislation enabling a State within a State to be formed. I was one of those who opposed the formation of a State within a State. But then the legislation having been passed, the hill people's State as an autonomous State within the larger State of Assam is going to come by the subsequent legislation that has to be brought forward. And very serious thinking is made by other disputed areas and people in those areas of this country as to why the pattern that has been adopted for Assam should not be implemented for those areas to resolve those disputes. I am particularly having in mind the very serious differences that have grown in the matter of the administrative set-up for Telengana. Telengana has become a very highly controversial issue and so far as the people of the Telengana region in Andhra Pradesh are concerned, as you know better, it has become a very live issue, an issue of life and death struggle. They feel it impossible to submit to the State Government of Andhra Pradesh including the Telengana region. Therefore, the demand has come that there should be a separate State of Telengana. For the last seven months, I understand, not one single student in the schools and colleges in the Telengana region of Andhra Pradesh has attended the institutions. It is a very, very serious position. There have been a number of police shooting and large number of deaths. There has been destruction of property. There has been a sort of paralysing of the administration particularly in the rural areas of the Telengana region of Andhra Pradesh, and yet what has the State Government of Andhra Pradesh or the Central

Government done to resolve these disputes? It is true, Sir, that the Prime Minister and the Home Minister at one stage had gone to Hyderabad. It is true, Sir, that some attempts were made to contact representative leaders of the Telengana region most of whom today are under preventive detention. Attempts are made to create a second line of leadership for Telengana and make it appear as if that is the leadership of the Telengana region. But so far no serious attempt has been made by either the State Government of Andhra Pradesh or the Central Government to call together the representatives of the Andhra region and the representatives of the Telengana region and make them sit together either before the Prime Minister or the Home Minister and see that there is some sort of solution for the very serious differences that have arisen between the Andhras and the Telenganas of the Andhra Pradesh State.

I would submit, Sir, that if this sort of course had been adopted by the Central Government, probably a solution could have been found. But as if it is a lone issue, the Telenganas are talked to separately and the Andhras are talked to separately and we find that there is no solution to the problem. I should think, Sir, in the conditions in which we exist today, in some of the regions of this country we may have to consider some sort of autonomy for the areas concerned, may be a separate State, may be something less than a State. But certainly something will have to be done in regard to these regions. I would particularly name these troubled spots or the possible troubled spots, as the Telengana region in Andhra Pradesh, the Rayalaseema region in Andhra Pradesh, the Vidharbha region in the Maharashtra State, the city of Greater Bombay in the Maharashtra State. Unless some sort of administrative set is possible of exploration and implementation for all these areas in due course, I have no doubt that in these areas there will be further forces of disintegration at work and the disputes and differences would grow from these regions and spread themselves and try to engulf other regions and other peoples. That is one of the solutions that I suggest so far as the problem of disintegration is concerned.

Another thing, Sir, which I have not been able to understand is why some of these former French possessions and Portuguese possessions in this country should remain separate as enclaves within

[Shri K. Chandrasekharan]

a particular, well-defined region in the State where they can be fitted into a common administrative enclave. But they are kept as separate administrative enclaves and the difficulty is that there is no real integration between the former French-owned areas and the former Portuguese-owned areas.

A third point that we will have to seriously tackle is the question of boundaries as between the various States in the country. Some boundary disputes arose in the wake of the implementation of the proposals of the States Reorganisation Commission and we tried to solve them in certain areas. But in other areas we did not make a serious attempt to find solutions. And today, particularly as between the States of Mysore and Maharashtra, there are very serious differences as to which area should be included in the Mysore State and which area should be included in the Maharashtra State. In spite of the fact that a Commission was appointed to go into these disputes, we find that no serious effort has been made by the Central Government for finding a solution to the problem of boundary disputes as between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore. If these boundary disputes are left as they are, the differences will grow, and my apprehension is, Sir, that the pattern of these boundary disputes would come to exist in areas and as between peoples where there are at present really no boundary disputes. It is, therefore, necessary that one should be able to look into these boundary disputes also. I have no solution to offer except that these boundary disputes can be resolved only after taking the village as a unit. Unless the question of these boundary disputes with the village as the unit, as was suggested in at least one of the reports of a Commission that went into this aspect with regard to some other areas—I refer to the Commission headed by Mr. Pataskar—is solved there will be no genuine and acceptable solution to the disputes regarding boundaries.

One other important thing that requires tackling, so far as preventing disintegration is concerned, is economic uplift of the nation as a whole. In spite of the fact that there have been three major Plans and two or three Annual Plans thereafter—we are now in the first year of the Fourth Five-Year Plan, it is almost disgraceful to find that the differences, particularly on the economic plane, that

exist to-day are wider and greater than the differences that existed at the moment the country attained independence. The mixed economy that we tried, the building up of the private sector side by side with the public sector, encouraging the growth of the private sector with large amounts of public funds diverted to the private sector, has to an extent failed and it is necessary for us to realise this failure. In spite of the fact that we have had rather illustrious chairmen for the Planning Commission, it is a lamentable fact that the Planning Commission even in regard to the Fourth Plan has not been able to make any revolutionary change in the pattern of the Plan and the pattern that we adopted for the First Plan continues to be, by and large, the pattern for the Fourth Five-Year Plan also. It is absolutely necessary that there should be some re-thinking in regard to the private sector. I have no doubt that the private sector should not be encouraged, that public funds should not in any manner be diverted to the private sector, as if private sector is part of the Plan and, therefore, Plan funds have got to be diverted to the private sector also. It is only the growth of the private sector that has led to the creation of big monopoly houses in this country and it is because of the creation of big monopoly houses that the entire industrial investment and finances invested in this country are controlled to-day by the private sector and not by the public sector or the Central Government or the Planning Commission.

The two things that the nation requires to-day are the implementation of land reforms and large-scale industrialisation. In spite of the fact that the Planning Commission has been stating so much about the land reforms during the three Plan periods, and the State Governments have been trying to do something and the Central Government has been trying to aid them, the final picture, if drawn to-day, will show that there is really no effective implementation of land reforms at all. Where has ceiling been seriously implemented? Where has ownership of land changed from the non-cultivating landlord to the tiller of the soil? We have had Peasants' Days and Tillers' Days. But the overall effect of the land reforms that we have implemented during the last about 17 years is only that the tenant has had some relief in the matter of the contract rent that he was paying, and now he has only to pay some sort of a reduced,

fair rent. Unless we are able to industrialise the country as a whole and unless we are able to see that land reforms are implemented in the quickest time and in the fullest measure, the feeling of despair, the feeling of desolation, the feeling that the country is disintegrating will grow more and more in the nation and will engulf the youth of this nation. There is large-scale unemployment and under-employment, particularly among the educated youth in this country. Unless we are able to work land reforms and industrialise the country, and face these two things on a war-footing, if necessary, the country will disintegrate itself and disappear; nobody will be able to save it.

There have been no doubt fissiparous and separatist tendencies and these tendencies have also to be tackled on the political plane. It is time, Sir, that we had some sort of a political polarisation in this country. I am of the view that the country has got to divide itself between the Right and the Left. And if this country has to improve, if this country has to stand by itself, if this country has to face the problem of disintegration, the Left forces have got to consolidate and unite and take an ultra-Left outlook so far as the politics of this country is concerned. I am sure that the political parties and the political leaders in this country would be able to turn their tasks to the nation's advantage.

Thank you.

**SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA :** Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am really very grateful to my friend, Shri Sitaram Jaipuria, for bringing this Resolution before this House. It has given an opportunity to this House to highlight the problems facing the country. Fourteen hon. Members have taken part in this debate and have dealt with various aspects of this Resolution, according to their own ways of thinking. I personally feel that too many ideas have been mixed up in the Resolution, and unless we deal with each idea separately, we cannot come to a decision about the operative portion of the Resolution.

The first idea in the Resolution is that there are fissiparous and separatist tendencies prevailing in large parts of this country. The second idea is that the country is slowly disintegrating. We have to find out whether this is true or not. If we come to the conclusion that this is true, then we

have to think of the steps which are necessary in that direction. The third idea is whether the country has been able to get an efficient, able and clean administration after independence, after the country became a Republic. If in the examination of that question we find that certain changes are necessary in the administration, we have to think of the possible ways of bringing about such changes. The fourth idea is whether India should be governed through so many States, as it is to-day, or it should be governed through five zones, as indicated in the Resolution. Finally, the fifth idea is how best the country can be administered as a whole, whether the Centre should be strong, whether the States should be strong, whether there should be more centralisation or there should be more decentralisation. These are the five ideas incorporated in this one Resolution by Mr. Sitaram Jaipuria.

I shall try to deal with each of the problems. We have to have a bird's eye-view of the administration since independence. When independence came to India in 1947, India was not a united unit. As is well known, there were over 500 States which had their separate administrations. There were Union Territories. There were Part A States, Part B States and Part C States.

I must pay a tribute to the maker of modern India, Sardar Patel, who, through his ingenuity, through his foresight, through his strong handling of the situation, through his mastermind, tried to knit the various States into an integral unit of what is called India. And then he gradually took up the various questions of the different types of States then existing in India. But for his efforts I do not know what would have been the shape of things in this country today. That was between the period 1947 and 1951. Then the Constituent Assembly drew up a Constitution for this country and we adopted it. The Constitution makers had in their mind that after the country became a republic it would be able to have a good, clean, efficient, administration and the development of the various parts of the country would be on a uniform basis and all those things which could bring fissiparous tendencies would be removed and the people would feel that they were part of the country and that the development of the country meant their own development. In those days, after the attainment of independence, the country was fortunate in having at the helm of affairs that

[Shri M. P. Bhargava]

beloved Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. He was so popular with the masses, his voice was so great and effective throughout the country, that whatever he said was law, whatever he wanted the people responded to it, and whatever lead he gave the country, the country ungrudgingly accepted it, and it looked that things were moving very smoothly during the period 1952—1962 because Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was at the helm of affairs. The weakness of our administration and the hollowness of our preparedness towards external attacks came to light when the Chinese committed aggression on India in 1962. And therefore, for the first time the people of India began to think whether the policies which we were following were correct, whether the line which we had taken in regard to our relations with our neighbours and friends and with all the countries around the world, was correct. That was the first occasion when the people applied their mind to the necessities and needs of the country because for fifteen years before 1962 nobody bothered about anything because every Indian felt that his interests were safe in the hands of the Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Before independence the Congress was committed to the formation of States on the basis of language. For some time the people resisted that this idea of a division of the country on linguistic basis should not be taken up till things had stabilised, till the country had made a certain progress. But the forces became so great with Shri Potti Sriramulu sacrificing his life, that the Government of India was forced to take steps towards a redistribution of the country on the basis of language. That process continued up to 1957. I need not go into what all happened during those days for demanding linguistic States because that is too well known a history. But did that solve the problem of the country? My reply is, "No, it did not solve the problem." If the formation of linguistic States was a solution, if it was the only solution for the administration of this country, then, we would not have noticed today all that is happening in Telangana. The people of Telangana and Andhra both speak the same language. They are people of the same soil. Then, why this clash? I must say that this has happened because we are not true to what we say. That is the only reason why all that is happening in Telangana now. I am not disclosing any secret if I give a little personal touch to the problem. After the States Reorganisation Commission had given its report, as Mem-

bers well know it, the report was that the Telangana region should have the option to remain as a separate State and to reconsider the issue of joining the Andhra State after a certain number of years. And that was being considered by the Working Committee. The Working Committee deputed Mr. S. K. Patil to go to that region and find out the wishes of the people. And he went there with all the fanfare and came back and gave a report that if a separate Telangana State was not formed there would be bloodshed in the Telangana area and the people would not accept the verdict. I had just returned about that time from America after attending the United Nations General Assembly session. The Prime Minister called me and said, "Bhargava, I want to give you a very delicate task. I want you to go to Hyderabad, go round the Telangana area and without making any publicity give me a report about the wishes of the people of Telangana regarding their joining or not joining the bigger State of Andhra Pradesh." I went to Hyderabad and posed as if I had brought a research problem from America to be handled by the Regional Research Laboratory, Hyderabad, and the Osmania University. That was what I pretended to be doing. And then quietly I took a car from one of my friends and for three days I continuously toured the districts of Telangana. In that period I must have met no less than two to three thousand people representing all shades of opinion in the various districts of Telangana. And my own impression was that the people, by and large, were not interested whether they were governed in a separate Telangana or whether they were governed within the State of Andhra Pradesh or even whether they were governed from Delhi direct. So, it is the politician's game which makes problems and un-makes problems. I have full faith in my countrymen. They are, by and large, a very sensible people. They can decide for themselves what is good for them and what is bad for them. The complications arise only when the politicians, for their own interests, for their own personal motives, misguide the innocent people of India, whether it is in West Bengal, whether it is in Andhra, whether it is in Kerala, or whether it is in my own State of Uttar Pradesh. It is always the politicians and the game of power politics which bring complications. So I was talking about Telangana. I came back and gave a very short report : 'Panditji, I have gone through the entire assignment you gave me and my own impression is, nothing will happen if Telangana is merged with An-

dhra. What I would like is—and that is the feeling I have got—that safeguards should be provided for the development of those areas and for keeping the political entity of that area. It should not be under-represented in the administration; it should not be under-represented in the services. The development should be on an equal basis, not that the resources from Telangana are used in Andhra or *vice-versa*. It should have a fair deal. That is the only safeguard I would like to provide and I can assure you that there will not be a drop of blood on that issue. I am happy to tell the House that Telangana was merged in Andhra and not a drop of blood was shed. Now where did the trouble start? A gentlemen's agreement was arrived at between the representatives of Andhra and Telangana and if I remember aright, Mr. Akbar Ali Khan, who is in the Chair, will bear me out, that there were four representatives from Andhra and four from Telangana who signed that what is called, the gentleman's agreement and the clauses in that agreement, if my memory does not fail, were that if the Chief Minister is from Andhra, the Deputy Chief Minister will be from Telangana and *vice-versa*. That was one of the clauses. The second clause was that the development of the Telangana area will not be neglected. Unfortunately in the years to come, these clauses in the agreement were not implemented except for a brief time when during the regime of Mr. D. Sanjivayya, Mr. K.V. Ranga Reddy was the Deputy Chief Minister. Thereafter, all these years, they have not cared to give a Deputy Chief Minister for the Telangana area, what to talk of Chief Ministership. That is one of the causes of the resentment. The other cause is, the services which I mentioned. People from Telangana have been seen that they have not got their dues in the services and most of the positions which should, according to the population ratio of 60 : 40 go to them are being denied to them. That is another cause. The third is about the development of the area. The development of the area has not been to that extent which should have been according to their resources. That has taken the shape of things in the form of resentment. Now what happened? It started as a small incident in a university election and the students and the Government servants became involved in the whole agitation. When this agitation was started, if the Central Government and the Government of Andhra had acted in time and quickly, and convened a meeting of the representatives of both the regions and tried to find a solution within the Andhra re-

gion, I have not the least doubt that a solution would have been found.

**SHRI K. P. MALLIKARJUNUDU** (Andhra Pradesh) : It was done.

**SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA** : I know what was done and what was not done. If vigorous efforts were made, things would not have happened like this but unfortunately a free hand was given to the Chief Minister and things are taking shape from bad to worse. Things have come to a stage to-day that nothing short of a separate Telangana may satisfy those people. I am against small States and that is why I have stood up to support the Resolution of Mr. Jaipuria.

I was talking about 1962. After the Chinese aggression Pandit Nehru was not keeping well and things, in my opinion, became out of control of his hands after 1962. Then came his unfortunate death in 1964 and most vital things happened, which, according to me, has brought us in a reverse gear. What I mean is the party in power at Delhi has the absolute right of choosing their leader who becomes the Prime Minister and then the Centre has its hold on the States. After the death of Pandit Nehru, the process had reversed. Instead of the central party having the absolute power of electing its leader, the Chief Ministers of the States were brought on the scene to choose a new leader. That was very wrong and when the Chief Ministers were brought on the scene, everyone wanted his pound of flesh after the elections from the Prime Minister. It was a coincidence that the Congress Party in the Parliament in Delhi wanted Lal Bahadur Shastri to be their leader and the Chief Ministers of the States also wanted him. It was just a coincidence because Shri Shastri was the obvious choice, according to me. There the process began where the Centre became weak and the States began to exert their influence and put pressure on the Centre. (*Time bell rings*) I am a person who remains according to the rules. If the fifteen minutes rule had been enforced on everybody, I would also have confined within that time. Mr. Chandrasekharan took more time. . .

**SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN** : Because my previous speaker took 35 minutes, I took more time.

**SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA** : It is a vicious circle.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE** (Maharashtra) : The smaller group suffers even on a Private Members' day.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : Mr. Khobragade has always his say. Then Shastri became the Prime Minister and he was there for a short time and as you all know even during that short period he showed to the world that he was a Prime Minister for the country for peace time as well as at the time of war. The able manner in which he conducted the Indo-Pakistan war is not unknown to anybody and it was the country's misfortune that he died suddenly in January, 1966 in Tashkent and the country was again faced with the problem of choosing another leader and again my gruse is the same. Instead of the party choosing the leader, it was the Chief Ministers who again had their say in choosing a leader.

SHRI B. D. KHOBRA : Is he talking of the Central leadership?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : I am talking of . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : The Resolution is not on that.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : I am coming to that. If you want me to finish, I will do so in two minutes.

Now this is what has been happening, and in the process we have not been able to give a good administration after 1962. There was no atmosphere, if I may put it that way bluntly, till the 1962 elections, because Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, well, was supreme. Whenever he went to the polls, he got the votes and he got majority everywhere. Democracy came into being only in the 1967 elections. And thereafter, what has been happening is not unknown to anybody. Repeatedly elections are being held in States. Small States are playing havoc. Who does not know the story of Haryana, the story of *Aya Ram, Gaya Ram* of Haryana? Who does not know what has been happening in Bihar repeatedly?

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : पहले तो यू० पी० से शुरू हुआ ।

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : So many; not one.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : No interruptions please.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA : Now can we find a solution to this problem by keeping these small States unless the parties emerge out on an all-India basis ?

श्री राजनारायण : तर्ग्व जी, बिहार में क्या हो गया ?

श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव : बिहार में रिपीटेड इलेक्शन्स हो रहे हैं। क्या हो रहा है प्रेसीडेन्शियल रूल है ।

Now, unless the parties emerge out, unless two or at the most three parties emerge out on an all-India basis, democracy will not function in this country. Therefore it is absolutely necessary that efforts should be made to give such units to the country which will be economically viable and administratively strong. Therefore I support the Resolution of Mr. Sitaram Jaipuria, because that is the one way in which I see the development of the all-India parties, good administration in the States and better relations between the Centre and the States, because the lesser the number of M.L.A.'s, the more nuisance they can create in the State as well as for the Centre, the greater the number of M.L.A.'s in the region, the lesser are the chances of defections and more are the chances for all-India parties to come up.

Thank you.

श्री बी० एन० मंडल (बिहार) : उप-सभाध्यक्ष जी, श्री सीताराम जयपुरिया जो प्रस्ताव इस सदन के सामने लाये हैं उसके लिये वह धन्यवाद के पात्र है। आज देश में यह एक अहम समस्या है कि देश की स्थिति में पृथक्वादी मनोवृत्ति बहुत जोर शोर से उभर रही है और उसका ही नतीजा देश में यह हो रहा है कि अनेक तरह के उपद्रव खड़े हो रहे हैं। साथ ही साथ, इस देश में इसके समाधान में एक यह भी आंदोलन चलाया जा रहा है कि शायद इस देश की गड़बड़ी का कारण जो भाषा के आधार पर देश का बंटवारा हुआ है वह है। मेरी समझ में यह बात गलत है। इसलिये समाधान के रूप में श्री जयपुरिया का जो प्रस्ताव है कि देश को 5 भागों में बांट देना चाहिये और उनका एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव यूनिट बनाना चाहिये, इसको मैं गलत समझता हूँ। जिस समस्या की ओर उन्होंने ध्यान दिलाया है, वह समस्या सही है

लेकिन उसका समाधान सही नहीं है। आज देश में बराबर उपद्रव होते हैं। उपद्रव का तुरन्त कारण कोई दूसरा रहा करता है, लेकिन असली कारण छिपा रहता है, कभी-कभी भाषा उपद्रव का कारण बन जाती है, कभी-कभी संप्रदाय उपद्रव का कारण बन जाता है, कभी-कभी जातीयता उपद्रव का कारण बन जाती है, लेकिन इन सब उपद्रवों का असली कारण नहीं कहा जा सकता। असली कारण यह है कि समूचे देश के लोगों की एक कुढ़न है, खास कर देश के जो छोटे लोग हैं, साधारण लोग हैं, उनके दिल में हमेशा एक कुढ़न रहती है और उसकी वजह से कभी ऐसी बात सामने आ जाती है, जो कि इमीजियेट प्रोवेकेशन का काम करती है, जो उपद्रव खड़ा करने वाला होता है। इसलिये अगर उस स्थिति को दूर किया जाये, तो उतनी जल्दी उपद्रव खड़ा नहीं होगा, जितनी जल्दी उपद्रव खड़ा हुआ करता है। इसलिए इसको सोचने की जरूरत है। इस बात को सोचने के सिलसिले में हम पाते हैं कि जिस ढंग से 20 वर्ष तक इस देश का शासन चलाया गया है, उन नीतियों के ऊपर चलाया गया है, उन नीतियों में अनेक ऐसी नीतियां थी, जो गलत नीतियां थीं और उन गलत नीतियों को खोजने के सिलसिले में यह भी पाया जायेगा कि क्यों वह गलत नीतियां निर्धारित की गई थी इस देश के लिये, तो यह भी मालूम पड़ेगा कि जो नीति बनाने वाले लोग थे, उनमें स्वाभाविक तरीके से वह नीति ही बन सकती थी। तो इसके दो कारण होते हैं। एक तो गलत नीति और दूसरे उस नीति को बनाने वाले जो लोग हैं, वह खुद भी गलत हैं, इसलिये भी इस देश में इस तरह का शासन नहीं हो सका, इस तरह की कार्यवाही सरकार की ओर से नहीं हो सकी, जिससे देश में एकता आती। जो हम लोगों का संविधान है, उस संविधान के प्रिम्बल में भी कहा गया है कि किस ढंग से किस तरह का समाज हमको बनाना है और उसके लिये कहते थे कि अमुक अमुक बात करने की जरूरत है और उसके अंदर में कहा गया है। इस ढंग से सरकार कार्यवाही करती, इस ढंग से संविधान के

प्रिम्बल में जो कहा गया है, उस पर अमल करती, तो देश में एकता कायम हो जाती।

जो डाइरेक्टिव प्रिन्सिपल है, उस संबंध में भी कुछ कहा गया है। अगर दिल से उसके ऊपर सरकार आचरण करती तो निश्चित तरीके से देश में एक इन्टीग्रेशन कायम हुआ होता और वैसी हालत में जो भाषा के आधार पर जो प्रान्त बने हैं, उनमें आपस में भाषा के आधार पर लड़ाई नहीं हो सकती थी। लड़ाई कहां पर होती है, जहां पर विषमता रहती है। वहां पर लड़ाई होती है, जहां पर आर्थिक विषमता हो या दूसरे तरह की विषमता हो, लेकिन प्रधानतः इस देश में लड़ाई का कारण है आर्थिक विषमता। उस आर्थिक विषमता को मिटाने के लिये सरकार ने प्लान बनाया उस ढंग का प्लान नहीं बन सका, जिस प्लान के जरिये देश के साधारण लोगों की तकलीफ दूर होती और वह इस बात को महसूस कर सकती कि यह देश हमारा है, देश की सरकार हमारी है। इस ढंग की बात सरकार महसूस कर सकती थी। लेकिन इस तरह की परिस्थिति प्लान के जरिये से सरकार इन बीस वर्षों में नहीं लाई है। इसलिये यह कहना कि सिर्फ इस देश को 5 भागों में बांट देने से ही जो देश की समस्या है उसका समाधान हो जायेगा, ऐसी बात नहीं है। किस तरीके का एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव स्ट्रक्चर हो, इसके रूप-रेखा के संबंध में हमारी पार्टी ने शुरू से ही सफाई के साथ कहा है। यह देश जनतंत्र है। जनतंत्र का मतलब होता है कि जनता की जनता के लिये और जनता के द्वारा सरकार यही जनतंत्र का सर्वमान्य सिद्धांत है, तो इस सिलसिले में हमको देखना पड़ेगा कि जिस ढंग से हिन्दुस्तान का जनतंत्र कांग्रेस पार्टी की लीडरशिप ने चलाया, क्या जनतंत्र की यह जो डेफिनिशन है, उस डेफिनिशन को उसने पूरा किया है। तो मेरा अपना अनुभव है, वह यह है कि उस ढंग के जनतंत्र को नहीं लाया गया है। दूसरी बात यह भी है कि इसके पहले इस बात को भी जान लेना चाहिये कि जनतंत्र की स्थिति क्या है। जब कोई देश स्वतंत्र होता



[श्री० बी० एन्० मंडल]

है, स्वतंत्र होने के बाद देश की जितनी जनता रहती है सबको बराबर का हक रह जाता है, देश का जितना एसेट रहता है, चाहे उसका जंग हो, पहाड़ हो, चाहे उसका खेत हो, चाहे उसके नाले हों, चाहे उसकी झीलें हों, चाहे उसके फंफू हों, चाहे उसके उद्योग हों, जितनी सम्पदा देश की होती है, सारी जनता का उस पर अधिकार हो जाता है। चुनी हुई जो सरकार आती है, उसका कर्तव्य होता है कि इस ढंग का इंतजाम करे, जिस इंतजाम का यह नतीजा निकले कि बराबरी के आधार पर मेहनत की जाये और जो कुछ उसका फल निकले, उस फल का बराबरी के आधार पर सभी लोगों में बांटा जाय। यह जनतंत्र का मूल सिद्धांत है। और उस सिद्धान्त को चलाने के लिए जो जनतंत्र की दूसरी डेफिनिशन हमने कही है, वह डेफिनिशन तो है ही, लेकिन इन सारी परिस्थितियों को अगर आप देखेंगे तो आप पायेंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान का शासन इन 20 वर्षों में जिस ढंग से चलाया जाना चाहिये था, उस ढंग से नहीं चलाया गया। जो विषमता अंग्रेजों के जमाने से हमारे समाज के अन्दर चली आ रही है, वही आज भी कायम है। जो आर्थिक विषमता, सांस्कृतिक विषमता, सामाजिक विषमता, राजनीतिक विषमता और सारी की सारी जितनी भी विषमताएं हैं, जिन्हें स्वतंत्रता के जमाने में, जनतंत्र के जमाने में मिटनी चाहिए थी, वे नहीं मिट सकी। इसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि समूचे देश में अलग-अलग गिरोह बन गये और वे विभाजन की मांग करने लग।

3 P.M.

अभी हमारे मामले नागा प्रदेश की समस्या है। बिहार में झारखण्ड का आन्दोलन है और आन्ध्र प्रदेश में तेलंगाना की समस्या है। इन सारी समस्याओं को इन परिस्थितियों में देखना चाहिये। अगर आज देश का इंतजाम उस तरीके से हुआ होता, जिस तरीके से मैंने कहा है, तो आज हमारे सामने इस तरह की स्थिति नहीं आती। जैसा अभी हमारे मित्र श्री महावीर जी ने कहा था कि अगर इन

बातों का पहले से ही अन्दाजा लगा लिया जाता तो आज हमारे सामने तेलंगाना की स्थिति नहीं आती। जो वहां का पिछड़ा हुआ एरिया है, उस एरिया के लिए विशेष विकास की योजनाएं बनाई जातीं। जिन लोगों ने वहां के लोगों को शासन करने के लिए इजाजत दी थी, उन्होंने शासन से इस बारे में एग्रीमेंट करा लिया था कि चूंकि यह पिछड़ा हुआ इलाका है, इसलिए वहां के विकास की ओर विशेष ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिए। लेकिन इस तरह का एग्रीमेंट होते हुए भी शासन ने इस बात का कोई खयाल नहीं किया। वहां के शासन ने वहां का डेवलपमेंट इस तरह से नहीं किया, जिससे वहां के लोग संतुष्ट हो जाते।

वहां के लोगों से इस बात का वादा किया गया था कि फलां क्षेत्र का चीफ मिनिस्टर होगा और फलां क्षेत्र का डिप्टी मिनिस्टर होगा। इस तरह का जो वादा किया गया था वह पूरा नहीं हुआ और न वहां का विकास ही हुआ। इसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि वहां के लोगों को जो तकलीफें थीं वे दूर नहीं हुईं और वहां का एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सैट अप जिस तरह का होना चाहिये था वैसा नहीं हुआ। वहां के लोग समझने लगे कि यह शासन हमारी तकलीफों को दूर नहीं कर रहा है और एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सैट-अप के बारे में जो वादा किया गया था वह भी पूरा नहीं किया जा रहा है। इन सब बातों का नतीजा यह हुआ कि तेलंगाना के लोग अपना एक अलग प्रदेश बनाना चाहते हैं, अपना एक अलग एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सैट-अप कायम करना चाहते हैं। क्या इस तरह की मांग करना डेमोक्रेसी के सिद्धान्त के खिलाफ है। किसी के स्वार्थ और हितों के खिलाफ हो सकती है, मगर किसी चीज के खिलाफ नहीं है। अगर किसी चीज के खिलाफ है, तो जो कोई अपना नाजायज स्वार्थ किसी दूसरे के ऊपर लादना चाहता है उसी के खिलाफ है।

आज हमारे देश में दो तरह की मांग हो रही है। कुछ लोग और कुछ पार्टियां तो यह कह रही हैं कि सेन्टर को मजबूत होना चाहिये और

कुछ लोग और पार्टियाँ कह रही हैं कि प्रान्त मजबूत हो और सेंटर कमजोर हो। इस तरह से लोगों में दो तरह के मतभेद हैं। लेकिन मेरा यह कहना है कि न यह दृष्टिकोण ठीक है और न वह दृष्टिकोण ठीक है। हम तो यह कहते हैं कि जनतंत्र की परिभाषा में यह कहा गया है कि जनता के द्वारा शासन हो और उसके चार भाग हों। जनता सरकार को एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन चलाने के लिए जो पावर देती है, उस पावर को चार भागों में बांट दिया जाना चाहिये। एक भाग केन्द्र में रहे, दूसरा भाग राज्यों में रहे, तीसरा भाग जिलों में रहे और चौथा भाग गावों में रहे। जो कुछ भी रुपया पैसा जनता सरकार को शासन चलाने के लिए देती है, उसको भी चार भागों में बांट दिया जाना चाहिये। इस तरह से जो अधिकार है, उन्हें चार भागों में बांट दिया जाना चाहिये और रुपया पैसे को भी चार भागों में बांट दिया जाना चाहिये। जो इतजाम गाव के लैवल पर होता है, उसको वहाँ की जनता को सौंप दिया जाना चाहिये। इसी तरह से जो एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव काम जिलों का होता है, वह जिलों को सौंप दिया जाना चाहिये और जो काम राज्य सरकार का होता है वह उसको दे देना चाहिये। अगर आप इस तरह का प्रबन्ध कर देंगे, तो जो गड़बड़ी आजकल हमें दिखलाई दे रही है, वह गड़बड़ी इस ढंग से दूर हो सकती है।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में किसी एक गिरोह का बहुमत है और वह अपने स्वार्थ को साधने के लिए सब तरह की बात करता है। आज शासन चलाने वाले कौन लोग हैं। शासन चलाने वाले वही लोग हैं, जिन्होंने किसी जमाने में, हिन्दु जमाने में समाज को दो टुकड़ों में बांट कर रख दिया था। एक टुकड़े में तो बड़े लोग रहते थे, जो ब्रिज कहलाये जाते थे और दूसरे टुकड़े में हिन्दुस्तान की आम जनता के लोग थे। इन लोगों ने मुसलमानों के जमाने में उनके अधीन रहकर भी शोषण की प्रथा को चलाया। इसी तरह से अंग्रेजों के जमाने में भी उनके अधीन रहकर इन लोगों ने शोषण की प्रथा को चलाया।

कांग्रेस के आन्दोलन में भी इन लोगों की लीडरशिप रही और इसी लीडरशिप के हाथों में आज हिन्दुस्तान का शासन है। हिन्दुस्तान के स्वतंत्र होने के बाद इन लोगों का देश की जनता के ऊपर जो इतजाम हुआ, वह गलत इतजाम हुआ और उस गलत इतजाम का नतीजा यह हुआ कि आज देश में इतनी ज्यादा तकलीफ बढ़ गई है कि साधारण लोगों के लिए जीना मुश्किल हो गया है।

यही सब कारण है कि आज आन्ध्र में तेलगाना का मसला उठ खड़ा हुआ है और इस मसले को सुलझाने के लिए देश को पाँच भागों में बांटने से काम नहीं चलेगा। बल्कि तेलगाना वालों की जो तकलीफें हैं, जो आज उनकी पिछड़ी हुई स्थिति है, जब तक उसको सुधारा नहीं जायेगा तब तक यह मसला हल नहीं हो सकता है। अगर अपनी स्थिति को सुधारने के लिए वे अलग होना चाहते हैं, तो सरकार को इसके लिए तैयार रहना चाहिये। लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि तेलगाना के आदमी इस बात को समझे कि अलग होने से उनकी तकलीफें दूर नहीं हो सकेंगी। अगर वे एक साथ रहे तो एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन चलाने में कम खर्च होगा। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि तेलगाना के लोग आन्ध्र में ही रहकर अपने क्षेत्र का अलग से इतजाम करें। उन लोगों को अपने क्षेत्र का इतजाम करने के लिए छोड़ दिया जाना चाहिये और उसके लिए पूरे साधन उन्हें दिये जाने चाहिये। अगर इस तरह का प्रबन्ध कर दिया जायेगा, तो उन्हें अपनी तकलीफें दूर करने का अवसर प्राप्त हो जायेगा। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस ढंग से कोई व्यवस्था कर दी जानी चाहिये।

इसी तरह से छोटा नागपुर के भाग में झारखण्ड वालों का आन्दोलन चल रहा है। अभी उस आन्दोलन में तीव्रता नहीं आई है, लेकिन वह भी तीव्रता प्राप्त कर सकता है; क्योंकि बिहार के छोटे नागपुर के हिस्से में बाहर से लोग आकर वहाँ के खदानों में कब्जा किये हुए हैं, कारखाने चला रहे हैं, कोयला निकाल रहे हैं और इस तरह से वहाँ से मुनाफा लेकर दूसरे जगह के

[श्री बी० एन० मडल]

लोगो को देते हैं। उस क्षेत्र में बसने वाले जितने भी आदिवासी हैं, उनकी तकलीफें दिन प्रति दिन बढ़ती ही चली जा रही हैं। वहाँ पर जो टिप्पू जाति के आदिवासी हैं, वे कहते हैं कि दूसरे जगह के लोग आकर हमारे ऊपर शासन चला रहे हैं, और हमें अपने ही देश में तिरस्कार की भावना से देखा जाता है। इसलिए मैं सरकार से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वह अब भी चेत जाय, वहाँ की हालत को समझ ले और उसको सुधारने का जल्द से जल्द प्रयत्न करे।

इसी तरह की जो बातें हैं, वे नागा प्राबलम की जड़ हैं। वहाँ पर जो प्लेन्स के लोग आ गये हैं, उन्होंने उनका शासन में तिरस्कार कर रखा है और उन्हें किसी चीज़ में भी शामिल नहीं कर रखा है। हिन्दुस्तान में जाति प्रथा पहले से ही चली आ रही है और यही कारण है कि नागा प्रदेश में जो वहाँ के लोग हैं उन्हें अपर क्लास के लोग तिरस्कार की भावना से देखते हैं। वे लोग उन लोगों का बिल्कुल खयाल नहीं करते हैं। यही कारण है आज वहाँ की समस्या इतनी भयंकर हो गई है।

इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो प्रस्ताव श्री जयपुरिया जी लाये हैं और उसमें उन्होंने जो सुझाव दिये हैं, उसको मैं ठीक नहीं समझता हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आज सरकार सारी स्थिति को और समस्या को अच्छी तरह से समझे और इस तरह से एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन करे कि लोगो को यह महसूस होने लगे कि सरकार हमारी उन्नति के लिए कार्य कर रही है। सरकार को पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्रों के लोगों की दशा सुधारने के लिए जल्द कदम उठाने चाहिये ताकि उनकी हालत सुधर सके। सरकार को कम से कम इतना तो अवश्य ही करना चाहिये कि एक वर्ष में उनकी कुछ न कुछ उन्नति हो, अगर कच्चा हजारवा भाग के बराबर उनकी दशा में उन्नति हो जायेगी, तो वे लोग समझेंगे कि सरकार हमारी उन्नति के लिए कार्य कर रही है। इस ढंग से सरकार को काम करना चाहिये।

SHRI T CHENGALVAROYAN (Tamil Nadu). Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am indeed very much obliged to my esteemed friend, Mr. Jaipuria, for having brought forward this very important Resolution which has stirred our thoughts and sublimated our feelings on one of the most poignant problems of the present-day conditions in our country. I should have expected with no unseasonable importunity willing support to my friend's motion if he had brought this before 1956. Since 1956 we have accepted the pattern of State reorganisation on the fundamental basis of a linguistic and to a certain extent territorial nexus for the different States that we have organised. I, therefore, plead with my esteemed friend, Mr. Jaipuria, that today to think of another reorganisation, even though on a very scientific basis which his Resolution propounds clearly, to my mind will create greater political and national confusion. I, therefore, submit for the very kind consideration of this House that we must take note of the factors and forces that Mr. Jaipuria's Resolution brings to the forefront for our consideration. He has complained in his Resolution about the fissiparous and separatist tendencies. May I ask this House as I would certainly ask my people outside, why these fissiparous and separatist tendencies have cropped up and why, in the context of the great onward march of our country to a greater and more purposeful expansion and elevation of our nationhood, we should fall back upon such fissiparous and separatist tendencies? I remember I had occasion to translate my great and beloved leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru speech at Madras, when he said this immediately after 1953. Why should there be this upsurge in sections of our people in the name of language, in the name of community, in the name of region and in the name even of religion? He gave a brilliant analysis of the political features of such a phenomenon and said that when a new era of expansion and elevation comes to a country, after a long spell of slavery and subordination, naturally everybody wants to have an efflorescence to greater heights and greater comforts and this onrush may appear at the outset to be fissiparous and may appear to be separatist, but in the ultimate analysis by a wise and proper handling of the fundamental forces that are behind these tendencies, we could overcome this difficulty. If I may just take for illustration though not for exhaustive consideration the question of linguism as being a very formidable and to a very great extent a fateful factor in the fissiparous and separatist tendencies, rightly

we have given unto ourselves that sublimated status to all our national languages and we consider that all the languages are the different tongues of Mother India. However, other nations may speak with one language; so far as Mother India is concerned, she speaks in fourteen or seventeen tongues in such sweet symphony that it gives an orchestral music for the entire country. Therefore, the question of linguism has to be handled very delicately and I may submit very respectfully for the consideration of this House that if we want to have linguistic harmony the process must be not of imposition, but must be a process of assimilation. It will be a motivation, it will be a factor for the gradual realisation of the fundamental unity of this country and we may accept a linguistic formula acceptable to all sections of the people. But in our hurry, in our haste, in our desire to be rather dominating, we made some mistakes and naturally these raised a kind of fissiparous tendency.

Then, let us again consider the fissiparous tendency of regionalism. In this context of regionalism it is rather unfortunate that it is manifesting itself, its dragon's head in the different sections of our country and have we calmly analysed why this regionalism is again cropping up? In my analysis I have found that it is because of the imbalance in our economic development, it is because of the neglect of the vulnerable groups of our society, it is because we were blind to certain important and urgent aspects and upsurges of the backward people, there is this clamour for regionalism and, therefore, it results in a kind of separatist demand. May I respectfully plead that our Planning Commission must set up an independent apparatus in the planning division in order to assess, analyse and ultimately decide upon a particular priority in respect of planned growth and development of our country. I may just give the example of Telangana which has got current value and current importance. Why is it that there is the demand for a separate Telengana? You, Mr. Vice-Chairman, know and perhaps none better with regard to this area that there has been a long historic neglect even before the reorganisation and when this historic neglect has been continued and perpetrated naturally the people lose faith, lose confidence and lose even cheer in their life. Naturally it leads to a kind of separatist demand. Therefore, I submit that it is not only in Telengana. Even in different parts of different States there are sections and sectors which are neglected. How long can you expect our

people to bear this disappointment? How long can you expect our people to endure this suffering? Therefore, the solution, if I may say so with great respect to my friend, Mr. Jaipuria, is not zonal division of our country once again, but in attending to the problem of imbalanced growth in different sections of our country. I have no doubt in my mind that when we attempt and succeed in it, this demand for regional separatism would disappear.

There is one more point and that is the communal appeal and also a kind of religious fanaticism that is being spread in some parts of the country. Have we examined why this communalism once again is rearing its head? Have we examined why this fanaticism is trying to take a political dimension? We recall to ourselves the days when we were struggling for the freedom of our country and under the most inspiring leadership of Mahatmaji was there any communal bickering? Was there any religious division? If there was a struggle in Bombay, we, in Tamil Nadu, were thrilled with ecstasy and were inspired. If Babu Chidambaram Pillay was arrested in Tuticorin, Bal Gangadhar Tilak created a stir for it in Bombay. In that great blazing ideal of political freedom for our country, all this petty, mean and small considerations vanished into thin air. Therefore, I submit that we in this House, and also elsewhere as great leaders of thought and action should see that today our country requires vision, our country requires an ideal, today our country requires dynamism, today our country requires a direction, a destiny and what that dimension and what that destiny should be I find after an ultimate analysis, is a new ideal of socialism, which alone can engulf all the entire sections of this country, a new tidal wave of socialist thought, of socialist work, of socialist endeavour, a socialist pattern, a socialist structure, a socialist civilisation for our country. I visualise that it will certainly inspire every section of our people. That will certainly enthuse every part of our population to a new vision and to a new ideal.

I will conclude with this. Perhaps I may be accused of having a certain amount of weakness. I have a dream that the chill winds of Kashmir will blow on the shores of Kanya Kumari. I have a dream that the sweet Ganges will mingle with the rippling rhythm of the Cauvery. I have a dream that the teachers of the North will make the people in the South learn and that people from the South will teach students in the North. I have a dream that our

[Shri T. Chengalvaroyan]

country is going to be united, united not only by history, united not only by geography, united not only in our direction, united not only in our dimension, united not only in our destiny, but also we shall all march forward and onward. With this grim determination we shall bury all these fissiparous and separatist tendencies and once more show to the world that India leads mankind to a better and more purposeful life. This is my midnight dream. This is my waking theme.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBRADE :** Mr. Vice-Chairman, I thank our colleague, Mr. Jaipuria, for having given us an opportunity to express our views on a vitally important issue. However, I cannot agree with the views that he has expressed in his speech or the solution that he has proposed in his resolution. I am opposed to the resolution moved by him for dividing the country into five zones. In my opinion it will be a retrograde and politically unwise step. It has been mentioned here that due to the division of the country on linguistic basis there has been a rise in the fissiparous tendencies. I do not agree with this contention that it is a result of the division of the country on linguistic basis. Even before the country was divided on linguistic lines there were quarrels, disputes and bickerings among the different groups within a State. If you go back to 1953 when there were composite States of Madras, Hyderabad and Bombay, you will notice that there were always quarrels between Tamils and Telegus in Madras, between Gujaratis and Maharashtrians in Bombay, and similar was the case with Hyderabad. So you cannot say that because the country has been divided on linguistic basis there are disputes and bickerings and fissiparous tendencies. These were experienced when there were composite States like Bombay, Hyderabad and Madras. Therefore, if we accept the proposal of Mr. Jaipuria and create larger zones consisting of different linguistic groups, I do not think we will be in a position to solve the problem and create a homogeneous society where national integration will be observed.

What is the position even now? We have got larger States. But are we to understand that there are no such disputes between the different regions in a State? As has been pointed out in this House, there are disputes between Telangana and Andhra, there is dispute between old Mysore and new Mysore, there is dispute between Gujarat and Saurashtra, there is

dispute between Maharashtra and Vidarbha, there is dispute between Eastern U.P. and Western U.P., there is dispute as has been pointed out by Mr. Mandal, between some parts of Bihar and other parts of Bihar. So these disputes will continue whether you have got smaller units or bigger units. This is not going to solve the problem. Mr. Jaipuria has pointed out that because there are smaller units, because there are linguistic States, all these bickerings are going on. I do not think we will be in a position to solve the problem by accepting the measure suggested by Mr. Jaipuria. What are the reasons for that? There are disputes between different States. What are the reasons for that? There are disputes regarding boundaries. There are disputes regarding distribution of river waters. There are disputes regarding setting up of different industrial projects in the public sector in the different States. How can we solve this problem? When it was decided that India is going to have fourth steel plant, every State was agitating that this steel plant should be set up in that particular State only. If I am not wrong, I think there was very strong agitation in Andhra State. But by agitation these problems cannot be solved. There is agitation in Maharashtra regarding the solution of the boundary dispute between Mysore and Maharashtra. As suggested by one hon. Member just now, what difficulty is there to adopt the Pataskar formula? These disputes will go on as long as the people living in a particular region have a feeling that an injustice is being done to them. If you adopt certain principles and try to show the people that justice is being done to them, then in spite of the fact that a particular decision might go against them, they will not agitate. When the feeling of injustice grows, then only there is agitation, because they feel that as compared to the people of the other region in the country they are not getting justice from the leaders of the country.

Now when there was a dispute between Madras and Mysore, you adopted the Pataskar formula. The dispute was resolved on the basis of village as the unit. When there is the same border dispute between Mysore and Maharashtra, why should not the same formula be adopted? As for the solutions that have been suggested so far, the Pataskar solution is the best solution that could be utilised to solve the problem between Maharashtra and Mysore. If you adopt this principle, then whether Maharashtra is agreeable or not or Mysore is agreeable or not they will believe that certain principles have been

evolved for arriving at a decision. But you appointed the Mahajan Commission. Can anyone say that the Mahajan report is based on sound principles even though Mr. Mahajan was a Judge? Can anyone say that the award is impartial? Nobody can say that. It is not an impartial award at all. It is not based on any principle. It appears to be an arbitrary award. Therefore, whether it is river dispute regarding Narmada between Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh, whether it is border dispute between Mysore and Maharashtra, whether it is the dispute on Chandigarh between Haryana and Punjab, you must first evolve the principle by which you want to solve the problem, and then you apply the principle impartially and solve the problem. I will not agitate because I would feel that justice has been done to me. You are not adopting any uniform principle and you are trying to solve the problem according to the exigencies of politics, not national politics but exigencies of the politics of the party which is in power and which wants to retain its power. That way you will not be able to promote national integration. For that purpose you must evolve principles and on the basis of the principles you must solve the problems.

There is discontent in Telengana, in Vidarbha, in Saurashtra, in old Mysore, because the gentlemen's agreement is not implemented. That grievance has been ventilated in this House by those people who supported Telangana. The same thing can be said about Vidarbha. There was a gentlemen's agreement between Maharashtra and Vidarbha leaders on certain programme, but this agreement has never been implemented. It should have been done. Naturally when the agreement is not implemented, there is discontent, there is dissatisfaction and frustration, and it leads to agitation. The proposal suggested by Mr. Jaipuria cannot successfully solve the problem and promote national integration. I may quote here the experience in West Pakistan. Let Mr. Jaipuria see what is happening in West Pakistan. In West Pakistan they have abolished all States. There is no Sind, there is no Punjab, there is no Baluchistan, there is no North West Frontier Province. But for administrative purposes they have created only one Province, West Pakistan. But even then, in spite of the fact that there has been an authoritarian regime, they could not remove the differences between different regions, between different peoples living in different regions. If it is not possible to remove the differences

there in an authoritarian regime, how can we solve the problems in our country where we are trying to promote democracy by forming bigger States? I do not think it will be possible. A proposal has been made by the spokesmen of the Jana Sangh that if we want to have national integration in this country, we should have the unitary system. I must say that this proposal exhibits utter lack of realism. India is a vast country and being a vast country, I do not think that we can have the unitary set-up. Apart from being a vast country, India consists of different and diverse languages, diverse religions and diverse cultures, and therefore it is not at all possible to have a unitary system in this country. The most suitable system for governing this country is the federal type of set-up and therefore a unitary type of system will not at all be successful.

Sir, I would suggest one more thing. If we have to again reorganise this country, it should be done on the basis of smaller States. Dr. Ambedkar had advocated that it would be in the interests of the country that this country should be reorganised into smaller States. Recently, Shri Jaya Prakash Narain also has supported this proposal and he has advocated that the country should be divided into smaller States. Why I suggest that the country should be divided into smaller States is this. We have accepted the formula of one State, one language because of our experience prior to 1953. We had noticed that where there were multi-lingual States, there were disputes and bickerings going on and we wanted to stop these disputes and felt that we should not have multi-lingual States but we must have uni-lingual States. They accepted the formula and divided the country on this basis. Consequently, there are smaller States like Kerala. We have created that State on the basis of language. Kerala cannot be further expanded. We find that in the South there are all smaller States like Kerala, Madras and Mysore as compared to the Hindi States or the Northern States. What do we find here? In the North, we have got States like UP, Bihar, and MP, which are huge and monolithic States. Therefore it was pointed out by Dr. Panikkar that there would always be some sort of conflict between South and North. It was not in the mind of Dr. Ambedkar alone, but even Sardar Panikkar in his Dissenting Note to the States Reorganisation Commission's Report had pointed out that it would be in the interests of national unity to have smaller States, I

[ Shri B. D. Khobaragade ]

am quoting from Sardar Panikkar's Note :

"I consider it essential for the successful working of a federation that the units should be fairly, evenly balanced. Too great a disparity is likely to create not only suspicion and resentment but generate forces likely to undermine the federal structure itself and thereby be a danger to the unity of the country. This is clearly recognised everywhere. In most federal constitutions, though wide variation exists in respect of the population and resources of the unit, care is taken to limit the influence and authority of the larger States. Thus, in the United States of America for example, though the States are of varying population and resources and the State of New York has many times the population, say of Nevada, the constitution provides for equal representation for every State in the Senate."

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair]

Therefore, Sardar Panikkar has pointed out that danger to the national unity in having States of different areas and different populations. So I would suggest that we should have uniformly smaller States. For that purpose, it is essential that UP, Bihar and MP should be divided. In the larger State of MP there is no efficient administration. In the larger States it is impossible to have an efficient administration. If you have smaller States you will have efficient administration.

Sir, while speaking you have mentioned that if we have larger States we will have bigger parties and there will be two or three major political parties and therefore the atmosphere will be congenial to democracy. I beg to disagree. UP and Bihar, as I have already mentioned, are big States. What is the experience in those States? In UP during the last mid-term elections there were about 27 political parties which participated in the elections. In UP there were 27 political parties contesting the elections. Then how can we say that if we reorganise the States into bigger units there will be only two or three bigger parties. Experience has proved that this will not be possible. The same experience we had in Bihar also where 25 to 30 political parties participated in the elections.

Sir, the main reason for any dispute in the different regions or different States is, as we have noticed, due to services and unbalanced economic development....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : You will have to wind up. The Minister was to have been called at 3.30.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE : We have noticed that there is large-scale unemployment nowadays.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : She has announced that he can intervene. And then you can continue if you want.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE : There is unemployment on a large scale and therefore everybody is trying to get some kind of job. If we can have some policy by which we can provide adequate representation for all regions, then we can remove one bone of discontent.

There is another thing—balanced economic development. India is a great country. There are certain regions which are more advanced and more developed, and there are other regions which are still backward. Even in a State like Maharashtra, we notice that Bombay and the surrounding areas are greatly developed economically but Vidarbha and Marathwada are backward. For that purpose it is essential to have regional economic planning. Even in Great Britain it will be noticed that for different regions which are not equally developed, they have got different regional planning Committees, and according to them...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : For various reasons you have to wind up now.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE : If we want to remove the bone of discontent on that score, then we should see that all the projects in the public sector are evenly distributed for the purpose of removing the imbalance and disparity in the development of different regions. Then only will we be able to remove the discontent and promote national unity and integrity.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA) : Sir, Shri Sitaram Jaipuria has raised a very interesting topic by his Resolution. I would like to refer to the historical background of linguistic States. Even before

independence, this matter was considered by our national leaders and a resolution was passed saying that the country should be reorganised on a linguistic basis. As the hon. Member knows, the various erstwhile provinces in the country were created not on any rational basis, *i.e.*, they were not created on economic consideration or for facility of administration or on other considerations. But they were only created on the basis of conquests and accession of the Princely States on the basis of the Doctrine of Laps when there was no heir-apparent to any of the Princely States. Therefore, when India became independent in 1947, we were faced with a peculiar situation administratively. This situation became a little more complicated with the merger of the Indian States into the various Indian provinces. Therefore, to put the administrative units of the country in a proper manner a States Reorganisation Commission was appointed with a view to re-organising the administrative units in the country on a more rational and definite basis.

Again, when this matter was considered we had to find out which would be the most national and most abiding basis on which the administrative units could be formed. As we all know, our decision was that in free India the people's language should be the language of administration. And this was also incumbent and also necessary. In a democracy we have to run our administrative system on the basis of democracy. Then the democratic administration must run in a language which the people understand. And, therefore, it was regarded necessary that the administrative units of the country should be re-organised on the basis of a language that the people spoke. The main consideration was that when such linguistic administrative units were formed the people will be able to conduct their own administrative affairs in their State in their own language and, therefore, it was a welcome move to form the States on a linguistic basis.

Most of these States were formed in 1956. After that varying amount of progress has been made in the various States to run the administration in the language of the people. There is no doubt in my mind that ultimately the linguistic States are going to strengthen and consolidate the unity of India and the fissiparous tendencies, regionalism and other bad tendencies that we are seeing today would be completely finished if these linguistic States are allowed to operate

in the manner in which they were conceived. Today if the situation is examined we will find that in spite of reorganisation of linguistic units on the basis of language, there are State Governments which are not using the people's language to run their administration and this is creating a very difficult situation. If Mr. Jaipuria's Resolution were to be accepted and implemented it would mean that the administrative units will have four or five or even six or seven major Indian languages spoken in each administrative unit. If one administrative unit has four or five national languages in it, then we will have to find one common language to run the administration in that unit, also run the administration in all the six or seven languages that may be found to be spoken there. We know how difficult it is to find one language which will be acceptable to all. For instance, let us take the Eastern zone. Imagine the linguistic areas it would comprise of. It will comprise of people who speak Assamese, people who speak Bengali, people who speak Hindi and people who speak Oriya, four languages. If you have to conduct the administration in this administrative unit it will have to be conducted in any of the four national languages of the country. And I do not think if these States can agree to one common language being adopted. If Bengali is taken, the Assamese will not accept it as their language. If Assamese is adopted, the Bengalis will never accept it as the language of West Bengal. Similarly, Oriya cannot be acceptable to other States. And we do not want that because of this, a neutral language, that is, English, which is not a national language, should be perpetuated. Therefore, if you divide the country into five or six units, irrespective of the languages that are spoken, it would mean the perpetuation of English in this country leading to endless troubles. And suppose all the major languages that are in vogue are used for purposes of administration, that will create a more hopeless and a completely chaotic situation. Therefore, I do not think it will be either in the public interest or in the interest of democracy or in the interest of efficiency that such units should be created.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY (Tamil Nadu) : May I interrupt the Minister for a minute? The Minister was pleased to say that if we have several linguistic regions formed into one State, it will create a chaotic condition. May I invite your attention to the composite State of Madras, in pre-Independence days and



[Shri R. T. Partha sarathy]

subsequently also. We had four languages, Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam and Kannada and people were allowed to conduct either in English or in one of their mother-tongues. Educational institutions in the different areas were carried on in their regional languages or in the mother-tongue of the wards. If Madras could function so methodically and forcefully how does the Minister substantiate that the country would be in a chaotic condition? I am unable to understand that.

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :** I am grateful to the hon'ble Member for pointing out this matter. I am trying to point out that if all of us in Madras or in the State of Bombay, where English was used as the language of the administration, could adopt one language there may not be any difficulty.

**SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY :** When in Madras they could carry on...

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :** No administration worth the name can be carried on in four languages or two languages. Even in one language there would be a lot of difficulty.

**SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY :** It ran with great success.

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :** Only one language, English, was used. In free India you cannot envisage perpetuating English on the people who do not understand that language.

**SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY :** In Madras they were using all the four languages.

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :** In the composite State of Madras they were not using all the four major languages for the purpose of administration. Even for purposes of higher education those languages were not used. But in independent India every language group has got the urge to get education and carry on the administration in its own language.

My point is that having the administration or giving education in people's own language does not weaken our unity. On the other hand it strengthens the unity. And, therefore, I would say that this Resolution of Shri Jaipuria is completely misplaced and misconceived. It is not going to strengthen the unity of the country. It is, on the other hand, going to

create chaotic conditions. It is going to create all kinds of practical difficulties. As a matter of fact effort should be made to create homogenous and compact linguistic State units which can be administered in the people's language, and by creating such units we shall be enhancing the prestige of our country and also enhancing the unity of our country. Therefore, I do not think the House should accept this Resolution of Mr. Jaipuria.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) :** When the Deputy Chairman announced that the Minister would be called at 3-30 P.M., probably the idea behind her mind was that the debate should finish and the mover of the Resolution should be called upon to reply. But I will take the sense of the House because some Members want to speak. So those who are in favour of continuing the debate may say 'Aye'.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS :** Aye.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) :** Those against will say 'No'.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS :** No.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI Mr. P. BHARGAVA) :** I am unable to find .

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) :** On this point may I submit that this time I got the number two position in the ballot. Unless I get a chance today, probably I will not get it next time.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) :** I am in the hands of the House.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA :** In the Business Advisory Committee we have always been of the opinion that Resolutions should be given limited number of hours and last time we said that every Member .

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) :** That was the intention in the morning when the Deputy Chairman announced that the Minister would intervene at 3-30 P.M.

**AN HON'BLE MEMBER :** If that was the intention why do you ask for the sense of the House ?

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) :** Because some Members want to speak.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : If you want to accommodate a particular Member you may allow him.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : I want to make one point very clear.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Let me make my point clear. I shall not continue the debate for any particular Member. If the House wants to continue the debate I shall call one by one from the remaining names before me. If the House is of the view that this debate should be concluded, and Mr. Sitaram Jaipuria should be called upon to reply, I shall do that.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : I quite see the relevance of the point made by my friend, Mr. Lokanath Misra. What I would suggest is, let this debate continue till 5 O'Clock and from 5 to 5-30 we can have Mr. Misra's Resolution...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : No, no. I may tell you that we have a fixed time discussion at 5 O'Clock.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, इस विधेयक को आप ऐसा करिये ... सीतारामजी, आप जवाब में कितना समय लेंगे ।

श्री सीताराम जैपुरिया : दस, पन्द्रह मिनट ।

श्री राजनारायण : अच्छा 20 मिनट ले सकते हैं । साढ़े 4 बजे तक हाऊस को चलाइये और आधा घंटा उनको दे दीजिये ।

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Let the time be fixed.

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN) (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, this Resolution of Mr. Jaipuria has already taken 3½ hours last time and it has consumed this afternoon also. Moreover, you said that the Deputy Chairman suggested that the Minister should be called at 3-30 and then the debate should finish. But now you are in the Chair and the Chair can use its discretion ...

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY : Mr. Vice-Chairman, a little while ago you said that from the Ayes and Noes, you were unable to ascertain the opinion of the House. According to the parliamentary procedure, which you, Sir, know

very well, when a decision is not possible to be taken, the existing state of things should continue. The Chair has got that inherent right to continue the existing state of things. So the debate should continue for another half an hour.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : I take it that the sense of the House is that we continue the debate and at 4-30, whoever is in the Chair will call upon Mr. Sitaram Jaipuria to reply. In the 40 minutes which we have before us, four speakers can be accommodated if Members limit their remarks to 10 minutes each.

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, my time should not be sacrificed for this purpose.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : At 4-30 you would be called.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I thought that at 4-30 you would take up the other Resolution.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : He will finish by 4-30; then your Resolution will come. Now, Mr. Mallikarjunudu.

SHRI K. P. MALLIKARJUNUDU : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I should congratulate Mr. Jaipuria on bringing forward this Resolution which is important, if not for anything else, at least for stimulating some thought on a question of great Constitutional importance.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair]

Sir, you know that we gave to ourselves in 1950 a Constitution under which we are now being governed. You also know that this Constitution is of a federal character. Now, the present linguistic division of provinces is the result of a long historical process. As already stated by our Home Minister, they were brought into being as a result of some historical factors. Now, the question is whether this system is to be continued or any change is to be brought about in this structure. My humble opinion is that it requires a little change, though not of a fundamental character. In my opinion, Sir, there should be a four-tier Constitutional structure. We have got now two tiers, the federal tier and the States tier. I want to introduce one tier above the States and one tier

[ Shri K. P. Mallikarjunudu ]

below the States and make it a four-tier structure. In that view of the matter, the Resolution brought forward by Mr. Jaipuria has some significance.

We know that our present federating units are the result of a long historical process. The reorganisation of provinces on a linguistic basis had been accepted as one of the most important principles even from very early times. If we look at the Mont-Ford Reforms or if we look at the Simon Commission's Report or if we look at the Nehru Report, we find that all of them adopted language as the most important and significant principle. On that basis, our present States, or provinces as they were once called, were carved out. So we cannot go back upon it. I also believe that there is a strong rationale behind that language principle. I do not want to expatiate upon that point because I have not much time at my disposal. But I would like to say one thing and it is this. Because language is taken as a very important basis for the constitution of the federating States, certain difficulties have been experienced in their working. It is to remedy those grievances that Mr. Jaipuria brought forward this Resolution. It cannot be denied that there are certain deficiencies in the working of this system. Then, what is the remedy? Should we go in for a unitary kind of State or should we enlarge the Status of provinces and make the Centre weak. In my opinion, Sir, it is quite necessary that our Centre should be very, very strong and our national unity, security and solidarity should be maintained at all costs. That should be the fundamental approach to the problem of our Constitutional structure. If that be the case, no attempt should be made to weaken the Centre. Accepting that principle, I would like to touch upon the point of the federating units. The federating units are based upon language and language should remain the important basis for these States. Then there is another principle, Sir, which is inherent in democracy. That is, if we are really to work a democracy, the people must feel a sense of involvement in it. They must feel a kind of direct responsibility. In the present circumstances, in a vast country like ours with a vast population, it is not possible for people to take any direct interest in the governance of the country. So some kind of decentralisation is necessary at a particular level and it is at that level decentralisation should operate. What is that level? It is the level of panchayats.

At the level of panchayats, in my opinion there should be complete decentralisation. What I mean by that is that panchayats also should be Constitutionally set up. Now, according to the Constitution, there are only two things, the Centre and the States. What I want is that there should be panchayats with Constitutional powers, not with powers derived from any statute of Parliament or of legislatures. They should be empowered under the Constitution to enjoy certain powers and to govern. If that is done, then direct involvement of the people in the governance of the country will be achieved and real democracy will come into operation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AK-BAR ALI KHAN) : Are the units to be villages or districts ?

SHRI K. P. MALLIKARJUNUDU : They are village units. Gandhiji envisaged a village to be the unit. The panchayat should be constituted on the basis of villages and that should be invested with constitutional powers. Then, in order to avoid the difficulties that may arise from language, according to me, there should be constituted some zonal councils. Now, Sir, we have got certain zonal councils which are working as advisory boards. What I want is that even the zonal councils must be invested with constitutional powers. They must be part of the Constitution. The zones must have certain constitutional powers and it is necessary to do so because these zones will curb the centrifugal tendencies to a certain extent. Then, take, for example, the disputes like the boundaries, the river water, etc. They can be solved amicably in a zonal system. That is why Prof. Coupland come here when the Constituent Assembly met and he drew up a scheme of zones on the basis of rivers and river valleys. That was based on the economic point of view. What is more useful from an economic point of view should be the basis of the constitution of zones. That was the idea behind Prof. Coupland's scheme. So, he advocated the scheme of zonal system, and I think there is some sense in that. With that view in mind I advocate the system of zones also coming in between the Centre and the federating States. In that view of the matter I suggest that it should be a four-tier system. It may be argued that this system is expensive and cumbersome. I agree, but in order to see that democracy functions well, it is necessary. Democracy in its very essence is expensive and cumbersome. It is not so simple as dictatorship or as an authoritarian form

of Government. Democracy means some kind of cumbersomeness, some kind of delay, some kind of all that sort of things. They are inherent in the very system of democracy. So, what I would like to say is that these four things, these four-tiers will meet all the points of view. Even though they are cumbersome they are very necessary for a successful functioning of democracy. And in that view of the matter I advocate this four-tier system and I request that this may be considered by the Government. This should not be thought of simply as an academic matter. This should be examined in all its various aspects. And I should think the Government will agree with me that this type of a Constitution is the best suited for our country.

Thank you.

SHRI G. A. APPAN (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Mr. Jaipuria has put before us a very good Resolution for our thought. The Minister of Home Affairs has also pondered over it and has expressed his opinion about it. After having known the views expressed here I am constrained to believe that according to the Constitution we are wedded to the formation of linguistic States, no doubt. But the draconian formation of these linguistic States has brought down upon us various maladies, as, for example, the Telangana agitation, the north-south disturbances, the Hindi-Tamil disturbances. It has brought forth numerous types of troubles in the form of fourteen national languages, and now some people are asking for two or three more national languages. All these things have now come to the forefront and are frightening us with national disintegration in all its aspects. If national integration is our aim what we should do is we should ponder over the question and chalk out a constructive policy and programme of work. Everybody is bound by the formation of linguistic States. Of course, I have heard Mr. Parthasarathy mentioning very pleasant things about our Madras State where people from four languages were running the administration in a very healthy way. But we cannot expect that every contiguous unit will have this type of cooperation which is so conducive to national integration. In Madras there is a deep fraternal feeling between the Hindus and the Muslims, between the Tamilians and the Andhras. And people from even northern States are there speaking different languages. Therefore, there are certain economic benefits by dividing

the whole country into five zones, economically and administratively viable zones. We have so many disparities, regional disparities, linguistic disparities, and what not. We have so many disputes, boundary disputes, river-water disputes, and things like that. And for the solution of all these things, I feel that the proposal of Mr. Jaipuria might be conducive and it is very very necessary and it will certainly yield good results. We are already disintegrated. Nobody can deny the fact that unity is strength and too many cooks spoil the broth. That is how we have disintegrated ourselves nowadays into so many States and Centrally administered territories. So, it has become a must that we should seriously consider the proposal that is before us. There are economic advantages in having only a few Chief Secretaries, a few Secretaries, a few Legislators, and a few languages. So, what I would suggest is that the division of India into linguistic States should be done away with and a suitable measure should be evolved to run the administration with greater power to the States. At the moment all the power is concentrated in the hands of the Centre. For everything most of the States depend upon the Centre. They have to depend upon the Centre for their revenues. The officers and employees of the Central Government get more pay while the officers and employees of the States have to satisfy themselves with lesser pay. There is thus a discrimination. Why? It is because the power of distribution of the various revenues is vested in the Centre. Under these circumstances, I would suggest that a committee of experts from both the Houses of Parliament should go into the whole question and suggest whether the present set-up could continue as it exists or whether it is better to adopt Mr. Jaipuria's proposal. The whole thing should be decided on scientific lines after eliciting public opinion. Of course, fortunately or unfortunately we do not have a provision for referendum or initiative in our Constitution. However, I would again suggest that an expert committee of both the Houses of Parliament should be constituted and asked to examine this Resolution and see how far it is practicable and beneficial to the nation and how far it is worthwhile for national integration.

Thank you.

श्री पंडरीनाथ सितारामजी पाटील (महाराष्ट्र):  
उपसभापति महोदय, मझे बहुत ही कम समय है  
इस लिये मैं ज्यादा बोल नहीं सकता, मुझे इस

[श्री पठरीनाथ सितारामजी पाटील]

विषय पर बहुत कुछ बोलना था और अपने खयालात आपके सामने रखना था।

अभी जो यह सकल्प श्री सीताराम जी जैपुरिया लाये हैं उसका मैं विरोध करता हूँ। जो कारण उन्होंने दिये हैं वे बिल्कुल बेबुनियाद और अस्वाभाविक हैं। जैसे वे समझते हैं वैसे पाँच विभाग अगर इस देश के किये गये तो प्रत्येक में दो या तीन भाषीय जनता आयेगी इसमें न सरकार को कोई सुविधा होगी और न जनता को ही, अपितु इससे लोगों में तो सदा भाषीय विवाद चलते रहेंगे। उनका क्या खयाल है और वे किस तरह से इसको अमल में लाना चाहते हैं, वह एक बड़ी टेढ़ी खीर है। मैं यह समझ नहीं पाया कि ऐसी क्या दिक्कत आ गई है जिन की वजह से ऐसे बड़े विभाग बनाने की आवश्यकता हो रही है। भारतवर्ष में आज के जो पन्द्रह शासकीय राज्य हैं वे पृथक-पृथक भाषा के आधार पर लोगों की सुविधा के लिये बने हैं। वे कैसे अच्छे चल रहे हैं इसका विवरण पहले इस सभा में मंत्री महोदय, श्री शुक्ल जी ने दिया है। मैं ऐसा समझता हूँ कि आज के जो प्रदेश हैं वे ठीक हैं वे न बहुत बड़े हैं और न बहुत छोटे हैं। यू०पी० और बिहार जैसे कुछ थोड़े से बड़े प्रदेश हैं और उन्हीं के साथ हरियाणा और पंजाब जैसे कुछ छोटे प्रदेश हैं। जैसे हाथ में उगलिया छोटी बड़ी होती है उसी तरह से हमारे प्रदेश भी छोटे बड़े हैं। लेकिन ये प्रदेश भाषा के आधार पर बने हैं, वे लोगों की इच्छारूप उनकी सुविधा के लिये बने हैं। वे स्वाभाविक भी हैं, क्योंकि लोक-भाषा में ही लोक-राज्य चले ऐसी लोगों की धारणा है। हम सब लोग जानते हैं कि कांग्रेस ने बार-बार स्वराज्य मिलने के पहले भाषाभाषी प्रदेशों का पुरस्कार किया था। उस समय के महान पुरुष गांधी जी ने भी न सिर्फ उसको आशीर्वाद दिया था बल्कि उन्होंने उसको पुरस्कार भी किया था। आज भी जो हमारे प्रदेश बने हैं उनसे किसी तरह से हमारे देश को नुकसान नहीं हुआ है और न आगे होने वाला है। वस्तुतः भाषायी प्रदेश बनने के बाद हमारे कुछ प्रदेश बलवान

हो गये और बलवान होते चले जा रहे हैं। ऐसे एक भाषी प्रदेशों से राज्य चलाने वालों को तथा प्रजा को भी सुविधा हो जाती है। वे एक दूसरे के खयालात समझ लेते हैं और लोगों के खयालात समझने के बाद वे उसके ऊपर कार्यवाही भी कर सकते हैं। इस लिये मैं इस बात का पुरस्कार करता हूँ कि जो आज के प्रदेश हैं वे ठीक हैं। 1956 में जो ये भाषायी प्रदेश बन गये उसमें कुछ कमियाँ रह गई हैं, कुछ खामियाँ रह गई हैं, कुछ गलतियाँ रह गई हैं। इस लिये बीच-बीच में हमारे देश में भाषायी सवाल पर झगड़े पैदा होते हैं। 1956 में जब यह नये प्रदेश भाषायी आधार पर बने तो उसमें कुछ प्रदेशों के ऊपर कुछ अन्याय भी हो गया है। इस समय महाराष्ट्र एक ऐसा प्रदेश है जिस पर सब से ज्यादा अन्याय हुआ है। मराठी भाषी लोगों के इलाके जिन की जनसंख्या करीब करीब 20 लाख होगी अलग अलग गैर-मराठी प्रदेशों में बंट गये हैं, चले गये हैं। इस लिये उन प्रदेशों में असंतोष ज़रूर है और उनका सवाल बार-बार इस सभा के सामने आता है। 1956 में जब से ये भाषायी प्रदेश बने तब से मराठी प्रदेश के बेलगाव और कारवार ये दो जिले कर्नाटक में डाले गए, वहाँ से कभी कोई कांग्रेस का आदमी विधान सभा में चुन कर नहीं आया। वहाँ की मराठी भाषी जनता कांग्रेस पर गुस्सा भरी है, अतः प्रत्येक चुनाव में वहाँ से कांग्रेस के विरोधी महाराष्ट्र एकीकरण समिति के उम्मीदवार चुन कर के आते हैं। वैसे ही मध्य प्रदेश में है। बहरानपुर, मलताई, भैंसदही, सौसर तहसीले ऐसी जगह हैं जहाँ से कभी कांग्रेस के लोग चुन कर के नहीं आये। कांग्रेस का उन प्रदेशों में बहुमत है लेकिन कांग्रेस के लोग उन इलाकों से कभी चुन कर नहीं आये क्योंकि उन मराठी भाषी प्रदेशों को जबरदस्ती हिन्दी भाषी मध्य प्रदेश में डाला गया है। वहाँ के लोगों ने इस तरह की अपनी राय चुनाव के द्वारा देश के सामने रखी है। तो ऐसी बातों को ध्यान में रखा जाना चाहिये।

अब जैसे गोआ का सवाल है। गोआ में आज भी जो मराठी भाषा बोलने वाली, संयुक्त

महाराष्ट्र को पुरस्कार करने वाली पार्टीया है उनकी वहा पर मिनिस्ट्री बनी हुई है। ऐसे प्रदेश जानबूझ कर जो बाहर रखे जाते हैं उससे अपने देश में असन्तोष पैदा होता है। इस लिये भाषायी प्रदेश बनाने में जहा गलतियां रह गई हैं वहा उनको दुरुस्त कर के इस असन्तोष को मिटाना चाहिये।

मैं इतना ही सिर्फ कहूंगा क्योंकि मुझे बोलने का अब ओर टाइम नहीं है। हमारे देश में एकता का निर्माण करने के लिये अंग्रेजी भाषा को छोड़ कर हमें सारे देश में हिन्दी को बढ़ावा देना चाहिये। लेकिन हमारी सरकार का अभी भी इस तरफ पूरा ध्यान नहीं है। हमने हिन्दी को राष्ट्रभाषा मान लिया है। लेकिन रोजाना हम देखते हैं कि यहा हो या कोई सामाजिक समारोह हो सब जगह हमारे बड़े बड़े मिनिस्टर जिन की मातृभाषा हिन्दी है वे भी अंग्रेजी में ही बोलते हैं। इस से हमारा देश कभी हिन्दी भाषी नहीं बनेगा। हमारे अपने देश की अगर अपनी भाषा नहीं होगी तो हम अपने देश की एकता नहीं रख सकेंगे।

इस तरह से इस विषय में मैं इतने ही अपने विचार आप के सामने रख कर आप से इजाजत लेता हूँ।

**श्री राजनारायण :** श्रीमन्, श्री सीतारामजी जैपुरिया ने जो प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत किया है वास्तव में इसने सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों को अवसर प्रदान किया है कि एक बार देश की इस समस्या पर लोग पुनः विचार करें। सब लोगो ने श्री सीतारामजी जैपुरिया को इस के लिये धन्यवाद दिया। क्योंकि यह हमारे ही प्रदेश से आते हैं इस लिये हम को इन को धन्यवाद देने की अलग से आवश्यकता नहीं है।

मैं अपने मित्र श्री जैपुरिया जी से यह अवश्य कहूंगा कि इस समस्या को तो उन्होंने खड़ा कर दिया, मगर जिन समस्याओं को उन्होंने खड़ा किया है क्या उन समस्याओं का समाधान यही है कि देश को पांच भागों में बांट दिया जाय। मैं चाहूंगा कि वे स्वतः सोचें और मैं सरकार से

भी चाहूंगा कि सरकार जिद्दी न बने। हो सकता है कि सरकार उनके प्रस्ताव में कोई संशोधन करे या कोई मुझाव वह खुद दे या सरकार कोई कमेटी या कमीशन बनाये कि आज देश के अन्दर जो अलगाव की प्रवृत्ति चल रही है उस अलगाव की प्रवृत्ति को कैसे रोका जाय। यह प्रश्न तो सही है कि अलगाव की प्रवृत्ति चल रही है और यह अलगाववाद इस द्रुत गति से आगे बढ़ रहा है कि पता नहीं चल रहा है कि यह अलगाववाद हम को कहा ले जायेगा। इसकी धारा इतनी तेज है कि पता नहीं है कि अपनी धारा में यह किस को कहा बहा ले जा रही है। इस लिये हम को बहुत ही गंभीरता से इस प्रस्ताव पर विचार करना चाहिये।

इस सम्बन्ध में यहा पर जनतंत्र की भी चर्चा हुई, युनिटरी स्टेट की भी चर्चा हुई, आर्थिक और राजनैतिक सत्ता के बंटवारे की भी चर्चा हुई। इन चर्चाओं में जाने के लिये हमारे पास समय नहीं है। मगर मैं इतना अवश्य कहना चाहूंगा इस स्तर पर कि जो मुझाव श्री सीताराम जी जैपुरिया ने दिये या जो आज की स्थिति है उससे काम बन नहीं रहा है। मान लीजिये हम सारे मुल्क को पांच भागों में बांट दें और पांच भागों में देश बंट कर के पांच विधान सभाएं हो जाय या विधान मंडल हो जाय और एक देश रहे, तो पार्लियामेंट रहेगी या नहीं रहेगी।

पार्लियामेंट के पास सत्ता कितनी होगी? उतनी दूर क्यों जा रहे हैं? हमारे मित्र भागव साहव चले गए, उन्होंने कुछ बिहार की चर्चा की, मैं उनमें कहना चाहता हू कि इस समय सभी बाहर की चर्चाओं को छोड़ो, इस समय दिल्ली की चर्चा करो। पार्टी और सरकार का कोई रिलेशन है, व्यक्ति और पार्टी का कोई रिलेशन है या सरकार और देश का कोई सम्बन्ध है? श्रीमन्, आप खूब जानते हैं और हम से ज्यादा जानते हैं। आप देख रहे हैं कि एक ही अस्तबल में दुलती चल रही है। इस अलगाववाद को कौन रोकेगा। सारे देश को पांच भागों में बांट दें तो कौन रोकेगा श्री निजलिगप्पा को और

[श्री राजनारायण]

कौन रोकेगा श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी को ? ये बातें इस समय जरा गम्भीरता के साथ और गहराई के साथ विचार करने की हैं। अलगाववाद पर रोक कैसे लगे ? हर आदमी अलग अलग अपने को मुल्क समझता है, हर आदमी अपने को पार्लियामेंटरी बोर्ड समझता है, हर आदमी अपने को प्रधान मंत्री समझता है।

मुझे बड़ी खुशी हुई जब आज हमने इस सदन में श्री मोहनलाल गौतम को देखा। जब हम लोग कांग्रेस सोशलिस्ट थे, जब सोशलिस्ट थे तो श्री मोहन लाल जी गौतम हमारे सेक्रेटरी थे उत्तर प्रदेश के, आज वे उत्तर प्रदेश से आकर बैठे हैं, थोड़ा मुस्करा रहे हैं, हम उनसे पूछते हैं कि कहा फंसे। ऐसी दुर्गति हो गई है कि

श्री मोहन लाल गौतम (उत्तर प्रदेश) : आपकी सोहबत में।

श्री राजनारायण : हमारी सोहबत में थे, अब हम आपकी असोहबत में हैं। गांधी जी का एक वाक्य है कि पद, धन और सत्ता का मोह मनुष्य से क्या-क्या अनर्थ नहीं करवाता है। इसी में वे फंसे हुए हैं। सन्तति और सम्पत्ति के बंधन से मुक्त होकर ही कोई सच्चा समाजसेवक हो सकता है, यह मैं साफ साफ कह रहा हूँ। अगर समाज की सेवा करनी है तो गांधी बनो, जैसे उन्होंने घर-द्वार छोड़ा आश्रम बनाया, बैसा करो, डा० लोहिया बनो, अपने जीवन के अन्त तक उन्होंने शादी, बाल-बच्चे, भाई बहिन की चिन्ता नहीं की। श्रीमन्, आप अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि उनकी मृत्यु के बाद हम लोग सब पार्टी के बैठे और हमने कहा कि उनकी अन्तिम इच्छा थी कि हमको एक गरीब जितने में जलाया जा सकता है उसी तरह से जहाँ बिजली हो जला देना या हमारी लाश को किसी अस्पताल को दे देना ताकि विद्यार्थी उसको देखें।

तो इस समय स्थिति है विचार-मन्यन की। हम एक विचार रख रहे हैं। हम आज भी कहते हैं कि अपने से सत्ता को अलग करने की बात करो। सारा राजकीय और आर्थिक

व्यवस्था को चार भागों में बांट दो, केन्द्र के पास केवल विदेशी मसले रहने दो, सुरक्षा रहने दो, अन्तर-राज्यों के मसले रहने दो, करेन्सी वगैरह रहने दो। केन्द्र की सरकार, राज्य की सरकार, जिला की सरकार और गांव की सरकार अगर इन चार पायों पर सारी राज्य-सत्ता और धन-सत्ता को बांट दिया जाय तो हमारे देश का मसला बहुत ही अच्छी तरह से सुलझ सकता है और चारों एक दूसरे से सम्बद्ध हो। अगर पांच भागों में हमारे मुल्क का बंटवारा हो जायगा तो फिर यही दिल्ली और फिर पांच भागों का विधान-मंडल। फिर जिला कहा रहेगा ? पांच भागों के बंटवारे में तेलगाना का मसला, श्रीमन्, हल होगा ? तेलगाना का मसला हल नहीं होगा। भाई सीताराम जी इस पर विचार करेंगे, गौर करेंगे। तेलगाना का मसला सब लोग जानते हैं। जब स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन हो रहा था उस समय की उसकी रिपोर्ट को पढ़ा जाय तो उसमें तेलगाना को अलग रखने की बात कही गई है, मगर कुछ राजनीतिक कारणों से तेलगाना को आन्ध्र के साथ मिला दिया गया और यह कहा गया कि इसकी एक अलग व्यवस्था होगी। एक जेंटिलमेन्स एग्रीमेंट हुआ, जेंटिलमेन्स एग्रीमेंट का पालन होगा। प्रेसिडेंट ने 1958 में डिवलेशन कर दिया कि वहाँ रीजनल कमेटी बनेगी लेकिन रीजनल कमेटी ने जब जब मुझाव दिया उसको राज्य की सरकार ने अमान्य कर दिया। हमारे पास जो आकड़े अब तक आए हैं उनके मुताबिक 100 करोड़ रुपए की रकम जो तेलगाना के क्षेत्र में लगनी चाहिए थी उसको तेलगाना के क्षेत्र में न लगा कर उसको दूसरे हिस्से आन्ध्र में लगा दिया गया। धीरे धीरे जो नौकरी में हिस्सा तेलगाना के लोगों को मिलना चाहिए था वह नहीं मिला, धीरे धीरे उनके अन्दर असतोष फैलता गया और असतोष उस विकराल रूप को पहुँच गया जब वहाँ के लोग मजबूर हो कर कहने लगे कि अब हमको अलग करो, अब हमको सेपरेट करो। यहाँ बराबर चर्चा चल रही है, यहाँ की चर्चा के बावजूद भी अभी तक घर विभाग इस बात के लिए तैयार नहीं हो

रहा है—जो मैं समझता हूँ कि उसको हो जाना चाहिए—कि सरकार एक घोषणा करे कि हम रीजनल कमेटी को विशेष पावर दे रहे हैं और विशेष पावर देकर उनको यह-यह अधिकार दे रहे हैं, हम उनको ग्रेटर आटोनमी दे रहे हैं जिससे अपने विकास सम्बन्धी, कारोबार और शिक्षा सम्बन्धी कामों को वे अच्छी तरह से कर सकें। यह चीज अपने आप हल हो जायगी अगर हमारी चौखम्भा राज्य की योजना को मान लिया जाय क्योंकि चौखम्भा राज्य के सिद्धान्त में जो गांव सरकार होगी वह शिक्षा की योजना को चलाएगी, ग्राम सरकार सफाई की योजना को चलाएगी, ग्राम सरकार अपने क्षेत्र में सिंचाई के लिए पानी का इन्तजाम करेगी, ग्राम सरकार दवा का इन्तजाम करेगी। अपने अपने कामों के लिए कुल रकम का चौथाई गांव सरकार को, चौथाई जिला सरकार को, चौथाई राज्य सरकार और चौथाई केन्द्र की सरकार को मिल जाना चाहिए। यह व्यवस्था अगर हो तो अपने आप तेलंगाना का सवाल हल हो जाय। यों अगर लेक्चर देने को कोई कहे तो हम कह सकते हैं कि सारा भारत एक है कांग्रेस पार्टी एक है, मगर आप देख रहे हैं कि कांग्रेस पार्टी की क्या हालत है। शिक्षा मंत्री जो...

**शिक्षा तथा युवा सेवा मंत्री (प्रो० बी० के० आर० बी० राव):** मेरे सब्जेक्ट पर आप बोल रहे हैं ?

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN):** This is not his Resolution. This Resolution does not relate to his Ministry. This relates to the Ministry of Home Affairs.

**श्री राजनारायण :** शिक्षा का विभाग सर्व-व्यापी है। अगर शिक्षा विभाग ही नहीं है तो कहां घर-विभाग है, कहा उद्योग विभाग है। शिक्षा का सम्बन्ध बुद्धि में है। मैं शिक्षा मंत्री से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि कुछ ऐसी शिक्षा दें कांग्रेस पालियामेंटरी पार्टी को जिससे उन्हें मालूम हो कि कांग्रेस पार्टी का प्रधान मंत्री सुप्रीम है, सगठन सुप्रीम है, या केबिनेट सुप्रीम है। बड़ा भारी सवाल खड़ा हो गया है।

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN):** This is irrelevant to the discussion.

**श्री राजनारायण :** श्रीमान्, इसी से सम्बन्धित है, बिल्कुल प्रासंगिक है। क्यों प्रासंगिक, इसको जरा आप देखेंगे। आज प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिबा सब जगह टेलीफोन कर रही हैं। हमने चिट्ठी लिखी, श्रीमती इन्दिरा जी, प्रधान मंत्री को चित्त का दुबल नहीं होना चाहिए। आपने श्री निजलिगप्पा को जो पत्र लिखा उस को पढ़ने से मैं इस नतीजे पर आया कि आप श्री रेड्डी को वोट नहीं देंगी, मगर आपने साफ नहीं किया, इसलिए आप सफाई के साथ कहिए कि आप गिरि को वोट देंगी और जो आपके साथ हों उनसे अपील करिए कि गिरि को वोट करें। प्रधान मंत्री को चित्त का दुबल नहीं होना चाहिए, यह हमने सफाई से कहा क्योंकि यह सवाल भी इसमें सन्निहित है। आज आन्ध्र के लोगों को एक तरफ निजलिगप्पा कह सकते हैं कि देखो अगर तुम चाहते हो कि तुम्हारा तेलंगाना का मसला हल हो तो हमारा साथ दो दूसरी ओर प्रधान मंत्री कह सकती हैं कि अगर तुम चाहते हो कि तेलंगाना का मसला हल हो तो हमारा साथ दो।

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN):** Nobody is saying this, neither the President nor the Prime Minister.

**श्री राजनारायण :** यह एकदम से भ्रष्टाचार होगा। फिर सवाल है जनतंत्र और व्यक्ति की स्वतंत्रता का। शिक्षा मंत्री जो इस पर आप लेखमाला या विचारमाला चलवाइए।

**प्रो० बी० के० आर० बी० राव :** मेरा क्या होगा ?

**श्री राजनारायण :** आप तो रहेंगे। हमारा निवेदन है कि श्री जैपुरिया जी के प्रस्ताव को यों ही हवा में न बहाया जाय। मैं जैपुरिया से एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक मुझाव समिति बने, प्रस्ताव में इस बात को रखें कि सरकार एक कमीशन बनाए। आज हर प्रकार से जो देश में एक बुद्धि विरोधी मोर्चा कायम हो रहा है



[श्री राजनारायण]

इसका मुकाबला कैसे किया जाय, इस अलगाव वाली प्रवृत्ति का मुकाबला कैसे किया जाय, जो कमीशन बनाए वह कमीशन सब बातों की ठीक तरह से जाच-पड़ताल करके अपनी रिपोर्ट दे। श्रीमन्, मैं हैरत में पड़ा हुआ हूँ, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह मसला श्री लालबहादुर शास्त्री को अपने समय में तय कर देना चाहिए था। यह मसला श्री जवाहर लाल जी को अपने समय में तय कर देना चाहिए था, मगर मुझे अफसोस है कि लाल बहादुर जी इस दुनिया से चले गये। उस बेचारे ने कुछ करना चाहा मगर किम तरह से लाल बहादुर जी की जान गयी आज तक वह रहस्य ही बना हुआ है। मैं तो परेशान हूँ इस तरह की घटनाओं पर। किस तरह से डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया की जान गयी, किस तरह से डा० श्यामा प्रसाद मुखर्जी की जान गयी, किस तरह से दीन दयाल उपाध्याय की जान गयी यह सब रहस्य ही बना हुआ है। तो हर मसले का रहस्य बना कर इस सरकार ने रखा। मैं सीताराम जी को इस मुझाव के लिए धन्यवाद देता हूँ। उन के मुझाव में इतना वजन तो है कि कम से कम उन्होंने जो समस्या पैदा हुई है, जो सवाल उठाया है, जो शका उत्पन्न की है उस का हल कैसे हो इसे हम सोचें। मैं देश को 5 भागों में बांटने का पक्षपाती नहीं हूँ। राज्यों का जो निर्माण हुआ है उन को जल्दी जल्दी में अस्त-व्यस्त करने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जिन राज्यों की जो स्थिति है उसे रखा जाय, मगर उन को जय दा से ज्यादा स्वायत्त शासन दे कर, पृथक् आटोन् मो दे कर समस्या का मुलझाव हो सकता है। अगर समझ है तो उसे कर दीजिए। जैसे तेलंगाना है, उन के प्रस्ताव के कारण हम को फिर मौका मिला कि तेलंगाना की जनता जो सताया गयी है, जो गोलियों से भूनी गयी है, जिन के सिर फटे हैं, जिन के घर जलाये गये हैं और जो आज दो सौ और ढाई सौ मील दूर जेलों में बंद किये गये हैं, जैसे हमारे मित्र बद्री विशाल जी आज भी जेल में बंद हैं उन के बारे में हम कुछ कहें। यह क्या तूफाने

बदतमीजी है। अगर समस्या का समाधान करना है तो सब लोगों को जेल के बाहर करो और उम के बाद सदबुद्धि से वस्तु-स्थिति को हृदयगम करते हुए, उस का विश्लेषण करते हुए एक सच्चे मुझाव को स्वीकार करो।

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am extremely grateful to the hon. Members of this august House for the great interest they have taken in this debate. All have agreed that fissiparous and separatist tendencies are rampant in the country and the economic, social and political structure of the country is being disturbed in a manner which has been causing concern. The hon. Minister of State Mr. Shukla replied to the debate. He might have had cogent reasons to put forward those arguments but I am quite sure that had he been present here on the last occasion when this Resolution was discussed and today his reply would have been absolutely different. I feel in the light of the discussion that has been held here it can be said without any fear of contradiction that everyone here agrees that there is necessity to re-think, to readjust and to re-organise the structure of our country and if necessary the Constitution could be suitably changed. There are some who think that the forming of five Zones is not a solution of the problem while among those who do not agree on this step a few differ on the details. Their main argument has been that if very large States are created the result would be that difficulty would be felt by the people. Because of the great distance to the capital they will not be able to participate in the governance of the country which some friends here feel may not be right democratically, politically or otherwise. I would like to remind my friends here that hardly a day passes in any State when there is not one election or the other in some part or other of the States. The people have got their rights but unfortunately those rights are misused and in spite of the smallness of the different States the people do not yet have that feeling of satisfaction. All the Members who have spoken from all the parties and from almost all the States have said in their speeches that they have one region or other which is neglected by the ruling party in those States. What does that point to?

The hon. Minister said that it will be politically very unwise, that five or six languages in one particular region might create chaotic conditions. I would venture

to ask in all humility the hon. Minister : is there less chaos in the country today? Does not the entire population of the country realise that the country is passing through chaotic conditions? What steps have been taken, what steps are being taken and what is being thought of to ensure that these chaotic conditions may cease to exist so that we may live in peace and harmony? Linguistic States have been justified by the Minister and few speakers. Language of course is called the mother-tongue in all places. When a student was asked as to why it is called mother-tongue his very simple and innocent reply was that it is because the mother is privileged to use it more than the father and that is why it is called the mother-tongue. Sir, I would most humbly suggest that the time has come when we have to think over it. Whether there are five zones or whether there are fifty zones, the time for re-adjustment has come and if re-adjustment is not done the result will be violence, arson, looting, uncertainty of life and property of the citizens. We already have such things and they will be repeated in many States. The Government as usual will first say, no and when violence comes down on their head they will accept justifying it for one reason or the other, and the people will get the feeling that probably violence and shouting of slogans is the only way of achieving their purpose. I say the country is one and the country's oneness must be retained. When I move this Resolution I think this will be the best way of doing it. If the country is divided into five zones the financial and administrative matters will become the responsibility of the zones. Of course in the matter of defence the Centre will be there. The zones being economically and administratively viable there is no reason why administrative and economic considerations should not be supreme in their mind for the governing of the zones. Now, it has been said that there will be five or six languages in every zone. Even now is there any place where you have not got more than one or two languages? In North Bihar for instance you know Bhojpuri is very prominent and there is a demand that Bhojpuri language should be recognised. Similarly there is the Rajasthani language. There are so many languages in the country which are still to be recognised. If we keep the idea that every State or every region should have a language of its own, then I am afraid the country might have to be divided not into 15 or 16 States but into hundreds of zones. I would therefore humbly request that the hon. Minister

should consider this matter very coolly and see if this will not be in the larger interests of the country. Sometime or other the problem will have to be faced and it would be better if once and for all some principle is evolved and on the basis of that principle the administration of the country is carried on. I therefore suggest that a high-power Commission be appointed for this purpose. When I am suggesting this I am keeping in view the fact that it has been recognised in all quarters—including Government spokesmen at many places—that lawlessness, violence, agitations against regional imbalances and all kinds of political difficulties and problems confront the country today and there is disintegration of the country at various levels. To keep a closed mind and say that what they are doing is right, what they are not doing is wrong and that is why they are not doing it and what they are doing is in public interest is not a correct approach. It is in this context, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I feel it is necessary that a high-power Commission should be appointed. That Commission should be a very very small Commission and should not consist of more than three persons. The Chairman of that Commission should be one of the ex-Chief Justices of the Supreme Court, one member should be an eminent economist-cum-administrator of unblemished character and the other a leader of no party but of national status but these three should not be people with any linguistic bias. If such a Commission is appointed and if that Commission is requested to record public opinion all over the country by visiting all the States in the country and meeting administrators, educationists, political leaders, economists and other people, if they go into the financial structure of the different States to see what exactly the financial conditions of those States are what they can do and what they cannot, where it needs to be further strengthened and where they have got to be curtailed, whether there is regional economic viability or not, if all these things are gone into by that particular Commission and the report of the Commission is placed before Parliament within the next six or eight months, we shall be able to discuss more objectively the pros and cons of this particular Resolution as to whether the country should be divided into five or six zones or the country should be divided into more zones or less. I think then we shall have a more objective picture before us which will enable us to go deeper into the matter and come to certain conclusions, as to what will be in the larger interests

[ Shri Sitaram Jaipuria ]  
of the country. If the hon. Minister is prepared to consider and give serious thought to this matter...

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA : Withdraw your Resolution. Having raised these points and having raised this debate it would be in the fitness of things that you withdraw your Resolution and then the country at large can consider your arguments and come to a consensus.

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA : If the hon. Minister will give an assurance that he will appoint a Commission, I will be glad to withdraw my Resolution.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA : I will not be in a position to give any assurance of any kind.

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA : As the hon. Minister has said, the country will look into it, but the country acts through the Government. If the country acts by itself, a situation will develop as it has developed in certain places and I think it will be very difficult to run the Government of the country. My suggestion is a very innocent one whereby the entire country will be given an opportunity. I can assure you that before this Resolution was moved, I got hundreds of letters and telegrams from different places and most of them agree that in the situation as it is prevailing today reorganisation of the States is necessary. I would, therefore, again request the hon. Minister that if he cannot give an assurance on the floor of the House, at least to give very serious consideration to this matter. In our country the Government is accustomed to saying 'No' first to everything. When they think it over again they come round and accept the proposal. I am quite certain that if the Minister does not agree today, tomorrow or the day after, a day will come when he will have to reconsider the whole thing and come to some agreement.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : There are two amendments.

The question is :

1. "That in lines 4-6 of the Resolution, for the words 'for purposes of administration, India should be divided into five economically and administratively viable zones, the words 'early steps should

be taken to establish a unitary form of Government in India' be substituted".

*The motion was negatived.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : The question is :

2. That in line 5 of the Resolution, for the words 'five', the word 'such' be substituted; and at the end of the Resolution, the words 'as will command public support' be inserted".

*The motion was negatived.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : As regards the original Resolution, do you press it, Mr. Jaipuria ?

श्री राजनारायण : वह एश्योर तो करें कि हम कमीशन बनायेंगे ।

श्री सीताराम जैपुरिया : एश्योर तो कर रहे हैं न !

श्री डाह्याभाई व० पटेल (गुजरात) : नहीं कर रहे हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं जैपुरिया जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि सरकार में बटर सेंस प्रिवेल करेगी इस होप में वह इसे वापस ले लें ।

श्री सीताराम जैपुरिया : मैं राजनारायण जी से सहमत हूँ कि जो सब मुझाव यहां पर आये हैं उन पर गवर्नमेंट विचार करेगी और इसके लिये कमीशन एप्वाइंट करेगी । इस आश के साथ मैं इसको विदड़ा करने को तैयार हूँ ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) : तो आप विदड़ा कर रहे हैं !

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA : Sir, beg leave to withdraw my Resolution.

*The Resolution was by leave withdrawn.*