

have been provided with some other alternative jobs before allowing the import of automatic looms. In that case, probably, the prices of our textiles could have been less and in a more agreeable position, or in a convenient position to compete with the prices in the international market. This is all, Sir, that I could say by way of suggestions in the matter of our export policy in the short time at my disposal.

Now, Sir, I take up the question of simultaneous functioning of private and the public sectors. This is a piece of mixed economy and this is a new thing; this is a new thing in the world. We have a bloc of private sectors represented by the United States of America and the modern nascent nation of West Germany; West Germany has shown that the private sector or the private monopolists there could also excel those who talk of socialism. On the other hand we see an affluent society, whose future is ensured, in Soviet Russia. As comrade Khrushchev said the other day, according to the 20-year programme that he has envisaged, the society would be not only an affluent one but that it would be free from all worries of food, shelter and even recreation. Now these are the two sectors. We are somewhere in the middle. Therefore, the emphasis lies on the adjustment of these two sectors, and if they are happily adjusted, then only we can prosper in our economic field, and we can show a new way to the other countries.

Here are some of the difficulties that we are feeling. The difficulties of course arise in the matters of wages being linked to the prices. The labour policy should effect downward tendency in prices as a result of its rational link with wages.

Before I conclude I would again like to pay tributes to the planners. While doing so, I have also shown the other side to them, the darker side, which needs their care and serious attention.

SITUATION IN PUNJAB

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): With your permission, Sir, I only rise to formally initiate the discussion. Our colleague, Dr. Z. A. Ahmad, will be explaining the position of the party in this matter. But I would like to say only one or two things before I sit down.

Sir, we are all anxious about the gravity of the situation and the developments that are taking place. In a matter of few hours the Prime Minister of the country is leaving the country and he will be leaving behind him a certain situation which you can well imagine. Sir, I rise here to press again our suggestion that this demand for the reorganisation of the present bilingual Punjab should be accepted in principle. Having accepted this principle with regard to the rest of India and drawn up the map of the whole country on a linguistic basis, there cannot be any justification either in principle or in democracy to deny the same treatment to the people of Punjab. Therefore, it is a question of principle.

As far as the other things are concerned, once the principle is accepted we are convinced that the solution of the rest of the problem would be found in an atmosphere of mutual goodwill and understanding. Sir, in this matter I regret to say that the Prime Minister has not risen to the occasion. He is a wise man and a far-sighted man, but somehow or other in this matter of reorganisation of States life marches ahead of either his wisdom or his farsight. I would beg of him to reconsider this matter and take a decision on principle and accept the principle so that other avenues of the solution of the problem are at once found.

Finally, Sir, I would only like to say that repression is not the way out for the solution of the problem. We read in the newspapers that re-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

pressive actions are taken even against the secular forces like the Communist Party. I strongly protest against such action. That will not solve the problem. As you know, repression has never solved such problems.

I wish to say again, before I sit down, that hon. Members in this House should consider this matter objectively, realistically and face the issue, rise to the occasion and accept the principle. And we are confident that once this is accepted, the solution of the problem will follow and a great anxiety will be removed and we shall find proper atmosphere in Punjab, an atmosphere of friendship and amity and an atmosphere of unity between the various sections of the community there.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE (Gujarat): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to participate in this debate with a full sense of the gravity of the situation and with a desire not to do anything whereby even inadvertently I might contribute to any worsening of the situation there. I realise, Sir, that sentiments are involved in this issue, and that as we are considering what possible solutions could be found out of it, we will have to take into consideration these sentiments, we will have to take into consideration the situation as it is likely to develop from time to time and we have also to take into consideration the interests of the people of Punjab and of the country as a whole.

Sir, I fully accept the need of taking practical considerations into view in solving or trying to find a solution of the extremely critical situation. I fully accept the view that mere academic principles, however valuable, may not be translated into real politics without fully realising the practical difficulties and the various forces that are in operation and that are likely to be affected as a result of the application of these principles in concrete cases.

Having said all these things, Sir, I would also like to say that we have to examine this question of the Punjabi Suba in a very dispassionate manner while not belittling the difficulties that are in the way, at the same time not imagining the difficulties which might never arise.

Sir, I have tried to understand very carefully the Government of India's point of view on this question of Punjabi Suba. I have read carefully the correspondence between the Prime Minister and the representatives of the Akali Dal. I have read carefully the statements issued by the Prime Minister from time to time and I have also read carefully the speech that he made in the Lok Sabha the other day. From all these various documents one thing clearly emerges that the Prime Minister considers this question of Punjabi Suba from a practical point of view, trying to see all the consequences that might follow in case this demand is conceded. His main argument is that Punjab is a linguistically integrated area, that people there speak and know Punjabi excepting in a few areas where Hindi is the predominant language and the real issue is only one of script. Punjabis, even when they meet outside India, speak in Punjabi and are great friends as Punjabis, looking at each other as Punjabis. It is also contended that this area is socially integrated and that the customs, habits, food, etc. of the people of this area are common; it is a socially integrated area. Not only that, he further informs us that there are a large number of families in Punjab who are half-Sikh half-Hindu and in every way social integration has taken place. Lastly, he has also informed us that this area is economically integrated and that if any splitting up is done, perhaps the economy of this area will suffer. These are, Sir, his main arguments in rejecting the demand of Punjabi Suba.

Sir, the Prime Minister has gone a step further and told us that in case this Punjabi Suba demand is accepted, we would be 'tearing up the finely

woven garment of the social fabric' of the Sikh community and the Hindu community there and, therefore, we should not accept this demand. May I, Sir, humbly suggest that this is taking a rather alarmist view of what is likely to happen in case the demand for Punjabi Suba is conceded? I would like to submit, in all humility, that what we are confronted with is not the partition of Punjab or the partition of India. What we are confronted with is a demand for the re-organisation of the State on the basis of language. It may be that the arguments that were applicable for the creation of the State of Andhra or for the bifurcation of the State of Bombay might not be applicable in the case of Punjab but from that, to jump to the conclusion that it would lead to a sort of consequences that followed when India was partitioned is to go to the other extreme. I am reminded of the arguments that were put forward against the inclusion of the City of Bombay in Maharashtra when the State of Bombay was created. At that time we were told that the cosmopolitan culture of Bombay would suffer if the City of Bombay was included in Maharashtra, that the fine industrial civilisation that was growing in the City of Bombay would suffer if Bombay City was included in Maharashtra, that the economy of Maharashtra and Gujarat would suffer if the State of Bombay was bifurcated. I come from the City of Bombay and I speak Gujarati. I have not been able to master the Marathi language so far in spite of the fact that I am staying in that City for a long time. I am there in the linguistic minority but I have never come across any situation wherein I have found that I am somewhere in a State where I might consider migrating from the City of Bombay or that my economic future in the City or even the political future in that City is unsafe, or that either the Gujaratis or the Maharashtrians might consider me to be belonging to another camp. All these arguments were there. They have proved to be false. More and more industries are being established al-

most every day by the Gujarati-speaking people in the City of Bombay because they have full confidence that it is merely a question of the re-organisation of the State on linguistic basis and it was not the partitioning of the State of Bombay between Gujaratis and Maharashtrians. It may be that the arguments and the situations might not be fully applicable in the case of Punjab but I do not see any reason why, given goodwill, statesmanship and capacity to handle delicate situations, the happy experience that we had in the City of Bombay should not be repeated in Punjab even after the demand for Punjabi Suba is conceded.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Maharashtra): Would you bifurcate the City of Bombay itself?

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: There is no question of bifurcating the City but the whole question was whether the cosmopolitan character of the City of Bombay would be affected or not. Here also the question is whether the integrated culture of the Hindus and Sikhs will be affected or will not be affected and my whole argument is that it is to take an alarmist view of the situation to feel that merely because a demand for Punjabi Suba is conceded, all this culture would disintegrate. That is my argument. I would go a step further and would like to remind this House that after there was bifurcation of the State of Bombay, a tremendous enthusiasm is generated both in the State of Maharashtra and Gujarat and without any rancour, without any hostility towards each other, they are trying to build up the fortunes of their respective areas. We quarrel sometimes. There is the Koyna Project. The problem is there but we quarrel as members of a family and we know that if the cosmopolitan character or civilisation or culture of Bombay is to be preserved, we will have to live peacefully, amicably and in a friendly manner with each other. That realisation has come and I do not see any reason why the same experience would not be repeated in the case of Punjab

[Shri Rohit M. Dave.]

and why it would not be that after the deeply held sentiments of the people of Punjab are fully satisfied, they should not release the same enthusiasm and the same Creative energy for the prosperity and the progress of the region.

Sir, the situation has become critical because of the fact that positions have been assumed by the two sides and at the present moment, it looks as if these positions are irreconcilable but I find some expressions in the speech of the Prime Minister in the other House which give me some hope even at this late hour. The Prime Minister informed the Lok Sabha that he was always ready for compromise, that he was always ready to convert the other to his point of view and was also ready to appreciate the other's point of view without in any way sacrificing the principles which he considers basic and the matters which he considers important. He has said that he is prepared—not in matters of principles, not in matters which he considers important but otherwise—to bend. He has gone a step further and said that it was conceivable to split Punjab. He does not even rule out completely the possibility of the splitting up of Punjab. He has only one condition and that is that it can only be done peacefully and by widespread agreement among the people concerned. This is the condition. He is prepared to concede even Punjabi Suba, as far as I can understand by those expressions 'splitting up of Punjab', provided the people concerned are agreeable to this suggestion. He has also told us that the difficulties regarding the Regional Committees arose because of the question of the status and privileges of those Regional Committees. From the correspondence it seems that a further element has been introduced regarding the functions to be entrusted to these Committees. These are the three things which I consider important and perhaps if properly handled, might lead to some solution of this extremely difficult problem. The Prime Minister has

assured us that he is prepared to bend. The Prime Minister has assured us that he is prepared to concede even the splitting up of Punjab and he has also stated that the question of Regional Council really revolves round the question of the functions, the privileges and the status of the Regional Committees. If these various ideas are examined, perhaps, I do not know, even at this late hour when we are fast approaching the zero hour, some solution may be found. I shall only trust and pray that there will be enough constructive statesmanship in this country to find a solution which is honourable and acceptable to all concerned even at this late hour. Sir, I thank you.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): Sir, I have listened with a great deal of respect, as I always do, to my hon. friend, Shri Dave but I am afraid Mr. Dave has probably not studied the Punjab situation. He certainly has studied the Bombay situation. My hon. friend talked about the linguistic basis for a change, forgetting the fact, as we allege, that today not only 8 districts out of 18 in Punjab but the entire area of Punjab is Punjabi-speaking. When you demand that 8 districts should be separated out of 18, you are demanding something which is neither logical nor practical nor borne out by the facts. Do not forget that four and a half million people came away from West Pakistan. They did not vanish into thin air. They settled down and they settled down all over the Punjab, the Indian Punjab, all over these eighteen districts, particularly, Sir, in the sparsely populated area of what was known as Hariana. When you talk today of a Hindi-speaking area and a Punjabi-speaking area you are not talking in terms of 1961, but you are talking in terms of 1947, before this great migration took place. And these four and a half million people are a virile lot of people and they are now probably nine millions in population. Remember that in 1951 the population was about 16 millions and the latest figures show that it has gone up by

another 4½ millions. And those 4½ million people make all the difference to this proposition of a Punjabi Suba. Now, in the Haryana area, there are today about 7 million people where there were 4 million people. Many of them, even in the olden days, spoke Punjabi, not merely Hindi. I went to Amritsar yesterday, and may I say this—and I am sure the House will agree with me when I say it—that we all wish the Prime Minister every success in the arduous mission that he is undertaking and we pledge ourselves here that we will not permit any untoward thing to happen during his absence abroad. It is very very important . . .

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Why afterwards?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I say during his absence abroad. Certainly not after his return to, but after his return he will be able to take charge of it himself. I visited Amritsar, as I said, and I pleaded with the Akali leaders, Master Tara Singh and Sant Fateh Singh. They are old friends of mine, old colleagues of mine. I remember those times when I was given the yellow Saropa for my services to the Akali Takht. We were old friends fighting the British Government. They are colleagues of mine and I was indeed hurt to see the condition in which I saw them. I said to them: Remember this, the whole of the Punjab is really Punjabi-speaking today. How can anyone take a few districts away and say we want these districts separated from the rest of the Punjab in order to create a Punjabi Suba, when the whole area is Punjabi-speaking from that linguistic point of view which Mr. Dave raised? Therefore, it is quite clear that the demand is not a practical demand. It is not a demand that can be conceded without grave injury to the Punjab and to the economy of the Punjab, including the economy of the Haryana and the eight districts that Master Tara Singh wants to be separated. They are all intimately

integrated. Do you think that the sparse areas of Rohtak or Hissar or Gurgaon would ever have been habitable, would ever have been prosperous, as they become prosperous, but for the water that is supplied from the other area of the Punjab and the electricity that is supplied from that area, from Ganguwal and Kotwal? Certainly not. Not only that, we are emotionally integrated and culturally integrated, and even our families are integrated. There is not a big family in the Punjab, no great family in the Punjab which has not inter-married with an important Sikh family in the Punjab. Our language is a very important language. Nobody should decry this language. It is one of the most important languages in India. It has its basic roots in Sanskrit. It has its basic roots in Turkish, it has its basic roots in Greek. People have not really studied it from that particular point of view. It is a very important language. We all speak that language today. I said to the great leaders in Amritsar: Would you like to have an enquiry made into the matter of this proposition, namely whether Punjabi is being spoken all over the area or not? They were not willing to have that enquiry. They wanted to put the cart before the horse. They wanted division first and possibly an enquiry later. Definition of the boundaries to come after, let the principle be conceded. I remember Mr. Jinnah saying to me in 1944 just after I had come out of the jail and asking me, "Why does not Mahatma Gandhi accept the principle of partition? Let him just accept the principle of partition and the rest will be easy." I remember communicating through Dr. Gopichand when he was going to see Mahatma Gandhi in Poona, this very message, and naturally it was turned down by Mahatma Gandhi. I heard the same voice again at Amritsar. Why not accept the principle, we will discuss the question of boundaries afterwards? I made this suggestion that I would ask the Prime Minister of India to institute a high ranking commission to go into the matter of the use of this language in

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

the Punjab. When I made that suggestion to them, they could have accepted that suggestion; they want a decision *a priori*, that is a decision first and examination of the problem after.

Then I was confronted with the question of discrimination and here I must pay compliments to my colleague who went with me—unfortunately she is not here now—for she conducted the negotiations in a very able manner. We said, if you want to enquire into this discrimination which you allege, against the Sikh community, we will ask the Prime Minister—in fact he has already announced it in the other House—we will ask him, request him, to have a high-power committee to go into the matter of discrimination and if any discrimination was found against the Sikh community, we pledged ourselves that we would do everything in our power to eliminate that discrimination against the Sikh community. And the answer that we got, Sir, was this, because in reality, there is no such discrimination. If there is any discrimination, it is against the Hindu community in the Punjab. I did not want to say it, but let me say it. There was no such discrimination. The answer that I got from Master Tara Singh was: The only discrimination that I am concerned with is discrimination in refusing me the Punjabi Suba. Now, when a great leader says a thing like that, argument comes to an end. There is no further argument that can be advanced. If he considers denial of the Punjabi Suba as discrimination, there is no further argument with regard to this matter.

Now, I do say, having rejected the suggestion regarding an enquiry into the language, having rejected again another enquiry into the question of discrimination, then what remains? What is the issue that remains? We know that it has been said that the Regional Committees are not function-

ing properly. My colleague who went with me, Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam, suggested to Sant Fateh Singh that with regard to these Regional Committees, we would be prepared to suggest to the Prime Minister that the scope of these Regional Committees might be widened to such an extent as to leave only finance and law and order to be controlled by the Punjab Cabinet. She went so far. Apparently there was something in that suggestion and Sant Fateh Singh said: This is a matter on which I shall telephone to you at the airport and let you know what we have to say about it. Sant Fateh Singh telephoned and he was asking: Do I understand it rightly, namely that you have suggested further decentralisation of the administration through these Committees? Remember, these Regional Committees already deal with about 18 subjects, including education, including health, including economic development and such other matters of importance to the life of the people. While he was saying this, Sardar Mohan Singh, son of Master Tara Singh—rather an excitable young man—turned to Sant Fateh Singh and said, 'Don't make any commitment without consulting Master Tara Singh' and the matter rested exactly where it was. I have not the slightest doubt in my mind that the Government of India and the Prime Minister would be agreeable to any further decentralisation if it is needed, if it is necessary, keeping law and order and overall finance in the hands of the Punjab Cabinet. But, Sir, these matters cannot be decided by appeals, as Master Tara Singh rightly told me, by emotional appeals made to him. We have to consider these matters, practically, as Mr. Dave said; we have to consider them calmly, as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta for once in his life has considered this matter calmly. We have to consider them like statesmen, wisely. You cannot bifurcate the Punjab any longer; the Punjab will not and cannot be bifurcated any longer. We have seen misery untold in the bifurcation that took place at the time of the formation

of Pakistan. We will not go to that extent any more; we will not face up to an issue like that any more. Come what may, we will not accept a further bifurcation of the Punjab. I suggest, Sir, with that basic principle in sight, everything that could be done to help our Sikh brethren to understand the significance of what is happening in the Punjab, to try and put their doubts at rest, to make their minds calm and peaceful in regard to the happenings in the Punjab, should be done. I am certain that each one of us from the Punjab will be prepared to give his whole attention to this particular aspect of the subject and assure them of our fullest support if there is any injustice done to them.

I do not know, Sir, what actually is happening in the Punjab at the present moment but it is understandable that the authorities should take the necessary precaution to keep law and order lest something untoward should happen and I suggest that if that is being done, it should not be criticised. It is the duty of the Government to preserve law and order. All our planning, all our future, all that we stand for will vanish into thin air if there is no law and order preserved in this country, and the first essential duty of a Government is to preserve law and order in the Punjab. I have no doubt that the time will come when each one of us is firm in his resolve that nothing wrong should be done as far as the Punjab is concerned, as the Prime Minister is. If he remains firm, the time will come and come soon when a settlement will be achieved which will be satisfactory to all concerned.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the question that we are considering though not important by itself has now acquired a serious aspect. I am not unfamiliar with this question. It is said now, as it was said five or six years ago, that there are two languages in Punjab, Punjabi and Hindi. It was even said to the States

Reorganisation Commission that Punjabi was allied to Lehanda and not to Hindi. I do not want to go into philological questions but as the great authority of Greerson was appealed to, I am bound to point out that Greerson has written that though Punjabi at the base is allied to Lehandi, the superstructure is Hindi and that the superstructure has become so important that Punjabi should now be regarded as allied to western Hindi. The argument that Greerson was of the view that Punjabi was distinct from Hindi was used by those who wanted a Punjabi-speaking Suba but really Greerson said nothing of the kind that they had claimed. He, on the other hand, supported the views of those who thought that there was such similarity between Punjabi and Hindi that they should be regarded as belonging to one family.

Now, Sir, I should like to point out another fact in order to make hon. Members realise what the people in general thought of Punjabi and Hindi before the present agitation was created. In the Punjab University, examinations are held, or at least were held till a few years ago, in Hindi and Punjabi. The States Reorganisation Commission collected information with regard to these examinations and it learnt that during the last five years, five years preceding 1955, in the Hindi and Punjabi examinations of the Punjab University from the Jullundur Division, 62.2 per cent. appeared in the Hindi examinations and 37.3 per cent. in the Punjabi examinations. Now, Sir, this fact is of considerable importance. According to the Census of 1931, in the six Punjabi-speaking districts of the old

[Pandit Hriday Nath Kunzru.]

Punjab, the percentage of Punjabi-speaking people was 97.2 and Hindi speaking people only 1.3. In spite of the fact that almost the whole population of the six districts to which I have referred was regarded as Punjabi-speaking, 62.2 per cent. of the candidates appeared for the Hindi examination of the Punjab University. Again, Sir, out of about 103,000 candidates who appeared in the Matriculation Examination of the Punjab University during four years preceding the States Reorganisation Commission's enquiry in Punjab and who had the option to answer History and Geography papers either in Hindi or in Punjabi, 73.5 per cent. elected to answer the question papers in Hindi and only 26.5 per cent. in Punjabi. As the Commission has rightly observed, motives cannot well be attributed to examinees at university examinations who must have exercised their option on the basis of their own literary needs and family traditions. For this reason the conclusion which seems to be indicated cannot be ignored. Hindi will not by any means be unimportant in the Punjabi-speaking zone and Punjabi and Hindi will have to exist and develop side by side. Now, our hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, who really asked for a discussion on the motion before us, was not fair to us in saying only a few words and then leaving it to Shri Z. A. Ahmad to make the position of the Communist Party clear. Surely, as the mover of the motion he should have placed the views of the Communist Party clearly before us so that we might know what we might have to consider. But Shri Dave has clearly explained his views and has claimed that just as Maharashtra and Gujarat were separated, so can the Punjabi-speaking districts and the Hindi-speaking districts be separated but the facts that I have placed before the House will show that the distinction sought to be made by him between Hindi and Punjabi is unreal in the extreme.

There is one other fact that should be borne in mind in connection with

this matter. According to the Sachar-Gyani Kartar Singh formula Punjabi will be the regional language of the Punjabi zone as demarcated in connection with the establishment of regional committees. Now, this is really a concession to Punjabi for in strict logic the population which claims Hindi as its mother-tongue is so numerous even in the Sikh districts that according to the criterion laid down by the States Reorganisation Commission and accepted by the Government and the Chief Ministers of the States, Punjab will have to be regarded not as a unilingual but as a bilingual State. Now, suppose the Punjabi-speaking zone which has already been demarcated is separated from the rest of Punjab, can the Gyani-Sachar formula still apply to it? I do not think that it can. The Hindus, I understand, will be about 39 per cent. of the population in this area; virtually, say, two-fifths of the population claiming Hindi as its mother-tongue will live in this area. This area will therefore have to be bilingual and if Master Tara Singh can accept a bilingual State, what reason has he to ask for the division of the present Punjab which at the worst is a bilingual State. The Prime Minister has said more than once that though there are both Hindi and Punjabi-speaking people in Punjab, Punjabi is the dominant language of Punjab. Yes, according to the Sachar formula and taking Punjab as a whole there is no doubt that Punjabi will be the dominant language but if the Punjabi-speaking area is separated from Punjab—let me repeat—Hindi will have to be accorded all those rights that Punjabi will get. It is not merely in the matter of education that Punjab will be a bilingual State. In regard to administration, the courts and for every other purpose Punjab will have to be a bilingual State. In what respect will such a State be more in consonance with the wishes of Master Tara Singh and the self-respect of the Sikh community which he claims to represent than the present Punjab? If this position is not conceded, in the Punjabi-speaking suba there will obviously be trouble between the Hindus and the Sikhs.

Again, I ask, is it wise to create a suba in which if the outlook of the dominant party is in the least narrow, serious trouble will be created. And remember this that any trouble that is created in the Punjabi-speaking suba will be reflected in the Hindi-speaking area. Before India was partitioned some people used to say that if only we agreed to partition, there would be no further trouble between the Hindus and the Muslims. But has that contention turned out to be true? Our experience ought to warn us in this matter and we should, I think, take strict facts into consideration and not feeling or sentiment. If a Punjabi-speaking suba is created and Hindi is not accorded a place of equality with Punjabi, there will be serious trouble not only in the Punjabi-speaking zone but also in the Hindi-speaking area. I therefore agree on the basis of facts which cannot be controverted—and not, let me repeat, on the basis of feeling or sentiment—with the Prime Minister that there is no case for the division of the Punjab into two States. Linguistically, culturally, administratively and economically, as he has said, both the parts of Punjab belong to an integral whole and they cannot be separated without injury to both of them.

Now, Sir, perhaps I am coming to the end of my time. I just want to say one word more. The situation is a serious one. We know that Master Tara Singh is the most important leader of the Sikh community. We know that he is widely respected in Punjab. I have personally great respect for him and like others I am greatly concerned that nothing should happen to him which would lead to further trouble in Punjab. But in spite of this desire, I have repeatedly asked myself whether the formation of a Punjabi-speaking suba will avert the danger of further trouble altogether and enable both sections of the people to live together in peace and harmony. I have not been able to answer that question in the affirmative. The more I think about it the more I sincerely feel that the Gov-

ernment of India will be sowing the seeds of unending trouble if it agrees to the division of Punjab into two States. To divide Punjab into two States would be like dividing U.P. into two States. Indeed it seems to me that the division will create greater problems than exist now and I therefore say in all humility, in spite of my respect for Master Tara Singh and my admiration for the Sikh community which fought in the past for the Hindu religion and which has rendered services of incalculable value to the country, that it would be suicidal for Punjab and ruinous to the country if Punjab were at this juncture divided into two States.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the old saying, uneasy lies the head that wears the crown, cannot be more truly applicable than on this occasion. Here two parties, Sikhs on the one hand and Hindus on the other, in Punjab are resorting to fast and whatever decision the Prime Minister would take, his action will be criticised by one or the other. It is indeed a grave situation and therefore we have great sympathy with the Prime Minister in this hour. We do hope that for the good fortune of the country something satisfactory will come about in the end. This question is not a new one. For years this dispute has been going on and it is now reaching the breaking point. The question can well be asked: Why is there a fast by Sikhs on the one hand and by Hindus on the other? The answer appears to be quite clear. The Sikhs feel that they have exhausted all the constitutional means to attain their goal of a Punjabi Suba and they also feel that if they take advantage of the lessons of the past and if enough political pressure is put on the Government, they will concede it. In this respect they believe that the breaking point has been reached and, therefore, their leader, Master Tara Singh, has taken to fasting. Why have Hindus taken to fasting? Because they feel that in the end the Government will

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]
surrender to political pressure. Their cause will go by default and, therefore, they also want to make sure that the Government is not subjected to political pressure. Two of their leaders, as against one of the Sikhs, have taken resort to this fast. Have we not seen that this very position, which the Prime Minister is taking now in regard to the Punjab issue, he took in the past and what was the result in the end? The formation of Andhra is a case in point in front of us. Their leader, Shri Sriramulu, undertook a fast upto death and Andhra was formed. That cannot apply in the case of Punjab. But in regard to Bombay, what happened? The Prime Minister and the Government took the same attitude as they are taking today in the case of Punjab.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA (West Bengal): No, no. It was decided long ago.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I must say what I feel and I cannot be guided by other people's opinion. There was a case in favour of the formation of unilingual States of Maharashtra and Gujarat. Because of Bombay, because of the fear that it would lose its universal culture, their demand was not conceded. Hundreds of people were shot down and killed in the City of Bombay and in Ahmedabad and still the Government stood by their original decision. So far so good. But what happened afterwards? Political pressure was brought to bear and they yielded and I should say that they surrendered. The two States of Maharashtra on the one hand and Gujarat on the other were formed. This case is in front of both the Sikhs and Hindus. The Sikhs have taken the view that the only way to bring the Government to their point of view is to take this extreme step. The Hindus feel that the only way to keep the Government on the present position is that they should also go on a counter-fast. This is the position at present and it is a very grave position. As I stated, we have full sym-

pathy for the Prime Minister and I pray that God will give him wisdom and strength to solve this question in the interests of the country.

Now, Sir, I have been reading in the speeches and the statements of the Prime Minister and in the correspondence that has passed between them, that there is a condemnation of this coercive method of fasting, saying that it has no application in a democratic set-up in our country. But here I feel that two standards are being applied. I do not want to go into the past history where Gandhiji resorted to this step against a foreign government. But after independence two cases have happened. One was in the case of Andhra to which I have referred. The second was in regard to a colleague of the hon. Prime Minister, Shri Morarji Desai. He also went on a fast. He is one of the topmost Congress leaders. Probably if he plays his cards well, he may be the next Prime Minister. He may succeed Mr. Nehru. What happened? He also resorted to this step. He also went on a fast for an unlimited period . . .

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): Not against the Government. Not against the people.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: My friend said that there should be no fast against the Government but it can be against the people. (*Interruption*) I wish that the same advice were given to the Prime Minister to go on a fast as regards the Punjab as a counter-fast against the Sikhs and Hindus. But that is a separate question. Therefore, this question of fasting would be there whenever the people have a grievance.

Now, coming to the present issue, I agree totally both with Dr. Kunzru and Diwan Chaman Lal that, in the present set-up of the Punjab and seeing what has happened as a result of the partition of India and the creation of Pakistan, there is no basis whatsoever for a further division of the Punjab for the simple reason that

it has an integrated culture. This is not a case of Sikhs and Hindus. The Sikhs feel that they should have self-determination and it is nothing but a question of religion. I will not say that it is communal, but it is a question of religion. In this set-up, in the circumstances of the Punjab, it will be more than suicidal if the Government surrenders to this pressure. It is a very serious question. Undoubtedly Master Tara Singh is the decided leader of the Sikhs. He is the leader of the Sikhs, whether the Sikhs belong to the Congress or they are neutral or they are in the Akali Dal. They are following Master Tara Singh. He is the undisputed leader of the Sikhs and his voice carries great weight. The only point I have against the Government is this that the argument that they are applying for not conceding the demand of Master Tara Singh is wrong and their position is stultified. Their argument is that it is a border area and, therefore, this cannot be done. Well, there are other border areas also. U.P. is a border area, Bengal is a border area, Assam is a border area and they are unilingual States. Now, in regard to the Punjab it is pure and simple a bilingual State. Hindus are there. They inter-marry. And if the Prime Minister, to save Master Tara Singh, were to concede the principle of a separate Suba, then it will be the thin end of the wedge. Nobody can say where it will end and nobody can say what will happen. Therefore, I submit that the arguments that are being given for not conceding the demand of the Sikhs, in my opinion, are not right.

The question arises whether the Punjab should be divided or it should be kept as a bilingual State. I am certain in my mind that it cannot be divided. It has to be bilingual. We have to stand firm, whatever may be the result. We hope that in the end good sense will prevail on the contending parties in the interests of the country. But if we surrender ourselves to political pressure, as we have done in the past, it will be a suicidal step

which the country will never forgive and forget, whoever he may be and howsoever big he may be.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Where do you stand, except the confusion part of it?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I submit that the Punjab has to remain as it is. If it is bifurcated into two portions, I feel that it will not be a viable unit at all. How can the Sikhs in a small area form a good sizeable State? They will have to depend practically wholly on the Centre for subsidy, for assistance or for aid. It will not be a viable unit. Therefore, firstly, on the ground that it will not be a viable unit, and secondly, on the ground that it is an integrated State, it has to remain a bilingual State and I appeal to the Prime Minister to stand by the position that he has been taking, whatsoever and howsoever great the pressure may be on him. I say this because this thin end of the wedge will be most dangerous. We have already seen the partition of the country and we cannot take further risks by having further partition.

Lastly, Sir, I would say one word, and it is this. The situation indeed is very serious, it is very grave. Nobody can deny that law and order has to be maintained, whether it is in respect of the followers of Master Tara Singh or in respect of the followers of any other Party or community, and I understand from my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, that particularly pressure is being put on the Party to which he belongs. That is a question which I am not competent to deal with, but I am certain in my mind with regard to one thing. If trouble has to be avoided in Punjab, if calamity has to be avoided, and if we have to have a safe time, then in that case there is no remedy except to have President's Rule in Punjab. I am certain in my mind that the situation will worsen . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is the only wisdom.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It may be that the position may go out of hand, because the Punjab Government under no circumstances can control the situation. Already there are murmurs and rumours, and the position may become very serious. If something happens to Master Tara Singh or if something happens to the two Hindu leaders who are going on a counter fast, the situation may be worsened. It may be that violence may be resorted to. I do not feel certain in the capacity of the present Punjab Government to deal with the situation. My submission would be that the safest thing for the country would be that the sooner President's Rule is promulgated in Punjab the better, in the interests of Punjab itself, in the interests of the Sikhs, in the interests of the Hindus and in the interests of the country as a whole.

श्री मोहन सिंह (पंजाब) : जनाब डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहब, हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने पंजाबी सूबा के बारे में एक स्टैंड लिया है और मैं उसकी पूरी सपोर्ट करता हूँ। एक वक्त था कि पार्टिशन से पहले पंजाब काफी बड़ा सूबा था। पार्टिशन होने के बाद हिन्दुस्तान में जो पंजाब का हिस्सा आया वह बहुत छोटा रह गया और पिछले १० वर्ष में पंजाबियों ने बड़ी मेहनत से इस सूबा को फिर पांच पर खड़ा किया है और अब यह सूबा हिन्दुस्तान के बाकी जो तरक्कीयाफता, तरक्की करने वाले, सूबे हैं उनकी अगली कतार में समझा जाता है। यह जो फास्ट और काउंटर फास्ट के जरिये इस पहले से ही छोटे पंजाब को और छोटा बना कर इसको एक पंजाबड़ी करने का फैसला जो मास्टर तारासिंह जी कर रहे थे उससे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने एक मजबूत स्टैंड लेकर पंजाब को बचा लिया है और पंजाब उनका बड़ा मश्कूर है। मास्टर जी और उनकी अकाशी पार्टी फिरकापरस्ती के जज्बात को भड़का कर अपना सियासी

मकसद हल करने के लिये उसको धार्मिक रंगत देकर पंजाब और सिखों का बहुत नुक्सान कर रहे हैं और पंजाबी सूबा लेने के लिये जो ढंग उन्होंने अख्तियार किये हैं वे पंजाब के लिये और सिखों के लिये निहायत खतरनाक हैं। वह उतने मसले हल नहीं करते जितने नये प्राबलम्स और पैदा कर देते हैं। मैं एक सिख होने के नाते यह हाउस के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ कि मास्टर जी का स्टैंड सिखों के लिये निहायत खतरनाक है। जब कोई कम्युनिटी जज्बात में बह जाती है तो वह रैशनल थिंकिंग नहीं कर सकती है और आज जो वह स्टैंड ले रहे हैं चन्द वर्षों के बाद कुल थिंकिंग जब की जायेगी तो यह मालूम होगा कि यह एक नाक्राबिले माफ़ी गुनह वह कर रहे हैं, खास करके सिखों के साथ।

यह पंजाबी सूबा का झगड़ा पंजाबी जबान से शुरू होता है। पिछले चन्द वर्षों में पंजाबी जबान ने जितनी तरक्की की है, मेरा ख्याल है कि हिन्दुस्तान में और किसी भाषा ने नहीं की है। जितने विद्यार्थी पंजाबी पास कर रहे हैं, सर्विसेज में कितनी पंजाबी हो रही है, पंजाब युनिवर्सिटी बन रही है और पंजाब गवर्नमेंट ने पंजाबी लैंग्वेज को डेवलप करने के लिये एक अलग मुहकमा बनाया है। बहुत कुछ हो रहा है और अभी चीन के बार्डर से ले कर लाहौर, स्पीती, कांगड़ा होते हुए दिल्ली से गुजर कर गुड़गांव तक हर जगह पंजाबी पढ़ाई जा रही है, पंजाबी बोली जा रही है, पंजाबी समझी जा रही है। पता नहीं मास्टर जी और उनके साथी इस पंजाबी के पीछे हाथ धो कर क्यों पड़े हुए हैं कि इतने लम्बे चौड़े एरिया में— चीन की सरहद से लेकर गुड़गांव तक— जो जबान पढ़ाई जा रही है उसको चन्द जिलों में कैद करना चाहते हैं। पंडित जी ने पंजाबी जबान को मास्टर तारासिंह जी के हमले से बचाया है और हिस्ट्री इसको याद करेगी। हिन्दी रीजन में कई लाख पंजाबी

बसे हुए हैं। उन्होंने पता नहीं मास्टर तारासिंह जी का क्या बिगाड़ा है, क्या पाप किया है कि उनको पंजाबी पढ़ने का वह मौका नहीं देना चाहते हैं और पंजाबी को कैद करते हैं अपनी जंजीरों में, चन्द जिलों में हिन्दी रीजन के तमाम हिन्दू भाई बड़े शौक से पंजाबी पढ़ रहे हैं। यह हर स्कूल में पढ़ाई जा रही है। कोई कर्षी नहीं सर्विस में जा नहीं सकता जब तक कि वह पंजाबी में क्वालीफाई न कर ले। लेकिन मास्टर तारासिंह जिस ढंग से यह सूबा बना रहे हैं वह पंजाबी पर निहायत खतरनाक हमला है।

अगर पंजाबी जवान को छोड़ दिया जाय और दूसरे नुक्तेनिगाह से, सिखों के नुक्ते-निगाह से देखा जाय तो सिख की एक बेराइल और एडवेंचरस कम्पुनिटी है। हिन्दुस्तान का कोई हिस्सा नहीं, कोई शहर नहीं, कोई सूबा नहीं जहां कि सिख बसे हुये नहीं है और जहां बसे हुए हैं वहां वे बड़े बाइज्जत तरीके से बसे हुए हैं, किसी न किसी बिजनेस, व्यापार या किसी न किसी चीज पर उन्होंने कब्जा किया हुआ है। राजस्थान की कितनी जमीन उन्होंने आबाद की है, ५० पी० में कितने उनके फार्म चल रहे हैं, कलकत्ते की ट्रांसपोर्ट पर किस कदर उनका कब्जा है। हर बड़े बड़े शहर में वे फैले हुए हैं। दिल्ली प्रेक्टिकली पंजाबी सूबा नज़र आता है। हमें अपना टैलेंट बनाने के लिये और जगह मिलनी चाहिये। हमें एक जगह लिमिटेड करके, बंद करके पीछे की तरफ नहीं खींचना चाहिये। मैं हिन्दुस्तान से बाहर जिस किसी मुल्क में गया हूं मुझे कोई मुल्क ऐसा नज़र नहीं आया जहां कोई इन्सान का बच्चा पहुंच जाय तो वहां कोई सिख न हो। सिख ज़रूर उधर पहुंचेगा। ऐसे ऐसे जंजीरे मैंने देखे हैं जहां अकेला सिख ही नज़र आता है, उसको जिधर चाहे उधर बसाया जा सकता है। तो ऐसी एडवेंचरस कम्पुनिटी यह है कि जहां ये जाते हैं अपनी हिम्मत और शक्ति के जरिये से जाते हैं और उनको कोई पीछे खींच कर बंद नहीं कर सकता। एक बात था कि सिख

हिन्दुओं की रक्षा के लिये फरार में बोलते थे कि हम हिन्दुओं की तलवार है। फिर समझ में नहीं आता कि यह नारा क्यों बलंद किया जाता है कि सिख पंथ खतरे में है, सिख खतरे में हैं। जब से मैं सियासत में आया हूं मैं हर तरफ देखता हूँ लेकिन मुझे किसी तरफ तोपों, गनों और एयरोप्लेन लेकर मिखों पर चढ़ाई करते हुए कोई खतरा नज़र नहीं आया। ना ही मास्टर जी के पास ऐसी कोई तोपें और गनें देखी है जिनसे वे बहुत सख्ती से अपनी डिफेंस लाइन बनाये हुए हैं। कौम के जज़बात भड़काये जा रहे हैं, जज़बात के साथ खेला जा रहा है। अभी पंजाब के एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को लें—सिखों ने और क्या लेना था? मेरा तो खयाल है, मास्टर जी को गुस्सा इस बात पर है कि सिख चीफ मिनिस्टर क्यों बन गया पंजाब में, उनकी जिन्दगी में दूसरे सिख का नाम क्यों पैदा हो गया और कैरों कैरों लोग क्यों करते हैं। वे तो इसको वर्टिजन ही नहीं कर सकते। चीफ मिनिस्टर सिख है, उनके साथी सिख हैं और सिखों के साथ उनका दर्द है, सिखों के दुश्मन नहीं हैं वे। पंजाब के एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन पर सिख छाये हुए हैं। दिल्ली में हमको उसमें काफ़ी हिस्सा मिला हुआ है। कोई जगह नहीं जिधर सिखों को सिख समझ कर नज़रअंदाज किया गया हो, सिख समझ कर उनका फ़ायदा ही किया गया है और शायद वे सिख न होते तो उतना फ़ायदा न मिलता मैं नहीं समझता हूं अगर रोहतक, गुड़गांव और हिसार में एक सिख डी० सी० लगा हुआ हो या सिख एस० पी० लगा हुआ हो तो सिखों का वकार उससे बढ़ता है या सिर्फ पांच, चार जिलों के अन्दर सिख कुएं के मेंढक की तरह रहें तो उससे बढ़ता है? लेकिन एक तंगखयाल लीडर अपनी कौम को डुबा कर डी दम लेता है। मैं समझता हूं कि अभी यह जो दिल्ली शहर है हिन्दुस्तान का नव सेन्टर, इसको पंजावियों ने चारों तरफ से घेरा हुआ है। पंजाब का कलचर दिल्ली में छा रहा है। दिल्ली हमें तो एक किस्म का पंजाब ही नज़र आता है, यहां खाना पंजाबी हो रहा है, गाना पंजाबी हो रहा है,

[श्री मोहन सिंह]

लिबास पंजाबी हो रहा है। पंजाबी भांगड़ा डान्स हो रहा है। मैं तो देखता हूँ अमृतसर में जो लस्सी का डबल स्टोरीड ग्लास सिखों में पीना शुरू हुआ था वह दिल्ली में आज हर कोई पी रहा है। पंजाबियों को खीच कर ले जाना और दिल्ली पर भी उसका असर न पड़े, मैं समझता हूँ मास्टर जी पंजाब के साथ बड़ा पाप कर रहे हैं। असल में बात क्या है? सेक्यूलरिज्म की कम्पूनलिज्म के साथ जंग है। नाम उसका कोई हो, एक तरफ फोर्सेज आफ इन्टीग्रेशन कोशिश कर रही हैं, दूसरी तरफ फोर्सेज आफ डिसइन्टीग्रेशन काम कर रही है और रूरल एलीमेन्ट की अरबन एलीमेन्ट से टक्कर है। यह चीज पंजाब में चल रही है। मास्टर जी अरबन एलीमेन्ट को रिप्रेजेंट करते हैं और वही हिन्दू तबका उनके साथ मिलता है। मास्टर जी चाहते हैं सिख सिख हो जाय, हिन्दू हिन्दू हो जाय और ये कांग्रेस, कम्प्यूनिस्ट, सोशलिस्ट जो उनकी मदद कर रहे हैं ये बीच से आटोमेटिकली एलीमिनेट हो जायें तो काम बड़ी जल्दी हो जायेगा। सो, यह जो मौका है, यह इलैक्शन से एक वर्ष पहले सोजन होता है, कई किस्म के एजीटेशन का। मास्टर जी ने हमेशा इलैक्शन से एक वर्ष पहले कोई न कोई एजीटेशन किया। एजीटेशन के लिये अकाली दल को उन्होंने एक जीना बनाया हुआ है पावर पर आने का। हमेशा एजीटेशन के बाद कोई न कोई सौदा हुआ और अकाली दल के लीडरान में से कोई पंजाब गवर्नमेंट में तो कोई सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट में आया। वह एक पुराना प्रोसेस है जो कि इस दफा भी रिपीट हो रहा है। मैं पंडित जी को मुबारकबाद देता हूँ, उन्होंने वह जो पुराना प्रोसेस था, उसको रोक लिया है और अगर किसी ने अभी पावर हासिल करनी है तो उसे ज़रा सीधी तरह करना पड़ेगा। जो रास्ता मास्टर जी ने अख्ति-यार किया है भूख हड़ताल का और जो उनके दूसरे साथी हैं जो काउन्टर भूख हड़ताल कर रहे हैं, उनका रास्ता निहायत गलत है। अगर हम रास्ते में यानी फ़ास्ट या काउन्टर फ़ास्ट के

जरिये कोई डिमान्ड करे और उसको हमने मान लिया तो फिर यह कांस्टीट्यूशन बनाने की कोई जरूरत नहीं थी। कल कोई तीन जिले की मांग लेकर बैठ जाय और कड़े में शहीद होता है—कोई न कोई स्वामी ले आया—तो फिर कितने सूबे हम बनाते जायेंगे? अगर एक डिमान्ड आपने मान ली तो कई पोलिटिकल पार्टियां अपने इलैक्शन मैनिफेस्टो में जित्त किया करेंगी कि फलां आदमी को, फलाने स्वामी को हमने फलानी मांग पूरी कराने के लिये फ़ास्ट करने को तैयार कर लिया तो इसका कोई अन्त नहीं होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि डिमान्ड अगर जायज़ भी हो तो भी यह हथियार इतना खराब है कि इसके जरिये एक जस्ट डिमान्ड भी कभी नहीं माननी चाहिये। अभी गुरुद्वारे और मंदिर एक सियासी मकमद हासिल करने के लिये इस्तेमाल हो रहे हैं और पंजाब में ऐसी फ़िज़ां बन गई हैं कि पंजाब की सियासत का फ़ैसला एसेम्बली में या पार्लियामेन्ट में नहीं बल्कि मन्दिर और गुरुद्वारे में हो रहा है। यह गलत बात है। अभी इस किस्म का इम्पेशन दिया जा रहा है कि ये जो पंजाबी सूबे की मांग है यह सिखों की मांग है। यह भी गलत है। सिखों के एक धड़े की मांग है, अकालियों की मांग है। वे इसको गुरुद्वारों से धार्मिक रंग देकर, सिखों की मांग बना कर, बाहर जाहिर कर रहे हैं। अगर पिछले गुरुद्वारा इलैक्शन को बेस बना लिया जाय, जो मास्टर जी ने पंजाबी सूबे का इश्यू बना कर लड़ा था, तो उसमें मास्टर जी के विरोधियों को ३५ ६ परसेन्ट वोट मिले थे और बदकिस्मती से या खुशकिस्मती से दूसरी तरफ उनके खिलाफ लड़ने का इन्चार्ज मैं था। इलैक्शन से दो महीने पहले मुझे बताया गया कि हमें इलैक्शन लड़ना है। हम पहले से तैयार नहीं थे। किसी गैर अकाली के नाम कोई वोट नहीं बनाया हुआ था और जो वोट बनाये हुए थे, मिल मिला कर अकालियों ने दफ्तरों में जा कर उन की लिस्टें ही माफ कर दीं, वे नाम ही उड़ा

दिये। मेरा खुद अपना नाम, गांव का नाम उसमें नहीं था। मैंने जब लिस्ट भेजी उस वक्त वोटर थे और जब वोटिंग का वक्त आया तो गांव का ही नामोनिशान नहीं था, कोई वोटर ही नहीं था। मास्टर जी के जितने विरोधी थे वे मेरे गांव के इर्दगिर्द उनकी लिस्टें ही एलीमिनेट थी। तो इस तरह से वोट हासिल किये गये और बहुतां के वोट नहीं पड़े।

मास्टर जी जो पंजाबी सूबा चाहते हैं, उनके रीजन में, उस सूबे में जो हिन्दू भाई रहते हैं उनमें से कोई भी उसके हक में नहीं है। पंडित जी ने कई बार अच्छी तरह से इसको क्लीयर किया है कि बम्बई के जो हालात थे वे पंजाब के साथ नहीं मिलते। उधर क्या हालात थे? वहां जो डिमान्ड थी वह यूनेनीमस थी, थोड़ा सा फर्क था। इधर एक कम्युनिटी समूचे तौर पर पंजाबी सूबा नहीं चाहती और दूसरी कम्युनिटी भी काफ़ी हिस्सा नहीं चाहती। लेकिन फिर भी बार-बार वे इस चीज़ को लाते हैं और फ़िज़ां को गंदला करते हैं। मैं समझता हूं, हिन्दू और सिख, जैसाकि मुझ से पहले कई दोस्तों ने इधर कहा है, वे आपस में इतना घुलमिल गये हैं कि उनको सेपरेट करना मुश्किल है। मेरे ही घर की बात ले लीजिये, मेरी जो फ़ैमिली है उसमें मैंने दो ब्रदर एडाप्ट किये हुए हैं; एक राजपूत है होशियापुर ज़िले का और एक गोरखा है नेपाल का। दोनों हिन्दू हैं। मेरी फ़ैमिली बड़ी हैप्पीली रह रही है। किसी घर में झगड़ा नहीं है, एक ही घर में हिन्दू और सिख आपस में रह रहे हैं। ये सियासी पावर हासिल करने वाले कोई न कोई ढोंग बना कर इस किस्म की चीज़ हमारे सामने रोज़ ले आते हैं। अब सवाल यह रहा कि मास्टर जी इस तरह की लहर क्यों चला देने है? अगर सिखों को इतना नुकसान है तो वे इस तरह की लहर क्यों चलाते हैं? मैं समझता हूं कि मास्टर जी का मक़सद बड़ा क्लीयर है।

वह समझते हैं कि पंजाबी सूबे की मांग से मेरी सियासी ताकत बढ़ जायेगी और मैं गुरुद्वारे में बैठ कर हर एक पर फ़तवा दे कर उस पर हुकूमत कर सकता हूं। हमें यह पता है कि जिस समय गुरुद्वारों का इलैक्शन हुआ था, उस समय क्या क्या फ़तवे हमारे बरखिलाफ़ दिये गये थे। यह कहा गया था कि ये पंथ के ग़द्दार हैं, ये सिख नहीं हैं, झूठ बोलते हैं और हिन्दुओं के एजेन्ट हैं और हमें अखण्ड पाठ के लिये चंडीगढ़ से परमिशन लानी पड़ेगी। यह जो शाप एक्ट जिसके जरिये दुकान ६ बजे खोली जाती है उसका नतीजा गुरुद्वारों पर भी पड़ेगा और उस की वजह से गुरुद्वारों का कोई नामोनिशान नहीं रह जायेगा। इस तरह से गुरुद्वारे के नाम पर रीलिजस टच देकर हमारे खिलाफ़ बोला गया और लोगों को भड़काया गया।

अब मैं बैठने से पहले यह अज़ कलंगा कि चीफ़ मिनिस्टर पंजाब, जो बड़े डिफ़ीकल्ट सिचुएशन में हैं और जो पंजाब में बड़े दिलेराना और ठंडे मिज़ाज से मुकाबला कर रहे हैं, उनकी हमें हर तरह से सपोर्ट करनी चाहिये और उनके हाथ मज़बूत करने चाहिये। मास्टर जी के सामने भी मेरी यह अपील है कि अगर वे सचमुच हिन्दू सिख युनिटी चाहते हैं तो वे अपना मरण ब्रत छोड़ दें और बजाय एक कम्युनिटी के लीडर बनने के, दोनों के बनने की कोशिश करें।

DR. Z. A. AHMAD (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I realise the extremely complicated nature of the problem that we are discussing today. I also realise the gravity of the situation, and that situation has become all the more serious after the breakdown of the negotiations that were going on between the Prime Minister and the Akali leaders. We are facing a deadlock today.

Now the question is how can this deadlock be broken, I refuse to believe, Sir, that we have reached a stage when there is no course left to us except a

[Dr. Z. A. Ahmad.]

showdown between the Government and the Akalis. I do not like that development to take place. I think that it would not be in the interests of the Akalis, nor would it be in the interests of the people of Punjab. I do believe, Sir, that there is still a large fund of goodwill, sanity and wisdom amongst us, among our people in Punjab and outside upon which we can draw and find out a solution and create a new atmosphere in Punjab.

Now, before I suggest what should be one in the matter, and what the understanding of our party is, I would like to make a few observations about the peculiar situations that develop from time to time in Punjab. I agree that the problem of Punjab cannot be equated with the problems that develop in other parts of the country. In Punjab they have a peculiar character of their own. I also come from that area and I know that there is a peculiar background to every problem that comes up in Punjab, and that, I say, is a communal background. Punjab politics has, for a long time, been dominated by communal passions and communal sentiments, and that has been the bane of Punjab politics. I remember those days, before partition, when every major community in Punjab had its own organisation, more or less a communal organisation. I remember, even at the time of our revolt against the alien Government—well, some friends may disagree with me—even the National Congress in Punjab was tending to be communal-minded at that time. Then I remember those days when in Punjab there were the so-called nationalist Muslims—the Ahrars. They were nationalists but their whole outlook was religious, was bigotry-ridden, and orthodox. The Arya Samaj started at a particular level, came at a certain time and gave a progressive outlook but later on, became a communal organisation. Similarly the Akalis—the Babbar Akalis, the Akalis now, and all sorts of Akalis—came. Now this has been the bane of Punjab politics, and that factor gives a peculiar background to every

problem that comes up in Punjab—we must understand this. Therefore I say I realise the extremely complicated character of the problem that we are facing, and I do not also place Punjab on a par with, say, Andhra, or other places, because it is rather an explosive type of State, and an explosive type of population lives there, which is moved by certain considerations which do not exist elsewhere.

Therefore, in tackling this problem we have to be very realistic, we have to be very careful, and we have to take all factors into account. Now, Sir, my next submission is that the urge of the Punjabi-speaking people, or of sections thereof, for a Punjabi-Speaking State is basically and fundamentally not a wrong urge—I am speaking in a broad sense. If it was not a wrong urge for the Andhras or Gujaratis or Maharashtrians or other people, it is not a wrong urge for the Punjabis. The principle of linguistic division is a correct principle, because it creates sanctions for the flowering out of the cultural life of people having a sort of common culture and living together in large areas, I refuse to accept the position that in Punjab this urge on the part of all Punjabi people for come together in a sort of linguistic group does not exist—I do not recognise that position. I think that that urge is there, but it is also a fact that that urge has been vitiated by communal-minded elements on both sides. Now I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that the manner in which the Akalis have been conducting their campaign for a Punjabi Suba—it is called Punjabi Suba—has been wrong, has been disruptive, has been communal—I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that. The use of Gurdwaras for this purpose is impermissible. The slogan that the Panth is in danger is a strange slogan. One cannot understand how the Panth is in danger. Then, that there is discrimination against the Sikhs, I cannot understand. Therefore it is very clear that they have themselves created a situation in which a very big section of the Pun-

jabi-speaking population in Punjab is pitted against them. They are not convinced that the Akalis are really for a Punjabi Suba but the impression is created that they are fighting for some sort of a Sikh State. Now that is a fact about which I think we are all agreed. The Communist Party had made its position very clear on this point. We submitted, some time ago, a memorandum to the Prime Minister in which we stated as follows:

"It is a very well known fact that we Communists sharply differ from Master Tara Singh and the Akali Dal in their approach to the question of linguistic reorganisation. We have always taken the stand that this is a question which has nothing to do with any religion or community, that it concerns all Punjabis. We have been firmly against making religion or community the basis of such demands. Nor do we accept that there is any validity in the charges levelled by Master Tara Singh, of discrimination against Sikhs since independence. Our party has openly come out against such charges, but we cannot at the same time subscribe to the idea that the problem can be dealt with by repression."

5 P.M.

Anyway, that position is clear. At the same time I also want to state very categorically that there are certain Hindu organisations in Punjab which, in the name of fighting Sikh communalism, are really fanning communalism among the Hindus. That is also a reality which has to be recognised. They become the supporters or defenders, the champions of Hindi. I do not think that there are many people very much interested in Hindi. It is a fanatical, religious Hindu outlook just as on the other side there is the fanatical, religious Sikh outlook, which these organisations are trying to foster and they come out as the champions of nationalism. I consider that organisations like the Jan Sangh cannot be regarded as champions of nationalism. I think

their very approach is anti-national, communal and disruptive.

Now, having said this I would briefly point out what we consider to be the way out. We do think that in a general way the idea of the reorganisation of Punjab on a linguistic basis should be accepted. That principle should be accepted because I know that, though today this complication may be there, it will come up in future. The Punjab people may be divided as Hindus and Sikhs, at present may be antagonistic to each other today, but as life grows, as culture flowers out and as Punjabi language and literature comes into its own, the whole idea of the Punjabi people coming together and having a State of their own, just as the Marathis have or the Gujaratis have or other people have, that thing will be there and that tendency will grow. Therefore, I want the Government of India to state that they are not basically or fundamentally against the reorganisation of the State in a manner that in that State there will be the fullest possible opportunity for the Punjabi-speaking people, for their growth, for the flowering out of their cultural life. That principle should be accepted.

But, Sir, that does not mean that the Punjabi Suba of the Akali conception has to be accepted. I do not know what that conception is. But I presume that it is a very, very narrow conception and I do not subscribe to that. That also does not mean that once we say that we are prepared to accept the principle of linguistic reorganisation in Punjab, on this basis suddenly the Akalis will launch their onslaught and say, 'Well, come on. Start demarcating the area tomorrow'. No. When that reorganisation will take place, how that reorganisation will take place, depends on several factors, and one of the most vital factors in that connection is the unity of the Punjabi-speaking Hindus and Sikhs. So long as that unity is not there, obviously you cannot inflict a state pattern on a certain people. Therefore, it becomes essentially a

[Dr. Z. A. Ahmad.]
problem of educating both the Punjabi Sikhs and the Punjabi Hindus that if they do want a State of that pattern, they have to learn to live together, they have to learn to be tolerant of each other, they have to fight out communal forces in their respective camps, they have to come together and stand together in order eventually to evolve a State where the Punjabi-speaking people will have full guarantees, where they will not be obstructed by a big minority coming out with its own demands, but will have the fullest possible freedom for their social, cultural life like any other group in the country.

Here, Sir, I regret to state that the position taken up by our hon. Prime Minister is much too categorical. I would have liked him not to have stated it so categorically that this question does not arise, not today and not for all time to come. Later on, I am told, he has said something which does give a scope, which creates a hope that the earlier inflexible position is no longer there. But how can we take up that rigid position today particularly when we bear in mind the fact that we had taken up a similar inflexible position earlier in the case of other linguistic state and had to retrace our steps?

श्री तारकेश्वर पांडे (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
एक सवाल आपसे पूछना चाहता हूं . . .

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: Just now I do not want to answer any question, Mr. Deputy Chairman. He can ask me later.

Sir, while the Prime Minister in his statement has given expression to many bitter truths about Punjab, I would have liked him also to state that the Government would not tie itself down to a position permanently and for all time to come, that is to say no linguistic reorganisation of the State on any basis whatsoever. The Communist Party takes the position, let the atmosphere be created, let the

Hindus and Sikhs come together, let there be unity among the Hindus and Sikhs, let them discuss amongst themselves, let them sit together and we pay the utmost attention to this type of development. That is the position that we should take and that creates the basis for a talk on a bigger issue between the two groups, whether they are on this side or that side today. That creates the basis for them to come together. I do not want the Sikhs to get frustrated. I do not want all Sikhs or a large section of them to feel bitter a situation that may lead to some conflict where some people are arrested, some people shot down and then the heritage of bitterness persists. I do not want that to take place.

Then, Sir, other questions have been raised. My esteemed friend, Diwan Chaman Lall, said that the whole area was Punjabi-speaking. That is wrong. I also know that there are large areas in which the Hindi-speaking people are dominant.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Which area?

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: They are Gurgaon, Hissar. . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: In Gurgaon with a population of 46,000 in the City of Gurgaon 42,000 people speak Punjabi.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: I am not speaking of the city. In Delhi also a very large population speaks Punjabi. I am talking of the whole district. But the fact that you have given two Regional Committees shows that there are two regions, one in which the majority of the people speak Hindi and the other in which the majority of the people speak Punjabi. I am not going to restrict this.

So, Sir, later on even if the demarcation has to take place, that demarcation need not be strictly on the basis of Haryana or something else

coming out. But let the demarcation take place bearing in mind all the factors. One of the most vital factors to be borne in mind would be the necessity of Hindus and Sikhs coming together in that State, living together a common life. Therefore, let us not run away with some statistics here and there which are not very correct.

Then, Sir, Dr. Kunzru referred to the question of Punjabi and Hindi and said that the distinction between the two languages was only artificial. I do not accept that argument. I think there is a difference between the two. A Punjabi-speaking person does not understand Hindi easily. A Hindi-speaking person does not and cannot easily understand Punjabi. There is a difference between the two, and with the growth and development of Punjabi, with the growth of Hindi in one direction and Punjabi in another direction, that distinction will grow. Anyway, these things are not very material. My main contention, Sir, is my submission to you is, that you have to bear in mind the fact that there is a large section of population in Punjab, in however communal-minded a manner they may be moving, yet it is a reality that as life grows, their demand for the grouping of the Punjabi-speaking people will grow. This demand will grow more and more Hindus will come and accept this demand. Therefore, that atmosphere has to be created. We have to deal with the situation with patience. We have not to resort to repression. The theory that we can take a position for all time has to be ruled out. We say that if the principle of linguistic reorganisation is accepted—and I say it will be accepted—then all that is essential for the implementation of this demand is the unity of the Punjabi-speaking Hindus and Sikhs.

Therefore, the whole approach should be a flexible approach. It should not be a rigid approach. We also tend sometimes . . .

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Maharashtra): Divorce by mutual consent?

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: It is not a divorce. It is a union by mutual consent. I do not think it is a divorce. It is a union. There can be no forced separation I do submit that this is a sensible approach. This is a sane approach. This is an approach which is fair to all and this is an approach which is not inconsistent with the principles of secular democracy. Therefore, my submission is that this broad approach should be accepted and having taken that approach, we should unitedly come forward and make an appeal to all sections of the people. There are hunger-strikes. Let them be withdrawn. Let there be some round table conference and let the people come together, sit together, talk over the whole matter and let them arrive at an understanding on this matter.

ज्ञानी जैल सिंह (पंजाब): श्रीमान्, उपसभापति जी, प्राइम मिनिस्टर के स्टेटमेंट के सम्बन्ध में हमारे सामने जो चीजें आई हैं उन पर कई मेम्बर साहबान ने अपनी राय का इजहार किया। मैं प्राइम मिनिस्टर के स्टेटमेंट के हरफ़ हरफ़ की तारीफ़ करता हूँ। मैं उनमें से हूँ जो शुरू से लेकर पंजाबी सूबे की फार्मेशन के खिलाफ़ रहे हैं। शिरोमणि अकाली दल काफ़ी मुद्दत से पंजाबी सूबे की डिमांड करता चला आ रहा है और उनकी डिमांड के पीछे यह आर्ग्यूमेंट रहा है कि सिखों के लिये यह सूबा लाभदायक होगा।

पंजाबी सूबे की हिमायत करने वाले दो किस्म के लोग हैं और पंजाबी सूबे की मुखालिफ़त करने वाले भी दो किस्म के लोग हैं। एक तो वे हैं जो कि पंजाबी सूबे की हिमायत इसलिये करते हैं कि वह हिन्दुस्तान के लिगविस्टिक प्राविसेज के हक़ में थे और वे युनिलिगुअल प्रान्त चाहते हैं। उनके दिमाग़

[जानी जैल सिंह]

मैं तो फिरकापरस्ती का असर नहीं है, मगर दूसरे वे लोग हैं जो कि यह सोचते हैं कि अगर पंजाबी सूबा बना तो उस एरिया में सिखों की आबादी बढ़ जायगी और उस आबादी के बढ़ने से वे अक्सरियत में आ जायेंगे और इसलिये उस फिरके को फायदा होगा। इसी तरह मे मुखालिफत करने वालों में से एक तो वे लोग हैं जो कि हिन्दुस्तान की युनिटी चाहते हैं और पंजाब को एक बहुत बड़ा प्रान्त देखना चाहते हैं और नेकनीयती से इसको मजबूत बनाना चाहते हैं। मगर, दूसरे वे लोग हैं जो कि मुखालिफत इस ढंग से करते हैं कि अगर यह सूबा बन गया तो उसमें हिन्दू नहीं रह सकेंगे और उसमें सिख गालिब आ जायेंगे। तो दोनों में से एक एक हिस्सा ऐसा है जो कि बहुत गालिब आया हुआ है और यह सही होगा अगर मैं यह कह दूँ कि एक तरफ अकाली हैं और दूसरी तरफ आर्यसमाजी है जिन्होंने कि किसी ज़माने में बहुत अच्छा काम किया था, आर्य समाज ने भी और अकाली दल ने भी, मगर आज उनकी बदौलत यह बात पैदा हो रही है। मास्टर तारासिंह कहते हैं कि वह हिन्दू-सिख युनिटी चाहते हैं और लिगविस्टिक बेसिस पर एक सूबा चाहते हैं और अगर वह नहीं बनेगा तो फिर मेरा सिख पंथ खतरे में है और नहीं बनेगा तो सिखों पर बेएतबारी का इजहार होगा। दूसरी तरफ स्वामी रामेश्वरानन्द कहते हैं कि अगर पंजाबी सूबा बन गया तो वहां हिन्दू नहीं रह सकेंगे और मैं चाहता हूँ कि पंजाब की एकता रहे, हिन्दू सिख की युनिटी रहे। इन नेताओं की बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आई। वे एक तरफ तो सेल्फ-कॉन्ट्रिडिक्टरी बात करते हैं और दूसरी तरफ कहते हैं कि हम हिन्दू सिख युनिटी चाहते हैं, मगर दोनों की राय ले कर कोई कुछ नहीं करता। न स्वामी रामेश्वरानन्द के साथ कोई सिख बैठा है और न मास्टर तारासिंह के साथ कोई हिन्दू बैठा है। अगर हम यह मान लें कि लिगविस्टिक प्राविस एक मुतासिब बात है तो गैरमुतासिब तरीके से उसको पेश करने से,

उसके पीछे यह आर्गुमेंट देने से कि यह सिखों के लिये जिन्दगी और मौत का सवाल है, एक फिरकेवाराना रंगत आ जाती है। मैं महसूस करता हूँ कि आज यह ऐसा समय नहीं जिसमें कि मैं ज्यादा कुछ कहूँ क्योंकि इससे ज्यादा इरिटेशन बढ़ती है और ताल्लुकात में कुछ खराबी आती है। प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने काफ़ी मुद्दत से बहुत से खत लिखे, उनके खत आये, मुलाकातें हुई और हर मुमकिन तरीके से कोशिश की कि किसी तरह से मास्टर तारासिंह भूख हड़ताल से टल जायें। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बहुत बड़ी ग्रेटनेस प्राइम मिनिस्टर आफ इंडिया की है और उन्होंने बगैर भूख हड़ताल तुड़वाये संत फ़तेहसिंह से बातचीत की और बातचीत करने के बाद उनको फिर राय दी कि मास्टर तारासिंह को परसुएड करो कि वह अपनी जिदगी इस बात के लिये न लगाये। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज की पंजाब की हालत में—जिन तीन आदमियों ने भूख हड़ताल की है अगर वे कहीं खुद अस्तिथार में होते, ऐसा हो तो नहीं सकता मगर मिसाल के तौर पर मैं कहता हूँ कि अगर वे अस्तिथार में होते—और वे फ़ैसला करने वाले होते तो क्या फ़ैसला कर सकते थे सिवाये इसके जो पंडित जी ने किया है। उन्होंने पंजाबी लैंगुएज के लिये और रीजनल कमेटी को कुछ और ताकत देने के लिये कहा है, अगर रीजनल कमेटियों ने काम नहीं किया है और वक्त पर उस पर अमल नहीं हुआ है तो उसकी तहकीकात कराने के लिये उन्होंने अपनी राय का इजहार किया है। इससे ज्यादा और कुछ कहा नहीं जा सकता था। मगर, मैं नहीं समझ सका कि मास्टर तारासिंह इस बात पर क्यों अड़े हुए हैं। मुझे याद है कि जब संत फ़तेहसिंह ने भूख हड़ताल की तो उस वक्त पंडित जी ने रामलीला ग्राउंड में एक तकरीर में उनसे अपील की कि वह भूख हड़ताल तोड़ दें और उसी ख्याल से ज्ञानी गुरुमुख सिंह मुसाफ़िर और उनके साथ मैं अमृतसर गया और संत फ़तेहसिंह से अर्ज किया कि पंडित जी की अपील को मानना चाहिये और इससे और कोई बड़ी बात नहीं है

कि पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू—जो कि संसार के, अमनपसन्द दुनिया के नेता हैं—आपसे रिक्वेस्ट करते हैं। तो संत फतेहसिंह जी ने जवाब दिया कि मैंने पंडित जी की स्पीच को सुना है, पढ़ा है और मैंने पंडित जी का बढाया हुआ मुहब्बत का हाथ वुट के पकड़ लिया है यानी मैंने मजबूती से पकड़ लिया है, मगर मैं कुछ और वजाहत चाहता हूं। इसके बाद दो, तीन आदमी भावनगर गये और पंडित जी से मिले, मास्टर तारासिंह जी को रिहा किया गया, मास्टर तारासिंह भावनगर गये और वहां से वापस आ गये मगर फिर पंडित जवाहरलाल जी का वह भाषण भावनगर में हुआ जिसकी बिना पर मास्टर तारासिंह ने संत फतेहसिंह की भूख हड़ताल को तुड़वा दिया। तो मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि उससे भी ज्यादा अच्छा स्टेटमेंट आने के बाद भी मास्टर तारासिंह भूख हड़ताल पर क्यों बैठे हुए हैं। वह यह नहीं सोचते कि संत फतेहसिंह जी का एक प्रण था। संत फतेहसिंह जी ने एक हलफ लिया था और वह हलफ पंडित जी के स्टेटमेंट से पूरा हुआ था और मास्टर तारासिंह जी ने तो कोई हलफ ही नहीं लिया है मगर फिर भी वह इस ज़िद पर अड़े हुए हैं।

मैं इस बात को अच्छी तरह से जानता हूं कि अगर कम्युनल नुक़्तेनज़र से भी देखा जाय तो सिखों के लिये पंजाबी सूबा बनने से नुक़सान होगा। मगर मेरे दिल में यह शुबहा है कि मास्टर तारासिंह की पार्टी में ऐसे आदमी मौजूद हैं जो कि मास्टर तारासिंह जी के मरने का फायदा उठाना चाहते हैं कि इस बुजुर्ग—जिसके पीछे काफी से ज़ियादा तादाद और ज़्यादा से ज़्यादा तादाद सिखों की है—के मरने के बाद हम उसकी जगह पर कब्ज़ा करें। हो सकता है कि मेरी यह ओपीनियन गलत हो, मगर मैं समझता हूं कि इस बात में सच्चाई है। मैं इसलिये कहता हू कि जब हिन्दुस्तान की रियासतों में हम प्रजा मण्डल में काम करते थे और ब्रिटिश इण्डिया में

हमारे कांग्रेसी भाई काम करते थे उस वक़्त मास्टर तारासिंह से हम मिले और मास्टर तारासिंह से बात की कि हम रियासतों में लड़ना चाहते हैं और उसमें हमारी मुख़ालिफ़त आपकी पार्टी की तरफ़ से होती है, आपको नहीं करनी चाहिये . . .

तो मास्टर तारासिंह जी ने कहा कि मेरे पास एक डेपूटेशन आया है कि रियासत में रहने वाले ८० फी सदी सिख हैं और वहां के महाराजा सिख हैं, तुम लोग सिख हो इसलिये तुम उसके खिलाफ क्यों लड़ते हो ? मैंने मास्टर जी से कहा, मास्टर जी, आपको एक सिख की मोहब्बत अच्छी लगती है या ८० फी सदी सिखों की मोहब्बत आप चाहते हैं ? हम जो प्रजा की तौर पर वहां बसते हैं, हम भी सिख हैं और हमारा राजा भी सिख है। आप राजा सिख के साथ जायेंगे या प्रजा सिख के साथ जायेंगे ? तो मास्टर जी ने कहा, हां मैं प्रजा के साथ जाऊंगा। मुझे याद है, उस वक़्त शिरोमणि अकाली दल के प्रेसीडेंट थे बाबू लार्बसिंह। वे हमारी रियासत के प्रजा मण्डल की कान्फरेन्स में पहुंचे और एक तक़रीर में उन्होंने कहा, मैं आपसे कहता हूं कि ये जो काली पगड़ी वाले हैं अगर इनमें से कोई अकाली के नाम पर प्रजा से धोखा करता है तो उसकी काली पगड़ी उतार दो और वह अकाली नहीं है। मगर ज़माना आता गया, आता गया और मास्टर तारासिंह के गिर्द वे लोग जिन लोगों ने देशभक्तों की, जिन लोगों ने अंग्रेज़ों के साथ लड़ने वालों की मुख़ालिफ़त की, उन लोगों ने ही रियासत की प्रजा के खिलाफ काम किया। नतीजा यह हुआ कि वह पार्टी जो यह कहती थी कि प्रजा का साथ देना चाहिये वह राजाओं का साथ देती थी। मैं समझ नहीं सका कि इस बात में फायदा क्या होगा। मैं उस रियासत का रहने वाला था जहां ८० फी सदी सिखों की आबादी थी। और एक छोटी सी रियासत थी। जब हमने मर्जर का नारा लगाया तो हमारे खिलाफ आवाज़ उठाई गई कि आप इस सिख रियासत

[श्री जैल सिंह]

को बर्बाद क्यों करते हैं ? उसके बाद फिर क्या हुआ इस पर मैं लम्बी बात कहना नहीं चाहता। जब पेप्सू बना और पेप्सू में सिखों की अक्सरियत थी, तब वहाँ के गवर्नर पर्मिनिटल सिख थे। मगर वहाँ जो हालत थी, हमें वहाँ जो तरक्की मिलती थी उसमें, जब वह पंजाब के साथ मर्ज हुआ, तो कोई रुकावट नहीं आई। मैं समझता हूँ सिख जितना आगे बढ़े हैं, बड़े विशाल हिन्दुस्तान में आगे बढ़े हैं उतना ही उनको फायदा हुआ है। अगर वे आगे नहीं आयेगे तो उनको नुकसान होगा। अगर फिरकेवाराना नुकतेनजर से देखा जाय तो मैं आज देखता हूँ कि जिम हरियाने की ६१ लाख की आबादी है उसको काट दिया जाय और ११ लाख आबादी के कागड़ा को काट दिया जाय, जैसा कि मास्टर तारासिंह जी चाहते हैं, तो उससे कोई फायदा नहीं होगा। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि उसमें ४५ फी मदी जो हिन्दू होंगे क्या आप उनको निकाल सकेंगे ? हर्गिज नहीं निकाल सकेंगे। वहाँ की मिनिस्ट्री में भी २० परसेन्ट हिन्दुओं को लेना पड़ेगा। और जब रीजनल फारमूला बना तो रीजनल फारमूला बनने के बाद हिसाब हुआ। और उम हिमाचल में क्या हुआ ? चार सिख राज्य सभा में कम हो गये और दो सिख लोक सभा में कम हो गये। मैं समझता हूँ कि जाट को बनिये के साथ कभी हिमाचल नहीं करना चाहिये। जब कभी हिसाब किताब की बात आई तो सिखों को नुकसान हुआ। उनका ओहदा कम हुआ। ऐसी हालत में जब कि लड़ाई और झगड़े मुमकिन हैं, तो पंजाबी सूबे की बात को प्रेस करना मैं गैर मुनासिब और बिल्कुल गलत समझता हूँ। मैं दरखास्त करता हूँ कि मास्टर तारासिंह इस बात को समझें कि जितना उनको माँग और गौरव मिला है वह मिटने वाला है अगर वे भारत के प्राइम-मिनिस्टर की बात को नहीं सुनेंगे। उनको आज मुनना चाहिये कि इससे सिखों की इज्जत है और मास्टर तारासिंह की इज्जत

है। वे पंडित जी के जाने के पहिले पहल आज शाम तक इस बात का यकीन दिला दें कि मैंने भूख हड़ताल तोड़ दी है और फैसला आप के ऊपर छोड़ दिया है। जो पंडित जवाहरलाल जी करेंगे मैं उसको मंजूर करूँगा। यह रैगनल अगर मास्टर तारासिंह नहीं दिखलायेगे तो मुझे दुःख है और खतरा है कि सिख धर्म और पंजाब के लिये उसका नतीजा अच्छा नहीं निकल सकेगा।

दूसरी बात, जो वे कहते हैं कि सिखों के साथ बे इन्साफी हुई है, उनके साथ इमतिआज इस्तेमाल होता है, यह बिल्कुल गलत और झूठ है। इसके सम्बन्ध में बहुत से आर्गुमेंट्स दिये गये हैं। मगर मैं तो सिर्फ इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि ठीक है, हमें प्यार है अपने प्राइम मिनिस्टर से, मगर आज मुझे कोई यकीन दिला दे, कोई सिख यह साबित करदे कि सिखों के साथ बेइन्साफी हुई है तो मैं पहला सिख हूँगा कि मैं इस पार्टी को छोड़ दूँगा। मगर मैं यह भरोसे के साथ कहता हूँ कि सिखों के साथ इन्साफ ही नहीं हुआ बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार, पंडित जवाहरलाल की सरकार उनके साथ रियायत करती है और रियायत करने के लिये मैं उनको मुबारकबाद देता हूँ चूँकि माइनारिटी के साथ रियायत करना एक निहायत नेकी और भला इन्साफ है।

(Time bell rings.)

दो मिनट और। मुझे एक बात यह कहनी है कि सिख धर्म के उसूल के मुताबिक, भूख-हड़ताल करके मरना यह बहुत बुरी बात है। जो लोग भूख हड़ताल करते हैं उनके बारे में गुरु ग्रंथ साहब की वाणी में यह लिखा है कि न तो वे सुहागिनो के साथ हैं और न वे विधवा के साथ हैं। ईश्वर उन लोगों को नहीं मिलता जो अनाज का त्याग करके परमात्मा को पाना चाहते हैं। इसी तरह से गुरु गोविंद सिंह जी महाराज, जिन्होंने सिख धर्म की बुनियाद रखी, जिन्होंने सिखों को यह केश,

दाढ़ी वाली शकल दी है —क्योंकि उससे पहले कोई पाबन्दी नहीं थी, नवें गुरुओं तक ये सब हिन्दू ही समझे जाते थे और बाद में थोड़ा सा शकल में फर्क आया, वैसे सब सिख हिन्दू एक हैं— तो उन्होंने एक हुक्म दिया था सिखों को, जो मैं आपकी जानकारी के लिये सुनाना चाहता हूं ।

कोई भयो मुडिया, सन्यामी कोई
जोगी भयो,

कोन ब्रह्मचारी कोई यति, अनमान बो
हिन्दू व तुर्क कोउ राफजी इमाम शाफी
मानस को जात सबै एक: पहचानबो
करता करीम ओही राजक रहीम सोई
दूसरोन भेद कोई भूल भरम मानबो
एक ही की सेव सबही को गुरु देव एक,
एक ही सरूप, सब: एक रूप मानबो

कोई सिख जो अपने आपको सिख कहता है वह फिरकू नहीं हो सकता और जो फिरकू है वह सिख नहीं हो सकता । गुरु गोविंद सिंह जी ने इन्सानियत का दर्जा सबसे बड़ा रखा और उनके सामने यह निशाना था कि हिन्दुस्तान के रहने वाले लोग जब तक हिन्दुस्तान के कोने कोने को पवित्र नहीं समझेंगे जब तक हिन्दुस्तान मजबूत नहीं होगा । हिन्दुस्तान की एकता और हिन्दुस्तान की मजबूती के लिये गुरु गोविंद सिंह जी ने अपने चारों बेटों को कुर्बान किया, अपनी माता को कुर्बान किया था और खुद भी कुर्बान हुये थे । अगर आज हम हिन्दुस्तान से ताल्लुकात कुछ कम कर देते हैं और एक ही जगह पर रह कर अपने आपको मजबूत और पवित्र भूमि में रहने वाले समझने लग जाते हैं तो यह हिन्दुस्तान के साथ ही नहीं बल्कि अपने साथ भी बेइन्साफी होगी । गुरु गोविंद जी का जन्म बिहार पटने में हुआ, और उनका देहान्त दक्षिण हिन्दुस्तान नदेड़

में हुआ । तो कैसे यह हो सकता है कि सारा हिन्दुस्तान हमारा देश नहीं है ।

हिन्दोस्तान 'यारा है बहुत सान्, सान्दे

वड़ेयां बी कत्लगाह एथे

दसवें गुरु जी ने चारे लाल वारे,

दिता सीस नावें बादशाह एथे

साडा मक्का मदीना ते हज्ज कावा,

साडा अरब एथे करवला एथे ।

हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर जितनी जगहें हैं वे सारी जगहें सिखों के लिये पवित्र हैं । इसलिये मैं ज्यादा कुछ न कहते हुये मास्टर तारासिंह से यह दरवास्त करूंगा कि वे हमारी आवाज को सुनें । और आमरन ब्रत को छोड़ दें क्योंकि आप जैसी महान हस्ती का जिन्दा रहना देश के हित में है ।

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh):
Mr. Deputy Chairman, Dr. Ahmad was developing here a thesis which was marked by a lot of plausibility. But basically I think that the thesis that he developed was a wrong one. If he will carefully go through the Statement which was read out by the Home Minister, on behalf of the Prime Minister, in this House, he will find that what Master Tara Singh is claiming is a communal State and what Sant Fateh Singh is claiming is a communal State. There is, therefore, no getting away from that fact. The Punjab Suba is already there and Punjab is one linguistic, social and cultural unit. There is no unilingual State in India as such. For example, there is U.P. The hill districts of Uttar Pradesh speak a language which is not understood by the people of eastern U.P. or for that matter, even parts of western U.P. Therefore it would be wrong for us to accept linguism as the only criterion for the formation of a State. We have not so far accepted linguism as the basis for the formation of a State.

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

Sir, reference was made to the formation of the Andhra Pradesh State. Well, the decision to form the Andhra Pradesh State had been taken before the death of Potti Sriramulu but it could not be implemented because there were differences between the Tamils and the Andhra Pradesh people regarding the future of Madras. So far as Bombay is concerned, Maharashtra and Gujarat were able to get separate States because the people of those States agreed to the separation. It was the will of the people that they should separate and that prevailed with us ultimately.

Now, I would like, with all the earnestness at my command, to make an appeal to Master Tara Singh. He is a distinguished Indian and has rendered eminent service to his community in many fields of social work. I would like him to consider whether it is right for a religious leader of his stature to undertake a fast within the precincts of a sacred place, the Golden Temple. I should have thought that the Golden Temple was the last place where a fast would be undertaken. Sir, I look upon fasting as an illegitimate method of political warfare in a democracy. We cannot recognise the right to have demands acceded to by political fasting. The solution of the Punjab tangle is not so easy as Dr. Ahmad thinks. It is not only Master Tara Singh who has undertaken a fast; there are two other Swamis who have undertaken a fast. If you yield to the demands of Master Tara Singh, you may be able to save his life but you will not be able to save their lives at all. Therefore, I say that we should not look at this question from this point of view. There should be a calm atmosphere in which the question can be considered. The Prime Minister has gone to the farthest limit that he as constitutional head of the Government could in giving assurances of a satisfactory character to Master Tara Singh.

He has referred to the regional formula. I have got the regional formula

before me. Many important matters have been entrusted to the Regional Committees and it has also been laid down as a directive that normally the decision of the Regional Committees shall be accepted by the Legislature. But if they are not accepted, then the Governor comes in. Regional Committees are committees of the Legislature; they cannot be given the status of sub-legislatures. They will be functioning largely as the Committee for Scottish Affairs in the British Parliament functions. May I also say that the Prime Minister has not ruled out the possibility of adding to the list of functions entrusted to these Regional Committees? There was some delay in the formation of these Committees. There was some delay in implementing the educational programme regarding Punjabi language. That was because of paucity of teachers. Teachers had to be trained for that purpose. I would also like to point out that almost everything that could humanly be done is being done for the promotion of the Punjabi language. Punjabi is one of the major languages of our country. It is one of our regional languages. I think it has the tenth place; of course, it is not an order of merit but I think it is the tenth language mentioned in the Eighth Schedule. Punjabi has a vast literature and it is a growing literature. Now, Government is proposing to establish a Punjabi University. Punjabi is the dominant language of Punjab. There are some Hindi-speaking parts in the Punjab but of course they are at the district level. Though Hindi is there, Punjabi is the dominant language so far as Punjab is concerned. Do Master Tara Singh and Sardar Gurnam Singh seriously think that they will be furthering the cause of Punjabi by limiting it to the confines of a few districts in the Punjab?

(Time bell rings.)

Sir, I was going to develop one or two points but I would like to say this. The best thing, the most right thing, for Master Tara Singh to do is to give up his fast. He will rise in the estimation of the people of this

country; he will rise in stature if he gives up his fast. He will be true to the ideals of his great religion of which he is one of the leaders if he gives up this fast. This is a wrong approach; this is not the democratic method. The method of persuasion is the right method and we have not ruled out anywhere that method of persuasion. I would also like to make a similar appeal to the two swamis who have undertaken counterfasts. Fast and counterfast do not settle controversies. You cannot make the heart of your opponent change if your opponent thinks that his case is righteous and your case is not righteous. This is not the method by which political controversies can be settled in a democratic State.

Sir, as my time is up, I have nothing further to say except to emphasize once again the seriousness of the situation which has been created in Punjab and to say that one of the impossible demands which Master Tara Singh has laid down is that Mr. Kairon should be removed from office as Chief Minister of Punjab. Now, the Prime Minister is a very powerful man and we have got very great regard for him, but he is in no sense a dictator in this country and it would be constitutionally improper for him to remove the Chief Minister who enjoys, rightly or wrongly, the confidence of his Legislature and of his party.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Deputy Chairman, during the last few days I have been engaged in listening and speaking on this subject in Parliament. During the last few weeks I have been engaged in discussing this matter at very considerable length with various people. During the last few months I have been dealing with this matter in my correspondence, interviews, meetings etc. One might say that for the last year, apart from

the previous period, I have been enveloped and tied up by this developing situation in Punjab and because of all this I feel it is a little difficult for me to say anything fresh or new about it.

And I would not like to weary this House by repeating what has been sometimes so well said by others. Yesterday in the other House we discussed this matter for four or five hours. Here for the last 2½ hours many hon. Members have spoken. Even the two Members I believe, if I am right, who gave some kind of a back-handed support to the demand for a Punjabi Suba had qualified that support so much that it was doubtful whether they were supporting it or not. That, I take it, is an advance in the right direction even from yesterday's. The hon. Member, Shri Jaswant Singh, finished by saying that he hoped that God would give me wisdom. I am always hoping that that might happen not only to me, but to hon. Members opposite too, because I say that one may differ and one does differ in many matters, but in this particular matter, which we are discussing today, I do submit that there can be only one opinion to any intelligent approach to the problem. There is no room for a second opinion. Variations of that may be. And I am led to think, why is it that people who are intelligent can say things which have no basis in intelligence or logic. Why is it so. I found in the other House that some hon. Members who took up that line broadly took it up on the basis entirely of some principle they believed in, the linguistic principle or what happened in Ahdhra or what happened in Gujarat. They knew nothing and said nothing about the Punjab because they knew nothing about it. And yet here in this vital matter, which may have serious consequences, they took up a line which I thought was a wrong line leading to dangerous consequences. Now, it is a very odd thing that the only persons, normally speaking,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

generally speaking, who have given some slight, modified support to this business of a linguistic Punjabi Suba are gentlemen who hail from the farthest corners of India and who know nothing about Punjab. Now, I must make an exception in the case of Dr. Ahmad, because I have no doubt that he knows something about Punjab. If he is not a Punjabi, he comes from near Punjab. But the others have no conception, the faintest conception. Except that Punjab is a State in India I doubt if they know anything more about it. From the manner of their speaking it had something to do with the principles they believed in like the principle of linguistic provinces, but nothing else. Now, Sir, I say so with extreme deference and humility but wondering why in the past especially these various attitudes have been taken up and some parties, notable parties of this country, have held out their hand to this proposal for a Punjabi Suba. I wondered if this was not at least partly due to the shadow of the coming elections and perhaps not much to do with the facts or logic of the situation. In fact, it is a matter to be considered how far all this development in the Punjab is itself not conditioned by the coming elections.

I think my friend and colleague, Shri Mohan Singh, referred to this matter. It is an odd thing that always this kind of thing happens a year or so before election starts. Last time it happened. This time it has happened. There is a curious connection, correlation, between the two. I am merely referring to this. This is no argument, I admit, but it is a matter for consideration to see this connection between the coming of elections and the raising of such slogans and such proposals. I have the most vivid recollection of five years ago, when we dealt with similar problems. Again, long discussions, long arguments, long interviews and talks took place which resulted in certain agreements. And we were very happy.

Even though, speaking for myself, I did not entirely approve of those agreements, but it is better to agree even to something which is not one hundred per cent. right than not to agree. That was my approach. So, I was happy and I was happier still when it was declared openly and repeatedly by Master Tara Singh, by other noted leaders of the Akalis, that all his demands had been satisfied. These were his words. He had nothing more to demand of the Government. I am not quite sure, but I think he said that about the Punjabi Suba also. Anyhow he said that. Further, as a condition of that agreement or rather as a part of that agreement, it was said that the Akali Dal would henceforth become a social organisation, social or religious, not a political one. In fact, the Akali Dal held a meeting and in order to give effect to this part of the agreement, changed its constitution somewhat and took out some words from somewhere. All this happened five years ago. It comes back to me now. And yet within two or three months of that those agreements were rejected by Master Tara Singh. I do not exactly remember for what reasons, because the reasons even then appeared to me rather extraordinary and trivial. But they were rejected I think, with the result that the Akali party itself to some extent was split up. Some people said that they must hold to those agreements. Others followed Master Tara Singh's lead. All this may not be relevant today. But it has a background which we might remember, because this time, again, my hon. friend, Diwan Chaman Lall, comes and tells me, after seeing Master Tara Singh, that if the Punjabi Suba is accepted, the principle, the Akali Dal will give up politics. This is exactly the thing that was said five years ago, in fact not said but agreed to and acted upon by changing the constitution of the Akali Dal. And yet the Akali Dal has functioned since then in a fairly active and even it might be said aggressively political way. And now the same thing comes back again.

Now, Sir, what are the principal matters before us? First, I would say and I believe that in saying that I will have the agreement of everyone present here, as we had in the other House yesterday, that this method of using hunger-strike and the threat of committing suicide by a hunger-strike as a political weapon is a bad thing, is a dangerous thing. It is socially a harmful thing, and must be ruled out completely. And it does not matter—people may remind me—that Gandhiji started this. I can argue that question. It is not for me to argue about what Gandhiji did or did not do. I ventured not to agree to his hunger striking even when he did, but anyhow he did it for particular purposes, usually for his own people. However, it is neither here nor there. It was in a moment of struggle against the British and many things happened.

Then, an hon. Member referred to a fast indulged in by the present Finance Minister, Mr. Morarji Desai. Again, I am not here to defend him for his fasting, but it was an entirely different thing. Because violence was going on in Ahmedabad City he said that he would fast indefinitely till violence stopped. That was a reaction of his. You and I may not have reacted in that way. But I can very well understand the reaction, the pain and the torment of the person who saw that thing happening in Ahmedabad and he said, 'well, I shall fast till this violence stops'. There is nothing comparable about it. But it has become a habit even in minor complaints as some strike or some trouble that somebody fasts. I think we must make it perfectly clear that this is highly objectionable and the fact of a hunger strike should lead to that demand not being given in to. I would even go that far, that people should feel that it is an argument against that demand which is put forward through hunger strike. If they feel that way, then they will desist. But in this particular matter conditions are much more serious of course,

because Master Tara Singh is a popular leader, and, whether it is right or wrong, a hunger strike obviously produces emotional reactions, and emotional reactions may lead to very bad results because as it is we are discussing this subject today not quietly and dispassionately as we might have done but under the heavy pressure of this hunger strike and the possible consequences of it either this way or that way. It is not the right pressure to exercise in discussing this. I have no doubt that there are many people who may disapprove completely on logical and reasonable grounds of the demand for a Punjabi Suba, but under this pressure may feel, 'Well, one should give in to it, otherwise there will be trouble'. That is how our thinking is affected. That is how even possibly a decision of Parliament may be somewhat affected. Therefore, the first thing I submit is that we should make it perfectly clear that we reject and condemn the method of hunger-striking for political purposes and to gain such demands.

Now the other point I would like to repeat and which has been of course stressed by other hon. Members is that even though the words 'Punjabi Suba' are used, even though this is called a linguistic demand, it has practically nothing to do with a real linguistic demand. I think that is fairly clear. That came out clearly of course during my long talks with the eminent persons who met me, it was said quite clearly, as clearly as anything can be, and Master Tara Singh said that 'my demand is not a linguistic demand; it is a demand for the protection of the Panth, but in order to protect the Panth that linguistic demand will help'. That is, the main purpose becomes something different; to protect the Panth. Now the point is he is perfectly entitled and every Sikh is entitled to protect the Panth. He is perfectly right. I do not personally know what he wishes to protect the Panth from, what dangers they are, what attacks they are, it is a different matter. But to come up with this linguistic garb confuses the issue. It has

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]
 confused the mind of hon. Members, and Mr. Dave who talks highly of the linguistic principle. It has nothing to do with it, this linguistic principle in this matter. Mr. Dave comes from Bombay, he is perhaps full of memories of the linguistic controversies of the old Bombay State. So, it has really no relation to the linguistic principle, this thing.

Dr. Kunzru, Diwan Chaman Lall and others have pointed out the nature of the language question in the Punjab. Apart from the fact that Hindi and Punjabi overlap so much, overlap both in their content, overlap much more by the fact that people know both and can get on with both, apart from that, the question as it has arisen now has certainly, I agree with Dr. Ahmad, become a little vicious because of the communal approach to this problem both on the side of the Akalis and the Hindus, there is no doubt about it in my mind. And it is an odd thought that I think that the Hindus in the Punjab have probably done more injury to the Hindi language—I would not say the Hindus as such, I am sorry I do not wish to include all the Hindus, but I mean those who have stood up for Hindi in the Punjab have probably done more harm to the Hindi language there than the opponents of Hindi. In the same way the Akalis, I think, have done or tried to do—they have not succeeded, they have tried to do—more harm to Punjabi than those who actually opposed Punjabi, some narrow-minded people. Some of the Hindi people went about telling many people whose language is Punjabi, 'Don't say your language is Punjabi. Say it is Hindi in the Census'. And so all the large numbers of the people whose mother tongue was Punjabi wrote Hindi which was neither truthful nor in any sense reasonable. Many of them have gone back to Punjabi now. They are going back feeling that they made rather fools of themselves at that time. As for the Akalis, in order to

protect Punjabi they take steps and encourage steps and put forward proposals which can be demonstrated to be injurious to the growth of Punjabi. In the formation of these Regional Committees, one for Punjabi region and one for Hindi region, there is a part adjoining the Punjabi region, the hill part, Kangra etc. Kangra from any linguistic point of view is a Punjabi region. It is a slightly different dialect of Punjabi far nearer to Punjabi than Hindi, and it should have gone to the Punjabi region, and it was not taken by the leaders of the Akali Party; they did not want it there because they felt that the Kangra people coming in, even though they talk Punjabi, would add to the weight of the non-Akali element or non-Sikh element there. So, the whole approach has been in that way—how to isolate an area where, as has been said, not the Sikhs perhaps even but the Akalis can control, can have power. It comes to that. Therefore, let us be clear that this is not a linguistic issue. I do not think it should be or can be a linguistic issue for the reasons advanced by Dr. Kunzru or other hon. Members.

May I remind the House that Dr. Kunzru and others and all of us who are speaking today speak under the stress of a certain problem which is overhanging us, and that sometimes influences our judgment. But if you go back to the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission, at that time this matter was raised before that Commission and that Commission did not have to face these agitations and pressures and they wrote something about it, argued about it and analysed the position calmly and dispassionately. So it is worth reading what they wrote about it then. It is interesting not because what they wrote must be accepted in any sense but because it is a reasoned argument by some able persons who studied the subject at a time when there were no pressures. Therefore it is worth reading, that chapter on this demand.

6 P.M.

So, I venture to submit, Sir, that this demand—the last few years' experience, even expressions, etc. have shown that—has nothing to do with a real linguistic province. Of course, there is the other aspect of it. That is the close inter-twining of Punjabi and Hindi in the Punjab—the close inter-wining not only of the language, but of the whole mode of living, habits, food, dress and one hundred and one things that go towards the making up of an integrated community. The Punjabis are integrated I say, and they are more integrated than almost any other people in any other State—the Hindus and the Sikhs broadly. I would have gone further and I would have added the Muslims too, but not to that extent. But the Hindus and the Sikhs are so integrated that inter-marriage which is the biggest sign of integration is quite common between the two and it is not an unusual phenomenon. So, anything that comes in the way of that integration is bad, any separate thing is bad. It is not, therefore, merely a question of language. Where does the question of language come in? Is the language suffering in any way or is it suppressed in an sense? I have not yet been told how. The fact is that it has progressed tremendously. But there has to be some kind of complaint which has to be met; some objection which has to be removed. Nothing of that type is happening. But this whole movement, this language movement, has led to various tendencies and forces coming into play, communal forces—basically communal—and separatist. And both parties, certain Sikhs—chiefly the Akali Party—and certain Hindus have played up to this. They act and react with extreme rapidity whenever this kind of thing happens. And this is a dangerous thing, and a very dangerous thing for the Punjab. Now, I feel—and I believe that most hon. Members feel—that this particular proposal for a Punjabi Suba—language apart, everything apart—adds to that separa-

tism, adds to that tension, adds to that straining at the least kind of thing, tearing up something that you have got. It is dangerous, it is bad, utterly bad for the Punjab, for the Hindus and the Sikhs and for India. We have been talking particularly in the last few months about national integration, and almost everybody has approved of it and said, 'Yes, something has gone wrong. Let us pull it back.' We have talked about communalism, we have talked about so many things—about linguism and casteism—and so many other things under this broad cover of national integration. Now, when we talk about this, we see before our eyes and in front of our nose that this thing is happening in the Punjab which is the reverse of national integration, which is a going apart. You can see it. It is not necessary for me to produce evidence of it. One may say that this is not the intention of those who put forward this proposal. Well, it is not for me to challenge any such statement. It may not be the motive, it may not be the intention, whatever the intention may be, though I rather doubt that that intention is not coloured by the communal approach. But the effect is obvious, whatever the intention may be, just as the effect of certain organisations trying to promote Hindi is obvious—the effect of their agitation and their approach of narrow-mindedness and communalism produce narrow-mindedness and communalism on the other side, among the Akalis and the Sikhs. This kind of thing happens. But here today one can see exactly the effect of this. There is no doubt about it. It may be symbolised in a hunger-strike in Amritsar, in a hunger-strike in Delhi or elsewhere. But even apart from this, the effect is obvious that this is having a disruptive effect on masses of people, and we have arrived at a stage when there can be no doubt that if effect is given to this proposal of a Punjabi Suba, it will be resisted. I am not saying that there will be a civil war and all that, but it will be resisted, and it will be very difficult to give effect to it when this kind of resist-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

ance is offered not by outsiders, but by the people there. That very thing, what you call the Punjabi Suba, will be resisted by the people in the Suba, because the whole approach is not the approach of "Let us all work together because we are Punjabi-speaking people". That is not the approach at all. It has become, unfortunately, a communal approach and a communal reaction.

Now, in that area which is supposed to be the Punjabi Suba, large numbers of people—I do not know the exact percentage, 45 per cent. or thereabouts—reject this demand for a Punjabi Suba not because of the language, but because it has become covered with this communal idea. How a thing like this is going to function satisfactorily when 45 per cent. of the population aggressively reject it and try not to help it, is rather difficult to consider.

Take the other side. As Diwan Chaman Lal pointed out, a host of people, quite a considerable number of Punjabi-speaking people, have come to the so-called Hindi regions, Haryana, etc. They are learning Hindi, they have learnt Hindi no doubt. But, nevertheless, Punjabi is their basic language, and should remain so. Now, you are going to cut them off from that. Today all over the Punjab, everyone, I believe—I do not know if this is the practice—is supposed to learn both Punjabi and Hindi. In the Punjabi region, Punjabi is language number one and Hindi is language number two. In the Hindi region, Hindi is language number one and Punjabi language number two. In the services, it is laid down that they have to learn both and pass tests in both. They have every right to sit in them.

Now, there will be—there is no doubt about it—a reaction to the creation of the Punjabi Suba, not a legitimate or reasonable reaction, but the reaction will be, 'Oh! let us remove

Punjabi from our curricula.'—in the other areas, I mean. It is quite wrong, but they will say, 'Well, the Punjabi is for the Punjabi region. Why should we teach Punjabi?' Immediately you cause a loss to Punjabi, immediately you create barriers. There Punjabi will go ahead presumably; here Punjabi will not be nourished with that care, although it will remain, of course. And the differences between the people of that area and this area will become greater and greater. Barriers will be created, psychological, linguistic and the rest. And this unity of the Punjab—cultural and linguistic—would be broken up and would do grave damage to all the people there. As an example, it will be bad for India, but the actual, direct damage will be in the Punjab itself. The Punjab came into existence as a province under the British a trifle over one hundred years ago. It continued as such till independence, till partition which was naturally a grave shock. But it survived it remarkably because of their energy and capacity for work. Now I do not wish to compare that partition and reorganisation of States. I admit they are quite different. Nevertheless, there are two things about it which we must bear in mind. Firstly, there is some memory of that partition, painful memory. You cannot get rid of it—it is different—but that memory will pursue you in this. Secondly, even though it is quite different, it will have certain wrong tendencies; separatist tendencies will be encouraged; communal tendencies will be encouraged. And, in fact, any idea that you are creating a linguistic or other problem will be completely wrong, because that problem will come up before you in a much more acute and continuing form in both those areas in the Punjab. That is what is bound to happen. As, I think, Dr. Kunzru pointed out, if you have, let us say, the Punjabi Suba, and 45 per cent. of the people do not agree to the language provisions that may be adopted there, they will claim under our Constitution their rights for their language—protection of

minority language—and they will do so; even wrongly; even where their language is Punjabi, they will do so just to show their resentment, that something is being done against them. You see how separatism comes in step by step and creates these barriers. The result is that one of the most integrated communities of India, that is the Punjabi community, will be split up, broken up, with bitterness growing between them.

I think that is a very serious matter, much more serious than any reorganisation of States, this kind of thing happening, and it is this that has been troubling me. I honestly feel, as I said in the Lok Sabha yesterday, that the Punjab—this may be said of the whole of India, but more particularly of the Punjab—it almost seemed to me as a kind of tapestry, woven tapestry, with the warp and the woof, these different faiths coming together. You may pull out one side of it, the whole thing breaks up—it does not break up; anyhow it suffers irreparable damage, and something that has grown through hundreds of years, through ages almost, you break up; it is a very serious matter. It is not a light matter, to please somebody or even for fear of certain consequences you break up and tear up something which has grown through these hundreds of years, and certainly I am not prepared to do it, and I think it would be wrong for anyone to try to do it.

Therefore I want this question to be considered by this House in its entirety—not the question of applying some linguistic principle which, as a matter of fact, does not apply to the Punjab at all. I repeat it, that Punjab is a more linguistically-unified area than almost any area in India; it is more of a socially unified area, and in regard to practices, song, dance and whatever you like—these are important things in the life of a people. It is more of a unified area than you will find, I think, almost anywhere in India. Partly all this is due to the fact that the Punjab has been less caste-ridden than other

States in India, because I had thought, with all this business of communalism and all these approaches, that behind them has been a social backwardness of our people. Whether it is Hindu communalism, Sikh communalism or Muslim, it is social backwardness that has brought about these things, and they will never go completely till socially we are a little more advanced, and freer. The Punjab, for a variety of reasons which I need not go into, has been socially more advanced than many other States of India. The caste system has not strangled it. They have been freer—their women have been freer, the women living there, with the result that they have built up this tapestry of their joint lives there, and to pull it back would really be a tragedy, and should not even be given thought to.

I think it was Dr. Ahmad, in a speech showing remarkable ability not to commit himself either way, who finally ended up by saying that we should not be too categorical about this, and although he did say, I think, we should accept the principle of Punjabi Suba, but wait for better times. Well, I should like him to consider what the acceptance of the principle would lead to. First of all, one accepts a principle with the idea of giving effect to it. He accepts a principle and waits for better times when the acceptance of the principle will lead to worse times straightway, and continuing worse times, and then, when the principle itself is a fundamentally bad principle—I am not saying for everywhere, I am talking about the Punjab, as Punjab is constituted—how can we accept it?

There was something in what—I forget, I think it was Mr. Mohan Singh—he said about city versus village, about rural areas and city areas in the Punjab, and I think you will find perhaps a little more understanding of Punjab problems if you keep this in mind, the city and the rural areas. In the rural areas in the Punjab there is a peasantry, generally it is a

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

prosperous peasantry, and therefore it cannot easily be sat upon, and what has happened in the Punjab in recent years is—looking at it Governmentally, and elections and all that—that the rural areas are coming more to the front; the rural areas or their representatives have more power in their elected Assemblies, and the like, today, and the city-folk do not like it. Whether the city-folk are Hindu or Sikh, they do not like it, simply because the peasantry and others gradually are coming to represent the power of the State, more than previously. I should like—although it may not be perhaps a very good instance, still I should like—to remind this House that only recently, very recently, there have been in the Punjab widespread elections to Panchayats, which are really going down to the roots of the village, more than your General Elections, because they have been put to elect their own people, and the result of these elections has been significant. The elections were not held, so far as I know. On strict party lines—Congress or Akalis or any other—but nevertheless the results are instructive, because of the election of—I forget now—80,000 Panches. I think 80,000 is the figure, they were elected. There are very few Akalis who have been elected. That does not mean, of course, that the Akalis had not got any influence there—I do not say that. I am merely pointing out that for us to take for granted that the population of the Punjab, specially the rural population, necessarily agrees to what the Akali Dal says, is not correct. The Akali Dal's influence is more city influence, urban influence, not so much rural influence.

Now I would just like to mention one thing before I conclude, and that, Sir, is that I received a telegram from Sant Fateh Singh complaining of a misstatement, according to him, that I made yesterday, that I made in my statement that was read out here two

days ago. It has appeared in the press too today—nothing new about it. But I am very sorry if I made any misstatement, or stated what he had told me, in the wrong way. What he now says perhaps makes the position a little clearer and—well—even more difficult for me to accept. I had put his case, as I understood it, as Punjabi Suba, or the Regional Committees being given powers of some kind of subordinate legislatures, I had used the word “sub-legislatures” apart from other powers, and I had said that I could not understand how there could be three legislatures in a small State, or any State, two sub, and one apparently of a higher status. Now he says: I did not want any sub-legislatures; I wanted full-blooded legislatures on the two sides—that means, of course, a Punjabi Suba completely. Except for this he says, apparently he means that he was prepared that finance and law and order might not be given to them. Where would they go to? Now they were to be reserved for the Governor's use—there will be no other legislatures. Now thus a very extraordinary constitutional position would be created, and some kind of diarchy, and in a very bad form. And I just do not see how it could work, and why it should be created at all—it is a confusing thing. As it is, the Regional Committees have very considerable, very important subjects under their control including all development, which is basic, and so far as my information goes, whatever they have proposed in the last several years, since they have been formed, has been accepted, has been admitted. This is a convention that has grown up, and it was meant to grow up. In the case of one—perhaps two cases—the Punjab Assembly did not accept the Regional Committee's recommendations, and both these cases came from the Hindi region, not from the Punjabi region.

The Governor decided against that recommendation. I think at least one of these was, or perhaps both

were, against the teaching of the Punjabi language in the Hindi region and the Governor would not permit it. As a matter of fact, in spite of early difficulties, this Regional Formula has functioned with considerable success, although there has been a lack of co-operation. I do not think the Formula was bad. Still, I suggested, 'Let this Formula be looked into by the representatives of the Hindu region, the Sikh region and the Punjab Government and let it be improved, the working of it. If there are any difficulties, let us try to remove them. If necessary, give them some more powers, although they have considerable powers'. That was my suggestion but they rejected that, as they rejected, with some force, my proposal that a high-level Committee or Commission should examine any charges of differential treatment of the Sikhs. That too was rejected. I do not quite know what further I could have said. There is nothing. There is no middle stage left. Either one accepts the Suba or one does not because we have gone as far as one could go without accepting the Suba and I do feel that accepting it in principle cannot be done unless one means it seriously to be given effect to. It should not be done and one cannot do it. Seriously to give effect to it means not any protection to the language, in fact some harm to the Punjabi language, which will be much more limited in its area. It would mean the dangerous division of the Punjab actually, not in a deep sense politically maybe, but on communal lines. Communal tendencies, fissiparous tendencies will grow, bitterness will grow. Economically the Punjab will suffer and the pattern of life that the Punjab has developed during—whatever period it may be—long periods will be torn to shreds. I submit, therefore, that we cannot compromise on such a matter when the consequences are so serious. I have thought and my colleagues have thought a great deal about the consequences of our not agreeing to the Punjabi Suba. There too the consequences will be grave but whatever those consequences may be, we felt

that the consequences of agreeing to it were far graver, far more far-reaching and will affect the whole future of the Punjab and of India. Therefore, we came to this firm conclusion that we cannot agree even in principle to this Punjabi Suba demand. I cannot guarantee the distant future. Nobody can. That is a different matter. We are talking of the present and in the present we cannot allow such things to pass by without making our position quite clear on this issue and I am glad that nearly all Members, most Members of this House, appear to be of that opinion, as the other House was, and I hope that this strongly felt and strongly expressed opinion of both the Houses of Parliament will carry some weight to Master Tara Singh and his colleagues and he will decide to do what we have been pleading with him to do, that is, give up his fast.

MESSAGES FROM THE LOK SABHA

I. THE INCOME-TAX BILL, 1961

II. THE RELIGIOUS TRUSTS BILL, 1960

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following messages received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha.

I

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Income-tax Bill, 1961, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 28th August 1961.

2. The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India."

Sir, I beg to lay the Bill on the Table.