

प्रधान मंत्री तथा वंदेशिक कार्य मंत्री (श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू) : (क) और (ख). १७ जुलाई, १९५६ की चार पुर्तगाली सिपाही सावंतवाडी-गोआ सीमा पर नेतारदा गांव के पास भारतीय प्रदेश में ३ या ४ मील तक घुस आये और अर्जुन सीताराम को, जो खोलबा गांव से घरे मवेशियों को चरा रहा था, जबर्जस्ती ले गये। यह घटना ऐसे क्षेत्र में हुई जो पहाड़ी है और घने जंगलों से घिरा है। जहां यह घटना हुई उसके नजदीक कोई भारतीय सीमा पुलिस या कस्टम पुलिस नहीं थी।

पुर्तगाली अधिकारियों ने बाद में अर्जुन सीताराम को छोड़ दिया और वह अपने गांव वापस आ गया। भारत सरकार ने नई दिल्ली स्थित मिन्नी राजदूतावास के जरिये पुर्तगाली सरकार के पास भारतीय प्रदेश के इस अतिक्रमण के खिलाफ बड़ा विरोध पत्र भेजा। सरकार ने पहले ही यह हिदायत जारी कर रखी है कि भारतीय प्रदेश में घुस जाने वाले सशस्त्र पुर्तगाली कर्मचारियों को गिरफ्तार करके रोके रखा जाय, और अगर जरूरी हो तो भारतीय प्रदेश में उनके प्रवेश को रोकने के लिए ताकत का इस्तेमाल किया जाय। सीमांत पुलिस को भी सावधान कर दिया गया है कि वे ऐसे सभी जरूरी कदम उठाये, जिससे इस तरह की घटनाएं फिर न हों।

†[THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): (a) and (b). On the 17th July 1956, four Portuguese soldiers trespassed into Indian territory to a distance of 3 or 4 miles near the village of Netarda on the Sawantwadi-Goa border and forcibly took away one Arjun Sitaram, who was grazing cattle off the village of Kholba. The incident took place in an area which is mountainous and thickly wooded. No Indian border or customs police were in the immediate vicinity of the incident.

* The Portuguese Authorities subsequently released Shri Arjun Sitaram and he returned to his village. The Government of India have strongly protested to the Portuguese Government through the Egyptian Embassy in New Delhi against this violation of the Indian territory. The Government have already issued instructions that armed Portuguese personnel violating Indian

territory should be arrested and held, and where necessary, force used to prevent their intrusion into Indian territory. The border police have also been alerted to take all necessary steps for preventing repetition of such incidents.]

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

REPORTS OF THE COIR BOARD FOR THE YEAR 1956

THE MINISTER FOR CONSUMER INDUSTRIES (SHRI N. KANUNGO): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table:—

- (i) under sub-section (1) of section 19 of the Coir Industry Act, 1953, a copy of the Report on the activities of the Coir Board and the working of the Coir Industry Act, 1953, for the half-year ending the 31st March 1956. [Placed in Library. See No. S-317|56.]
- (ii) under sub-section (1) of section 19 of the Coir Industry Act, 1953, a copy of the Second Annual Report of the Coir Board for the period ending the 31st March 1956. [Placed in Library. See No. S-345|56.]

THE STATES REORGANISATION BILL, 1956—continued.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay): Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on this Bill with mixed feelings of joy and sorrow. The events that have occurred during the last 15 days are known to the Members of this House. The Bill, as it emerged from the Joint Select Committee, envisaged a Centrally administered Bombay City and separate Gujarat and Maharashtra. I would confine my speech only to that part of the Bill because I am coming from Gujarat, where feelings are exasperated at present. I will say that the leaders of Gujarat—the Chief Minister of Bombay, the Chief Minister of Saurashtra and the Congress President all of whom come from Gujarat—have arrived at this decision in the larger national interests, when they saw that 250 Members of Lok Sabha desired this decision, and when these Members came not only from the Congress Benches but from the Opposition too, the P.S.P. in particular. Now, it is well-known who are opposed to it here. It is only the Communist Party. I think

[C. P. Parikh.]

we had better ignore them for the present.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): You are ignoring the entire Gujarati population.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta knows very well that Gujarat is one with the rest of the country and will always remain one, in spite of whatever they may do. I submit that whatever differences there may be in Gujarat, will be settled by the people of Gujarat and not by outsiders. If at all we want the assistance of any outsiders, it will be the assistance of Pandit Nehru, yourself, Sir, or Pandit Pant, and also some other persons who have the national interests at heart. I hope we will never have the necessity to seek the advice and guidance of any other people. Whatever differences we have had, we have always settled in that manner, in a non-violent manner, as befitting the place from where Mahatma Gandhi came, and Members of Parliament need have no apprehensions on that account. Mr. Gopalan went there, Mr. Kamath went there and Mr. Chatterjee is going. You know what kind of reception they have met with or will meet with in Gujarat. Gujarat is a land which is considered to be very well-disciplined in the matter of non-violence.

Let me give you a little of the background of the whole question, of how this decision was arrived at. The people who put forward the views of Gujarat before the States Reorganisation Commission were the Gujarat Congress Committee and the Gujarat Sema Samiti. Both were united in making a demand for a bilingual State of Bombay excluding Vidarbha irrespective of majority and minority considerations. They never asked for a separate State of Gujarat. They only asked for a bilingual State of Bombay with Maharashtra and Gujarat. That was the stand. At that time, no consideration of majority or minority was there. But then the Maharashtra Congress Committee said that they would have a bilingual State of Bombay with Vidarbha, Marathwada, Gujarat and Saurashtra on the condition that Gujarat would have the option to go out of that State after a period of five years. This created misgivings in the minds of the leaders of Gujarat about the *bona fides* of the proposal that emanated from Maharashtra. On that account we did not accept that

offer, and the only alternative was to remain as a separate State of Gujarat. We the people of Gujarat have always kept the interests of the nation before us. In the present bilingual State of Bombay the Gujaratis are only a 32 per cent. minority. Even then, we feel that we have never been wronged, or no wrong has been done to us, and thus we have never entertained any considerations of majority and minority. In the future also we shall never, in any democratic set up, have any consideration of majority or minority. Now in the proposed bilingual State what is the position? We are a 34 per cent. minority instead of 32 per cent. at present. The people of Gujarat, on account of their ability, intelligence and confidence in the matter of making sacrifices know that they will live as minority in a respectable way and their interests will not be sacrificed. They have that much confidence. That confidence increases when Members of Parliament unitedly came to us and said: "You have the bilingual State of Bombay in order that the controversies that have arisen and inflamed the feelings of many people may be set at rest." We accepted their decision irrespective of the consideration of majority or minority. That is the position at present. With regard to Parliament Members who have appended their signatures in asking us to accept a bilingual State, the people of Gujarat, have every confidence in them that they will look after us and will see that no injustice is done to Gujaratis even though we are in a minority. Such feeling is ensured by certain persons, but we, the people of Gujarat and particularly Members of Parliament have every confidence in the representatives of all other States that they will see that no injustice is done to us. When no injustice was done to us in the past, we are confident that in a democratic set-up, which is ever becoming all-India in character it will never happen. With that confidence we have accepted this arrangement. In spite of our accepting these things, I find that some unfortunate events have happened in the City of Ahmedabad and elsewhere. The main cause is that the people of Ahmedabad knew that there was going to be a separate Mahagujarat and Bombay was to be separate. When overnight or in a period of 48 hours, the decision was known to them that the Members of the Lok Sabha and representatives of Parliament wanted to have a bigger bilingual State of Bombay their feelings were roused. That was natural, Sir, be-

cause, we had not the occasion to explain to them the manner in which we, the Members of Parliament, with the Chief Ministers of Bombay and Saurashtra and the Congress President, accepted this decision and this guidance from the sovereign body of India. What is that sovereign body? This sovereign body has a right to declare war or peace. This sovereign body has a right to levy any taxation or annul it. This sovereign body has a right to amend Constitution and to requisition the services of any man for purposes of economic activity or for defence. Now when we know this, then we naturally thought that because the principle of a bilingual State was accepted by all sections of the community in Gujarat, we were making no mistakes. But everybody is liable to make a mistake and that is proved by these incidents. The leaders of Gujarat thought that in the past the people of Gujarat had reposed implicit confidence in them and I think this is the first instance when the implicit confidence on which the leaders of Gujarat were banking has been shaken. What is the reason? We would not have minded if it had been shaken in the manner in which it has, because the Congress in Gujarat believes in the voice of the people and the Congress will always carry out the wishes of the people of Gujarat and not their own. They have never imposed their wishes on the people of Gujarat. About that we have no misgivings. But at least when this decision was known and although people were aware of the bilingual possibilities, this has occurred. Unfortunately the student community came into the picture. Why? Because the whole vernacular press of Gujarat was full of the news which demanded a separate Gujarat and I may emphasise that these persons who demanded a separate Gujarat State also demanded that Bombay should remain separate. There were two conditions—one was that Bombay should remain separate and another was that Gujarat should remain separate. They never expressed an opinion on what will happen if Bombay was handed over to Maharashtra. I think the Parliament representatives from the various States have a responsibility not only to the people of Gujarat but also to the people of Bombay City as well as to the people of Maharashtra. I think from that angle they found out this solution because the importance of the city of Bombay should be well recognised on the map of India. I say that Bombay City is the economic and

financial pivot of the whole of India. I may say that in the international field India is known by the City of Bombay. All these considerations are there. Therefore the High Command never tried to impose their decisions, not even the Cabinet, but said that Bombay should remain separate. They also made a proposal that Bombay will be Centrally administered and when it was known that it was to be Centrally administered, naturally it can well be assumed that it will be administered in the larger interests of the country. But the Maharashtra feelings were legitimately aroused and every part of the country has to be kept contended, we must remember. There should also be no lopsided development of any part. In a democratic system we have passed only 9 years but as we pass on from year to year, we shall have to see that all parts of India are treated equally and fairly. The High Command thought "Let the passions cool down in Bombay and then we shall find a solution". The Members of Parliament, however, thought that it was risky and they came to this decision and therefore we have agreed. Now it is the student community who joined this movement or who took the initiative in Ahmedabad. I may tell the hon. Members of this House here that the students as a community have never expressed, in the past, their opinion about unilingual or bilingual State of Bombay. They were not in the picture at all and when they knew this, their feelings were aroused owing to the press propaganda that was carried on. Their feelings were inflamed and these unfortunate incidents occurred. They went in a procession and then firing took place. Once there is procession, there is stone-throwing. Once there is stone-throwing, there is lathi and tear-gas and once there is lathi and tear-gas, there is firing. I deplore the incidents that have occurred for which firing had to be resorted to, but unfortunately the position is there. Those incidents occurred. Once firing is there, it takes time for feelings to cool down. Now it is the responsibility of the Government, whatever it be, Congress or otherwise, to look to the person and property of private citizens as well as the public property and they have also to look to the safety of the police. All these cannot be scrupulously observed in an atmosphere of violence. Some students and some other persons have been killed. The sympathies of the Congress will always be with these unfortunate deceased, and I think when the Congress

[Shri C. P. Parikh.]

meets and it is meeting on the 19th, the firing Resolution will be to express sympathy towards the deceased. In this firing and I think if anybody's heart bleeds at these happenings, it is the heart of Congressman, the heart of Mr. Dhebar, the heart of Shri Morarji Desai and the heart of Shri Khandubhai Desai rather than the heart of Shri Bhupesh Gupta and his.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why this feeling.....

(Interruptions.)

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ (Madhya Pradesh): You were responsible for that.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: if these communists have any heart at all. Now we know that these things have happened. I may tell you that two years back a severe famine occurred in Gujarat and not one life was lost. We, the Congressmen, made all possible arrangements. Do you think that in this case the Congress is not alive to the unfortunate situation? The Congressmen deplore it more than anybody else.

12 NOON

Our leaders will now learn how to pay more attention to the students and their feelings and their ways of thinking. We know what that happened in Uttar Pradesh in Lucknow University due to the students. This now here is the second happening. Students should be trained and moulded in the proper way by our leaders. We have our full sympathy for the students and we should build them upon base, for they are our heirs and they are the precious jewels of our land and they are the future leaders of this nation. So we can never discard their opinions and we can never afford to disregard their legitimate wishes. They have not however yet been trained on the practical side of politics; unfortunately they are trained only in the theoretical side and the result is that these incidents happened. Students, naturally, have not the occasion to learn by past mistakes. In fact they have neither successes nor failures and therefore they lack practical experience. That is why I say our first and foremost duty, the first and foremost duty of every leader in Gujarat is to appreciate the stand of the students and understand their views. That is our first task, and

if we do not do that, we will be failing in our duty. If we do not bring them round, the fault is ours and not theirs. The political leaders should respect more and more the opinions of students and mould them on right lines. We should give them more and more lectures in order to see that they are not led astray. Sir, the land of Gandhiji, the soil where stands Sabarmati Ashram from which emanated the movement that brought us our freedom, we in that land have to hang our heads in shame at the violence that occurred there. We are deeply grieved and we have the deepest sympathy for those people. Any sympathy expressed from opposite quarters is with a purpose. The Congress has the greatest sympathy towards these occurrences.

Sir, it is said that some of the Congressmen in Gujarat are against this decision. That is bound to be when so much of press propaganda is there. Some say that the leaders have not acted wisely, some say that they have committed mistake. But I would like to see the person who has not made any mistakes. If our opinions are wrong, if our actions are not in the interest of Gujarat, if they are not in the interest of the whole of India, then we would like to listen to those who would explain the whole position and tell us what is wrong and what right. We have an open mind and all we want is that there must be a calm and peaceful atmosphere in order to have proper discussions. We should have such an atmosphere for moulding public opinion. I think nobody will be welcome to interfere in the affairs of Gujarat, because the people of Gujarat are quite sagacious and prudent in managing their own affairs. Only a calm atmosphere is needed, a non-violent atmosphere like the one which led us to our independence. That violence is bad, has been recognised not only in India but it is being recognised in the whole world. Even nations which have large armaments and atomic power, recognise the importance and power of non-violence. Therefore, it is much more necessary that its value is recognised by all those who are concerned here in building up the new India and if we do so, then what was occurred in the city of Ahmedabad in Gujarat will be a thing of the past.

If we really find that people in Gujarat want only Maha-Gujarat, then we will afford all opportunities to them

to express their opinions in a peaceful and non-violent manner. The Congress will do that. The elections are coming in another six months. If majority opinion in Gujarat wants to have a Maha Gujarat separately, then I think neither Congress nor anybody else can come in the way. The wish of the majority will always prevail. Whatever decision is taken will always depend on the will of the people and I may say that Congressmen in Gujarat are more loyal to the decisions of the people than we can imagine.

Now the question is how to make the atmosphere better. We are having some improvement and there is more calm now in Gujarat and in Ahmedabad. If this calm and peaceful atmosphere continues for about ten days, then I think the whole question can be solved to the satisfaction of many and the position will be realised and understood by many. We must understand what is happening in India and what is the real position. Those persons who are asking for a separate Maha Gujarat must know that a separate Maha Gujarat will be a deficit State. Those people should realise it. Secondly they should remember that Gujarat depends for its economy and for its finance on the city of Bombay. Just as the economy and finance of Maharashtra are linked with the city of Bombay, so also the economy and finance of Gujarat are linked with the prosperity or otherwise of the city of Bombay. I may tell you, Sir, that if you go to any town or village in Gujarat, with a population of 1,000 and more, you will find that one house out of ten gets its money from other parts of India, and mainly from the city of Bombay. I may tell you, every ten houses in Gujarat is supported by the city of Bombay. That is the position and the persons who want a separate Maha Gujarat must realise this. So I say, we have again to explain these things to the public, which they have known in the past and especially because we were wedded to the bilingual principle. Therefore, Congress leaders, Members of Parliament as well as those in the Congress Party must be allowed to explain all this to the public. If any decision is taken afterwards no difference will arise in the future. If we are told by a large majority that it is in the interest of Gujarat to remain separate, we with an open mind will examine and accept it. But people should sit and discuss matters and get convinced or convince the other. The whole problem should be discussed by going

into all the pros and cons. And for that a non-violent and calm atmosphere is very necessary. It is also indirectly the responsibility of Members of Parliament to see that such an atmosphere is created in Gujarat, because this sudden decision has made some in Gujarat feel that this decision has been foisted upon Gujarat by the Members of Parliament. I think I will not be misunderstood if I were to say that Members of Parliament, who were signatories to the memorandum owe a duty to the people of Gujarat to establish a calm and peaceful atmosphere thereby at least saying—if they cannot visit those places—that no injustice will be done to the people of Gujarat or that no injustice will be done to Gujarat if we accept this decision. That would help to bring about the calm atmosphere that we so much need.

As regards the other things that occurred, the firing and all that everyone has the greatest sympathy for these unfortunate persons. Nobody is more worried than the Congress High Command over such happenings. But these things happen and when person and property are not respected firings and things like that occur. If this firing had not occurred, then more killing and violence would perhaps have occurred. We have to go deep into these matters and see how and why such things occur. We should see that violent sentiments are not roused in order to destroy person and property. We have, as I said, to create a peaceful and calm atmosphere.

Let me tell you one thing and which I think my hon. friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta may like to know. The labour class, the working classes in Gujarat have not joined in this movement. Whenever there has been such a violent movement in any part of India, the labouring classes have joined it. But in the city of Ahmedabad, the labouring classes who number about a lakh and a quarter, have not joined this movement and they have kept themselves aloof. What is the reason?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Your police.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: What is the reason for that? The reason is that the cult of non-violence has been impressed upon them in such a way that they demand whatever they want, in a peaceful manner, by means of peaceful me-

[Shri C. P. Parikh.]

of whatever occurred during the last fifteen days or so, these workers have remained peaceful, and in spite of the agitation that was sought to be launched by the Communist organisation in that city, many of the mills were working with full complements for many of those days.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Since when has our party become so strong in Gujarat?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH. The textile mill workers and the other workers and labourers of Gujarat are the most disciplined and non-violent not only in India, but I would even say, in any part of the world. I may tell you that in Gujarat we have had no strike for the last thirty years. In spite of the insinuations and propaganda of so many other parties, there has not been a single strike in the city of Ahmedabad except for achieving political independence and that shows how the workers have been trained in non-violence. That emphasises how the workers can be trained in non-violence. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and his Party believe only in violence and I think, Sir, the Party will therefore gradually vanish from year to year.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: At the moment we are concerned with Gujaratis who are being shot and who are protesting against certain decisions. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta does not come into the picture at all.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: We have accepted this decision for a bilingual State of Bombay in good faith and what is more, without any reservations. That is most important. We have not demanded, the leaders of Gujarat have not demanded, regional committees which have been demanded in many parts of India. We have absolute confidence in the persons who have constituted this bigger bilingual State as well as in the Sovereign Parliament. Everything will go on well but the only thing is that initially the leadership is challenged, the Congress leadership in Gujarat is challenged. It was not challenged till now. I know how Mr. Morarji Desai, Mr. Dhebar, Mr. Khandubhai Desai and Mr. Balwantrai were respected in all parts of Gujarat. We never heard even one word against their decision. Now that such words have come—and it is but proper that we should have them in a

democratic set up—they must open our eyes. If we want to change anything, if we want to build anything, we must convince a large majority of people of Gujarat in a calm and peaceful atmosphere. If we think or find that our leaders have gone wrong, then we must displace them but we shall have to find the persons who will displace them. We have not found them so far in the past.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What about yourself?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: I am simply a close follower of them all. Even Mr. Bhupesh Gupta knows very well that among Congressmen, if they elect one man, everybody will endorse the decision of that one man. There is this discipline especially in Gujarat. (*Interruption*). Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you have still to learn and the more you will ask me, the more you will learn. I may tell you, Sir, that the Congress Party in the Parliament is here because it enjoys the support of 72 per cent. It is so strong because it has implicit faith in its leader, Pandit Nehru. If such faith in a leader had not been there, it would have been broken up into pieces. It is only the loyalty, the allegiance and the discipline that count. If your leader is not doing the job properly, then displace him and displace him in twenty-four hours, but at least you will have to elect some new leader. We should also see that in excitement we do not do something over which we will come to grief later. I have no doubt that calm and peaceful atmosphere will be established in the city of Ahmedabad as well as in Gujarat. I have also no doubt that the many resignations which are appearing in the papers will also be withdrawn because opportunity will be given to all of them to explain their view-points. We will see that in a calm and peaceful atmosphere the worst critics will be given full chance to put up their views because, we want to learn something from them also. We have sometimes to learn from the Opposition and if we are unable to convince them, it would be not their fault but ours. That is humility and it is there in Ahmedabad. Whatever be the decision, it is never final if the people do not like it but the point is that we must first ascertain whether the majority of people likes it or not, and this, I again emphasise, cannot be done unless there is a calm and peaceful atmosphere. Panditji, speaking about Bombay, said that whatever may

happen about Bombay, whatever be the decision, it can only be arrived at in a calm and peaceful atmosphere. No calm and peaceful atmosphere was established in Bombay and no firm decisions were arrived at. I should inform Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that our leaders were, in the first instance, for a bigger bilingual State from January onwards, but they did not try to impose that decision on any section of Gujarat or Maharashtra or Bombay or on any political party. They said, "This is our view. If you want to accept it, accept it; if not, reject it." They said this although pressure was brought to bear upon them to give a decision which will be carried out. These leaders said that unless the parties agreed they did not and would not wish to impose a decision. That is the democracy that is flourishing and that is the democracy from which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has to learn. As long as this democracy is there, as long as there is this liberty on the expression of opinion, I think democracy will grow stronger and stronger till it approaches perfection in the country.

I will now try to show how this decision was arrived at. Members of Parliament, including the Lok Sabha Members of the Congress Party and the Opposition Parties, submitted a memorandum to our leader. Did he act upon it? I will tell you how he acted upon it. He called Members from Gujarat and ascertained their views; he also called Members from Maharashtra separately and ascertained their views. Not only this but he called all Members of the Congress party and asked the whole Party as to what it wanted. Even though his will could always be carried through he did not try to impose his will on the Members. That is democracy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But we were never consulted.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: You will never be consulted. You should know that it is only in this country that you are enjoying this liberty of expression of opinion. If opposition political parties were in Russia all their members would be massacred. That is not so in India. You must see what is happening. We have given all opportunities to you but do not abuse them. The moment you try to abuse them through violence, we will concentrate all over strength upon you. We may not be successful by non-violent methods but we will not mind it

and will continue to use non-violent methods. Mr. Asoka Mehta sponsored that movement and his followers, I think, have felt that Mr. Mehta has not acted wisely. Sometimes, the soldiers become wiser than the Captain. All these things are bound to happen in a democracy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But nobody likes to talk to us even.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Nobody will talk to you. Everybody is afraid of associating with you. That is the point. Mr. Gupta has to learn something from democracy and everytime an interruption comes, it is going against him.

Lastly, Sir, I would say that we have to save this great country only by non-violence. (*Interruption.*) Through non-violence only and what is the reason? The reason is that we are embarking on a great programme to raise the standard of living of the low income groups. So, whatever happens, everybody must try to subordinate his own interests to the interests of the Nation. If we do that, India will have a proud place in the world and I think, with our population and our resources, we can yet build the India of our aspirations but then we must discipline ourselves. Then only can we hope for progress.

With these words, Sir, I support the Bill.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, the States Reorganisation Bill will become an Act as soon as the Rajya Sabha passes the Bill and the much debated question of this linguistic division of the country will have come to an end. One can only wish that it sets at rest the uneasiness that has been raised in the country, if not for ever, at least for a long time. There are people who would be very happy over the way in which this linguistic division has been finally settled, but there are others both in the Parliament and outside who are not happy to see that any division of the country should have taken place at this time. They would have wished, Sir, that this independence of the country—which is only a child of nine years—should have had a greater chance to come to maturity and, in that mature judgment of better conditions in the country, of the Five Year Plans having been fully fulfilled, the income of the

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] people having been doubled as promised and the people having become literate and the health of the country having improved.....they should have looked at this question of how the administrative division of the country for better conduct of its affairs should have taken place. Unfortunately, Sir, a promise was given to Andhra for the formation of Andhra as a linguistic State and the State of Andhra was formed and if I may compare that to the first sin of Adam, it in a way has been the cause of this trouble that the country has been going through. Sir, a growing democracy as ours is has to face these growing pains and we are very proud that ultimately, in spite of a decision right or wrong, in spite of the difficulties we have had to go through, at least the problem has been solved as far as all major issues are concerned. Sir, the problem of Bombay was the most ticklish one, but I will come to that later. Sir, there are people like Rajaji who even to the last moment have been suggesting that the States Reorganisation Commission Report and the division of the country should be dropped. But, Sir, it is very difficult—one has to realise—when the Government has gone on taking one step after the other with a view to achieving a certain goal, to come back. Sir, the question of Bombay, which has been solved, could not have been solved in any other way and it is very strange why it was not solved that way earlier. After all there was a suggestion in the S.R.C. Report itself that Bombay should be a bilingual State and ultimately, after going round and round the solution in different ways, that very solution had to be accepted. We are very sorry that, with all the things that passed before the solution could be arrived at, violence in Bombay should have been perpetrated and that the Bombay State which has the honour of having Mahatma Gandhi, the apostle of non-violence and whom we have accepted as the Father of the Nation, Tilak as the Father of Independence and Gokhale as the Father of Democracy should not have been able to come to a decision in a peaceful and understanding way, as it was ultimately done. People may point to Ahmedabad and even yesterday people on the opposite side were saying and giving warnings that we would repent of the decision and that more dangerous things might happen. They should remember that if anybody goes and incites the violent elements there would be plenty of them

to come and help them. Similarly, the inflammable element of students can always be relied upon to join for the moment, but later wiser counsels always prevail and ultimately peace has again started reigning over Ahmedabad and I am sure it will continue provided others do not disturb it. But some of the people of the political parties, leaders of the political parties like the Hindu Mahasabha who arrogate to their name the word 'Maha' as in Maha Sabha, want a Maha Gujarat and a Maha Punjab and believe that the ignorant people would think that those people who are "Maha" themselves and belong to an organisation which is Maha—the Congress is not Maha Congress—would alone be able to deliver the goods and give them a Maha Gujarat. Sir, if these agitations were not to be provoked by people who would stand to gain in the immediate future, one would have understood and believed in their sincerity of purpose. Unfortunately when everything seems to have been settled, the people of the Socialist Party, the Communist Party and the Hindu Mahasabha Party are going there as if to awaken people from a trance in which they might fall, but unfortunately this would not be just the time, not until another 8 or 10 years elapse, not until calm is fully restored, to rely on the common man's judgment. It is somewhat unfortunate that the decision over Bombay had to be taken all of a sudden. The Bill was before the House. The solution seemed to be baffling and as everybody had acclaimed the decision, at last a solution was arrived at. Sir, the question of Bombay having been settled amicably we have to accept it. I need not add to what has been said here by some Members from Gujarat and Bombay, even to say that it should never have been a question at all whether the Gujaratis would trust Maharashtrians even if they are in a majority and *vice versa*. I would like here, in addition to the many remarks that were made on this subject in the speech of Shri Deokinandan Narayan, to point out one or two things, that if in the whole country any two people of States with different languages have fused together more than anybody, it is the Gujaratis and Maharashtrians. Sir, even in the National Anthem the words "Gujarat and Mahatma" have come together and no less a person than the leader of Bombay, Shri Morarji Desai, has welcomed into his house his son's bride, a girl from a Maharashtra family. There are hundreds of unions like that, but I have

just pointed out these two things to show that for the unfortunate mistake that was made by the suggestion that these two separate States should be formed and Bombay should be a different State and because the economic interests of Bombay were so linked up with Maharashtra a huge controversy arose and over that this storm in a tea cup, as it were, arose.

Sir, I would like to mention before I proceed further that if this Commission had consisted of ten people from different parts of the country I am certain that the documents, nearly 2,000 they say, which were well considered memoranda that were received by them, would have received better preliminary attention from a wider outlook as we always say, the bigger the number of Judges on the bench of a High Court the better the judgment would be. Similarly I feel if we had ten people on this Commission we would have been saved some of the confusion that has arisen. Having said this, Sir, I would like to turn to a question which is of a little detail.

I realise fully, Sir, that the Bill having passed the Lok Sabha and the Act having to be implemented on the 2nd of November and the party members having had more or less full chance to have their say before their party with regard to their different views, even through the Select Committee, not much point would be served in referring to the matter now, but the only reason for my putting this before the House is that in the other House the Home Minister was pleased to say with regard to this territory of Belgaum and portions of Karwar that questions of similar type would be referred to the Zonal Councils. That is very well, Sir, but when local questions are to be decided, the local people's judgment is bound to be slightly swayed by sentiments and as such I would have liked that the Parliament as such, where people from different parts come, should have given their verdict on this knotty question just as they have given on the question of Bombay and the decision of Parliament rather than the decision of any other single body had been able to seal that difficult question. I would mention, Sir, that certain portions, the Marathi-speaking areas of Belgaum taluk and the Marathi-speaking areas of Khanapur taluk and the Nipani Bhag portion of Chikodi taluk which is ad-

jacent and used to be part of Kolhapur, and similarly the Marathi-speaking portions of Athni and Hukeri taluks and Karwar and Halyal taluks and Supa Peta in North Kanara district which is a contiguous area and which formed part of the present Bombay State unfortunately have now been handed over with a population of nearly six lakhs of people to Karnataka. Sir, I for one have always been against unilingual States, but having once accepted a bilingual State more for administrative convenience, for the convenience of education, it seems rather strange that this big tract of 2,500 square miles, with six lakhs of people and a contiguous border of the present Bombay State should be handed over to the new Karnataka State thus making it difficult also for Karnataka people apart from these people to have their daily needs, the courts and education properly looked after. Sir, it may be pointed out that Belgaum being the headquarters of the District, there would not be any other properly constituted headquarter to take care of the remaining three taluks and the portion of Belgaum District. I would point out in this connection that Ghataprabha on which an expenditure of Rs. 5 crores is being incurred for the project there would form, with its various new buildings for the project, a suitable headquarters which could be the new Belgaum Headquarters. And the hon. Minister was very proud to have the name of Kanyakumari given to a new district; he will be going to Kanyakumari District but if it forms part of Bombay he will again come back to Bombay, I think.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA (Madhya Bharat): But the hon. Lady Member is from Madhya Pradesh.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: That is why in an impartial manner I want to suggest this. I want to point out that Ghataprabha would be the headquarters of that district and no hardship would be caused to anyone. Even if it meant a heavy expenditure for the new Karnataka State for having a new headquarter for the district, Bombay State could make over a crore of rupees—not a very big sum as nowadays crores are considered by everybody as if they are lakhs—and that would be more than enough for the formation of a new headquarters.

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]

Sir, I would add one more argument for taking this step. When the States Reorganisation Commission reported about Bellary, they had suggested that it should go to Andhra but later on it was decided that Bellary should go to Karnataka. Similarly, though it is not known for what reason the Commission took this decision on Belgaum by which they have allowed one taluk of Chandgarh to be in Bombay State but allowed the rest to go to Karnataka, now on account of these arguments that are so cogently being put forward, this should become part of Bombay State. In this connection I suggest that the promise given by the hon. the Home Minister in the other House that this would be favourably considered should be more or less repeated again and ratified on the floor of this House as it was done there, so that the people sitting in the Zonal Council will have his promise along with the views of the Members of Parliament for their guidance.

A word about All India Services because the reason for now taking up this question of reorganisation is this. Reorganisation is a very convenient word which is used very often; whenever you want to hold an enquiry you say reorganisation of that particular body; similarly if you want to divide the country instead of saying you are dividing it you say reorganisation of the country. The hon. Deputy Minister, I am sorry, the hon. Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs Mr. Datar yesterday very kindly promised that care would be taken to see that the Services are constituted in such a manner as to contribute to the greatest unity. I was not quite sure whether he said that all services, namely, Engineering, Forestry, Education etc., would be All India Services in future. I want to make a concrete suggestion that in addition to the I.A.S. and the I.P.S. these Services should also be made All India Services. It would be a strong force for the unity of the country if that is done. I would say that particularly with regard to education. If the people at the top who are the Directors and people who are a little lower had to go from one State to the other, they will be able to have uniform standards and apart from that they would be able to feel that they all belong to one country. The people who enter the Services in the lower rungs of the ladder in the States, will know that their ultimate goal is not only at the Centre but it will be anywhere in the country and thus they will

remember that this is one country. Sir, language should present no difficulty because when Englishmen came from abroad—and for a long time Englishmen used to be Directors of Education apart from being Heads of departments—they were able to carry on easily. If departmental examinations and prize examinations in different languages are held and if all Hindi-speaking incumbents in Services are made compulsorily to learn one language of Dravidian origin in the beginning of their service, there will be no difficulty as far as administration is concerned.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Sir, I would also like to say one more thing with regard to language. Now that perhaps the recommendation of the language Commission is going to be that the All India Services Examinations should be held in all the 14 languages, the suggestion made by me is of still greater importance. We very glibly point to countries like Switzerland etc., with different languages which have unity. Sir, just as the Prime Minister was telling in his Red Fort speech on the 15th August that there is something special in the soil of this country, that it has produced people whose ideals are peace, namely, Mahatma Buddha and Gandhiji, similarly at least for some time there will be and there has been something peculiar in the soil of this country that it tends very easily to disunity and so we should not remain complacent with the idea that common religion will be the binding force for unity. If religion were such a binding force, there would never have been wars in Europe where there is one religion viz., Christianity in different countries. Similarly we point to places like the U.S.A. where in spite of a common language, there had been wars but we have to remember that when those wars took place, there were two languages, French and English. But certainly one thing can be said for common language that it has a greater chance of keeping up unity than other forces like religion, or common culture, common food or even common dress in some respects or for that matter the oft-repeated argument that there is the word 'Ram' in every name out of seven names right from Kanyakumari to Badrinath. That is the usual computation. In spite of that, forces of disunity might work and we have to take every care possible to strengthen the forces of unity.

Finally, I would say that this bilingual State of Bombay should really be the beginning or a sort of pointer or nucleus for the future five zonal units in the whole country. Let us hope that this experiment of unilingualism or States based on one language which is being tried now will be given up after the enthusiasm has faded away and after the difficulties have been realised when people in the interests of the country at large are bound to unite. Sir, we are aiming at one world government. We are trying to have through the U.N. one World Bank for monetary affairs; similarly through the I.L.O. and similarly through GATT and other things we have the affairs of the entire world settled in one place. If that is our aim, only a common language, that is, Hindi, and not laying emphasis on the removal of English in an unnatural manner—let it disappear in a natural manner—that is what is required. Let the people decide according to their requirements the real place of English because with one world government we would require initially more and more ways of conducting the affairs of the country in a common language, thus contributing to one world management of human affairs which ultimately lead to lasting peace in the world.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI (Bombay): Sir, I am going to make a very short speech as now the time has passed for arguments on one side or the other. First of all, I accept this Bill, as emerged from the Lok Sabha, which has been put before the House by hon. Shri Datar. Government has found different solutions for many problems which were very baffling all these months. It is a Herculean task and it is good to see that the majority of the problems are settled to the satisfaction of the parties concerned. Members who have suggested solutions are our elders and they have striven very hard and in their wisdom they feel that at the present juncture no better solution could be found.

Having said that, so far as the solution of the Bombay problem is concerned, I am of two minds. The solution is in the interests of the people of Bombay city. It is welcomed by all the people in Bombay and as a 'Bombay-ite' I also welcome it. But at the same time I am a Gujarati and the people of Gujarat have felt that the solution has gone against them; rightly or wrongly.

3—14 R. S./56.

We are not going into the merits of it but being a Gujarati I shall be less than human if I do not feel for them or for what is happening in all parts of Gujarat. The way the Lok Sabha in its wisdom has imposed this national solution at the eleventh hour on Gujarat, to say the least, is unique in its haste. Even if this solution is a good solution it should have been first explained to the people of Gujarat. Our leaders took great pains to explain their point of view to the people of Punjab, to the people of Maharashtra, to the people of Hyderabad and many other States, but the people of Gujarat were taken for granted. The Gujarat people are very docile and they are obedient to the Congress. Even now they are obedient to the Congress. So, no necessity was felt to explain things to them. Today when things have gone wrong, Members of Parliament are trying to find scapegoats. Some of them say "Oh! it is the communists who have done it, or it is the capitalists who have done it or it is the communalists who are behind this trouble." I tell you that neither capitalists, nor communists, nor communalists are at the back of this trouble. The sudden shock of the decision is felt by the people of Gujarat as a whole and I beg of you not to turn away from the people of Gujarat in their hour of trial, but go to them, see them and show your friendliness to them. They need it very much at this time. I am really sorry that no Congress leader has thought it fit to go to Gujarat. It was left to the communist, P.S.P. and other parties to visit Gujarat. We do not believe in what they saw and say. And we do not go to them and see the situation for ourselves. Only we praise, we sermonise from here, from a safe distance. We do not know what is happening and why it is happening.

Sir, I do not want to go into the merits of this question. Only the future will show whether the decision is right or wrong. Let the members here do unto Gujarat as they want to be done unto themselves. The bilingual solution having been praised by each and everyone, let the Members of all States try the same solution in their own States. Let Bengal and Bihar be joined; let U.P. and Punjab be joined; let Madras and Mysore be joined; let Andhra and Kerala be joined, so that....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore): Andhra and Kerala cannot go together.

SHRI RAGHAVENDRARAO (Hyderabad): Let Andhra and Karnataka join.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Hyderabad): We are ready for that.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI:the solution applied to Gujarat can be regarded as a national solution. I am sure that our great leaders who have the good of all the people of India at heart will not be indifferent to the sufferings of Gujarat, the people of Mahatma Gandhi, the people of Sardar Patel. I am sure they will do the best that they can for them, go to them and explain to them why the decision was taken. I am sure that if the people of Gujarat feel that their sacrifice is needed to save the whole of India, they will not lag behind. But at least let them feel that it is so. Thank you very much.

SHRI KAKASAHEB KALELKAR (Nominated): Sir, I rise to support the Bill. I think we have will-nilly accepted the principle of linguistic redistribution of the land and this bilingual State of Bombay is also a triumph of that principle. My own feeling is that the leaders of the nation were unreasonably afraid of accepting the principle of linguistic redistribution of the country and they tried to put it off because of the partition of the country. They were so much afraid that they would not tackle this problem at all. Otherwise, the best occasion for the re-distribution of the country was when we had the Constituent Assembly. Along with our Constitution we could easily have redistributed the country according to the linguistic principle. Now, the greatest difficulty was that people did not realise that the redistribution of the country on the basis of linguistic areas was one thing; and regarding people speaking one language as a sub-nation was a different thing. The second idea was mischievous and I think since the days of partition of Bengal this mischievous idea that "people speaking one language were a sub-nation" has grown in volume.

I have always felt that Bombay is a city of destiny and I always told my friends, both in Gujarat and Maharashtra, that 'if you make Bombay a bone of contention, nothing but bones would remain of Bombay'. This is what I said some ten or fifteen years back. Now, I am glad that Bombay is made into a bilingual State. But unfortunately for us, our people have not studied the impli-

cations of linguistic States. If volumes were written about bimetalism, volumes must also be written and an amount of scientific thought must also be given to bilingualism. If people speaking different languages come together and are not under the domination of a foreign language like English, the problem of bilingualism will have to be scientifically studied and literature must be produced and there must be educative propaganda in the country. Recent happenings both in Maharashtra and Gujarat are a clear eye-opener. It is not that something is wrong with the people, but the wrong is that the problem has not been studied at all. People go by mere slogans. It is supposed that Gujarat is a land of capitalists. I refuse to believe it. I have lived in Gujarat. I have had my birth, education and culture from Maharashtra. I served Gujarat for a long time and I am proud to say that today in the Sahitya Akademi I represent Gujarati literature and not Marathi. So, I am perfectly sure that Gujarat as a whole is not a capitalist province, and also the whole of Maharashtra is not temperamentally pledged to a socialistic pattern or for that matter the ascendancy of labour. So, to say that Gujarat is a capitalist area is: I think, utterly wrong. We study the countries of England, we do not study our own literatures. We are strangers in our own land. I once answered a question "To whom does India belong" by saying that it belonged to Hunters and Griersons, because they know the land and know all the details about us. Even the geography of India is not known to our people. Everyone thinks that the Hinduism of his own city or district is the real Hinduism. So there is a certain amount of confusion because of ignorance.

In the changed Bill Karnataka is put in the Western Zone. There it is called Mysore; officially people will continue to call it Mysore, but the popular name will continue to be Karnataka. It has been put along with Bombay. I welcome the change. A good many problems could now be easily solved, and the old association of Karnataka with Bombay will be maintained. Now, because we have made certain mistakes. What happens is when there is some wrong done in the S.R.C. report, they do not care to correct it, they say that the thing will be amended later at a higher level. When we bring the same problem again at the higher level, they say "all right, don't mind, it will be solved". Again,

when the question is raised, we are told "accept the Bill as it is, the Zonal Council will have to solve the problem". In the meanwhile additional weight is lent to the wrong arrangement and then discontent goes down underground. For instance, the other day we were discussing Kasaragod. I think the upper part of Kasaragod has to go to Karnataka. I have seen the people there, and I am convinced the upper part of Kasaragod north of Chandra-giri river and Payaswini automatically should have gone to Karnataka. Because they were under the influence of some principle of not disturbing a taluka—which they did not keep up to the last—they put it along with Malabar. I am told that the people of Malabar are not very keen about it. A few Moplas may be quarrelling there who recently went and settled there. So, why wait for the two zones to come together and then decide the problem? I think it is not fair.

I know we have been talking of mutual agreement. You put all your weight on one side and decide in favour of one party and then say "you come together and agree between yourselves". One party says 'we don't want arbitration, we don't want to come together'. Here I would ask our leaders if they could have succeeded in settling the question of the boundaries of Bihar and Bengal by mutual agreement. We have heard speeches on both sides *ad infinitum* till at last people did not know that they were talking over and over again. It was clear no settlement could ever have been arrived at by mutual agreement. The Centre has got to put its weight and if you put your weight on one side and then tell the other side "you have an admirable case, your case is very strong, you need some help, some adjustment is necessary". I do not think it is a wise policy. Although I am not going to move an amendment about Kasaragod, I think it would have been wiser if northern Kasaragod had been given to Karnataka, and we could have easily sailed ahead.

Then, again, about Karwar and Belgaum. I belong to both Karwar and Belgaum. My childhood was spent there and I also got my education there. I know the areas through and through. Now Halyal and Supa are purely Marathi-speaking areas. Konkani is the language of my fore-fathers and Konkani and Marathi go well together, and the Konkani-speaking people and the Marathi-speaking people freely intermarry.

For administrative reasons Konkani and Maharashtra must be put together. Portions of Belgaum and Karwar ought to have gone to Maharashtra. Failing this, my suggestion is that those areas could be centrally administered because then there would be no difficulty but the Centre is afraid of taking such responsibility. I think the Centre ought to shoulder this responsibility. If those people are left to themselves and every time we say "no, no, we are afraid we cannot intervene; you agree amongst yourselves, we will put our weight, you manage to convince the other side; if you manage to take something from them we have got no objection"—I think that is a cruel solution of the problem.

Gujarat and Maharashtra are two linguistic units. They have lived together since ancient times. Gujarat Kings have ruled over Maharashtra and Maharashtra Kings have ruled over Gujarat, and they have managed to live together. Yet Gujarat is a unit of three sub-units—Kutch, Saurashtra and the other parts. Similarly, Maharashtra could be divided into three parts, (1) the Konkan, the sea coast area, (2) Desh and (3) Vidarbha. These are ancient units decided by physical geography and the whole history of Maharashtra. There were recognised three Maharashtra units since ancient times. They have got a new unit now in Marathwada. This Marathwada should have been distributed in part to Vidarbha and in-part to Desh *i.e.*, Bombay Maharashtra up the Ghats. Now the three units of Maharashtra and the three units of Gujarat could come together on equal terms. They could come on equal terms and federate. You may call it a sub-federation, you may call it one bilingual unit, but they could come together under the banner of Bombay, and Bombay would belong to the whole of a bilingual State. But the answer I received to this was that the history of constitutional development in the world says that sub-federations are dangerous to federations. I feel we should go by our own history and not by the doctrines of text-books of foreigners. We know the history of our own country. We could have successfully managed a sub-federation. Now, simply because there is some disturbance in Ahmedabad and other places, let us not suppose that the situation is lost. I know that the people of Gujarat are not given to violence. Something was said about the students in connection with the disturbances. I have been a lifelong teacher myself and I had

[Shri Kakasaheb Kalelkar.]
always to do with students. Whenever I find that there is something wrong with the students, I do not go and blame the students, but I feel that something is wrong with the teacher and that is why the students have gone wrong. There is nothing wrong with the students. They are raw people. They have got an idealism, a little more fancy and imagination. Therefore, if we are to study the problem of the students, it must be studied at other levels—what is wrong with the professors and teachers; are they responsible people; are the lives that they lead and the things that they preach in the interests of the nation, or are they irresponsible?

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA: Also newspapers, Kakasaheb.

1 P.M.

SHRI KAKASAHEB KALELKAR: About bilingualism, I think we should now have a special body—call it a Committee or Commission or Board to study this problem objectively and in a scientific spirit I know that Gujarat must be a unit by itself and the administration must be carried on in Gujarati. Maharashtra must be one unit by itself and the administration should be carried on in Marathi, and the services must know at least three languages, Marathi, Gujarati and Hindi. No Government servant should be made permanent unless he knows these three languages. These three languages are very akin to each other and can be learnt in six months. Therefore, instead of putting a strain on the people, let us put some strain on the Government servants. It is not a strain; it is a joy if you can enjoy three literatures. Let us pass this Bill, but let us take a lesson and let us reconsider the whole situation and find permanent acceptable remedies.

SHRI T. BODRA (Bihar): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is not only with disappointment but also with sadness that I am today speaking on this Bill. I am convinced of the fact that the Congress is the only organisation which can run the administration of India efficiently and satisfactorily. At present the Government of India is composed of the best of the Ministers, of the best of intellectuals and the best of our politicians, and so I expected equal justice to all parts of the country. Of course, I can also realise and understand that the Cabinet Ministers of the Government of India have got more important work, and therefore they had to seek the

assistance of the Members of the States Reorganisation Commission. It was the duty of the States Reorganisation Commission Members, who are also very eminent people, to help to the best of their ability and honesty the Government of India and send in their proposals. It is evident from the States Reorganisation Commission's Report that one of the Members abstained from joining the other Members in signing the report when he found himself in a delicate position so far as the Bihar-Bengal question was concerned, as he had been intimately connected with Bihar and had served it also. The result was that the other two Members who had little knowledge and perhaps very little time to consult the Bengal Gazetteer, the Bihar Gazetteer and the District Gazetteers of Manbhum and Singhbhum or the ethnological report of the Commissioner of Chota Nagpur Division, came to a final decision as to the report they should submit. The net result is that the Government of India is now in a fix and is not able to incorporate the Bihar-Bengal Bill in this States Reorganisation Bill. I ask this question: Why are there these two Bills? Is Bihar or Bengal outside India? What were the reasons for having two separate Bills for different parts of the same country?

Now, I find that out of the 18 administrative units to be formed, Assam, Bihar, Bombay, Kerala, Delhi, Orissa, Punjab, West Bengal, Himachal Pradesh, Manipur and Tripura are dissatisfied with the decisions arrived at. This gives satisfaction only to Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Mysore, Madras, Andhra, Rajasthan and Jammu and Kashmir. If the decision of the Government of India was fair, certainly the decision would have been acceptable to and would have satisfied the sentiments of the people of eleven administrative units out of eighteen. What are the reasons for ignoring the sentiments of the people of these eleven administrative units? I feel that they have not been fairly treated.

So far as I am concerned, I stand here to speak on behalf of 1,63,67,172 people who are downtrodden, poverty-stricken, who are illiterate, who have not seen the light of education, who have not seen the light of civilisation. These people's voice has not been heard by the Government of India. As the House knows, the people of this part of the country are very inarticulate. They are more or less like dumb cattle, and

they are spread over a plateau which is over 2,000 feet above sea level; they are spread over the hills, dales and ravines of the Chota Nagpur plateau. Their voice has not been heard; their case has not been considered, and they have been disintegrated into four different States of Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Bengal and Bihar. What the Adivasis want today is not isolation, not disintegration. What they want is integration into the national life of India. Adivasis want to play an effective and equal part with the rest of the country in the administration of the country of which they are inhabitants. Adivasis want education. They want good irrigation schemes. They want to play a part in the industrial development of the country, and they do not want to remain mere spectators. What they want is fair treatment, sympathy and due consideration of their cases. I was hoping much from the Zonal Councils. The House must know of the dissenting note submitted by Mr. Anthony. He wanted that their should be a statutory Minorities Board, a Ministry for Linguistic Minorities, the appointment of a Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities, so that the case of the minorities will not be overlooked. Yesterday in his speech, Mr. Deokinandan Narayan said: मेजारिटी जब तक माइनारिटी का ख्याल नहीं करती तब तक मेजारिटी राज्य नहीं कर सकती हैं। I object to the words: राज्य नहीं कर सकती है।

The English translation would be that the majority will not be able to rule over the minority. It is for this reason that people who are in a minority wanted to have provisions for the appointment of a Minorities Board, a Ministry of Linguistic Minorities, etc. to be incorporated among the provisions relating to the Zonal Councils.

Mr. Deokinandan Narayan perhaps knows little as to under what grievances and sufferings the minority people of these places have to live. I have sufficient evidence, both documentary and factual, to give to the Home Ministry and I can do it even now, to substantiate my point of view as to why the minorities are today afraid of the majorities and why they are today clamouring for safeguards and protection. I will read:

"Extract from the Proposed Budget 1952-53 of the Bihar University to be presented to the Senate on the 28th November 1952. The name of Urseline College, Ranchi, is conspicuous by its absence; the name of St. Xavier's Ranchi, is conspicuous by its comparative neglect.

Both leading Aborigines and Non-Aborigines of Bihar State fail to understand the step-motherly treatment meted out to two of the most brilliant colleges of the State situated in Aboriginal areas. St. Xavier's College, Ranchi, gets only the crumbs in spite of its splendid results and achievements. The Urseline College, Ranchi, does not even get the crumbs. It gets stones instead. The majority of Aboriginal girls have freely given their preference to this college using their constitutional rights as Indian citizens. Yet this college continues to be deprived of its recognition although both the Syndicate and the Senate have twice granted that right. Will it ever be said that these Aborigines are the only people in Bihar who are not allowed to join the college of their choice, even though it has the unique results of St. Xavier's College, Ranchi, or of its sister College the Urseline College? Aborigines of all faiths and of all States watch with bitterness the artificial starvation process which is doomed to drain the blood of the colleges of their choice. They ask the question: who is responsible?"

I am today standing here and asking the question as to who is responsible for the systems which are crippling the life of the aborigines in Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa and Bengal. If 20 per cent. of the revenue also is not spent for the welfare of the scheduled tribes and scheduled castes and backward classes, why should not they seek protection from the Government of India? This is the reason why we were hoping much from the Zonal Councils.

From the statistical account of Bengal by W. W. Hunter, B.A., LL.D. Volume XVII, page 156, the House will come to know that there was an administrative.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All those details are not necessary here. We are now concerned with States reorganisation.

SHRI T. BODRA: I am trying to strengthen my argument for the Zonal Councils.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You need not go into the details. All that will be relevant when budget is discussed in those particular States, not here.

SHRI T. BODRA: Now where are these people living and who are these minorities? They are:

Aboriginals—Indian: Bhuihar, Bhumi, Binjhia, Birhor, Chero, Gond, Jhora, Ho, Kaur, Kharia, Khandu Kol, Korwa, Kuru, Munda, Nageshwar, Pandabasi, Puran, Rautia, Savar, Santal, Saout, Uraon.

Semi—Hinduised: Bahelia, Balda, Banjara, Bari, Bauri, Bhuiya, Bind, Chamar, Chik, Dhanuk, Dom, Turi, Dusadh, Ganda, Ghasi, Kharwar, Bhogta, Manjhi, Mahiti, Mal, Minao, Mihtar, Pab, Pan, Parirka, Pasi, Rajwar, Shikari.

Hindu—superior caste are Brahmins, Khandait, Rajput, Bhat, Kayasth, Mahanti—they form a very small percentage.

Now for the economic, educational and other development of these communities, our only hope under this Bill is the Zonal Council and I am very happy that in the Purva Pradesh all these areas have been included but I would have been very grateful to the Government of India if a Regional Council would have been appointed subordinate to the Zonal Council of the Eastern Zone so that they could have minutely taken into consideration the economic, educational and other problems of these people whom I have just mentioned and they would have been able to submit their report to the Zonal Councils who, in turn, would have submitted their report to the Parliament. But in the Bill even under that Zonal Council system, it is not written anywhere that they will be compelled to submit their report to the Government of India and the Parliament for their consideration and discussion. I wish that these reports of the Zonal Councils are submitted to the Parliament and we have a chance of discussing them. Now, in the report of the

Economic Adviser to the Government of India, at para 4 what we find is that the places and the parts inhabited by these minorities are full of minerals. It is written there:

“Bihar is very rich in minerals. Among the principal minerals worked in Bihar are coal, iron ore, Mica, copper, bauxite, chromite, limestone, fire-clay and china-clay. Coal is available at Jharia, Bokaro and Karanpura. The Jharia coalfields supply most of India's requirements of metallurgical coal. Iron ore is extensively mined in the Singhbhum District and next to Orissa it has the richest iron ore deposits in India. Mica is mined in a ninety-mile long and twenty-mile broad belt extending from Gaya District through Hazaribagh to Monghyr and Bhagalpur Districts. Extensive bauxite deposits have been discovered in Palamau and Ranchi Districts.....”

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All this is not relevant here. Whatever you say must be relevant to the Bill under discussion. We are now concerned with the linguistic groups particularly where the States are reorganised. Any remarks on that would be relevant but what is going on in the coal-fields or mines of Bihar or Orissa is not relevant here.

SHRI T. BODRA: I am not saying what is going on in the mines. But what I say is in the future, India will need the labour from Santals, Mundas and Uraons who are expert miners but if some provisions are not made by the Government of India, these under-fed, uneducated, under-clothed, unhealthy aboriginal races will die out and then wherefrom can we get these tribals to work in the coal-mines? This is my argument.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That would be relevant when the Backward Classes Commission Report comes for discussion. The backward classes and Adivasis are scattered throughout India. It is not relevant to this Bill. We are now concerned with the protection given by the Bill to the linguistic groups in the reorganised States. Whatever you have to say on that point, you may say. Don't go into a general discussion about adivasis and backward classes.

SHRI T. BODRA: The Mundas speak the Munda language. The Uraon language also is there. I am speaking about

the linguistic minorities. They (the tribal languages) have no other names. Now these people speaking these tribal languages must live in order to supply at least the labour, if not anything else and if provisions are not made under the Zonal Councils, and if the Zonal Councils are not vested with more powers for protecting the linguistic minorities, then wherefrom can we get the labour to work in our mines? To our misfortune, although these areas are so rich in minerals, yet these people are so poor that they cannot even get a dose of medicine when they are sick. They are under-nourished, under-fed and they are dying out. It is a matter of great shame for the country and therefore I appeal to the Government of India to reconsider about these Zonal Councils and give them more powers. Let them not be only advisory in character. If they are only advisory in character and if their report is not submitted to Parliament for discussion and consideration, it is quite possible that the Chief Secretaries, who are I.C.S. and I.A.S. people, of Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Assam in the Purva Pradesh who come from the higher level of society, belong to the high families, cannot appreciate the starvation of these poor people. If the hon. Minister could have had the kindness to go down only 800 miles and see the people of this region, in the month of August, this difficult month of August, he would have fully realized and appreciated the difficulties of these people.

How naked they are, how under-fed they are. In spite of the rich minerals available in that part of the land, they are not able to get down the mining pit and get work. They are dying out due to disease and there are no hospitals, not even enough rice to eat, for that part of the country is suffering from drought. So far as the linguistic minorities are concerned, Sir, let me point out that the people who speak Bengali, or the people who speak Hindi, Gujarati or Marathi or English, are not the only minorities. These tribal people whom I have mentioned, have their own languages which they speak among themselves and with their families; they too need this protection and if that protection is not given to them, they will go down. In the Second Five Year Plan there is to be so much industrialisation, but the prosperity of these people will not come about, though they live in areas which are so rich in minerals. So

I appeal to this Parliament to make some provision for their protection. The Government of India have a lot of facts and figures and they can find thousand and one reasons and arguments for giving protection to these linguistic minorities also.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Have you finished?

SHRI T. BODRA: Only one or two more minutes. I will just quote one paragraph from the book "Tribal India Speaks". On page 106, it is stated:

"In a democratic India, the Aborigines, like any other race in the country, have a right to demand and agitate for a separate province if they honestly think that this would give them a better chance as men and as Indian citizens. It is for the Central Government to decide in view of the general good, whether the demand is mature, timely and for the welfare of all the inhabitants of the areas concerned in these individual states and in the country as a whole. It is for the states concerned to prove to the Aborigines, more by works than by words, that it is in the interest of both the common good and the good of the Aborigines, that they should remain citizens of their present states. The next five years are a challenge to the administration of the various states to prove this. To regain or to keep the love of the Aborigines will be one of the major tasks, more gigantic than the D.V.C. or the Kosi schemes, and very likely more urgent and more difficult if not more costly.

"The question of recasting the old provinces of India on a cultural basis is an All-India question."

—and I would say there is a strong case for Jharkhand—

"Whatever be one's opinion, let no one belittle, despise or oppress the Aboriginal because he dared to clamour for a Jharkhand (forest area) state whether by Jharkhand, he means, South Bihar only or the whole of the Jharkhand (forest) belt from Bombay to Assam between Aryavavata proper and Deccan. The demand of the Aboriginal may not be timely, but it is not foolish. There is a case to be made for a reshuffle of provinces even for Aborigines. Recent history proves for instance that Santhals in Monghyr district were not protected by special

[Shri T. Bodra.]

laws, as they were in Santhal Parganas with the result that the Santhals in Monghyr district are starving and perishing."

Therefore, Sir, I would appeal to the hon. the Home Minister to see to it that if we are not to get anything else, at least the zonal council should be vested with more power and more and more protection should be given to see that these linguistic minorities, from the tribals, too, do not perish, but they survive.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): I am a displaced person and for many months past I, as a displaced person from Sind, have felt like a misplaced person. Pakistan threw me out of Sind and scattered me all over India. And now, I like other Sindhis, had the apprehension that we would not have one Pakistan but several Pakistans within India. We have passed through a time of great anxiety and apprehension and it is to my great relief that after all these tribulations we have found light, that we have come to the right road and I, as other displaced persons, feel that after all, I am again placed on a safe road.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): But you are rehabilitated now.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: Yes, I may be rehabilitated, but you have been dehabilitating me in my mind and in my emotions.

Though I am a displaced person, in a way, I am a well-placed person especially for the consideration of a Bill like this. I say that we should here develop a kind of a convention that whenever on any subject great passions are aroused, when emotions are aroused to the extent that we are not able to come to any sound judgment, in a cool and considered manner, the convention should be that the parties interested and agitated, should place their case before us and then keep quiet and let the rest decide for them. As a matter of fact, when I spoke on this subject last time, I gave a kind of a challenge to my hon. friend Deogirikar and told him: "Either you go to the High Command and get its verdict and bow your head to that decision, or do the next best, namely, you give us your brief, place it before us and then keep quiet. Let us decide for you". It appeared then that my cry

was a cry in the wilderness; but ultimately, Sir, that cry in the wilderness has come to be the true cry, for it was only when Members of the other States suddenly realised their joint responsibility, to all the people and to the country, it was only then that we were able to come to some sort of a decent, I will not say a fine decision, but a fair decision. It was only when people whose emotions and passions were not so much roused, but roused just enough to hear the call of the nation, that they gave a decision which the people and the country have accepted. Sir, this Parliament will go down in history as a great Parliament, for doing such a great thing at the right time when the country was in tribulations.

Sir, personally as an Indian I am full of regrets now. There was a time when I felt dejected. But now I am full of regrets. I feel more like looking within myself, more in an introspective mood, and I want to know why these things happened and what were the reasons behind them. And I feel very much ashamed of myself. I am not at all proud of the organisation to which I have had the honour to belong for so many years, when I think of the behaviour of many of its members during the last few months; and I am extremely sorry for a number of other parties, communal and non-communal, and their behaviour during the last few months. There was a time when not only I, but much bigger persons than myself, got shaken to the roots about the very future of India and its solidarity. We found that communalism, though it was scotched, was not killed. We found provincialism rampant and we found political parties were without any code of honour and they were out to make up a case and to re-entrench themselves and rehabilitate their lost reputation by alliances, holy or unholy. We did not know on whom to depend. For years, Sir, we have been looking to the High Command, but this time even the High Command was shaken and it did not see light. And that is the great regret.

That regret makes me feel whether our future is going to be as bright as we expect it to be. It can only be when we avoid the mistakes of the past. It is quite obvious, Sir, that we got our swaraj too cheap. We have made too few sacrifices for it and that is why we lack what is now called an emotional integration. We lack that dedication to the country, that love for the country

without which no country can become great. Our country can never become great if the present tone of lack of affection towards the country continues where every personal, every communal, every regional and sectional interest is put ahead of the country. Such a country can never become great with all the leaders that we have with all the legacy that we have, with all the blessings of Gandhiji. Such a country cannot lead its own people, much less be a leader of other nations. And yet, I have hope because we have great leadership. I have every hope, but, at the same time, I do not know my way. I am lost in my way and I do not know how this emotional integration will come, how this passion for the country will grow where small, petty and trivial interests will not stand before the interests of the country. I do not know myself but I do feel that certain things may be done today and in the Bill, certain attitudes may be adopted and through the Bill, which might help us in this emotional integration. Sir, even out of evil cometh good and let me say, even out of these disputes, may come good and we may stand on our feet again and not on our head any more.

Sir, looking at the Bill and turning the pages, nothing interested me so much as the Chapter—I think it is in Part III—on Zonal Councils. Take away that and the Bill appears to be more or less a common place, humdrum thing making adjustments, creating States but nothing very promising, nothing very luminous. To my mind, the Chapter on Regional Councils though small is the most luminous and the most promising.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA: Zonal Councils.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: I mean Zonal Councils. I said something else? What did I say?

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA: Regional Councils.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: It is the same thing. The provisions, as they are, are few and yet important. The composition of the Zonal Council is excellent. But to my mind, their functions leave much to be desired; they are more or less of an advisory nature. I am not bold enough just now to suggest that these functions should be made executive but I certainly do desire that one of these days the Zonal Councils do grow into

something like Zonal Assemblies with executive powers, if not legislative powers and we should do nothing to hinder that, to my mind, very natural progress. I would go further and very much desire that the principle behind this Zonal Council should be extended and applied in other spheres as well, not only in this particular sphere. I would like to apply the principle, more especially to the services. I would like to have not two All-India Services but more than two Indian Services. This is a Welfare State, a Development State and we should have an All-India Development Service. Why not? If we could have an All-India Police Service, why not an All-India Development Service? I am aware that at present this service is on a very temporary basis and one of the reasons why development work is not going ahead is that not the very best people are selected for it. Those who are there are men of many departments and others come in temporarily and it is thus in a state of complete flux. It is the most important kind of work that we are doing but we have transitory men there. It should be called not the Development service but the miscellaneous service. It is a temporary service; it has no core of permanent, trained and experienced men and we call this a Welfare State on a Socialistic pattern. That service, as I said just now, is a heterogenous and a temporary service. To my mind, it is far more important that such a service with permanent and experienced hands should belong to an all-India cadre.

So far as the Public Service Commissions are concerned, I would apply the same principle as applies to the Zonal Councils. I will not scatter and disperse the public Service Commissions into eighteen or fourteen parts in every State. I would have a Public Service Commission for each Zone though not for each State. I would see to it that whenever appointments are made in each State by the Public Service Commission, at least 50 per cent. should come from the other State of the Zone—so with all the five Zones—so that the Services become a Zonal Service and yet a local State Service. I would see to it that whenever appointments are made in these Services, especially important appointments are made in these Services, the recommendations of the Public Service Commission should be more or less final and should not be thrown overboard by the executive. If and when it is necessary that the recommendation

[Prof. N. R. Malkani.]
of the Public Service Commission should not be accepted, then they should have the consent of the Governor. I am coming to the Governor later on but so far as the recommendations of the Public Service Commission are concerned, they should be final, more or less.

I will even say, with regard to the Zonal Councils, that whenever they make any recommendations which are more or less, unanimous, a convention should grow that they must be implemented. The convention should grow that the Governor should see to the implementation of unanimous recommendations of the Zonal Councils. These are steps forward to integrate India organisationally, to build up new attitudes of behaviour, new reactions and new responses. Let that emotion come from the top or from the bottom, I do not mind from where, but we shall make our life anew and we shall make India a leading nation and a leader of other nations as well.

I would like to apply the same principles to the High Courts. The High Courts may have uniformity in regard to the salary of Judges and so on and so forth but when appointments are made, I would say again that there should be five cadres for the five Zones. In each Zone, fifty per cent. of the Judges should come from the States of the Zones and all appointments should be made on the recommendation of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court with the President's sanction so that the services may cease to become provincial.

Sir, it is very unfortunate that provincialism is less with politicians but is much more in the case of the Services. It is rampant in the Services. I belong to a community which goes for jobs and it suffers from this provincialism which is very rampant among the Services. There is no use making an appeal to politicians here because provincialism is more rampant amongst the Services.

The Services must be taken out of it, kept above that by extending the zonal principle to them also. Sir, I would go further and I would make the Governor not a figure-head, not a social entity and a political non-entity, not a mere adviser for whose advice nobody cares, not a person who goes about in some ridiculous manner living in a huge bungalow in which he himself perhaps feels unhappy because some of us were very

poor. Some of us have seen great hardships. In any case if you were to put me in the Governor's house I would be lost in a few months if not in a few weeks. It is unhappy that they are put in these huge structures where they are utterly lost. I would give them, however, important duties if not functions, not legal duties but political duties or create functions for them to make them more important. For instance, Sir, as rightly recommended in the Report also, so far as the minorities are concerned, it would be their special responsibility. It is a right decision—just the decision. I would go further and expand it and extend it. It is a good thing. Here is a man, a senior man, a respected man coming from some other State and a Governor living in a big bungalow with pageantry and all that. Why not give him something worthwhile, though he may be living in that bungalow, to look after the well-being of the so-called Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes living in the cottages, look after the backward regions in that State? I have given him a special responsibility of a non-controversial nature. It is a non-political thing, but it is a thing which we have neglected. Sir, I have worked in the Harijan Sevak Sangh for many years and even now I am closely connected with it. I know to what extent their welfare and their well-being is neglected by the State and, may I say, even by the Harijans themselves. I have a grouse against them, that they are themselves not as active and as earnest as they should be for their own well-being. They are out for their individual ends, for some job, for some position, for some sheltered place, some place for themselves but not to help their own people. But if they were to do so, in that case Harijan welfare would go at a faster speed than is the case at present. Sir, I would make the Governor more or less guardian, a guardian angel of all neglected people, suppressed people, helpless people like the Scheduled Castes, the Scheduled Tribes and the Backward people in his own area. Now I would extend that principle further. Sir, I would go further and would say—I am bold to say so—that all heads of departments and all secretaries who are heads of official portfolios should not be appointed by the Governor but their appointment should receive his approval, because we do know that much depends upon the suitability of a man to be a secretary or to be the head of a department; and we do know unfortunately that in many cases

influence, ambition, rivalry and petty things come in so that we don't have good administrators at the top and so wherever you go you hear somebody whisper in your ear, "I have no god-father." Everywhere people say, "We have no god-father, nobody to put us here and there" as if everybody who is in an important place has a god-father or, rather I would say, devil-father. In the case of men who come up by merit, they deserve to be where they are. But today the feeling outside in the streets is a very unhappy feeling and it is that people in position are there, not because of merit but because they have a 'father' who puts them in that position by hook or crook, who belongs to a Party and supports them and so on. It completely demoralises our administration. When I say to them, "I won't interfere in this matter", they tell me that I am a crank. Of course I cannot but be a crank because I have no Party in the sense that I do not belong to this Group or that Group and surely because of that I can talk about it. But the rest do go with recommendations, letters and so on to the Ministers and others asking them to put their own people in particular positions.

Sir, I am very much of the view that today the administration has got to be purified and put on a high pedestal. Then the people who are responsible for the administration, who are to carry out important policies, when they are appointed, their appointment must receive the consent, to my mind, of the Governor. I am of that opinion, Sir, and I would even say that the Governor should be given powers of suspending an officer, if necessary in an emergency. Just as there are his other emergency powers I would also give him the power of suspending a high officer if and when necessary. He may not do so in fact, but the power in itself will be a sobering factor, would be a controlling factor and would raise the status of the office, would raise the atmosphere within the administration. Sir, I would even give him another power, a power by convention, and that would be as I suggested before. If a Zonal Council makes certain recommendations which are more or less unanimous, I do not say exactly unanimous, more or less unanimous, and the States are found to be cool about certain recommendations, then to warm them up, to pull them up, to shake them up to see that their recommendations are actually implemented I rather think the Governor

should be expected to play his own part and see to it that the recommendations of these Zonal Councils are not ignored. Often they are not resisted, but they are not touched either. But they should be taken up; they should be implemented. The Governor should have the reports of their working. He should be able to guide and he should be able, if necessary, to pull up people and see to it that the recommendations are carried out. Otherwise, Sir, the Zonal Councils will be entirely in the air, only as toys to play with. I want them to be fine good institutions to create a kind of an attitude of solidarity of the nation so that the nation may itself stand together and take important steps when important steps have to be taken in modern India. I therefore look to this ray of light called Zonal Council and the principle behind it, the principle involved in that Zonal Councils, of integration, of making our attitude towards things different from what it is today.

Today the attitudes are disruptive. Today trivial interests come before the country and the country's interests are ignored. I expect that the Zonal Councils will put the country's interests before everything else, even though a particular State's interests may suffer, in order that India may be a great country.

I will just say a few words about linguistic minorities. I am myself of a minority but I am not standing up to talk about the protection of Sindhi. It can look after itself. It will survive. It is an Indian language, an important Indian language and it must stand on its own legs, but I would say, Sir, rather than take a negative attitude of giving protection to linguistic minorities. I would also suggest a positive attitude of taking positive steps in that direction. I suggest to my own Sindhis in Gujarat, to learn Gujarati immediately, at least after the IV standard if not earlier to learn Gujarati, write Gujarati, speak Gujarati. "If you are in Maharashtra", I say, "Learn Sindhi upto the IV class; after that learn, write, talk Marathi." There should be a convention for the linguistic minorities not to persist in maintaining their "safeguards" and making an "appeal" every now and then to the Governor, but see to it that they learn the regional language where they are living their full life for generations together. There must be a convention of that kind. I know Bengalis living in Bihar—I was in Bihar for several

[Prof. N. R. Malkani.]
 years— not looking at Hindi, even now not caring for Hindi. Lakhs of them have been in Bihar for years and yet they feel that Bihari is nothing, Hindi is nothing and when they do talk Hindi it is less good than what I can do. Now we must have a convention that the linguistic minorities must learn, as a matter of course, the language of the region but, Sir, more than that I would say, as I did not believe before, as I believe now, that Sanskrit as a language might almost be made compulsory all over the country, north and south and east and west and over all the Zones. Just now somehow I begin to feel that while I am searching in darkness what factors can bind us and bring us together I am searching like a blind man what factors can bring us together and I feel that here is one, so far as languages are concerned, which can bring us together. Even the Tamil and the Bengali, the most parochial States in India today which, to my mind, hinder the linguistic integration of India, I think even there they would find it difficult to resist Sanskrit.

Sir, I would go further and I would say if possible, and if it is desirable it should be possible, that India, at least north India or a large part of India, at least three out of the five zones should have a common script. Nothing will bring us together. Take my own Sindhi, I tell you that if we two Sindhis talk perhaps you may think that it is some tribal language. But let me write my Sindhi in Nagari script and I challenge you that 50 per cent. will be understood by you, if not more, and so is the case with every other language. Bengali if it is written in Nagari, and if I know the context, 50 per cent. I will be able to understand. It may not be so with regard to Tamil. But so far as the north Indian languages are concerned, nothing will bring us together, nothing will enrich us, nothing will enrich Hindi more than a common script. To my mind that will bring us together. So, Sir, these are steps in the right direction which are only steps, because ultimately the integration must be emotional and that integration has not yet come. A great calamity perhaps may evoke that great emotion, that great passion. In the world great calamities, great wars have evoked that emotion. God forbid, we do not want a war here. We have some fear of Pakistan. I wish we had a little more fear than we actually have. If we had a greater fear of Pakistan, perhaps some emotion might be deve-

loped to put us together. But I do not know how, because even Gandhiji could not evoke in us that great passion, that great love for the country not even the Congress could evoke that passion, that great love for the country though it is for the love of the country, for the solidarity of the country for which it stood that I honour the Congress and to my mind I consider myself honoured that I am a member of the Congress. But today even the Congress has failed so far as the solidarity of the country is concerned. I do not know how this emotion will come and envelop us.

Sir, only one word about what has happened in Bombay and other places. I do not wish to rake up all these; it is no use raking up the past. Things have cooled but things are not quite yet. It is true that Parliament's word, the voice of the nation or the voice of the High Command transformed and transmuted into words of Parliamentary, has been accepted but unfortunately the country has accepted it a little too coolly—I do not say coldly—but I wish the reception had been more warm. I find that both sides have accepted it but not with much warmth and cordiality; and that is why the reaction in Gujarat has been of the type for which we are all sorry and for which they themselves will be sorry tomorrow. Unless the parties realise that both of them have blundered, that both of them have let down the country badly, unless they realise their lapses which they have committed for the last ten months or so, unless the Maharashtrians and the Gujaratis—I have close relations with both, more with Gujaratis of course than with Maharashtrians—unless both of them realise their lapses, to my mind serious and grave lapses, of the last ten months, there can be no cordiality. Unless both of them also realise that they are mutually dependent on each other, intertwined with each other that they cannot do without each other, unless they help each other and thus help the country, unless both of them realise that only if they stand together Bombay will become Greater Bombay, unless they realise that they are all indispensable to each other, that they have been fools, that they have been blundering, there would be no feeling of warmth and cordiality in the country. I would suggest that when the Parliament is over—I would offer myself for that kind of job or mission—a goodwill mission should go round from Gujarat to Maharashtra, to Bombay and to all other areas where there have

been emotions and passions roused. If people from other States who were not moved by emotion were taken round with Gujaratis and with Maharastrians into those areas we can see in the next fifteen or thirty days that the wounds are healed and see that the people smile not only from the lips but from their very hearts. Only then, I may say, we shall have hope. Otherwise when we look outside India it is quite bright but when we look inside it is dark and it, is, to my mind, very depressing. Sir, let us hope that we have turned the corner, that India has today before it a great future outside and a greater within itself, that we have not only come to the right road, but will keep on to that right road and march forward.

श्री बी० पी० अग्रवाल (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : उपसभापति महोदय, शुरू से जब से राज्य पुनर्गठन का सवाल उपस्थित हुआ है अब तक इसमें मैंने कोई विशेष दिलचस्पी नहीं ली। मेरा जीवन उत्तर भारतवर्ष में प्रायः सभी प्रान्तों में थोड़ा-थोड़ा बीता है। राजस्थान में जन्म होने के कारण मैं राजस्थानी होने का दावा करता हूँ। बंबई में कितने ही वर्ष मैं रहा हूँ और उत्तर प्रदेश में, मध्य प्रदेश में और बंगाल में भी। यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता था कि यह कंट्रोवर्सी, इतना वादविवाद जो इस सवाल पर चल रहा है यह किस लिये है। दुर्भाग्य का विषय है कि जिस दिन से हमारे ऊपर यह भाषा का भूत सवार हुआ है, हम लोग अपने आपको भूल गये हैं। एक समय था कि जब कांग्रेस ने भाषावार प्रान्तों की योजना किसी कारणवश उचित समझी थी। किन्तु समय बदलता है और समय के साथ सिद्धान्त भी बदलते हैं। यह आवश्यक नहीं है कि एक बार जो हम लोगों ने कोई सिद्धान्त किसी कारणवश स्वीकार किया था, उसको हम हमेशा मानने के लिये बाध्य हैं। उत्तम यही होता कि वर्तमान बदली हुई परिस्थिति में हम लोग अपनी उस भूल को शुरू में देख लेते और इस बात को मान लेते कि उस वक्त जो कुछ हम लोगों ने सोचा था वह उस समय की परिस्थिति में उचित था, किन्तु आज की बदली हुई परिस्थिति में यह भाषावार प्रांतों का बटवारा, यह भाषावार देश का विभाजन हम लोगों के लिये घातक होगा। वह महात्मा गांधी की महान शक्ति थी कि जब कभी उन्होंने बड़े से बड़ा काम शुरू किया और आगे चल कर उनकी समझ में यह बात आई कि हम गलत रास्ते पर जा रहे हैं तो उन्होंने अपनी हिमालियन ब्लैंडर कह करके ऐसे ऐसे सवालों को छोड़

दिया, किन्तु हमारे दुर्भाग्य से आज वह शक्ति हम लोगों में नहीं रही कि यदि हमारी भूल हमारे सामने आ जाय तो हम फौरन उससे अपना कदम उठा लें। उस वक्त जो भूल हो गई थी अगर हम शुरू में उसे मान लेते तो संभव है कि जो इतने फूट के बीज बोये गये हैं और जो आज भारतवर्ष में जगह जगह हो रहा है वह न होता। पहले हम लोग कहा करते थे कि भारतवर्ष में फूट का कारण अंग्रेजों की, ब्रिटिश की डिवाइड एंड रूल की नीति है, किन्तु मेरे देखने में या आप सब लोगों के देखने में हम आज अंग्रेजों को या अन्य लोगों को इसके लिए दोष नहीं दे सकते। आज यह फूट इस देश में हमारी अपनी बोई हुई है। हमारी जनता प्रायः पढ़ी लिखी नहीं है। वह राजनैतिक मामलों में, अपने अधिकार के मामलों में अभी तक बहुत कुछ नहीं समझती है। जनता को उभारना हमारी लीडरशिप का काम है। उन्हें अच्छे रास्ते पर ले जायं या गलत रास्ते पर ले जायं, यह हमारे नेताओं के हाथ की चीज है। मेरी समझ में हमारे नेताओं ने महात्मा गांधी के अनुयायी होते हुये और अहिंसा के सिद्धान्त को मानते हुये भी उनके सिद्धान्तों के प्रति खाली मौखिक सहानुभूति दिखलाई है और अन्तरात्मा से किसी ने उनके सिद्धान्तों का पालन नहीं किया है। यदि हम अन्तरात्मा से उनके सिद्धान्तों का पालन करते तो आज यह परिस्थिति हमें देखने को नहीं मिलती। लिग्विस्टिक प्रश्न तो आज हमारे सामने आ रहा है इसके अतिरिक्त हमारे देश में और बहुत से फूट के कारण थे। जातीयता, प्रान्तीयता और भिन्न भिन्न प्रकार के फूट डालने वाले कारण हमारे यहाँ बहुत पहले से मौजूद थे। उनमें एक नया कारण ऐसा और जोड़ दिया गया है कि उसका कब निपटारा होगा, कैसे होगा, क्या होगा, इस पर विचार करके, जैसा मलकानी साहब ने कहा है, प्रत्येक आदमी को दुःखी होना चाहिये।

2 P.M.

किन्तु, जो कुछ हुआ सो हुआ, अब उन भूलों पर पश्चाताप करने से तो कुछ नहीं होगा। अब हमारे लिये यही उचित है कि इस परिस्थिति से जो कुछ शिक्षा हमें मिली है उससे हम लाभ उठायें। हमारे देश में यह जो फूट हुई है इसको किस तरह से मिटाया जाय, इसके लिये क्या उपाय किया जाय इसके ऊपर हम लोगों को पूरा ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है। हमारे देश में बड़े बड़े महात्मा और महापुरुष होते रहे हैं और किसी बात की हमें कमी नहीं रही है

¶ [श्री बी० पी० अगरवाल]

लेकिन यह सब होते हुए भी दुर्भाग्य से जो सबसे बड़ी कमी हमारे देश में रही है वह यह रही है कि हम में एकता नहीं रही है और हमारा देश आपस में फूट होने के कारण से हमेशा गुलामी की जंजीरों में जकड़ा रहा है।

[THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA) in the Chair]

यह अफसोस की बात है कि हम अभी तक इससे निकल नहीं सके हैं। महात्मा गांधी की ही यह विभूति थी जिसने कि राष्ट्रीयता की भावना देश के लोगों में फैलाई लेकिन अफसोस और दुःख है कि उनके चले जाने के बाद ही हम फिर उसी बर्बरता में गिर गये। यह आवश्यक है कि हम इससे निकलने की कोशिश करें। कितने दुःख का विषय है कि जिस साबरमती के किनारे हमें सत्य, अहिंसा और प्रेम के उपदेश सुनने को मिले थे आज उसी साबरमती के किनारे पर भाई भाई आपस में लड़ रहे हैं। मैं तो अपने सब भाइयों से यही प्रार्थना करूंगा और कहूंगा कि हमें इस दुःखद अध्याय को जहां तक हो सके बन्द कर देना चाहिये।

स्टेट्स रिऑर्गनाइजेशन बिल हम लोगों के सामने है और मैं इसे कोई बहुत आदर्श की चीज भी नहीं मानता हूं क्योंकि उत्तम तो यह होता कि हमारे देश के पांच, छः या सात डिवीजन किये जाते। जिस तरह से कि हमने ऊपर से पांच डिवीजन बनाने की बात रखी है उसी तरह से राज्य संचालन के लिये, एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव कनवीनिएंस के लिये यदि, पांच-छः या सात विभाजन कर दिये जाते तो बहुत अच्छा होता। भाषा के सवाल को या और सवालों को अलग रख कर के केवल शासन की सुव्यवस्था के लिये ही छः या सात डिवीजन होने चाहियें थे, यदि देश एक उत्तर भारतवर्ष में, एक पश्चिम भारतवर्ष में, एक दक्षिण भारतवर्ष में, एक पूर्व भारतवर्ष में और एक मध्य भारतवर्ष में विभाजन किया गया होता, इस तरह से अलग अलग पांच, छः डिवीजन बनाये जाते तो उससे बहुत कुछ सुभीता होता और यह आपस का वैमनस्य और झगडा फसाद नहीं होता। किन्तु, आज जैसी परिस्थिति उत्पन्न हो गई है उस परिस्थिति में तो ये सब बातें बहुत दूर की रह गई हैं। अब तो यह संभव नहीं है। इस वक्त हमारे सामने जो स्टेट्स रिऑर्गनाइजेशन का बिल है वह एक तरह से काम्प्रोमाइज की चीज है। जिन्होंने कि इस सवाल को फिर से उठाया और बम्बई की समस्या को हल करने के लिये, एक रास्ता

निकाला उन लोगों का हमें कृतज्ञ होना चाहिये। इस अवस्था में सिवाय इसके कि हम इस बिल का पूर्णतया समर्थन करें और कोई दूसरा मार्ग हमारे सामने है ही नहीं। मैं समझता हूं कि इस बिल का समर्थन करने से ही यह समस्या हल होगी और जो झगड़े उत्पन्न हुए हैं वे भी शीघ्र ही मिट जायेंगे।

कहा जाता है कि माइनारिटीज की समस्या है। पहले तो हम धर्म की माइनारिटीज और तरह तरह की माइनारिटीज की बातें सुनते थे लेकिन अब भाषा की माइनारिटीज का एक नया सवाल पैदा हो गया है। वास्तव में देखा जाय तो माइनारिटी और मेजारिटी का सवाल हमारे देश में पहले कभी था ही नहीं। यह तो ब्रिटिश राज्य की करतूतें थीं। वे तो चले गये लेकिन उसकी बुनियाद हमारे सामने रह गई है और अभी तक हम लोग उसको नहीं भूले हैं। मेरे खयाल से अगर हम माइनारिटी और मेजारिटी के सवाल को इसी तरह से रखते रहेंगे तो फिर हमारे देश में कभी भी आपस में मेल जोल ही नहीं हो सकेगा। आप देखें कि इस देश में बहुत से समाज हैं, जैसे कि पारसी समाज है और उस समाज में थोड़े से लोग हैं लेकिन थोड़े से लोग होते हुए भी वे किसी तरह का स्पेशल सेफगार्ड बगैरह नहीं मांगते हैं और वे खूब अच्छे ढंग से चल रहे हैं। मुझे एक समय की बात याद है जब कि इस देश में साइमन कमीशन आया था। उस वक्त कलकत्ता के मारवाडी समाज के कुछ लोगों ने उसके सामने यह बान रखी थी कि हम लोग बंगाल में माइनारिटी में हैं इसलिये हम लोगों को कुछ स्पेशल राइट्स दिये जायें, कुछ विशेष अधिकार दिये जायें और कुछ सीट्स दी जायें। लेकिन उस समय में बंबई में था और हम लोगों के बम्बई के समाज ने कहा कि हमें कोई सेफगार्ड्स नहीं चाहिये, हम देश के अंग हैं और जो ये अच्छी या बुरी हालत देश की होगी वैसी ही हमारी भी होगी, देश के उत्थान और पतन के साथ ही हमारा भी उत्थान और पतन है। तो जब तक हम लोगों में यह भावना नहीं होगी तब तक माइनारिटीज का सवाल हल होने वाला नहीं है।

इन संक्षिप्त विचारों के साथ मैं अपनी बान खत्म करता हूं और इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूं।

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Madam, I rise to give my wholehearted support to the States Reorganisation Bill as it

has now emerged after undergoing very many vicissitudes of life. We all know that we must pay rich and handsome tributes to those friends of ours in the Lok Sabha who evolved a formula for solving the tangle of Bombay and thus succeeded in securing 240 Members of the Lok Sabha to put before the Government a solution of the Bombay problem. We are sorry that those hon. friends of ours in the Lok Sabha did not think it fit and proper to include ourselves also in putting that proposition before the Government, but we make no complaint of it. We refused to be ignored and the next day when the Parliament met we took up the very same proposal and secured signatures of our friends in this House and expressed our complete agreement and willingness with the step that our friends of the Lok Sabha had taken. I am very happy indeed that our joint efforts have succeeded and succeeded unexpectedly and completely. The net result of the effort, in which I must mention by name our old leader, our ex-Congress President, Acharaya Kripalani and my hon. friend from the Praja Socialist Party, Shri Asoka Mehta, is the States Reorganisation Bill as it has emerged now. It has proved that the initial mistake that the Government committed in appointing the States Reorganisation Commission and selecting its personnel was this that it did not contain in its membership any prominent politician. That was the reason why some of the recommendations, I should say, of the States Reorganisation Commission failed and failed miserably. It was again the politicians and the Parliament who came to the rescue and evolved the formula by which that great and apparently insoluble problem of Bombay was solved.

I offer my best congratulations to my Maharashtrian friends all over the land who have succeeded completely in getting the thing very near to their heart, in getting their full desires and wishes satisfied. We all know that they had pinned their faith on Bombay and they had somehow or other come to the conclusion that the State of Maharashtra as recommended for them would be meaningless if it did not contain Bombay City also. Now this new formula contained in the present States Reorganisation Bill gives them the City of Bombay, whole and entire, and our congratulations are due to those Maharashtrian friends. I hope they will bestow the greatest possible care on the maintenance, survival, grandeur and great-

ness of the City of Bombay and make it greater still. I must also appreciate and admire the sacrifice made by the Gujarati friends in putting aside all considerations of minority and majority and accepting the proposal of the formation of a very big composite Bombay State knowing full well, as they did, that their percentage will be only 34 in that composite State of Bombay and that of the Maharashtrians 66. Now this is a great sacrifice worthy of the great people of Gujarat, the home of Mahatma Gandhi, and this sacrifice will remain written in letters of gold as long as India lives. The Gujaratis, as we all know, are very good people. They can make any amount of sacrifice. They have the advantage of money.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Not all of them.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: They are as docile as a little child, they are good and mild like a lamb. They are no doubt cunning and clever, especially as far as money is concerned, as a fox. And last but not least they are very hospitable indeed. With these attributes of theirs, with these talents, is there any surprise that these people are not afraid of minorities, majorities, and this and that? They are content with the formation of a composite Bombay State because they have got a feeling of self-confidence, a reliance in themselves, that wherever they are put, amidst whatever sort of men they are put, they will make their way, they will predominate over the other people by virtue perhaps of the advantages that I have mentioned which are their characteristics.

There is yet a device by which this small minority of 34 per cent. can be converted into a majority or something near majority if my friends, the Gujaratis, accept my suggestion and advice that I make bold to tender to them, and it is this that they should take themselves out of the narrow social outlook into which they have been falling, specially their womenfolk, since long. The world is changing, India is changing, the British Government has gone overseas, left India in dismay and disappointment, despair and discontent. Yet the Gujaratis stand where they did centuries ago. Their womenfolk would go and bow before the Mahatma and offer their gold ornaments, big and heavy ornaments, and do everything else, but they would never budge out of their kitchen or eat anything which is not cooked in their own 'rasoikhana'. This narrow outlook

[Shri H. P. Saksena.]

I hope and trust, will soon change and their social outlook will broaden in time to intermarry outside their caste, and if they decide to intermarry with the Maharashtrians, it will not take much time for their population to increase; the offspring will be known as Gujaratis and the present-day minority of the Gujaratis will be converted into a majority or near majority.

Madam, there was much talk about linguistic minorities. I wonder what this question of minority is based upon. Is it based on religion? If it is so, I ban it exclusively. If it is based on language, I taboo it wholly and exclusively and entirely, and I am very glad that the States Reorganisation Bill has laid low the demon of linguism which was taking every breath out of us and putting us into untold miseries and difficulties. The demon of linguism, I hope has been laid low once and for all and it will never raise its ugly head, and if miraculously enough it ever raises its head, there would be the youth of the country to crush it to death.

There are two things with which the people of a country, the people of a nation should be gifted, and they are duty and discipline. Duty, Madam, is towards God dictated by one's own conscience. The voice of conscience, the voice of God, is enough as we all know, and we should obey that command of our conscience unconditionally and implicitly. Another duty is with regard to man-made laws and that leads us to discipline. An undisciplined nation, an undisciplined people is like an unbridled horse which may go astray any moment, and no reliance can be placed on its deeds or on its activities or on its words. Madam, I have been a lawbreaker myself and it is a very ridiculous thing for me to be advocating discipline.

But then we made it a point under the advice and counsel of the great Mahatma that we shall be breaking only the bad laws. It of course presupposes that one should have the sense, the intellect and the intelligence to understand what laws are good and what laws are bad. The Mahatma in his great wisdom felt that the people of India were capable enough to differentiate between good and bad laws, and therefore, what he had advised us was to break the bad laws, whether it be the Salt Tax or anything like that, but good laws we were to obey. If people are capable enough to differentiate between good

and bad laws, it should be their duty to obey implicitly and faithfully, honestly and conscientiously, the good laws of the land. If they find that there are certain laws which are not to the interests of the country and are, detrimental not to the interests of any individual or small tract of land but to the interests of the people as a whole, they have got every right to bring them to the notice of the administration and also to tell the administration when they mean to disobey those particular laws. Then they may not forfeit the title of being treated as disciplined persons. But then both duty and discipline should be thoroughly understood and should be practised thoroughly; understanding a thing is one thing and practising it is another. It is only the practice that matters. No amount of preaching is of any avail if the preacher himself does not practise what he preaches. The same applies to the doctrine of truth and to the doctrine of non-violence. If I indulge in acts of violence and in untruth in thought and in deed and ask people to be non-violent and truthful, that would be hypocrisy. Similarly the best way to teach people to speak the truth is by one's own practice. I have asked people to point out to me whenever I have slipped and when they did, I have thanked them for having done so. That is how you can preach to other people and that is how you can make our nation a truthful nation, a nation which can always be trusted and depended upon. Why I am bringing in these two doctrine of truth and non-violence, of duty and discipline, in the midst of this debate is this: Our country is pledged, is wedded, to truth and non-violence from times immemorial. It was not only as a matter of political strategy or expediency for the sake of winning our freedom that we had adopted the principles of non-violence and truth, but we knew that the salvation of our land lay only in the practice of these two principles, and that is why we mean to continue them for future generations.

India, I am sure, has got a very bright future before it. Some hon. friend of mine was doubtful about what the future of India was going to be. I see no clouds in the horizon of the future of India. I am an optimist of optimists in this matter. and I would only remind my hon. friends that the various departments of life in which we are fast progressing are a symbol and a symptom of the shape of things that we are going to have in our country in the

near future. It may not be the near future. It may be the far and distant future, but then all good things take time to shape themselves. You cannot make even a gold ornament in a quarter of an hour. It takes days, if not weeks, for a goldsmith to prepare an ornament of your liking. When it comes to the rebuilding of a whole country it would certainly take a considerable time.

I am sorry, Madam, that this question of majority and minority is still haunting us. As I said, there is talk of safeguards. There is a full chapter devoted to the safeguards of linguistic minorities. What is this linguistic minority? If a brother of mine, if a neighbour of mine, if a friend of mine, speaks different language from that which I speak, what should it matter, so long as we are capable of passing on our thoughts, ideas and wishes to each other? There is no difficulty so far as the question of language is concerned. So far as religion is concerned, let God save us from that accursed thing known as religion-mindedness being introduced in the region of politics. If I love my God as everyone does, with the exception of a few friends perhaps to my right, we are certainly free to sit in our homes and worship our divinities in the manner we choose. There is no bar, there is no restriction, on that. But in administrative matters, in matters connected with the rebuilding and the reconstruction of a country, there is no reason why this religion should be brought in. One very esteemed friend—I will not name him—spoke yesterday about linguistic minorities and he wanted the assurances that have been given to these minorities to be honoured. I submit that the greatest assurances, the greatest guarantee of the fulfilment of those assurances, lie in the goodwill of the majority. If you somehow or other forfeit that goodwill, no number of assurances, no amount of lip sympathy, no statutory provisions even, would be of any use. So, the greatest assurance, the greatest guarantee, is the goodwill of the majority. This applies not only to the minorities but to the majorities also. If the majority knows that there are a set of people, its own brothers, friends and neighbours who find it difficult to convey their feelings, wishes and thoughts in a language which unfortunately they do not know, it is for the majority to show a sympathetic attitude towards them, advise them to pick up the rudiments of that language

which is commonly spoken by the people and then, if they fail, to help them, if they find it difficult, to remove their difficulty, and thus bring them on a par, on a level, with themselves.

That is the treatment which one human being ought to extend to another human being if we have not altogether forgotten all ethics of humanity and have brought ourselves to the position of being worse than beasts.

Now, Madam, the greatest day of sorrow for me at least and for many of us, was the day on which the proposal for the merger of Bihar and Bengal went wrong and a great patriot and a great leader had in a weak moment, to withdraw his own pledged and honoured word. Just a defeat of a Congress candidate at a by-election upset him so completely that he made no preparations kept the whole world uninformed and the next day announced that the merger proposal of Bengal and Bihar did not hold the ground, and it was withdrawn. That was a very sad day and a day of great sorrow for us all. If these two States of Bihar and Bengal had united, all the problems, especially now by the formation of this composite State of Bombay, would have been solved and my dream of dividing the country into five zones, North, South, East and West with Delhi as Centre should have been fulfilled but then unfortunately it was not to be. Now Madam, it is again time for both Bengalis and Biharis to reflect over the great and irreparable loss that has been done to the country as a whole to those two Pradeshes particularly, and not to think that all was lost and nothing else could be done. For friends to separate and then to meet again is an easy thing and it should be attempted repeatedly and repeatedly unless and until the object is achieved.

Madam, this States Reorganisation Bill gladdens our heart in this sense that it is the harbinger of the greater unity of India, the solidarity of the different portions and States of this great land and that is why I said that I envisage a very great and bright future for India and there is no despondency, no disappointment in my heart, in my breast. Everything is clean. There are no clouds and a very glorious sun of the new India is going to shine and shine very brilliantly and it will shed the greatest lustre like that of 2,500 years ago, the lustre that fell on not only India but on the whole world by the birth of that great

[Shri H. P. Saksena.]

Prince of Peace, Gautama Buddha. So we have that ideal before us and we shall continue pursuing this task of reconstruction and rebuilding of India and we hope, God will help us. Madam, the one thing of which the sponsor of the Bill spoke was about the Boundary Commission. I am terribly afraid of these Commissions and particularly this Boundary Commission and I hope and trust and I emphatically assert that the Government of India should not, in any weak moment, agree to the appointment of a Boundary Commission. We have had enough of troubles, enough of calamities, enough of knots and knotty problems to unravel and therefore we cannot go back again indulging in the solution of another difficult problem and I am dead certain that if the Government of India lapses into the appointment of Boundary Commission, it will be a terrible day for the country once again. These are administrative matters. The fixation of boundaries is a pure and simple administrative matter. The representatives of the people of both the areas can meet together and decide in a friendly and amicable way the boundaries. After all whether the boundary post is pitched here or there, fifty yards in the north or south, should not make much difference. The whole area will remain inside the country and it will be belonging not exclusively, say in one case, to Uttar Pradesh. It will be belonging to the whole of India and therefore there should be no grouse, no complaint and no grievance on that account but I humbly, respectfully but most emphatically recommend that no Boundary Commission for the solution of administrative limits should be appointed.

Now there is a small request, I should say, on the part of our friends from the Andhra Pradesh, that they should have a Second Chamber. Now so far as the Constitution goes, it explicitly lays down that the formation of Second Chambers in a State is the prerogative of the Legislative Assembly of that State. The Constitution or the Central Government has no say and no voice in the matter but if there is any hitch, it should be, I hope it will be, allowed by the Centre. Because Andhra wants a Second Chamber, it should be allowed to have it. There should be no restriction on its having a bicameral legislature.

Madam, I may remind you that it was this Andhra which was the cause of all

linguistic troubles in India and it was this Andhra State on the formation of which while I was speaking, I reminded the hon. House as well as the Government: 'Let this be the last word on the subject of the formation of linguistic States but unfortunately my advice was not paid attention to and the result we have all seen.

I shall be failing in my duty if I do not express my heart-felt sympathy to the members of the bereaved families of those persons who lost their lives, who were killed and butchered in the streets, by their own men, by their own brethren, by their own neighbours, for the simple fault that they spoke another language. The killers spoke one language and the killed spoke another language.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO (Hyderabad): There was no such thing at all.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I note these interruptions; but for one thing, they are semi-voiced and spoken only in whispers which I cannot obviously respond to. And secondly, I am one of those who consider it as bad manners to be interrupting a person when there is no ground, no cause, no room for it. Of course, if there is room for interruption, one must interrupt, as I do sometimes.

So I am glad to note that this demon of linguism, as I call it, has been laid low and that gives me great rejoicing. The one thing that I have pleaded for is the non-appointment of the boundary commission. I further say that there is no necessity for any safeguard for linguistic minorities. We should not treat ourselves as distinct from one another, living as we do in the same area, in the same country and pledged as we are to the unity and solidarity of our country. How can we become so narrow in our outlook as to demand safeguards for the protection of our language? Language and culture, Madam, never die. They take care of themselves, unless of course you unfortunately associate one language with one particular religion and another language with another religion. Unfortunately Dr. Gour is not here otherwise I would have given him a fitting reply to all his misstatements and bombast that he spoke yesterday.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: It will be communicated to him.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Madam, is it proper, is it wise, is it a service to a language to associate it with one particular set of people, with a set of people who profess one religion?

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: We do not associate a language with a particular community.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: The same is the case with that dear language, the language that is dear to me, namely Urdu. Some of my friends think that Urdu is their exclusive property....

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: No

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA:....that it was they who introduced that language to the world, that it was they who gave birth to it. Never, Madam, never. I emphatically repudiate this statement of theirs and I refuse to associate Urdu with any religion. I would never associate Hindi with Hinduism. Why should I? Hindi can be easily learnt by the non-Hindus, the Muslims, the Christians the South Indians, and my friends of the PEPSU led by my very esteemed friend Shri J. N. Kaushal. Here I must pay a tribute to my friends of the Parsi community who, even though they are an infinitesimal minority, never ask for any safeguards for their language or for their culture or for anything whatsoever. They swim with the rest of India and they sink with the rest of India. They go with the rest of India. They never claim any special privileges for their community. The same advice I would make bold to tender to my Muslim friends whose number has unfortunately, by the sheer obstinacy of a certain individual, been reduced from about ten crores to about four crores here in India and yet they have no ground, they have no room and they have no reason to apprehend any difficulty in the future. Their culture, their language, their social conditions and their traditions are all safe, being our own. Nevertheless, Madam, our Muslim friends in India are labouring under a very great misunderstanding.

श्री किशन चन्द (हैदराबाद) : बस करो, बस करो ।

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I never knew, Madam, that there were two presiding officers in this House at the present moment. I take very strong exception to the non-parliamentary voice raised by

my hon. friend Shri Kishen Chand. While, Madam, you are not stopping me from speaking, he says : बस करो, बस करो । That is bad on his part.

(The hon. Member resumed his seat)

I am not sitting down under protest. Do not be under that misapprehension.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Is it parliamentary to sit and talk like this?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Will you kindly repeat your query so that I may be able to reply to it?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: You are sitting and talking.

(Shri H. P. Saksena stood up)

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: No, I was addressing the Chair. I had first obtained her permission to sit down and then to make my point clear, subsequently to her.

Next I come to the question of the zonal council. I am not happy at the formation of the zonal councils. If we look for a while at the present state of the Punjab, that is how we feel. Our Prime Minister, concerned as he is with much bigger things, may think this petty. He thinks it is mischievous on the part of the Maha Punjab people or rather the Maha Punjab Samiti people, to be raising this agitation. But I say there can be no smoke unless there is some fire. Therefore, Madam, the wise policy is to find out the root cause of this trouble, the root cause of this agitation and then to treat it sympathetically and to put a stop to it. Mere indignation would not solve the problem. The thing is getting, unfortunately, deep-rooted. So before it goes down much deeper, it is up to us to evolve a solution. All is not well in the Punjab. They are a warrior people and it is a matter of pride. The Punjab used to be the granary of India in olden times. Now too it is one of our sentinals on the frontier and it would not be wise to keep a section of that useful province of ours discontented and that is why, Madam, I say that these zonal councils should be modelled and shaped in such a manner as to give cent per cent satisfaction to the people residing in both the zones.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You are referring to Regional Committees, not Zonal Councils. They are bigger.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Call them by any name you like. One friend called them Regional Committees and he was promptly corrected by my friend from Madhya Bharat. I then thought that I was wrong and that Zonal Council is the correct expression but now I am told that the term "Zonal Councils" is not correct. I accept the correction and call them Regional Councils. Now, so far as these Regional Councils are concerned, I personally have no experience of these Councils and hope that those who have brought them into existence will take due care of them.

सरदार रघुवीर सिंह पंजहजारी (पैम्स) :
रीजनल काउंसिल्स के लिये आप कहते हैं कि लोग सेंट पर सेंट मानते नहीं हैं। तो फिर क्या होना चाहिये ?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Madam, it is a very awkward question that has been put to me. As you all know, I have no administrative experience. The one experience that I have is that of digging the foundations of the British Government and that experience is very limited. Therefore, it is not for a person like myself to be evolving a better formula than the one that has been proposed.

Now, the States Reorganisation Bill satisfies not only my friend Mr. Panjhzari but other people also and I shall be amply satisfied; nobody will be happier than myself, if the whole of Punjab is satisfied.

Now, Madam, this States Reorganisation Bill, as it has emerged in its present form will, I hope and pray, usher in a new era in the country and the 362 million people of this land will begin to live and love each other like real brothers and sisters forgetting all the unpleasant things that happened in the recent past, during the last eight or ten months, and embrace each other in an affectionate embrace of a newly found region of love and affection.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA: Madam, I belong neither to Maharashtra nor to Gujarat nor even to Bombay but am really very much concerned about some solution of this Bombay problem. I was out of Delhi when the atmosphere for the new formula of a bigger Bombay was being prepared here and all of a sudden I heard of it. I was much relieved to hear that it was agreed to by both the Maharashtrian and Gujarati friends. The

whole country generally shares the sense of relief today. Although a friend over there yesterday said that this new arrangement would be disastrous for the country....

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE (West Bengal): He has told the truth.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA:....the whole country, I think, shares this view that it is a great relief that this new formula has been found out. The Gujaratis in the new Bombay State will be a minority and yet they deserve all congratulations for their giving a courageous and correct lead at this time. Although some friends had gone to Gujarat during these days probably to fish in troubled waters, still I hope that this trouble will subside. I heard that in Bombay all people are happy over this formula, be they Maharashtrians or Gujaratis or anybody else. I think that it is a good formula and when Rajya Sabha has affixed its seal to it, it will become the law of the land. I think even the formula of having a centrally administered Bombay was not a bad one and the argument that was put forward by some people that there was animosity in the mind of Pandit Nehru against the Maharashtrians is entirely wrong. On the other hand, the Central Government had changed from one formula to another in order to satisfy the friends from Maharashtra and probably, it was at their own insistence that this formula was changed. The leaders of the Central Government had positively helped in the unification of Maharashtra but this 'now or never' attitude about Bombay, I think, was a wrong attitude. I know that there are riots in Gujarat but they are not directed against the Maharashtrians. That is a good feature. The riots that were organised in Bombay were certainly directed against the Gujaratis and the Kutchis which was not a good thing. Kakasaheb Gadgil who spoke in the other House and other who spoke about fighting in the streets did not say about the wounds inflicted on the Gujaratis. They did not shed any tears but if they had shed any tears they probably were crocodile tears. I am extremely happy that the Kakasaheb has now come round and blessed this new formula but in this heat the controversy, by attacking Shri Nehru and the Central Government, bad blood has been created and we have also weakened our sense of national unity and the democratic system in this country.

Madam, an important leader of Maharashtra once used to print a newspaper and on that newspaper there was a motto from Mahabhartar "साप्तादपि शरादपि" which means "Attain your objective by both means, by aggressive means as well as by peaceful means". That kind of a policy is bad. Our leaders should always give a correct lead.....

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: You are beating a dead horse.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA:.....although it may be unpopular for sometime. Even though it may be unpopular for some time, you should give a correct and a courageous lead. That will be good. Gandhiji did it many times. I congratulate the leaders of Gujarat who have openly said and courageously said that they would accept whatever is decided by way of a compromise. I think this should be accepted in the interests of Gujarat as well as in the interests of India. As one of our hon. friends said, Gujarat by itself would be a deficit State and Maharashtra by itself would be a deficit State without Bombay. So, both have accepted this in the interests of themselves and in the interests of the country also. Now, this decision is going to be Parliament's decision and it must be accepted. If there is any difficulty later on, there would be Constitutional ways of changing it to something better still but I think that at present this is a good formula and must be worked out and it can be worked out.

Madam, the solidarity and the unity of India is a precious thing and history has shown that whenever India was united, it was free or it could become free but when baser tendencies of separatism dominated us, we became slaves. Time and again, there have been events in our country that showed that our weaknesses come up to the surface. We should fight against casteism, communalism and provincialism and create real and everlasting oneness in our country.

3 P.M.

I do not mean to hurt anybody here, nor am I blaming any man or section, but really, it is the duty of every person and every section to build up the whole country's unity. Pandit Nehru recently has rightly said that language and culture are all right but they should unite us rather than separate

us and disunite us. Too much of linguism is bad. Are we not putting up claims for dividing the area village by village. I think we should not go below the taluka level and should not divide our country or reorganise our country below the level of talukas. Congress's new policy now is against this linguistic separatism. Madam, I cannot understand the language phobia or language mania of the Communist Party in India. If the Communist friends believe in democracy and in Parliament their role should be to stop violence, to pacify people and to abide by what the Parliament decides. An hon. Member of the opposite Party had just said: Ask the Congress Members to go and face the people in Gujarat. I say that the members from Gujarat are here and they know their responsibility to face their own constituencies and they will be going there and they are holding their meetings very soon. As I said, even if our policies according to them are not correct even if they be unpopular with them they have accepted them and they are going to face their own people. So our Gujarati friends deserve our congratulations for giving this courageous lead at this time. The people can be misguided only for sometime but not for long. Madam, the Communist Party stands for a slogan: "Workers of the world! Unite." When they want poverty, illiteracy, ignorance, disease and hunger to vanish from this country, how is it that they are sticking now so much to the bourgeois idea of language and culture? India has not yet attained economic prosperity and so economic and administrative factors should be given priority over this linguistic or any other factor. That is my advise to my Communist friends.

Then, Madam, there should be a code of ethics also among all the parties of our country. Elections are coming and there are many affairs of national importance. So there should be some code of ethics or some general rules which should be followed by all the Parties of India. After all all these Parties aim at the good and the welfare of the whole country and of its masses.

Now I fully support the new provision of a bilingual Bombay State in this Bill. The new light of multi-lingual States in this country did not dawn from the East, but from the West and let it spread now to the East. Madam, in the journey of the progress of our country this reorganisation, if effected with good-

[Shri Gopikrishna Vijaivargiya.] will, will also go down in history as an important stage in the progress of our people. I have been one of those who strongly supported the idea of a big new Madhya Pradesh in my part of the country, a big new Madhya Pradesh out of all the Hindi-speaking areas. It includes Bhopal, Vindhya Pradesh, Madhya Bharat and the residuary Madhya Pradesh. Though there would have been many advantages to us in a parochial, small Madhya Bharat, we sacrificed our separate Madhya Bharat in the interests of a greater merger, which will be a bigger asset for the unity of the country. I have to point out one thing in this connection that in the bigger Bombay our friends from Maharashtra should be happy with such industrious people and adventurous people as the Gujaratis whom some have called money bags. There are some money bags there with them but they will create prosperity by flourishing business and industries. If they do not want these money bags please let them join us and our people of big Madhya Pradesh are prepared to invite them to come to our State of Madhya Pradesh. Let them come over to our State and join us.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): They will come in spite of that.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVARGIYA: Madam, all the four States comprising the new Madhya Pradesh wish for an Upper Chamber and I am glad that this has been provided. We would very much like to see that there are Upper Chambers in all the big States of India, and I think that all the States are now big enough. So there should be Upper Chambers in all these States.

Now only a few words more about the scheme of this Bill. I think the Bill is all right and I do not find any defects in it. I shall briefly narrate them. In Part I there are the preliminaries. Part II contains the main subject, that is, the territorial changes and the formation of new States. The three portions, that is, Maharashtra, Gujarat and Bombay territory are now united into one Bombay State. As regards the territorial changes in Bihar and Bengal we shall consider them in a separate Bill. Now the main thing in the Constitution is that the First Schedule in the Constitution stands entirely changed. Part III contains provisions about Zones and Zonal Councils. Here also many hon. friends have spoken about the Zones

and Zonal Councils and for this idea we should give credit to our Prime Minister who emphasised about this and at whose initiative this has been incorporated in this scheme of reorganisation. This is a very good feature. Although these Zonal Councils would be advisory bodies, they will prove to be the cementing force for the whole country. Then there are other Parts containing provisions about representation in Legislatures and provisions about High Courts financial arrangements, etc., the Services and legal matters. They are all consequential on this reorganisation and they are absolutely necessary.

About Boundary Commissions I also entirely agree that this would encourage separatist tendencies. Therefore for the present let us do without them and the Zonal Councils, when formed after the elections, will look to these border adjustments, of course below the district level. We should not divide the area village by village. We should not go below whole talukas and that is what I have said already.

There are the other changes, for example, the name 'Andhra-Telangana' has been changed to 'Andhra Pradesh'. The seats of some Union Territories have been increased, the Speakers and Chairman should be elected, etc. All these are things which are very reasonable and I support them. The appointed date for the new State to come into being has been changed from 1st October to 1st November. That also is proper.

Now in the end I would say that we are passing this Bill as well as the Constitution (Amendment) Bill very soon, without much delay, so that we may conclude all these things even before the great conference in London, which is considering the Suez Canal affairs, even before that concludes so that the prestige of our country may again rise and we may again rise in the eyes of all the nations, that we did solve this our thorny problem very smoothly.

Thank you.

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख (हैदराबाद) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, मैं यह जानता हूँ कि आज इस मामले में आखिरी लम्हा पर मेरी इस तकरीर का कोई फायदा नहीं होगा। लेकिन मैं अपना कर्तव्य समझता हूँ कि उस पर अपने ख्यालात का इजहार करूँ। यह बड़े दुःख की बात है कि गये ८ अगस्त से गुजरात में, और खास तौर पर

अहमदाबाद में, लोगों पर फायरिंग हो रही है और तकरीबन १८ लोगों, जिनमें ज्यादातर स्टूडेंट्स हैं, पर फायरिंग की गई। कांग्रेस की अहिंसक सरकार ने हिंसक गोली उन पर दागी और उनका खातमा कर दिया।

श्री भूपेश गुप्त : अहिंसक मर्डर किया।

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख : यह बड़े अफसोस की बात है कि एक तरफ तो कांग्रेस अहिंसा का शोरगुल करती है और दूसरी तरफ जिन तुलबा का खून अहमदाबाद के रास्तों पर बह रहा है उनके लिये सिर्फ हमदर्दी का इजहार करती है।

[Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the chair]

उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, यहां इस बात पर गौर करने की जरूरत है कि जहां पर यहां के कांग्रेसी नेता यह कहते हैं कि गुजरात में हमारे सब कोई हैं इसके बावजूद भी वहां पर इस तरह के निदर्शन हुये। क्या उन पर गोलीबारी बन्द की जा सकती थी? मैं एक मिसाल पेश करूंगा। कल के अखबार में था कि बड़ौदा में वहां के स्टूडेंट्स निदर्शन करना चाहते थे। पुलिस ने उनको रोक दिया। लेकिन जब कलेक्टर साहब वहां गये और स्टूडेंट्स ने कहा कि हमको निदर्शन करना है, तो कलेक्टर साहब ने इजाजत दे दी और स्टूडेंट्स ने बड़ी शांति से निदर्शन किया। इससे नतीजा यह निकलता है कि लोगों को अपनी मर्जी से जो निदर्शन वे करना चाहते हैं, अपने खयालात का इजहार करना चाहते हैं उनको अगर मौका दिया जाता तो यह गोलीबारी या इस किस्म के फसादात होने की कोई तक्को वहां नहीं थी। लेकिन मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि ऐसा पता चलता है कि कांग्रेसी हुकूमत किसी तरह से लोगों को निदर्शन करने से रोक कर ऐसे फसादात पैदा करना चाहती है कि वे अपने खयालात का इजहार न कर सकें। इसके बाद यह भी देखने की जरूरत है कि वहां के स्टूडेंट्स ने और दीगर लोगों ने यह निदर्शन क्यों किया। हिन्दुस्तान में तकरीबन ६० साल से अंग्रेजों के खिलाफ हम मूवमेंट करते रहे। इसके साथ साथ हम यह भी करते रहे कि भाषावार ग्रुप के लिए एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव ग्रुप अलग अलग बन जायें। जब स्वराज्य आ गया तो लोगों को यह यकीन हो गया कि चूकि हमारे नेताओं ने अंग्रेजों के खिलाफ जबानवार सूबों में तक्सीम करने की मांग की थी इसलिये उनके हाथ में हुकूमत आने के बाद जबानवार सूबे कायम हो जायेंगे। पार्लियामेंट में यह तहरीक आने से

पहले तक वहां के नेताओं ने महागुजरात का स्वप्न उन लोगों को दिखाया था और एकाएक उनके ऊपर महागुजरात नहीं बल्कि महाराष्ट्रियों का डामिनेशन लाद दिया गया। इस तरह की चीज उनके सामने आने के बाद जाहिर है कि उन्होंने निदर्शन किया।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, क्या भाषावार प्रान्त रचना कोई ऐसा प्रश्न है कि जिससे गोया हम हिन्दुस्तान की एक राष्ट्रीयत्व की भावना को तोड़कर हिन्दुस्तान से अलग हो रहे हैं। मुतलक नहीं। जहां मुस्लिम भाषाएं एक देश में, एक राष्ट्र में लोग बोलते हैं वहां पर एक भाषा बोलने वाले ग्रुप जो मुस्लिम तरह से एक दूसरे से सम्मिलित एक जगह रहते हैं उनकी ख्वाहिश यह होती है कि एक भाषा बोलने वाले लोग सब एक जगह आ जाय और क्या यह उनकी ख्वाहिश बुरी है या एक राष्ट्रीयत्व की कल्पना के खिलाफ है? ऐसा नहीं है। इसके बावजूद भी कुछ तारीखी हालात और कुछ खास हालात के तहत ये मुस्लिम ग्रुप्स गोया एक भाषी ग्रुप्स एक जगह रहे हैं। उनकी संस्कृति अलग है, उनका कल्चर अलग है और अगर किसी की यह ख्वाहिश है कि हम एक अपना एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव ग्रुप बना कर या एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव स्टेट अलग बना कर अपनी जबान को तरक्की दें, अपनी संस्कृति को तरक्की दें तो यह मैं नहीं समझता कि एक राष्ट्रीयत्व के खिलाफ होगा। यह होने के बावजूद और गुजरात के स्टूडेंट्स ने जो अपने खयालात जाहिर किये उसके बावजूद वहां की सरकार ने उनके उन खयालात का जायजा लेकर उसको यहां तक पहुंचाने की कोशिश करने के बजाय उनके ऊपर गोलीबारी की और उन पर सक्ती से दबाव डालने की कोशिश की। हिन्दुस्तान में बहुभाषिक स्टेट्स जितनी हैं उनकी निस्बत एस० आर० सी० ने यह जायजा ले लिया है कि जहां दो भाषी या बहुभाषी स्टेट्स एक जगह पर हैं वहां पर दो भाषी एक दूसरे के साथ समझौते से नहीं रहे हैं बल्कि उनमें हमेशा से जेलसी चली आ रही है। यह होने के बाद जब उनको यह मालूम हो कि महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात को एक जगह लाने के बाद महाराष्ट्रियों का डामिनेशन उनके ऊपर रहेगा तो मैं समझता हूं कि उनका यह खयाल कोई गैर वाजिब नहीं है।

मैं इस द्विभाषी बम्बई राज्य की मुखालिफत दो तरह से करता हूं। एक यह है कि दरअसल डेमोक्रेसी में, लोकशाही में, लोगों के खयालात

[श्री एन० बी० देशमुख]

सरकार तक पहुंच जायेंगे और सरकार लोगों के खयालात के मुवाफिक ही अपना निर्णय लेगी। लोगों ने, जाहिर है, कि एक भाषिक प्रान्तों की मांग मुस्लिम मुकामात से की और एस० आर० सी० ने भी बम्बई का एक सवाल छोड़ कर सब जगह एक भाषिक प्रान्त बनाने का फैसला किया और एक भाषिक प्रान्त बनाने की खास अहमियत दी, और अब जब कि सारे प्रांत एक भाषिक प्रांत बनने जा रहे थे, न मालूम कहां से यह तहरीक ऊपर से आ गई कि पार्लियामेंट के कुछ सदस्यों ने एक अप्लीकेशन दे दी कि बम्बई बाइलैंगुअल राज्य होना चाहिये। यह जो तरीका है कि लोगों के खयालात को नजर अन्दाज करके गोया पार्लियामेंट ने ऊपर से किसी चीज को लोगों के ऊपर थोप दिया, इस तरीके को मैं पसन्द नहीं करता और इस तरह से जो यह बाइलैंगुअल स्टेट गुजराती लोगों पर लादी गई है, यह मुनासिब नहीं है।

दूसरे इस वजह से भी मैं इसकी मुखालिफत करता हूं कि जहां हम एक भाषिक राज्य मांगते आये हैं वहां हम यह नहीं चाहते हैं कि हम किसी गुजराती पर डामिनेशन करें। हम इसको मुनासिब नहीं समझते हैं बल्कि हम अलग महाराष्ट्र और अलग गुजरात प्रांत बनाना ज्यादा मुनासिब समझते हैं। इस तरह से मैं यह अर्ज करूंगा कि यह तो बहुभाषिक प्रांत का निर्णय लिया गया है वह मुनासिब निर्णय नहीं है। उसकी मैं मुखालिफत करता हूं।

इसके साथ साथ सरहदों की निस्वत भी मुझे अर्ज करना है। हम यह देख रहे हैं कि जहां सरहद में एक भाषिक इलाके का कुछ हिस्सा दूसरे भाषिक इलाके में या दूसरे भाषिक प्रान्त में मिला दिया गया है वहां पर सब लोगों की मांग है कि इस तरह से नहीं होना चाहिये। बेलगाम और कारवार की सरहद पर, दीदर जिले के भालकी और संतपुर इलाके में और अदीलाबाद जिले में और हर इलाके में स्ट्रगिल जारी है।

मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि जहां स्ट्रगिल जारी है वहां लोगों की मर्जी के खिलाफ उनको किसी दूसरे स्टेट में थोपना मुनासिब नहीं है। खसूसन, बेलगाम को जो कि मराठी बोलने वाले लोगों का इलाका है उसको जो कर्नाटक में जोड़ने की कोशिश की गई है वह मुनासिब नहीं है। उसके लिये एक ही साल्युशन हो सकता है और वह यह है कि उसके लिये एक सरहद

कमीशन मकर्रर किया जाय और कांटेंगुअस इलाके का, मुत्तिसिल एक भाषाई इलाके का, अलग किया जाना ही इसका एक सच्चा साल्युशन हो सकता है, इसके सिवाय और कोई दूसरा साल्युशन नहीं है।

सिर्फ एक चीज की तरफ और आपकी तवज्जोह दिला कर मैं अपनी तकरीर को खत्म करूंगा। हम तकरीबन २०० साल तक हैदराबाद में एक जगह रहे हैं और अब हम महाराष्ट्र के साथ जो बम्बई है उसमें जा रहे हैं। गौकि हमारे इस्तिलाफात बहुत हो गये थे लेकिन फिर भी हम इतने दिनों तक हैदराबाद में रहे हैं और अब हैदराबाद के लोगों से अलग होते वक्त वाकई हमें थोड़ा सा अफसोस होता है।

इतना कह कर के, बहुभाषिक बम्बई सूबे की मुखालिफत करते हुए और यह बताते हुए कि इस हद तक दुरुस्ती होनी चाहिये, मैं अपनी तकरीर को खत्म करता हूं।

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI (Travancore-Cochin): Mr. Deputy Chairman, strange are the ways of God and stranger seems to be the course of politics. I never expected to discuss the States Reorganisation Bill in this House in such a calm and cool atmosphere. Bombay city which seemed to be a wedge driven between Gujarat and Maharashtra has now turned out to be the hinge on which both are held together. It is good. As the child is the living bond between the mother and the father, Bombay, the child of Gujarat and Maharashtra, is the living bond between them now. It is good....

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: A beautiful damsel.

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI: ...that a quarrel ended in the reconciliation of the couple and there are the blessings of the whole nation to the reconciled couple. Let Bombay be the home of harmony, concord and love. Let peace, prosperity and progress of Bombay provoke the bachelor unilingual States into matrimony, instead of their present monotonous, solitary and selfish existence.....

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Something for you, Mr. Gupta.

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI: But the marriage must be a marriage of love, spontaneous and mutual and not a forced one.

I am indeed very happy that after the threatening thunder and storm we are able to arrive at a decision, or rather a national solution of the most baffling problem. Of course, the national interest demanded a national solution and I am happy that Parliament rose to the occasion with courage and conviction. With the solving of this most intricate issue on Bombay, the debate on the States Reorganisation Bill in this House has lost all its anticipated excitement. Sometimes I wonder whatever lofty ideals our Prime Minister might preach, we most often function in our own narrow spheres, passionately attached to our own clan, class, language and State. In fact, I sometimes begin to despair whenever 'stalwarts' quarrel like little children over toys—quarrelling so violently that the beautiful little toy itself is likely to be dismembered!

Now Sir, the decision of a composite State for Bombay is well and good. But has not a lot of bitterness been created and venom poured out during the process—I ask. Virtue, valour, blackmarketing and profiteering, all these are not the exclusive preserve of one language, group or community. We have seen non-martial people becoming martial. We have seen new entrants in business being more tempted by profit.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not non-violently, but violently.

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI: But even from high quarters, intemperate words are uttered which neither enhance their prestige nor advance their cause nor serve the nation. After all, why is Bombay so much coveted by one party and resisted by the other? Is it mere sentimental attachment? I am afraid it is not. It is the prosperity of Bombay, its money, its commerce, its harbour, its factories that tempt. So, there is nothing wrong in saying that all who contribute to the prosperity of the city must generally come to an agreement. Otherwise, that which makes Bombay so tempting now, will not be there for long. Hence there was every reason to exercise restraint on the question of Bombay. Unless we in the Parliament of the nation try to lift the people to, higher plane of thinking and focus the attention of the people on the economic reconstruction of the country, where are we going? Making belligerent speeches in the Parliament and allowing disruptive forces to exploit the situation, to keep up

strife, to foment indiscipline and violence even among students, is no service to the nation. Sir, an hon. Member from Kerala seems to be everywhere, wherever there is a house on fire, with his tin of kerosene oil—whether it be Bombay, whether it be Poona, or Ahmedabad or a demonstration in front of the Parliament House. Solution of the problem is not their motto, but dissolution of the country.

Now, coming back to the Bill, I think by and large the propositions put forward are sound and good. We have to accept them and work them out. We have to forget our petty little quarrels about this chip of land and that chip of territory. When all is said and done we still have to live within the boundary of India, move about from place to place and settle down in whichever place congenial to us. We are not trees to be rooted to the soil, whether it be Malayalee soil or Tamil soil or any other soil. We are human beings who can learn a language and acquire a new mode of living. If we cannot, our children can. What is there to be downhearted if the people who speak your language become a minority in a State of your taluka goes to a new State? In the redistribution of States, the geographical, economic and linguistic aspects are considered and by one standard one area may go to one State and by another to a different State. So, the award of these disinterested persons we have to accept and respect and not try to attribute motives or make insinuations. We cannot accept the cruel, communist method of uprooting millions and transferring them from one part of the country to the other, in order to solve minority problems or to liquidate minorities. We have to live mixed and intermingled in this land of ours.

Now coming to my own State, Sir, I know there are friends who want to unsettle the present decisions. You may know, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that a political crisis itself was created by some people in Travancore-Cochin under cover of "Akhand Kerala", that is, Kerala with the present Kanya Kumari district. You may also know, Sir, that there are people who feel sore about Gudaloor and I am one among them, but I am against reopening any of these issues at present. I do not want to repeat all that Mr. Madhava Menon and myself said in defence of Kasaragod in this House last time when we discussed the S. R. C. Report. I can understand the

[Shrimati K. Bharathi.]
 righteous indignation of Mr. Hegde when he spoke yesterday in defence of Kasaragod, because I myself feel sore at heart about the Kanyakumari district and Gudaloor. It is only natural, it is only human nature that we fret and fume when suddenly somebody snatches away our property or what we thought to be our property by right. But after thought and clear analysis of the position cool down our passions. I hope Mr. Hegde has cooled down by this time after the downpour of a lawyer's eloquence yesterday. Sir, it is a fact that Truth flies and hides itself when a lawyer argues, and I myself was carried away by Mr. Hegde's argument yesterday. I am no lawyer myself and with the patience of a woman I can catch hold of the fleeing truth and place before the House statistics concerning the population based on the 1951 Census Report of Madras. Mr. Hegde himself admits that the area south of Chandragiri river rightly goes to Kerala. Of course he is shrewd enough not to raise his eloquence on that portion which is south of the Chandragiri river because he knows that there are 90 per cent Malayalees there living just now. Sir, his main disapproval was about the area north of the Chandragiri river. Sir the total population north of the Chandragiri River is 1,85,000 out of which Malayalees number 1,01,000; forming 55 per cent of the entire population, and 50,000 Tulus forming 27 per cent of the entire population, and Kannadigas only 17,000 forming only 9 per cent of the entire population of that area. Sir, is it right or just to allow the 55 per cent Malayalees to be tagged on to the 9 per cent Kannadigas, I ask. Sir, you might know that Tulu is more akin to Malayalam than to Kannada, and there are 27 per cent of Tulu-speaking people in that area. Sir, if the Malayalees do not speak or write chaste Malayalam, it is none of their fault. It is because they are bereft of the facilities to develop their own mother tongue and their own culture that they are given a chance now. So Mr. Hegde's argument goes against him now. Sir, why did we allow the Kanya Kumari district to break away from us, though it is really our head or 'Uthamangam'? It is because we felt that that area is predominantly Tamil now, though the court language and the language in most of the schools is Malayalam. Now we are only a trunk without our head, yet we keep our mouth shut because we feel it our duty to stand solidly by

the present decision in the larger interests of the nation.

Sir, I can read out to convince the House the real position of the Kannada, Malayalam and Tulu-speaking people at village level, if you want. I have got the thing with me. Sir, these statistics show that there are 35 villages in this area where in only one village the Kannadigas are in a majority, and that itself an object majority, if I may say so, of 31:9 against 25:9. So Sir, there is no point in Mr. Hegde being furious yesterday.

Now, Sir, let us abide by the present decisions at this stage and decide to go ahead with goodwill, and accept with a little philosophy the present arrangement. After all within a few decades the frontiers of States as well as the frontiers of languages are going to wear out and I will not be surprised if there emerges out one single language for all of us.

Then, as to bilingual States, I may say, Sir, that we are not allergic to Tamil or Karnataka. But unless the overwhelming majority of the people feel like coming together, there is no point in thinking of bilingual or multilingual States at present. The narrower the loyalty that you can invoke the more intense the feeling that you can create.

I do not know, Sir, whether the Zonal Councils will wither away in time or become powerful out of which will emerge bigger units. Sir, I am extremely unhappy to note that in the Lok Sabha they adopted a change as regards the southern Zone. I cannot reconcile with the idea of taking away Mysore from the Southern Zone and joining it with Bombay in the Western Zone. In fact this is an unwarranted move. The four Southern States must come under one zone. They have many common problems to be solved mutually, common schemes to be implemented and identity of interests. How can you dream of a future bilingual or multilingual Dakshinaprant while you yourself bar the way to unity? Sir, I very strongly oppose this mischievous move against the interests of the people of the south.

Sir, I can appreciate that the new bilingual Bombay cannot alone constitute a zone. But this can be solved without creating trouble in the south or hurting the people of the south. You can very conveniently reconstitute the present five zones into four zones. Then

the four southern States can come into one zone. The Western Zone can be composed of Bombay, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh, the Northern Zone can be composed of U.P., Punjab, Jammu and Kashmir and Part C States of Delhi and Himachal Pradesh, and the Eastern Zone can be as it is now in the Bill. Sir, I appeal to the House to view this point sympathetically and I hope the Government would act up to this suggestion without hurting the feelings of the people of the south. Sir, the Kerala people will feel that a part of their body is cut off if Mysore goes out from the Southern Zone. It is essential that we must come out of this pinpoint patriotism with ever shrinking mental horizon.

One important thing in the formation of States is the integration of services. The headache caused by the integration of Travancore-Cochin still continues. It is the integration of services that caused the headache. Persons with different service conditions came together and both went to get the best out of the two worlds! That is simply impossible. So, the officers in order to advance their cases try to work on the parochial feelings of the Members of the Cabinet, Members of the Legislature, and the public at large. Thus conflicts and suspicions and ill will are created.

Sir, taking off the service integration from the shoulders of the States, the same must be solved expeditiously with the help of an Integration Committee, say, the Chairman of the Public Service Commissions of the States plus the Chairman of the Union Public Service Commission.

Sir, in the wake of independence vast changes have taken place in which the Princes willingly and voluntarily laid down their crowns and their privileges.

The zamindars have lost their positions. But the members of the public services are not prepared to be jolted or jostled a bit in this gigantic step forward. They who have had the privilege to get an office, they who are the envy of the unemployed and under-employed, become angry and unfit for work, if what they deem to be their right, does not go to them. Everyone must be prepared to suffer the bit of inconvenience caused by these changes. Let them not brood over it; let them not attribute motives; let them take it cheerfully as part of their contribution for these vast and sweeping changes.

As for Kerala, what I feel is this: It is only a tiny bit of Travancore-Cochin that goes to Madras, and so also, it is only a small fraction of Madras that goes to Kerala. I do not think, since the changes are very small, any disturbance in the supervisory personnel or the Secretariat is called for. In that case, a lot of complication can be avoided. Those who come from one State will carry on under the conditions of service they were in, and future recruitment will be under the conditions of service prevailing in the new State.

I wish that service integration does not create complications in the new States and the same may be solved as early as possible. Thank you.

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL (PEPSU): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I hail this measure as it has emerged from the Lok Sabha. The one ticklish question, viz., the question of Bombay, has been satisfactorily solved, and there is no gain-saying the fact that it has given relief to the whole country. We are sorry to note that some interested people are still creating trouble in Ahmedabad and other parts of the country. We would only appeal to them that they should abjure the path of violence and accept the will of the nation. There is no other way for a democracy to function except perhaps by the will of the majority and then trying to change the will of the majority, if you can, by constitutional methods. The Members of the States Reorganisation Commission, as we all know, perhaps suggested the best solutions for all the States of India and after about eight to ten months of wandering into different channels, the Members of Parliament have come to feel that the solutions suggested by the States Reorganisation Commission were the best solutions. The reason is quite obvious. Those Members were actuated by the most patriotic urges and by the very best of intentions, and that is why the solutions which they suggested were the solutions which were in the best interests of the country. Later on, the Government tried to find agreed solutions and in that effort sometimes they succeeded and sometimes they failed, but we are happy to note that the Bill, as it has come from the Lok Sabha, has the support of the majority of the people. It is more or less a unanimous Bill. We cannot expect that there would not be any opposition to a measure of this type, but then the opposition which is now there, I would say, is a very

[Shri J. N. Kaushal.]

mild type of opposition and it is only for the sake of opposition.

After these few words, I would like to place a few factors regarding the State of Punjab which concerns me most. So far as the PEPSU people were concerned, they had from the very beginning as, part of their national duty, advocated the merger of PEPSU with Punjab, since they thought that that was a natural State on the borders of India. Nobody else has advocated self-extinction as the people of PEPSU did, because they were motivated by one desire, and that desire was the promotion of the national interests of the country. Now, the whole credit for that goes to the present leadership of PEPSU Chief Minister, Mr. Brish Bhan, and the President of the Pradesh Congress Committee, Giani Zail Singh. They have been co-workers since the Praja Mandal times and they were always of the view that the Princely States should be liquidated, and they also advocated that that part of the country should join other progressive parts of the country, and that is why they wholeheartedly supported the merger move, and now we see that we are going to merge with Punjab and we are all very happy about it. The only thing that I want to place before the House is that the spirit which we have shown ought to be reciprocated by the people of Punjab in the sense that they should also try to be a bit magnanimous and respect the sentiments of the PEPSU people. PEPSU did not put forward any demand as a condition precedent to the merger. They only put forward one demand and that was that Patiala, which is the premier city of PEPSU should be made the capital of the greater Punjab, because in their view that was the only centrally-situated city in Punjab and perhaps the most developed also. I would say that this was not waged from any parochial point of view. The Commission themselves recognised the importance of Patiala and they did say in their report that the importance of Patiala should be maintained and that Punjab would do well to utilise all the facilities that exist in Patiala. Although the question of the capital of the new Punjab has not been finally decided, since it is a matter to be decided by the Legislature which is to come into existence after the new State is formed, I do feel that the people of Punjab should respect the sentiments of the people of PEPSU. I would only appeal to my friends in Punjab. On

Chandigarh of course a lot of money has been spent. Anybody who has visited Chandigarh can vouchsafe that it may take perhaps 50 years or more for Chandigarh to develop into a full-fledged city. So far as Patiala is concerned, it is already a full-fledged city.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): What will happen to Chandigarh?

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL: So far as Chandigarh is concerned, there are two matters which have to be taken into account. One question which my friends from Punjab raise is that they have already spent about Rs. 12 crores on it and that, therefore, if it is not utilised, all that money will go waste. Well, I agree with that proposition. Who says that money spent on Chandigarh should go waste? Also look at the amount which is yet to be spent. It is not Rs. 12 crores which are going to give you a capital. Chandigarh can be utilised for some other purpose, e.g., for locating the headquarters of the Western Command, or for locating the Punjab University. So far as Patiala is concerned, I would say that the money which has been spent on Patiala is much more. It runs into, not Rs. 12 crores, but to Rs. 200 crores, because in the recent past as the Commission has recognised, Patiala has spent considerably on development schemes. There is an Engineering College; there is a Medical College; there is a Central Library; there is a big hospital, leave aside the other residential and Government accommodation.

If, for some reason or other, the balance swings in favour of Chandigarh and people think that since Chandigarh has once been located as Capital, let it continue as Capital, then I would say, as it has been done in other States where Part A and Part B States have merged, let the important organs of the Government be divided between Patiala and Chandigarh. If that also is not done, then we cannot forget that perhaps our friends in the Punjab do not show proper respect for our sentiments. Now, the two big organs of the Government are the seat of the Executive Government and the seat of the Judiciary. By all means let the Executive Government be located at Chandigarh but let the High Court come to Patiala. If the argument is only to be advanced every time that they have built the buildings at Chandigarh also for the High Court and therefore the High Court also cannot move to Patiala then

I would say that this argument does not hold water because any building which is built at Chandigarh is not going to be wasted. It can be utilized for some other purposes. As has been just now submitted by me, Chandigarh can be a University town but if you are not prepared to make Chandigarh a University town, let the University move to Patiala but something must be done to maintain the importance of Patiala. That is the minimum demand I make before this Parliament and before the Central Government. The University has no building of its own. They are yet having their headquarters at Solan and they have to construct the whole of the University building anew. Instead of constructing the University at Chandigarh, that can be constructed at Patiala. There seems to be no sense in locating all important institutions at one place. It will only concentrate the whole public life in one city and all other important cities in the State would lose their importance, which will not be ultimately to the benefit of the people at large but it will be to the benefit of a few persons who have vested interests.

I would therefore, with all the emphasis at my command request the Central Government to view this demand of PEPSU with favour and see that our friends in Punjab divide the Executive Government and the High Court or at least the University and locate it in Patiala. Otherwise the location of a few offices will not satisfy us; because the importance of a city is not maintained only by a few offices being located there. It is some intellectual and cultural atmosphere which has to prevail in a city so that that city can also play its part in the civic life; in the social life and the political life of a State. This is one point on which I want the Central Government to come to our help. Although I know the present leadership in the Punjab—Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon—looks sympathetically at all these demands of PEPSU, some vested interests do not allow perhaps that leadership also to function. I would only request the Central Government to come to our help so that we can have our proper and due share so far as the importance of Patiala is concerned.

The only other point which I want to place before the Government is the approach to the integration of services. So far as services are concerned there is no denial of the fact that if those people are dissatisfied, then the progress

of any State will be retarded. There is one factor which stands in the way of smooth integration of services and that is, that our friends of Part A States do not shed their superiority complex. Somehow or other, they feel that people living in Part B States are inferior people and the services there, are not good and that is why, at the time of integration, they want to run down these services. I would, with all vehemence place before this House that this outlook must radically be changed. Since PEPSU was formed or since the Part B States were formed, regular cadres were created. People were integrated after proper screening and now, when regular services are functioning, it will be too much to say that those services cannot be integrated from cadre to cadre. Unless we integrate the services from cadre to cadre, dissatisfaction to the extreme is bound to be caused. Now what is happening? I want to place the facts in a very few minutes, before the House. The Punjab people are insisting that we might integrate from cadre to cadre but then they say 'We will create a group of services where seniority will be determined'. I would explain my point because as far as I see it, this group has nowhere been heard of for determining the seniority of the services. They say that a clerk, an assistant, a deputy superintendent and a superintendent will all constitute one group and the seniority will be determined in that group, meaning thereby that a clerk who has put in more number of years as a clerk, will rank senior to the superintendent although the superintendent is drawing a higher pay, and is in the rank of a superintendent for a number of years. I have not heard of such a formula and that formula the Punjab officers are advocating only because of one thing. They say that since the people from PEPSU are coming, their seniority would go down. I fail to follow this. If people from PEPSU are coming, the cadres are also being enlarged. There is no question of seniority going down but they insist that the seniority must be counted in that group and not from cadre to cadre.

I would request the Central Government to look into this matter very sympathetically because the only reasonable solution is that the superintendents' seniority must count among superintendents and not with clerks and assistants. Similarly they say Sub-judges and Sessions Judges will form one group. I again fail

[Shri J. N. Kaushal.]

to follow how a sub-judge for the purpose of seniority, will rank senior to a District Judge; but then this is going to happen.

The other thing which they say is this. When we enlarge the cadre, if, for example, five superintendents count from PEPSU and 10 from Punjab, then they want to create a cadre of 15 superintendents but they say that in those 15 superintendents post it is not necessary that persons from Punjab and PEPSU who are coming as superintendents will be put as superintendents. On the other hand they say that their assistants who are senior to them in the group formula will all be integrated as superintendents and people from PEPSU who are coming as superintendents will only be superintendents on some supernumerary posts. I would say that this requires the personal attention of the Central Government. The other matter which has now been mooted is that people from PEPSU, although they may be put as superintendents or as District and Sessions Judges will draw their own pay while a District and Sessions Judge of the Punjab or a superintendent from Punjab will draw his own pay. To my mind these two anomalies are unheard of that people must be ironed out before a group is created and then a man is integrated as a District and Sessions Judge but he will draw some other pay and a District Judge of Punjab will draw some other pay. These inequities and anomalies must be ironed out before a smooth working is ensured. I again say that perhaps leadership on both sides in Punjab and PEPSU want to do full justice to the services and they want to do full justice to the sentiments of PEPSU but in the matter of services and the matter of the location of the capital, vested interests work and it is only when the vested interests don't allow the leadership to work properly that we look to the Centre. I would therefore say, that if the leadership in the Punjab, in spite of their best intentions, cannot do justice to us, then the Central Government must come to our help. Otherwise the one good thing which we are going to do will lose much of its value. The one good thing which the present Bill is trying to do is to create a sense of oneness in the whole of India. Part A States and Part B States are being abolished—why? They are being abolished for the simple rea-

son that there should be no discrimination between one part of the country and another.

4 P.M.

Let all people feel that they are in much the same status, that they have the same privileges. So I say the good effect would be lost if this sense is fostered and forcibly forced down the throat of our people, that they do not have the same efficiency as the people in another State. I would say that this argument is one that I will strongly resist. I do not mind officers being screened. The efficient persons may be taken and the inefficient ones may be asked to go. I do not mind that. But then to say that all the services in a particular state do not come to a particular standard and that all the services in another State do come as from some superior stock, is something that I refuse to recognise. So my submission to this House and through this House to the Government is that both these matters, the matter of the location of the capital and keeping the importance of Patiala, and then this matter of the services, are two questions that the Central Government should in particular look into and see that proper justice is done so that we may be on the road to progress.

I assure the House that we welcome the merger of PEPSU with Punjab. But let me tell the people of the Punjab also that they should by their conduct show that they welcome us, that they are prepared to treat us as their equals. It is only then that we can have real progress which is so very essential to this part of the country. Situated as it is on the frontier, it is essential that we should have a prosperous and nappy State there on the border of India.

I would only say a few words regarding the solution which has been suggested for the Punjab, because yesterday, the hon. lady Member, Shrimati Lakhanpal had said that probably the solution for the Punjab has not been satisfactory and she thought that some better solution could be suggested. I would only submit that our leaders have done the best thing, that they have shown extreme sagacity in evolving the regional formula. There is now one State—the Punjab—with one Legislature, one High Court, one Public Service Commission and one Governor. So in fact, it is one State and there is no doubt about it. But then the State has been divided into two zones only for the purpose of development. What is wrong

about it? Even now the M.L.As take care of their part of the State. The M.L.As. take care of their constituencies. In the regional formula, the M.L.As. living in that particular region will have the voice in the development of that region. They will work within the framework of the Cabinet, within the framework of the Budget passed and only for the development purposes, for health schemes, for education and for other development works, these they will tender advice and that advice will normally be accepted by the Government. And the further safeguard also has been provided that if at some stage the Cabinet finds it difficult to give effect to that advice, to agree with that advice, then the matter can be referred to the Governor and the Governor's decision would be final. I would submit that this solution is perhaps the best solution. Nobody has suggested a better solution. Some extreme views have been put forward, but this solution is the perfect *via media* between the two extreme views. I would say that our Sikh friends have left off their demand for a Punjabi Suba and our friends speaking Hindi have also left off their demand. So now one State exists on the border of India. So far as the difficulty of languages is concerned, as I have once stated in this House, there is no conflict between Hindi and Punjabi. Hindi is our Rashtira Bhasha and everybody has to learn Hindi. So far as Punjabi is concerned, it is our regional language. I again repudiate the suggestion that Punjabi is the language of the Sikhs. No, Punjabi is not the language of the Sikhs. The difficulty arises when language is sought to be attached to one particular religious sect, as my hon. friend Shri Saksena pointed out a few minutes ago. He refused to associate one language with one particular sect. Punjabi is the language of all the people living in the Punjab. So far as the script is concerned, there is no difficulty presented by it. In the schools, up to a certain stage the books are in Punjabi and then they are in Hindi. In other regions they can start with Hindi and then change to Punjabi. So by the time a person passes his matriculation examination, he would know both the languages equally well. My own children read Punjabi with as much fluency as they read Hindi. So I submit no controversy should be raised on the script issue. We must learn both the languages, Hindi in Devanagari script and Punjabi in Gurmukhi script, even if it means some difficulty for our friends to read Gur-

mukhi. I would, however, assure them that reading Gurmukhi is a matter of seven days only. It is such an easy script. There is no difficulty. We are all speaking Punjabi and there is no difficulty in reading it in this script. I would therefore, appeal to my Hindu friends who are still raising some agitation against the regional formula that their problem is settled and they should support this formula. They should try this formula and work it. Later on, if some difficulty arises, then, of course, a remedy could be found. No solution is final in that sense and we can then try to find out something better. My submission to the House is that this is perhaps the only solution which can be acceptable to the majority of the Punjabis. I do not say that this satisfies everybody. But there is no doubt that this Bill satisfies the overwhelming majority of the Punjabis. And since this has the concurrence of all the major political parties, I should think there should be no difficulty in working it. If only our friends shed suspicion against each other, everything would be all right. The job of the majority is to foster confidence in the minds of the minority and if that minority at some stage feels that some safeguard should be given to them, I personally feel that there is no harm in it. Otherwise the minorities will remain dissatisfied. We on our part should try to create such conditions that the minorities might feel safe. Once the minorities feel this they will not demand any safeguards. And till such a stage comes, there is no harm in trying to accommodate them and their views. We should try to work with all shoulder to shoulder and show to the people that as we have been living up till now like brothers, we can still continue to live in reorganised India. The whole object of this reorganisation was to promote the country's unity, not to promote disunity. I would therefore commend this regional formula to all persons residing in the Punjab and I would beg of our friends who are still opposed to it, to bow to the will of the majority, accept it and try to work it. Let us try to work the formula and create goodwill among the communities residing in these areas. Both the communities will live side by side, because in all things they are more or less closely related to each other. Hindus and Sikhs are related even by marriages, they are related by their past inheritance. Everything is one. It is only for political purposes that different slogans are sought to be raised.

[Shri J. N. Kaushal.]

I would point out one thing. Now that the main grievance of the Sikhs has been satisfied by the regional formula, the PEPSU Akalis have given the lead and Shri Gyan Singh Rarewala has proclaimed that there is no sense in the Akali Dal continuing hereafter, that body, he says, should hereafter confine itself to social, religious and cultural activities. I would request the other Akali leaders to follow this lead of Shri Gyan Singh Rarewala. That is the path to follow for the permanent solution of the Punjab. As a matter of fact, the Sikhs should now have no different politics, for they proclaim that all their political grievances have been satisfied.

If their political grievances have been satisfied, then the only work which now remains to be done is the work of the development of India and the work of the progress of India. PEPSU has again given the lead. Sardar Gyan Singh Rarewala, as I submitted a minute earlier, has joined the Congress and has advised his other colleagues in the Akali Dal to end their present activities and direct them towards religious, social and cultural matters. He has said that the Akali Dal cannot continue as a political organisation now and that it should join the Congress and work side by side so that the progress of Punjab goes on at a rate at which it ought to go.

Now, one last word, Sir, and then I finish. Some territories have still been kept apart as Union Territories. The reasons may be various in different places but I would only say that the one main reason for keeping such territories apart from the contiguous Part A States was that these were perhaps backward areas and could not get as much progress as they should get if they joined the other areas. We do not object to it; they may remain under the Centre and it may look after their progress and try to bring them to the level of the adjoining areas because, ultimately they have to merge with those progressive States but then do not let them now remain backward politically. One danger which now seems to me is that now they are enjoying political democracy, they are having Legislatures but they will be deprived of the present political life by being declared as Union Territories. Something must be done to the people of these territories so that they may be associated with the administration. Otherwise, after sometime,

again the question will arise that although these people are not backward so far as their economic prosperity was concerned, they are backward politically and so, they must remain permanently Union Territories. On the other hand, we should try to evolve some formula by which they could get their training in democracy and people could be associated with the administration.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: This applies particularly to the Delhi area.

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL: Also to Himachal Pradesh because we all know that that area has been kept apart because our friends there feared that they will not get a proper share if they went along with Punjab; they thought that they will not be developed at the rate at which they should be developed. After some time, when they are economically advanced and the question of their joining the adjoining areas comes, it might be said that they are politically very much backward and that if they merged with politically advanced people they will not get their proper share. My submission is that these territories should not be deprived of their democratic rights and the people should be associated with the running of the administration in some form or other.

With these few words, Sir, I commend this Bill and request the House to pass this Bill.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I wholeheartedly welcome this Bill. I am a believer in unilingual States. I think it was very essential to have such States and this Bill has very rightly, after long deliberation and long consideration, suggested a solution of the problem. I was a Member of the Joint Select Committee and I beg to submit that the Joint Select Committee had suggested a better solution about the creation of Maharashtra, Gujarat and the Bombay City. While I belong to an area which is different from Maharashtra and Gujarat, I would say that if the people of Maharashtra and Gujarat jointly want to have a united bilingual State, they are very welcome to it. I wish them all prosperity and happiness but I submit, Sir, as an all-India question, I will have to say a few words about it. I will have to say that it would have been in the greater interest of Maharashtra and Gujarat if these separate States had been formed. I feel, Sir, that this bilingual

State of Bombay will be too big a State. If Maharashtra had been a separate State, the enthusiasm and the desire to progress and develop their own area would have been so much greater than would be the case in the greater Bombay State. Similarly,.....

SHRI J. S. BISHT: With the resources of the one State?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: If the hon. Member waits for a minute, I will come to that; otherwise, my arguments will by State. Similary,.....

Similarly, Gujarat also would have put in greater effort and the Gujaratis would have developed their State to a much greater extent. Both the States wanted Bombay because Bombay is a surplus area. Bombay has certainly got industries and its surplus is mainly due to the sales tax levied on the purchase and sale of goods produced there. I submit, Sir, that a good part of it has been taken away by the Inter-State Sales Tax Act and if a solution had been found by which the surplus of Bombay State was distributed between Maharashtra and Gujarat, both Maharashtra and Gujarat would have got the benefit of the surplus and yet not had the burden of such a big State. I will have to enlarge myself a little on this point in order to explain the reasons why I wanted a separate State of Maharashtra and a separate State of Gujarat and Bombay City kept as a separate entity. I submit, Sir, that the whole of India is interested in the development of Bombay City. If Bombay City continues as a capital whether of a united Gujarat and Maharashtra State or as a capital of the Maharashtra State only, the industrial and commercial development of Bombay City would be retarded. It would have been to the interests of Maharashtra if Bombay City had been made a separate City State and the surpluses of Bombay State had been distributed between Maharashtra and Gujarat in any proportion that the Government decided. On account of the presence of the Bombay Government in Bombay City, there is so much cramping, there is so much lack of space that the industries of Bombay cannot be developed. If we do not want concentration of industries in Bombay and want them to be distributed that is another viewpoint. If there are no industries in Bombay, nobody wants Bombay. Certain hon. Members said that they thought bi-metallism was good. You

know, Sir, that for hundreds of years nations followed bi-metallism, that means, the standard of gold and silver, but it did not work. Similarly, bilingualism cannot work. Mr. Parikh said that the Gujaratis were only 32 per cent. in the former Bombay State and that it worked very well. He forgot probably that Bombay was not a bilingual State; it was a trilingual State and in a trilingual State where no party has a majority, where there are three parties and none of them has got an absolute majority, the minority party does not feel the burden of the majority. In the new Bombay State, the Maharashtrians will be 60 per cent., the Gujaratis will be 34 per cent., and the odd six per cent. will be other people. You will find that there will be continuous grumbling. If any money is spent, the Gujaratis will say that the proper share of the second Five Year Plan was not spent in Gujarat; the Maharashtrians will say that the Government was spending more in Gujarat than in Maharashtra, that it was spending less in Maharashtra. That conflict will continue. We want harmonious development of our country. In regard to harmonious development, *Kakasaheb Kalelkar* has suggested a novel scheme. If it is practicable and if it could be worked, certainly we can have bilingual States all over the country. Why was it that Bengal and Bihar did not merge? Why was it impracticable? It was because Bengal thought, 'We are sovereign State today. We are independent, except of course that we are part of India but there is no question of pressure from any other State'. If they merged with Bihar—Bihar has 60 per cent., of the total population of the two States—Bihar will have 60 per cent. of the seats in the joint Assembly;..... while the Bengali Members would be only 40 per cent. Therefore Bengal could not have felt secure to the same extent. It was the minority group, the Bengali group that backed out. Bihar was quite happy and Bihar never minded it. Similarly Maharashtra does not mind it. Maharashtra suggested this solution in the very beginning and they have now got it. At that time the hon. Prime Minister was opposed to it and said, that he would not yield in the matter of Bombay City but he has now indirectly yielded to this formula of a bilingual State that was created by the signatures of 240 Members of the Lok Sabha and he has agreed to this greater Bombay State. In the very first talks the Maharashtrians said: "Including Vidarbha and the Marathwada area if

[Shri Kishen Chand.] you form the bilingual Bombay State, we have no objection." But the Gujaratis said, "No, we are prepared to join only if Vidarbha is kept out." What was the meaning behind it? The meaning is absolutely clear. They wanted to join a Bombay State where the Gujaratis and the Maharashtrians would be 50:50. The moment you change that ratio it becomes unworkable. You can never join two unilingual States in India which are not equal in population. The moment you join them one part will become an inferior or junior partner. You can have partnership between two equals, never between a superior and an inferior, and they become inferior and superior in this matter because the number of representatives in the Assembly will be fixed by the population, and therefore the part with a smaller population will have smaller number of representatives and smaller representation in the Ministry and in the distribution of loaves and fishes. Naturally, Sir, the smaller partner feels grieved. Hon. Members express opinions and they say, "Well, India is one. Why should you worry?" But the moment the question of their State comes in, they immediately think differently. It is all right as far as the other man's interests are concerned but not in respect of their own interests. I know, Sir, that in the previous discussion somebody had suggested something about U.P. and every Member from U.P. felt aggrieved and argued that such a thing should not take place.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: You wanted to cut us up.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I am not saying anything. I am not trying to justify any demand against U.P. I am simply stating that the moment an hon. Member suggested something about U.P., every Member from U.P. immediately got up and protested against it as if the whole thing was being acted upon on the suggestion of that hon. Member. I am trying to say that it is easy to be wise about other people's affairs when it does not affect you. So also in this matter, within five years, you will see that Gujarat will have to be separated and it will become a unilingual State. The hon. Mr. Parikh said, "Well, we will decide again after four or five years." If you are wise people you must think now. You must see what is going to happen to India in the next five years and plan for it. The bet-

ter plan would have been a separate Maharashtra State and a separate Gujarati State and to keep Bombay city under the Centre, distributing its surplus between them in any proportion that they agreed to. But that is a story of the past. Anyhow, Sir, now I am glad that there is a unanimous solution and I wish it a most hearty welcome.

Now I come.....

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Is it unanimous?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Whether it is unanimous or not, at least a big majority of the Lok Sabha and a good number of Members of this House had signed that application suggesting this solution. It means that majority of the members are of this opinion. If everybody is happy, well, I am also happy, and if it leads to the progress of India we should all be happy, but I have sounded a note of warning because I see that within four or five years what I am suggesting today will come to happen. That means that the Maharashtrians are getting Bombay indirectly by kicking out the Gujaratis instead of getting it by the process of starting as a separate Maharashtra State and a separate Gujarat State. As per the assurance of the Prime Minister they would have got Bombay City within two years. Now they are going to get it by this indirect method. From this you can see whether the Central Government has gained or lost in prestige. I leave it to the hon. Members to make up their minds about it. I personally think that the Government has lost tremendously in prestige. It has taught the Gujaratis a lesson that if they continue propaganda, if they continue hooliganism they will get their object. This is the bad lesson that the Government is teaching our countrymen. I think it is entirely the bungling of the Central Government. The Government had come to a good decision and it should have stuck to it. The Joint Select Committee also suggested it. Anyway it does not matter. The matter has ended.

Now, Sir, I very much welcome the new Andhra State. I am interested in the Andhra State and I believe it has a very good compact homogeneous unit. It has just the right population because, in my humble opinion, too large a State is not a good State and too small a State is not a good State, because in too large a State the problem of law and order assumes enormous proportions. The area becomes too much spread

out. (*Interruption.*) Well, about U.P. being a very large State it is their headache; it is not my headache. If they are happy, well and good.

As far as I am concerned I was saying that Andhra is an ideal State. The hon. Minister, while introducing the Bill, commenced to the Hyderabad Cabinet and the Hyderabad Assembly that they voluntarily offered certain areas to Maharashtra because, in their opinion, those areas were predominantly Maharashtrian. May I submit, Sir, that he should have gone a step further and seen that, as it was the dismemberment of the Hyderabad State and it was a question of what part should go where, so the wishes of Hyderabad should prevail. Sir, may I point out that in Raichur district all the area which is to the east of the railway line is entirely inhabited by the Telugu-speaking people. When it was a question of the division of Hyderabad, how could you bring in the question of agreement of Mysore about it? If there was something that we wanted from Mysore I entirely agree with the hon. Minister that in such a case the consent of the Mysorians was essential. Certainly if you want something from them, but here it is not a question of Hyderabad or Andhra wanting something from Mysore, it is a question of how much to give to them. When it is a question of giving, when it is the Hyderabad people who are giving a part of theirs to somebody else and the Hyderabad Assembly has got representatives of Karnataka and representatives of Telangana and representatives of Maharashtra, they are the best judges to know from their statistics—because they possess the statistics—which part should have gone where when they decided that the entire part east of the railway line in Raichur district should continue to remain in the Telangana area, it was very unfair on the part of the hon. Minister to have introduced a provision in the Bill and taken away the entire Raichur district. When in the Joint Select Committee I put in an amendment, the hon. the Chairman said, "You must get the consent of the other party," in spite of my pointing out that the area does not belong to the other party, it belongs entirely to Hyderabad.

Then, Sir, I come to another point. It was very nice when it was a question of taking away some area from one State and adding it on to another State,

but when it was a question of giving Sironcha from Chanda district the answer was "No". Thus it becomes a one-way traffic. "We are prepared to take from you but never to give." Here also I leave it to the fairness and the good judgment of the hon. Minister to see whether it was right and proper.

Sir, we talk of linguism but there are the Koya tribes living in Bastar. It is a tribal area. A very large part of that tribal area is in Hyderabad State. Some of them are living on the Bastar side also. For the last 100 years Hyderabad had been negotiating that Bastar should form part of Hyderabad. It has linguistically, climatically, geographically great affinities with Hyderabad, but when it comes to the question whether it is wanted by Madhya Pradesh or not wanted by Madhya Pradesh, whether Madhya Pradesh is so large that it does not know how to manage it, it is kept there. The moment you tread on anybody's corns he starts jumping against it.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ (Madhya Pradesh): Let me remove your doubt; we are efficiently managing it.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I was trying to explain that we ask for ourselves unilingual States, but when we come to these tribes and when we find that it is in their interests that they are under one administration, the case becomes different. If you think it is better that they should be under the administration of Madhya Pradesh I would even suggest that the part of Koya tribes which is in Andhra-Telangana should also be given to Madhya Pradesh. I believe in it and suggest that they should be in one homogeneous unit. It is in their best interests. It is for their development. I have no prejudice either way. If that part is happy there, I will be happy about it, but to split them up simply because the Madhya Pradesh people think that there is likely to be some mines in that area and they are going to get wealth out of it, to divide them on this account is not fair and is not right.

श्री रामेश्वर अग्निभोज : बस्तर हैदराबाद से कब से अटैच्ड है ?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: When Madhya Pradesh is being split up they don't advance that argument that Vidarbha has been with Madhya Pradesh for the last 150 years, and now Vidarbha is being taken away. When Vidarbha

[Shri Kishen Chand.]
is being taken away the hon. Member does not get up and raise any objection, but if the Koya tribes be removed and taken away from Madhya Pradesh he feels that the Heavens have fallen.

The question is only about the southern part of Bastar, only that part of Bastar which is inhabited by the Koya tribe. I do not want an inch more than what is inhabited by Koya tribe. It is only to get the unity of the Koya tribe and that object alone.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: You mean to Andhra; not to Hyderabad.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Because Telangana will be merged with Andhra and it will become one Andhra State. Instead of repeating the word 'Andhra' before this Bill becomes law—it is still Hyderabad—I was using the word 'Hyderabad'. The moment this Bill becomes law, it will become Andhra.

Now I come to another question. As I said I am a believer in unilingual States and when the country has unilingual States it is a good idea of the hon. the Prime Minister that he has introduced Zonal Councils. The hon. Minister for Home Affairs will bear out that in the Joint Committee many of us were strongly in favour of giving statutory recognition to Zonal Councils in the Constitution but the hon. Minister did not agree. The Zonal Councils are in this Bill all right, but the Zonal Councils should have been given a statutory recognition.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): This is statutory recognition.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: This is statutory recognition, but you will be surprised that Regional Committees are mentioned in the Constitution (Amendment) Bill and they have been given the status of being described in full and their powers being given in detail in the Constitution (Amendment) Bill while the Zonal Councils which are still bigger things have not been given that status. The Regional Committees are only for a temporary period of four to five years. They will disappear after four or five years. They are put in with a set purpose and with a definite object. But these Zonal Councils are really the more useful things. Why they are so, I will explain in a minute.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: They are experimental.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I submit that they are not experimental. They are the basis of the economic development of our country. There is great regional disparity and it is very difficult for backward States and regions to develop until and unless they combine. I would therefore have liked that these Zonal Councils had been given greater recognition.

PROF. G. RANGA: This recognition ought to be enough.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Greater, I said. I do not say that there is no recognition given to it. That is why I am trying to explain and labour on the point. I am trying to explain how my suggestion would have benefited the States. I am only saying that greater stress should have been laid on these Zonal Councils.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: If experience shows that there is quarrel, then what happens?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: If experience shows that there is quarrel and if the Government or Parliament in its wisdom comes to the conclusion that they should be abolished, whether they have got statutory recognition or not, whether they are stronger or less strong, they can always be abolished. I am only asking, why do you start an experiment on a weak basis? Why don't you give a full and fair trial? A full and fair trial can only be given if you give them substantial powers. You should have said that if the Chairman thinks necessary he could call a meeting every month, that it should have agenda in such and such a form and so on and in this way you could have really helped in the equal development of all areas.

Sir, we want to solve all problems and for the solution of all problems we should view them from a proper angle. It may look a little out of place now, but later on we are going to discuss the transfer of territories from Bihar to Bengal. Why are you transferring territories from Bihar to Bengal when there is so much opposition? As a large number of refugees are arriving in West Bengal from East Bengal, land is urgently wanted. It is the only possible solution. I raised it before the Joint Select Committee on this Bill that unless you agree to transfer some part of Madhya Pradesh to Bihar, Bihar will not agree to transfer some part of its territory

to Bengal and unless Bengal gets some territory they cannot rehabilitate the refugees who are pouring in from East Bengal. The hon. Mr. Chairman of the Committee adopted a very safe attitude by saying that this does not relate to this Bill and when he came to Bengal Bihar Bill, he again said that this does not relate to that Bill. The net result is that a good solution has been thrown out on technical grounds from both the Bills. I would once more venture to suggest that if you want to look at this problem from an all-India point of view and if you want a permanent solution and if you want a greater and better development of the country, it is only possible if at this time we adjust the sparsely populated areas and attach them to the areas which are densely populated. It is after all the density of human population.....

PROF. G. RANGA: What about linguism then?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I will come to it in a minute. It is only possible that way. I believe linguism has to be satisfied. Now, luckily for us, that part of Madhya Pradesh is entirely Hindi-speaking and Bihar is also Hindi-speaking and it is therefore immaterial whether that part is attached to Madhya Pradesh or to Bihar. And in the case of the border between Bihar and Bengal, the area is populated by a large number of people who speak either of the dialects in between Bengali and Bihari or some parts speak Bengali and some parts speak Bihari and a nice adjustment could have been made.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Bihari is a language?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: It is a dialect of Hindi derived from Maithili or Eastern Hindi. Anyway, it is slightly different from the Western Hindi. There are slight variations as you go from the East to the West in Hindi and I was trying to represent that variation by giving it a glorified name of Bihari. If the House does not want to call it that, I will not use that word.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned now with Bihar and Bengal.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I know; the same argument was used by the Chairman of the Select Committee.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That Bill is coming.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: But that Bill cannot be altered until you make a provision for it in this Bill.

Then, Sir, I come to the question of legislative councils. I believe in the bi-cameral system of legislature. Bicameral legislature is very essential when we are having large States with populations numbering over 30 millions. I was very glad that in the original Bill there was provision for a Legislative Council for Madhya Pradesh. Certain Members of the Joint Committee had sent in amendments that the name of Andhra Pradesh should be added to it and that a Legislative Council created for Andhra Pradesh also. Both the Legislatures of Hyderabad and Andhra have unanimously voted.....

PROF. G. RANGA: Not unanimously.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: have recommended by a majority vote that a Legislative Council should be created for the greater Andhra State. The hon. Minister instead of accepting the proposal to include Andhra Pradesh took out the name of Madhya Pradesh also. In the Lok Sabha, Madhya Pradesh has been given a Legislative Council. I am very glad about it and I welcome it and I would suggest that there should be a Legislative Council for Andhra also. If the hon. Members agree to that now, it will be that the Lok Sabha has added Madhya Pradesh and the Rajya Sabha will add Andhra Pradesh. Thus by balancing each other we will have a Legislative Council for Madhya Pradesh as well as for Andhra Pradesh.

Sir, Now I come to Regional Committees. Some hon. Members thought that the Regional Committees were not suitable but in the peculiar condition of the Hyderabad State which is being disintegrated and which had been a separate entity for the last 200 years, there are special problems. I must give all credit to Andhra and to the leaders of Andhra that they have voluntarily accepted everything which has been demanded by the Telangana people, by the Telangana Pradesh Congress Committee and by the leaders of Telangana. When there is so much of goodwill between the two, I think that the hon. Minister will be well advised if in the Regional Committee some sort of statutory recognition is given to the understanding which has been arrived at between the leaders of Andhra and the

[Shri Kishen Chand.]
 leaders of Telangana. After all for the last one hundred years Urdu was the court language and the State language of Hyderabad State. Whether it was right or wrong is a different question. Whether the Hyderabad Government was suppressing the regional languages of Telugu and Marathi is a different question. But the position of Urdu is a matter of fact. It was the State language and willingly or unwillingly everybody had learnt it because they had to deal sometimes with the State Government. So, when it is a recognised fact, if some concession is given especially when the leaders of Andhra are willing and agreeable to it, I think it is only fair and right. Due recognition should be given to that formula and understanding arrived at between the leaders of Andhra and leaders of Telangana.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: You mean the Congress leaders?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I do not know who were the leaders. It is quite possible every decision was by majority. It was never a unanimous decision. It is quite possible that some opposition leaders may have put in a minute of dissent; but in these things there is always an element of give and take and you have got to agree to certain things.

Then, Sir, I come to the question of Union territories. I submit that there is no justification for making Himachal Pradesh a Union territory. I do not see any justification for it. No arguments were advanced to say that though the area is backward it would be better looked after by the Centre than by the Punjab Government. It is really a reflection on the Punjab Government, that if Himachal Pradesh had been merged in Punjab, the Punjab Government would have given less attention to the development of Himachal Pradesh, than what probably the Centre would give. If the Centre was so solicitous about Himachal Pradesh, they could have given a special subvention, specially earmarking the amount for Himachal Pradesh and asking the Punjab Government to spend it on Himachal Pradesh. But eventually Himachal Pradesh is going to be merged with Punjab and what is the point in keeping it separate, creating antagonism, creating differences between Punjab and Himachal Pradesh during the next five years? I do not see any justification.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): The people of Himachal Pradesh are very backward.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: If they are very backward, they have got to be developed. Somebody is going to develop them. After all the Centre is going to appoint a Commissioner to develop them and will give some money for it. I cannot see why the same amount of money cannot be given to Punjab to be spent on Himachal Pradesh, the same officer could have been appointed by the Punjab Government. To say that because a certain area is backward and you want to keep it separate, it is not a justification for doing so.

Next, I come to Tripura and Manipur. There also I submit that they should have been merged with Assam. There is no point or reason for making them Union territories. They are like islands in Assam and they should have been merged with Assam.

Then, about the Nicobar and Minicoy and so many other islands, these islands were formerly part of the Madras State and they could have easily continued as parts of Madras or Kerala State. Why should the Centre take on those small islands and add to its worries and bother? And, therefore, I say that there is no justification for making them Union territories.

Next, I come to the question of Judicial Commissioners. I am very glad that in most cases, in all Part C States—of course the Part C States are to disappear—there are going to be no Judicial Commissioners. But in the case of Himachal Pradesh, the Judicial Commissioner is going to continue. In the Joint Select Committee there was a great deal of discussion and it was pointed out that the Judicial Commissioners are an anachronism and that they should not be allowed to continue. When we have got High Courts, very responsible High Court, with high prestige behind them, there is no reason why we should continue the court of Judicial Commissioner. It was very easy. Himachal Pradesh could have been attached for legal purposes to the Punjab High Court, in spite of the fact that Himachal Pradesh would continue to be separate from Punjab as a Union territory. Because in the case of Delhi, it is attached to the Punjab High Court. When Delhi is going to become a Union territory, I suppose it will continue to be under the Punjab High Court. When Delhi can remain under Punjab High Court, why do we want a Judicial Commissioner for Himachal Pradesh?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: At present there is one in Bhopal.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: But all Part C States will go. Sir, I have made certain suggestions and when the amendments come—I am going to move certain amendments—I will clarify my points in greater detail. I welcome the States Reorganisation Bill and I commend my amendments for the consideration of the House.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Bombay and Gujarat have overshadowed all other issues in the discussions on this Bill and in my opinion that is as it ought to be, for in respect of Bombay and Gujarat alone—and to a lesser extent in the case of Punjab also—you have given the go by, you have disregarded the governing principle of this Bill. We need to be realistic in these matters. And what is the governing principle? What is the great merit about this Bill? Look at Part II. Now, Part II provides for a redistribution of the major portion of India on a linguistic basis. The Malayalee people get Kerala; Tamil people get Tamil Nadu or Madras; Karnataka people get Mysore; Telugu people get Andhra Pradesh; Oriya people get their State; Bengalis have their State. All these vast Hindi-speaking areas you have divided into four big States for administrative convenience. There also this linguistic principle of distribution prevails, but that principle has not been extended to Gujarat and Maharashtra and the people of Gujarat do not like it. In spite of your shootings they do not like it. Now, it has been attempted to be made out that only a few trouble-shooters, people who are not decent, people who are not civilized, are creating some trouble there. Facts are not like that. Facts speak differently. Very reasonable, eminently reasonable gentlemen, gentlemen of very cool and calculating disposition—I mean the members of the Gujarat Chamber of Commerce—they are not communists, they are not trouble-shooters, they do not like this idea of a bilingual State there. They have said so. They have passed a resolution and as a reader of newspapers I come to know of it. Again, the Gujarat Seema Samiti are not communists. They do not approve of this. They have come out in strong words against this bilingual thing being imposed upon them suddenly. These are facts and you will be deluding yourselves if you think that it is just a stray Gopalan or some Govindan Nair

or Kamath going there and kicking up trouble. It is not so. It has touched deeply the emotions and the urges of the whole people. Women and children are out. They protest. And that aspect of the matter I would commend to the Members on the opposite side who must seriously consider about it. Now, on this question I have been chided by Members on the other side. They referred to the so-called language mania, language phobia and all that. Why chide the communists? You take your own Congress organisation, the organisation set up by the Congress from 1921 onwards when Mahatma Gandhi had the Congress constitution formed. From 1921 onwards the Congress organisation's set up has been on linguistic basis. Is it your point, do you argue seriously that because the Congress functioned on a linguistic basis, it has promoted fissiparous tendencies, it has cultivated disunity in this country?

If linguistic basis is quite good for your Congress, it is quite good for other purposes, for administrative purposes. There is no question of language phobia or language mania. We have been accustomed to think along those lines, and you will yourself recognise having functioned for more than 35 years on this linguistic basis—the Congress and other organisations and I refer to other political parties also, they have been functioning on this basis—that they have only contributed to the unity of India and never contributed to the disruption of India. So that fear, that apprehension, that once you accept the linguistic basis the unity of India will be in danger is not quite correct. Now, mention has been made about violent behaviour, disorderly behaviour, and all that. I think, if I remember aright, it was Sri Parikh who said that even the working classes of Ahmedabad have learnt the lessons of non-violence. My information is correct—I have got information from the papers—the working classes of Ahmedabad of course were quite peaceful, we are glad of it, we are proud of it. They have taken a great path, they have registered their protest and they have organised hartals of course peacefully. It is good that this lesson of peaceful protest has been learnt by them. But then, may I ask why not your own administrators, your own followers who are running the administration, why this lesson of non-violence has been lost on them? Shooting people by the scores—you do it outside, and then if you come and sermonise to us on non-violence, well, Sir,

[Shri Perath Narayanan Nair.]

I beg to submit that that is not convincing.

I do not want to refer to other aspects of the matter because this problem of Gujarat is very important. But I am today more concerned with an equally important issue from a different angle. I refer to the Kerala issue. I have very little to say just at the moment about the points raised by Sri Hegde, about these border disputes and other things. Of course there are certain border disputes, but to us they are of a secondary nature, and friends from this side of the House, and also Shrimati Bharathi, referred to these vital things. But Sri Hegde had said that there was some little difference between the Communists on the other side of the Chandragiri river and the Communists on this side of the river. I would like to assure him that there is absolutely no division among us. From the very beginning the Communist Party has taken up a certain stand which we consider to be the correct stand, that village should be accepted as the basis and contiguity must be there, and on this basis the problem must be solved, and we Communists whether on this side or on that side of the Chandragiri river are not bound by any shallow loyalty. We accept that basis because of our deep conviction that on that basis alone a solution can be found for these border disputes and other things and Sri Hegde will find us Communists eminently reasonable. Only let him be satisfied about certain facts. We have absolutely no objection to a few villages, going this side or that side, though we are a small unit, but that will not stand in our way of doing justice to our neighbours. I am also glad that Sri Hegde recognises that it is on good neighbourliness that the future of our country depends. All our States are interdependent, and for promoting the real unity of India we have to work the different States in perfect understanding. So, in regard to Kerala that is not the main issue which we are concerned with. The issue which I want to bring before the House, in which I want the House to bear with me for a few minutes, refers to a wider question. Mr. Deputy Chairman, you know that a democratic set-up, a democratic administration has been denied to us in Travancore-Cochin, and if we are to follow the provisions of this Bill, it will be denied to us in the Kerala State also. I shall take a very objective view of the matter. I shall not rake up

past controversies. Now this question has two different aspects, the political aspect and the constitutional aspect. I do not want to get the two mixed up. What is this political aspect? In March last year the Congress Ministry there which was functioning on a bare majority, a precarious majority in the Travancore-Cochin Legislative Assembly, found that its strength was reduced through the resignation of 6 plus 2, that is, 8 members from their party. Now in a House of 118 they had a strength of 58, and because these 8 members resigned their strength got reduced to 50. Having no majority in that House, the Chief Minister Shri Panampalli Govinda Menon thought he would resign. Then—I am not going into the merits of those various arguments—the Rajpramukh, could not be persuaded that an alternative Ministry was possible. So the Rajpramukh recommended, the President acted, and the Parliament ratified, that there need be no democratic rule there. The administration was taken over by the President. Now that was the political situation there, I am not raising that point. My point is that an entirely different, entirely new political situation obtains there. My point is that, though in March last year there was no possibility of a stable Government, now in the new set-up there is all the possibility of a stable Government. The possibilities of a stable Government are worthwhile exploring, and I want this House and I want the Government to give us the opportunity. I shall explain the point. Now, we are quite happy about the provisions of the Bill regarding Kerala. We have worked for it, we have cherished the idea for a long time, and we assure you that we the people of Kerala will put forth our best efforts to make a success of this Kerala, not to disrupt the unity of India, not to promote fissiparous tendencies, but to develop our resources in unison with the resources of India. This attitude is in keeping with the spirit of the Malayalees as it is of any other nationality. That is the spirit with which we approach this problem.

Now, in this new set-up the district of Malabar is also added to the Travancore-Cochin State. We give away a portion in southern taluks, and we take on Malabar. When I say that a definitely new political situation has been brought about, I refer to this point that when Malabar is added on and when the four Tamil areas are taken off, the political set-up inside Kerala gets

changed. Formerly in a House of 118 the Congress majority got reduced to 50. Now because the Tamil taluks in the south have been taken away, the Congress voting strength has again been reduced by 11 members from those parts. They have no place in Kerala and they must be taken into the Madras Legislature. So their effective voting strength gets reduced to 39. Now, Malabar has been added. For Malabar, in the present Madras Legislative Assembly, we have got 30 members, out of whom 5 are Congressmen, 5 are Muslim Leaguers, 13 are P.S.P., and 7 are Communists. Now, you create a new interim Assembly—I am not asking for the resuscitation of the old Assembly, there may be constitutional difficulties for it—but what I want to suggest is that you can create a new interim Assembly for the whole of Kerala. In the new Kerala State consisting of the present territory plus Malabar there is all the possibility of a stable Government. The only thing I am emphasising is that the Congress will not have a majority. The Communists, the Praja Socialists and the R.S.P. people together will form 75 out of a new interim Assembly of 137. The possibility is there. Already those parties are working along those lines, and not only that but I want to call the attention of the House to one particular fact. When you join Malabar district to the Travancore State, Malabar has got some experience.

5 P.M.

There we have got a District Board functioning on adult franchise, may be, with limited powers. All the same, it is the most representative institution

there. There we have got a Communist as the President. We have not a single party there; the administration is carried on by the United Front, of which the major unit is the Communist Party. Now, if you look at the working of the District Board of Malabar during the last three years under Communist administration, you will find that they have functioned eminently well. They have secured the co-operation of the other parties, including the Congress. If Malabar is joined to Travancore-Cochin, our strength there would increase. In the new interim Assembly you will not get a Congress majority. You speak of democracy; you sermonise to us on the lessons of democracy. Do you want to stick to one-party rule? Would you not give a chance to the other parties also to function in this democracy and prove their mettle? In Malabar, in that limited field today, we are proving to the whole world that we can function very well. You may call us names; you may chide the Communist, but in the actual field of administration in so far as it has come to us, even within that limited sphere, we function well. If the people of Travancore-Cochin or the people of other parts of the country go there, they will also recognise that we are functioning well.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can continue on Monday. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday.

The House then adjourned at two minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 20th August 1956.